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 Introduction

European Research Council

ERC Proposal Writing

Marie Skłodowska Curie Fellowships
The main Funding Axes of Horizon 2020

**I. Excellence Science**
- European Research Council
- Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions
- Future and Emerging Technologies
- Research Infrastructures

**II. Industrial Leadership**
- Enabling & Industrial Technologies
  - Information and Communication Technologies
  - Nanotechnologies, Advanced Materials, Advanced Manufacturing and Processing, and Biotechnology
  - Space
- Access to risk finance
- Innovation in SME

**III. Societal Challenges**
- 7 Challenges
  - Health, demographic change and wellbeing
  - Food security, sustainable agriculture, marine and maritime research and the bio-economy
  - Secure, clean and efficient energy
  - Smart, green and integrated transport
  - Climate action, resource efficiency and raw materials
  - Inclusive and reflective societies
  - Secure societies
Participant Portal

RESEARCH & INNOVATION
Participant Portal

Funding Opportunities

- Horizon 2020 - EU research funding from 2014
- Seventh Framework Programme (FP7)
- Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP)
- other research and innovation programmes

Horizon 2020 is the new EU funding programme for research and innovation running from 2014 to 2020 with a €80 billion budget. The first calls for proposals for Horizon 2020 were published on 11 December 2013. Its simplified rules and submission and grant management tools should facilitate participants’ tasks. For practical guidance, see the H2020 online manual.

COSME
Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME) will run from 2014 to 2020, with a planned budget of €2.3bn. It will facilitate SME access to finance, create supportive environment for business creation, help small businesses operate outside their home countries and improve their access to markets.

3rd HEALTH PROGRAMME
The Third Health Programme will run from 2014 to 2020, with a planned budget of 445 million EUR. It will support actions that complement, support and add value to the policies of the Member States to improve the health of EU citizens and reduce health inequalities by promoting health, encouraging innovation in health, increasing the sustainability of health systems and...
Necessary documents for an application

**Work programme**
- Programme objectives
- Research topics
- Instruments
- General advice on implementation of work programme
- Evaluation criteria + process
- Content of calls
  - For each call: Call fiches as single document: binding information

**Guidelines/information for applicants**
- Relevant information for respective call
- Information on proposal application/submission
- Project selection
- Instructions for completing part A (organisation + summary) + B (project details) of proposal
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ERC Grants

ERC Funding
Funding Instruments of the European Research Council

**Starting Grants**
starters
(2-7 years after PhD) up to
€ 2.0 Mio for 5 years

**Consolidator Grants**
consolidators
(7-12 years after PhD) up to
€ 2.75 Mio for 5 years

**Advanced Grants**
track-record of significant research achievements in
the last 10 years up to € 3.5 Mio for 5 years

**Synergy Grants**
2-4 Principal Investigators
Up to € 14 Mio for six years

**Proof-of-Concept**
briding between research - earliest stage of marketable innovation
up to €150,000 for ERC grantees
**Starting Grant**
Who may apply:
- Investigators at the beginning of an independent researcher's career
- Benchmark: one publication without PhD supervisor

**Consolidator Grant**
Who may apply:
- Investigators at the stage of an independent researcher's career
- Benchmark: several publications without PhD supervisor
| Targeted scientists | ▪ StG: 2-7 years after PhD  
▪ CoG: 7-12 years after PhD |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>▪ Researchers of any nationality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Funding             | ▪ max. 1.5 / 2 Mio. € for max. 5 years  
(+ 500.000 € / 700.000 € e. g. for large investments or PI from third countries) |
| Topic               | ▪ Open to all areas of research (bottom up)                        |
| Host institution    | ▪ EU state or associated state for Horizon 2020                   |
| Time commitment     | ▪ StG: ≥ 50% in project (≥ 50% in Europe)  
▪ CoG: ≥ 40% on project (≥ 50% in Europe) |
| Proposal/Evaluation | ▪ Full proposal submission/but two stage evaluation (including interview) |
| Call schedules      | ▪ Published once a year up to 2019                                |
ERC – Advanced Grants

Who may apply:

• “Exceptional leaders in terms of originality and significance of their research contributions”

