ERC Grant Application | Horizon 2020

TUM Guidelines for Applicants
Prolog

With over 100 ERC grants, the Technical University of Munich (TUM) has been very successful in applying for ERC funding over the last years. Based on our long experience and knowledge collected through recent ERC grant application rounds, the following guidelines should provide support for a successful application. Please note that all comments are non-binding suggestions and that we cannot guarantee a successful outcome.

For a smooth and efficient preparation of the proposal submission, we kindly ask you to refer to our TUM CHECKLIST FOR APPLICANTS.

Please also take into account all instructions of the ERC Guide “INFORMATION FOR APPLICANTS” and the “WORK PROGRAMME” of the relevant call.
Guidelines

1 ONLINE ADMINISTRATIVE FORMS

→ Search in the FUNDING & TENDERS PORTAL for your call or ask us for the link

→ Log in/Register

→ Create your proposal online
  • TUM’s PIC is 999977463
  • TUM’s Main Contact Person is Ulrike Ronchetti, TUM’s LEAR (ronchetti@zv.tum.de) (in Step 4)

Scientists who are affiliated with the University Hospital Klinikum rechts der Isar (TUM-Med), please contact RENATE RÄDLEIN and BEATE SCHAULIN for TUM-Med’s PIC and Main Contact Person

→ Hints on how to fill in Part A (administrative data) online

  • 1 - General information
    o Declarations: please select 1), 2), 3), 4): “in case of a sole participant in the proposal, the applicant is exempt from the financial capacity check” and 5)

  • 2 – Administrative data of participating organisations
    o Department(s) carrying out the proposed work: please indicate the name of the relevant chair/professorship at TUM where the ERC project will be hosted.
    o Main Administrative Contact Person: Ulrike Ronchetti, ronchetti@zv.tum.de, Position in organisation: LEAR, Department: TUM Legal Office, Arcisstr. 21, 80333 München

  • 5 – Call specific questions
    o Extended Open Research Data Pilot in Horizon 2020: please note that participating/not participating in this Pilot does not constitute part of the evaluation process. In case you wish to participate, the TUM Research Service Center (https://www.ub.tum.de/en/eresearch) can provide support, e.g. by helping to create the required data management plan.
→ Upload
  • B1 + B2
  • Commitment of the host institution
  • (PhD certificate)
  • (Ethical self-assessment)

→ Submit your proposal (did you receive the e-mail confirmation?)

→ Verify your proposal and its content by downloading all the submitted files

→ Tip: register your application well before the deadline
PART B1

ERC [Starting/Consolidator/Advanced Grant year]

Research proposal [Part B1]¹

(Part B1 is evaluated both in Step 1 and Step 2. Part B2 is evaluated in Step 2 only)

Proposal Full Title

PROPOSAL ACRONYM

Cover Page:

- Name of the Principal Investigator (PI)
- Name of the PI's host institution for the project e.g. Technical University of Munich
- Proposal duration in months usually 60 months

Text highlighted in grey should be deleted.

Proposal summary (identical to the abstract from the online proposal submission forms, section 1).

The abstract (summary) should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the research proposal and how they will be achieved. The abstract will be used as the short description of your research proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to contact in particular the potential remote referees and/or inform the Commission and/or the programme management committees and/or relevant national funding agencies (provided you give permission to do so where requested in the online proposal submission forms, section 1). It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information.

Please use plain typed text, avoiding formulae and other special characters. The abstract must be written in English. There is a limit of 2000 characters (spaces and line breaks included).

Proposal summary and title are the first impression that the reviewers get of your proposal. Try to stir the interest of the reviewers and to summarise the most important aspects of your project in a clear and convincing manner. Particularly keep the following questions in mind when writing your summary:

- What have been the recent advances in your field? Which questions still remain unresolved today?
- How is your project going to address these challenges? Clearly name your project's main objective(s) and the proposal acronym
- What are the expected breakthroughs of your project?

→ reconsider every “we” in the proposal as ERC grants reward individual excellence

Explain and justify the cross-panel or cross domain nature of your proposal, if a secondary panel is indicated in the online proposal submission forms. There is a limit of 1000 characters, spaces and line breaks included. Please contact us in this case.

