Expert Point of View: How to write a successful proposal?

**Ali E. Pusane** Boğaziçi University "Expert" Point of View: How to write a successful proposal?

**Ali E. Pusane** Boğaziçi University



**Professor of Electrical and Electronics Engineering Boğaziçi University** 

**Professor of Electrical and Electronics Engineering Boğaziçi University** 

### **Education:**

- B.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- M.Sc. in Applied Mathematics (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)

**Professor of Electrical and Electronics Engineering Boğaziçi University** 

#### **Education:**

- B.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- M.Sc. in Applied Mathematics (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)



Brussels, 06/10/2015

#### Certificate of Award

Ali Emre Pusane

was awarded in 2010 a

#### MARIE CURIE Fellowship

as part of the EU-funded project

Advanced coding techniques for mitigating error floors (ErrorFloors)

landa

Alessandra Luchetti Head of Department 'Excellent Science' Research Executive Agency

**Professor of Electrical and Electronics Engineering Boğaziçi University** 

### **Education:**

- B.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electronics and Communications Engr. (ITU)
- M.Sc. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- M.Sc. in Applied Mathematics (Univ. of Notre Dame)
- Ph.D. in Electrical Engineering (Univ. of Notre Dame)

### **MSCA** experience:

- Fellow (2010-present)
- Expert (2013-present) in the ENG and MAT panels (CIGs, IFs, and PFs)



Brussels, 06/10/2015

### Certificate of Award

Ali Emre Pusane

was awarded in 2010 a

#### MARIE CURIE Fellowship

as part of the EU-funded project

Advanced coding techniques for mitigating error floors (ErrorFloors)

landa

Alessandra Luchetti Head of Department 'Excellent Science' Research Executive Agency





### **Researchers** equipped with

- a brilliant idea!
- a desire to establish a strong research program in Europe







### NCP is always with you through

- Call conferences
- Manuals detailing proposal submission
- Proposal templates
- Sample proposals
- Frequently asked questions
- Pre-evaluation support



REA coordinates the whole process and guarantees a fair evaluation of your work!

- Call coordination
- Guides for both applicants and expert evaluators
- Transparent processes for each step of evaluation







### **Expert evaluators are out to get you :)**

They are equipped with

- Expertise in the proposal area
- Have access to high-quality learning materials about the call details
- Have easy access to very experienced Vice-Chairs
- Manual for evaluators
- Assessment grid





No single trick to achieve this;

Every researcher/proposal/host combination is unique

\* Goals have significantly changed over the years!

- Consider the proposal scoring method
  - 1. Excellence weighted 50%
  - 2. Impact weighted 30%
  - **3. Quality and Efficiency of the** Implementation - weighted 20%

- Consider the proposal scoring method
  - 1. Excellence weighted 50%
  - 2. Impact weighted 30%
  - **3. Quality and Efficiency of the** Implementation - weighted 20%

\* Useful information -- if it were 10 years ago!

- \* Pusane vs. Pusane in 2010 (Özlem's 83.40 vs. Ali's 82.60)
  - *S&T Quality:* The research methodology consists of a combination of existing methods;
    originality should be further clarified.
  - \* *S&T Quality:* The design part of the **methodology is not clearly described**. The channel specification and the corresponding engineering requirements are important factors in this respect.
  - \* *Researcher*: The researcher has not yet established an independent research course.
  - \* *Researcher*: The applicant's leadership qualities have yet to be clearly established.
  - *Implementation:* There is inadequate information supplied on the host's infrastructure and resources.
  - \* *Implementation:* Phase 1 is too long given the researcher's experience on the subject.
  - \* *Impact:* The potential of transfer of knowledge to the host is not adequately described.
  - \* Impact: Contribution to European excellence is not fully convincing.
- \* I was able to get away with these *major* weaknesses!

Number of eligible proposals	1428 proposals	162 s proposals	1560 proposals	966 proposals	1966 proposals	196 proposals	1032 proposals	1912 proposals	60 proposals	15 proposals	109 proposals	107 proposals	143 proposals	10 proposals	110 proposals	436 proposals
Cut off score for funding*	93.6	92.0	94.8	95.2	94.2	91.4	92.0	94.2	95.0	92.0	96.4	95.2	96.0	92.8	95.0	96.0
Score equa to or above		EF-ECO	EF-ENG	EF-ENV	EF-LIF	EF-MAT	EF-PHY	EF-SOC	GF-CHE	GF-ECO	GF-ENG	GF-ENV	GF-LIF	GF-MAT	GF-PHY	GF-SOC

https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/opportunities/topic-details/HORIZON-MSCA-2024-PF-01-01

