



Horizon Europe

European Research Council (ERC)

Frontier Research Grants

Guide for Peer Reviewers

Starting and Consolidator Grant Calls



European Research Council
Executive Agency

Established by the European Commission

Version 6.0
30.09.2025

Version	Publication Date	Description
<u>1.0</u>	13.04.2021	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2021 Calls</i>
<u>2.0</u>	23.11.2021	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2022 Calls</i>
<u>3.0</u>	13.10.2022	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2023 Calls</i>
<u>4.0</u>	10.10.2023	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2024 Calls</i>
<u>5.0</u>	08.10.2024	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2025 Calls</i>
<u>6.0</u>	30.09.2025	<i>Guide for Peer Reviewers – Starting and Consolidator Grant 2026 Calls</i>



European Research Council
Executive Agency

Established by the European Commission

European Research Council (ERC) Frontier Research Grants

Guide for Peer Reviewers

**Applicable to the ERC Starting and Consolidator Grants
(ERC Work Programme 2026)**

**Version 6.0
30.09.2025**

IMPORTANT TO NOTE

This Guide for Peer Reviewers is based on legal documents setting the rules and conditions for the ERC frontier research grants, in particular:

- The [ERC Work Programme 2026](#)¹, which defines the objectives and principles of the ERC funding as well as the main features of the Calls for Proposals for the ERC Starting and Consolidator Grants including the call deadlines and the call budgets. It also specifies that a two-step peer review procedure will be applied following a single submission of a full proposal, and sets the framework for budgetary implementation and the evaluation criterion;
- the [ERC Rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#) establish the rules of submission of proposals and the related evaluation process, selection and award procedures relevant to the [Specific Programme of Horizon Europe](#) – the Framework programme for Research and Innovation (2021-2027);
- the Contract² or the Letter of Appointment³ for ERC experts and ERC Remote Referees respectively, which defines the relationship between the ERCEA and the experts, and the use of personal data by the ERCEA.⁴

This document complements and does not supersede the aforementioned documents, which are legally binding and prevail in case of any discrepancies. This guide specifies in more details the peer review evaluation process, its inputs and outputs, and the responsibilities of the participating reviewers in the process.

The European Commission, the ERC Executive Agency or any person or body acting on their behalf cannot be held responsible for the use made of this document.

Abbreviations

AC - [Associated Country](#)

CoG - [Consolidator Grant](#)

ERC - [European Research Council](#)

ERCEA - [ERC Executive Agency](#)

ERC WP - [ERC Work Programme](#)

F&T Portal - [EU Funding & Tenders Portal](#) [Single Electronic Data Interchange Area (SEDIA)]

HI - Host Institution

PI - Principal Investigator

PM - Panel Member

PEV - Panel Evaluator

RR - Remote Referee

ScC - [ERC Scientific Council](#)

SEP - [Submission and Evaluation of Proposals System](#)

StG - [Starting Grant](#)

¹ European Commission Decision C(2025) 5000 of 08 July 2025.

² Published on the F&T Portal: https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/experts/model-contract_en.pdf.

³ See Annex B to the [ERC Rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#).

⁴ The personal data are processed in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 2018/1725.

CONTENTS

- 1. EVALUATION OF ERC STARTING AND CONSOLIDATOR GRANT PROPOSALS..... 6**
 - 1.1 PEER REVIEWERS 6**
 - 1.2 EVALUATION PROCESS.....10**
- 2. INDIVIDUAL REVIEW.....14**
 - 2.1 EVALUATION CRITERION14**
 - 2.2 HOW TO EVALUATE A PROPOSAL – DOs AND DON'Ts.....15**
 - 2.3 APPROACH TO MULTI- AND INTER-DISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS.....17**
- 3. ELECTRONIC TOOLS USED IN EVALUATION17**
- ANNEX 1 – EVALUATION FORM17**
- ANNEX 2 – PANELS: ALLOCATION, INDICATIVE BUDGET AND STRUCTURE18**
- PRIMARY PANEL STRUCTURE19**

1. EVALUATION OF ERC STARTING AND CONSOLIDATOR GRANT PROPOSALS

The ERC has the mandate to implement a bottom-up, investigator-driven approach to frontier research funding. The selection of proposals for funding by the ERCEA is a result of a panel-based, peer review evaluation with excellence as the sole criterion. The principal objective of this peer review system is to select the best science, independent of its discipline and of the particularities of the review panel structure.

The purpose of the ERC Starting and Consolidator Grants schemes is to empower individual researchers at different stages of their career and to provide the best setting to foster their creativity. These grant schemes support projects carried out by individual teams, which are headed by a single Principal Investigator. Principal Investigators must demonstrate the ground-breaking nature and ambition of their scientific proposal. The ERC research proposals are expected to take risks. It remains important, however, that the risk and its management are well thought through and addressed in the proposal.

1.1 PEER REVIEWERS

In the ERC panel-based system, high-level scientists and scholars assess proposals and make recommendations for funding with the assistance of external specialists called Remote Referees. The relationship between the ERCEA and the peer reviewers is governed by a signed Expert Contract for Panel Members, Panel Chairs and Panel Evaluators (PEVs) and by a Letter of Appointment for Remote Referees (see the Model Contract for Experts² and the Letter of Appointment for ERC Remote Referees³, respectively).

By signing these documents, the reviewer accepts the conditions regarding confidentiality and conflict of interest, and use of personal data by the ERCEA. The ERCEA cannot make proposals available to a reviewer who has not been officially contracted/appointed.

