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ERC STARTING, CONSOLIDATOR OR ADVANCED GRANT PROJECT

1. Why submit an ERC project?

Submitting a project to the European Research Council (ERC) offers a host of scientific, institutional and financial advantages. By promoting research at the frontiers of knowledge, the ERC encourages the freedom to explore innovative ideas and take scientific risks. This support creates an environment conducive to innovation and discovery.

Winning an ERC grant is widely regarded as a sign of scientific excellence. It opens the door to new collaborations and opportunities, while expanding your professional network. What’s more, ERC-funded projects enhance the prestige of your host institution and make a significant contribution to society, by generating innovative discoveries with a tangible impact, in both basic and applied science. ERC projects are generally divided into several categories, either collective or individual. Although the collaborative aspect is evident in the former, it can also appear in the latter. For example, projects can be designed and carried out collaboratively, enabling a whole team of researchers to work together, stimulating creativity and fostering a fruitful exchange of ideas. By capitalizing on the diversity of perspectives within the team, this offers invaluable training opportunities for researchers at the start of their careers, and professional development for the more experienced. An ERC project puts the spotlight on an entire research theme, contributing to the influence of their disciplinary field.

ERC projects are of long duration (60 months), requiring in-depth reflection and a long-term vision of a major scientific issue. The process of writing such a project, as well as the feedback received by candidates after submission, can easily be assessed in other contexts, such as the preparation of an "habilitation à diriger des recherches" (HDR) thesis or the application for other complementary or alternative funding.

Finally, ERC grants enable researchers to bring their most ambitious projects to fruition, with a high rate of reward compared to the modest size of the initial application document. Thanks to this substantial funding, and minimal administration, it is possible to devote oneself entirely to research, free from the usual budgetary constraints.

2. The ERC in brief, from the idea to the submission

ERC calls for proposals are open to all scientific disciplines, and are not thematically limited. They aim at a double scientific excellence: that of the research project and that of the applicant.

A project submitted to the ERC must be ambitious and innovative, capable of generate significant advances in a scientific or technological field, while seeking to push back the current frontiers of knowledge. However, this level of ambition inevitably entails risks. These risks must be judiciously taken into account, with clear strategies for managing, controlling and circumventing them.

The project must not simply extend or improve an existing study; it must aim to overcome a major scientific obstacle, introduce a radically new idea or approach, or aim for a genuine scientific or methodological breakthrough. Despite its lofty ambitions, the project must remain feasible.

1. What is an ERC project?

An ERC project consists of 2 parts:
- An administrative section (A)
- A scientific section (B). This is itself divided into 2 parts:

  Part B1 includes:
  - A cover page with title, acronym and 2,000-character abstract,
  - A 5-page synopsis,
  - CV with track record, max. 4 pages.

  Part B2 includes:
  - The scientific project is strictly limited to 14 pages, excluding references,
  - Budget and resource information on 8,000 characters.

Constraints on font size and margins must be respected in accordance with ERC guidelines.
Projects are submitted in one of three main thematic areas:

- Physical Sciences and Engineering (PE)
- Life Sciences (LS)
- Social Sciences and Humanities (SH)

These areas are divided into 28 panels referenced PE1 to PE11, LS1 to LS9, and SH1 to SH8, described here.

The keywords of the PE6 and PE7 panels, which are at the heart of CNRS Informatics, are given in Appendix A.2 of this document.

There are 5 categories of ERC projects:

- Individual projects, are 5-year projects, with 3 categories depending on the experience of the principal investigator (PI) in relation to his/her (first) thesis degree:
  - Starting, for a PI with 2 to 7 years post-thesis experience,
  - Consolidator, for a PI with 7 to 12 years post-thesis experience,
  - Advanced, for a PI with more than 12 years post-thesis experience.

- The Synergy program targets collaborative projects lasting 6 years, involving 2 to 4 researchers and their teams.

- Proof of Concepts (PoC) projects last 18 months and are reserved for those who are already PIs on an ERC project. They must be submitted during their ERC project or up to one year after the end of the project. The aim is to fund the first steps in the valorization of the ERC results, leading to a prototype.

