



# IRISH RESEARCH COUNCIL

An Chomhairle um Thaighde in Éirinn

## IRISH RESEARCH COUNCIL LAUREATE AWARDS PROGRAMME 2022/23

### CALL DOCUMENT: GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

**Please Read This Document Carefully Before You Register  
as an Applicant**

Expression of Interest Open	15 July 2022
1st FAQ published	29 July 2022
Expression of Interest Deadline	14 Oct 2022 at 4pm
Call open	06 Oct 2022 at 4pm
FAQ deadline	08 Dec 2022
Deadline for applications	15 Dec 2022 at 4pm
Outcome of Stage 1	June 2023
Rebuttal phase	June 2023 (2 weeks)
Stage 2 panel meetings	July 2023
Outcome of Call	August 2023
Award commencement date	01 Dec 2023

**Due to heavy server traffic on the closing day of the competition, applicants are strongly advised to submit applications well in advance of the deadline.**

## CONTENTS

1.	The Irish Research Council (IRC)	2
2.	Introduction to the advanced Laureate Awards	2
2.1	Laureate Programme Overview	2
2.2	Description of the Advanced Laureate Award	3
3.	Eligibility Criteria	3
3.1	PhD or equivalence	3
3.2	Track record	4
3.3	Eligible track record extension (career breaks)	5
3.4	Employment status and host institution	5
3.5	Additional awards	6
3.6	Resubmissions	6
4.	Application Submission	7
4.1	Language requirements	7
4.2	Application deadline	7
4.3	Grant management system	7
4.4	Expression of Interest (EOI)	8
4.5	Application documents	8
4.6	Gender	9
4.7	Sex-Gender Dimension in Research	10
4.8	Open access: data management	10
4.9	Ethical approval	11
4.10	Nominating peer reviewers	12
4.11	Request to exclude certain peer reviewers	12
4.12	Endorsement from proposed host institution	12
4.13	Frequently asked questions	13
5.	Evaluation process	13
5.1	Eligibility checks	13
5.2	Evaluation of proposals	14
5.3	Evaluation process	14
5.4	Evaluation criteria	16
5.5	Feedback	17
5.6	Appeals procedure	17
5.7	Success rate	17
	Appendix 1 - Policy on PhD and equivalent doctoral degrees	18
	Appendix 2 - Eligible Costs	20
	Appendix 3 - Guidance on the Sex-Gender Dimension in Research Content	25
	Appendix 4 - Resources on Data Management Plans and FAIR Principles	28
	Appendix 5 - Ethics Self-Assessment Table	29

## **1. THE IRISH RESEARCH COUNCIL (IRC)**

The Irish Research Council (IRC), an associated agency of the Department of Further and Higher Education, Research, Innovation and Science (DFHERIS) under the aegis of the Higher Education Authority (HEA), funds research across all disciplines on the basis of excellence. The IRC supports the development of excellence in research within the higher education system, facilitating exceptional researchers to independently develop their ideas within their chosen discipline and across disciplines. In recent years, a consensus emerged that Ireland's research and innovation framework contained a significant gap: namely, opportunities for exceptional researchers to conduct frontier basic research across all disciplines beyond postdoctoral level. The introduction of the IRC Laureate Awards in 2017 sought to bridge this gap and has enabled the IRC to deliver further on its remit by enhancing investment in excellent basic research across all career stages.

## **2. INTRODUCTION TO THE ADVANCED LAUREATE AWARDS**

### **2.1 Laureate Programme Overview**

- 2.1.1 The health of the Irish research eco-system depends on a balanced set of funding measures which cultivate excellent research and researchers across all career stages, from postgraduate students to senior professors who are at the forefront of their disciplines internationally. A strong bedrock of basic research is essential to the functioning of our eco-system, providing the environment for world-class education, training and development, for new discoveries and the potential future application of those discoveries for economic or societal impact. The publication of an independent review of the [Laureate Awards Programme 2017-2019](#), declared it to be a critical and timely addition to the Irish research landscape. The report also highlighted a wealth of high-quality basic research capacity across all disciplines in Ireland.
- 2.1.2 Funding will be awarded solely on the basis of excellence, assessed through a rigorous and independent international peer-review process. Funding will enable awardees to enhance their track record and international competitiveness. As well as the benefits for the awardee and their team, it is anticipated that this funding will enhance the potential for subsequent European Research Council (ERC) award success as a further career milestone; indeed, it is a requirement of all awardees that they make a follow-on application to the ERC.
- 2.1.3 The aims and objectives of the IRC Laureate Awards Programme are as follows:
- a. To enhance frontier basic research in Irish research-performing organisations, across all disciplines;
  - b. To support exceptional researchers to develop their track record, appropriate to their discipline and career stage;
  - c. To build the international competitiveness of awardees and Ireland as a whole;
  - d. To leverage greater success for the Irish research system in ERC awards;
  - e. To retain excellent researchers in the Irish system and to catalyse opportunities for talented researchers currently working outside Ireland to relocate to Ireland.
- 2.1.4 The Laureate programme co-exists with and is complementary to a range of funding instruments within Ireland's research eco-system. It is characterised by a sole focus on research excellence, and support at senior-career stage for research that is more fundamental in nature, curiosity driven, with less focus on defined application. The programme operates on

a 'bottom-up' basis and applications can be made in any field of research with an emphasis on the frontiers of science, scholarship and engineering.

## 2.2 Description of the Advanced Laureate Award

2.2.1 The 2022/23 call invites applications for Advanced Laureate Awards. The aim of the Advanced Laureate Award is to support individual researchers who are already established research leaders with a recognised track record of research achievements and who can demonstrate the groundbreaking nature, ambition and feasibility of their research proposal.

A summary of the awards is outlined below:

Award type	Duration	Value	Award start date	Discipline coverage	Location
Advanced Laureate Award	2 to 4 years	Max. of €1,000,000 (incl. 25% overhead)	Awards must commence by 1 <sup>st</sup> December 2023	All disciplines	Irish HEI/RPO <sup>1</sup>

Table 1. Summary of Advanced Call

## 3. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

National or international researchers may apply to the Irish Research Council Laureate Awards provided they meet the eligibility criteria outlined in section 3.1-3.6 below:

### 3.1 PhD or equivalence

3.1.1 In order to be eligible to apply for an Advanced Laureate award, applicants must have been awarded their first PhD (or equivalent doctoral degree)<sup>2</sup> no less than 15 years prior to the 10 Nov 2022.

3.1.2 As part of the application process, applicants will be required to upload a verifiable copy of their degree certificate or transcript in order to confirm the date of award of the PhD (see section 4.1.2). In order to substantiate the equivalence of their overall training to a PhD, medical doctors need to provide certificates of both a medical doctor degree and a PhD or proof of an appointment that requires doctoral equivalency, e.g. postdoctoral fellowship, and information on their research experience, including peer-reviewed publications.

3.1.3 The IRC recognises that in exceptional cases, senior researchers with a competitive track record may not have a PhD or equivalent qualification. In recognition of this, applications will be accepted from these researchers provided they have over 20 years of equivalent research experience. These applicants must ensure that Section A of their institutional letter of support is filled out. This will confirm that they have suitable research experience and track record to apply. Likewise experienced applicants may have only recently attained a PhD and in such cases they can use their previous experience to supersede the eligibility date associated with years post PhD.

<sup>1</sup> As of July 2019, Athena SWAN Charter Ireland award attainment is a requirement for research funding eligibility. HEIs/RPOs stand to lose access to research funding if they do not achieve Athena SWAN awards within a set timeframe, as outlined in this [statement](#). The list of eligible HEIs/RPOs can be found at the following [link](#)

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 1 for more information on PhD and Equivalent Doctoral Degrees for the Laureate Awards Programme.

## 3.2 Track record

3.2.1 Advanced Grant Principal Investigators (PIs) are expected to be active researchers and to have a track record of significant research achievements **in the last 10 years** which must be presented in the application. A competitive Advanced Grant Principal Investigator must have already shown a record which identifies them as an exceptional leader in terms of the originality and significance of their research contributions. Advanced Grant applicant PIs are expected to demonstrate a record of achievements in the past 10 years appropriate to their research field, for example:

- a. Up to 10 publications as main author in major international peer-reviewed multidisciplinary scientific journals, and/or leading international peer-reviewed journals and peer reviewed conferences proceedings of their respective field.
- b. Three major research monographs (for research fields where publication of monographs is the norm). Applicant PIs should clearly report joint authorships and co-corresponding roles in their publications.

3.2.2 Other alternative benchmarks that may be considered (individually or in combination) as indicative of an exceptional record and recognition in the last 10 years, for instance, for instance:

- c. 5 granted patents;
- d. 10 invited presentations to well-established internationally organised conferences and advanced schools;
- e. 3 research expeditions led by the applicant Principal Investigator;
- f. Organisation of 3 well-established international conferences or congresses where the applicant was involved as a member of the steering and/or organising committee;
- g. International recognition through scientific or artistic prizes/awards or membership in well-regarded Academies or artefact with documented use (for example, architectural or engineering design, methods or tools);
- h. Major contributions to launching the careers of outstanding researchers;
- i. Recognised innovation leadership.

Note: Any documented career break during the last 10 years should be clearly explained in the CV if the PI wishes to extend the track record beyond 10 years.

3.2.3 With the adoption of the San Francisco Declaration of Research Assessment (DORA) principles, the mention of Journal Impact Factors is no longer accepted, and use of H-Index is discouraged among the field relevant bibliometric indicators that may be included as part of the publications track record. Instead, applicants are encouraged to briefly note the significance of the publications they have chosen to include in the track record:

- a. Research monograph(s), journal articles, and any translations thereof;
- b. Granted patent(s);
- c. Invited presentations to internationally established conferences and international advanced schools;
- d. Other forms of peer-reviewed recognition of achievement (prizes, awards, academy memberships).

