

European Commission Horizon 2020 European Union funding for Research & Innovation

ERC funding activities 2007-2013

Key facts, patterns and trends



European Research Council

Established by the European Commission

ESEARCH & INNOVATION POLICY



· · · · · · · · · · · ·

LEGAL NOTICE

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (http://europa.eu).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015

ISBN 978-92-9215-036-5 doi:10.2828/36703 © European Union, 2015 Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Printed in Belgium

PRINTED ON ELEMENTAL CHLORINE-FREE BLEACHED PAPER (ECF)



• • • • • • • • • • • •

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

ERC Funding Activities 2007-2013

ERC European Research Council



European Research Council Established by the European Commission

EUR 3688

• • • • ٠ • • • •

. .

• •

Contents

	Co	ntents	
	1	• Introduction	7
• •	1.1	Purpose of the report	9
	1.2	Data source	9
	1.2	Outline of the report	9
	2	ERC in context	11
	2.1	ERC and the Framework Programmes	12
	2.2	Mission and European added value of the ERC	12
	2.3	Structure of the ERC	13
	2.4	ERC budget	14
	2.4.1	ERC budget in FP7	14
	2.4.2	ERC budget evolution	14
	2.4.3	ERC budget allocation by funding scheme	14
	2.4.4	ERC budget in comparative perspective	14
	3	ERC proposal selection and funding	19
	3.1	ERC funding schemes	20
	3.1.1	Description of funding schemes	20
	3.1.2	Evolution of funding scheme conditions	20
	3.2	Proposal selection	22
	3.2.1	Calls for proposals	22
	3.2.2	Proposal submission	22
	3.2.3	Evaluation experts and panels	22
	3.2.4	Proposal evaluation	23
	3.2.5	Evolution of submitted and evaluated proposals	
		in numbers	23
	3.3	Proposal success rates	25
	3.3.1	Success rates of A-scored proposals	26
	3.3.2	ERC success rates from a comparative perspective	26
	3.4	Proposal funding	27
	3.4.1	Time-to-grant	27



.

•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	

	• • • • • • • • • • •	
	• • • • • • • • •	
4	ERC research areas	31
4 1	Scientific domains and ERC peer-review	
	evaluation papel structure	30
4.2	Eupling	32
4.2	Propagals and suppose rates	22
4.3	Proposals and success rales	33
5	ERC grant characteristics	37
5.1	Project duration	38
5.2	Project costs	38
5.2.1	Project costs breakdown	39
6	Demographic profiles of applicants	43
6.1	Gender	44
6.2	Age and research experience	46
6.3	Nationality and country of residence	49
7	Host Institutions of applicants	55
7.1	Overview	56
7.2	Applicants and success rates by Host Institution	56
7.3	Research areas of applicants by Host Institution	57
7.3	Gender of applicants by Host Institution	59
8	Host countries	61
8.1	Applicants and success rates by host country	62
8.2	Funding by host country	66
8.3	Alternative indicators of country participation	
	in ERC competitions	67
8.4	Gender of applicants by host country	68
8.5	Research areas of applicants by host country	70
8.6	Inter-country grant portability	70
9	Host regions and localities	75
91	Applicants and success rates at the regional level	76
9.2	Applicants and success rates at the sub-regional lev	rel 76
10	Appendix	83





Introduction



· · · · · · · · · · ·



.

•••••

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the report

This report aims to provide an authoritative quantitative overview of the European Research Council (ERC) funding activities over the course of the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Union for research, technological development and demonstration activities 2007-2013 (FP7).

This report complements other material already published by the ERC, through which reliable and timely information on the outcomes of its competitions was regularly communicated to its stakeholders and the general public:

- > After the completion of each call the ERC published the names of the grantees and statistics on the competitions, which included success rates by research area and country, as well as committed budget.
- > The ERC contributed to the annual FP7 monitoring reports produced by the European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (DG Research and Innovation), which presented data on the implementation of FP7 and its Specific Programmes (SPs).
- > The ERC produced annual reports, which regularly presented selected sets of indicators, such as mobility patterns of ERC grantees or the demographic characteristics of the participants in ERC competitions.
- > The ERC regularly provided information on its funding activities in the form of presentations made by members of the ERC Scientific Council or ERC staff members in scientific fora and information events.