A breach of the Expert Code of Conduct or other serious misconduct by a reviewer may be qualified as grave professional misconduct and may lead to the termination of the Contract or the appointment.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY RULES FOR PEER REVIEWERS

Peer reviewers should not be put in a situation in which their impartiality may be questioned, or where suspicion could arise that their recommendations are affected by elements that are outside the scope of the review. Furthermore, peer reviewers should not engage in any contact with applicants or beneficiaries (affiliated entities or other third parties involved in the proposals/actions or team members or persons linked to them) about the evaluation that they are participating in (neither during nor after the evaluation).

A list of conflicts of interests (see below) will be displayed in the on-line evaluation system when experts are asked to review a proposal, and the experts will be asked to confirm the absence of conflict of interest when accepting to review a proposal and when submitting their individual review. Based on the information available, the Panel Chair shall avoid assigning proposals to reviewers who have a conflict of interest. Please note that it is the responsibility of the expert to declare the conflict of interest.

List of conflicts of interests displayed in the on-line evaluation system⁵:

- I am PI or team member in the proposal (or any other proposal submitted to the same call).
- I was involved in the preparation of the proposal (or any other proposal submitted to the same panel).
- I would benefit should the proposal (or any other proposal submitted to the same panel) be accepted or rejected.
- I am employed or contracted by one of the entities involved in the proposal (applicant, affiliated entity, named subcontractor or other participant involved in the proposal) or have been so in the past 3 years.
- I am a director, trustee or partner or involved in the management of any entity involved in the proposal (applicant, affiliated entity or other participant involved in the proposal) or have been so in the past 3 years.
- I am collaborating scientifically - or have done so in the past 5 years - with the PI.
- I have (or have had) a mentor/mentee relationship with the PI.
- I have family ties or close personal relationship with the PI (or any PI submitting a proposal to the same panel).
- I have family ties or close personal relationship with anyone who was involved in the preparation of the proposal (or any other proposal submitted to the same panel).
- I have family ties or close personal relationship with anyone who would benefit from the proposal being granted (or from any other proposal submitted to the same panel being granted) or rejected.
- I am (or was) in a relationship of scientific rivalry or hostility with the PI.
- I am a National Contact Point or working for the Enterprise Europe Network (EEN).
- I am a member of an EU programme committee.
- I am in any other situation that would preclude the impartial review of the proposal or that could appear to do so.

ROLES OF THE ERC PEER REVIEWERS

ERC Panels - An ERC panel typically consists of a Panel Chair and between 11 and 17 Panel Members. In exceptional and duly justified situations, the size of the panels can be increased, for example to better balance the workload in areas with many submitted proposals and/or to appropriately cover all areas of research in a panel. The Panel Chair and the Panel Members are selected by the ERC Scientific Council (ScC) on the basis of their scientific reputation and following the criteria set up by the ERC ScC Standing Committee on Panels. They have specialist as well as generalist competences and should not act as representatives of a single discipline or of a particular line of research. ERC panels are expected to work as entities, reflecting broad visions embracing emerging fields, inter- and multi-disciplinary research.

Panel Chairs and Panel Members make a significant commitment of their time to the ERC peer review evaluation process, working individually and as a group. Each panel meets twice to carry out a two-step review of proposals. The panel as a whole takes decisions on the proposals recommended for funding and it is therefore crucial for the quality of the evaluation process that Panel Members are fully available for both panel meetings.⁶ It is expected that Panel Members attend the evaluation sessions that are held on-site in person.

⁵ Please note that the above-mentioned briefly outlined examples of the conflict of interest situations are fully described in the Expert Contract and the [Letter of Appointment](#), including the actions that the ERCEA might put in place in order to ensure the strict impartiality of evaluations.

⁶ Panel meetings usually take place at ERCEA premises in Brussels, in exceptional cases remotely, using teleconferencing IT tools.

Panel Chairs and Panel Members perform the following tasks:

1. Familiarisation⁷ with proposals of their panel in preparation for the panel meetings.
2. Individual remote review - by electronic means - of a subset of those proposals in preparation for the panel meetings.
3. Participation in the panel meetings.

ERC Panel Chairs and Panel Members are expected to contribute to the evaluation process by delivering concise but substantial reviews based on their specialist expertise and generalist competence, which should reflect openness to inter- and multi-disciplinary research perspectives, as well as by actively participating in the panel meetings. Panel Chairs and Panel Members are also expected to review upon request proposals submitted to other panels if their expertise is sought. The panels may decide to assign each proposal to a Panel Member having the special role of '**Lead Reviewer**'. During the panel meetings, the Lead Reviewer is in charge of introducing the proposal, based on the submitted reviews⁸ to the panel for discussion and is responsible for drafting the panel comment at the end of the meeting (except for proposals scored C⁹).

Panel Chairs have additional tasks and responsibilities, while working in close collaboration with the ERCEA Scientific Officers of the respective panel:

1. To chair the panel meetings.
2. To attend the Initial Panel Chairs' meeting to assess the response to the call for proposals and plan the work of the panel accordingly.
3. To reallocate proposals to panels if applicable. Although the initial allocation is based on the expressed preference of the applicant, when necessary, owing to the expertise required for their evaluation, proposals may be reallocated to a different panel at the beginning of the evaluation. This reallocation should be done by the agreement of the two Panel Chairs concerned in the interest of the applicant to ensure a competent and fair evaluation of the proposal.
4. To assign proposals to Panel Members (and to Remote Referees) for individual reviewing. Panel Chairs will pay particular attention to the rules on conflict of interest and exclusion of experts.
5. To ensure that the panels produce all necessary deliverables of the required quality standards by the end of the panel meetings, including the ranked lists and feedback to applicants.
6. To select experts for remote evaluation.¹⁰
7. To attend the Final Panel Chairs' meeting.