3.2.4 Applicants are also invited to use this section to outline their broader contribution to research through teaching, public engagement, academic administration, etc. Applicants may also provide a short narrative description of the scientific/scholarly importance of the research outputs submitted as part of the proposal, and of the role that the Principal Investigator (if

applicable) played in their production.

### **3.3 Eligible track record extension (career breaks)**

- 3.3.1 An applicant's 10-year track record period may be extended in the following circumstances which should be highlighted in the CV:
- a. For maternity leave, the track record can be extended by 18-months for each child born before or during the last 10 years, regardless of how long the applicant took for maternity leave. The same principle also applies for child adoption.
  - b. For paternity leave, the track record can be extended by the amount of paternity leave actually taken for each child born before or during the past 10 years. The same principle also applies for child adoption.
  - c. For parental leave/carer's leave, the track record can be extended equal to the documented amount of leave actually taken by the applicant for each incident which occurred before or during the past 10 years.
  - d. For long term illness (over ninety days for the principal investigator or a close family member, i.e. child, spouse, parent, sibling), clinical qualification or national service, the track record can be extended by the amount of leave actually taken until the call deadline and clearly explained in the career break section of their CV for each incident which occurred during the last ten years.
- 3.3.2 Career breaks explained by working outside of academia or by being unemployed for a period of time will not be considered as valid reasons to extend the eligibility window. Examples of other ineligible career breaks include taking time off to travel or to complete examinations for the Bar<sup>3</sup>.

### **3.4 Employment status and host institution**

- 3.4.1 Applicants must either:
- Hold an academic post (permanent, or a contract that covers the duration of the award) in the proposed eligible host institution,
- or
- Be an individual who, upon receipt of a Laureate Award, will be conferred by the proposed eligible host institution with a contract of employment of sufficient duration to cover the term of the award. The contract of employment must enable the awardee to independently direct the research project and provide for the necessary accommodation and supporting infrastructure.
- 3.4.2 By providing a letter of support, the proposed eligible host institution confirms that the applicant is either a member of the academic staff or will be conferred with a contract of employment to cover the duration of the award if their application is successful.
- 3.4.3 All awardees must be based whole-time within, and employed by, the proposed host institution for the period of the award. Awards will not be made on a joint appointment basis with other institutions.
- 3.4.4 International applicants must satisfy Ireland's regulations on immigration and employment and must have the support of their proposed host institution with respect to these regulations and requirements, if they are not a national of a member state of the European Union (EU).

---

<sup>3</sup> A bar examination is a test intended to determine whether a candidate is qualified to practice law in a given jurisdiction.

Arrangements with respect to immigration will be a matter for settlement between the applicant and their proposed host institution and the relevant immigration authorities of the Nation.<sup>4</sup>

- 3.4.5 The full list of eligible host institutions can be found here: <https://research.ie/funding/eligible-higher-education-institutions-and-research-performing-organisations/>

### **3.5 Additional awards<sup>5</sup>**

- 3.5.1 To be eligible to apply for a Laureate Advanced Award, applicants cannot currently hold an Advanced IRC Laureate and/or Advanced ERC award. Applicants who currently hold an Advanced ERC that is due to be completed before the start date (1<sup>st</sup> Dec 2023) of the Laureate Advanced Award may apply. Current IRC Laureate Advanced awardees are not eligible for the 2022/23 call.
- 3.5.2 It is not intended that successful applicants would concurrently hold an IRC Advanced Grant and an ERC/IRC Consolidator Laureate Award. However, the IRC will allow a maximum period of overlap of six months from the start date of the Advanced Laureate Award to enable successful applicants to finish their IRC/ERC Consolidator Grant obligations.
- 3.5.3 Applicants may have pending ERC Advanced Grants at the time of application for a Laureate Award. Where an applicant for a Laureate Award secures an ERC award during the application process or in the conditional offer phase, the application/award will be terminated. In these circumstances, applicants are required to inform the IRC immediately of the ERC award.
- 3.5.4 Applicants who are successful in obtaining ERC funding after the conditional offer phase, must inform the Council. They may retain the Laureate award only if the project is distinct from the ERC grant. The Council will not double-fund similar projects.
- 3.5.5 Successful Laureate applicants are expected to lead their individual teams and devote a significant amount of time to their project. A minimum time commitment of 25% of full-time employment is required. This time commitment is not pro-rated in the case of part time employment: for example, an awardee on a 0.5 full time equivalent (FTE) contract must dedicate at least 50% of their working hours to the Laureate award. In cases where an awardee is claiming 100% employment costs from the grant, they must devote at least 50% of their time to the Laureate Award project (see Appendix 2).

### **3.6 Resubmissions**

- 3.6.1 The number of applications across all the IRC's programmes always exceeds the number of awards that can be made. As such, restrictions will apply as to how many times an applicant can re-submit a proposal for a Laureate Award.
- 3.6.2 Current IRC Advanced Laureate awardees will not be eligible for the 2022/23 Advanced call but may apply to any subsequent call.
- 3.6.3 There is no restriction on the resubmission of unsuccessful applications from the last call.
- 3.6.4 Applications that do not progress beyond stage 1 of the current call may face restrictions to future Laureate Advanced calls.
- 3.6.5 Reserve, ineligible or withdrawn proposals from the last call do not count against any of the

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/services/index> provides information on living and working in Europe.

<sup>5</sup> Applicants will be deemed to hold an award at a particular date if any obligations from any of the parties to the award remain outstanding as at that date.

above restrictions.

- 3.6.6. Applicants should carefully and objectively evaluate their track record against the criteria set out above in order to ascertain if they are competitive at the time of application before deciding to apply.

#### **4. APPLICATION SUBMISSION**

Applicants who wish to apply for the Laureate awards through an eligible HEI/RPO in Ireland must inform the Research Office (or other appropriate office) of their intent to submit an application to the programme. Canvassing of the IRC by, or on behalf of, applicants will render an application automatically ineligible. Where this occurs, the proposal will not, under any circumstances, be funded. Applications are subject to a mandatory Expression of Interest (EOI) submission (see section 4.4).

##### **4.1 Language requirements**

- 4.1.1 Applications will be accepted in either the Irish or English languages only. In order to facilitate evaluation by international panel members and remote peer reviewers, applications submitted in Irish must be accompanied by a translation of the documents in English.
- 4.1.2 Copies of official documents, e.g. PhD degree certificate or transcript, can be submitted in any language. Official document(s) may be submitted in English, Irish or Latin without an accompanying translation, however, documents submitted in any other language must be accompanied by a certified translation in English. A certified translation is a translation that has been stamped and signed by the translator with a statement confirming that the translation is a true, accurate and correct rendering of the document submitted for translation.

##### **4.2 Application deadline**

- 4.2.1 The IRC strongly encourages the submission of applications **well in advance** of the closing date for the competition, as on the day that the call closes there will be heavy traffic on the server.
- 4.2.2 If you need to upload your application on the closing day, allow **at least 6 hours before the deadline** to allow the upload time to complete.
- 4.2.3 All applications will be assessed solely on the basis of the material submitted to the IRC at the time of the application deadline.
- 4.2.4 Please note that the IRC will not follow up on any supporting documentation related to the application. It is the sole responsibility of the applicant to upload all supporting documentation prior to submission. If the documentation is not submitted by the stated deadline, the application will be deemed ineligible and will not proceed to the evaluation stage.

##### **4.3 Grant management system**

- 4.3.1 Applications to the Laureate Awards Programme will only be accepted through the online grants management system, which can be accessed through the call page or by following this link: [https://irishresearch.smartsimple.ie/s\\_Login.jsp](https://irishresearch.smartsimple.ie/s_Login.jsp)
- 4.3.2 A full step-by-step guide to creating a profile and logging into the system is detailed on the Laureate webpage in the Applicant Guide to Smart Simple.



#### 4.4 Expression of Interest (EOI)

- 4.4.1 EOIs are used by the IRC to allow for early and accurate sourcing of international peer reviewers. The submission of an EOI is mandatory; full proposals will only be accepted from applicants who have submitted an EOI before the deadline of 16:00 on 14 October 2022. This will be strictly enforced.
- 4.4.2 Calls for expression of interest (EOI) submissions will open from 15 July 2022 and will remain open until 16:00 on 14 October 2022. Submissions will only be accepted through the Research Office.
- 4.4.3 The template for EOIs will be available on the Laureate webpage and will ask for the applicant's name, proposed host institution, intended panel domain, discipline, keywords and a lay abstract for the project.
- 4.4.4 In the course of recruitment, the lay abstract provided in the EOI may be used to ensure sufficient expertise of the peer reviewer. No personal identifying information will be provided to potential peer reviewers during reviewer recruitment.
- 4.4.5 As peer review is confidential, reviewers will be required not to share EOI abstracts. This applies both during and after the application review process.
- 4.4.6 After the EOI deadline, the IRC will compile a list of all EOIs received through research offices. The final list of EOIs will be sent to each HEI/RPO for verification. This list must be stamped/signed by the Research Office of the proposed host institution and returned to the IRC. If it is not possible for EOIs to be stamped due to COVID-19 restrictions, an electronic signature from the relevant institution's Research Office will suffice.