¹ Instructions for completing Part B1 can be found in the ‘Information for Applicants to the Starting and Consolidator Grant 2019 Calls’.
Please keep in mind the following points while writing part B1:

- After the (short) reading of part B1, the reviewers should be convinced that you are the right person to get the grant: **you are an excellent researcher and your project is ground-breaking.**
- The reviewers have to read many proposals; therefore, it is essential that they can see all key information at once. **Optimize the layout** of your proposal through bullet points, numbered sub-titles, text in bold, breaks etc. It is possible to include graphs and figures which should be clearly separated from the main text and numbered consecutively.
- Note that the reviewers have access only to part B1 at the first step of the evaluation. **All essential questions** (e.g. content and feasibility of your project, your suitability to carry it out) should be answered in part B1. Please do not refer to part B2.
- Please be aware that B1 is your entrance ticket to the second evaluation step, therefore we recommend that you carefully elaborate your Extended Synopsis (B1 section a).

→ Try to follow a red thread during the whole proposal: go from the broad overview into the details and avoid coming back and forth (try to avoid unnecessary repetitions!)

**Section a: Extended Synopsis of the scientific proposal (max. 5 pages, references do not count towards the page limits)**

*The Extended Synopsis should give a concise presentation of the scientific proposal, with particular attention to the ground-breaking nature of the research project, which will allow evaluation panels to assess, in Step 1 of the evaluation, the feasibility of the outlined scientific approach. Describe the proposed work in the context of the state of the art of the field. References to literature should also be included. Please use a reference style that is commonly used in your discipline such as American Chemical Society (ACS) style, American Medical Association (AMA) style, Modern Language Association (MLA) style, etc. and that allows the evaluators to easily retrieve each reference.*

Please respect the following formatting constraints: Times New Roman, Arial or similar, at least font size 11, margins (2.0cm side and 1.5cm top and bottom), single line spacing.

Only the panel members, who are not necessarily experts in your specific field, are reading part B1 at the first step of the evaluation. Therefore, their evaluation is based on their general scientific knowledge and their global scientific understanding. To guarantee the best possible understanding of your research project and its relevance to the scientific community, it is important to give sufficient background information and clearly situate your project in the state of the art.

Highlight any aspects of your project that are novel, go significantly beyond the state of the art or could make substantial advances at the frontiers of knowledge.

There are no structure specifications for the Extended Synopsis of part B1, however we recommend that you **structure your B1 similar to your B2** and that you include the following aspects:

- **Short introduction** of the recent advances in your field: which questions remain unresolved today and how is your proposal going to address them?
- **State of the art and objectives**: clearly name your project’s main objectives and the expected breakthroughs. How are your project and project’s objectives embedded in the state of the art, why is your proposal particularly timely?
- Overview of your **research methodology** (if possible already divided into Work Packages): how are you going to reach your objectives? Why are you the right person to carry out the project?
- **Risk assessment**: is your project feasible, which potential difficulties and how to address them? Please keep in mind that ERC projects are expected to be high risk/high gain.
- **Impact**: Why should your project be funded? Why is your work unique, which breakthroughs are foreseen and what impact will it have on your research field and in general?
- **Resources**: briefly mention your main cost items (i.e. personnel, equipment) and the total requested funding amount.

→ It could be helpful to write first the scientific proposal (part B2) and then the Extended Synopsis (part B1).

→ Try to point out the key elements mentioned in the evaluation criteria, as the panel members are explicitly advised to base their evaluation on these criteria (see EVALUATION CRITERIA).

→ Try to use buzz words such as: ground-breaking nature, beyond the state of the art, novel approach, for the first time etc. if you feel comfortable with them and if they describe your work.
Section b: Curriculum vitae (max. 2 pages)

[Please follow the template below as much as possible (it may however be amended if necessary).]