An ERC project is evaluated in two steps:

- **Step 1:** Part B1 of the project is evaluated by a generalist committee, so it is essential that the tone and style of B1 be accessible by non-expert evaluators. Innovative aspects of the project should be clearly highlighted in this part of the document. Around 1/3 of projects are selected to proceed to step 2.

- **Step 2:** Part B2 of the project is intended for review by specialists with the appropriate expertise. In this step, parts B1 and B2 are considered together by 6 to 8 experts (1 or 2 panel experts, and remote experts) to evaluate the project. Of the projects selected at step 1, around 1/3 will be funded at the end of step 2 of the evaluation. This gives a success rate of around 15%.

Find out more:

- Full information on ERC projects can be found on various dedicated websites, including:
  - > On the official ERC website
  - You can consult: the official ERC 2024 work program

- Examples of how to present the different parts of the submission:
  - For Starting
  - For Consolidator
  - For Advanced
  - For Synergy

- The ERC Starting or Consolidator Applicant’s Guide, which provides detailed information to help you prepare your application

- > On the official website of the French Ministry of Research
  - You’ll find all the information you need to prepare your project, as well as announcements of ERC information and support meetings.

- > On the CNRS website
  - You’ll find advice and pointers to help you with the scientific and administrative aspects of your project.

- > The ERC National Contact Point (PCN)
  - It provides information, help and advice to all project owners hosted by French institutions.

- > On the CNRS Informatics website
  - You’ll find the timetable, the contact point, the ERC leader’s guide, and the evaluator’s guide, for people who can help you review your project.
2. Inform and contact

As soon as your project begins to take shape, you need to:

- Exchange ideas with other scientists (team leaders, DU, ERC unit from CNRS Informatics) before any concrete action is taken.
- Inform your unit director and your team leader.
- Contact the "Service Partenariat et Valorisation" (SPV) of your "Délegation Régionale" (DR), for CNRS researchers, or the equivalent department at your university, for people recruited by universities.
- Contact the CNRS Informatics’ ERC unit to assess the relevance of your application.

The SPV at your DR or university will be your key contact for administrative and financial aspects of your project (Part A). This department will help you to fill in the administrative part of the project and the financial form, and will provide you with the letter of commitment from the host institution, which must be downloaded from the submission site.

Local structures are available to help with the preparation of the scientific part of the project, covering all ERC scientific fields. It is essential to plan several reviews of the project, in particular by people with varied profiles, preferably those who are familiar with the ERC, and who reflect the diversity of the panels of experts responsible for evaluating the project. The CNRS Informatics ERC unit will provide you with more precise assistance, with reviews by laureates or former panel members, within the scientific perimeter of CNRS Informatics, i.e. panels PE6 and PE7.

3. Choose your category

Check the category in which you can apply, which depends on your seniority in relation to the date of doctoral graduation on the first of January of the call (January 1, 2024 for the 2024 call).

You are **Starting** if you have successfully defended your doctoral thesis at least 2 years and up to 7 years before January 1, 2024, i.e. successfully defended your doctorate from January 1, 2017 to December 31, 2021, inclusive.

You are a **Consolidator** if you have successfully defended your doctorate thesis at least 7 years and up to 12 years before January 1, 2024, i.e. successfully defended your doctorate from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2026, inclusive.

Beyond that, you’re in the **Advanced** category.

The dates for calculating the seniority of your degree may be modified in certain duly documented circumstances, such as maternity and paternity leave, long-term illness, national service, application for asylum, and so on. Candidates are advised to consult the specific guidelines of the ERC and their host institution for detailed information on these regulations.

4. Choose your panel

The choice of the thematic panel in which the project is submitted is an important step. An ERC project is submitted to a main panel, which may be supplemented by a secondary panel. It is strongly recommended, wherever possible, to choose only one panel, and to do so carefully. The dossier must highlight the project’s added value in the scientific field covered by that panel, and projects that straddle several panels, while convincing each of them, prove very complex (these projects generally have lower success rates). To help you make your choice of panel, you can first consult the keywords associated with each panel in the ERC Work Programme 2024. To refine your choice, a simple method is to check whether you know any experts or prize-winners in the panel you have chosen. To do this, please consult:

- **The composition of evaluation panels** for previous calls (members and chairmen); search with the keywords “ERC panel members Starting” or “ERC panel members Consolidator”, specifying the year.
- **The database of ERC projects funded to date**: you can target your selection by category, year and/or country, to find the winners, their subjects and panels.