#### 4.5 Application documents

- 4.5.1 A single submission of the full proposal documentation will be followed by a two-stage evaluation process outlined in section 6 below.
- 4.5.2 In fairness to all applicants, the page limits will be strictly applied, and applicants must use the following formatting constraints: Arial, at least font size 11, font colour black, prescribed margins (2.0cm side, 1.5cm top and bottom). Templates can be found on the Laureate Advanced Call webpage. Only the material that is presented within these limits will be evaluated. Peer reviewers will only be asked to read the material presented within the page limits, and will be under no obligation to read beyond them.
- 4.5.3 A complete proposal will comprise the following documents, to be uploaded via the grant management system as PDFs (Word documents will not be accepted):
  - a. **Detailed Research Proposal – 15 pages max**

The research proposal must provide a detailed description of the scholarly, scientific and/or technical aspects of the proposal, demonstrating the originality and novelty of the research, the proposed research methodology (including key risk and contingency plans) and its potential impact. The proposal must include a detailed budget justification and reference to resources and time commitment. Explicit and clear justification should be provided for each budget category. References do not count towards the page limit.

*The research proposal should include the following:*

    - State-of-the-art and objectives

Specify the proposal objectives in the context of the state of the art in the research field. It should be clear how and why the proposed work is important for the field, and what impact it will have if successful, such as how it may open up new horizons or opportunities

for science, technology or scholarship. Highlight any particularly challenging or unconventional aspects of the proposal, including multi- or inter-disciplinary aspects.

- **Methodology**

Describe the proposed methodology in detail, including as appropriate, key intermediate goals. Explain and justify the methodology in relation to the state-of -the-art, including any particularly novel or unconventional aspects addressing 'high-risk/high-gain' balance. Highlight any intermediate stages where results may require adjustments to the project planning.

- **Resources (including project costs, see Appendix 2)**

State the amount of funding considered necessary to fulfil the objectives for the duration of the project. The resources requested should be reasonable and fully justified in the proposal. The requested grant should be appropriate to the actual needs to fulfil the objectives of the project. Describe the size and nature of the team, indicating, where appropriate, the key team members and their roles. Specify any existing resources that will contribute to the project. Describe any other necessary resources, such as infrastructure and equipment. It is advisable to include a short technical description of any equipment requested, a justification of its need, as well as the intensity of its planned use. When estimating the costs for travel, please also consider participation of the awardee and team members in conferences and dissemination events.

**b. CV – 2 pages max.**

Follow the suggested template available on the Laureate website. Hyperlinks should be avoided, as experts are under no obligation to review external documents. Include (and explain) any career breaks or unconventional career paths, so that professional achievements are fairly assessed by the evaluation panels. If applicable, any impact Covid-19 had on the scientific productivity may be highlighted.

**c. Track Record – 2 pages max.**

Applicants must provide a list of achievements, highlighting their track record over the past 10 years. Applicants should refer to the track record profile for the Advanced Laureate Award for the type of achievements expected, as outlined in section 3.2 above.

**d. Statement on ethical issues to be addressed – 2 pages max.**

The self-assessment table in the online system must be completed even if there are no issues (simply confirm that none of the ethical issues apply to the proposal). See section 4.9 for further information.

**e. One letter of support from the host institution as specified below.**

**f. PhD certificate or transcript (including translations if applicable).**

4.5.4 In the context of the Covid-19 pandemic, applicants may mention in their track record section, any specific situation caused by the pandemic that had a negative effect on their curriculum vitae or track record.

## **4.6 Gender**

4.6.1 A key feature of the IRC's Gender Strategy is to provide equal outcomes to both men and women so that Ireland can attract and retain the most talented, creative and innovative researchers, thereby maximising its collective research intelligence.

4.6.2 Principal investigators are encouraged to take all measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women in the implementation of the research and aim for a gender balance

- at all levels of personnel assigned to the project, including at supervisory and managerial level.
- 4.6.3 The IRC also gives the option to applicants to gender-blind their application. For applicants who choose to gender-blind their application, the IRC will remove profile information containing the full name and gender of the applicant from all documentation provided to remote peer reviewers during Stage 1 evaluations.
  - 4.6.4 Applicants who choose to gender blind their application will be asked to use non-gendered pronouns when describing their research and track record and to review their CV and supporting documentation for obvious indicators of gender. Only the applicant's initial(s) and surname should be included.
  - 4.6.5 In circumstances where an applicant opts to gender blind their application, the support letter provided by the HEIs/RPOs should also be gender neutral and refrain from identifying the applicant's gender. Only the applicant's initial(s) and surname should be provided.
  - 4.6.6 The IRC commissioned an independent review of the 2013 Gender Strategy and will use recommendations from the report to shape future calls and a new Gender, Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Policy.

#### **4.7 Sex-Gender Dimension in Research**

- 4.7.1 A further initiative arising from the IRC's Gender Strategy is the requirement for all applicants to demonstrate that they have given full consideration to whether there is a potential sex and/or gender dimension in their proposed research. Applicants should consult Appendix 3 for further information.
- 4.7.2 Where applicants have indicated that there is no sex/gender dimension to their research, they will be asked to justify this assertion.
- 4.7.3 The integration of the sex-gender dimension in research is commonly mistaken for the integration of gender balance in research teams. These are two distinct matters, and the gender balance of a team should not be used to answer the sex-gender dimension in research question.

#### **4.8 Open access: data management**

- 4.8.1 In 2016, the European Commission adopted three goals for EU research and innovation policy: open science, open innovation and open to the world<sup>6</sup>. An important aspect of open science is a move towards open access to research results funded with public money. Facilitating access to those results encourages the re-use of research outputs. It is now widely recognised that making research results more accessible to all societal actors contributes to better and more efficient research, and to greater innovation in the public and private sectors.
- 4.8.2 In 2017, the National Open Research Forum (NORF) was established in Ireland to drive the Irish agenda for open research. As a signatory of NORF, the Irish Research IRC aims to achieve an open access environment that supports excellent research.<sup>7</sup>
- 4.8.3 Successful applicants will be required to address the data management needs of their research project. A detailed data management plan (DMP) should be submitted to IRC within six months of the award commencement date.
- 4.8. A DMP is a key element of good data management. A DMP describes the data management

---

<sup>6</sup> European Commission (2016), *Open Innovation, Open Science, Open to the World: a vision for Europe*, pp.6-7.

<sup>7</sup> See IRC policy on Open Research in the [Terms and Conditions for PI-led awards](#)

life cycle for the data to be collected, processed and/or generated by a research project. As part of making research data *findable, accessible, interoperable and re-usable* (FAIR), a DMP should include information on:

- a. the handling of research data during and after the end of the project;
- b. what data will be collected, processed and/or generated;
- c. which methodology and standards will be applied;
- d. whether data will be shared/made open access. If data cannot be made available, explain why;
- e. how data will be curated and preserved (including after the end of the project);
- f. How the data will be stored/managed in compliance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Health Research Regulations (HRR) if applicable.

4.8.5 Applicants should consult the list of resources in Appendix 4 for further information.

#### **4.9 Ethical approval**

4.9.1 The IRC is committed to the maintenance of high ethical standards in the research that it funds. The proposed research shall comply with ethical principles and relevant national, EU and international legislation including the *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union* and the *European Convention on Human Rights and its Supplementary Protocols*. Awardees should adhere to the recognised ethical practices and fundamental ethical principles appropriate to their discipline(s), as well as to ethical standards as documented in the different various national, sectoral, or institutional Codes of Ethics.

4.9.2 The host institution must have in place clear ethical guidelines and assurance procedures designed to manage research under its direction. The host institution and awardee must ensure that the research complies with all national and international regulation requirements governing the use of sensitive materials or processes: for example, radioactive isotopes, ionising radiation, laboratory animals or other animals, pathogenic organisms, genetically manipulated organisms, toxic and hazardous substances, and research on human subjects and human embryos. The aforementioned examples do not constitute an exhaustive list.

4.9.3 The IRC is unable to award funding for research activity under any of the following prohibited areas:

- a. human cloning for reproductive purposes;
- b. genetic modification of human beings that could make such changes heritable (with the exception of research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads, which may be funded);
- c. creation of, or use of, human embryos or human embryonic stem cells/tissues for the purpose of research, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer.

4.9.4 The ethics self-assessment table in Appendix 5 serves to identify any ethical aspects of the proposed work and must be completed (via the online system only), even if there are no issues (simply confirm that none of the ethical issues apply to the proposal). Please note that, if you answer YES to any of the questions, you are requested to provide an ethics self-assessment. The aim of the ethics self-assessment is to provide guidance for discussion of ethical issues that may arise in the proposal and to identify how the applicant will deal with the identified issues.

4.9.5 Common ethical issues include:

- a. the involvement of children, patients, vulnerable populations;
- b. the use of human embryonic stem cells;

- c. privacy and data protection issues;
  - d. research on animals and non-human primates.
- 4.9.6 Ethical concerns also include the avoidance of any breach of research integrity, which means, in particular, avoiding fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other research misconduct.
- 4.9.7 Where an awardee's research proposal requires approval by the Host Institution Ethics Committee or equivalent, written evidence of such ethical approval is required by the IRC within six months of the commencement date of the award.
- 4.9.8 Applicants are advised to consult the Horizon Europe guidance document *How to complete your ethics self-assessment*, before completing the ethics self-assessment. See Appendix 5.
- 4.9.9 If access to archival material in private custodianship or archival material with restricted access is required for the project, written evidence of appropriate permission to consult such material must be furnished to the IRC at the award acceptance stage.

#### **4.10 Nominating peer reviewers**

- 4.10.1 Applicants are asked to nominate at least four and as many as ten international academics to be considered for peer review of their proposal. The role of a peer reviewer is to provide an expert academic review of proposals, not personal testimonials. Nominated peer reviewers must NOT:
- a. Be a collaborator on the proposed project or have collaborated on a research project, or worked closely, with the applicant in the last five years;
  - b. Have, or have had in the past, a mentor/mentee relationship with the applicant;
  - c. Be employed, or was employed within the three previous years, by the proposed host institution;<sup>8</sup>
  - d. Be a former PhD supervisor of the applicant;
  - e. Have close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with the applicant of any proposal they are requested to evaluate;
  - f. Be resident in the Republic of Ireland.
- 4.10.2 The IRC reserves the right to appoint a peer reviewer to the proposal who is not a nominated peer reviewer of the applicant.

