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ERC has a unique mission

- To encourage the highest quality research in Europe through competitive funding

- To support investigator-driven frontier research across all fields, on the sole basis of scientific excellence
ERC’s funding: it is part of H2020

For 2019, the budget is more than 2 billion euros, the highest ever since the beginning of the ERC.
ERC Structure

The European Commission
- Provides financing through the EU framework programmes
- Guarantees autonomy of the ERC
- Assures the integrity and accountability of the ERC
- Adopts annual work programmes as established by the Scientific Council

The ERC Scientific Council
- 21 prominent researchers proposed by an independent identification committee
- President appointed following recommendation of an independent committee
- Appointed by the Commission (4 years, renewable once)
- Establishes overall scientific strategy; annual work programmes (incl. calls for proposals, evaluation criteria); peer review methodology; selection and accreditation of experts
- Controls quality of operations and management
- Ensures communication with the scientific community

The ERC Executive Agency
- Executes annual work programme as established by the Scientific Council
- Implements calls for proposals and provides information and support to applicants
- Organises peer review evaluation
- Establishes and manages grant agreements
- Administers scientific and financial aspects and follow-up of grant agreements
- Carries out communications activities and ensures information dissemination to ERC stakeholders
The ERCEA

The ERC Executive Agency

- Implements calls for proposals
- Organises peer review evaluation
- Establishes and manages grant agreements
- Administers scientific and financial aspects
- Carries out communications activities

ERC Scientific Officers

- Work closely with the panel members
- Manage all practical aspects of the evaluations
- Carry out scientific follow-up
What do ERC grants offer?

Creative Freedom of the Individual Grantee

ERC offers independence, recognition & visibility

- to work on a research topic of own choice, with a team of own choice
- to gain true financial autonomy for 5 years
- to negotiate with the host institution the best conditions of work
- to attract top team members (EU and non-EU) and collaborators
- to move with the grant to any place in Europe if necessary (portability of grants)
- to attract additional funding and gain recognition; ERC is a quality label
ERC Grant Schemes – Who can apply?

- **Researchers (PIs)**
  - Any nationality, age or current place of work

- **In conjunction with a Host Institution (HI)**
  - Based in the EU or an Associated Country (spend min. 50% of total working time)
  - Individual research team: Researcher has freedom to choose national or trans-national team, if scientific added value proven

- **ERC Grants are portable**
Particular emphasis on.....

Frontier of science, scholarship and engineering, i.e.

- Multi- or interdisciplinary proposals which cross boundaries between different fields of research, or
- Pioneering proposals addressing new and emerging fields of research, or
- Proposals introducing unconventional, innovative approaches and scientific inventions.
## ERC Funding Schemes

### Starting Grant
- one PI
- 2-7 years after PhD
- up to €1.5M (+1M)
- for 5 years

### Consolidator Grant
- one PI
- 7-12 years after PhD
- up to €2M (+1M)
- for 5 years

### Advanced Grant
- one PI
- 10 year track-record of significant research achievements
- up to €2.5M (+1M)
- for 5 years

### Proof-of-Concept
- for ERC grant holders only
  - supporting innovative potential of ideas from ERC projects
  - up to €150,000
  - for 1 year

### Synergy Grant
- Re-launched 2018
  - 2-4 PIs at any career stage
  - up to €10 M (+4M)
  - for 6 years
  - **NEW** (2019): one PI can be based outside EU/AC
Design of the Synergy call in a nutshell

2018: Call budget: 250 M€
2019: 400 M€

Grant size: up to 10 M€ + 4 M€ for 6 years

2018: 25-30 projects
2019: 40-45 projects

HI in general to be in EU or Associated Country (AC)
SyG2019-2020: possible for one PI to be outside of EU or AC

2-3-4 Principal Investigators

No restrictions on their location

SyG2020 call to be open for submission in July 2019

3 Step evaluation: with interviews for all PIs in step 3

≥50% of working time in EU or AC and ≥30% of working time on the ERC project
SyG2019-2020: it does not apply to the Principal Investigator applying with a Host Institution outside of EU or AC

SyG2020: call to close for submission on 5 November 2019
Budget: 350 M€: around 40 grants to be funded
ERC achievements
Priority to young scientists

Two-thirds of ERC grants to early-stage Principal Investigators.

