

ERC Advanced Grant Call 2021: Notes and Tips for Applicants (Version July 2021)

The information provided in this compilation is based on several sources, in particular on key documents published by the ERC, such as the Information for Applicants, as well as suggestions by ERC Panel members and evaluation comments.

Content

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Quick Overview for the Advanced Grant Call 2021 | 3 |
| Important Documents and Useful Links | 4 |
| Ethics and Security..... | 6 |
| Evaluating Scientific Excellence: Questions that AdG Reviewers Need to Answer | 7 |
| The Evaluating Process – Generalists and Specialists | 8 |
| <i>Which panel?</i> | <i>8</i> |
| <i>Indicative Evaluation Schedule for the Advanced Grant Call 2021.....</i> | <i>9</i> |
| Considerations and Tips for a Convincing ERC Advanced Grant Proposal | 10 |
| <i>Structure</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>B1 – Extended Synopsis</i> | <i>10</i> |
| <i>B2 – Scientific Proposal.....</i> | <i>11</i> |
| <i>Further Suggestions with Relevance both for B1 + B2</i> | <i>12</i> |
| Specific Remarks on CV, Track Record and Resources | 13 |
| <i>Curriculum Vitae (B1, Section b, max. 2 pages)</i> | <i>13</i> |
| <i>Ten Years Track-Record (B1, Section c, max. 2 pages).....</i> | <i>14</i> |
| <i>Resources (Online Submission Form Section 3: Budget Table + Text).....</i> | <i>15</i> |
| <i>Budget Table – Remarks on Specific Cost Categories</i> | <i>15</i> |

Quick Overview for the Advanced Grant Call 2021

Deadline: August 31, 2021 17:00 CET

- Waiting time for resubmission of ERC proposals that failed in step 1 of the evaluation: 1 year for proposals evaluated as category B, 2 years for category C proposals (most likely)
- Proposals that proceed to step 2 but are not funded can most likely be resubmitted “immediately” (to ERC calls of Work programme 2022 in Horizon Europe)
- **Waiting time for resubmission** of ERC proposals that failed in **step 1** of the evaluation: 1 year for proposals evaluated as category B, 2 years for category C proposals (most likely). Proposals that proceed to **step 2** but are not funded can most likely be resubmitted “immediately” (to ERC calls of Work programme 2022 in the next Framework Programme, Horizon Europe)
- **ERC panel structure has been revised** and expanded (2 new panels)
- The previous **section c) resources of part B2 is now part of the online submission form** (section 3, max 2 pages/8000 characters in total). Part B2 is now limited to **14 pages**
- Additional funding of up to 1 Mio EUR can be granted in exceptional, defined circumstances
- Literature references do not count towards page limits (B1+B2)
- 10 years Track Record: Presentation of up to 10 publications from the last 10 years; **preprints** may be included, if freely available from a preprint server
- Model CV-Template provided by ERC (should be followed; some adaptations possible)
- Mandatory Funding ID annex to indicate ongoing grants and submitted grant applications
- Dedicated textbox to explain cross-panel/cross-domain nature of proposal, if a second panel is selected
- Request for exclusion of up to three reviewers possible without justification
- Minimum 30% of the PIs total working time needs to be committed to the ERC project, and the PI needs to spend minimum 50% of his/her total working time in an EU or Associated Country, even if the salary of the PI is not charged to the project
- Written consent by all proposal participants/collaborators needs to be documented, e.g. by an email dated before the call deadline, but not submitted with the application (online form, section “Declarations”)
- **Open Access** for peer-reviewed publications is mandatory (new: immediate, without any embargo); related costs can be charged to the project
- **Provisions on research data sharing apply** also for ERC grants (as set out in Model Grant Agreement used for ERC actions). Therefore, a Data Management Plan (DMP) is now a mandatory deliverable of the ERC grant (6 months after project start)
- **Ethical issues table** and **Security issues table** need to be completed online (**template**)
- **Written consent by all participants named in the proposal needs to be documented**, e.g. by an email dated before the call deadline (not to be submitted with the application)

Important Documents and Useful Links

Please read the following two documents:

ERC Work Programme 2021 (legally binding)

Information for Applicants to the Advanced Grant Call 2021

→ includes the detailed panel expertise keywords

- ERC **Standard Proposal template** for the Advanced Grant, including administrative forms and Letter of Commitment of the Host Institute: available via the online-submission tool after registration (Funding & Tenders Portal)
- **ERC Homepage:** erc.europa.eu
- ERC Advanced Grant 2021 Applicant Mailbox for queries related to the call: ERC-2021-ADG-APPLICANTS@ec.europa.eu

- Link to previous **ERC panel members (frequently generalists):**
<https://erc.europa.eu/document-category/evaluation-panels>

The lists of previous panel members can be used to get an overview on the different backgrounds from which panel members may assess your proposal (considering that typically four panel members will read it). ERC panel members alternate between even and odd years, while several of the panel members will usually be replaced by new ones.