The primary target group of this report are EU and national policy makers and administrators, but the report is also addressed to other types of stakeholders in the field of research policy.

The report brings together existing information and analyses on ERC funding activities with comprehensive new analyses that expand substantially the scope of information published so far. For example, it publishes for the first time aggregated data on applications and funding at the level of research organisations that ERC applicants and grantees are affiliated with and/or hosted by, as well as at the level of the regions and localities where these organisations are located.

1.2 Data source

This report combines in-house data on ERC funding activities and data from external sources. Data on ERC funding activities come from an in-house database (ERCSTATS) purposely designed for statistical analysis. This database is mainly based on data from other information systems used for various administrative operations of funding activities: grant submission by applicants, evaluation of submitted proposals as well as financial transactions on funded projects. An extensive quality check has been performed in order to produce this report, including for example the detection and correction of data entry errors on date of birth and the harmonisation of names of Host Institutions. In addition, the database also includes datasets related to the funding activities of other parts of FP7 which come primarily from the Common Research Data Warehouse (CORDA) but also relevant datasets from official sources (mainly the statistical office of the European Union (Eurostat)). Due to the significant size of the raw data that were cleaned, cross-checked and analysed and the multiple sources used, there is always the chance that some data were not processed accurately. We apologise for any possible errors and discrepancies.

1.3 Outline of the report

The report consists of nine chapters. After this introductory chapter, Chapter 2 presents the mission, structure and budget of the ERC in the context of FP7, as well as a comparison with other public research-funding organisations. Chapter 3 presents the ERC funding schemes, their main parameters, their evolution over the course of FP7, and detailed quantitative evidence on the proposal submission, evaluation and funding processes, and the related success rates. Chapter 4 presents the number of proposals received, the corresponding success rates, and the distribution of ERC funding by ERC peer-review evaluation panel. Chapter 5 discusses aggregate ERC grant characteristics, such as duration, cost, and budget allocation. Chapter 6 focuses on the distribution of proposals, corresponding success rates and funding with regard to the demographic characteristics of ERC applicants and grantees, including gender, nationality, age and career stage. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 present some aggregate characteristics of the organisations with which ERC applicants and grantees are affiliated, including their geographical location, again in terms of numbers and corresponding success rates of received proposals and funding distribution.





ERC in context

· · · · · · · · · ·

ERC in context

This chapter presents the ERC in the context of FP7, highlighting its mission, European added value, structure and budget. The ERC budget is also examined in the context of the overall FP7 budget as well as of the overall research funding in the EU, and compared to the budgets of other major research-funding bodies.

2.1 ERC and the Framework Programmes

The EU Framework Programmes (FPs) are the main funding instruments of EU research policy, bundling all researchfunding EU initiatives under a common roof. The FPs are considered to be instrumental in the aspiration of the EU to maintain its leadership in the global knowledge economy, while creating favourable socio-economic conditions in terms of employment, growth, competitiveness and the quality of life of its citizens and are one of the pillars of the European Research Area (ERA).

The broad objectives of EU research policy in the context of FP7 have been subsumed under four SPs:

- > 'Cooperation' is designed to foster collaborative research among EU Member States, Associated Countries and third (non-associated) countries by funding projects carried out by transnational consortia of various types of research bodies, from academia, industry and the public sector. It has an allocated budget of EUR 32.4 billion.
- > 'People' aims to strengthen Europe's research and development (R&D) human potential by supporting researchers' mobility and career development through its Marie Curie fellowships. It has an allocated budget of EUR 4.7 billion.
- > 'Ideas' (ERC) is conceived to support frontier research in Europe through competitive, investigator-driven grants. It has an allocated budget of EUR 7.5 billion.
- > 'Capacities' aims to enhance Europe's research and innovation capacities by supporting the development of research infrastructures, the innovation capacities of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), the coherent development of research policies, and the fostering of synergies with regional and cohesion policies. It has an allocated budget of EUR 4.1 billion.