It is recommended to use the suggested template as most reviewers are familiar with it.
- Report on any significant career breaks as the reviewers take them into consideration during the evaluation of your career progression.
- Do not hesitate to include some self-marketing!
- In addition to the tabular resume, you could also write a short text to describe your own profile, scientific achievements and personal strengths. If helpful for the reviewers, do not hesitate to add additional comments on single points of your CV.

PERSONAL INFORMATION
Family name, First name:
Researcher unique identifier(s) (such as ORCID, Research ID, etc...):
Date of birth:
Nationality:
URL for web site:

- EDUCATION

200? PhD
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution, Country
Name of PhD Supervisor

199? Master
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution, Country

- CURRENT POSITION(S)

201? – Current Position
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

200? – Current Position
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

- PREVIOUS POSITIONS

200? – 200? Position held
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

200? – 200? Position held
Name of Faculty/Department, Name of University/Institution/Country

- FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

200? – 200? Scholarship, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution/Country

199? – 199? Scholarship, Name of Faculty/Department/Centre, Name of University/Institution/Country

- SUPERVISION OF GRADUATE STUDENTS AND POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS (if applicable)

200? – 200? Number of Postdocs/PhD/Master Students
Name of Faculty/ Department/ Centre, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **TEACHING ACTIVITIES** (if applicable)

  200? – Teaching position – Topic, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **ORGANISATION OF SCIENTIFIC MEETINGS** (if applicable)

  201? Please specify your role and the name of event / Country
  200? Please specify type of event / number of participants / Country

- **INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES** (if applicable)

  201? – Faculty member, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  201? – 201? Graduate Student Advisor, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – 200? Member of the Faculty Committee, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – 200? Member of a Committee; role, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **REVIEWING ACTIVITIES** (if applicable)

  201? – Scientific Advisory Board, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  201? – Review Board, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  201? – Review panel member, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  201? – Editorial Board, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – Scientific Advisory Board, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – Reviewer, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – Scientific Evaluation, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – Evaluator, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **MEMBERSHIPS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES** (if applicable)

  201? – Member, Research Network “Name of Research Network”
  200? – Associated Member, Name of Faculty/ Department/Centre, Name of University/ Institution/ Country
  200? – Founding Member, Name of Faculty/ Department/Centre, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **MAJOR COLLABORATIONS** (if applicable)

  Name of collaborators, Topic, Name of Faculty/ Department/Centre, Name of University/ Institution/ Country

- **CAREER BREAKS** (if applicable)

  Exact dates Please indicate the reason and the duration in months.
Appendix: All ongoing and submitted grants and funding of the PI (Funding ID)

Mandatory information (does not count towards page limits)

- The funding ID shows the extent to which you are able to raise and manage funding.
- Describe clearly any relation between your ERC application and ongoing grants/grant applications (no funding overlap).
→ Please feel free to add another table for completed grants.

On-going Grants (Please indicate "No funding" when applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Amount (Euros)</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Role of the PI</th>
<th>Relation to current ERC proposal²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grant applications (Please indicate "No funding" when applicable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Amount (Euros)</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Role of the PI</th>
<th>Relation to current ERC proposal²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Describe clearly any scientific overlap between your ERC application and the current research grant or ongoing grant application.
Section c: [Early achievements/Ten years] track-record (max. 2 pages)

(see ‘Information for Applicants to […]’—instructions for completing ‘Part B’ of the proposal)

Starting and Consolidator

“Early achievements track-record […] should list your important achievements, including your most important publications (up to five for Starting Grant and up to ten for Consolidator Grant) highlighting those as main author and/or without the co-authorship of your PhD supervisor. The publications should be properly referenced, including all authors in the published order. Field relevant bibliometric indicators as well as research monographs and any translations thereof may also be included. If applicable include: granted patent(s); invited presentations to internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools; Prizes/Awards/Academy memberships etc.”