• Established researchers with a track-record of significant achievements in the last 10 years
## Fact Sheet: Advanced Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Targeted scientists</strong></th>
<th>Established researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td>Researchers of any nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>“Track record of significant research achievements in the last 10 years”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>max. EUR 2.5 million for up to 5 years (+ EUR 1 million e.g. for major equipment &amp; PIs from Third Countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td>Open to all areas of research (bottom up)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Host institution</strong></td>
<td>EU member state or associated state to research framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time commitment</strong></td>
<td>≥30% (≥ 50% in Europe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal/Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Single submission of full proposal (24 pages) / two-step evaluation (25 panels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call schedules</strong></td>
<td>Published once a year up to 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One step Application, two step Evaluation

Proposal

Part A
Online Forms
Annexes

Part B1 (9 p.)

Part B2 (15 p.)

Eligibility Check

Step 1 Evaluation

Part B1

0) Abstract

a) Extended synopsis of the project (5 p.)

b) CV (2 p.) + Funding ID

c) Track Record (2 p.)

Step 2 Evaluation

Part B1

Part B2:
Extended Scientific Proposal (15 p.)

+ StG/CoG: Interviews
Evaluation: panels to select

- **3 domains and 25 panels**
- **Each panel**: chair and 10-15 members

---

**Life Sciences**

- LS1 Molecular & Structural Biology & Biochemistry
- LS2 Genetics, Genomics, Bioinformatics & Systems Biology
- LS3 Cellular and Developmental Biology
- LS4 Physiology, Pathophysiology & Endocrinology
- LS5 Neurosciences & neural disorders
- LS6 Immunity & infection
- LS7 Diagnostic tools, therapies & public health
- LS8 Evolutionary, population & environmental biology
- LS9 Applied life sciences & biotechnology

---

**Social Sciences and Humanities**

- SH1 Individuals, institutions & markets
- SH2 Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour
- SH3 Environment & society
- SH4 The Human Mind and its complexity
- SH5 Cultures & cultural production
- SH6 The study of the human past

---

**Physical Sciences & Engineering**

- PE1 Mathematical foundations
- PE2 Fundamental constituents of matter
- PE3 Condensed matter physics
- PE4 Physical & Analytical Chemical sciences
- PE5 Materials & Synthesis
- PE6 Computer science & informatics
- PE7 Systems & communication engineering
- PE8 Products & process engineering
- PE9 Universe sciences
- PE10 Earth system science
Panel Chairs of the ERC Peer Review Panels

ERC Starting Grant Panel 2014

The list below includes the panel chairs in the seventh ERC Starting Grants peer review process, identified and invited by the ERC Scientific Council. There are in total 35 panels, divided between the 3 domains as follows: 9 panels in Life Sciences, 10 panels in Physical Science and Engineering, and 16 panels in Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH). The full list of ERC peer reviewers (panel members and remote referees) will be published by the European Commission after the conclusion of the current peer review process.

Note to applicants:
This information is given for reasons of transparency. Under no circumstances should peer reviewers be contacted by applicants, potential applicants or potential host institutions.
Questions can be addressed to:
- ERC Helpdesk http://erc.europa.eu/researchindex.cfm?g=en&q=helpqueries
- ERC National Contact Points http://erc.europa.eu/erc-european-contact-points

**LIFE SCIENCES**

LS1 Moleculer and structural biology and biochemistry: Prof. Tomi P Makela
LS2 Genomics, genomics, bioinformatics and systems biology: Prof. Frank Grosfeld
LS3 Cellular and developmental biology: Prof. Daniel Robert St Johnston
LS4 Physiology, pathophysiology and endocrinology: Prof. Helmut Augustin
LS5 Neurosciences and neurodisorders: Prof. Michael Sprengtrop
LS6 Immunology and inflection: Dr. Diego Sebastian Amigorena
LS7 Diagnostic tools, therapies and public health: Prof. Stelios Dimopoulos
LS8 Evolutionary, population and environmental biology: Prof. John N. Thompson
LS9 Life sciences and non-medical biotechnology: Prof. Diana Barani

**SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

SH1 Markets, individuals and institutions: Prof. Philip Hans B F. Franses
SH2 The social world, diversity and common ground: Prof. Gustavo Guzmán Seabra
SH3 Environment, space and population: Letizia Cardoso
SH4 The human mind and its complexity: Prof. Pieter Pfeifer
SH5 Cultures and cultural production: Prof. Sonja Antona Kutz Cimons
SH6 The study of the human past: Prof. Maria Todorova

**PHYSICAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING**

PE1 Mathematics: Prof. Ari Laptev
PE2 Fundamental constituents of matter: Prof. Maciej Lewenstein
PE3 Condensed matter physics: Prof. Günter Bauer
PE4 Physical and analytical chemical sciences: Prof. Marco Dantini
PE5 Synthetic chemistry and materials: Prof. Horst Waller
PE6 Computer science and informatics: Prof. Marta Zofia Kwasnieska
PE7 Systems and communication engineering: Prof. Peter Kennedy
PE8 Products and process engineering: Dr. Christian Sattler
PE9 Universe sciences: Prof. Monica Tosi
PE10 Earth system science: Prof. Dorte Dahl-Jensen

Panel Chairs of the ERC Starting Grant Panels

ERC-2014-15G Panel Chairs

**ERC-2014-15G**

Panel Chairs

Panel Members

ERC-2013-15G Panel Chairs

Panel Members

ERC-2012-15G Panel Chairs

Panel Members

**Panel Chairs and Panel Members from the ERC Starting Grant calls**
Evaluation of excellence at two levels:

Quality of the Principal Investigator (PI)

- Intellectual capacity
- Creativity
- Commitment

Quality of the Research Project

- Ground breaking nature
- Potential impact
- Scientific Approach

Panel Members and Referees evaluate and score criteria numerically. Panels rank the proposals and propose them for funding!
Feedback during Evaluation

**Step 1:**
- **A:** Excellent
- **B:** Good, but not sufficient
- **C:** Insufficient

**Step 2:**
- **A:** Excellent
- **B:** Good, but not sufficient
- **C:** Insufficient

- **A:** Funded
  - **B:** Unfunded due to ranking

- **Wait 1 year**
- **Wait 2 years**
- **Apply again**
ERC success rate - Max Planck scientists perform better than average

**Starting Grants**
- Framework Programme 7
- Horizon 2020
- StG-MPG: 3.4%, 10.2%, 15.8%, 12.2%, 11.5%, 9.0%, 11.5%, 10.0%, 13.0%
- StG All

**Advanced Grants**
- Framework Programme 7
- Horizon 2020
- AdG-MPG: 13.9%, 16.1%, 13.8%, 13.5%, 13.0%, 11.8%, 8.3%, 14.2%, 9.6%
- AdG All

**Consolidator Grants**
- Framework Programme 7
- Horizon 2020
- CoG-MPG: 8.5%, 15.0%, 16.0%, 13.8%, 12.8%
- CoG All

**Synergy Grants**
- Framework Programme 7
- SyG-MPG: 1.6%, 3.0%
- SyG All
## Indicative summary of ERC calls – 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call identifier</th>
<th>Starting Grant</th>
<th>Consolidator Grant</th>
<th>Advanced Grant</th>
<th>Synergy Grant</th>
<th>Proof of Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Apr 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Sep 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget million EUR (estimated number of grants)</td>
<td>581 (391)</td>
<td>550 (278)</td>
<td>450 (194)</td>
<td>250 (30)</td>
<td>20 (130)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERC: Time to Grant

10 Months

Deadline

Evaluation

Funding decision

3 Months

Contract negotiation with successful applicants

Signing of grant agreement

Approx. 13 months as indicated in ERC Work Programme 2015

Time to grant

Art. 20 III Rules for Participation

The period of 8 months may be exceeded for actions of the ERC
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Proposal structure

- **Administrative forms (Part A)**
  - A1: General Information (**abstract proposal**, primary/secondary panel)
  - A2: Participants & Contacts (PI, Host institution)
  - A3: Budget
  - A4: Ethics
  - A5: Call specific questions (academic training of PI, exclusion of experts)

- **Research proposal (Part B1 and Part B2)**

- **Annexes**
  - Commitment of the host institution (**host support letter**)
  - StG/CoG: **PhD certificate** (and supporting documentation)
  - Ethics Self-Assessment (if applicable)
  - Further documents (if applicable)
The proposal summary (abstract) is important in order to catch the attention of the evaluators (panel members, remote referees)