If a Panel Chair is unable to attend the Initial Panel Chairs' meeting, this task can be delegated to the Deputy Panel Chair.¹¹

The names of the Panel Chairs are publicly available around the submission deadline of the call. The names of the Panel Members will be published after the call deadline and before Step 1 evaluation on the ERC website, provided that their consent for this publication has been obtained. In addition, the names of all Panel Members will be published on the ERC website after the evaluation process is concluded and the final results have been communicated to all applicants.

⁷ Reading and assimilating briefing documents (including briefings).

⁸ In cases when lead reviewers identify inappropriate comments (e.g. factual errors, offensive statements, swapped reviews), they should inform the Panel Chair and the ERCEA Scientific Officer.

⁹ Proposals scored C at Step 1 will receive an Evaluation Report with a standard panel comment and the individual reviews.

¹⁰ The ERC Scientific Council mandates the Panel Chairs. See footnote 36 of the [ERC rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#). The Panel Chair signs the list of experts nominated for remote evaluation. The approval by the Panel Chair is required before any remote expert is contacted and appointed.

¹¹ At the beginning of the evaluation process, the Panel Chair may appoint a Deputy Panel Chair among the Panel Members.

Panel Evaluators (PEVs) are Panel Members of other ERC calls and/or panels and can be involved in both steps of the evaluation process. Panel Evaluators help the Panel Members at the Step 1 remote evaluation, if their expertise is needed, or in case of a large number of submitted proposals. When involved in the Step 2 remote evaluation, they have been selected by the panel due to their close expertise to the proposal, hence they act as specialists similarly to the Remote Referees. Panel Evaluators do not participate in panel meetings. Their remote reviewing work is remunerated.

Remote Referees – In addition to the Panel Members (who act as generalists) and PEVs, the ERC evaluations rely on input from Remote Referees (usually two to five per proposal). They are scientists and scholars who bring in the necessary specialised expertise.

Remote Referees are non-paid experts who deliver their individual assessments by electronic means and do not participate in the panel meeting. However, they may raise questions that the panels could ask the applicants during the interview. Their involvement is limited to the Step 2 of the evaluation process. Due to the specialised nature of the work, the demands on the time of individual Remote Referees are comparatively smaller (typically, they are asked to evaluate one or two proposals). The names of all Remote Referees are made public once a year for all ERC calls, after the results have been communicated to all applicants.

The assignment of Remote Referees to proposals is carried out under the responsibility of the Panel Chair in collaboration with the Panel Members and with the support of the ERCEA Scientific Officers. Any researcher of the international scientific community can act as a Remote Referee, subject to the approval and accreditation of the person in question and their acceptance of the conditions regarding confidentiality and conflict of interest.

All the reviews will then form the basis for the panel discussions.

Exclusion of independent experts at the request of an applicant¹²

Applicants submitting proposals may request that up to three specific persons would not act as peer reviewers in the evaluation of their proposal. Such a request is made in the administrative forms at the time of proposal submission. If the persons identified for exclusion are independent experts participating in the evaluation, they may be excluded from the evaluation, as long as it remains possible to have the proposal evaluated. Such a request will be treated confidentially by the authorised staff of the ERCEA and the concerned Panel Chair. If the excluded expert is a member of the panel, they will be informed in confidence about the request concerning them. In the case of exclusion of the Panel Chair, the authorised staff of the ERCEA may consult the Deputy Panel Chair accordingly.

PANEL MEETING OBSERVERS


The ERC Scientific Council may also delegate its members to be present during the panel meetings as observers. The role of these delegates is to monitor the evaluation process and ensure and promote coherence between panels.

In conformity with the mandate of the ERC Scientific Council to carry out the scientific governance of the ERC and in line with the role of the ERC Scientific Council foreseen in the [ERC WP](#), ERC Scientific Council Members will abstain from influencing the results of the peer review evaluation process.

Independent observers - Independent external experts may be appointed as observers to examine the peer review evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The independent observers are external to the ERCEA and to the ERC Scientific Council. Their function and role is described in section 3.4 of the [ERC Rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#).

¹² See section 3.3 of the [ERC rules of Submission and Evaluation under Horizon Europe](#).

1.2 EVALUATION PROCESS



ADMISSIBILITY AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA OF ERC PROPOSALS

The assessment of admissibility and eligibility¹³ of submitted proposals is carried out by the ERCEA. Nevertheless, if an expert considers a proposal to be potentially inadmissible or ineligible during the evaluation process, they should report the case immediately to the ERCEA's Scientific Officers. Resubmission restrictions and HI eligibility are verified by the ERCEA prior to the completion of Step 1 evaluation. The remaining checks (in particular checks concerning the date of the successful defence of the PI's first PhD degree and eligibility extension requests) are run only after the Step1 evaluation. Thus, proposals not complying with admissibility or eligibility criteria may be declared inadmissible or ineligible during or even after the peer review evaluation process.

