Welcome to the ERC Advanced Grants webinar

The webinar will start at 13.30.
ERC Advanced Grants webinar

The organizers: the ERC National Contact Points (NCPs) in Belgium

**NCP Flanders**
Flemish institutions
Margot Beereboom
[www.ncpflanders.be](http://www.ncpflanders.be)

**NCP-FNRS**
Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles
Natacha Wittorski
[www.ncp.fnrs.be](http://www.ncp.fnrs.be)

**NCP Federal BE**
Federal institutions
Bram Lefever
[https://ncpfederal.belspo.be](https://ncpfederal.belspo.be)
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Programme of the webinar 1/2

• 13h30 – 13h35: **Welcome**

• 13h35 -14h00: **ERC 2021 Advanced Grants**
  
  Iliana Nikolova, ERCEA, Advanced Grant call coordinator
  Sol Sayans, ERCEA, Advanced Grant call coordination team
  Carolina Ávila, ERCEA, Unit B1, ethics team

• 14h00 – 14h25: **Q&A with audience**

• 14h25 – 14h30: **Short break**
Programme of the webinar 2/2

• **14h30 - Social Sciences and Humanities Session**
  - Inge Bertels, UAntwerpen, previous member SH 5 panel
  - Paola Conconi, ULB, grantee 2018 call, SH 1

• **15h00 - Life Sciences Session**
  - Karin Sipido, KULeuven, previous member and chair of the LS 4 panel
  - Kodi Ravichandran, UGent/VIB, grantee 2018 call, LS 3

• **15h30 - Physical Sciences and Engineering Session**
  - Denis Dochain, UCLouvain, previous member PE 8 panel
  - Michel Van den Bergh, UHasselt, grantee 2019 call, PE 1

• **16h00 - Questions**
ERC Advanced Grants webinar

Useful info

- Send your written questions to speakers using Q&A and mention to whom your question is addressed.

- Use the chat for non-content related questions/comments.

- You will also be able to intervene orally after each session.

- Slides & recording of ERCEA presentation later on [https://www.horizon-europe-info-sessions.be/event/erc-advanced-grants-webinar/](https://www.horizon-europe-info-sessions.be/event/erc-advanced-grants-webinar/)
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Outline

• ERC Overview
• Advanced Grants - statistics for Belgium
• Advanced Grants 2021 – novelties
• Ethics issues
• Frequently asked questions
European Research Council

ERC is….
Science Funding: part of Horizon Europe

Horizon Europe
THE NEXT EU RESEARCH & INNOVATION PROGRAMME (2021–2027)

ERC Budget

Total WP budget, M€

Note: Projection based on MFF compromise budget, including EFTA and excluding associated countries budget

BREXIT!

No Synergy Grant and Proof of Concept calls

+22%
European Research Council

ERC is…
Scientific Council & Executive Agency

Scientific Council
• 22 prominent scientists
• overall scientific strategy
• control operation quality

Annual Work Programme & Expert Selection

ERC Executive Agency
• Former researchers (& science admin.)
• Execute annual WP
• Support applicants, PIs, experts, ScC

Organise peer review evaluations & Grant Management

ERC Scientific Council

[Diagram showing the structure of the ERC Scientific Council with various scientists and their roles]
ERC Evaluation
Scientific excellence

Excellence
is the sole evaluation criterion

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

Excellence of the Principal Investigator
- Intellectual capacity
- Creativity
- Commitment

ERC in figures

10,500+
Total projects funded by ERC

82
Nationalities (ERC grantees)

34
EU and Associated Countries hosting ERC projects

125,000+
Publications reported by ERC projects

1,300+
Prestigious prizes awarded to ERC grantees

75,000
Researchers and other professionals hired in ERC teams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERC calls</th>
<th>Call Opening</th>
<th>Submission Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting Grants ERC-2021-SIG</td>
<td>25/02/2021</td>
<td>8/04/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidator Grants ERC-2021-CoG</td>
<td>11/03/2021</td>
<td>20/04/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Grants ERC-2021-AdG</td>
<td>20/05/2021</td>
<td>31/08/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of Concept ERC-2021-PoC</td>
<td>No Proof of Concept call in ERC WP 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy Grants ERC-2021-SyG</td>
<td>No Synergy Grant call in ERC WP 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERC Advanced Grants in brief