The **Panel Chairs** for the ERC Advanced Grant Call 2021 are listed at

https://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/Panel_Chairs_ERC_Advanced_Grant_2021.pdf

- Link to previous **ERC external referees (specialists):** <https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/how-to-participate/reference-documents;programCode=H2020>
- Link to ERC **database of ERC-funded projects:**
<https://erc.europa.eu/projects-figures/project-database>

Here you can search for ERC project summaries (abstracts) and Principle Investigators of ERC grants. Search results can be filtered e.g. by panel and keywords. Project abstracts and the CVs of Principal Investigators funded by the panel you consider applying for may prove helpful for deciding on the best evaluation panel, and for comparing CVs/track records of PIs.

- ERC webpage with information and guidelines on Open Access and Open Research Data with Guidelines (however, not yet updated for Horizon Europe):
<https://erc.europa.eu/funding-and-grants/managing-project/open-access>
- List of **ERC proposals published online** by ERC Principal Investigators:
<https://www.ffg.at/europa/heu/erc/published-proposals>

“Submit early, submit often”

Online submission of ERC proposals

*We strongly recommend to **submit a first version of the proposal around one week before the deadline**, in order to check for any browser problem or other technical issues that may block proposal submission, or lead to layout changes in the submitted proposal. Up to the call deadline, you can continuously modify your proposal by submitting (not just uploading) a new version, which will overwrite the previous one.*

- In case of technical problems with the online submission system, please **contact your host institution** (grant management/researchers’ service), the National Contact Points for ERC at FFG (ylva.huber@ffg.at, lil.reif@ffg.at) or directly the **Helpdesk: EC-FUNDING-TENDER-SERVICE-DESK@ec.europa.eu** or **+32 (2) 29 92222**
- Information on how to use the online submission system is also available via the proposal submission service user manual:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/support/sep_usermanual.pdf
- Please ensure that all the **required supporting documents are submitted** via the submission tool in time (**Commitment letter of the Host Institution in the current template** [older versions are not accepted], ethical issues annex [ethical self-assessment and any additional documents related to ethics], other supporting documents as applicable)
- Also, please note the remark on “**Consent obtained**” in the online forms (“other questions”): *Please confirm that you (as PI) have the written consent of all participants on their involvement and the content of this proposal, as well as of any researcher mentioned in the proposal on their participation in the project (either as team member, collaborator, other PI or member of the advisory board). We may request you to provide proof of the written consent obtained at any time during the evaluation.**

The written consents should however not be submitted with the application. Consent can e.g. be documented by an **email** by the participant, which is **dated before the call deadline**.

Ethics and Security

- An **ethics issues table** has to be completed in the online submission forms. The page numbers in the ethics table refer to part B2. It is possible to indicate several page numbers divided by '/' (e.g. 12/14).
- If any of the ethics issues listed in the table apply to your proposal, **an ethics self-assessment** should be provided as well, within the corresponding online template (one text box each for ethical dimension of the objectives, methodology and likely impact; and compliance with ethical principles and relevant legislations). The ERCEA has provided some further explanation:

“The Ethics self-assessment text boxes have a character limit. The automatic limit is currently set to 5000 characters/box = 10000 in total. We suggest that PIs make use of both boxes. If the detailed explanation goes beyond the limit (10000 characters), our recommendation is to provide the detailed explanation in a separated document and uploaded the pdf file as one of the optional annexes. Please inform PIs to make a reference to the annex in the Ethics text box (application form).”

“Applicants should only respond to the questions as displayed in the online submission form – they prevail over the ones presented in the general guidelines”.

- The **ethical issues section will not be evaluated** during proposal evaluation, as communicated to FFG by the ERCEA previously:

“Any document related to ethics (including the ethics issues table) will not be made available to the ERC reviewers during the evaluation. Hence, they will not be instructed to look at them. The evaluators are not supposed to take ethic issues into account during evaluations. The ethics clearance is done by the ethics review after evaluation is final.”