#### **4.11 Request to exclude certain peer reviewers**

- 4.11.1 Applicants may also specify up to five individuals whom they wish to be excluded as an international peer reviewer in the evaluation of their proposal. The persons identified will be excluded from the evaluation of the proposal concerned as long as this does not compromise the IRC's ability to have the proposal evaluated in line with the evaluation process as set out.
- 4.11.2 Applicants are required to provide the name, institution and e-mail address of nominated and the name and institution of excluded peer reviewers via the online system.

#### **4.12 Endorsement from proposed host institution**

- 4.12.1 All applications must be endorsed by the proposed host institution. For this reason a letter of

---

<sup>8</sup> When an expert is working in a different department/laboratory/institute to the one where the work is to be carried out, and where the constituent bodies operate with a high degree of autonomy, the IRC may exceptionally allow the expert to participate in the evaluation, if duly justified by the limited size of the pool of qualified experts.

support, signed by the relevant Head of School and the Vice-President/Dean for Research<sup>9</sup> is required.

4.12.2 Applications that are not accompanied by completed and signed letters of endorsement will be deemed ineligible and will not go forward for assessment.

4.12.3 The proposed host institution is required to confirm the following via the letters of institutional support:

- a. Based on the information available to it, the eligibility of the applicant. In particular, where the applicant is claiming relevant research experience in place of a PhD;
- b. The applicant is, or will be, upon receipt of a Laureate Award, recognised as an employee of the institution for the duration of the award;
- c. The applicant, if successful, will be based at the institution for the duration of the award;
- d. The requested budget is consistent with institutional policies;
- e. The infrastructure required to undertake the research project will be made available to the applicant, if successful;
- f. The relevant ethical approval has been, or will be, sought and fully considered within six months of the commencement date of an award;
- g. If sought, the transfer of a Laureate Award to another eligible research institution will be allowed – subject to the approval of the IRC<sup>10</sup>;
- h. The institution is satisfied as to the applicant's standards of research conduct and integrity based on available information;
- i. Where a finding of bullying, harassment (including sexual harassment), and/or sexual violence has been upheld against the applicant and there is a current disciplinary sanction or warning in place, an appropriate risk assessment has been performed (or will be performed, if successful in obtaining a Laureate Award).<sup>11</sup>

#### **4.13 Frequently asked questions**

4.13.1 Any queries relating to this Call Document, or the operation of the programme generally, should be submitted to the relevant research office of the HEI/RPO in the first instance. In the interest of transparency and fairness to all applicants, IRC staff will not discuss queries from individual applicants over the telephone or by e-mail.

4.13.2 A list of all queries not resolved by the Research Office should then be submitted as a batch to [laureate@research.ie](mailto:laureate@research.ie) by the designated Research Officer. The FAQ page on the IRC's website will be updated on a weekly basis. The deadline for submitting FAQs is 3 December 2022.

## **5. EVALUATION PROCESS**

### **5.1 Eligibility checks**

5.1.1 Before applications are forwarded to Stage 1 assessment, the IRC will perform eligibility checks, including checks on the following:

- a. The application must be submitted by the relevant deadlines;

---

<sup>9</sup> Where neither of these positions exist in the host institution, the letter of endorsement should be signed by the most senior institutional officer with responsibility for research. The use of authorised signatories or pro-persona signatories will not be accepted.

<sup>10</sup> Mobility of IRC awards is detailed in the [Pi-Led Terms and Conditions](#) in section 22.

<sup>11</sup> This action is in line with the IRC's Policy on Bullying, Harassment (including Sexual Harassment) and Sexual Violence.

- b. Submission of all required elements of the proposal and completeness of same (i.e. all requested forms, parts or sections of the proposal, and supporting documents must be completed and present);
  - c. Post-PhD duration, including PhD equivalence;
  - d. Funding awards (ERC and IRC);
  - e. Supporting documentation as appropriate.
- 5.1.2 Any applications that do not meet the eligibility criteria or are incomplete will not go forward for assessment. This will not count towards the number of times a Laureate award can be applied for in the future.
- 5.1.3 The eligibility checks are completed on the basis of the information provided as part of the application. Where there is a doubt about the eligibility of a proposal, the peer review evaluation may proceed pending a final decision. If it becomes clear before, during or after the peer review process that one or more of the eligibility criteria has not been met (for example, due to misleading or incorrect information), the proposal will be declared ineligible and not considered any further. This will not count towards the number of times a Laureate award can be applied for in the future.

## **5.2 Evaluation of proposals**

- 5.2.1 The IRC is committed to rigorous peer review of its funding programmes in line with international best practice. All peer reviewers engaged by the IRC are subject to an agreed Code of Conduct.
- 5.2.2 For the Laureate Awards Programme, the IRC is adopting a two-stage evaluation process. In the first stage of the review, all applications in the programme will be evaluated by subject-matter remote peer reviewer experts, across four panel domains:
- Humanities (H)
  - Social Sciences (SS)
  - Life Sciences (LS)
  - Physical Sciences and Engineering (PE).
- A breakdown of the disciplines included in each panel is available on the Laureate webpage.
- 5.2.3 At stage 2, proposals will also be evaluated by an international panel in the selected panel domain. The composition of each panel will broadly reflect the disciplines within the respective domain. The members of each panel will act as 'generalists' and both the Chair of each panel and the constituent members will be appointed by the IRC based on their international scientific/scholarly standing.
- 5.2.4 Any direct or indirect contact about the peer review evaluation of a proposal between an applicant or their host institution and a peer reviewer involved in the assessment process may result in the decision of the IRC to exclude the proposal concerned from the evaluation.

## **5.3 Evaluation process**

- 5.3.1 All remote peer reviewers and panel members used in the Laureate scheme are required to agree to a Code of Conduct set out by the IRC. They must also agree to maintain confidentiality regarding the application content and must declare any conflict of interest under the same grounds outlined in section 4.10.1 above.
- 5.3.2 In stage 1 of the evaluation, the proposals will first be evaluated by remote international peer

reviewers. Remote peer reviewers provide specific disciplinary expertise and are selected based on the abstract and keywords provided by the applicant. Each reviewer will be required to review the full proposal, assigning scores and commentary under two categories: **Project** and **Principal Investigator (PI)**. Each category will be scored in a range from 0-4.

5.3.3 The scores returned at stage 1 will be averaged to form a scored ranked list. In any given panel approximately 24 applications will progress to stage 2. Unsuccessful applications at this stage will receive a ranking of "C" (see table 2 below) and may be subject to restrictions in terms of resubmission.

5.3.4 Applications that progress to stage 2 will be invited to submit a rebuttal to comments from remote peer reviews provided during stage 1 of the process. Remote peer reviewers at stage 1 are provided with a separate section in the scorecard to probe elements of the application that were unclear and that impacted on the awarded score. These comments, where provided, will be released to applicants that progress to stage 2. Applicants will have two weeks from receipt of feedback to respond to the comments and to provide additional supporting evidence, where necessary. The rebuttal document will be size-limited.

Note: The rebuttal is not feedback. It is designed to allow reviewers to seek clarification on specific aspects of the proposal as initially submitted, and which in their judgement, require some further elaboration. For the purpose of evaluation, the proposal as submitted to the call has to make a convincing argument for the proposed research, in the first instance.

5.3.5 After rebuttal, members of an international panel of generalist experts will be convened in each domain and assigned applications to review remotely. Each application will be assigned to 3 panel members. Panel members will have access to the comments and scores of each remote peer reviewer, as well as the rebuttals submitted by applicants. Panel members will be asked to consider all information available and assess the application as follows:

- a. Assign a new score for the **PI category**. Panel members will assess the PI in the context of the entire panel of applications using the remote peer reviewers' evaluation as a guide only.
- b. Where deemed appropriate, amend the average **project category** score from the remote peer reviewers having regard to all the information provided including the rebuttal. Any amendment to the project score awarded at stage 1 must be fully justified by the panel member.

The scores of the three panel members will be averaged and will form the basis of the ranked list going into the stage 2 panel meeting.

5.3.6 Ahead of the stage 2 panel meeting all panel members will have access to the scores and comments for every application on their panel. During the panel meeting every application will be discussed and as a consequence of deliberation, panel members will come to a consensus on the final scores.

5.3.7 The result of the meeting will be a scored ranked list. Applications will be given a categorisation of either 'A' or 'B' (see table 2 below). All applications with an 'A' ranking will be offered funding in order of rank until the budget is exhausted. The top two of the remaining applications ranked "A" will form the reserve list. Applications receiving a "B" ranking will be deemed unsuccessful but will not be subject to any resubmission restrictions.

5.3.8 In the event of a tied score, the scoring of the quality of the proposed research will be used as the selection criterion to separate applications. In the event that proposals are still tied, the minority gender for that panel will be used as a criterion for selection. Minority gender is



determined by the percentage representation in each panel against the total eligible applications received in that panel.

'A' rating	Application is recommended for funding.
'B' rating	Application is of high quality but not sufficient to recommend for funding.
'C' rating	The proposal is not of sufficient quality to pass to Stage 2 of the evaluation.

**Table 2. Rating categories used in evaluation**

5.3.9 Applications that fall below the budget cut-off will be placed on a reserve list for 12 months. The reserve list will be activated in order of ranking where budget becomes available, e.g. in the case of declined awards, or where awards are terminated in the first year. The Reserve List will be limited in number due to the low probability of award offer declines. All applicants who progress to stage 2 and are assigned to the reserve list will be awarded a small collaboration bursary to aid the progression of their research proposal.