**AdG Principal Investigator**
- track-record of significant research achievements in the last 10 years
- exceptional leaders in terms of originality and significance of their research contributions

**Time commitment**
- ≥ 30% working time on the ERC project
- ≥ 50% time in Europe (MS + AC)

**Budget**
- up to €2.5 Mio for 5 years
- + up to €1 Mio
Resubmission restrictions

The resubmission restrictions based on previous applications are maintained in 2021:

- C at Step 1 in StG, CoG or AdG in 2019
- B or C at Step 1 in StG, CoG or AdG in 2020
- C at Step 1 in Synergy Grant in 2020

Belgium: Success rates in previous AdG calls
By domain
Belgium: Success rates in previous AdG calls
By gender

ERC Grants
Success Rates by Domain
Main changes in the AdG 2021 call

- Panel Structure: 27 panels (2 new panels, PE11 and SH7)
- Interviews: for 1st time in AdG
- Some new parts in the Administrative forms

ERC Panel structure


- 3 Domains / 27 Panels

- Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH)
  - SH1 Individuals, Markets and Organisations
  - SH2 Institutions, Governance and Legal Systems
  - SH3 The Social World and Its Diversity
  - SH4 The Human Mind and Its Complexity
  - SH5 Cultures and Cultural Production
  - SH6 The Study of the Human Past
  - SH7 Human Mobility, Environment, and Space (NEW)

- Physical Sciences & Engineering (PSE)
  - PE1 Mathematics
  - PE2 Fundamental Constituents of Matter
  - PE3 Condensed Matter Physics
  - PE4 Physical & Analytical Chemical Sciences
  - PE5 Synthetic Chemistry and Materials
  - PE6 Computer Science and Informatics
  - PE7 Systems and Communication Engineering
  - PE8 Products and Processes Engineering
  - PE9 Universe Sciences
  - PE10 Earth System Science
  - PE11 Materials Engineering (NEW)

Life Sciences (LS)
- LS1 Molecules of Life: Biological Mechanisms, Structures and Functions
- LS2 Integrative Biology: from Genes and Genomes to Systems
- LS3 Cellular, Developmental and Regenerative Biology
- LS4 Physiology in Health, Disease and Aging
- LS5 Neuroscience and Disorders of the Nervous System
- LS6 Immunity, Infection and Immunotherapy
- LS7 Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of Human Diseases
- LS8 Environmental Biology, Ecology and Evolution
- LS9 Biotechnology and Biosystems Engineering
ERC evaluation process
StG/CoG/AdG: single submission, two step evaluation

Evaluation Preparation
- Eligibility Checks
- Initial Panel Chairs Meeting
- Proposal Allocation
  - Proposals Assignment to Panel Members

STEP 1
- Remote assessment by Panel members of Part B1
  - Panel Meeting
    - Proposals retained for Step 2
    - Feedback to applicants

STEP 2
- Remote assessment by Panel members and Remote Reviewers of full proposal (Part B1+Part B2 and budget)
  - Panel Meeting with interviews
    - NEW: interviews also for AdG!

Interviews

Principal Investigators whose proposals are retained for step 2 of the evaluation will be invited for an interview to present their proposal to the evaluation panel

→ typically 5-10 min. presentation + 20-25 min. Q&A

Each panel decides on the exact format of its interviews (duration, number of slides allowed, time allocated to the presentation and the question and answer session) which will be communicated to the successful applicants after Step 1.

How to prepare for your ERC interview:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F4qXVGcdH5w&list=PLtv6FnsXgnXAYRk6HCErwMxwMLDZKoMcy&index=6
## Proposal structure

**Part A: Administrative form**
1. General information
2. Participants
3. Budget table and Resources *(evaluated in Step 2)*
4. Ethics and Security
5. Other questions

**Annexes - submitted as PDF**
- Host Institution support letter *(new template)*

References and funding ID do not count towards the page limits.