Structure of the abstract: short and clear (max. 2000 characters, copy/paste of abstract from the A-Forms)
- State-of-the-art
- Description of the scientific problem/question
- Include your preliminary work
- Aim of the project/methodology (not too technical)
- Novel approach/innovative aspects
- Scientific impact

Abstract must have good readability and structure in a twofold manner: for generalist and specialist in your field

Abstract will be used to contact potential remote referees
- **Concise presentation** of the research project

- Particular attention to the **ground-breaking nature** of the proposed idea

- Demonstration of the **feasibility** of the scientific approach

- **State of the art** of the field

- **Short work plan, team composition and budget**
The extended synopsis is the only information on your project in step 1 of the evaluation process.

The whole project has to be described here.

It is recommended to structure the Extended Synopsis similar to B2.

Scientific/academic vocabulary - general comprehensibility

- Try to convince experts and non-experts in your field of research.

Use selected ERC terminology (evaluation criteria).

Elaborate on possible risks (alternative strategies) and expected results.

Visual highlights and illustrations (graphs, tables etc.).

Summarise the ground-breaking nature, e.g.: 
  - Still unsolved problem although many attempts have been made.
  - The PI aims at developing methods beyond the state of the art.
Curriculum Vitae (2 pages)

- **Standard academic and research track record**
  (including fellowships, awards, memberships, collaborations)

- **Explanation of career breaks** and/or unconventional paths

- Apart from a personal data sheet – possibility to add a **short text describing your profile**
  - Most important scientific/academic achievements
  - Particular strengths
Purpose of the Funding ID (table not within the page limits)

- On-going Grants and Applications
- Capability to raise and manage funding
- No double funding
- Fulfilment of the time commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Role of the PI</th>
<th>Relation to current ERC proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XY</td>
<td>DFG – Emmy Noether</td>
<td>XY EUR</td>
<td>2007 - 2012</td>
<td>group leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Track Record: 2 pages

- **Publications** in major/leading international peer-reviewed journals
- **Conference** proceedings
- **Monographs**
- Granted **patent(s)**
- Invited **presentations**
- **Prizes and Awards**
State of the art and objectives

- Ground-breaking
- Potential scientific (!) impact

Research methodology

- High risk/high gain
- Feasibility
- Key intermediate goals

Resources

- Appropriate use
- Work plan, team composition and budget (budget table: total in Euro/five years)
Short summary in a box at the beginning and at the end of the scientific proposal

- The proposed project aims at
  1. ...
  2. ...
  3. ...

Novelties/ground-breaking nature:
...

Description of methodology may be written in a more technical way than the Extended Synopsis

Use your own subheadings within the general given structure

Highlight important aspects by using italics or bold type

Risky projects are funded, but
  - Contingency plan/risk management plan should be presented
Include graphs for a work plan
(work packages, aims, research steps etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>WP2</th>
<th>WP3</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ERC – Budget calculation

**Example for calculation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Total in Euro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total in Euro</td>
<td>2,000,000,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>0,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>0,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>400,000,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (including Open Access fees), etc.</td>
<td>0,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify) e.g. audit certificate costs</td>
<td>4,000,00 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Postdocs</td>
<td>1,370,000,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Students</td>
<td>0,00 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>226,000,00 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Costs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct costs for Personnel (in Euro)</td>
<td>1,596,000,00 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Total Other Direct Costs (in Euro)</td>
<td>404,000,00 €</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A – Total Direct Costs (i + ii) (in Euro)     | 2,000,000,00 €        |
| B – Indirect Costs (overheads) 25% of Direct Costs (in Euro) | 500,000,00 €         |
| C1 – Subcontracting Costs (no overheads) (in Euro) |                     |
| C2 – Other Direct Costs with no overheads (in Euro) |                     |
| Total Estimated Eligible Costs (A + B + C) (in Euro) | 2,500,000,00 €       |
| Total Requested EU Contribution (in Euro)      | 2,500,000,00 €       |
General advice on preparation

- Check if your CV and project fit the profile of the ERC, look also on already funded projects on ERC-website

- **Register early**, get familiar with the system and templates and start filling in the forms

- A submitted proposal can be **revised until the call deadline** by submitting a new version and overwriting the previous one

- Follow the formatting rules and page limits.