Advanced

“The Principal Investigator must provide a list of achievements in the last 10 years. The PI should list his/her activity as regards (if applicable):

1. Up to ten representative publications, from the last ten years, as main author (or in those fields where alphabetic order of authorship is the norm, joint author) in major international peer-reviewed multidisciplinary scientific journals and/or in the leading international peer-reviewed journals and peer-reviewed conferences proceedings of their respective research fields, (properly referenced, field relevant biometric indicators may also be included)

2. Research monographs and any translations thereof;

3. Granted patents;

4. Invited presentations to internationally established conferences and/or international advanced schools;

5. Research expeditions that the applicant Principal Investigator has led;

6. Organisation of international conferences in the field of the applicant (membership in the steering and/or organising committee);

7. Prizes/ Awards/ Academy memberships;

8. Major contributions to the early careers of excellent researchers;

9. Examples of leadership in industrial innovation or design.”

We recommend that you shortly introduce your track-record (i.e. how many publications in refereed international journals, as first/last author, h-index/impact factor, yearly and overall number of citations etc.) and to highlight your major achievements.

- For starting and consolidator grant applicants, please clearly highlight the publications without your PhD supervisor (minimum one).
- No repetition from the CV
- You can comment on your publications (e.g. relation to your ERC project idea) or list them in relation to the ERC research project
PART B2

ERC [Starting/Consolidator/Advanced Grant year]

Research proposal [Part B2] ³

(not evaluated in Step 1)

Part B2: The scientific proposal (max. 15 pages, references do not count towards the page limits)

Please respect the following formatting constraints: Times New Roman, Arial or similar, at least font size 11, margins (2.0 cm side and 1.5 cm top and bottom), single line spacing.

In the second evaluation step, both parts B1 and B2 are evaluated by the panel members and external experts. Part B2 can therefore be more discipline-specific than part B1. Keep the following aspects in mind when writing your proposal:

- The proposal must be concise and clear
- Focus on the uniqueness, novelty and high risk/high gain aspects of your project
- Reconsider every “we” in your proposal as ERC grants reward individual excellence
- If sufficient space, highlight all key aspects in a box

→ Try to follow a red thread during the whole proposal: go from the broad overview into the details and avoid coming back and forth (no repetitions!)

Section a. State-of-the-art and objectives

Clearly outline the project’s objectives and situate them in the state of the art of the field.

- How is your project addressing outstanding questions of your research field, why is it important?
- Why is it particularly timely?
- What are the expected breakthroughs, which impact will your project have if successful?
- To what extent is your project high risk/high gain, what are the challenging or unconventional aspects that make your project unique?

Section b. Methodology

Section b is the main part of B2 and should give a clear and structured overview of how you are going to reach your project’s objectives.

- Clearly describe the different steps (ideally divided into Work Packages) of your project in detail and link them to the state of the art and to your objectives/subobjectives.

³ Instructions for completing Part B2 can be found in the ‘Information for Applicants to the Starting and Consolidator Grant 2019 Call’.
- Provide a risk assessment of your project and emphasize the high risk/high gain aspects of your proposal. Risky projects are welcome, however you have to show that you are aware of the risks and that your work plan includes sufficient mitigation measures (e.g. preliminary results, interdisciplinary qualification of the team, independence between WPs etc.).
- It is recommended that you include figures and graphs (e.g. a timeline showing who will work on which Work Package at what time and how risky the different project’s steps are).

Section c. Resources (including project costs)

(Note: State and fully justify the amount of funding considered necessary to fulfil the objectives for the duration of the project. To facilitate the assessment of resources by the panels, the use of the following budget table is strongly suggested. All eligible costs requested, should be included in the budget. Please use whole euro values only.)

- Please use the finances factsheet (ZA 3) attached to our internal TUM Checklist for Applicants
- Please use the table provided below.
- You have to justify your budget in written text. Describe the size and nature of the team (i.e. how many postdocs and PhD students over how many years etc.), the equipment needed and all other requested direct costs.
- If you request additional funding, you have to justify it. Please note that the size of the requested budget has no influence on the proposal evaluation.
- The estimation of the project’s costs should be as accurate as possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Total in euro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdocs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total Direct costs for Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (including Open Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fees), dissemination activities, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Total Other Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – Total Direct Costs (i + ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B – Indirect Costs (overheads)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of Direct Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 – Subcontracting Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no overheads)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 – Other Direct Costs with no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overheads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Eligible Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A + B + C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Requested Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in euro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project cost estimation should be as accurate as possible. Significant mathematical mistakes may reflect poorly on the credibility of the budget table and the proposal overall. The evaluation panels assess the estimated costs carefully; unjustified budgets will be consequently reduced. The Total Estimated Eligible Costs and the Total Requested Grant amounts in the table MUST match those presented in the online proposal submission form, section 3 – Budget.