+ 40 000 PhD and post-doc researchers working in ERC teams.

Reported team members (2015)
head count (1901 projects; almost 14,000 team members)
ERC schemes are highly competitive

Average success rate 12%

**Starting/Consolidator Grant**

- 2007: 3.4%
- 2009: 10.2%
- 2010: 15.8%
- 2011: 12.1%
- 2012: 12.2%
- 2013: 9.2%
- 2014: 11.7%
- 2015: 12.2%
- 2016: 11.3%

**Advanced Grant**

- 2008: 13.9%
- 2009: 16.1%
- 2010: 13.8%
- 2011: 13.4%
- 2012: 14.1%
- 2013: 12.3%
- 2014: 8.5%
- 2015: 14.4%
### Proposal submission

**ERC Work Programme 2019 calendar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERC calls</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Call Opening</th>
<th>Submission Deadline(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>580 M€</strong></td>
<td>1 August 2018</td>
<td>17 October 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC-2019-StG</td>
<td>(390 grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synergy Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>400 M€</strong></td>
<td>2 August 2018</td>
<td>8 November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC-2019-SyG</td>
<td>(48 grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidator Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>602 M€</strong></td>
<td>24 October 2018</td>
<td>7 February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC-2019-CoG</td>
<td>(314 grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Grants</strong></td>
<td><strong>391 M€</strong></td>
<td>21 May 2019</td>
<td>29 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC-2019-AdG</td>
<td>(166 grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proof of Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>25 M€</strong></td>
<td>6 October 2018</td>
<td>22 January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC-2019-PoC</td>
<td>(167 grants)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 September 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERC and Turkey
ERC Funded Projects by Country of Host Institution

- **Advanced Grant**
- **Consolidator Grant**
- **Starting Grant**

*Host country (as of 26/03/2019)*

| Country | UK | DE | FR | NL | CH | IT | IL | ES | BE | SE | AT | DK | FI | NO | IE | PT | HU | EL | CZ | PL | TR | CY | LU | EE | SI | RO | IS | BG | HR | RS | LT | LV | MT | SK |
|---------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Grants  | 1895 | 1381 | 1129 | 774 | 633 | 500 | 493 | 488 | 322313 | 246 | 190 | 156 | 10996 | 91 | 65 | 53 | 30 | 16 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
Success Rate by Country of Host Institution

Success rate (2007-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>EU15</th>
<th>EU13</th>
<th>A.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Host Institutions in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host institution</th>
<th>Starting Grants</th>
<th>Consolidated Grants</th>
<th>Advanced Grants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koc University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilkent University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Technical University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul Bilgi University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of ERC grantees in Turkish Host institutions with ERC Proof of Concept funding: 3

Total funding: about €450,000
ERC Evaluation procedure
Evaluation of Proposals:
Review procedure for StG, CoG and AdG

**STEP 1**
Remote assessment by Panel members of section 1 – PI and synopsis (part B1)

Panel meeting

Score: B or C

Proposals retained for step 2:
Score A

**STEP 2**
Remote assessment by Panel members and reviewers of full proposal (B1+B2)

Panel meeting + interview (StG and CoG)

Score: B

Ranked list of proposals:
Score A

Feedback to applicants
Evaluation criteria
The questions are mentioned in the ERC Work Programme

Individual Evaluation Report - step 1

- Criterion 1 - RESEARCH PROJECT
  Current score: - / 5.0 ; Threshold 0

Your score: *
☐ 1.0 - Non-competitive  ☐ 1.5  ☐ 2.0 - Good  ☐ 2.5  ☐ 3.0 - Very Good  ☐ 3.5  ☐ 4 - Excellent  ☐ 4.5  ☐ 5 - Exceptional

Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research project
To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?
To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines)?
To what extent is the proposed research high risk/high gain (i.e. if successful the payoffs will be very significant, but there is a higher-than-normal risk that the research project does not entirely fulfill its aims)?
Comments: *