#### 5.4 Evaluation criteria

5.4.1 The Laureate Programme is intended to support ground-breaking research. Proposals seeking to extend current research projects funded by IRC or other funding agencies will not be considered.

5.4.2 **Excellence** is the sole criterion of evaluation for both the research project and the applicant.

Criterion	Description
<b>Research project</b>	<p><u>Ground-breaking nature, ambition and feasibility:</u></p> <p>To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>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 high risk that the research project does not entirely fulfil its aims)?</p> <p><u>Scientific/scholarly approach:</u></p> <p>To what extent is the outlined scientific/scholarly approach feasible, bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high risk/high gain?</p> <p>To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?</p> <p>To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodology?</p> <p>To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources, budget and applicant time commitment adequate, good value for money, and properly justified?</p>

<b>Applicant</b>	<p>Intellectual capacity and creativity:</p> <p>To what extent has the applicant demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?</p> <p>To what extent does the PI have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?</p> <p>To what extent has the PI demonstrated sound leadership in the training and advancement of young scientists?</p>
------------------	---

## 5.5 Feedback

- 5.5.1 Feedback will be provided at the end of the evaluation process.
- 5.5.2 Unsuccessful applicants from stage 1 will be provided with a percentile range indicating broadly where their application ranked in relation to others. They will also be provided with a feedback report derived from the commentary of the remote peer reviewers.
- 5.5.3 All applicants who progressed to the second stage will receive an evaluation report comprising remote peer and panel comments, a panel consensus statement, and a percentile range indicating where their application ranked in relation to others.
- 5.5.4 The panel consensus statement is a key element of the information provided to stage 2 applicants at the end of the evaluation process. The panel comments reflect the consensus decision taken by the panel as a whole, based on prior assessments from remote peer reviewers, and on a thorough discussion and on the ranking against other proposals during the panel meeting.
- 5.5.5 It is important to note that comments by individual remote peer reviewers may not necessarily be convergent. Differences of opinion about the merits of a proposal are legitimate among evaluators, and it can be potentially beneficial for an applicant to consider differing perspectives on the research proposal.

## 5.6 Appeals procedure

The IRC has a [‘Declined Funding’ Appeals](#) Policy. The primary function of the appeals procedure is to ensure that the IRC's review process has been fair and reasonable, and that the IRC's review procedures were followed. The appeal procedure is not a peer review process itself and will not re-open such a process. Rather, it is designed to examine the possibility of procedural errors that may have occurred during assessment and other aspects of proposal review including: unaccounted-for conflicts of interest, inappropriate consideration of extraneous information / rumour / hearsay or incomplete / inconsistent documentation being made available to the reviewers.

## 5.7 Success rate

- 5.7.1 The previous Advanced Call in 2018/19 had an overall success rate of 8.6%. A total of 12 awards were made, four in each of the three panel domains.
- 5.7.2 The current call is anticipated to make a similar number of awards, divided evenly across the four panels.

## **APPENDIX 1 - POLICY ON PHD AND EQUIVALENT DOCTORAL DEGREES**

In order to be eligible to apply to the Laureate Awards Programme, an applicant must have been awarded a PhD or equivalent doctoral degree. For the purposes of this programme, the IRC is adopting the ERC policy on PhD and equivalent doctoral degrees since a condition of the Laureate award is a subsequent application to the ERC; therefore, Laureate award-holders must be able to satisfy the ERC eligibility requirements.

### *PhD degrees*

The research doctorate is one of the highest earned academic degrees. It is awarded for independent research at a professional level in either academic disciplines or professional fields. Irrespective of entry point, doctoral candidates have to meet a certain number of criteria in terms of the duration of the degree and the written assignments required, e.g. successful completion and examination of the research thesis comprising work of publishable quality is the basis of the doctoral award and making an original contribution to knowledge in the respective field. For applicants who hold more than one PhD award or equivalent, the date of the earliest award will define the applicant's eligibility for the Laureate Advanced Awards programme.

### *Degrees equivalent to the PhD*

It is recognised that there are some other doctoral titles that enjoy the same status and represent variants of the PhD in certain fields. All of them have similar content requirements. Potential applicants are invited to consult the following for useful references on degrees that will be considered equivalent to the PhD:

EURYDICE: [Examinations, qualifications and titles - Second edition, Volume 1, European glossary on education](#) (2004).<sup>12</sup> Please note that some titles that belong to the same category as doctoral degrees (ISCED 6) may correspond to the intermediate steps towards the completion of doctoral education and they should not be therefore considered as PhD-equivalent.

[U.S. Department of Education](#) provides a full list of research doctorate titles awarded in the United States that enjoy the same status and represent variants of the PhD within certain fields. These doctorate titles are also recognised as PhD-equivalent by the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF).<sup>13</sup>

### *Medical doctors*

A medical doctor (MD) degree will not be accepted by itself as equivalent to a PhD award for the purposes of application to the Laureate Awards. In order to substantiate the equivalence of their overall training to a PhD, medical doctors need to provide certificates of both a medical doctor degree and a PhD or proof of an appointment that requires doctoral equivalency, e.g. post-doctoral fellowship and information on their research experience, including peer-reviewed publications. In these instances, the certified date of the medical doctor degree plus two years is the time reference for calculation of the eligibility time-window (i.e. >17 years past the medical doctor degree).

For medical doctors who have been awarded both an MD and a PhD, the date of the earliest degree that makes the applicant eligible takes precedence in the calculation of the eligibility time-window (>15 years after PhD or >17 years past the medical doctor degree).

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic\\_studies\\_archives\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/thematic_studies_archives_en.php)

<sup>13</sup> <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ous/international/usnei/us/edlite-structure-us.html>



*First professional degrees*

It is important to recognise that the initial professional degrees in various fields are first degrees, not graduate research degrees. Several degree titles in such fields include the term 'Doctor', but they are neither research doctorates nor equivalent to the PhD.

## **APPENDIX 2 - ELIGIBLE COSTS**

All costs sought must be detailed and fully justified. Applicants must clearly demonstrate that the costs sought are necessary to undertake the research project and that such facilities are not available via any other means. Demonstration of value for money is an important consideration under the evaluation process. Applicants need to provide clear and convincing justification of their costings and should think carefully about the time and resources needed to complete the research successfully within the specified period. Overheads can be requested up to a maximum rate of 25% (of direct costs less equipment).

Only eligible costs as set out below will be considered. Applicants should ensure that their budget calculations are correct and seek guidance from their Research Office when preparing their budget to ensure that they are adhering to institutional guidelines and policies.

### **Staff Costs**

The budget for staff costs as proposed in the application must be clearly justified. It will not be sufficient to provide a breakdown of how the costs are calculated; applicants must explain why the costs are sought for the project and how all personnel for which costs are sought will contribute to the project.

### **Principal investigator costs**

There are two types of eligible cost associated with the principal investigator. The two categories are mutually exclusive and can both be claimed throughout the course of an award but never at the same time. These are:

**Replacement costs:** These are used to alleviate the awardee's commitments and to facilitate their participation as a principal investigator. Costs may be requested to facilitate the re-allocation of existing commitments of the awardee (e.g. teaching) in order that they can devote appropriate time and effort to successfully completing the award. An appropriate value on the Irish Universities Association salary scale for postdoctoral researchers or research fellows (including employer's pension contribution for members of the single pension scheme, see Pensions section on page 24) may be charged to the project to facilitate the awardee's leadership of the project. If the existing academic commitments of the awardee are fully replaced, this money can be charged to the project in order to recruit one whole-time person, e.g. a postdoctoral fellow, to discharge the awardee's commitments. As part of the reporting requirements, the awardee will be required to report on how the replacement costs have been allocated.

**Contribution to employment costs:** Up to 100% of the Laureate's employment costs may be charged to the award where hosting of the awardee gives rise to a new contract of employment. Up to 100% of the Laureate's employment costs may also be charged where an awardee's existing contract covers the duration of the award, and the balance of their employment costs are covered by either the host institution or by other specified means (e.g. other research grants/funds). Consideration must be given to sector salary norms and the overall budgetary requirements for a feasible research project, including the engagement of other research personnel. If a portion of the awardee's salary comes from other research grants/funds for the duration of the award, this must be in line with the individual terms and conditions of the other funding agency.

In cases of a new research contract of employment, to charge 100% of the applicant's employment costs to the Laureate Award, the applicant must devote a minimum of 50% of their WTE to the

research project. If their time commitment is less than 50%, the applicant’s employment costs must be calculated on a pro rata basis.

Employment costs of Laureates who are permanent academic members of staff are not eligible costs under the Laureate Awards Programme. Any budget requests for such costs in the application will not be considered.

A summary of the policy is as follows:

Options	Approved contribution costs
(i) Seek costs to re-allocate existing commitments of awardees	An appropriate value on the IUA salary scale for postdoctoral researchers or research fellows (inclusive of employers PRSI and pension contribution) to re-allocate existing commitments of the awardee.
(ii) Seek contribution to costs for new contract of employment or for an existing contract that covers the duration of the award	Up to 100% of the employment costs (including Employers PRSI and pension costs where applicable) of the Laureate can be charged to the award for the duration of the award, subject to sector salary norms and the overall budget requirements for a feasible project. The applicant must devote at least 50% of their time to the Laureate Award project to avail of 100% employment costs.

