



MSCA IF

Keisuke Hatada

畑田 圭介

Groupe Théorie, Département Matériaux-Nanosciences,
Institut de Physique de Rennes, UMR UR1-CNRS 6251,
Université de Rennes1, France



What I applied:

MARIE CURIE ACTION:
INTRA-EUROPEAN FELLOWSHIPS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT (IEF)
Call Reference FP7-PEOPLE -2013-IEF

Present name:

H2020-MSCA-IF(Individual Fellowships)-EF(European Fellowships)

My background is Synchrotron Radiation physics (Theory),
in the project I do BEEM theory.



UNIVERSITÉ DE
RENNES 1



Rennes

IPR (Institut de Physique de Rennes) CNRS-Univ. Rennes 1




MSNano

General presentation

The people

Didier SEBILLEAU (coordinator) Anna TARANUKHINA Takashi FUJIKAWA



Hubert EBERT


Maurizio BENFATTO

Ziyu WU

Peter KRUGER Ondrej SIPR Rakesh CHOUBISA

D. SÉBILLEAU MSNANO Presentation

European FP7 Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (IRSES)
 From Sept/2012 to Aug/2016 => **RISE**



2.1 IEF-Funding Scheme 'Support for Training and Career Development of Researchers': Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowships for Career Development

Criteria				
S&T Quality (award) Threshold: 3, Weighting:25%	Training (award) Threshold: 3, Weighting:15%	Researcher (award) Threshold: 4, Weighting:25%	Implementation (selection) Weighting:15%	Impact (award) Threshold: 3.5; Weighting:20%
Priority in case of ex aequo				
3	2	1	5	4
Research/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal	Clarity and quality of the research training objectives for the researcher	Research experience **	Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host	Impact of competencies acquired during the fellowship on the future career prospects of the researcher, in particular through exposure to transferable skills training with special attention to exposure to the industry sector, where appropriate *
Appropriateness of research methodology and approach	Relevance and quality of additional research training as well as of transferable skills offered, with special attention to exposure to the industry sector, where appropriate *	Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc., taking into account the level of experience	Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the research project *	Contribution to career development, or re-establishment where relevant *
Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field	Measures taken by the host for providing quantitative and qualitative mentoring/tutoring	Independent thinking and leadership qualities	Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan	Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area
Timeliness and relevance of the project		Match between the fellow's profile and project	Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow *	Development of lasting cooperation and collaborations with other countries
Host research expertise in the field		Potential for reaching or re-enforcing a position of professional maturity *		Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness regarding the expected research results
Quality of the group/scientist in charge		Potential to acquire new knowledge		Impact of the proposed outreach activities *

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Decimal marks may be given.

Interpretation of the score:

- 0- The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1– Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2– Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
- 3– Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
- 4– Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
- 5– Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question.
Any shortcomings are minor.

About 27 pages

Strengths of the proposal:

Weaknesses of the proposal:

Evaluation

	1 st	2 nd	weight	threshold
1. S&T quality	4.1	4.8	5	3.00/5.00
2. Training	4.3	4.5	3	3.00/5.00
3. Researcher	4.2	4.7	5	4.00/5.00
4. Implementation	4.5	4.7	3	
5. Impact	3.9	4.7	4	3.50/5.00
TOTAL	83.5	93.9		

Risk management

Aim/objective concerned	Risk identified	Probability (high/medium/low)	Importance (high/medium/low)	Contingency plan proposed (alternative way to achieve the aim)
Theory	Failure to obtain a reasonable tunnelling effect	low	low	Lower the vacuum level Use of DVR
Experiment	No new results obtained	low	low	Use of existing results

Work Packages	Activity	Monitoring and reporting
WP1: Theory of BEEM		
Task 1.1 : Formulation of BEEM theory within partitioned MS framework	scientific	Monthly monitoring meetings Reporting meeting month 6
Task 1.2 : Derivation of MS theory with an external field	scientific	Monthly monitoring meetings Reporting meeting month 12
WP2: Coding		
Task 2.1 : Mastering of GPU coding	training	Monthly monitoring meetings
Task 2.2 : Implementation of MS-BEEM Fortran code and incorporation into the MsSpec package	scientific	Monthly monitoring meetings Reporting meeting month 24

Festival des sciences




Visiting 3 elementary schools

A la découvert de la Recherche



JASSO



Since 2014 from Chiba Univ.

22 students (B, M, PhD) for one month each

One Erasmus Mundus Master course (42000euro)

=> Visiting associate prof

Now applying ITN with aquatic scientists to study the impact of the contamination by synchrotron radiation

Thank you for your attention!!