Scientific Approach
To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high risk/high gain (based on the Extended Synopsis)?
Comments: *

0 / 5000 characters
- **Criterion 2 - PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR**

  Current score: - / 5.0, Threshold 0

  Please click here for more information

  **Your score:** *

  - 1.0 - Non-competitive
  - 1.5
  - 2.0 - Good
  - 2.5
  - 3.0 - Very Good
  - 3.5
  - 4 - Excellent
  - 4.5
  - 5 - Exceptional

  **To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?** *

  - Non-competitive
  - Good
  - Very Good
  - Excellent
  - Exceptional

  **To what extent does the PI provide evidence of creative independent thinking?** *

  - Non-competitive
  - Good
  - Very Good
  - Excellent
  - Exceptional

  **To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?** *

  - Non-competitive
  - Good
  - Very Good
  - Excellent
  - Exceptional

  **Comments:**

  [Enter comments here]

  0 / 2000 characters

- **SUGGESTED REMOTE REFEREE FOR STEP 2 EVALUATION**

  Add Remote Referee
Evaluation of Proposals:
Review procedure for StG, CoG and AdG

**STEP 1**
Remote assessment by Panel members of section 1 – PI and synopsis (part B1)
Panel meeting
Proposals retained for step 2:
Score **A**

**STEP 2**
Remote assessment by Panel members and reviewers of full proposal (B1+B2)
Panel meeting + interview (StG and CoG)
Ranked list of proposals:
Score **A**

Feedback to applicants
Evaluation of Proposals:
Review procedure for StG, CoG and AdG

**STEP 1**
Remote assessment by Panel members of section 1 – PI and synopsis (part B1)
Panel meeting
Proposals retained for step 2: Score A

**STEP 2**
Remote assessment by Panel members and reviewers of full proposal (B1+B2)
Panel meeting + interview (StG and CoG)
Ranked list of proposals: Score A

Feedback to applicants
Step 2: Reviewers have to respond to additional evaluation questions

Individual Evaluation Report - step 2

- Criterion 1 - RESEARCH PROJECT
  Current score: - / 5.0 ; Threshold 0

  Your score: *
  ○ 1.0 - Non-competitive  ○ 1.5  ○ 2.0 - Good  ○ 2.5  ○ 3.0 - Very Good  ○ 3.5  ○ 4 - Excellent  ○ 4.5  ○ 5 - Exceptional

  Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research project
  To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?
  To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines)?
  To what extent is the proposed research high risk/high gain (i.e. if successful the payoffs will be very significant, but there is a higher-than-normal risk that the research project does not entirely fulfil its aims)?
  Comments: *

  Scientific Approach
  To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high risk/high gain?
  To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?
  To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodology?
  To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources and PI commitment adequate and properly justified?
  Comments: *

  0 / 5000 characters
**Evaluation - StG/CoG/AdG Peers**

- **Panel members:** typically 375 / call (SyG:~90)
  - High-level scientists
  - Recruited by ScC from all over the world: ~14% from outside Europe
  - About 12-16 members plus a chair person

- **Remote Referees:** typically 2000 / call
  - Evaluate only a small number of proposals
  - Similar to normal practise in peer-reviewed journals
ERC Panel Members by Country of Host Institution and Gender

Averaged over 2007-2017 29% of the ERC panel members were women.
Preparing and submitting a Proposal

Hints and tips
Preparing the proposal

Quality is the sole evaluation criterion

Evaluation of quality at two levels:

- **Quality of the Research Project**
  - Ground-breaking nature
  - Potential impact
  - Scientific Approach

- **Quality of the Principal Investigator**
  - Intellectual capacity
  - Creativity
  - Commitment
Preparing an application
Check the already Funded Projects

Menu allows searching by Funding Scheme, Research Area, Country of Host Institution.
Preparing your proposal
Check past panel members for the call

IMPORTANT: You are not allowed to contact panel members of the call you wish to apply to about the evaluation! Any such contact can lead to exclusion from the call.
ERC Starting and Consolidator Grants
The applicant’s profile

“Am I competitive enough?”