4 An additional cost category 'Direct costing for Large Research Infrastructures' applicable to H2020 can be added to this table (below ‘Other Goods and services’) for PIs who are hosted by institutions with Large Research Infrastructures of a value of at least EUR 20 million and only after having received a positive ex-ante assessment from the Commission's services.

3 When calculating the salary, please take into account the percentage of your dedicated working time to run the ERC funded project (i.e. minimum 50% of your total working time).

6 Please note that the overheads are fixed to a flat rate of exactly 25%.

7 Such as the costs of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the beneficiary.
In case you are requesting additional funding above the normal EUR 1,500,000, fully justify your request by filling in the table below (please delete the table if not applicable). **Include these costs in the above budget table.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request for additional funding above</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EUR 1,500,000 for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep only that category(ies) that apply to the project:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) covering eligible 'start-up' costs for a PI moving from another country to the EU or an Associated Country as a consequence of receiving an ERC grant and/or,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) the purchase of major equipment and/or,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) access to large facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requested contribution should be in proportion to the actual needs to fulfil the objectives of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the duration of the project in months:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please indicate the % of working time the PI dedicates to the project over the period of the grant:</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specify briefly your commitment to the project and how much time you are willing to devote to the proposed project in the resources section. Please note that you are expected to devote at least 50% of your total working time to the ERC project.

*Please note that you are expected to devote at least 30% (Advanced Grants)/ 40% (Consolidator Grants)/ 50% (Starting Grants) of your total working time to the project and spend at least 50% of your total working time in an EU Member State or Associated Country. Please keep in mind that you have to be able to prove your invested time upon request of the European Commission (e.g. with timesheets). We recommend to add a sentence which describes how important the ERC project is for you.*

---

8 The maximum award is reduced pro rata temporis for projects of a shorter duration (e.g. for a project of 48 months duration the maximum requested EU contribution allowed is EUR 1.2 million). Additional funding to cover major one-off costs is not subject to pro-rata temporis reduction for projects of shorter duration (e.g. with additional funding it is possible to request a maximum EU contribution of EUR 1.7 million for a project of 48 months duration).
1. **Research Project**

**Ground-breaking nature, ambition and feasibility**

- 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 fulfill 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 does the proposal go beyond what the individual Principal Investigators could achieve alone?
- To what extent does the proposal require and demonstrate significant synergies, complementarities and scientific added-value to enable it to achieve its objectives?
- 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 and resources necessary and properly justified (based on the full Scientific Proposal)?

2. **Principal Investigator Intellectual capacity, creativity and commitment**

**Starting and Consolidator**

**Intellectual capacity and creativity**

- To what extent has the PI demonstrated the ability to propose and conduct ground-breaking research?
- To what extent does the PI provide evidence of creative independent thinking?
- To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?

**Advanced**

**Intellectual capacity and creativity**

- To what extent has/have the PI(s) demonstrated the ability to propose and conduct groundbreaking research?
- To what extent does/do the PI(s) 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?
Contact

TUM ForTe - Office for Research and Innovation
Christian Körner I +49 89 289 25299 I koerner@zv.tum.de
Nadja Loch I +49 89 289 22042 I loch@zv.tum.de
Dr. rer. nat. Amaryllis Vidali I +49 89 289 22617 I vidali@zv.tum.de
Michaela Werther I +49 89 289 22618 I werther@zv.tum.de
Sources

Nationale Kontaktstelle ERC: *From idea to proposal: How to write a project proposal for the ERC*, 2017.


Source: https://www.ediundsepp.de/design/magazin-faszination-forschung-technische-universitaet-muenchen/