**Part B1 - submitted as PDF** *(evaluated in Step 1 & Step 2)*
- Extended synopsis 5 pages
- Curriculum vitae 2 pages
- Funding ID *(does not count towards the page limit)*
- 10 years track-record 2 pages

**Part B2 - submitted as PDF** *(evaluated in Step 2 only)*
- Scientific proposal 14 pages
- State-of-the-art and objectives
- Methodology

---

## Proposal budget

Up to 2.5 M€ for a period of 5 years + up to 1 M€ additional funding

Requested funding must be fully justified by estimation of real project cost

Project costs reimbursed at 100% funding rate *(for actual incurred costs)*
+ 25% indirect costs *(flat-rate)*

1 M€ additional funding can be requested for:
- a) Start-up costs for moving to EU/AC from abroad
- b) Purchase of large equipment
- c) Access to large facilities
- d) other major experimental and field work costs *(no personnel cost)*
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
- Justify requested resources – explain your budget properly
- Get well prepared for the interview

Where can you find more information?

**ERC 2021 Work Programme**

**Information for Applicants to the Advanced Grant call**
(to be available on the ERC Website by the call opening)

For questions: [ERC-2021-ADG-APPLICANTS@ec.europa.eu](mailto:ERC-2021-ADG-APPLICANTS@ec.europa.eu)

[erc.europa.eu](http://erc.europa.eu)

Funding & Tender Opportunities

Our social media channels:
Where can you find more information?

Videos - ERC Classes
- What to consider before applying
- How to fill in the application (Part B1 and B2)
- The interview
- How the evaluation works

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x
bFbzkVWgCU&list=PLtv6FnsXgnXA
YRk6HCEnwMxwML0ZKoMcy

Novelties in the administrative forms

1. Admissibility criteria
2. Gender Equality Plan
3. Career stage of the PI
4. Description of resources and time commitment
5. Cost categories
6. Data Management Plan
7. New template for the HI support letter
8. Ethics and Security section
Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

Admissibility criteria

• All proposals must be complete, readable, and accessible.
• They must be submitted by eligible PI via the official online submission system before the relevant call deadline.
• Proposals which do not meet these criteria may be declared inadmissible.

Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

Gender Equality Plan (GEP)

• ‘yes/no’ tick box question
• Only for Public bodies, Higher education establishments and Research organisations
• Information not available for evaluators
• In case the proposal is selected for funding, having a Gender Equality Plan will be necessary before the grant signature.
Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

PI Career Stage

• New field on the “career stage” of the PI
• It refers to the ones defined in Frascati 2015 manual
  (A) Top grade researcher
  (B) Senior researcher
  (C) Recognised researcher
  (D) First stage researcher

Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

Description of Resources and time commitment

• Now under section Budget in Part A
• Text box max length of 8000 characters
• The budget table and description of resources available to the experts at Step 2.
Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

Cost categories in the budget table

A. Direct personnel costs (PI, senior staff, post docs, students, other personnel).
B. Subcontracting costs (no indirect costs).
C. Purchase costs (travel and subsistence, equipment, consumables, publications and dissemination, and other additional direct costs).
D. Internally invoiced goods and services (no indirect costs).

Data Management Plan (DPM)

- As from 2021 it is no longer possible for applicants to opt out of the submission of Research Data Management plans
- Brief plan to define what data sets the project will generate or process and how they will be curated, stored and preserved.
- A first version must be submitted within the first six months of the project implementation.
Novelties in the administrative forms (cont.)

Host Institution Support letter

- Please note that the template has changed – please use the new 2021 template
- Reference to the Horizon Europe
- The provisions are the same but have been rearranged

Ethics and security section

The European Research Council

ERC Ethics review procedures

Carolina C. Ávila

ERC/European Commission
ERCEA, Unit B1
What is expected from the applicant? (Ethics Self-Assessment – PDF)

- Ethics Issues and security tables
- Ethics self-assessment
- Annexes can be included (approvals, authorizations,…)

Activities raising ethics issues in HE

1. Human embryonic stem cells (hESCs) & human embryos
2. Research involving humans
3. Human cells or tissues
4. Personal data
5. Animals
6. Non-EU countries
7. Environment, health and safety
8. Artificial intelligence
9. Other ethics issues

Crosscutting issue: potential misuse of results
New in Horizon Europe

- Artificial Intelligence added as an activity potentially raising ethics issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Artificial Intelligence</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this activity involve the development, deployment and/or use of Artificial Intelligence? (if yes, detail in the self-assessment whether that could raise ethical concerns related to human rights and values and detail how this will be addressed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Misuse and dual use excluded from ethics issues table and added in new security table
  - Security Issues Table: misuse issues concerning security rules (for instance activities that could result in the development of chemical weapons that could be adapted for criminal activities).
  - Ethics table: Any potential misuse issues not covered in the Security Issues Table should be flagged and analysed under the relevant ethics sections (humans, personal data, animals, environment, health and safety, artificial intelligence, other ethics issues, etc).