The experts on the panel:

- **Have a wide range of expertise** in relation to your project: there are about fifteen of them, and they must cover all the panel’s keywords (for PE6 and PE7, see Appendix A.2 of this document).
- **Are of different nationalities**: you should be aware that you will probably not be appraised by a person of your own nationality. French (acronyms, schools, abbreviations, etc.) must be explained so that they can be understood by jury members of all nationalities.

Extract from the participants’ guide:

It is the PI’s responsibility to choose the most relevant ERC panel (primary review panel) for the evaluation of the proposed research. The initial allocation of the proposals to the various panels will be based on the expressed preference of the PI. In the case of cross-panel/cross-domain proposals the PI may indicate a secondary review panel. The primary panel will then decide whether the proposal is indeed cross-panel or even cross-domain and if its evaluation requires expertise from other panels. Despite the initial allocation being based on the preference of the PI, when necessary due to the expertise required for the evaluation, proposals may be reallocated to different panels during the course of the peer review evaluation.
5. Writing

Writing the summary, synopsis (short project in B1) and long project (B2), as well as the CV and track record, requires a great deal of care and time. You also need to set aside time for numerous proof-readings and corrections to ensure the quality of your project.

It is strongly recommended to start drafting the project 6 months before the submission date. We suggest starting with document B1, which represents a particular challenge in terms of finding the right tone and discourse for non-expert reviewers.

To be able to submit in good conditions, plan to have a first quality version of the complete project at least 2 months before the submission date, having in particular a first version of part B1 at least 3 months before the submission date. This will give you time to have your project proofread, corrected and fine-tuned.

The project must be ambitious, i.e. groundbreaking in relation to what you’ve done so far (and in relation to the state of the art). So if your project builds on previous work, it must also show that there is a significant leap between that work and the objectives of the ERC project, to persuade the panel of its originality and feasibility.

The project must also respond to the ERC slogan high risk / high gain. The extract from the ERC Work Program 2024 outlines the questions to be answered by rapporteurs. Specific recommendations for drafting the CV, track-record and parts B1 and B2 of the project are detailed in Section 5 of this guide.

6. Submit

Submissions are made online, via the participant portal submission service (PPSS for short). The first step - as soon as the idea of writing a project takes shape - is to obtain an EU login account. This login enables you and your employer (host institution) to fill in various administrative and financial documents online, in addition to your scientific project. To guide you, several documents are available on the ERC website:

1. The User Guide of the Submission Service is available.
2. The H2020 Online Manual describes the project submission procedure.
3. The IT HOW TO wiki site is an online manual with screenshots that requires you to log in with your username

When the submission deadline approaches, remember to validate your project several days in advance, to check that no parts are missing and that the pdf is legible. You can then update your project right up to the submission deadline, with each new upload replacing the previous version.

3. Profile of the project leader

Eligibility criteria and a description of the profile of an ERC Advanced Grant recipient are given in the ERC Work Program 2024. These criteria, which are listed in part below, are only indicative. A more pragmatic way of evaluating your profile is to compare it with recent winners in your category and panel.

For Starting

A competitive Starting Grant Principal Investigator must have already shown the potential for research independence and evidence of maturity, for example by having produced at least one important publication as main author or without the participation of their PhD supervisor. Applicant Principal Investigators should also be able to demonstrate a promising track record of early achievements appropriate to their research field and career stage, including significant publications (as main author) in major international peer-reviewed multidisciplinary scientific journals, or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals of their respective field. They may also demonstrate a record of invited presentations in well-established international conferences, granted patents, awards, prizes etc.

For Consolidator

A competitive Consolidator Grant Principal Investigator must have already shown research independence and evidence of maturity, for example by having produced several important publications as main author or without the participation of their PhD supervisor. Applicant Principal Investigators should also be able to demonstrate a promising track record of early achievements appropriate to their research field and career stage, including significant publications (as main author) in major international peer-reviewed multidisciplinary scientific journals, or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals of their respective field. They may also demonstrate a record of invited presentations in well-established international conferences, granted patents, awards, prizes etc.