#### Laureate award team members

Staffing category	Approved rates
PhD Students/ research masters students <sup>14</sup>	The rate of postgraduate stipend should be €19,000 per annum from 2023 onwards, with registration fees capped at €5,750 per annum for all students.
Postdoctoral fellows and research assistants	Applicants should use the Irish Universities Association’s researcher salary scale for research assistants and postdoctoral fellows. The point on the scale should be determined by qualifications and experience and the rationale for selecting this point should be explained in the budget justification. The requested costs must include provisions for pension and employer’s PRSI. These costs can be pro-rated where appropriate. <b>See section below on the pension costs for IRC funding awards.</b>
Other	Other personnel costs may be considered e.g. technicians, digital archivists. These costs must be explicitly justified, and institutional salary scales can be used for this category. As part of the award acceptance process, the Research Office must provide documentary evidence of the salary scale used.

#### Pensions Costs

<sup>14</sup> Taught masters/diploma/taught doctorate (not including structured PhDs) students cannot be recruited to a Laureate award.

Government is continuing to examine the provisions of the Single Pension Scheme and the implications for research funders in relation to the provision of pension costs as part of the total employment costs of researchers. In the context of budgeting for 2023 call and in order to ensure that budgets are complete, applicants are requested to **include** pension costs in the calculation of employment costs for postdoctoral researchers and research assistants. The IRC is keen to ensure long-term certainty for all stakeholders in relation to the pension funding of single pension scheme members, and HEIs/RPOs should note that further changes to guidance may occur when a definitive position is issued or confirmed by government. If such definitive guidance confirms that pensions are to be paid centrally the IRC will require any pension costs budgeted in each Laureate proposal to be returned to the IRC. In this scenario no adjustment to overheads will be required.

#### **Recruiting staff**

The recruitment of staff and students must be done openly, through public advertisement. Staff and students must be recruited for the specific project and awarded topic only. Recruitment of staff can commence before the start date of the project and costs for recruitment can be charged to the project (outside the official start date) with the prior approval of the IRC.

Institutions must continue to adhere to the principles of the Employment Control Framework, including ceilings for core posts as communicated to the institutions by the HEA.

#### **Eligible research expenses**

All research expenses must be strongly justified. Should a particular expense be insufficiently justified within a successful application, the IRC reserves the right to remove/amend this particular expense item at the award offer stage.

<b>Travel costs</b>	Costs for travel, subsistence and accommodation may be requested. Details on the number of trips, location, purpose and duration of the trips should be provided and the team members involved. Requests for travel and accommodation should be in line with institutional rates and norms for travel and accommodation. Business class travel is not an eligible cost.
<b>Materials &amp; consumables</b>	Where relevant to the viability of the project, the following research costs may be sought but are not limited to: books and journals; animal costs; bench fees; laboratory fees; recruitment fees; survey costs; costs for participants in focus groups; etc. Costs related to data management for the duration of the project can be included in this category. Small equipment of a value of less than €1,000 should be included in the materials and consumables section, with the exception of computer equipment.
<b>Publication costs</b>	Publication costs can include the following but are not limited to: copyediting, indexing, copyright, images, proofreading, open access costs etc. Archival and digitization costs may be included in this category. The IRC strongly encourages the use of open access publishers. It is the IRC's expectation that all publication costs should be incurred <u>during</u> the period of the award rather than being built into a budget as an anticipated expenditure after the award has concluded. If the costs are not incurred during the lifetime of the award, the funds cannot be transferred to any other budget heading and must be returned to the IRC.

<b>Dissemination and knowledge exchange costs</b>	Costs associated with the dissemination of the research, seminar/conference attendance (provide details of name and location where possible) and other channels of dissemination and material; e.g. leaflets, reports, websites and other knowledge exchange activities.
<b>Access to research infrastructures and supports</b>	<p>Research infrastructures are facilities, resources and services that are used by research communities to conduct research and foster innovation in their fields. They include: major scientific equipment (or sets of instruments), knowledge-based resources such as collections, archives and scientific data, e-infrastructures such as data and computing systems and communication networks and any other tools that are essential to achieve excellence in research and innovation. They may be 'single-sited', 'virtual' or 'distributed'.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>Charges for access to facilities and services not directly available to the applicant, such as the costs associated with commissioning specific experiments in research facilities and National Testbeds (e.g. ICHEC, Tyndall, CRANN, etc.) and access to necessary facilities, services, archives which are not available in the host institution, (i.e. consultancy fees, methodological support, bio banking, Clinical Research Facility support, MRI facilities) may be requested.</p> <p>Requests may also be included for accessing international databases and facilities or for the commissioning of experiments in international facilities/research labs where appropriately detailed. Justification should be provided where the required infrastructure is not available in Ireland.</p> <p>Supports can include training for the awardee and team members where it advances the project or the career development of the team members and is not provided by the host institution.</p>
<b>Relocation expenses</b>	Only applies to applicants who are moving to Ireland from another country specifically to take up the award. A maximum of €5,000 can be sought under this heading and can only be sought for the first year of the award.
<b>Overheads</b>	Overheads can be charged at a rate of 25% of direct costs less equipment.
<b>Equipment</b>	<p>For equipment costs, provide details and justification for any small items of equipment being sought. The IRC will pay particular attention to any larger equipment requests. Any such requests will require a strong rationale and an account of why such items might not be already available to an applicant or fundable from core budgets.</p> <p>All Equipment must be acquired, in compliance with all National and EU procurement guidelines, at the most cost-effective price and upon the most competitive terms having regard to the needs of the Laureate Research Programme in relation to economy, time, and quality, and without any conflict of interest.</p>

<sup>15</sup> European Commission (2016), [European Charter for Access to Research Infrastructures: Principles and Guidelines for Access and Related Services](#), p.9.



	<p>Details of all requested equipment necessary for the research programme should be itemised and the rationale for why it must be purchased (i.e. access to it is not currently available to the applicant) should be included. In the event of an equipment item which costs in excess of €50,000, the quote number and cost must be included in the budget justification. Quotations should also be available for services costing in excess of €50,000. Documentation supporting such quotations must be kept in a manner and form that will meet audit requirements and such documentation must be made available to the Council on request.</p> <p>The financial elements of proposals will be considered as part of the assessment process.</p>
--	--

### **Ineligible Research Expenses**

Examples of ineligible costs include:

- Journal subscriptions;
- Fees for speakers (honoraria);
- Legal fees;
- Membership fees;
- Smartphones;
- Subventions to publishers.

## **APPENDIX 3 - GUIDANCE ON THE SEX-GENDER DIMENSION IN RESEARCH CONTENT**

Excellent research fully considers the potential biological sex and social gender dimensions as key analytical and explanatory variables. If relevant sex-gender issues are missed or poorly addressed, research results will be partial and potentially biased. In worst-case scenarios poor consideration of the sex-gender dimension in research can result in real-world applications based on inaccurate results or conceptions. Full consideration of the sex-gender dimension in research content is a requirement for all Irish Research IRC awards and is a requirement of Horizon Europe funding.

**The integration of the sex-gender dimension in research is commonly mistaken for the integration of gender balance in research teams. These are two distinct matters, and the gender balance of a team should not be used to answer the sex-gender dimension in research question.**

We recommend this short video from the European Commission on the integration of sex/gender dimension in research: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=67sbLrJAfIQ>.

### **Definitions**

**Sex** refers to a set of biological attributes in humans and animals. It is primarily associated with physical and physiological features including chromosomes, gene expression, hormone levels and function, and reproductive/sexual anatomy. Sex is usually categorized as female or male.

**Gender** refers to the socially constructed roles, behaviours, expressions and identities of girls, women, boys, men, and gender diverse people. It influences how people perceive themselves and each other, how they act and interact, and the distribution of power and resources in society. Gender is usually conceptualized as a binary (girl/woman and boy/man) yet there is considerable diversity in how individuals and groups understand, experience, and express it.

Irish charity, *BelongTo* provides a list of terminology associated with gender: <https://www.belongto.org/parents/lets-talk-terminology/>

### **Resources**

The following links provide positive and negative examples that result from the inclusion or exclusion of sex and gender in research respectively. These may be useful for applicants to complete the Sex-Gender dimension statement in the application:

#### *General*

[Integrating Gender into Research IGAR](#)

[Stanford University resource concerning the sex-gender aspects of research](#)

The following examples demonstrate these principles in the panel domains relevant to the Laureate programme:

#### *Life Sciences*

[Online training for integrating sex and gender in health research](#)

[Article about the dangers of drug testing on all-male animal populations](#) (animal studies, drug design)

[Gender research focus in agricultural technology and botanical science](#) (agriculture, botanical science)

#### *Physical Science and Engineering*

- [Transport Infrastructure Ireland report on the implications of transport design for women in Ireland](#) (transportation engineering)

- [Machine learning reinforcing gender stereotypes](#) (machine learning)
- [Oxfam study about the gendered impacts of mining](#) (geoscience)
- <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.1270-draft.pdf> (mathematics, statistics, and computing)

#### *Social Science*

[Book by Trine Rogg Korsvik & Linda M. Rustad on the gender dimension in research](#) (multiple examples provided in the chapter, Safe Societies)

#### *Humanities*

[Article on urban design principles that take into account the needs of women and minority groups](#) (urban design)

### **Toolkit: Gender in EU-funded research**

This toolkit aims to give the research community practical tools to integrate gender aspects into their research, including equal opportunities for women and men and the sex-gender dimension of research, thereby contributing to excellence in research.

#### [Toolkit Link](#)

Investing in a sex-gender-sensitive approach to the research content makes for higher quality and validity. If research takes into account the differences between men and women in the research population, the results will be more representative. General categories such as ‘people’, ‘patients’ or ‘users’ do not distinguish between men and women.

Research based on such categories may well draw partial conclusions based on partial data. For example, research on a new breast cancer treatment should include male patients, so as to draw a complete picture. Most basic research with animal models focuses on males to the exclusion of females (Zucker et al., 2010; Marts et al., 2004). Research on economic migrants cannot limit itself to male points of view if it wants to understand the whole migrant population.