For proposals with immediate ethics issues, it is nonetheless *“advisable to include a short paragraph summarising how they will be dealt with and refer to the ethics self-assessment.”*

- In Horizon Europe, applicants are also requested to identify if the proposed activity will use and/or generate information which might raise **security concerns**. This occurs by completing a **security issues table** in the online proposal submission form. If applicable, available supporting documentation should be provided as well (as separate annexes). For proposals selected for funding, additional information regarding security issues may be requested at a later stage.

Evaluating Scientific Excellence: Questions that AdG Reviewers Need to Answer

Source: ERC Work Programme 2021, p. 33

Research Project – Ground-breaking nature, ambition and feasibility

Ground-breaking nature 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 between or across disciplines)?
- To what extent is the proposed research high risk/high gain (i.e. if successful the payoffs will be very significant, but there is a higher-than-normal risk that the research project does not entirely fulfil its aims)?

Scientific Approach

- To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high risk/high gain (based on the Extended Synopsis)?
- To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project (based on the full Scientific Proposal)?
- To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodology (based on the full Scientific Proposal)?
- To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources and PI commitment adequate and properly justified (based on the full Scientific Proposal)?

Principal Investigator – Intellectual capacity and creativity (Advanced)

- To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?
- To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?
- To what extent has the PI demonstrated sound leadership in the training and advancement of young scientists?


The Evaluation Process – Generalists and Specialists

Which panel?

- Consider which panel is likely in the best position to understand the ground-breaking nature of your project, and to appreciate your previous achievements.
- While the ERC welcomes interdisciplinary projects, they constitute a challenge for the evaluation process, as these proposals need to be rated as excellent in every discipline they cover. If you consider your proposal to be interdisciplinary (cross-panel/cross-domain), you can indicate a secondary panel in the online-submission system. In this case, please describe the cross-panel/cross-domain nature in the dedicated text box on the B1 cover page.

However, we recommend to give some extra thought to this question. So far, the success rates of cross-panel proposals apparently has been lower at least in the first stage of the evaluation, while success rates for cross-panel proposals are higher in the second stage, according to information by the ERCEA. One reason for the lower success rate at step 1 might be that panel members from the secondary panel (usually one panel member) are not physically present during panel meetings, but only submit their written comments to the panel, according to our information. As an alternative to selecting two panels, you can choose only one panel, and add keywords from other relevant panels (as well as free keywords).

- Exceptionally, the ERC may also allocate a proposal to a different panel than the one indicated by the PI.



Evaluation process step 1

Usually **four Panel Members** (out of approximately 14-16) **read part B1 only**. The majority may often be **generalists rather than specialists** in the area(s) of your project.

Evaluation step 2

The **full proposal (B1 and B2) becomes accessible** to the **panel members and specialist remote referees** (who are selected by the panel members based on B1 only). The final decision on the recommendation of a project for funding lies with the panel members.

Indicative Evaluation Schedule for the Advanced Grant Call 2021



Updates at: <https://erc.europa.eu/timeframe-advanced-grant-2021-evaluation-erc-2021-adg>

Considerations and Tips for a Convincing ERC Advanced Grant Proposal

Questions and critical comments of colleagues (both within and beyond your research field, ideally with a background similar to that of potential panel members) on the proposal will be highly valuable. In addition, polishing of the proposal by an English native speaker, where applicable, is highly recommended.

Structure

- Your proposal should read as a compelling and authentic **narrative**.
- Provide a **clear, coherent structure**.
- **Present the big picture to** put your research into a broader **context**. This will help to **motivate your research goals** and to capture the interest also of reviewers who are **non-specialists** in the field (often the majority)
- The **major part** of the proposal should explain your **novel approach and planned work**. (As a rule of thumb for B1: minimum 50 % of the extended synopsis)
- Present the concrete **aims/objectives** of your project rather early and in a highly visible manner (e.g. bullet points, bold fonts, text box), so that panel members can find them at the first glance.
- The **perfect match between aims/objectives, the methodology and the workplan** of the project should be easy to perceive. For instance, you can refer to aim(s) 1,2 when describing method x or research line/workpackage y). This will support the impression of an well organised, coherent proposal.

B1 – Extended Synopsis

Part B1 is your “ticket to the interview”: a crucial element of the proposal that needs to capture both the ambition and the feasibility of the project. The success rate for step1 of the evaluation process, where only Part B1 is assessed, was lately below 30% for the Advanced Grant.