Number of eligible proposals	1428 proposals	162 s proposals	1560 proposals	966 proposals	1966 proposals	196 proposals	1032 proposals	1912 proposals	60 proposals	15 proposals	109 proposals	107 proposals	143 proposals	10 proposals	110 proposals	436 proposals
Cut off score for funding*	93.6	92.0	94.8	95.2	94.2	91.4	92.0	94.2	95.0	92.0	96.4	95.2	96.0	92.8	95.0	96.0
Score equal to or above		EF-ECO	EF-ENG	EF-ENV	EF-LIF	EF-MAT	EF-PHY	EF-SOC	GF-CHE	GF-ECO	GF-ENG	GF-ENV	GF-LIF	GF-MAT	GF-PHY	GF-SOC

https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/opportunities/topic-details/HORIZON-MSCA-2024-PF-01-01

# 9303 EF + 1057 GF = 10360 proposals in 2024 vs. 8039 in 2023

Number of eligible proposals	1428 proposal	162 s proposals	1560 proposals	966 proposals	1966 proposals	196 proposals	1032 proposals	1912 proposals	60 proposals	15 proposals	109 proposals	107 proposals	143 proposals	10 proposals	110 proposals	436 proposals
Cut off score for funding*	93.6	92.0	94.8	95.2	94.2	91.4	92.0	94.2	95.0	92.0	96.4	95.2	96.0	92.8	95.0	96.0
Score equa to or above		EF-ECO	EF-ENG	EF-ENV	EF-LIF	EF-MAT	EF-PHY	EF-SOC	GF-CHE	GF-ECO	GF-ENG	GF-ENV	GF-LIF	GF-MAT	GF-PHY	GF-SOC

https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/portal/screen/opportunities/topic-details/HORIZON-MSCA-2024-PF-01-01

- 9303 EF + 1057 GF = 10360 proposals in 2024 vs.
  8039 in 2023
- Criteria score distribution is not important. You simply cannot afford to have more than a *minor* weakness.

The use of the **Assessment Grid** is highly recommended to ensure that all sub-criteria are covered in the evaluation of a proposal.

Manual for Evaluators

The use of the **Assessment Grid** is highly recommended to ensure that all sub-criteria are covered in the evaluation of a proposal.

Manual for Evaluators

\* "The evaluators have to assess each sub-criterion."

The use of the **Assessment Grid** is highly recommended to ensure that all sub-criteria are covered in the evaluation of a proposal.

Manual for Evaluators

- \* "The evaluators have to assess each sub-criterion."
- The researchers then need to make sure they address these sub-criteria.

The use of the **Assessment Grid** is highly recommended to ensure that all sub-criteria are covered in the evaluation of a proposal.

Manual for Evaluators

- \* "The evaluators have to assess each sub-criterion."
- The researchers then need to make sure they address these sub-criteria.
- \* A common issue in proposals from Turkiye until recently.
- One quick trick is to use subsection headers for each sub-criterion!



### **CURRICULUM VITAE**

In the p + and method by not provide frongs the set of + indigger role which entropes the address of any discussion of the set of the set of the set of + indigger role which entropes the set of the

In a nonligage tars. For individuals have enough autoge or light locks to evalue their is purchase property subget, in southeas where the person's to have personing it highest, along domains markets for marginger tars devalued.

Task couple and lage

element for den "stolgange" antibilities generality for how an element of points that I than an additional antibilities of the loss of the stolgange" antibilities generality for how and general points that I than an additional and of the loss of the stolgange data to optic how any optic for the storgange forms that points and or constant that backness from them them them to the storgange and the storgange forms which any set official to the storgange for the storgange of the storgange to the storgange forms which any set official to the storgange forms and the storgange of the storgange forms which any set official to the storgange forms and the storgange of the storgange forms which any set official to the storgange of the storgange of the storgange forms and the storgange form and the storgange form and the storgange forms and the storgange forms and the storgange form and the storgange

encompresses diversals or a design to the property size as an executed work in the besize size consequence and a a similar to encompress more than the property in the size property of the property and the property of the

Pagers: An another analysis long based for some from of anyonity off any two coulds to coulds and one match for some of endors page and an another the some of anyonity of anyonic some of anyonic sounds of anyonic sound and any sound of a some of a sound to be based on a sound any sound of any sound and any sound of any sound of any sound of anyonic sound of anyonic sound of any sound of any sound any sound of anyonic sound of any sound any sound of any sound any sound of any sound

paperant annual and haquarey. The answer part pay period and the trapporty of payments, is some some, is part pay period may sharp in the barrows may have the option to nonzero in decrement to encount part.

> The two takes types of annotant takes are the fixed take multipage (700), and adjustate uses multipage (2000), select mean as a faulting one or variable alle multipage. In annie multitage start as the critical faults, fixed take multipage or the sense. As fixed in an employee are matching common. Combinations of fixed and faulting one multipage are multipage.

In a final real morphysic the intervent rank, and having periodic projects, services based for the the concentration of the inter-Transform the payment is their, attribuigh another; could place any payming teams and measures; can and do charges for a fixed ware realizingly, perpresents for principle and returned attribuits and charges can fixed the team.