Do's and don'ts

**Do**
- Include reflexion on ethics right from the start
- Take it as a way to broaden the perspective on your subject
- When in doubt, always tick the issue

**Don't**
- Don't think that issues depend on the general domain your research belongs to
- Don't do it in the last 5 minutes before submission of your proposal
- Do not abstain from...
You're not alone!

- Ethics committees
- Data protection officers:
- Persons specialized in your domain and/or in ethics
- Ethics Adviser or Board
- ERC internet site – www.erc.europa.eu
- ERC ethics team: ERC-ETHICS-REVIEW@ec.europa.eu
- Guidance – How to complete your ethics self-assessment?

FAQs
How to deal with multidisciplinary project proposals that are in between the life sciences and physical sciences and hence do not fit one ERC panel, but bridge multiple panels? Should I target/write it to one specific ERC panel? Which panel is best?

Each proposal is allocated to one specific panel for evaluation, however reviews from other relevant panels may be requested in case of cross-panel/cross-domain proposals.

In the online submission form (Part A):

- select the ERC panel that is closest to the proposed research (Primary review panel)
- where applicable, another relevant panel can be indicated (Secondary panel)

In Part B1: a textbox to explain and justify the cross-panel/cross-domain nature of the proposal

Is multidisciplinary research appreciated more than single-discipline research?

The ERC encourages multi and interdisciplinary research proposals. The only evaluation criterion is excellence.

FAQs

Are potential spin-offs of industrial interest appreciated in the evaluation of the project?

The Host Institution is not an evaluation criterion.

How important is the criterion that the PI must have a team. I have 5 doctoral students and we work as a team but I doubt that this counts as an established team.

Why is the career path of our former students a selection criteria and how important is it? this is difficult to control...

There is no formal requirement to have a team.

What the panel is going to evaluate is whether the PI has demonstrated sound leadership in the training and advancement of young scientists.
FAQs

What are the “minimum scientific and/or academic requirements” that are necessary to apply for an ERC Advanced Grant.

The profile of the ERC Advanced Grant Principal Investigator, as indicated in the ERC Work Programme, outlines the characteristics of competitive applicants and not their eligibility to the call.

PIs competing for an Advanced Grant are expected to be recognized leaders with research accomplishments typical for their field of research.

Because each scientific domain has its own benchmarks/achievements, it is the PI who should know what the standard practice for publications in her/his research field is.

FAQs

Does a successful ERC Advanced Grant candidate write his/her proposal himself/herself or does he/she usually hire someone to write the proposal?

In our opinion, there is no one better than the PI himself/herself to write the scientific proposal.

Do you need a consultant to rewrite your previously submitted proposal in order to resubmit?

In our opinion, no. Peer reviewers are good at spotting when a proposal is written by the scientist or a consultant however this shouldn’t impact the evaluation.

Note that even if you adress all the recomendations of the panel from a previous submission, there is no guarantee for the success of the new submission – the panels aternate and are partly renewed and the set of the competing proposals is different in each call.
FAQs

Have you considered the extension of the time window for the 10-year track record

AdG 2021 applicants may present their achievements over a longer period than the past ten years only under the circumstances outlined in the ERC Work Programme (maternity leave, paternity leave, long-term illness, clinical qualification or national service).

The circumstances should be clearly explained in the career break section of their CV.

FAQs

If the applicant does not have a permanent position, how should the application process be? Does the fund cover salaries of the applicant to be hired?

• The PI does not need to be employed by the HI at the time of submission of the proposal.
• The grant can cover personnel costs of all team members
FAQs

Can a PI have team members located outside the HI? How are these collaborators/team members being included in the budget?

- Where they bring scientific added value to the project, additional team members/collaborators may also be hosted by additional legal entities.
- HI/PI should choose the option that best suits the project needs.