INITIAL PANEL CHAIRS' MEETING AND BRIEFINGS OF EXPERTS

Soon after the Call deadline and at the start of the proposals' evaluation process, Panel Chairs are invited to the **Initial Panel Chairs' meeting**. They are briefed on all relevant aspects of the evaluation processes and procedures. ERCEA Scientific Officers support Panel Chairs in assigning the proposals to Panel Members and Panel Evaluators. Panel Chairs and Panel Members are briefed before the beginning of the Step 1 remote evaluation phase.¹⁴

¹³ See section 1.4 on Admissibility, Eligibility, Resubmission Restrictions of the [ERC WP](#).

¹⁴ See section 3.6.1 (1) – 'Briefings of the panels' in the [ERC Rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#).

A TWO-STEP EVALUATION

The Starting and Consolidator Grant calls foresee a single submission of full proposals followed by a two-step evaluation, including interviews with the applicants.

At both evaluation steps, two main elements of the proposal are evaluated: the **Research Project** and the **Principal Investigator**. The panels will primarily evaluate the ground-breaking nature and ambition of the research project. At the same time, the panels will evaluate the intellectual capacity and creativity of the Principal Investigator, with a focus on the extent to which the Principal Investigator has the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project. Each evaluation step includes a remote evaluation phase where individual reviewers work independently (see Section 2 – Individual Review) and deliver the reviews for each proposal assigned to them. The remote evaluation phase is performed through an online evaluation system, SEP Evaluation (see Section 3 – Electronic tools used in evaluation).

After the remote phase, the panel meetings are organised. During these meetings, Panel Members discuss, score and rank the proposals assigned to the panel.¹⁵ Each proposal is assigned to a Lead Reviewer (see Annex 2 – Role of the ERC Peer Reviewers), who introduces the proposal to the panel for discussion and is responsible for drafting the panel comment.¹⁶ The panels assess, score, and rank the proposals based on the individual reviews received and on the panel's discussion. At Step 2, the assessment by the panels will also take into account the interview with the applicant.

The deliverables of each panel meeting include the following documents:

Panel report with the following Annexes:

1. Ranked list of proposals
2. Panel comments approved by the panel (see paragraph below)
3. List of approved Remote Referees (only at Step 1)
4. Conflict of Interest list
5. Panel Recommendations for future evaluations (feedback and suggestions from the panel to the ERC Scientific Council – only at Step 2).

Besides the final rank list, the crucial output of the panel meetings is the feedback to applicants¹⁷. The **Evaluation Report** of each evaluated proposal contains:

1. the recommendation of the panel and the ranking range;
2. the panel comment;
3. the individual reviews for this proposal (see Section 2).

Once the scores and the ranked list of the proposals are decided, Lead Reviewers draft panel comments for A not invited and B scored proposals at Step 1 and for all proposals at Step 2, reflecting the main points of the panel discussion, and the panel agrees upon and approves their final version. The panel comment details the decision taken by the panel based on the individual reviews, the panel discussion on the proposal and, at Step 2, the interview with the applicant. The panel comment should clearly explain the reason(s), respecting the ERC evaluation criterion, which make(s) the proposal succeed or fail in the evaluation. Panel Members should also ensure that the scientific feedback to applicants (which may or may not be taken into account) is clearly distinct from their budget recommendations to the ERCEA (which are binding).

¹⁵ A not invited and C score proposals in Step 1 as well as B score proposals in Step 2 are not ranked within their category, applicants for those scores will receive a rank range of the entire category. Step 1 Bs are ranked with 10% intervals within the B category, which the applicants receive in their Evaluation Report.

¹⁶ Proposals that receive a numerical mark of 3.5 or lower from all reviewers, do not need to be discussed unless the panel explicitly decides otherwise. An applicant whose proposal is not of sufficient quality to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation and is scored C at Step 1 will receive an Evaluation Report with a standard panel comment and individual reviews.

¹⁷ The feedback is sent to the applicants of the proposals scored *A not invited*, *B* or *C* at Step 1, and of the proposals scored *A* or *B* at Step 2.

At each step, a number of proposals of reasonable or good quality will be rejected. Such proposals may typically have positive comments from individual reviewers. However, following the discussion at the meeting, they do not gather enough support from the panel either because there is a limit of 44 proposals per panel that can be passed to Step 2¹⁸ or due to the maximum number of proposals that can be funded at Step 2. In such cases, the panel comment may reflect this aspect.

In some cases, the panel may take a position that is different from what could be inferred from the comments/marks of individual reviewers. For example, if the panel discussion reveals an important weakness in a proposal, the panel comment may document this weakness. The panel comment is a concluding comment agreed upon by the panel and approved by the Panel Chair and as such should clearly explain the decision adopted by the panel.

STEP 1 Remote phase and panel meeting

At Step 1, Panel Members act as generalists and review remotely **Part B1 only** (Part I of the Scientific Proposal together with the PI's CV and Track Record)¹⁹. Part I of the Scientific Proposal should present the envisaged research and should lay out the current state of knowledge, explain the scientific question and the objectives of the project, and present the overall approach or research strategy to reach the goals of the project.

It forms the basis for the panel's decision whether to evaluate the proposal in the next step. Therefore, all essential information must be covered in this section.

