

Συνάντηση Εργασίας για το Ειδικό Πρόγραμμα "ΙΔΕΕΣ" του 7ου Προγράμματος Πλαισίου Έρευνας και Τεχνολογικής Ανάπτυξης της ΕΕ.

Κλέα Κατσουγιάννη
Εργαστήριο Υγιεινής, Επιδημιολογίας και Ιατρικής Στατιστικής, Ιατρική
Σχολή Παν. Αθηνών

Εθνικό Κέντρο Τεκμηρίωσης (ΕΚΤ), Εθνικό Σημείο Επαφής για το 7ο ΠΠ,
σε συνεργασία με τη Γενική Γραμματεία Έρευνας και Τεχνολογίας, και με την
υποστήριξη της Ευρωπαϊκής Επιτροπής και του Ευρωπαϊκού Συμβουλίου Έρευνας.



Funding available in Europe

The 7th Framework Programme (FP) for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities is now running. It covers the years 2007-2013, it has a total budget of 50 billion.

Grants are determined on the basis of calls for proposals and selected through a peer review process.

There are no fixed national or regional allocations.

Specific programmes

- Cooperation (collaboration industry-academia)
- **Ideas (research at the “frontier” of science-ERC)**
- People (mobility- career development)
- Capacities
- EURATOM

IDEAS Programme implemented by the
EUROPEAN RESEARCH COUNCIL
ERC

<http://erc.europa.eu>

President: Helga Nowotny

Frontier Research (to address the "grand challenges" ...help improve the lives of the citizens of Europe...)

- Investigator driven; bottom up
- Excellence; Creativity; Risks (high risk/high gain)
- ERC Starting Grants
- ERC Advanced Investigators Grants

ERC Starting Independent Researcher Grant

- Any field of science
- PhD >2 years and <12 years (extensions if there are justified breaks in career, such as maternity)
- Starters 2-7 years, Consolidators >7 -12 yrs (Now the 5th call is open)
- Host Organization (researcher moving) in EU or associated country
- Up to 1.5M euro (nominally 2M)- 5 years
- Calls published July each year, deadline autumn

5th call: Current deadlines

- Physical Sciences and Engineering (10 October 2011)
- Life sciences (9 November 2011)
- Social Sciences and Humanities (24 November 2011)

Submission to a panel (also interdisciplinary submissions)

- LIFE SCIENCES (9 panels)
- SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES (6 panels)
- DOMAIN PHYSICAL SCIENCE & ENGINEERING (10 panels)

LIFE SCIENCES

- LS1 Molecular and structural biology and biochemistry
- LS2 Genetics, genomics, bioinformatics and systems biology
- LS3 Cellular and developmental biology
- LS4 Physiology, pathophysiology and endocrinology
- LS5 Neurosciences and neural disorders
- LS6 Immunity and infection
- **LS7 Diagnostic tools, therapies and public health**
- LS8 Evolutionary, population and environmental biology
- LS9 Applied life sciences and biotechnology

Reviewing

- Panel members and external reviewers
- Two stage procedures (but all forms submitted in one date)
- Stage 1 (3-5 reviewers)
- Stage 2: Interview (4-9 reviewers)

Choice of Reviewers & Procedures

- Reviewers are from the Panel, from the "shadow Panel", or external
- All choices based on the Reviewers expertise. However, the final decision taken by the Panel!!!
- In the Panel I was participating, there were 172 proposals at stage 1; 43 were asked for interview (25%); about 22 were successful (I had to review about 40 at stage 1; 10 in stage 2)
- Deadline for proposals last year: 9 November 2010
- 1st stage meeting: 15-17 February 2011
- Interviews 7-10 June 2011

Profile of the ERC Starting Grant Applicant

- Starters and Consolidators are evaluated in parallel but separately.
- From erc.europa.eu/pdf/ERC_Work_Programme_2011.pdf
- " A competitive Starting Grant Principal Investigator must have already shown the potential for research independence and evidence of maturity. For example, it is normally expected that applicants will have produced at least one important publication without the participation of their PhD supervisor."
- ...track record of early achievements...including significant publications (as main author)
- ...record of invited presentations in well-established international conferences, granted patents, awards, prizes...

The Competitive Applicant

- Has shown potential for research independence & scientific maturity (Grant allowing consolidation of independence)
- (nominal: 1 important publication without PhD supervisor)
- Significant publications (as main author); invited presentations; patents; awards, prizes

Criteria for evaluation

- Excellence is the sole criterion of evaluation
- Evaluation of the Principal Investigator (PI)
- Evaluation of proposal

Criteria for the evaluation of the PI

- ***Intellectual capacity and creativity:*** *To what extent are the achievements and publications of the PI ground breaking and demonstrative of independent thinking and capacity to go significantly beyond the state of the art? To what extent will an ERC Starting Grant make a significant contribution to the establishment or consolidation of independence?*
- ***Commitment:*** *Is the PI strongly committed to the project and willing to devote a significant amount of time to it (>50%)?*

Criteria for the evaluation of the Research Project

- ***Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research:*** *To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges at the frontiers of the field(s) addressed? To what extent does it have suitably ambitious objectives, which go substantially beyond the current state of the art (e.g. including inter- and trans-disciplinary developments and novel or unconventional concepts and/or approaches)?*
- ***Methodology:*** *To what extent does the possibility of a major breakthrough with an impact beyond a specific research domain/ discipline justify any highly novel and/or unconventional methodologies ("high-gain/high-risk balance")? To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible?*

Grading

- 4: outstanding
- 3: Excellent
- 2: Very good
- 1: Non-competitive

- Threshold: 2

Essential features of the proposal

- For the PI to have some real degree of independence
 - (Unfortunately southern countries are at a disadvantage-time to change!- scientists mobility!)
- For the project:
 - Think of the impact!
 - Be specific
 - Employ preliminary data (e.g. exposure contrasts; previous response rates; prevalence/ incidence of a specific disease or health outcome)
 - Have a good structure, make it easy to read

Taking into account the Reviewer's
point of view

Reading your proposal as if you were the Reviewer

- The Reviewer is doing hard work trying to understand and judge in a fair way
- Often, especially in bottom-up approaches, he is not "the" expert in the field of your application
- Do not take anything for granted, do not assume something is so evident, it should be known.

Get in the Reviewer's shoes!

- Do not try to hide something you are not so certain or sure about, by writing commonplace generalities.
- Be clear and specific
- Better to admit a weakness
- Avoid abbreviations!
- Research your topic well, better to have a good idea of how you are going to implement your project

INTERVIEW!!

- Good knowledge of the literature
- For every point know "why" and "how".
- Don't hesitate to ask for clarifications
- Self confident but not arrogant

Ευχαριστώ για την προσοχή σας!

Ερωτήσεις? Σχόλια?