#### *How to consider the potential gender dimension and implications for your research*

**Research ideas and hypotheses:** The relevance of sex-gender for and within the subject matter needs to be analysed and an assessment made of the state of knowledge in this respect. The formulation of hypotheses can draw upon previous research and existing literature. Indeed, the body of knowledge on sex-gender issues has been steadily growing over recent decades and can serve as interesting reference material to build new hypotheses for future research.

**Project design and research methodology:** While research methodologies may vary, they all strive to represent (aspects of) reality. Whenever this reality concerns humans, any sound methodology should differentiate between the sexes/genders and take into account the male/female and/or men’s and women’s situations equally. Groups such as ‘citizens’, ‘patients’, ‘consumers’, ‘victims’ or ‘children’ are potentially too general as categories.

**Research implementation:** Data collection tools (such as questionnaires and interview checklists) should be gender-sensitive, use gender neutral language, and should make it possible to detect the different realities of men and women. This will help to avoid gender bias. For example, answers to be provided by the ‘head of household’ are not necessarily valid for all household members.

**Data analysis:** In most research concerning human subjects, data are routinely disaggregated by sex, which would logically lead to analyses according to sex. However to date this is still not common practice. Systematically taking sex as a central variable and analysing other variables with respect to it (e.g. sex and age, sex and income, sex and mobility, sex and labour) will provide

significant and useful insights. Involving gender-balanced end-user groups in the course of the research is also a good way of guaranteeing the highest impact.

**Dissemination phase – reporting of data:** Collecting and analysing sex-gender-specific data is not enough if they are omitted from the published results. Sex-gender should be included in ‘mainstream’ publications as it is as much part of daily reality as any other variable studied. Specific dissemination actions (publications or events) for sex-gender findings can be considered. Institutions and departments that focus on gender should be included in the target groups for dissemination. Publications should use gender-neutral language.

### Checklist for Sex-Gender in Research Content

**Research ideas phase:** If the research involves humans as research objects, has the relevance of sex-gender to the research topic been analysed?

If the research does not directly involve humans, are the possibly differentiated relations of men and women to the research subject sufficiently clear?

Have you reviewed literature and other sources relating to sex-gender differences in the research field?

**Proposal phase:** Does the methodology ensure that (possible) sex-gender differences will be investigated: that sex-gender differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of the final publication?

Does the proposal explicitly and comprehensively explain how sex-gender issues will be handled (e.g. in a specific work package)?

Have possibly differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research on women and men been considered?

**Research phase:** Are questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, etc. designed to unravel potentially relevant sex and/or gender differences in your data?

Are the groups involved in the project (e.g. samples, testing groups) gender-balanced? Is data analysed according to the sex variable? Are other relevant variables analysed with respect to sex?

**Dissemination phase:** Do analyses present statistics, tables, figures and descriptions that focus on the relevant sex-gender differences that came up in the course of the project?

Are institutions, departments and journals that focus on gender included among the target groups for dissemination, along with mainstream research magazines?

Have you considered a specific publication or event on sex-gender-related findings?

## **APPENDIX 4 - RESOURCES ON DATA MANAGEMENT PLANS AND FAIR PRINCIPLES**

[ERC Guide to Open Research Data and Data Management Plans](#)

[OpenAire](#) - The OpenAIRE2020 project

[FAIR data principles FORCE 11](#)

[ROAR](#)- Registry of Open Access Repositories

[OpenDoar](#) – Directory of Open Access Repositories

[Registry of Research Data Repositories](#)

[NORE](#) – National Open Research Forum

[Science Europe DMP Templates and Guidelines](#)

## APPENDIX 5 - ETHICS SELF-ASSESSMENT TABLE

Applicants are required to consider carefully ethical implications of their proposed research. The ethics self-assessment table below, which is drawn from Horizon Europe, should be completed by applicants as they are undertaking the relevant assessment in advance of completing the application form in the online system. Detailed guidance on completing the ethics table below and further information is available on European Commission's [website](#).

Section 1: HUMAN EMBRYOS / FOETUSES					
Does your research involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?		YES	NO	If YES, this is not currently a permitted area of research funded by the Irish Research Council	
Does your research involve the use of human embryos? If YES:				As above	
Does your research involve the use of human foetal tissues / cells? If YES:				As above	
Section 2: HUMANS					
Does your research involve human participants?		YES	NO	Information to be provided in one of the subcategories below:	
If YES:	Are they volunteers?			1)Details on recruitment, inclusion and exclusion criteria and informed consent procedures. 2) Details on unexpected findings policy.	1) Copies of ethics approvals (if required by law or practice). 2) Informed consent forms and information sheets.
	Are they persons unable to give informed consent?			1) Details on the procedures for obtaining consent from the guardian/legal representative. 2) Procedures to ensure participants are not subject to any form of coercion and undue inducement	Documents as above.
	Are they vulnerable individuals or groups?			1) Details on the type of vulnerability.	1) Copies of ethics approvals

				2) Details of the recruitment, inclusion and exclusion criteria and informed consent procedures. 3) Procedures to ensure participants are not subject to any form of coercion and undue inducement.	(if required by law or practice). 2) Informed consent forms and information sheets.
	Are they children / minors?			1) Details on the age range. 2) Details on assent procedures and parental consent for children and other minors. 3) Procedures to ensure the welfare of the child or other minors 4) Justification for involving children/minors.	Documents as above.
	Are they patients for medical studies?			1) Details on the disease/condition /disability 2) Details on the recruitment, inclusion and exclusion criteria and informed consent procedures. 3) Details on incidental findings policy	Documents as above.
	Are they healthy volunteers for medical studies?			Information as above	Documents as above.
<b>Does your activity involve interventions (physical also including imaging technology, behavioural treatments, tracking and tracing, etc.) on the study participants?</b>		YES	NO		
If <b>YES:</b>	Does it involve invasive techniques (e.g. collection of human cells or tissues, surgical or medical interventions, invasive			Risk assessment for each technique and as a whole	Copies of relevant Ethical Approvals.

	studies on the brain, TMS etc.)?				
	Does it involve collection of biological samples?			Details on the type of samples to be collected. Details on procedures for collection of biological samples.	Copies of relevant Ethical Approvals.
<i>If your research involves processing of genetic information, please also complete the section "Protection of Personal Data" i.e. Section 4.</i>					
<b>Section 3: HUMAN CELLS / TISSUES</b>					
	Does your research involve human cells or tissues? (Other than from "Human Embryos/Foetuses" i.e. Section 1)	YES	NO	Information to be provided in one of the subcategories below: details of the cells and tissue types involved.	Documents to be provided at award stage
If YES	Are they available commercially?			Details on cell types and provider (company or other).	
	Are they obtained within this project?			Details on cell types.	Copies of relevant Ethical Approvals.
	Are they obtained within another project?			Details on cell types. Provider of the cell types. Country in which the material is located.	Authorisation by primary owner of cell/tissues (including references to ethics approval).
	Are they deposited in a biobank?			Details on cell types. Name of the biobank. Country in which the biobank is located	Details on biobank and access to it.
<b>Section 4: PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</b>					
	<b>Does your activity involve personal data collection and/or processing?</b>  <i>It should be noted that:</i> <i>"Personal data" can be defined as identifiers: any information that could, in any way, lead to the specific</i>	YES	NO	1) Details of the technical and organisational measures to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the participants/data subjects. These may include:	1) Informed consent forms and information Sheets (if relevant). 2) Data management plan (if



<p><i>identification of one unique person, such as name, address, identification number, pseudonym, occupation, e-mail, CV, location data, Internet Protocol (IP) address, cookie ID, phone number, data provided by smart meters, data held by a hospital or doctor</i></p> <p><i>Any data that you are using should be taken into account, regardless of the method by which they are/were collected: for example, through interviews, questionnaires, direct online retrieval etc.</i></p> <p><i>Processing should be understood to not only include data usage, but also merging, transformation, transfer and, more generally, as all actions using data for research purposes.</i></p>			<p>- Project specific data protection policy and/or the contact details of the data protection officer (these must be provided to the participants) The security measures to prevent unauthorised access to personal data - Anonymisation /pseudonymisation techniques. 2) Details of the informed consent procedures with regard to the data processing (if relevant). 3) Explanation as to how all of the processed data is relevant and limited to the purposes of the project ('data minimisation' principle) 4) Justification of why personal data will not be anonymised/ pseudonymised (if relevant). 5) Details of the data transfers (type of data transferred and country to which data are transferred).</p>	<p>relevant). 3) Data protection impact assessment (if relevant)</p>	
<p>If <b>YES:</b></p>	<p>Does it involve the processing of special categories of personal data (e.g. sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, genetic, biometric and health data, political opinion, religious or philosophical beliefs)?</p> <p><i>It should be noted that this involvement applies, whatever the research topic or Programme. The above list is only indicative. If the type of data that you will be handling</i></p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>1) Justification for the processing of special categories of personal data (if relevant). 2) Justification to why the project objectives cannot be reached by processing anonymised/ pseudonymised data (if applicable).</p>	<p>Copies of relevant Ethical Approvals for the collection of personal data. Information sheets. Informed Consent Forms.</p>

