



DDS-MAP

THE DYNAMIC DIGITAL SKILLS FOR MEDICAL AND ALLIED PROFESSIONS
COORDINATION OF A PROJECT GRANT

PROFESSOR JOHN WELLS (SETU)

ANDREAS DALLUEGE (IBK)

FLORIAN SCHEIBEIN (SETU)

Conceptualising DDS-MAP

- ▶ Understanding the call – call was very dense
- ▶ Ensure you have a clear concept – what you want to do, why, how, impact and sustainable
- ▶ Important that your partners have relevant track records for the call
- ▶ Bringing together a consortium of HEIs (Medical, Nursing, Education and Digital Technology), NGOs, health authority and health insurers to develop new training module provision informed by a co-creation process with stakeholders DDS-MAP

Addressing the Call Elements in writing

- ▶ You should establish a 'tight' writing team
- ▶ Project proposals should address ALL elements of the call (remember how dense it was?)
- ▶ Proposals need to clearly identify how they interface with EU policy (not just health policies)
- ▶ Proposal had to include an assessment of the needs and the description of the intervention logic – in our case this included
 - ▶ Demonstrating how proposed programme would address both existing and future skills gaps
 - ▶ How it would upskill and reskill
 - ▶ How it would interface with micro credential agenda

Avoiding Hostages to Fortune – an example

- ▶ Don't over claim what you will do / achieve
- ▶ A comment from the assessor
- ▶ 'While its plan regarding micro-credentialing is sound in general, it is not fully clear whether the proposed activities of outreach to professional bodies will be enough to convince them to take on or buy into this project's efforts.'
- ▶ Our response
- ▶ 'DDS-MAP will promote micro-credentials to these bodies in terms of recognition of skills development within health care. Clearly, it is not possible to give guarantees in this regard, however, DDS-MAP is committed to engaging with the accreditation bodies in this regard and the DDS MAP consortium contains significant HEIs in the field of health care professional training in their respective jurisdictions which should guarantee that professional bodies will at the very minimum engage with them on this subject. In addition, we point out, that micro credentials are an EU policy commitment (the Final Report of the European Commission's A European Approach to Micro-Credentials (2020) which should ensure that accrediting bodies will engage with it seriously.'

Operationalising the concept 1

| | Project Quarters | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Project management and coordination, ethics | | | | | IR | | | | | | |
| Dissemination & establishing sustainability | CP | | | | CP | | | | CP | | |
| Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Survey and analysis training needs per country and per sector to inform module content and delivery | | | | DR | | | | | | | |
| Content development of four modules to deliver upskilling and reskilling | | | | | | | | DR | | | |
| Localising the module content into partner regions and testing the language versions with selected trainees | | | | | | | | DR | | | |
| Design & implement a delivery platform with augmented and virtual reality features | | | | | | | | DR | | | |
| Delivering and validating the modules with target group participants | | | | | | | | | | DR | |

- ▶ Make a first rough definition of WPs and how they spread over the time

Operationalising the concept 2

| WP | Tasks | Lead | PC | | QAM | | HEI | | | | | | | | | | Total | | | |
|------------|---|------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----|------|
| | | | Partners | | SETU | IBK | UCD | UM | OST | UNIUD | KU | UNIOS | MUL | GAIA | ASLT | EASPD | | BEFO | MTA | RCMC |
| | | | Member state | IE | DE | IE | SL | DE | IT | LT | HR | PL | ES | IT | BE | LV | | ES | LV | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | | | | |
| WP2 | Dissemination & establishing sustainability | 12 | 4,4 | 2,7 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,8 | 2,05 | 2,8 | 9 | 2,05 | 2,05 | 2,8 | 47,45 | | |
| 2.1 | Implementing, maintaining and continually updating a project website and community of practice | 12 | 0,5 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 1,8 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 0,2 | 4,90 | | |
| 2.2 | User friendly CI branding and design (Logo, website, policy briefs, academic posters, ...) | 12 | 0,25 | 0,25 | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1,50 | | |
| 2.3 | Developing and publishing a Communications and Sustainability Strategy with a BMC for post-project activities | 12 | 0,5 | 1 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 1,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 5,50 | | |
| 2.4 | Ongoing outreach and engagement with key stakeholders (media, community groups etc.) | 12 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,75 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 4,00 | | |
| 2.5 | Promotion & dissemination via stakeholder workshops, seminars & international conferences | 12 | 0,8 | 0,35 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 3,1 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 0,75 | 12,50 | | |
| 2.6 | Organising and running a workshop with Accreditation Agencies | 1 | 0,35 | | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | | | | 0,25 | 2,35 | | |
| 2.7 | Organising and running a final conference | 1 | 0,5 | 0,25 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,35 | 0,1 | 0,35 | 0,1 | 0,1 | 0,35 | 3,95 | | |
| 2.8 | Relevant project results made freely available according to FAIR principles | 1 | 0,75 | 0,15 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,25 | 0,5 | 0,5 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,5 | 6,15 | | |
| 2.9 | Scientific publications | 1 | 0,5 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,5 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 0,25 | 4,00 | | |
| | No. of Persons travelling for this WP | | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 58 | | |
| | Subcontracting | | | | | | | | | | | | 12400 | | | | | 12.400 | | |
| | Open access publication fees | | 3.000 | | 3.000 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 3.000 | 3.000 | | 3.000 | 3.000 | | | 3.000 | 33.000 | | |
| | Conference attendance | | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 30.000 | | |
| | Other costs for this WP | | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 2.000 | 30.000 | | |

- ▶ Define Tasks per WP
- ▶ Allocate efforts per Partner
- ▶ Define and allocate travel, investments and other costs for each WP

Financial Planning – Partner Costs

- ▶ Identifying and dealing with the ambiguities of cost categories
- ▶ “normalise” the labour-cost units to allow a common calculation basis for all partner regions
- ▶ Make sure that similar tasks are planned with similar resources for all partners
- ▶ Do not allow any “budget” discussions before that work-load distribution is fixed as a first draft

Engaging with the financial portal

▶ Don't panic!
... when you see the full budget details for the first time.