> will or results subject or in our or source neutrinois. Adjustation uses searching and of the senses one metric to the torsels and that are saidly and and and the first and the totage within the states or particulations in the rate is a standardie of the sources. As office interval was not to be searching. ETAs 17A searching to 10 years front view. The wate of the price differential will be stated to doll naminal conditions, excluding the price front view. The wate of the price differential will be stated to doll naminal conditions, excluding the

maps is the serviced induction approximation of the condition is the channel use and. The strategy origination and welling process models throwing conditioners, allowing neurons. Beinergenerics, and analyzes in companys and the beining are not acapted by processorial guarantees and here happen interast rates. Other incompanys and decisions can affect the rates as and

Last to ratio and therepayments and and and

terri rolling & rollings har to be automa if a property

AND INCOMENTATION OF CASE AND ADDRESS OF TAXABLE AD

and the second second second second

 The curriculum vitae is the first stop in an expert's journey towards your perfect research



- The curriculum vitae is the first stop in an expert's journey towards your perfect research
  - Address key accomplishments



- The curriculum vitae is the first stop in an expert's journey towards your perfect research
  - Address key accomplishments
  - Do not waste space time



- The curriculum vitae is the first stop in an expert's journey towards your perfect research
  - Address key accomplishments
  - Do not waste space time
  - Be prepared for a diverse expert pool



1. Excellence	Although the core of the proposal, do not use all your space on this! (5.0 in Excellence + lower in other criteria = low overall score)
2. Impact	Impact on career perspectives should be clear. Dissemination/exploitation/communication should be very clear. Do your best with scientific, societal, economic impact.

3. *Implementation* There is no reason not to score a 5.0 for this criterion.

### 1. Excellence

1.1 Quality and Pertinence of the Project's Research and Innovation Objectives

- \* A perfect balance for project objectives that are doable (credibility subcriterion) and imaginative (innovative aspects, creativity).
  - Can move a little further to the innovative (risky?) side if you can demonstrate a strong academic background (builds confidence in the expert)
  - SoTA is critical; need to convince the "expert" expert evaluator that you are confident in your knowledge on this domain.

### 1. Excellence

1.2 Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary aspects, gender dimension, open science practices)

- \* Methodology should be clearly shown; no place for vagueness or a 'kervan yolda düzülür' approach :)
- \* Is the proposal interdisciplinary? No problem if it is not, but if it is, it should be clearly discussed how these disciplines will be brought together.
- \* Is the gender dimension relevant? No problem if it is not, but you should then demonstrate this.
- \* Are open science practices in place? Go beyond open-access publications.
- \* Are the AI systems under consideration technically robust? My CNN code that classifies cat and dog pictures is not expected to get out of control and start harming people, but need to discuss why that is so :)

### 1. Excellence

1.3 Quality of the supervision, training, and the two-way transfer of knowledge

- \* When the proposal template calls for a two-way knowledge transfer, it means it!
  - We traditionally think of MSCA PF as a great benefit to the researcher; it has to be one for the host as well!
  - Both parties must bring something to the table (in case of GF, knowledge from the third country is the most precious one and it has to be transferred to Europe!)

### 1. Excellence

1.4 *Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's professional experience, competence, and skills* 

- \* Only few get these prestigious fellowships, have to prove (in combination with the CV) that you belong to the select few!
- \* You might have an amazing background -- on another field :(

### 2. Impact

2.1 Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to their skills development

\* Think of more long-term for this sub-criterion. How will this fellowship (if granted) affect your career during and after the fellowship duration?

### 2. Impact

2.2 Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts (dissemination, exploitation, communication activities)

- \* The financial source is the people; they need to know what you are doing with their money!
- \* Dissemination, exploitation, communication to the public, IPR, etc.

### 2. Impact

2.3 The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts

\* No need to exaggerate. Give a fair evaluation of the expected scientific, societal and economic impact.

### 3. Implementation

3.1 Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages3.2 Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements

- \* A little bit more mechanical portion of the proposal keep things on the simple/safe side.
- \* Risk management is often overlooked, but is a critical part of this criterion.

# Final tips

### \* Sample 1 - 94.40

- \* *Impact*: The societal and economic impacts of the proposed research are not sufficiently developed.
- \* *Impact:* The magnitude, importance and credibility of the expected impacts are not sufficiently substantiated and they are generic.
- \* *Implementation:* The number of deliverables and milestones is not convincing, considering the project's duration. This is considered as a minor shortcoming.
- \* *Implementation:* Research and administrative risks are not sufficiently identified in the proposal.

### \* Sample 2 - 96.80

- \* *Excellence*: The measurability of some of the research objectives is insufficiently discussed in the proposal.
- \* *Excellence*: Not enough details are presented on how open science practices will be implemented.
- \* *Impact*: The societal impact of the proposal is overestimated.

Good luck!