For Advanced

ERC Advanced Grant Principal Investigators are expected to be active researchers and to have a track record of significant research achievements in the last 10 years which must be presented in the application. A competitive Advanced Grant Principal Investigator must have already shown a record which identifies them as an exceptional leader in terms of originality and significance of their research contributions.
4. Project evaluation

To write a project with every chance of success, it is essential to be familiar with the evaluation procedure, and in particular with the profile of the evaluators and the evaluation criteria. This is the aim of this section.

1. The procedure in brief

The two-step evaluation procedure (Step 1 and Step 2) is shown in the diagram below. In Step 1, only the short part B1 of the project is evaluated by 3 to 4 members of the panel to which the project has been submitted. In Step 2, the parts B1 and B2 are evaluated by 4 to 6 external experts and 2 to 3 panel members.

**Submission**
- Parts A + B1 + B2 + Appendices
- Letter of commitment
- Doctoral degree
- Checking eligibility

**Evaluation step 1**
- Part B1
  - Panel evaluation
  - Panel meetings
  - List of selected projects

**Evaluation step 2**
- Part B1 + B2
  - Evaluation by external experts
  - Interview
  - Panel meetings
  - List of selected projects

Approx. T_0 + 3 months  
Approx. T_0 + 6 months  
Approx. T_0 + 9 months

**PLEASE NOTE**: Interdisciplinary projects are evaluated by the main panel, which, if necessary, involves members of the secondary panel(s).

2. Evaluation: criteria

At each of the two evaluation steps, the experts write comments and assign scores to various criteria relating to the applicant (PI) and the scientific project. Details of the evaluation procedure and criteria can be found in the documents provided by the ERC. We have copied some of the key points from the StG and CoG 2020 applicant guide.

**Evaluators assess the PI** by answering questions about his or her scientific abilities, creativity and the innovative nature of his or her contributions.

To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to propose and conduct groundbreaking research? To what extent does the PI provide evidence of creative independent thinking? To what extent does the PI demonstrate the level of commitment to the project necessary for its execution and the willingness to devote a significant amount of time to the project (for Starting Grants, min 50% of the total working time on it and min 50% in an EU Member State or Associated Country)?

Each criterion is rated: outstanding, excellent, very good or non-competitive.

**The evaluators assess the scientific project** in terms of groundbreaking nature, ambition, feasibility, 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 across disciplines)? How much is the proposed research high risk/high gain? To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible? To what extent is the proposed research methodology 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 and resources necessary and properly justified?

These two scoring elements (IP and scientific project) enable panel members to grade the proposal as a whole (A, B or C), which will determine its ranking in relation to the other proposals. By way of example (but each panel decides its own ranking), a proposal ranked in the top third in step 2 is likely to be funded.
3. Evaluation: step 1

In this first step, only part B1 of the project is evaluated by 3 or 4 panel members, with varying degrees of expertise in the field. At the panel meeting, all panel members have access to the full range of expertise.

As a reminder, Part B1 includes:

- A cover page with title, acronym and summary of 2,000 characters,
- A 5-page synopsis,
- CV with track record, max. 4 pages.

All of this must give a very clear and convincing vision of the project, its stakes, its potential impact, and make the expert want to read the rest (part B2), as well as the scientific qualities of the PI.

IMPORTANT NOTICE: Please be aware that at step 1 of the evaluation only Part B1 is evaluated by the panel members, while at step 2 both Parts B1 and B2 are evaluated. When drafting Part B1, PIs should pay particular attention to the extended synopsis (section a) and should not consider it as simply complementing Part B2. It is important that the extended synopsis contains all essential information including the feasibility of the scientific proposal since the panel will only evaluate Part B1 at step 1. Please note that at step 1 the panel has no access to Part B2.

At the end of the evaluation of step 1 (parts B1), the candidate is presented with three situations:

- You are graded A: you move on to step 2 of the evaluation, and in particular to the interview. Regardless of the outcome of step two, you will be able to resubmit next call.
- You are graded B: your application is of high quality but does not pass to step 2. You are not authorized to resubmit at the next call.
- You are graded C: average quality. You do not proceed to the second step. You are not allowed to resubmit to the next call for projects.

The re-submission conditions show the importance of part B1 of the project.

