



Memorandum and Evaluation Criteria for Short Term Scientific Missions

CephsInAction – call 2015

The aim of a Short-Term Scientific Mission (STSM) shall be to contribute to the scientific objectives of a COST Action.

These Missions (Exchange Visits) are aimed at **strengthening the existing networks** by allowing scientists to go to an institution or laboratory in another COST Country **to foster collaboration, to learn a new technique or to take measurements using instruments and/or methods not available in their own institution/laboratory.** They are **particularly intended for young scientists.**

The STSMs call for the 2015 is open to two different “kinds” of STSM-projects based on:

1. prioritized research themes related with the “research needs” of different WGs
2. open themes

STSMs based on the “prioritized research themes” should contribute to fill some of the ‘holes’ envisaged in biology and welfare research on cephalopods, and/or to cover aspects that would be otherwise underestimated by locally-funded research.

The FA1301 STSM Committee, in agreement with the MC, encourages this year applications based on the following suggested priorities:

1. Establishing of the optimal conditions for eggs incubation, and hatchling health fitness in decapod and octopods species
2. Examination of natural living conditions of selected cephalopod species, towards defining optimal conditions for their husbandry
3. Selection of biomarkers as candidates of welfare and health assessment for cephalopods
4. Neurophysiological research in cephalopods
5. Exploring anesthesia and analgesia methodology in cephalopods to refine and deepen species-specific physiological requirements
6. Working towards a semantic modelling of Cephalopod Welfare



Assessment (general criteria)

The MC of the Action will make the scientific and budgetary assessment and take the final decision. The MC formally delegated during the [first MC Meeting](#) in Brussels (14 October, 2013) these tasks to the STSM coordinators, which assess proposals and agree on those which may be funded, in agreement to the Chair and the Vice-Chair, in order to avoid any conflict of interest. External advice may be sought.

Requisites

1. Both the home institution and the host institution should be located in a participating COST Action Country or Cooperation State (for COST Action FA1301: Israel).
2. STSMs must be carried out in a COST country other than the applicant's.
3. Compliance with Directive 2010/63/EU, in view of the fact that we have included it in our MoU and in the aims of the Statute of CephRes, acting as proposer and Grant Holder of this Action (see also evaluation sheet). It is suggested that for the first two calls of FA1301 STSMs, the compliance with Directive 2010/63/EU will be considered only for the sake of advice and recommendation. Applications will be checked, and projects monitored, by an expert on animal welfare and with experience in dealing with issues related with Directive 2010/63/EU. Applicants will be requested to adjust/provide clarification for their projects in the sake of the legislation, whenever appropriate. This will facilitate guidance and education, and will allow to increase the awareness of the applicants and CephRes participants in this important change in the way of thinking experiments with cephalopods.

Requisites (other)

The participation of PhD students and early stage researchers (i.e. early stage researchers with PhD title <8 years) is strongly encouraged in order to enhance their capacity and mobility.

Attention should be given to favor females in science and, in general, to the Gender Balance.

The following documents should be included:

- agreement of the host institution;
- letter of support from the home institution;
- curriculum vitae (in academic format);
- motivation letter;
- list of publications;
- pdf of the application from the e-COST platform.

General actions to be taken afterwards

Participants in STSMs should present their studies at a WG meeting subsequently to their STSMs and should also ensure a report for the website of the Action.



Evaluation

An evaluation score will be given considering the **proposal clarity**, **relevance for the Action**, **feasibility**, **planning** and expected **outputs**.

Scoring should be attributed from 1 to 6.

Scoring

- 1 - Very poor:** proposal illogical and not understandable. Not clearly linked to any WG.
- 2 - Poor:** proposal with limited understanding, planning and no clear objectives. Weakly linked to at least one WG.
- 3 - Fair:** proposal with some understanding, planning and objectives. Moderate links to at least one WG.
- 4 - Good:** good proposal but needs input to develop feasible STSM. Well linked to at least one WG.
- 5 - Very Good:** very good proposal. Well linked to at least one WG.
- 6 - Excellent:** proposal well designed in terms of planning, feasibility and projected outputs. Strongly linked to at least one WG.

To each one of the considered topics (i.e.: proposal clarity, feasibility, planning and expected outputs) a score has to be attributed (from 1 to 6 as above).

Each member of the FA1301 STSM Evaluation Committee (COST Action Chair, STSM leader, STSM vice-leader) will score each proposal independently. The Chair will collate the outcome of the independent evaluation, and communicate the final scoring after verifying the fulfillment of requisites and possible deviation from the expected budget of each proposal to the Grant Holder.

The proposals will be ranked and those with the highest scores will be financed, subject to the duration of the STSM applications and the available budget. The results will be published in the COST Action website.

Summary grid of the evaluation criteria

| Category | Notes | Scoring |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Requisites | Yes/Not | |
| Support Letter - Home Institute | | Yes/Not |
| Support Letter - Host Institute | | Yes/Not |
| Requirements of the FA1301 call rules | | Yes/Not |
| Evaluation | | |
| Motivation Letter | Convincing or Not Convincing | 1/0 |
| Work plan | Scores | 1-6 |
| Compliance with Directive | Yes/Not | Recommendations will be provided |
| Overall evaluation of the candidate | No more than three lines | |
| CV and publications | | |
| Budget Request | Acceptable or Not | |
| Travel | | Yes/Not |
| Subsistence | | Yes/Not |
| Daily rate | | Yes/Not |

Evaluation outcome

The evaluation outcome has to be communicated within one month after the deadline.