- Potential for research independence
- Evidence of scientific maturity
  - For example, at least one (StG) /several (CoG) publications without participation of PhD supervisor

Condition StG: PhD at least 2 and up to 7 years before 1 January 2020 (for 2020 call, which will open in July 2019)
Condition CoG: PhD over 7 and up to 12 years before 1 January 2020

Promising track-record of early achievements

- Significant publications
- Invited presentations in conferences
- Funding, patents, awards, prizes

All these need to be shown in your proposal that will include your CV and an early achievements track record.
Shall I apply now or wait another year?
2018 STG-COG-ADG Calls
Age of Grantees

2018 Grantees by age and success rate

age on 1 Jan 2018

STG
COG
ADG
SR by age

Success rate

# funded proposals
ERC Advanced Grants
The applicant’s profile

“Am I competitive enough?”

- Exceptional leader in terms of originality and significance of your research
- Excellent track record and achievements during the last 10 years (this time window can be extended in case of eligible career breaks)

**Substantial track-record of significant research achievements**

- as appropriate for the field
- publications in peer-reviewed journals, monographs, invited presentations, funding, patents, awards, prizes
- Organisation of international conferences
- Major contributions to the early careers of excellent researchers
- Bibliometric data may be one of the proxies used (where appropriate) among many others
Online Submission
Proposal structure

Administrative forms (Part A)

1 – General information
2 – Administrative data of participating organisations
3 – Budget- resources section
4 – Ethics
5 – Call specific questions

Annexes
Commitment of the host institution, PhD certificates, certificates on extension of eligibility, ethics issues etc

Part B1 (submitted as pdf)
*Evaluated in Step 1 & Step 2*

Text box - Cross-domain nature explanation
a – Extended synopsis 5 pages
b – Curriculum vitae 2 pages
Appendix – Funding ID
c - Track-record 2 pages

Part B2 (submitted as pdf)
*NOT evaluated in Step 1 (Step 2 only)*

Scientific proposal 15 pages
a – State-of-the-art and objectives
b – Methodology
c – Resources: from 2019 AdG call: part A

→ Read the Information for Applicants
Preparing your proposal
Choosing descriptors

• Descriptors and free keywords may influence:
  – Evaluation Panel
  – Panel members
  – Whether a cross-panel evaluation is necessary

Rumour: The more cross-panel descriptors I indicate, the higher the funding chances, since I emphasize like this the interdisciplinarity of my proposal.

✗ NOT true: even though these are used to allocate proposals to Panel Members, once the proposals are allocated, Panel Members do not see the keywords and descriptors used. They see your justification of cross-panel aspects in the box provided in part B1.
Choosing the right Panel is important in StG/CoG/AdG (In Synergy grants the proposals are submitted to a single panel)

- Proposals are assigned to the Panel of the PI's choice
- The PI can flag one "Secondary Review Panel": the PI must explain the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal in Part B1
- Choose your descriptors/free keywords carefully!
- The Panel Chair can request cross-panel review(s)
- Transfer of proposals between panels may occur if:
  - there is a clear mistake on part of the PI
  - the necessary expertise is available in a different panel
- But: In case of cross-panel or cross-domain proposals, evaluation by members of other panels possible, without a transfer
Preparing your proposal

💡 Choosing the right Panel is important

**Rumour**: Choose the panel "strategically" in order to increase chances of success

❌ **NOT true**: The budget is distributed among the scientific panels as a function of demand ➔ success rate is equal amongst panels ➔ choose the Panel that is right for your proposal!

If you choose the "wrong" one because it has an X, Y, Z reputation, you will most probably hurt your proposal's chances of success!

---

**ADG COG STG 2015-2017**

- **Legend**
  - Green: number funded
  - Black: SR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th># funded proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS4</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS6</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS8</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS9</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE1</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE2</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE4</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE5</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE6</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE7</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE8</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE9</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH2</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH3</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH4</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH5</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success rate across panels is relatively consistent.
.. Questions to ask yourself when writing PART B1

**Research Project**

- Is my project new, **innovative**, bringing in new solutions/theories?
- Does it promise to go **substantially beyond the state of the art**?
- Why is my project **important**? **Think Big**!
- How can I **prove/support** my case? Have I proven the project's **feasibility**?
- Is it **timely**? (Why wasn't it done in the past?)
- What's the **risk**? Have I proposed **alternatives**?
- Have I given a realistic picture of my **collaborations**? Show that it is you who will be leading the project.