4. Evaluation: step 2

If, at the end of step 1, your project is selected for step 2 of the evaluation process, you go on to the interview. The panel members in charge of your project identify a list of international experts with skills very close to those of your project, who will be asked to evaluate your project (B1 and B2). The project will then be evaluated by 6 to 8 experts, including 1 or 2 from the panel, and others from outside but chosen for their expertise in the field of your project. At the panel meeting, all panel members have access to the full range of expertise.

To prepare your interview, the CNRS Informatics’ ERC unit ERC offers you rehearsal sessions in the format required by the ERC. Please contact the ERC unit immediately after receiving notification of admission to this step.

Contact

CNRS Informatics ERC unit
ins2i.erc@cnrs.fr

As a reminder, part B2 corresponds to the presentation of the scientific project in three parts: the state of the art, the methodology (max. 14 pages) and the description of the resources (8,000 characters).

In Part B2, you can draw on the synopsis of Part B1 to avoid too much repetition (although keeping some of it may help to emphasize the essential points). It’s important to remember, however, that the overall must be pleasant to evaluate, so that evaluators don’t have to keep going back and forth between B1 and B2.

For the “resources” section, don’t hesitate to contact the SPV department of your delegation or university.

At the end of step 2 of the evaluation (parts B1 and B2), the candidate is presented with two situations:

- If you have an A rating, you may be considered for funding, subject to the availability of funds.
- You are graded B: you are not considered for funding. However, you are authorized to resubmit a project the following year. In the event of mission the following year, please note that the members of the review committee will be different, and it’s possible that the external reviewers will be different too. Nor is there any memory effect, at least officially. Thus, it is not a review procedure, but is considered a completely new submission. In general, we find that a resubmission that takes account of the experts’ opinions has a better chance of success. Contact the CNRS Informatics’ ERC unit to help you with your resubmission, in particular by analyzing the experts’ scientific report (ESR) with you.
5. Writing tips

All the framed parts in English are taken from the candidate 2020 guide.

If you know an ERC winner, ask them to send you their project. In the writing phase, it’s usually very informative to have a few examples of successful projects. Several examples are available on the official ERC website:

- For Starting
- For Consolidator
- For Advanced
- For Synergy

1. Part B1

Extended synopsis of the scientific proposal (5 pages max.)

The project has to be attractive, punchy and announce the breakthrough and the challenges you’re tackling. If possible, this should appear in the title (choose carefully), in the summary and clearly in the synopsis (5 pages long).

The synopsis must convince all panel members that the project is worthwhile, and take into account the fact that some of them may not be experts in the field. It’s essential to provide convincing arguments to show that the project is feasible and that you are competent to carry it out. Feel free to detail preliminary data if available (project start-up, proven methodology, etc.).

The Extended Synopsis should give a concise presentation of the scientific proposal, with particular attention to the ground-breaking nature of the research project and the feasibility of the outlined scientific approach. Describe the proposed work in the context of the state of the art of the field. References to literature should also be included. References do not count towards the page limits. It is important that this extended synopsis contains all essential information including the feasibility of the scientific proposal since the panel will only evaluate Part B1 at step 1.

CV

In step 1, your rating as Principal Investigator (PI) is based on your CV and track record (max. 4 pages). It is therefore vital to select, sort and highlight the salient points of your profile, giving the experts elements to assess your qualities according to the following criteria: groundbreaking, creativity, independence. The fault of French candidates is sometimes that they are too modest.

The CV should include the standard academic and research record. A suggested outline is available in the Part B1 downloadable template. The structure of the CV may be modified. Any research career gaps and/or unconventional paths should be clearly explained so that they can be fairly assessed by the evaluation panels.

Comments and recommendations for the CV:

- **Personal information:** provide a link to your personal website for quick verification by the experts (don’t forget to update your site!)
- **Education:** specify the specific features of the French system (grandes écoles with information on selection, level, etc.);
- **Current and previous position(s):** specify level of competition;
- **Fellowships and awards:** specify selection rate, nature and quality of institution;
- **Supervision of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows:** specify the rate of co-supervision and the number of co-supervisors; if possible, give a brief description of what happened to the students;
- **Teaching activities:** specify the nature (course, TD, TP), if it is a new course, the number of hours, etc.:
- **Organization of scientific meetings:** specify your role, the name of the event and its importance in the field;
- **Institutional responsibilities:** specify what this responsibility entails, in terms of work, visibility, notoriety, etc. ;
- **Commissions of trust:** as far as possible, situate your role and the level of conferences, journals, institutions, etc. in which you are involved;
- **Memberships of scientific societies:** to be mentioned only if significant;
- **Major collaborations:** assess the reputation and quality of the lab and its partners.