Panel Members write individual reviews for each proposal they have been assigned to. These reviews are part of the evaluation report sent to the applicants with *A not invited*, *B* or *C* scores.²⁰

Concurrently, the reviewers are asked to suggest additional scientists/scholars (Remote Referees) who could assess the proposals, if passed to Step 2, as specialists. They are nominated on the basis of their expertise for the specific proposal; any researcher from anywhere in the world can be nominated. The Panel Chairs are mandated by the Scientific Council to select independent external experts for remote evaluation based on the specific expertise required by each proposal.

After the remote evaluation phase, the Panel Members take part in the Step 1 meeting to discuss the proposals assigned to the panel and to establish the panel ranking.

The proposals are ranked by the panel based on the comments, panel scores assigned during the meeting (*A invited*, *A not invited*, *B* or *C*) and the panel's overall appreciation of their strengths and weaknesses. Each proposal receives one of the following panel scores:

Score A invited – the proposal is of excellent quality and ranked sufficiently high to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation;

Score A not invited – the proposal is of excellent quality but not ranked sufficiently high²¹ to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation;

Score B – the proposal is of high quality but not sufficient to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation;

Score C – the proposal is not of sufficient quality to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation.

¹⁸ The *A not invited* score can be given to a proposal only if 44 proposals were passed to Step 2 in the respective panel.

¹⁹ If necessary, they can be assisted by Panel Evaluators - PEVs.

²⁰ These individual reviews may not necessarily be convergent - differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are legitimate among reviewers, and it is potentially useful for an applicant to be informed of the various views. The ERCEA will not change the content of the reviews that form part of the panel report, except if necessary to improve readability or, exceptionally, to remove any clerical errors or inappropriate comments, provided such errors or comments do not affect the evaluation results.

²¹ I.e. it exceeds the maximum threshold of 44 proposals that can be passed to Step 2 in the respective panel.

Applicants whose proposals receive a **B** or a **C** score in **Step 1** of the evaluation may be subject to ERC Work Programmes ²²

Based on the Step 1 evaluation outcome, proposals scored *A invited* (maximum 44 proposals per panel) are retained for Step 2.

At the end of the Step 1 panel meeting, the Panel Chair examines all proposals passed to Step 2 (**A invited** score) and decides on the assignment of proposals to experts. ERCEA contacts the Remote Referees selected by the panel and approved by the Panel Chair for a more in-depth review during the Step 2 remote evaluation.

Applicants who receive an **A invited** score are invited for an interview to present their proposal at the Step 2 panel meeting. Each panel decides on the exact format of its interviews (duration; number of slides allowed, if any; time allocated to the presentation and to the questions and answers session).

For each proposal scored **A not invited** or **B** a panel comment explaining the panel decision is written. The panel comment summarises the discussion on the proposal among Panel Members at the Step 1 meeting. For each proposal that is not of sufficient quality to pass to Step 2 of the evaluation and therefore receives a **C** score, a standard panel comment will be provided.

All applicants whose proposal has been rejected at Step 1 receive an information letter, together with an Evaluation Report including the final panel score, the ranking range of their proposal among the proposals evaluated by the panel, the panel comment/a standard comment and the individual reviews given by each reviewer.

Applicants whose proposals are retained for the Step 2 evaluation do not receive a Step 1 Evaluation Report.

STEP 2 Remote phase and panel meeting

At Step 2, Panel Members and Remote Referees remotely and individually review the complete version of the retained proposals – **Part B1** (Part I of the Scientific Proposal, Curriculum Vitae and Track Record) **and Part B2** (including Part II of the Scientific Proposal), along with the detailed budget table the description of resources and time commitment (information extracted from the administrative Part A) – providing generalist and specialist reviews, respectively.

Part II should be a detailed explanation of the project implementation, including research methodology, work plan, risk assessment and mitigating measures, justification for the requested budget and resources, and any further necessary background not included in Part I.

After this remote evaluation phase, the panel meets for the Step 2 panel meeting, at which interviews with the applicants take place. The assessment by the panels will consider the interview, as well as the individual reviews and the panel discussion. At the end of the meeting, the panel establishes the final panel ranking and each proposal receives one of the following panel scores:

- **Score A** – the proposal fully meets the ERC's excellence criterion and is **recommended for funding, if sufficient funds are available**²³;
- **Score B** – the proposal meets some but not all aspects of the ERC's excellence criterion and is **not recommended for funding**.

²² See Restrictions on submission of proposals under “Admissibility, Eligibility, Resubmission Restrictions” of the [ERC WP](#).

²³ Additional funds can become available in cases such as the failure of the granting procedure to projects, the withdrawal of proposals, budget savings agreed during the granting procedure, or the availability of additional budget from other sources.

Review of the proposal budget

At Step 2, the panel analyses the budget, its justification and the requested contribution of the proposals, which are being considered for funding. Recommendations on reduction of the requested grant may be made if some expenses (excluding salary costs) are not considered fully justified or needed (the analysis is done case-by-case, cuts across-the-board are not allowed). Such recommendations must be documented and explained in the panel comment for each proposal concerned, based on an analysis of the resources requested and necessary to carry out the proposed work. After the Step 2 meetings have finished for all panels, the results from the different panels are consolidated into one call ranking list based on the 'normalised accumulated budget'.²⁴ The highest ranked **A** scored proposals are invited for grant preparation until the entire call budget is spent. The remaining proposals recommended for funding may be funded by the ERC if more funds become available.

RANKING

Ranking of the proposals is the outcome of a thorough discussion in the panel, excluding those Panel Members who have a conflict of interest.