- Download and proof-read the proposal before submitting.

- Make use of the **help tools and call documents** (Information for Applicants, Work Programme, Frequently asked questions) to prepare your proposal

- Discuss your proposal with your Director / Group Leader / Colleagues / successful applicants
## Eligible Researchers

### Early-stage Researchers (ESR)
- Less than 4 years of research experience
- and
- no doctoral degree

### Experienced Researchers (ER)
- At least 4 years of research experience
- or
- a doctoral degree

### Mobility rules
- **EF/IF**: Fellow must **not** have spent **more than 12 months in the last 3 years** in the future host country
- **CAR/RI/Widening**: Fellow must not have spent **more than 3 years in the last 5 years** in the future host country
Individual Fellowships - IF

Individual cross-border fellowships for experienced researchers

The financial dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research, networking, training costs</th>
<th>800 €</th>
<th>Living allowance</th>
<th>4650 €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and indirect costs</td>
<td>500 €</td>
<td>Mobility allowance</td>
<td>600 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family allowance</td>
<td>500 €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The living allowance rate is multiplied by Country Correction Coefficient (CCC). Examples: Belgium 100.0%, Germany 98.8%
International Fellowships

**European Fellowship**
- For fellows coming to or moving within MS/AC
- 12-24 months

**Global Fellowship**
- For fellows from MS/AC going to third countries
- 12-24 months + returning to Europe (12 months)
Panels and Evaluation Criteria

**Excellence**
- Weighting: 50%

**Impact**
- Weighting: 30%

**Implementation**
- Weighting: 20%

**Eight main evaluation panels:**
- Chemistry (CHE)
- Social Sciences and Humanities (SOC)
- Economic Sciences (ECO)
- Information Science and Engineering (ENG)
- Environment and Geosciences (ENV)
- Life Sciences (LIF)
- Mathematics (MAT)
- Physics (PHY)

**Two multi-disciplinary evaluation panels:**
- Career Restart (CAR)
- Reintegration (RI)
Each proposal will be evaluated by at least three reviewers (selection by Research Executive Agency, REA)

Each criterion will be scored from 0 to 5

If necessary, the panel will determine a ranking for proposals which have been awarded the same score
Part B1

Start page
Table of contents
List of participating organisations

- 1. Excellence
- 2. Impact
- 3. Implementation

Part B2

- 4. CV Researcher (max. 5 pages)
- 5. Capacities of the Organisations
- 6. Ethical aspects
- 7. Commitment letters

Stand: November 2017
1. Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action

- Introduction, state of the art, specific objectives and overview of the action
- Research methodology and approach
- Originality & innovative aspects of the research programme
- The gender dimension and interdisciplinary aspects of the action (if relevant)
- Explain how the project is most likely to open up the best career possibilities for the researcher and new collaboration opportunities for the host

2. Quality/appropriateness of training and knowledge transfer
(Two-way transfer of knowledge should be described)

- Researcher should gain new knowledge & complementary skills; Host should benefit from the experiences of the researcher
- For ETN: Training programme should include transferable skills, inter/multi disciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects
- For GF: The newly acquired skills and knowledge in third country should be transferred back to the Host Institution in Europe
3. Quality of the supervision and the integration in the team/institution

- Qualification & experience of the supervisor(s): track record incl. main collaborations, projects, publications, patents, experiences in supervising PhD and postdocs
- Hosting Arrangements: nature/quality of research environment, measures to integrate researcher (GF: both phases)

4. Quality of the proposed interaction between the organisations (ETN)

- Contribution of organisations to the research and training programme
- Synergies between participating organisations

5. Capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity/independence (IF)

- Development as independent/mature researcher, during the IF
Excellence (III)

**Strengths**

- **Scientific expertise of the Host is well presented and proved**, e. g. through national and int. contacts and cooperation, publications, if applicable patent

- **Quality of the supervisor is well proven**, e. g. through internationally recognised expertise, publications in excellent journals, prizes, international contacts/cooperation

**Weaknesses**

- **Gaps in the description** of the state of the art; most recent results or developments are not elaborated