FAQs

Additional funding: could you give concrete examples for all three main domains what could be financed by this budget?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) “start-up” costs for PI moving to the EU or an AC from elsewhere as a consequence of receiving the ERC grant</td>
<td>• Costs to purchase the equipment to set up the laboratory of the PI&lt;br&gt;• Recruitment costs to hire team&lt;br&gt;• Travel costs of the PI to come to EU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the purchase of major equipment</td>
<td>Build a low-turbulence wind tunnel to study flight in controlled conditions</td>
<td>Supercomputer</td>
<td>Mobile scanning station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) access to large facilities</td>
<td>Access to vessels to conduct research in oceans</td>
<td>Access to a telescope facility</td>
<td>Access to archives or acquisition of images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) other major experimental and field work costs, excluding personnel costs</td>
<td>High amount of consumables to perform experiments</td>
<td>Specific tasks to be subcontracted (building of parts for satellites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAQs

**Do you have any statistics on how many applicants that go through the first, second and third time they applied for ERC AdG?**

- Second applications have a higher chance of succeeding than the first ones.
- The success rates of unsuccessful applicants at resubmission is 10% for “unfunded at Step 1” and 23% for applicants “unfunded at Step 2”.

---

Thank you for your attention!

Other questions?
Open Science in HE - publications

All peer-reviewed scientific publications relating to the results of ERC projects must be made available through Open Access:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement, Art. 17, ‘Open Science’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trusted repository</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“at the latest at the time of publication, a machine-readable electronic copy of the published version, or the final peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication, is deposited in a trusted repository for scientific publications”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate open access to the deposited publication (no embargo) under a CC BY licence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Immediate open access is provided to the deposited publication via the repository, under the latest available version of the Creative Commons Attribution International Public Licence (CC BY) or a licence with equivalent rights; for monographs and other long-text formats, the licence may exclude commercial uses and derivative works (e.g. CC BY-NC, CC BY-ND).” NB: For long-text publications CC BY-NC-ND is also acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information on research outputs / tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Information is given via the repository about any research output or any other tools and instruments needed to validate the conclusions of the scientific publication.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication metadata of the deposited publication</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deposited publications must include detailed metadata, including standard bibliographic details, the ERC grant/project details, licensing terms, PIDs for authors involved in the ERC project, for the published version of the publication, etc., as well as links to related research outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Access publication fees (APC, BPC, other fees)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Only publication fees in full open access venues for peer-reviewed scientific publications are eligible for reimbursement.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Science in HE – research data

The beneficiaries must manage the digital research data generated in the action (‘data’) responsibly, in line with the FAIR principles and by taking all of the following actions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizon Europe Model Grant Agreement, Art. 17, ‘Open Science’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Management Plan (DMP) within first 6 months</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“establish a data management plan (‘DMP’) (and regularly update it)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NB: for the ERC programme, no DMP is needed at application stage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deposition of research data in trusted repository; CC BY licence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“as soon as possible and within the deadlines set out in the DMP, ensure open access — via the repository — to the deposited data, under the latest available version of the Creative Commons Attribution International Public License (CC BY) or Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication (CC D) or a licence with equivalent rights, following the principle ‘as open as possible as closed as necessary’, unless providing open access would in particular: be against the beneficiary’s legitimate interests, including regarding commercial exploitation, or be contrary to any other constraints, in particular the EU competitive interests or the beneficiary’s obligations under this Agreement; if open access is not provided (to some or all data), this must be justified in the DMP”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information on research outputs / tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“provide information via the repository about any research output or any other tools and instruments needed to re-use or validate the data.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metadata of the deposited research data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deposited research data must include detailed metadata, standard bibliographic details, the ERC grant/project details, licensing terms, PIDs for authors involved in the ERC project, etc., as well as links to related research outputs / related publications, etc.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incremental research

• Do not go for incremental research (doing more of the same)
• Pay particular attention to the ground-breaking nature of the research project
• Take research and knowledge far beyond the state of the art
• Think big!
ERC Advanced Grants webinar

14h30 - Social Sciences and Humanities Session

• Prof. Inge Bertels
  – Universiteit Antwerpen, Faculty of Design Sciences
  – previous member SH 5 Cultures and cultural production panel

