



Tour de Suisse 2019

Project funding

Cornélia Sommer & Gilles Wasser

Please note that this presentation is only a summary. In case of doubt, please refer to the relevant regulations published on our website.

Project funding

- Open to **all disciplines** twice a year, **submission deadline** on 1 April and 1 October at 17:00
- Research projects have **no commercial goals**, distinguished by **research freedom** and **freedom of publication**
- **Individuals** or **research groups** can apply
- Project **duration**: min. 1 year, max. 4 years
- **Costs covered by the grant**: personnel, consumables, travel and small non-standard equipment; **applicants' salary is not covered**
- No fixed maximum amount for grants; min. amount CHF 50'000




General eligibility requirements

- **Employed at least 50%** at a Swiss institution in accordance with Swiss law
- **Research position** with an **employment for the duration of the project** ;
exception are possible for young researchers in qualification track.

Eligibility requirements for project funding

- Researchers with **at least 4 years' experience after doctorate/or an independent research position** with an **employment for the duration of the project***




**Exceptions possible for young researchers*


Eligibility requirements for project funding

Four years after doctoral thesis and an independent position during the project, such as:

- Full professors
- Assistant professors
- Chief consultants (Oberärzte/Oberärztinnen), senior staff physicians (leitende Ärzte/Ärztinnen), chief physicians (Chefärzte/Chefärztinnen)
- Senior scientists / Researchers
- Group leaders
- Senior assistants (Oberassistent/innen / Maître-assistant-e-s)
- Heads of teaching and research (Maître d'Enseignement et de Recherche)



Eligibility requirements for project funding



Eligible subject to conditions:

- Postdocs/Research associates/Assistant physicians
- Honorary professors, visiting professors
- Lecturers, senior lecturers (Privatdozierende)
- *Emeriti*


Conditions:

- Scientific independence
- Employed at least 50% for the entire duration of the project

Eligibility requirements for project funding

Not eligible:

- Employees under SNSF grants
- Ambizione/PRIMA applicants and grantees
- Eccellenza applicants
- SNSF professors/Eccellenza grantees in the first 2 years



Grant conditions in project funding



- **One ongoing grant** per funding period
- **Second grant/submission of another application possible if** overlapping research projects have **clearly different topics, aims, objects of study and research questions** and if applicants can show that they will make a **substantial contribution**
- **Project submission** limited to **one per** biannual submission **deadline**
- **Lead Agency projects** are a part of project funding
- **Sinergia** and **ERA-Net projects** are separate programmes
- Other applicants have the same rights/obligations than corresponding applicant. The restriction 1 person/2 grants also applies.

ATTENTION

Project partners - Subcontracting

Project partner: makes a scientific contribution; at a public, private or commercial research institution/company in CH or abroad under the condition that the contribution does not result in a direct monetary benefit for the employer

- Costs generated by project partners: max. **20% of total requested funds**
- **Salaries of the project partners' employees** are **not eligible** for funding

Subcontracting: buy-in of services, often from companies

- Usually max. **10%**, exceptions are possible

Grants in the form of global budgets

- Global budgets are the **rule**, paid out in annual instalments, **under responsibility of the PI**
- Grant holders **can dispose freely of the budget** within the framework of the applicable regulations, the submitted research plan and goals
- In **exceptional** cases, cost categories or **budget items are defined** by the SNSF
- In any case, **changes to the project design** that will result in major deviations from the research plan and goals **must be submitted to the SNSF for approval**



Eligible costs: categories

- Personnel (salaries and social security)
- Conferences and workshops
- Collaboration costs (national & international); travel
- Material of enduring value, equipment if not standard
- Costs of scientific open research data
- Third-party expenses (project partners, subcontracting)
- Direct costs for using infrastructures, computing time and data
- Costs of career measures
- Costs of scientific **open access publications**: no longer part of eligible costs in applications; to be **requested via new OA platform**




Employee categories of the SNSF

- **Doctoral students**
- **Postdocs**
- **Other employees** – these include:
 - Employees with degree, who do not want to do a doctorate
 - Employees with a doctorate who do not plan to acquire further academic qualifications in the context of the employment in question
 - Technicians
 - Auxiliary staff



Employment duration in SNSF projects



- Further employees: no eligibility windows
- The **conditions of the universities** must be respected
- The SNSF does not finance **permanent positions**

How to submit an application?