THE POSSIBLE USE OF A VOTING SYSTEM

While consensus decisions are strongly preferred, panels may expedite their ranking process by the use of a voting system (e.g. a majority vote on one or more proposals, with each Panel Member having one vote per proposal being considered).²⁵ A Panel Chair/ Panel Member can neither be involved in a discussion nor vote for or rank a proposal if under a conflict of interest.

All applicants whose proposals have been evaluated at Step 2 receive an information letter, together with an Evaluation Report including the ranking range of their proposal among the proposals evaluated by the panel, the panel score, the panel comment, and the individual reviews given by each reviewer.

2. INDIVIDUAL REVIEW

2.1 EVALUATION CRITERION

Scientific excellence is the sole criterion of evaluation and is at the core of the peer review evaluation process. It is applied primarily to the evaluation of the ground-breaking nature and ambition of the Research Project and at the same time to the intellectual capacity and creativity of the Principal Investigator, with a focus on the extent to which the Principal Investigator has the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project.

Part I should present the envisaged research and it should lay out the current state of knowledge, explain the scientific question and the objectives of the project, and present the overall approach or research strategy to reach the goals of the project.

Part II should explain in the project implementation in detail, including research methodology, work plan, risk assessment, and mitigating measures, justification for the requested budget and resources.

²⁴ The recommended normalised accumulated budget (NAB) for every panel is calculated by summing the normalised budget (recommended budget divided by panel's indicative budget) of each proposal from the top position down to the actual position of the given proposal. Thus, the NAB takes into account the position of the proposal in its panel ranking, the recommended budget of the proposal and of all proposals ranked higher in the same panel, and the indicative budget of the panel.

²⁵ It is also possible to use a cumulative ranking system where Panel Members contribute their individual preferred ranking of a subset of proposals under discussion. All rankings submitted by Panel Members are added up and divided by the number of Panel Members resulting in a cumulative ranking which reflects the view of the entire panel.

The detailed elements applying to the excellence of the Research Project and the Principal Investigator for each step and their interpretation are described in the applicable Work Programme. In evaluating the applicant's track-record, preprints properly referenced and with the DOI or linked to a preprint, may also be taken into consideration. All assessments on proposals must be made against the evaluation criterion and its detailed elements alone.

No other criteria than the evaluation elements applying to the Evaluation Criterion defined in the [ERC WP](#) must be considered when evaluating a proposal. Evaluation questions are listed in [Annex 1](#).

Please note that the incorrect application of the evaluation criterion or the application of inexistent or irrelevant criteria for the step concerned is considered a procedural error, which may justify a re-evaluation of the proposal.

2.2 HOW TO EVALUATE A PROPOSAL – DOs AND DON'Ts

Individual reviews are written prior to Step 1 and Step 2 panel meetings. The [ERC Rules of submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe](#) require that each proposal shall be reviewed by at least three peer reviewers.

During the individual remote review evaluation, **reviewers evaluate** the proposals according to (1) the Research Project and (2) the Principal Investigator, addressing the questions stated in the evaluation form (see Annex 1 of this document). Reviewers need to:

- Provide explanatory comments for the Research Project and a qualitative assessment for the Principal Investigator (explanatory comment for the Principal Investigator can be optionally provided at Step 2).
- Award an overall numerical mark for the Research Project²⁶ and an overall qualitative assessment for the Principal Investigator with the following five options: *Outstanding/ Excellent/ Very Good/ Good/ Non-competitive*. Please note that **Remote Referees award a qualitative three-option funding recommendation** on the proposal: *highly recommended, recommended, or not recommended*.

 **Individual reviews must be submitted no later than the deadlines set by ERCEA.**

Proposal mark and PI overall qualitative assessment

The proposal numerical **mark and overall qualitative assessment of the PI should be consistent with the comments**. Proposal marks are awarded in integers or halves. The use of the full range of marks is, in general, recommended. The proposal mark and overall qualitative assessment of the PI are not communicated to the applicants; only the final panel score expressed as A invited, A not invited, B or C is provided in the Evaluation Report.

Quality standards of individual reviewers' comments

All the individual reviewers' comments are included in the Evaluation Report and as such reproduced in the feedback to applicants. Reviewers should therefore formulate their comments carefully in the individual assessments.

Please note that the individual reviews should be of good quality, genuine, and substantial. They should also be polite. Comments should take the form of a statement and explanation of key strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, in light of the evaluation criterion.

²⁶ Marks are ranging from 5 (Outstanding), 4 (Excellent), 3 (Very Good), 2 (Good) to 1 (Non-competitive).

Reviewers need to observe the following guidelines:

General guidelines:

- Provide substantial, explanatory comments; avoid comments that merely give a description or a summary of the proposal.
- Use dispassionate, analytical, and unambiguous language.
- Use grammatically correct, complete, clear sentences with no jargon.
- Ensure that critical comments are constructive.
- Make sure that comments are in line with the marks/funding recommendation given and avoid referring to them in the comment's narrative.
- Avoid self-declaration of insufficient expertise (personal or panel) in the proposal. Avoid dismissive statements about the applicant, the proposed science, or the scientific field concerned.
- Consider the phase of the Principal Investigator's transition to independence, diverse research career paths and particularly noteworthy contributions to the research community, as well as possible breaks in the research career of the applicant and the effects of major life events or pandemic restrictions on the applicant's progression as a researcher.
- Avoid reference to the applicant's age, nationality, gender, or personal matters.
- Be aware of unconscious bias in aspects such as gender and diversity more broadly.²⁷
- Avoid any comments on the PI's past, current or future Host Institution, since its standing is not an ERC evaluation criterion.
- When assessing the research achievements of the applicants, focus on the scientific content and refrain from using surrogate measures of the quality of research outputs, such as Journal Impact Factors. Throughout the evaluation the qualitative judgement of the panels should be paramount and quantitative indicators should be used responsibly. Please note that the ERC Scientific Council has endorsed the DORA declaration and signed the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment.
- Note that the funding ID is requested to allow the ERCEA to assess a potential overlap during the grant preparation. The funding ID should therefore include only current grants or pending applications. The funding ID is not intended to be a complete funding record.
- Note that societal impact is not an ERC evaluation criterion.
- Avoid any direct comparison with any other proposals.
- Avoid any reference or comparison with previous assessments (in case of a resubmitted proposal).
- Avoid copy-paste from the proposal and/or from individual reviews of other experts.
- Avoid comments on the ethical and security aspects of the proposal. Ethical and security clearance is performed after the scientific evaluation by the ERCEA and respective EU institutions for all fundable proposals.

Resources assessment guidelines:

- Avoid recommendations on resources at Step 1 evaluation (assessment of resources is done at Step 2 evaluation).

²⁷ It has been shown that unconscious bias applies equally, regardless of the reviewers' gender. Whereas possible gender biases may be rooted in the institutions or the community where the applicants may come from, a wealth of evidence points at possible introduction of unconscious biases in evaluation processes ([see the ERC unconscious bias briefing](#)). Experts are requested to be vigilant and aware, so such elements are not introduced in the evaluation process.

- Avoid recommendations on salaries (they depend on national and institutional rules and customs and are eligible costs).
- Provide proper justification in case a budget cut is recommended (see assessment of proposal's budget at Step 2 evaluation).

The efficiency of meetings and preparation

The ERCEA aims to have highly efficient panel meetings. For this reason, preparatory work is carried out in advance of each meeting by electronic means:

- Panel Members assess a subset of proposals evaluated in the panel.
- Panel Members familiarise themselves with all proposals in the panel in order to make high-quality recommendations.
- Before the Step 2 meeting, Panel Members prepare for the interviews by identifying the proposals' strengths, weaknesses and concerns raised in the individual reviews previously delivered.

Expected Reviewers' confidentiality

During the individual remote review process, there shall be no discussions of the proposals between reviewers. Moreover, during the remote evaluation of proposals (i.e. before panel meetings), Panel Members should not disclose the proposals assigned for their evaluation to other experts. When a Panel Member considers that they have insufficient expertise to evaluate any of the assigned proposals from a generalist perspective, they should immediately inform the ERCEA Scientific Officers and the Panel Chair, so that the proposal can be reassigned to another reviewer.

2.3 APPROACH TO MULTI- AND INTER-DISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS

Research proposals of a multi- and inter-disciplinary nature are strongly encouraged throughout the ERC research grants. Proposals of this type are evaluated by the ERC's primary panels, which are per se multidisciplinary, with the appropriate external expertise where necessary.

The initial choice indicated by the applicant when submitting their proposal is paramount in determining the panel under which a proposal is evaluated. The broad definition of the panels allows many interdisciplinary proposals to be treated within a single panel (mainstreaming of interdisciplinarity). During the evaluation process, potentially interdisciplinary proposals are flagged as such, and the panel may request additional reviews from appropriate members of other panel(s). An applicant who considers their proposal as interdisciplinary (i.e. cross-panel or cross-domain) can also explicitly indicate a second panel in the application form. The responsibility to ensure that cross-panel/cross-domain proposals receive equal and fair treatment primarily rests with the panels to which they are allocated.

3. ELECTRONIC TOOLS USED IN EVALUATION

At both Step 1 and Step 2 remote evaluation, experts work individually using the [on-line Commission's Evaluation tool \(SEP\)](#).

Useful information on SEP is reported below:

Quick Guide on SEP Evaluation tool can be found here:

https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/common/it-manuals/user-manual_sep-expert-evaluation_en.pdf

Information on EU Login is available here:

<https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/funding-tenders-opportunities/display/IT/IT+How+to>

ANNEX 1 – EVALUATION FORM

Research Project. The ground-breaking nature and ambition of the Research Project is assessed as follows:

At Step 1:

To what extent does the research address important scientific questions?

To what extent are the project's objectives ambitious and will it advance the frontier of knowledge?

At Step 2:

To what extent does the research address important scientific questions?

To what extent are the project's objectives ambitious and will it advance the frontier of knowledge?

To what extent are the research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?

To what extent are the timescales and resources adequate and properly justified?

Principal Investigator. The intellectual capacity and creativity of the Principal Investigator is assessed as follows:

At Step 1 and Step 2:

To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to conduct groundbreaking research?

To what extent does the PI provide evidence of creative and original thinking?

To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?

ANNEX 2 – PANELS: ALLOCATION, INDICATIVE BUDGET AND STRUCTURE

ALLOCATION OF PROPOSALS TO PANELS

The applicant submits the proposal to the panel, which is most relevant for the evaluation of the proposed research ('primary review panel'). If the applicant considers the proposal cross-panel/cross-domain, they may indicate a second relevant panel ('secondary review panel'). In this case, the cross-panel or cross-domain nature of the proposal has to be explained and justified in Part B1. The applicant selects up to four ERC keywords according to the [ERC Panel Structure](#) to best describe the field(s) of research covered by their proposal.