• Prof. Paola Conconi
  – Université libre de Bruxelles / Maître de recherches F.R.S.-FNRS, European Center for Advanced Research in Economics and Statistics (ECARES)
  – grantee 2018 call, “TRASC - Trade Agreements and Supply Chains”, panel SH1 Individuals, Markets and Organisations

• Questions
ERC Advanced Grants webinar

15h00 - Life Sciences Session

• Prof. Karin Sipido
  – KULeuven, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Cardiovascular Sciences
  – previous member and chair of the LS4 panel

• Prof. Kodi Ravichandran
  – UGent/VIB Center for Inflammation Research
  – grantee 2018 call, "Sperm-Egg Phusion - Unexpected connections between a phagocytic machinery and mammalian fertilization", LS3

• Questions
ERC in Horizon Europe

- Delays in decision.. but strong budget seems secure
  - from 13 > 16 billion Euro
  - UK ‘pay as you go’
  - next call could have better success rate (2020 AdG <10%..)

- Impact expected through excellent science
  - excellent science as one of the pillars in Horizon Europe
  - continuous process of fine-tuning by the ERC Scientific Council
    - interviews
    - panel structure

Karin Sipido, AdG LS4 - member 2014, 2016; chair 2018, 2020
Panel workings

*step 1 / step 2 / chair meetings > feedback Scientific Council*

**Implemented by ERC Scientific Council**
- balance ERC + non-ERC grantees
- expertise / gender / ..
- members not eligible to apply
- autonomy within policy boundaries
- supervised

**Referee selection**
- panel members = referee
- external (Prophy tool) expertise
- building experience as referee and panel member

Karin Sipido, AdG LS4 - member 2014, 2016; chair 2018, 2020
PI and project < > project and PI

• **Scoring gives equal weight**
  • variability in scores from external reviewers
  • panel autonomy in weighing
  • scores are only guidance for the panel, comments are more important

• **Both elements to be well prepared / presented**
  • in step 1 panel evaluation only – part B1
PI and CV

A pool of excellent scientists – how to stand out?

- *Ground-breaking research*
  - a core set of achievements
  - quality > quantity
  - positioning in the field

- *Expertise and capacity to execute the program*
  - institution is not to be considered
  - PI-driven and executed <> collaborative projects or Synergy grant

- *Leadership in training and advancement of young scientists*
  - must be addressed

- *Free comments..*
The project

Ground-breaking nature and potential impact

- *important challenges* – scientific advance
- *ambitious - novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines*
- *high risk/high gain*. a difficult concept > emphasis on ‘ideas’

- preliminary data
  - unpublished
  - in B1
- graphical abstract
The project

Scientific Approach

- *research methodology and working arrangements appropriate*
- *development of novel methodology*
- *time scales, resources and PI commitment adequate*

- variable treatment by referees – cross-over with content evaluation
- resources – available / from the project budget..

Learning curve – success of re-applications / 2-3rd grantees
Budget proposal

Evaluation

- listing of other funding – honesty expected
  - evidence of success
  - robust resources
  - overlap
- ERC freedom to operate <> proper assignment
- Extra funding for relocation, equipment.. needs proper justification
ERC Advanced Grants webinar

15h30 - Physical Sciences and Engineering Session

• Prof. Denis Dochain
  – UCLouvain, Institute for Information and Communication Technologies, Electronics and Applied Mathematics (ICTEAM)
  – previous member PE 8 panel

• Prof. Michel Van den Bergh
  – Universiteit Hasselt/FWO, Faculteit Wetenschappen, Vakgroep Wiskunde en statistiek / Part-time professor at VUB
  – grantee 2019 call, “Schemes - Schobers, Mutations and Stability”, PE 1

• Questions
  16h00 – Questions
One central keyword: diversity

- scope, topics

- panel:
  - scientific expertise
  - geographical dispersion
  - way to express opinions (tough vs soft)
**PE8 Products and Processes Engineering**

Product and process design, chemical, civil, environmental, mechanical, vehicle engineering, energy processes and relevant computational methods