**Principal Investigator**

- Why am I the **best/only person** to carry it out? Know your competitors
- Am I able to work **independently**, and to manage a 5-year project with a substantial budget?
- Am I **internationally competitive**?
- Have I shown my **scientific leadership** in my CV?
When writing your CV

- Remember that the CV/Track Record are as important as your project!
- Explain what has been your own contribution to your key publications (incl. papers published without your PhD and postdoc supervisor).
- If you know that you have gaps or other issues in your CV (e.g. co-authored publications), explain them.
- Describe accurately any other activity which can indicate scientific maturity.
- Do not forget to put your h-index, total number of publications and citations (with and without self-citations)!
- Fully fill in your Funding ID

Rumour: One needs publications in Nature/Science/High Impact Factor journals to succeed.

✗ NOT true: However, publishing only with senior scientists (former supervisors) may raise doubts about maturity/scientific independence.
Preparing your Proposal:

Differences between Parts B1 and B2

- Pay particular attention to the **ground-breaking nature** of the research project. State-of-the-art is not enough.
- **Know your competitors** – what is the state of play and why is your idea and scientific approach outstanding?
- **Part B1: concise and clear presentation** is crucial (not all evaluators are experts in your field, panel members act as generalists).
- **Outline of the methodological approach** is recommended (feasibility assessment).
- **Show your scientific independence** in your CV (model CV provided in the part B1 template).

**STEP 1**

Only Part B1 is assessed by Panel members.
.. Differences between PART B1 and PART B2

- Do not repeat the synopsis, go into details on your methodology and work plan!
- Make sure that there is an obvious link between B1 and B2
- Explain hypothesis or provide preliminary data (if it exists)
- Make sure that the quantitative and qualitative differences to the state of the art are clear and referenced - show you did your homework!
- Provide alternative strategies to mitigate risks
- Make use of the evaluation criteria (Ground breaking nature, Potential impact, Scientific Approach) - use them as title/subtitle

Rumour: I need preliminary results.

❌ NOT true: however explain how the literature supports your "hypothesis".
.. Differences between PART B1 and PART B2

- Make the project "easy to read and attractive" – use paragraphs and correct typos!
- Check coherence of figures
- Use full space available (15 p.)
- Make sure you give full references (these are excluded from page count)
- You should add some sort of timeline
- Explain involvement of team members and collaborators (ERC proposals are NOT collaborative)
- Justify requested resources – explain your budget properly
... Explain your budget properly!
Part A3 of the submission forms: resources section => it will be evaluated in step 2 as a section of part B2

- Budget analysis carried out in Step 2 evaluation.
- Panels have responsibility to ensure that resources requested are reasonable and well justified.
- Budget cuts need to be justified on a proposal-by-proposal basis.

**Not explained costs are often cut!**

... Ask for funding for Open Access – this is obligatory in Horizon2020!

**Rumour:** Ask for more money, the reviewers will anyhow cut it down.

**NOT true:** Unexplained or non-motivated requests can be cut down, so if you artificially inflate your budget, the extra funding will be indeed cut.
3 - Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Short Name</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Direct costs</th>
<th>Other direct costs</th>
<th>A. Total Direct Costs</th>
<th>B. Indirect Costs</th>
<th>C1. Subcontracting Costs</th>
<th>C2. Costs of indirect costs not used on the beneficiary’s premises</th>
<th>Total Estimated Eligible Costs</th>
<th>Requested EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Other Personnel costs</td>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>Equipment - including major equipment</td>
<td>Consumables incl. fieldwork and animal costs</td>
<td>Publications (incl. Open Access fees) and Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chancellor, Masters And Scholars Of The University Of Oxford</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>123000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>385000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td>361000</td>
<td>123000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>760000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>385000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ONE budget line per beneficiary / linked third party
- All costs have to be described and justified in the text box below the budget table
- Justify requested resources / Explain involvement of team members
Organize explanations heading by heading (use terminology of the budget table)

If you request additional funding - you must describe and justify this request clearly in a separate paragraph

Remember to list the PI’s time commitment!
Have **clear and representative slides** and focus on SCIENCE!