The extended synopsis in **B1** should contain **all important information** to evaluate both the breakthrough character and the feasibility of the project.

This includes succinct information on:

- key **preliminary data/results/proof of principle** already obtained, e.g. in a pilot study. Ideally, a first publication demonstrating the high promise of your approach is available
- **risks and contingency strategies** (what are significant risks and your plan B, why does the project have a favourable risk-gain-balance)

- how will you **validate** the results of your project? E.g. how will you determine causality, as opposed to “only” correlation? → to show the **explanatory power** of your approach
- any other important information to underscore the breakthrough potential of your proposal. For instance, reviewers may ask whether the results obtained in the ERC project will be **generalizable**.
- Based on ERC evaluation comments, we highly recommend to also include a paragraph/sentence on the **team composition** in B1 (message: the necessary expertise will be assembled in your team), as well as a **brief timeplan** (1-2 sentences, or putting timing information in brackets, e.g. “aim 1... [Year 1-3]” / “key intermediate goal x [Year 3]”).
- One or a few high quality **figure(s)/charts** can be very helpful also for B1, e.g. a flowchart to illustrate your approach
- **References** to literature should be included. They do not count towards the five pages-limit. The references in B1 may also support Panel Members in selecting the remote referees to evaluate the proposal in step 2 of the evaluation.

B2 – Scientific Proposal

Part B2 should present the required details for the evaluation by specialist reviewers in step 2. This concerns in particular the methodology, preliminary data, and risks and contingency plans.

- **Avoid unnecessary repetition between part B1 and B2.** As part B1 should capture the essence of the entire proposal, B1 and B2 need to be mutually consistent. However, panel members may increasingly disapprove of longer sections with identical wording in B1 and B2. In part B2, you can also refer to figures/text presented in part B1. This can save space in B2 to provide more detailed information on e.g. methodological aspects for specialist reviewers.
- We recommend to maintain the overall structure of B2 provided for in the B2 template with two sections: a) State of the art and objectives; b) Methodology
- Where applicable, present important **intermediate goals** and any intermediate stages where results may require adjustments to your planning
- Highlight any **novel/unconventional methodology**
- Deal **appropriately with significant risks** (contingency plans, alternative strategies, convincing preliminary data) in order to further bolster the message of a favourable risk-gain-balance.
- At least in most cases, reviewers will likely expect a reasonable **time plan** for an ERC project. It has meanwhile become standard in part B2 of ERC proposals to present e.g. a

Gantt chart or overview table on key intermediate goals/milestones (see example below). The time plan should however not be too detailed to be credible for a ground-breaking research agenda.

| | Aim 1 | Aim 2 | Aim 3 |
|-----------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Years 1-2 | Analysis of... Publication 1... | Purify... | Visualize... Conference... |
| Years 3-4 | Maps... | Integration of... | ... |
| Year 5 | Model... | Correlation of findings... | ...Publications,... |

Figure 1 Fictitious example table for key intermediate goals

- **References** to literature should be included (they do not count towards the 14 page-limit)

Further Suggestions with Relevance both for B1 + B2

Novelty and unique features

- Address explicitly the **ground-breaking nature** of the project (what is the core novelty?) and its potential scientific **impact**. We suggest to outline both the “immediate” impact on your field/other fields as well as your more **long-term-vision** (5-10 years or beyond)
- Reviewers should understand what makes your approach **original, timely, genuinely novel**, and not a limited/incremental “extension” of (your) previous research.
- Explain the **unique features** and the advantages of your approach compared to **competing approaches**.

Hypothesis-driven project/clearly defined research questions

- While there can be differences between research fields/disciplines, ERC reviewers frequently comment positively on the fact that a project is hypothesis-driven. In any case, however, the overarching research questions should be crystal clear. Proposals that lack such question(s) and come across as largely technology- or methodology-driven will likely be at a disadvantage.

Scope of the project

- As with any research proposal, also the scope of an ERC project can be questioned by reviewers – either as being too broad or too narrowly focused/incremental. It is therefore important to explain why the approach you have chosen is the best strategy to achieve a breakthrough.