▶ Remember: It all is the same data as in your operational table – just spread out much wider!

| CONSOLIDATED COSTS PER WORK PACKAGE (PROJECT) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--|--|--|---------------------|
| PROJECT COSTS PER WORK PACKAGE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | A. Employee A.2 + A.3 Natural personnel under direct contract and executed personne | | B. Subcontracting costs | C. Purchase costs | | | | | D. Other cost categories | | E. Indirect costs <small>(C.1 + C.2 + C.3 + C.4 + C.5 + C.6 + C.7 + C.8 + C.9 + C.10 + C.11 + C.12 + C.13 + C.14 + C.15 + C.16 + C.17 + C.18 + C.19 + C.20 + C.21 + C.22 + C.23 + C.24 + C.25 + C.26 + C.27 + C.28 + C.29 + C.30)</small> | Total |
| | A.1 | A.4 SME owners | | C.1 Travel and subsistence | C.1 Travel | C.1 Accomodation | C.1 Subsistence | C.2 Equipment | C.3 Other goods, works and services | D.1 Financial support to third parties | | |
| PARTICIPANT [SETU] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 326.165,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 10.000,20 | 4.500,00 | 3.500,10 | 2.000,10 | 4.415,83 | 7.949,50 | 0,00 | 24.397,14 | 372.927,67 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [IBK] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 146.240,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 0,00 | 4.550,00 | 0,00 | 11.045,31 | 168.835,45 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [NUJED UCD] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 161.868,25 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 4.415,83 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 12.647,90 | 193.332,12 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [LUN] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 202.050,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,06 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,03 | 1.400,03 | 5.599,00 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 15.543,43 | 237.592,49 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [OSTFALIA] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 146.785,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 6.515,83 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 11.739,07 | 179.440,04 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [LUNUD] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 147.109,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 5.900,10 | 3.150,00 | 1.750,05 | 1.000,05 | 5.299,00 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 11.599,57 | 177.307,67 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [KLAIPEDOS] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 90.950,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 2.049,50 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 7.517,97 | 114.917,61 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [DRAZ] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 91.210,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 2.561,88 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 7.572,04 | 115.744,00 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [MUL] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 146.200,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 6.515,83 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 11.698,12 | 178.814,09 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [GAJA] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 138.200,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 0,00 | | 0,00 | 10.472,01 | 160.072,15 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [ASL Terano] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 107.579,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 0,00 | | 0,00 | 8.538,54 | 130.517,68 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [EASPD] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 119.361,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 0,00 | 7.684,00 | 0,00 | 9.383,16 | 143.428,30 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [BEFO] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 39.255,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 0,00 | 4.400,00 | 0,00 | 3.545,86 | 54.201,00 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [MUTUALIA] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 118.300,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 5.000,10 | 2.250,00 | 1.750,05 | 1.000,05 | 2.649,50 | 4.400,00 | 0,00 | 9.124,47 | 139.474,07 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PARTICIPANT [BSU SOKK] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Proposal Stage) | 85.015,00 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 7.000,14 | 3.150,00 | 2.450,07 | 1.400,07 | 4.415,83 | 7.400,00 | 0,00 | 7.268,17 | 111.099,14 |
| TOTAL COSTS PARTICIPANT (Grant Preparation Stage) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grand Total All Partners | 2.066.287,25 | 0,00 | 0,00 | 104.902,00 | 47.700,00 | 36.401,00 | 20.801,00 | 44.438,04 | 99.983,50 | 0,00 | 162.092,76 | 2.477.703,55 |

Issues we had to manage

- ▶ Reminding partners about differences between salaries and labour costs
- ▶ Dealing with “hobby-topics” of specific partners
- ▶ Dealing with different depreciation rates in Europe
- ▶ Understanding the EU-tables work with several decimal points

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--|
| Total costs | 168.835,45 | |
| Single Funding rate (%) | 80% | |
| Maximum EU contribution | 135.068,36 | |
| Requested EU contribution | 135.068,35 | |
| EU CONTRIBUTION | 135.068,35 | |

Getting the award

- ▶ Understanding the evaluation issues
- ▶ Reformulating the proposal – with change tracking tables

Contract negotiation

- ▶ Adding new demands
- ▶ Reducing Deliverables and Milestones
- ▶ Fine-tuning the partner budgets to reflect requested changes; e.g. sub-contracting → own labour efforts
- ▶ Alignment of activities with states objectives
- ▶ Addition of new indicators and increased clarity around impact
- ▶ Updating main document (removing text, adding content, new page numbers)
- ▶ Dissemination level (public versus private)
- ▶ Salary clarifications

Engaging with the portal

- ▶ Learning curve for a new portal
- ▶ Traffic light system and stages
- ▶ Partner validation issues (financial reports, verification as separate entities)
- ▶ Alignment of financial data with portal figures
- ▶ Deliverables, Milestones and Risks
- ▶ Communication and Dissemination Activities
- ▶ Event reporting (gender)

Dealing with Alerts

- ▶ Frequent cycles of back and forth
- ▶ Deadlines
- ▶ Be careful pressing the submit button!

Don't forget consortium agreements

- ▶ We used the Horizon template
- ▶ Issues identified included issues around clarity around legal signatories, conflict resolution, communication, intellectual property and data management