The Panel Chairs assign proposals to reviewers. The initial allocation of proposals to panels is based on the expressed preference of the applicant. However, proposals may be reallocated to a different panel with the agreement of both Panel Chairs concerned. This is done when necessary and solely due to the expertise required for the evaluation. Such decisions are finalised at the Initial Panel Chairs' meeting. If the proposal is well within the panel's scope and no additional expertise is necessary, at Step 1 it will be assigned for review only within the panel. However, if the panel considers that the proposal is cross-panel or cross-domain and that additional expertise is necessary for its evaluation, it may request additional reviews by appropriate members of other panel(s).

PANEL'S INDICATIVE BUDGET

The [ERC WP](#) establishes that the call budget is split among the panels in proportion to the budgetary demand of the proposals allocated to each panel. This important principle ensures comparable success rates across the individual panels regardless of how many proposals each panel evaluates.

Primary panel structure

Physical Sciences & Engineering

PE1 Mathematics

All areas of mathematics, pure and applied, plus mathematical foundations of computer science, mathematical physics, and statistics.

PE2 Fundamental Constituents of Matter

Particle, nuclear, plasma, atomic, molecular, gas, and optical physics.

PE3 Condensed Matter Physics

Structure, electronic properties, fluids, nanosciences, biological physics.

PE4 Physical and Analytical Chemical Sciences

Analytical chemistry, chemical theory, physical chemistry/chemical physics.

PE5 Synthetic Chemistry and Materials

New materials and new synthetic approaches, structure-properties relations, solid state chemistry, molecular architecture, organic chemistry.

PE6 Computer Science and Informatics

Theoretical and experimental computer science, information processing, intelligent systems.

PE7 Systems and Communication Engineering

Electrical, electronic, communication, optical and systems engineering.

PE8 Products and Processes Engineering

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

PE9 Universe Sciences

Astro-physics/-chemistry/-biology; solar system; planetary systems; stellar, galactic and extragalactic astronomy; cosmology; space sciences; astronomical instrumentation and data.

PE10 Earth System Science

Physical geography, geology, geophysics, atmospheric sciences, oceanography, climatology, cryology, ecology, global environmental change, biogeochemical cycles, natural resources management.

PE11 Materials Engineering

Advanced materials development: performance enhancement, modelling, large-scale preparation, modification, tailoring, optimisation, novel and combined use of materials, etc.

Life Sciences

LS1 Molecules of Life: Biological Mechanisms, Structures and Functions

For all organisms: Molecular biology, biochemistry, structural biology, molecular biophysics, synthetic and chemical biology, drug design, innovative methods and modelling.

LS2 Integrative Biology: From Genes and Genomes to Systems

For all organisms: Genetics, epigenetics, genomics and other 'omics studies, bioinformatics, systems biology, genetic diseases, gene editing, innovative methods and modelling, 'omics for personalised medicine.

LS3 Cell Biology, Development, Stem Cells and Regeneration

For all organisms: Structure and function of the cell, cell-cell communication, embryogenesis, tissue differentiation, organogenesis, growth, development, evolution of development, organoids, stem cells, regeneration, therapeutic approaches.

LS4 Physiology in Health, Disease and Ageing

Organ and tissue physiology, comparative physiology, physiology of ageing, pathophysiology, inter-organ and tissue communication, endocrinology, nutrition, metabolism, interaction with the microbiome, non-communicable diseases including cancer (and except disorders of the nervous system and immunity-related diseases).

LS5 Neuroscience and Disorders of the Nervous System

Nervous system development, homeostasis and ageing, nervous system function and dysfunction, systems neuroscience and modelling, biological basis of cognitive processes and of behaviour, neurological and mental disorders.

– *In humans and all other organisms*

LS6 Immunity, Infection and Immunotherapy

The immune system, related disorders and their mechanisms, biology of infectious agents and infection, biological basis of prevention and treatment of infectious diseases, innovative immunological tools and approaches, including therapies.

LS7 Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of Human Diseases

Medical technologies and tools for prevention, diagnosis and treatment of human diseases, therapeutic approaches and interventions, pharmacology, preventative medicine, epidemiology and public health, digital medicine.

LS8 Environmental Biology, Ecology and Evolution

For all organisms: Ecology, biodiversity, environmental change, evolutionary biology, behavioural ecology, microbial ecology, marine biology, ecophysiology, theoretical developments and modelling.

LS9 Biotechnology and Biosystems Engineering

Biotechnology using all organisms, biotechnology for environment and food applications, applied plant and animal sciences, bioengineering and synthetic biology, biomass and biofuels, biohazards.

Social Sciences & Humanities

SH1 Individuals, Markets and Organisations

Economics, finance, management.

SH2 Institutions, Governance and Legal Systems

Political science, international relations, law.

SH3 The Social World and Its Interactions

Sociology, social psychology, education sciences, communication studies.

SH4 The Human Mind and Its Complexity

Cognitive science, psychology, linguistics.

SH5 Texts and Concepts

Literary studies, literature, philosophy.

SH6 The Study of the Human Past

Archaeology and history.

SH7 Human Mobility, Environment, and Space

Human geography, demography, health, sustainability science, territorial planning, spatial analysis.

SH8 Studies of Cultures and Arts

Social anthropology, studies of cultures, studies of arts.