Early achievement track-record

The Principal Investigator (PI) must provide a list of achievements reflecting their track record. The PI should list his/her activity as regards (if applicable):

1. Publications (up to five for Starting Grant and up to ten for Consolidator Grant) in major international peer-reviewed multi-disciplinary scientific journals and/or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed conferences proceedings and/or monographs of their respective research fields, highlighting those without the presence as co-author of their PhD supervisor, and the number of citations (excluding self-citations) they have attracted;
2. Research monographs and any translations thereof;
3. Granted patent(s);
4. Invited presentations to peer-reviewed, internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools;
5. Prizes/Awards/Academy memberships.
Comments and recommendations for the Track record:

- **Publications**: limit yourself to what is international: indicate the leading journals and conferences in your field; specify the order of authors, which is customary in your field; give a summary of publications with figures, including the h-index (specify ISI Web of Science or Google Scholar, and the date), the impact factor of journals and the number of citations of your most significant articles. For Starting, give priority to identify publications without your thesis supervisor, as this demonstrates your independence. Present the contribution of each significant publication in a short sentence. Give priority to the best, most international or most significant publications. As a general rule: 5 in Starting Grant, 10 in Consolidator Grant and 10 in Advanced Grant.

- **Patents or software**: for patents, specify whether they are French patents only or whether they have given rise to extensions (PCT, national phases, etc.), indicate the inventors and their share of inventivity in the patents; briefly indicate the importance of the patents; for software, specify whether they have been filed with the Agency for the Protection of Programs (APP); in both cases, indicate whether they have given rise to operating licenses.

- **Invited presentations**: specify whether they are invited plenary lectures, invited lectures in a special session, or give precise details about the reputation of the event to which you are invited. Separate the events into different categories, and possibly keep only the most prestigious invitations;

- **Prizes and awards**: give details of the importance of the prize, the institution awarding it, the selection rate, etc.

- **Add a paragraph about your participation in projects**, indicating your role (partner, local coordinator, or PI of the project), the number of participants, the amount raised, etc.

Only this part B1 is considered in step 1 of the evaluation, and allows us to move on to step 2.

2. **Part B2**

Parts B1 and B2 are examined together in this step 2: B1 can be used as the basis for a long description of the project (less repetition), while maintaining a complete presentation that is pleasing to the expert. In particular, reading should be "linear" and not involve going back and forth between B2 and B1. Part B2 is the long description of the project (max. 14 pages, excluding references), which follows the following outline: state of the art, methodology, and description of resources (max. 8,000 characters). For this last part, don’t hesitate to contact the Partnership & Valorisation department of your Delegation or University.

**Scientific Proposal** (max. 14 pages):

This part is evaluated only in step 2 of the peer review evaluation. Please use the Word-template provided online in the Participant Portal Submission Page for the call.

References do not count towards the page limit. The scientific, technical, and/or scholarly aspects of the project should be described in more detail demonstrating the ground-breaking nature of the research, its potential impact and research methodology. The fraction of the applicant’s research effort that will be devoted to this project and a full estimation of the real project costs also need to be indicated.

Comments and recommendations for the scientific project:

- **State of the art** (presentation of scientific project): if necessary, use part B1 to avoid repetition. Repeat the most important and add equations, illustrations, diagrams, etc. that help understanding. Be careful not to force the expert to go back and forth between B1 and B2. Some experts prefer a self-sufficient B2 document.

- **Methodology** (organization): once the state of the art has been established, the challenges and objectives need to be precisely identified. This will enable us to structure the methodology in such a way as to respond clearly and in detail to those points clearly identified beforehand. It is not necessary to organize the “Work Packages” section with Gantt charts or other diagrams. If it is, however, essential to provide credible leads for tackling the various challenges of your project, and to convince the experts of its feasibility and of your ability to bring it to a successful conclusion.

