

How to Justify Personnel Effort Convincingly in Major EU Funding Lines (Examples on page 2)

Funding Line	What Evaluators Expect	How to Structure a Strong Justification	Senior Researcher (PI) Justification	When High PMs Are Credible	Common Weaknesses
MSCA (Doctoral Networks, PF, COFUND)	<p>Demonstrate/ link personnel effort to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-quality training • Knowledge transfer • Structured supervision • Career development dimension 	<p>Link PMs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives + Training modules • Supervision time • Secondments & intersectoral exposure <p><i>Example:</i> The DC (36 PM) will develop the AI-based catalytic screening platform (WP2), including data generation, algorithm training, and validation. 6 PM are allocated to secondment at Industry Partner X for scale-up validation.</p>	<p>PI effort must show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured supervision • Training plan oversight • Career mentoring • Consortium coordination (DN) <p><i>Example:</i> The Supervisor (5 PM) will oversee experimental design, ensure training milestones, and conduct quarterly career development reviews.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-host supervision • Laboratory + computational integration • Significant training activities • Secondments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic statements (“researcher works full-time”) • No reference to training component • Missing link to MSCA mobility/skills dimension
Cluster / Missions (Horizon Europe Pillar II)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear contribution to Impact pathway • Operational delivery of Work Packages • Stakeholder integration • Demonstration & validation 	<p>Link PMs explicitly to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WP tasks/ Deliverables • Demonstration sites • TRL progression <p><i>Example:</i> The Senior Engineer (24 PM) will lead pilot deployment (WP4), coordinate demonstration site calibration, and deliver performance validation report D4.3 required for TRL6 achievement.</p>	<p>PI effort should demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific coordination • Integration across partners • Alignment with policy objectives <p><i>Example:</i> The Coordinator (8 PM) ensures cross-WP integration and alignment with Mission implementation roadmap.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large consortia management • Multi-site validation • Stakeholder co-creation processes • Regulatory compliance activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No link to Impact pathway • Over-allocation of coordination PMs without justification • Tasks described at high abstraction level
EIC Pathfinder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breakthrough ambition • High-risk experimentation • Interdisciplinary integration • Iterative testing cycles 	<p>Link PMs to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Deliverables • Risk mitigation strategy • Experimental cycles • Novel methodology development <p><i>Example:</i> The Postdoctoral Researcher (36 PM) will develop and experimentally validate the non-linear control algorithm (D2.2–D2.4), requiring three iterative modelling–simulation–laboratory cycles to address technical risk R1.</p>	<p>PI effort must show:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual leadership • High-level theoretical development • Critical risk decisions <p><i>Example:</i> The PI (6 PM) defines the adaptive quantum coupling framework and supervises high-risk experimental adjustments at Milestone M2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Custom instrumentation development • Repeated exper. replication • Multidisciplinary fusion (physics–AI–materials) • High scientific uncertainty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generic full-time claims • No explicit link to risk mitigation • No evidence of scientific novelty driving effort

Funding Line	What Evaluators Expect	How to Structure a Strong Justification	Senior Researcher (PI) Justification	When High PMs Are Credible	Common Weaknesses
ERC (Starting, Consolidator, Advanced)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual ownership • Frontier research ambition • Independence of PI • Feasibility of ground-breaking idea 	Link PMs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific objectives • Hypothesis testing structure • Dedicated research streams <i>Example:</i> <i>The Postdoctoral Fellow (48 PM) will lead Objective 2, testing the stochastic resonance hypothesis via custom-built spectroscopy platform.</i>	PI effort is central: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must show intellectual leadership • Minimum commitment requirement applies • Conceptual development & supervision <i>Example:</i> <i>The PI (minimum 50% time for StG) will steer theoretical development, supervise all hypothesis testing phases, and personally lead high-risk experimental decision points.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple methodological workstreams • Complex experimental platforms • Frontier theory development • Strong PI involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diffuse task allocation • PI effort too low or poorly justified • Administrative PMs overemphasized

Cross-Cutting Principles for All Schemes: A convincing personnel justification always:

- Links effort to concrete Deliverables and Milestones
- Explains technical intensity (why the time is necessary)
- Demonstrates role differentiation (Postdoc ≠ PI ≠ Engineer)
- Connects effort to risk mitigation (especially Pathfinder/ERC)
- Avoids generic phrasing

A. Postdoctoral / Senior Researcher Template: “The [Role] ([XX PM]) will lead [specific scientific/technical objective] within WP[X]. This includes [core methodological activities: modelling / experimental validation / algorithm development / pilot deployment]. The effort covers [quantified technical intensity: number of experimental cycles, dataset size, prototype iterations, stakeholder workshops, etc.], culminating in Deliverables [Dx.x–Dx.x]. The allocation reflects the need for [risk mitigation / interdisciplinary integration / replication / TRL advancement], which requires sustained, hands-on involvement.”

B. PI / Senior Leadership Template: “The PI ([X PM]) will provide scientific leadership by defining the theoretical and methodological framework for [core breakthrough/innovation]. The PI will supervise critical risk points (Milestones Mx–My), validate major experimental pivots, and ensure integration across WPs. The allocation reflects high-level strategic oversight rather than operational execution.”

For ERC: Emphasize intellectual ownership and hypothesis leadership | For MSCA: Emphasize supervision quality and structured training oversight.

C. Technical Staff: “The **Laboratory Technician** ([XX PM]) will operate and maintain the [specific equipment/platform], including calibration, quality control, and safety compliance procedures required for WP[X]. The role covers preparation of [number/type] experimental runs, instrument optimization across [X] parameter regimes, and systematic data logging in accordance with Deliverables [Dx.x–Dx.x]. OR “The **Field Technician** ([XX PM]) will coordinate and execute data acquisition across [number] pilot sites under WP[X], including sensor deployment, calibration under variable environmental conditions, and on-site troubleshooting. The allocation covers [X] deployment cycles, seasonal variation sampling, and compliance with local safety and regulatory requirements.