Important facts in a nutshell:

- Submission via www.mySNF.ch
- Evaluation:
 1. Formal
 2. Peer review
 3. Selection by National Research Council in a competitive procedure
- Decision: about 6 months after submission

1. Personal data		
#	No./Title	Status
1.1	Responsible applicant	In preparation
1.2	Other applicants	In preparation
1.3	Applicants' employment	In preparation
1.4	Project partners	In preparation

2. Application data		
#	No./Title	Status
2.1	Basic data I	In preparation
2.2	Basic data II	In preparation
2.3	Use-inspired project	In preparation
2.4	Re-submission	In preparation
2.5	Continuation of	In preparation
2.6	Link to other SNSF projects	In preparation
2.7	Further requested and available funds (not from the SNSF)	In preparation
2.8	University or research institution	In preparation
2.9	Requested funding	In preparation
2.10	Data management plan (DMP)	In preparation
2.11	Research requiring authorisation or notification	In preparation
2.12	Exclusion of external reviewers	In preparation
2.13	General remarks on the project	In preparation

3. Annexed documents (upload)		
#	No./Title	Status
3.1	Research plan	In preparation
3.2	CV and research output list	In preparation
3.3	Quotes	In preparation
3.4	Cover letter	In preparation
3.5	Official certificates	In preparation
3.6	Lead Agency and other agreements	In preparation
3.7	Other annexes	In preparation
3.8	Administrative part of the application	In preparation

Submit grant application

Writing a project proposal

All relevant information can be found on the SNSF website and on mySNF

- Regulations on project funding
- Funding regulations
- General implementation regulations
- Website, FAQs

Profile

Organisation

Evaluation procedures

- › **Project funding**
- › Careers
- › NRP
- › NCCR
- › Conflicts of interests: bias and withdrawal

Partners

Research policies

Jobs & mandates

Contact

Publications

Events

SNSF Blog

Project funding

The SNSF's main funding scheme is project funding. A total of approximately 2,500 applications are received each year on two submission dates, 1 April and 1 October. The National Research Council of the SNSF assesses the applications as part of an established evaluation procedure and makes funding decisions, taking into account the external reviews.

The following description of the evaluation procedure for applications is based on the Regulations on project funding, the Funding Regulations, the General implementation regulations for the Funding Regulations and the Organisational regulations of the National Research Council. Its sole purpose is explanatory and they do not in any circumstances substitute the mentioned regulations.

- › [Regulations on project funding](#)
- › [Funding Regulations \(PDF, 386 KB\)](#)
- › [General implementation regulations for the Funding Regulations \(PDF, 511 KB\)](#)
- › [Organisational Regulations of the National Research Council \(PDF, 139 KB\)](#)

On the project funding page, you will find a full overview of application requirements, the preparation and submission of applications, as well as a summary of the evaluation process and the lifetime management of project funding grants, along with references to the specific regulatory principles.

Writing a project proposal

What does a good research plan contain?

- A contextualisation with regard to your own work and the current state of research in the field
 - » Show knowledge of state-of-the art; cite recent related work in the field
 - » Demonstrate your expertise by outlining what you have done
- A concrete research plan
 - » Is hypothesis driven and contains specific aims/research questions
 - » Understandable for experts in the wider discipline
- A well-structured research plan
 - » Describes methods, risks, alternatives, management
 - » Be specific and sufficiently detailed to allow evaluation based on the evaluation criteria
- Use the number of pages allowed but do not exceed that



Writing a project proposal

General remarks

- Start planning your submission early
 - » Deadlines are strict
- Invest enough in preparing all required documents
 - » It is a competitive process
- Question “rumours/myths” you may have heard from third parties
 - » Carefully go through the regulations. If you have questions, contact the SNSF

Is my project use-inspired?

Typology of aspects indicating that a project is use-inspired:

- **Aim:** the project aims to produce scientific insights and, at the same time, to solve practical problems
- **Cognitive/Conceptual:** although the project is primarily concerned with basic science, it could help to resolve practical problems or issues
- **Source of the research question:** the question was defined by scientists in collaboration with a user/practitioner community
- **Implementation in the near future:** the project has the potential to be implemented in the near future (e.g. by means of technology transfer)
- **Types of output:** the project will produce academic and non-academic publications
- **Target audience:** the results will be made accessible for a lay public outside academia
- **People involved:** the research team plans to collaborate with practitioners

Scientific evaluation criteria

Applicant(s)