- Insufficient details on the **scientific training**

- No reference to the **work plan**

- **Missing schedule**

- Only general description, **no concrete information**

- **Training plan is too ambitious**

- Problems are not identified, **no contingency plan**

- Methodology/research **focus is not clearly described**
1. Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher
   - Impact of research & training on the researcher’s career
   - Describe new competences to be acquired

2. Contribution to structuring doctoral/early-stage research training including the strengthening of the European Innovation capacity (ETN)

3. Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results
   - Communication into other research settings; Commercialisation (if appropriate)
   - Dissemination strategy for research results and Exploitation of results

4. Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action
   - Activities to different target audiences
Impact (II)

**Strengths**

- Applicability of the *trainings/experiences* for the *future career* are clearly described
- **Career goals** are defined
- Subject *specific skills* are acquired
- *Knowledge transfer* from/to institution is clear
- Extension of long-term *collaborations* and/or *networks* is foreseen
- *Dissemination* strategy is appropriate and goal-oriented

**Weaknesses**

- Application of research results is not discussed
- Dissemination of research results is not described
- **IPR management** is not mentioned
- Quality assurance is not described in sufficient detail
- Measurement of impact is not discussed
- Continual re-assessment of Career Development Plan is not planned
- Regular meetings with supervisor are not planned
1. Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

- Work package(s); Major deliverables; Major milestones; Secondments

2. Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources (IF)

- Describe how work planning and resources mobilised will ensure that research and training objectives will be reached (incl. appropriateness of person-months)

3. Appropriateness of management structure and procedures

- Organisation and management structure, as well as progress monitoring
- Research and/or administrative risks and the contingency plans (risk mgt)

4. Appropriateness of the institutional environment

- Contribution of beneficiary to research and training activities
- Main tasks and commitments of the beneficiary and partner organisation
- Describe the infrastructure, logistics, facilities offered

5. Competences, experience and complementarity of the organisations and their commitment to the programme (ETN)
Impact (II)

**Strengths**

- **Quality of the infrastructure**: e. g. equipment, workstation is adequate
- **Support for the fellow** is offered (e. g. assistance for finding an apartment etc.)
- Quality of the **international network** of the Host Institution is described on the basis of concrete examples

**Weaknesses**

- Work plan is too ambitious
- **Timetable is missing** (Gantt Chart)
- **Milestones** are not clearly described
- There is **no risk assessment**
- **Management capacities** are not described in enough detail, e. g. experience of the host’s administration of EU-projects
# Marie Skłodowska-Curie (MSCA) Participation of MPIs in Horizon 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSCA Action</th>
<th>Call 2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Call 2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Call 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Training Networks (ITN)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14,5 %</td>
<td>9,4%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6,3%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Fellowships</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18,6%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16,5%</td>
<td>14,2%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Fellowships</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36,6 %</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11,3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data: List of MPG-Projects based on Data available in the Commission Participant Portal, 3 July 2017.
2 Data: Based on Information of the National Contact Point (NKS).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITN</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>RISE</th>
<th>COFUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication date</strong></td>
<td>12 Oct 2017</td>
<td>12 Apr 2018</td>
<td>22 Nov 2017</td>
<td>12 Apr 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadlines</strong></td>
<td>17 Jan 2018</td>
<td>12 Sep 2018</td>
<td>21 Mar 2018</td>
<td>27 Sep 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget million EUR</strong></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Information based on the work programme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call identifier</th>
<th>ITN</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>RISE</th>
<th>COFUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication date</td>
<td>13 Sep 2018</td>
<td>12 Apr 2019</td>
<td>4 Dez 2018</td>
<td>4 Apr 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines</td>
<td>15 Jan 2019</td>
<td>11 Sep 2019</td>
<td>2 Apr 2019</td>
<td>26 Sep 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget million EUR</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information based on the work programme.
8 Months from submission to funding

5 Months

Deadline
Evaluation
Funding decision

3 Months

Contract Negotiation
Signing of Grant agreement

Time to grant
Art. 20 II a+b
Rules of Participation
Maximum period of 8 months from final date for submission to signing grant agreement with applicants

8 months may be exceeded for duly justified cases (Art. 20 III)
Thank you!