Aerospace engineering
Chemical engineering, technical chemistry
Civil engineering, architecture, offshore construction, lightweight construction, geotechnics
Computational engineering
Fluid mechanics
Energy processes engineering
Mechanical engineering
Propulsion engineering, e.g. hydraulic, turbo, piston, hybrid engines
Production technology, process engineering
Manufacturing engineering and industrial design
Environmental engineering, e.g. sustainable design, waste and water treatment, recycling, regeneration or recovery of compounds, carbon capture & storage
Naval/marine engineering
Industrial bioengineering
Automotive and rail engineering; multi-/inter-modal transport engineering
Diversity: opportunities or difficulties

ERC: major change of paradigm with respect to standard EC programmes

• Opportunities:
  - to learn new scientific ideas/challenges
  - to share scientific views
    ... But is it the role of the panel?

• Difficulties/challenges: Advanced grant projects are focused on a specific topic.
  - how to provide a sensible evaluation if you are not an expert in this specific niche?
  - how to reach a reasonable consensus around the table with a multi-expertise panel?
  - how to be fair in presence of very different way to express opinions?
  - for Non-European experts: how to appropriately perceive what is expected from the EC?
Interview of applicants: very much appreciated!
Context

► Michel Van den Bergh
► Area PE1 (Mathematics)
► Pure mathematics (Non-commutative algebraic geometry). Basic research!
► 2019 ERC Advanced Grant SCHEMES (Schobers, Stability and Mutations). Awarded first round.
► 1015047.50€. One PhD student and one Postdoc.
Writing the project

- No incremental research???
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Contact persons in Flemish institutions (1/2)

Iesel Van der Plancken
Research Coordination Office KU Leuven
tel +32-16-320-446, EU-info@kuleuven.be

Lieve Huys, Nathalie Vandepitte, Pieter-Jan Hutsebaut
EU team Ghent University
tel +32-9-264-3029, eu-team@ugent.be

Kristof Geeraerts, Liesbet Cockx
Grants Office University of Antwerp
tel +32-3-265-3193, research@uantwerpen.be

Stien Mommaerts, ELO, R&D VUB
tel +32-2-629-2213, elo@vub.be

Angélique Broux, Research Coordination Office UHasselt
tel +32-11-268-136, EUresearch@uhasselt.be
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Contact persons in Flemish institutions (2/2)

- Jan Meneve, Research Office
  tel +32-14-335-669, jan.meneve@vito.be

- Anne Van den Bosch, Director Public R&D Policies & Programs
  tel +32-16-281-682, Anne.VandenBosch@imec.be

- Lieve Ongena, Senior Science Policy Manager
  tel +32-9-244-6611, lieve.ongena@vib.be
  Elien Vandermarliere, International Grants Officer
  elien.vandermarliere@vib.be / grantsoffice@vib.be

- Ann Verlinden, Saskia Decuypere, Research Office
  research@itg.be

- Ger van den Kerkhof, ELO
  tel +32 497 438 247 / + 3211 790 560
  ger.vandenkerkhof@flandersmake.be
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Contact persons in Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles institutions (1/2)

Eléonore Couder, ADRE/RINT
tel +32 10 47 4992, eleonore.couder@uclouvain.be

Ophélie Ladrière, ARD
tel +32 4 366 5637, oladriere@uliege.be

Vanessa Gemis, Rachel Leproult, Dragana Petrovic
Département Recherche, Cellule Europe
tel +32 2 650 6718/3162/2996, ulb-europe@ulb.be

Christelle Saout, ADRE
tel +32 81 72 5047, christelle.saout@unamur.be
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Contact persons in Fédération Wallonie Bruxelles institutions (2/2)

Barbara Marchi, AVRE
tel +32 65 37 4776, barbara.marchi@umons.ac.be

Nathalie Schellens, SAR
tel + 32 2 211 79 99, nathalie.schellens@usaintlouis.be
ERC National Contact Points (NCPs) in Belgium

**NCP Flanders**
Flemish institutions

Margot Beereboom
margot.beereboom@fwo.be

www.ncpflanders.be

**NCP-FNRS**
FWB institutions

Natacha Wittorski
natacha.wittorski@frs-fnrs.be

www.ncp.fnrs.be

**NCP Federal BE**
Federal institutions

Bram Lefever
Bram.LEFEVER@belspo.be

https://ncpfederal.belspo.be