



H2020: Call 2019 Writing Successful Starting and Consolidator Proposals

In this workshop we will discuss the ERC and panel specifics for the scientific proposal and Principal Investigator. The deadlines for submitting in 2019 are not yet released but will most likely be mid-fall 2018 and early 2019.

The ERC selection criteria applied by each panel uses terms which have become familiar jargon, such as: important challenge, novel concept, scientific approach and feasibility. Most of these terms are also used by other funding agencies but they are interpreted and applied differently. This workshop will explain in detail not only what these terms mean and imply under the ERC umbrella but also how the ERC panel members use these terms to discuss, assess and select project proposals. This process differs from panel to panel, for example feasibility of the scientific approach is assessed differently in social sciences than from life sciences, and development of a new methodology has a different meaning in social sciences than physics. What does this imply? This workshop will supply you with the necessary knowledge to write a successful ERC proposal, as an invaluable aid in understanding the ERC standards and getting one step closer to obtaining an ERC grant.

Using the ERC *'Instructions for Applicants'* we will explain how you can address the ERC selection criteria in a panel specific manner and therefore write a competitive proposal. We will examine together the understanding of the evaluation criteria as: groundbreaking nature versus breakthrough potential feasibility of the scientific approach versus the appropriate methodology for the goals. We will discuss how to embed this into a scientific logical structure and how to translate this structure into proposal B1a and B2 part. Furthermore, we will explain how reviewers balance the PI's ambition versus their track-record, the risk versus the high-gain, the high-gain in relation to ground-breaking outcomes and finally the potential feasibility of the proposal as a whole, etc.

We will explain in detail how you can address the potential feasibility of the scientific approach, taking into account the panel specifics and research fields.

We will also discuss the panel specifics concerning the quality of the CVs and track-record of ERC grantees. What is the norm per panel and what does this mean for the CVs of the participants planning to submit under H2020? What "actions" do participants have to highlight or undertake to bring their CV in line with the expectations of the selected panel?

1. Training objectives

- To provide researchers with a good understanding of:
- the evaluation criteria and how to analyse them;
 - what makes an excellent PI according to the reviewers of the different domains/panels;
 - how to write a competitive scientific proposal considering panel specifics and type of project.

2. Who should attend?

The workshop will be of value for applicants who want to submit an ERC proposal.

Depending on the scientific backgrounds of the participants we will highlight domain specific issues.

3. Methodology

The seminar will be in English, with no translation. The trainer(s) will provide practical information and discuss the requested

information, the evaluation criteria and the best strategy for drafting the proposal with the participants.

The workshop is highly interactive and includes discussions to promote an exchange of views between participants and trainer(s). Each participant receives an extensive guide with the information on the topics listed in the programme.

4. Trainer

Lotte Jaspers, partner of Yellow Research, has extensive experience in running ERC workshops and in pre-submission review of ERC Starting, Consolidator and Advanced grants. At Yellow Research we have successfully trained candidates for writing ERC proposals since the 2008 call. Her knowledge and experience in pre-submission review of ERC proposals is an important aspect of her success in this training.

5. Programme

8:30	Start of the training
Part I	ERC Grants in a nutshell Short overview, ERC objectives, selection criteria and evaluation procedure
Part II	Scientific Proposal (incl. coffee & tea break) We use the project template to explain per paragraph <i>'state-of-the-art and objectives'</i> , <i>'methodology'</i> and <i>'resources'</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What needs to be addressed for the in depth reviewer, - How to address this: What kind of conceptualizing is needed to tell the story <p>We will detail how to address: 1) groundbreaking nature and ambition 2) the high gain and high risk balance and the link to feasibility of the scientific approach 3) the envisioned impact on future research and possibilities of utility 4) sound project plan and structure with intermediate goals and back-up plans.</p>
12.00	Lunch
12:30	Continuation: Scientific Proposal
Part III	Extended Synopsis The extended synopsis is a 5 page summary of the Scientific Proposal with an emphasis on the potential feasibility of the outlined scientific approach for a project with potential breakthrough for science, engineering or scholarship
Part IV	Principal Investigator We will address the key elements for Curriculum Vitae including Funding ID, Early Achievements Track-record and assessment of career achievements
15:30	End of course – Q&A

6 Date, Location, Contact

Date	April 5, 2018
Time	8:30 – 15:20 hrs
Location details	Jožef Stefan Institute, Velika predavalnica
Contact	Romana Jordan Romana.Jordan@ijs.si Tjaša Nabergoj tjasa.nabergoj@uni-lj.si