The non-nuclear research activities of the Joint Research Centre (JRC) are grouped under a specific programme with individual budget allocation.

FP funding takes the form of grants for research actors from



Transnational cooperation in most actions is perceived to be a key aspect of the 'European added value', which EU funding is expected to yield. However, in the case of the Specific Programme 'People' (Marie Curie Actions), the expected 'European added value' consists primarily in the promotion of researchers' transnational mobility, while in the case of the Specific Programme 'Ideas' (ERC), the main European added value lies in the promotion of excellence in frontier research by raising competition among scientists from the national to the European level.

2.2 Mission and European added value of the ERC

The ERC was established as the funding body for the implementation of the Specific Programme 'Ideas' of FP7. Its conception as a pan-European research funding apparatus was a radical departure from existing EU research funding mechanisms in several ways.

The ERC was set up to support curiosity-driven, frontier research and to strengthen the capacity of the European research system to generate new scientific and technological knowledge with potential spillover effects for Europe's economy and society. In the course of FP7 this approach has allowed the Specific Programme 'Ideas' to fund a very diverse portfolio of research projects, from projects addressing fundamental scientific questions to those addressing specific societal challenges. There is also an emphasis on supporting radical, high-risk, 'transformative' research, i.e. research with an inherent high degree of uncertainty but also with a potential to instigate paradigmatic shifts in science and the discovery and development of new technologies. This type of research tends to be underfunded, as its outcome is usually not directly appropriable and its long-term socio-economic impacts may be difficult to predict and to measure. This is one of the gaps in the European research system that the ERC aspires to fill.

The ERC was the first pan-European funding body specifically designed to stimulate excellence, dynamism and creativity in the European research system by funding investigator-driven research projects of the highest quality on the basis of Europe-wide competition. Until then the research funding efforts of the EU were predominantly directed towards fostering collaborative links between teams of researchers from different countries carrying out applied research in predefined thematic areas. Against this backdrop, the ERC introduced a new approach to 'European added value' in EU research funding by providing, for the first time, a pan-European competitive research funding apparatus, which was envisaged:

- > to channel resources to the most promising researchers selected from a larger pool, thus reinforcing their capacity to rival the world's best (in terms of resources and visibility), and raising the overall level of excellence in frontier research in Europe;
- > to catalyse changes in national research policies as well as institutional practices by providing a point of reference for national research systems and institutional actors on the basis of their performance in the European competition.

Finally, the setting up of the ERC was a response to the need to increase the attractiveness of Europe as a destination both for the best researchers worldwide and for industrial research investment.

2.3 Structure of the ERC

The ERC is designed to be a science-led funding body, supporting research at the highest level of excellence and operating to global standards of best practice. It consists of an independent Scientific Council, which establishes and monitors the implementation of its scientific strategy, and a Dedicated Implementation Structure (DIS), which is its administrative arm in charge of its operational management. The DIS operated under DG Research and Innovation as part of the European Commission until July 2009, when the ERC Executive Agency became autonomous. Both the Scientific Council and Executive Agency are accountable to the European Commission, which, for its part, guarantees the 'full autonomy and integrity' of the ERC and ensures that the ERC acts in accordance with the principles of scientific excellence, autonomy, efficiency and transparency.

The Scientific Council is composed of 22 distinguished scientists, engineers and scholars, who collectively represent Europe's scientific community, and act in their personal capacity, independently of political or other interests. This body sets the scientific policy of the ERC, establishes its overall research funding strategy and management arrangements, including the organisation of the peer review evaluation process and the selection of peer review experts, oversees the implementation of its work programme, and certifies the outcome of calls for proposals and the associated selection processes.

The members of the Scientific Council are appointed by the European Commission for a term of up to four years, renewable once (but possibly also for shorter periods in order to allow the staggered rotation of the Council's members), and remain in office until they are replaced or their term expires. In duly justified cases, the Commission may terminate the term of a member on its own initiative. The appointment of the members of the Scientific Council follows after a search process carried out by an independent identification committee, on the basis of criteria set out in Commission Decision 2007/134/EC of 2 February 2007 establishing the ERC, and in consultation with the research community. The mandate of the identification committee is twofold: to identify new members for the staged renewal of Scientific Council membership, and to create a pool of



candidates for future replacements of Scientific Council members. The first identification committee was created in 2005 with a mandate to name the founding members of the Scientific Council, while in the course of FP7 two more committees were set up for the renewal of the Scientific Council, in 2009 and 2011.