- **Anticipate questions.**
- Know the **details** of your proposal and methods, as well as your research area – who are your main competitors/collaborators?
- Your last slide is normally left on the screen during the questions/answers section of your interview
- Bring **additional slides** on new supporting data, if you have, and for possible explanations.
- **Don't over-explain your CV**
When the panel asks questions, keep your reply clear and concise. The more questions they ask the more details you can clarify.

Keep the time.

**PRACTISE, PRACTISE, PRACTISE, PRACTISE!!!!!**

**Rumour**: Choose your Acronym in alphabetical order, interviews are planned alphabetically.

**NOT true**: the important thing is to choose an easy-to-remember acronym since this helps identifying the project during discussions!

**Rumour**: Late afternoon interviews have less chance, PMs are tired.

**NOT true**: you need to "shake" the PMs up no matter what time of day!
In order to make the evaluation process more effective, the Scientific Council has introduced re-submission restrictions.

**STEP 1**

- You have to wait 2 years before re-applying.

**STEP 2**

- You can apply next year.

I did not get the grant, can I apply next year?
Typical reasons for rejection

Research Project
- **Scope**: Too narrow ↔ too broad/unfocussed
- Incremental research
- Collaborative project, several PIs
- Work plan not detailed enough/unclear
- Insufficient risk management

Principle Investigator (PI)
- Insufficient track-record
- Insufficient (potential for) independence

Before Redressing: see what you could you have done/explained/presented better before blaming the process!
- Differing scientific opinion is **not a motivation for redress**
- An obvious mistake however might result in a re-evaluation
A few tips and advice

- Be ambitious and "daring"; panels instructed to seek out high-risk research
- Grab interest and attention of readers/reviewers
- Remember that Part B1 will be seen by "generalists" (panel members)
- If you make it to Step 2, reviewers see both B1 and B2, so do not repeat/duplicate part B1 in part B2
- Do not include unnecessary partners and collaborators; it is not supposed to be a "consortium"
- Justify requested resources – explain your budget properly
Contrary to what you may think.....

- ... ERC funds 'frontier research', including applied research
- ... publication record is not decisive in selection decisions
- ... the Host Institution is not an evaluation criterion
- ... no indication that native English speakers are more likely to succeed
- ... ERC encourages not to delay in submitting
- ... the budget is distributed among the scientific panels as a function of demand, thus submitting to particular panels does neither increase nor decrease the chances
Contrary to what you may think.....

- ERC funds "frontier research", including applied research.
- The budget is distributed among the scientific panels as a function of demand.
- The panel descriptors do not represent ERC scientific priorities.
- The success rate is virtually flat across the eligibility window (StG, CoG).
- The Host Institution is not an evaluation criterion.
ERC encourages PIs

- ... not to delay in submitting a proposal
- ... gain experience from evaluation
- ... read evaluators comments
- ... redraft proposal
- ... reapply when possible
- Success rates from re-applicants are typically 1.5 times higher than call success rates
ERC grantees 2007-2017
Applications before and after funding
7514 grantees

- Unsuccessful application
- Successful application
Some useful tools and links

- Read Information for Applicants and Work Programme
- View the step-by-step video Introduction to application process, including tips & tricks for the interview https://vimeo.com/94179654
- Consult ERC website for latest funding opportunities, view ERC funded projects
The ERC: Some take-home messages

Do apply!

and

Re-apply!

The ERC:

- Has lean procedures for proposal evaluation and grant management

- Keeps administrative hassle away from you

- Lets you do what you do best:

Excellent Research!
The European Research Council

- More information: erc.europa.eu
  or watch: https://player.vimeo.com/video/154715819

- Sign up for news alerts: erc.europa.eu

- Follow us on:
  - www.facebook.com/EuropeanResearchCouncil
  - twitter.com/ERC_Research
  - www.linkedin.com/company/european-research-council