Clarity

- Your proposal needs to be **well understandable** also for **reviewers that are not specialists** in your own research field/topic. Motto: “everything on a silver platter”, in a **concise, easily accessible** writing-style

- Important: **Precise wording**/descriptions, **clear** (working) **definitions**, concrete **examples**, high quality **charts/figures**
- Ensure a **reader-friendly layout**. It can be helpful to highlight key messages, e.g. by a short summary of a section in a text box, bullet points, selective use of bold fonts

Collaborations

- Strive for a good balance when describing collaborations for the project: explain their importance for the project, but without giving the impression of the PI being "too dependent" on them. Messages: Due to the excellent network of the PI, s/he will have access to all required complementary expertise and infrastructure. The collaborations are well-defined and targeted. This should avoid a potential impression of a project based on a consortium, as the ERC explicitly does not fund consortia (see ERC Work Programme). If you think your project would actually require several PIs, the ERC Synergy Grant call (for a group of 2-4 PIs) could be an interesting option.

Demonstrating a competitive Advanced profile

- **CV, Track Record; B1 & B2**
Your scientific leadership should be evident throughout the proposal, i.e. not only in the CV and Track Record section, but also in the synopsis and the full scientific proposal, e.g. when presenting the state of the art or preliminary data (→ "As we could show in [ref.x]...")
- **Up to 10 representative publications** from the last 10 years should be listed in the track (see below and Work Programme 2021).

Picture the interview

- We recommend to think of the interview situation when writing the proposal. The core messages you would pitch to generalist panel members in a 5-10 minutes presentation should be highly visible in your proposal and well understandable also to non-specialists in the field.

Not to be underestimated: Proposal Abstract

The abstract is an important part of the proposal, also during panel discussions. The majority of panel members may only read the abstract and possibly leaf through the proposals when they are discussed in the panel meetings (and the entire panel takes the funding decision). The abstract should therefore present the essence of your project, including the scientific challenge/knowledge gap, novel approach, objectives, potential impact, unique features.

Specific Remarks on CV, Track Record and Resources

Curriculum Vitae (B1, Section b, max. 2 pages)

- Overall, it is recommended to **maintain the structure of the CV template**, as applicable; panel members seem to appreciate it (see also Information for Applicants, p20:

“Curriculum vitae ...should follow the suggested template“)

- In addition to the examples provided by the CV template, we suggest to present also key activities as **reviewer for journals**
- Ensure an impeccable and reader-friendly **layout** also of the CV and Track Record section
- **Appendix to the CV: All ongoing and submitted grants and funding of the PI (Funding ID)**
Mandatory information not counting towards page limits
- According to information by the ERCEA, the information in this table is also used to support the selection of reviewers for the proposal (avoiding potential conflicts of interest with reviewers that might be involved in running/submitted projects with the applicant).
- However, if several ongoing grants are listed which will temporally overlap with the ERC project, it is advisable to also demonstrate that **the PI will be able to fulfil his/her time commitment to the ERC project**, e.g. by indicating the percentage of time commitment of the PI for the other grants in the table.
- You can also present the total amount of funding obtained by the PI so far (CV or Track record)

Ten-year Track-Record (B1, Section c, max. 2 pages)

- The typical **structure of the ten years track record** is provided in the **ERC Work Programme 2021, p20**
- A central element of this track record is the presentation of your most important publications (**up to ten**) in the last 10 years, as main author¹/senior author*. You can also add field relevant bibliometric indicators, e.g. citations without self-citations (see ERC Work Programme 2021; Information for Applicants 2021). **Preprints** may be included, if freely available from a preprint server (preprints should be properly referenced and either a link to the preprint or a DOI should be provided).
- We recommend to provide **summary/overview information** for the reviewers (e.g. total number of publications, contributions to conferences, citations, h-index etc as applicable; and a **weblink to a full list of publications and talks**), as well as specific **“highlights“**.
- For the list of ten top publications in the Ten year Track record, we suggest to **describe their significance 1-2 sentences**, e.g. in a textbox (“Here, we could show for the first time...”) Such summaries appear to be highly appreciated by panel members.
- Judging from evaluation comments, reviewers like to see evidence for **successful mentoring activities** by “advanced” PIs (Track Record section: Major contributions to the early careers of excellent researchers). We suggest to provide **examples** (Dr. X, PhD student in my group,...now Prof. at Institution X/ group leader at Y, awarded with a prize,...)