In the course of FP7, the two past Presidents of the Scientific Council were elected by its members.

The Executive Agency is the administrative apparatus which supports the work of the Scientific Council, implements the established scientific strategy and carries out the ERC operational activities. Its Director is appointed by the European Commission. Its administrative oversight is carried out by a Steering Committee consisting of three representatives of the European Commission and two members of the ERC Scientific Council.

In the course of FP7, the ERC had a Secretary-General, independently selected by the Scientific Council and acting under the authority of the Scientific Council, whose main task was to assist the Scientific Council in its liaison with the Commission and the Executive Agency and in monitoring the effective implementation of its strategy and positions.

Finally, the ERC Board consists of the President and the Vice-Presidents of the ERC, who convene with the Director of the Executive Agency. The ERC Board supports the liaison of the ERC Scientific Council with the Agency. Its meetings are also attended by the senior management of the Agency.

2.4 ERC budget

2.4.1 ERC budget in FP7

FP7 spanned a period of seven years, from 2007 to 2013. The programme was endowed with a total budget of EUR 50.5 billion from the EU budget. This represents a substantial increase compared to FP6 (63% at current prices). The four SPs of FP7 are allocated a combined budget of EUR 48.7 billion, while the remaining EUR 1.75 billion is allocated to research activities carried out by the JRC of the European Commission.

The ERC implements the Specific Programme 'Ideas'. Its committed budget for the entire course of FP7 (including the contributions of the Associated Countries) is EUR 7.7 billion, corresponding to approximately 15% of the total FP7 budget. This makes 'Ideas' the second largest SP in budgetary terms after 'Cooperation'.

As Figure 2.02 below shows, when the FP7 budget is broken down by thematic area, the ERC budget ranks second, between the budget allocated to the thematic area 'Information and Communication Technologies' (EUR 9.0 billion) and that allocated to 'Health' (EUR 6.1 billion), both under 'Cooperation'.

2.4.2 ERC budget evolution

The average annual ERC budget is approximately EUR 1.1 billion. However, as a brand new instrument under FP7, the budget was heavily back-loaded to allow for the gradual build-up of the operational capacity of the ERC. The first calls were implemented by the Commission services and then through the ERC Executive Agency from July 2009. The budget therefore started small, from a level of just above EUR 300 million in commitments in the first year of its implementation (2007), reaching a level of more than EUR 1.8 billion in commitments in its last year (2013), as Figure 2.03 below shows. Budget commitments and payments broken down by year, funding scheme and scientific field are presented in more detail in Table A2.01 in Appendix.

2.4.3 ERC budget allocation by funding scheme

The Scientific Council initially decided that the Starting Grant (StG) would receive around one third of the ERC's budget over the course of FP7, but in response to the demand for the scheme and its impact, this position was gradually reversed so that by the end of FP7, the StG and Consolidator Grant (CoG) received 60% of the funding available in 2013. Overall in the course of FP7, Advanced Grant (AdG) received almost half of the ERC budget, notably 48.2% (EUR 3.7 billion in commitments), while StG received 40.5% (EUR 3.1 billion in commitments). The more recently introduced CoG received 7.4% of the ERC budget (EUR 573 million in commitments), the Synergy Grant (SyG) 3.5% (EUR 274 in commitments), and finally the Proof-of-Concept (PoC) grants received 0.34% (or EUR 26 million in commitments). About EUR 1.2 million is allocated to support actions (see Figure 2.04).

2.4.4 ERC budget in comparative perspective

Despite the impact and reputation that the ERC has managed to achieve since 2007, in budgetary terms the ERC is just a small- to medium-sized player in the complex global research landscape, which co-exists with a multitude of national and EU-level funding sources and instruments, both private and public. This becomes obvious when the ERC budget is compared to budget commitments of EU Member States and to the budgets of other public researchfunding organisations.