	<i>in your research is not included the list, it does not mean you should not take into consideration the subject of data processing.</i>				
	Does it involve processing of genetic biometric or health data?	YES	NO	<i>Information as above</i>	1) Declaration confirming compliance with the laws of the country where the data were collected
	Does it involve profiling, systematic monitoring of individuals, or processing of large scale of special categories of data or intrusive methods of data processing (such as, surveillance, geolocation tracking etc.)?			1) Details of the methods used for tracking, surveillance or observation of participants. 2) Details of the methods used for profiling. 3) Assessment of the ethics risks related to the data processing operations. 4) Explanation as to how the rights and freedoms of the participants/data subjects will be safeguarded and harm will be prevented. 5) Explanation as to how the data subjects will be informed of the existence of the profiling, its possible consequences and how their fundamental rights will be safeguarded.	1) Opinion of the data controller on the need for conducting data protection impact assessment under art 35 GDPR. (if relevant).
	<b>Does your activity involve further processing of previously collected personal data</b> (including use of preexisting data sets or sources, merging existing data sets)? If <b>YES</b> :	YES	NO	1) Details of the database used or of the source of the data. 2) Details of the data processing operations. 3) Explanation as to how the rights of the	1) Confirmation that the data controller has a lawful basis for the data processing and that the

			<p>participants/data subjects will be safeguarded.</p> <p>4) Explanation as to how all of the processed data is relevant and limited to the purposes of the project ('data minimisation' principle)</p> <p>5) Justification of why the data will not be anonymised/pseudonymised (if relevant).</p>	<p>appropriate technical and organisational measures are in place to safeguard the rights of the data subjects 2) Permission by the owner/manager of the data sets (e.g. social media databases) (if applicable). 3) Informed Consent Forms + Information Sheets + other consent documents (if applicable).</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Section 5: <a href="#">ANIMALS</a>				
Does your research involve animals?	YES	NO	Information to be provided	Documents to be provided at award stage
				<p>Details on implementation of the Three Rs (Replacement, Reduction and Refinement).</p> <p>Justification of animal use and why alternatives cannot be used.</p> <p>Details on species and rationale for their use, numbers</p>

			of animals to be used, nature of the experiments, procedures and techniques to be used in a chronological order. Details on procedures to ensure animal welfare during their lifetime and during the experiment and how its impact will be minimised.  Details on severity assessment and justification.	
If <b>YES</b>	Are they vertebrates or live cephalopods?		Information as above	Documents as above.
	Are they non-human primates (NHP)?		<i>Information above plus:</i>  Confirmation of Compliance with Art. 8, 10, 28, 31, 32 (Directive 2010/63/EU).  Discussion of specific ethics issues related to their use.	Documents as above.  Personal history file.
	Are they <a href="#">genetically modified</a> ? <sup>16</sup>		Confirmation of compliance with relevant EU and national legislation and details as for no	Copies of all appropriate authorisations for the supply of animals and the project experiments.

<sup>16</sup> [DIRECTIVE 2009/41/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 6 May 2009 on the contained use of genetically modified micro-organisms](#) and [REGULATION \(EC\) No 1946/2003 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 15 July 2003 on transboundary movements of genetically modified organisms](#) – see specifically its articles 4 to 11 and its annexes III to V

				genetically modified animals above.	Copies of the training certificates/personal licences of the staff involved in animal experiments.
	Are they cloned farm animals?			<i>Information as above</i>	Documents as above
	Are they an endangered species?			<i>Information above plus:</i> Discussion of specific ethics issues related to their use.	Documents as above
<b>Please indicate the species involved</b> (Maximum number of characters allowed: 1000)					
<b>Section 6: THIRD COUNTRIES</b>					
<b>Does your research involve third countries?</b> <i>Countries:</i> (Maximum number of characters allowed: 1000)	YES	NO		Information to be provided: Details on activities carried out in non-EU countries	Signed declaration to confirm compliance with ethical standards and guidelines of H2020. Copies of relevant Ethics Approvals from EU country host and non-EU country (double ethics review, is possible).
<b>Do you plan to use local resources (e.g. animal and/or human tissue samples, genetic material, live animals, human remains, materials of historical value, endangered fauna or flora samples, etc.)?</b>  If YES:				Details on type of local resources to be used and modalities for their use.	In case of human resources, copies of relevant Ethics Approvals.  In case of animals, plants, micro-organisms and associated traditional knowledge, document showing compliance with Convention on Biodiversity (e.g. access permit and benefit sharing agreement).
<b>Do you plan to import any material, including personal data, from non-EU/third countries into the EU?</b>				Details on type of materials or data to be imported.	As above (use of local resources) and: Material Transfer Agreement (MTA)

<p><i>If your research involves importing data, please also complete the section "Protection of Personal Data" i.e. Section 4.</i></p>				
<p>If YES: Specify the materials and countries involved (maximum number of characters allowed: 1000)</p>				
<p><b>Do you plan to export any material, including personal data, from the EU to third/non-EU countries?</b></p> <p><i>If your research involves exporting data, please also complete the section "Protection of Personal Data" i.e. Section 4.</i></p>			<p>Details on type of materials or data to be imported.</p>	<p>Authorisation for export from EU. Material Transfer Agreement (MTA).</p>
<p>If YES: Specify the materials and countries involved (maximum number of characters allowed: 1000)</p>				
<p><b>If your research involves <a href="#">low and/or lower-middle income countries</a>, are any benefit-sharing actions planned?</b></p>			<p>Details on benefit sharing measures.</p> <p>Details on responsiveness to local research needs.</p> <p>Details on procedures to facilitate effective capacity building.</p>	<p>As above (use of local resources) and narrative document describing benefit sharing, responsiveness to local research needs and capacity building.</p>
<p><b>Could the situation in the country put the individuals taking part in the research at risk?</b></p>			<p>Details on safety measures that will be implemented, including personnel training</p>	<p>Insurance cover.</p>

Section 7: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND SAFETY <sup>17</sup>				
<p><b>Does your research involve the use of elements that may cause harm to the environment, animals or plants?</b> If YES:</p>	YES	NO	Information to be provided: Details on safety measures to be implemented.	Documents to be provided at award stage: Safety classification of laboratory. GMO authorisation if necessary.
<p><b>Does your research deal with endangered fauna and/or flora /protected areas?<sup>18</sup></b> If YES:</p>			Confirmation of compliance with international/national/local guidelines/legislation.	Specific approvals, if applicable
<p><b>Does your research involve the use of elements that may cause harm to humans, including research staff?</b> If YES:</p>			Details on health and safety procedures.	University safety procedures. Safety classification of laboratory.

<sup>17</sup> [DIRECTIVE 2000/54/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 18 September 2000 - On the protection of workers from risks related to exposure to biological agents at work](#) – see specifically its Chapter II and article 16; [DIRECTIVE 2009/41/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 6 May 2009 on the contained use of genetically modified micro-organisms](#) – see specifically its annex IV; [DIRECTIVE 2008/56/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 17 June 2008 establishing a framework for community action in the field of marine environmental policy \(Marine Strategy Framework Directive\)](#) – specifically its Annex III; [COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora](#) [Council directive 79/409 EEC on the conservation of wild birds](#) and [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein](#)

<sup>18</sup> See, in particular:

[Directive 2008/56/EC](#); [Council Directive 92/43/EEC](#); [Council Directive 79/409/EEC](#) [Council Regulation \(EC\) No 338/97](#)  
[Council Decision 93/626/EEC](#)

<b>Does your research involve the use of elements that may cause harm to humans, including research staff?</b>				Details on health and safety procedures.	
If <b>YES</b>	Does your research involve harmful biological agents? <sup>5</sup>				
	Does your research involve harmful chemical and explosive agents? <sup>6</sup>				
	Does your research involve harmful radioactive agents? <sup>7</sup>				
	Does your research involve other harmful materials or equipment, e.g. high-powered laser systems?				
<b>Section 8: <u>DUAL USE</u></b>					
<b>Does your research have the potential for military applications?</b>		YES	NO	Information to be provided	Narrative document describing the potential dual use implications of the research.
If <b>YES</b>	Does your research have an exclusive civilian application focus?			Explanations on the exclusive civilian focus of the research	
	Will your research use or produce goods or information that will require export licenses in accordance with			Details on what goods and information used and produced in your research will need export licences	



	legislation on dual use items?				
	Does your research affect current standards in military ethics – e.g., global ban on weapons of mass destruction, issues of proportionality, discrimination of combatants and accountability in drone and autonomous robotics developments, incendiary or laser weapons?			Details on how the research might affect current standards in military ethics.	
<b>Section 9: MISUSE</b>					
	Does your research have the potential for malevolent/criminal/terrorist abuse?	YES	NO	Information to be provided	Narrative document describing the potential dual use implications of the research
If <b>YES</b>	Does your research involve information on/or the use of biological-, chemical-, nuclear/radiological-security sensitive materials and explosives, and means of their delivery?			Details on the legal requirements of the possession of such items and proposed risk mitigation strategies.	
	Does your research involve the development of technologies or the creation of information that could have severe negative impacts on human rights standards (e.g. privacy, stigmatization,			Details on measures to prevent malevolent abuse.  Details on risk mitigation strategies.	

	discrimination), if misapplied?				
	Does your research have the potential for terrorist or criminal abuse e.g. infrastructural vulnerability studies, cybersecurity related research?			Details on measures to prevent malevolent abuse.  Details on risk mitigation strategies.	
<b>Section 10: OTHER ETHICS ISSUES</b>					
Are there any other ethics issues that should be taken into consideration? Please specify: (Maximum number of characters allowed: 1000)	YES	NO	Information to be provided	Any relevant document.	

Resources for completing ethics self-assessment,

- [How to complete your ethics self-assessment](#)
- [Horizon 2020 Online Manual – Ethics](#) – documents for Horizon Europe under development at the time of publication
- [Ethics for researchers](#)
- [Strategy to minimize ethical misconduct](#)
- [Textbook on ethics in research](#)
- [Guidance Note for Researchers and Evaluators of Social Sciences and Humanities Research](#)
- [Identifying serious and complex ethics issues in EU-funded research](#)