¹ Until the ERC Advanced Grant Call 2016, the wording was “senior author”

Resources (Online Submission Form Section 3: Budget Table + Text)

- The **budget table and description of resources** are part of the **online submission form (Section 3 – Budget table and text box “Section C” below)**. They should therefore not be included in Part B2. However, we would expect that a note we received by ERCEA for the last calls in Horizon 2020 is still valid, which confirmed that some information regarding resources, i.e. *“regarding the role of team members and collaborators, may be added in the usual (B2) sections a and b”*. This would seem reasonable, as the text box in the resources section currently does not allow the inclusion of explanatory charts s.a. Gantt charts, which also may include information on team members. That said, section C is clearly also intended for information on the team (please see further below).
- The budget table and description of resources will be made available to panel members and remote referees. The **description of resources, without the budget table, is limited 8.000 characters** (corresponding to two pages). It does not count towards the 14 pages-limit for B2.
- Apart from explaining the project costs in the adequate detail, section C is also designed to present information on the “size and nature of the team, indicating, where appropriate, the key team members and their roles” (see ERC Information for Applicants). We recommend to include the expertise requirements for Post Docs and PhD students that will be hired for the project, as well as information on **working arrangements** (e.g. supervision of PhD students supported by Post Docs, overall supervision and guidance by PI).
- Reviewers may question whether certain tasks could be “too demanding for a PhD student” and should rather be allocated to a Post Doc; or conversely whether the presented tasks constitute a convincing PhD project.
- We also recommend to present relevant information on the **host institution/research environment** here, to strengthen the message of “the right project and team in the right place”.
- Explain your **commitment** to the project as PI, including the percentage of total working time. If you think there could be reasonable doubts on whether you will be able to fulfil the time commitment due to other duties, describe your strategy up front.

Budget Table – Remarks on Specific Cost Categories

Please contact the grant management office at your ERC host institution for support with the budget calculation.

- **Other goods, works and services** (with overhead flat rate): This category includes contracts to purchase goods, works or services, e.g. contract for a computer; contract for an audit certificate on the financial statements; contract for the publication of brochures; contract for the creation of a project website, contract for organization of the rooms and catering for a meeting, contract for hiring IPR consultants/agents. These costs do not arise from directly implementing the action tasks of the ERC project, but they are necessary to implement these tasks. Overheads apply to these costs, as opposed to the case for subcontracts (https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/agr-contr/general-mga_horizon-euratom_en.pdf)

- **Audit costs** should be included in the **other direct costs** category (see above). In Horizon Europe, only one audit (certificate of the financial statement) is required at the end of the project, if the funding (direct costs) amounts to ≥ 430.000 EUR (A special threshold applies for beneficiaries with a systems and process audit: requested EU contribution \geq EUR 725 000).
- **Subcontracting costs** (without overheads): Costs for subcontracts arise from contracts for goods, works or services that are part of the action tasks.
- **Equipment:** Please note that typically, only **depreciation rates** (according to national rules) can be charged to the ERC for equipment (with some possible exceptions). If the depreciation period of the equipment in question exceeds the duration of the ERC project, the remaining costs have to be carried by other means. Please contact your host institution in case of questions in this context.
- The category for **internally invoiced goods and services** refers e.g. to access to internal services that are charged as unit costs (no overheads apply)
- Do not forget the possibility to include costs for publications, including **open access fees** In Horizon Europe, as each ERC beneficiary must ensure open access to all peer-reviewed scientific publications relating to its results. Also costs related to management of research data/ **open access to research data** can be charged.
- **Other direct costs with no overheads:** This category includes costs of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the beneficiary (= host institution), e.g. access to large research facilities owned by a third party and not used on the premises of the beneficiaries.
- **PI salary:** As a PI, you may request funding for your salary corresponding to the percentage of total working time dedicated to the ERC project (or a smaller fraction of that amount), even if you already receive a salary by your host institution. Funding of (part of) the PI's salary can e.g. support the host institution in hiring a teaching replacement in case there is an agreement to reduce teaching obligations of a PI during the ERC project. Please consider, however, whether funding of the PI salary could negatively affect the suitability of the team due to budget constraints, as this needs of course to be avoided.

In case you consider a 100% **time commitment** as PI to the ERC project, we recommend to give this some extra thought. 100% time commitment of your total working time implies that there is no time foreseen for other activities such as teaching, writing grant proposals, etc, for the duration of the project. A slight reduction of your time commitment can provide you with more flexibility.

- While the administrative requirements for ERC projects are comparatively slim, please note that you also may include personnel costs for **administrative** work. You could discuss this with your host institution.