- Scientific track record
- Professional expertise and ability to carry out the proposed project

Proposed project

- Scientific relevance (including broader impact for use-inspired projects), topicality, originality
- Suitability of methods and feasibility

Evaluation is based on external reviews, the referees' recommendations and cross-comparison with all other proposals for the semester by the Research Council

SNSF signed DORA: San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment

Evaluation

Applicants' scientific track record and expertise

Please briefly describe the track record of each applicant and comment on the following points, referring to the external reviews (see Guidelines Part II C.1):


- Applicants' scientific track record in the last 5 years*
- Applicants' expertise to carry out the project**

* The track records of the researchers are to be assessed individually. The personal circumstances of the applicants should be taken into account (maternity leave, child care etc.). In the case of young researchers with less than 5 years experience since obtaining a PhD, comment on the experience they have.

**If there is more than one applicant, the assessment should refer to the team as a whole. In this case, please comment on the composition of the team and specify the roles of its members.

If your assessment corresponds entirely with the assessment(s) by one or more external reviewers, you can simply state this instead of writing your own text.

Comment *



A screenshot of a rich text editor toolbar with various icons for text formatting and editing.


Assessment of the proposed project

Please comment on and assess the following points, referring to the external reviews (see guidelines Part II C.2):

- scientific relevance, originality and topicality of the proposed project,
- broader impact (only for proposals classified as "use-inspired research")
- suitability of methods chosen for the project and feasibility

If your assessment corresponds entirely with the assessment(s) by one or more external reviewers, you can simply state this instead of writing your own text.

Comment *



A screenshot of a rich text editor toolbar with various icons for text formatting and editing.

Comparative ranking

Comparative ranking

Show/hide explanatory texts

Please assess the proposal (applicants and proposed project) in relation to other proposals from the same field which you have assessed, or are currently assessing, as a member of the Research Council (see Guidelines Part II D).

My overall assessment of the proposal (applicants and proposed project) in relation to other comparable applications is as follows: *

A	AB	B	BC	C	D
The proposal is among the strongest 10%	75% of the proposals are weaker, 10% stronger	50% of the proposals are weaker, 25% stronger	50% of the proposals are stronger, 25% weaker	75% of the proposals are stronger, 10% weaker	The proposal is among the weakest 10%

Please summarise on what grounds you have made the above assessments. You can further differentiate the rating by entering a comment in the field below.

In so doing, please mention the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in view of the SNSF criteria. A summary of your reasons will be forwarded to the applicants.

Main grounds for your assessment *

If you are successful...

Conditions for the release of funds:

- The project must start within 12 months after approval letter
- DMP
- Lay summary
- Request for changes to personnel
- Project specific conditions, budget, licences

During the project:

- Extensions possible for a maximum of 12 months
- Annual financial report
- Output data

At the end of the project :

- Output data
- Scientific report
- Financial report
- DMP

If you are not successful...

Read

- the rejection letter
- the peer reviews

If you are thinking of resubmitting,

- ask the SNSF administrative office if you have questions
- take into account the points criticised by the Research Council and the international experts
- list and explain your revisions made in the point-by-point response

If you strongly disagree with the decision,

- you can ask for reconsideration or appeal against the decision

Possible reasons for a rejection

- Lack of details with regard to the evaluation criteria
- Not clearly demonstrated experience or expertise in the field of the project
- Aims, research questions or hypotheses unclear or not well defined
- Lack of coherence, lack of focus
- Missing references to sources, archives, literature or competitors
- Theoretical background/framework is not clear
- Unclear progress of state-of-the-art or unclear impact
- Not enough details about the experimental approaches
- Unclear, outdated or inappropriate methods
- Missing details on planned data gathering and analysis
- Overambitious, too much to do, feasibility not clearly given
- No preliminary data/studies
- No backup plan
- Lack of power analysis, statistics
- No validation approach

Further information



www.snsf.ch



[Facebook.com/snf.fns.snsf.ch](https://www.facebook.com/snf.fns.snsf.ch)



[LinkedIn.com/company/snsf](https://www.linkedin.com/company/snsf)



[Youtube.com/SNSFinfo](https://www.youtube.com/SNSFinfo)



[Twitter.com/snsf_ch](https://www.twitter.com/snsf_ch)



[Instagram.com/swissnationalsciencefoundation](https://www.instagram.com/swissnationalsciencefoundation)