- **It is also important to**: situate the project in its international context (partners and competitors), present the team and team members that the PI will be coordinating, demonstrating the complementarity of skills and their suitability to the project’s challenges, add a paragraph with arguments on the expected spin-offs, provide a risk analysis, discuss a “plan B” in the event that objectives are only partially achieved.

- **Resources** (presentation of financial arrangements and project costs): contact the partnership department of your Delegation or the Europe department of your university for the financial set-up of your project, to ensure that it is compatible with the agreement between your institution and the European Union, in particular the rules governing the eligibility of expenses. In particular, it is possible to pay salary supplements using the ERC grant. This must be done in accordance with the usual rules and practices of the institution hosting the PI, in line with the rules of the grant agreement. Further information can be found [here].

**Note that a project that requires less money than the maximum possible has no greater chance of passing**: it’s the scientific excellence of the project and the candidate that counts. The financial aspect does not really come into play in the evaluation, but only after the project has been accepted, in the negotiation phase. The project leader’s involvement in the project must comply with two rules: 50% of his or her research time must be spent in Europe or an associated country; the project leader must devote at least 50% (Starting), 40% (Consolidator) or 30% (Advanced) of his or her working time to the ERC project. A higher level of involvement is appreciated, but you should not indicate a rate of involvement that is too high, as this would not be credible. For example, it is unreasonable to go beyond 70%.
Appendices

A.1. Calendar of the 2024 call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>ERC-2024-StG</th>
<th>ERC-2024-CoG</th>
<th>ERC-2024-AdG</th>
<th>ERC-2024-SyG</th>
<th>ERC-2024-PoC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call Opens</td>
<td>11/07/2023</td>
<td>12/09/2023</td>
<td>29/05/2024</td>
<td>12/07/2023</td>
<td>16/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline</td>
<td>07/11/2023</td>
<td>12/12/2023</td>
<td>29/08/2024</td>
<td>15/11/2023</td>
<td>14/03/2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17/09/2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.2. PE6 and PE7 panel descriptions

For information, here are the keywords of the PE6 and PE7 panels, corresponding to the scientific activities at the heart of CNRS Informatics. In particular, these keywords show the diversity of members within a panel. Remember that part B1 of the project will be evaluated by the members of the panel chosen for the submission, so it must be convincing for experts with a varied profile.

**PE6 Computer Science and Informatics**

- Informatics and information systems, computer science, scientific computing, intelligent systems.
- PE6_1 Computer architecture, embedded systems, operating systems
- PE6_2 Distributed systems, parallel computing, sensor networks, cyber-physical systems
- PE6_3 Software engineering, programming languages and systems
- PE6_4 Theoretical computer science, formal methods, automata
- PE6_5 Security, privacy, cryptology, quantum cryptography
- PE6_6 Algorithms and complexity, distributed, parallel and network algorithms, algorithmic game theory
- PE6_7 Artificial intelligence, intelligent systems, natural language processing
- PE6_8 Computer graphics, computer vision, multimedia, computer games
- PE6_9 Human computer interaction and interface, visualisation
- PE6_10 Web and information systems, data management systems, information retrieval and digital libraries, data fusion
- PE6_11 Machine learning, statistical data processing and applications using signal processing (e.g. speech, image, video)
- PE6_12 Scientific computing, simulation and modelling tools
- PE6_13 Bioinformatics, bio-inspired computing, and natural computing
- PE6_14 Quantum computing (formal methods, algorithms and other computer science aspects)

**PE7 Systems and Communication Engineering**

- Electrical, electronic, communication, optical and systems engineering.
- PE7_1 Control engineering
- PE7_2 Electrical engineering: power components and/or systems
- PE7_3 Simulation engineering and modelling
- PE7_4 (Micro- and nano-) systems engineering
- PE7_5 (Micro- and nano-) electronic, optoelectronic and photonic components
- PE7_6 Communication systems, wireless technology, high-frequency technology
- PE7_7 Signal processing
- PE7_8 Networks, e.g., communication networks and nodes, Internet of Things, sensor networks, networks of robots
- PE7_9 Man-machine interfaces
- PE7_10 Robotics
- PE7_11 Components and systems for applications (in e.g., medicine, biology, environment)
- PE7_12 Electrical energy production, distribution, applications

Earlier versions of this document were written by Christian Jutten, and by Marie-Christine Rousset.
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