During the course of FP7, the period 2007-2013, the aggregate government budget commitments, and more specifically Government Budget Appropriations or Outlays for R&D (GBAORD) of the 27 Member States amounted to an estimated EUR 632 billion. For the same period the aggregate EU27 government-financed Gross domestic Expenditure on R&D (GERD) reached an estimated EUR 593 billion, which again is only a fraction of the total EU27 GERD (including private-sector R&D expenditure) of approximately EUR 1,757 billion. The entire FP7 corresponds



. . . .



Source: CORDA





Source: ERC statistical database

to roughly 8% of total EU27 GBAORD, and to less than 3% of total EU27 GERD, while the ERC budget, in particular, corresponds to a mere 1.2% of total EU27 GBAORD, and to less than 0.5% of total EU27 GERD.

The relative size of the ERC budget can perhaps be better perceived when compared to those of other major researchfunding agencies, bearing in mind, however, that direct comparisons are not always feasible or meaningful for the following reasons:

- > Unlike the ERC, many research-funding agencies fund not only competitive grants for basic research, but also research infrastructures, specific top-down research programmes, innovation activities and applied R&D, etc.
- > Reliable and accurate data on the budgets of national research-funding agencies are not always publicly available.

- > Even when budget data are publicly available the figures may not be directly comparable, as it is often unclear whether they refer to expenditures or commitments, and they may include funds for the capitalisation of the agency.
- > In some agencies the budget is decided on an annual basis, and the funding stream is relatively stable from year to year; by contrast, in the case of the ERC, the budget follows the life cycle of the entire FP, and the annual levels of commitments and payments are very different as the full cost of EU-funded projects is committed in a single year, while the payments are made over a number of subsequent years which can go beyond the seven years of the FP itself (as shown in Figure 2.03).

Despite these limitations, a comparison of the budgets of selected public funding agencies for scientific research is indicatively presented in Figure 2.05. This figure shows

15



that the average annual budget of the ERC lies somewhere between the budgets of the two largest public researchfunding organisations in the EU (but is considerably smaller than any of them), notably the Research Councils UK (RCUK) and the German Research Foundation (DFG), and public research-funding agencies of smaller countries like the Research Council of Norway (NFR), the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF), the Australian Research Council (ARC) or the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBITAK). On the other hand, the ERC budget is dwarfed by those of the two largest US research-funding organisations, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF), and is merely half of that of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

Another interesting comparison can be drawn by considering that the combined annual budgets of the 44 organisations from 24 countries, which are members of the 'Science Europe' association, are about EUR 30 billion, i.e. roughly 30 times more than the ERC budget.



Figure 2.05: Budgets of selected public research funding agencies (€M)

Source: Agencies' annual reports





.

GBAORD

. . . .

. .

GERD

Source: GERD, GBAORD, Gov GERD from Eurostat The Budget of Science Europe members organisations is an sum over 7 years of the estimated 30 Billion € annual budget of the organisations (see Homepage of Science Europe).

Gov. GERD

Science

Europe



•



ERC

EU FP7



ERC proposal selection and funding

ERC proposal selection and funding

This chapter describes the ERC funding schemes, their corresponding eligibility criteria and their evolution since the establishment of the agency, and gives an overview of the proposal submission, evaluation and funding processes, with detailed data on the evolution of these processes in the course of FP7, including the volume of applications in the various stages of selection, their success and funding rates and the timelines of the processes.

3.1 ERC funding schemes

3.1.1 Description of funding schemes

By the end of FP7 five grant schemes designed by the ERC Scientific Council were available under the Specific Programme 'Ideas': StG, CoG, AdG, SyG and PoC.

- > The StG scheme is designed to support outstanding researchers at the early stage of their careers (2-7 years of post-doctoral research experience) by enabling them to develop an independent research career and to establish their own research team or programme in Europe. The scheme provides funds of up to EUR 2 million for a period of up to 5 years. This investment in research careers at their early stages is expected to foster the next generation of research leaders in Europe.
- > The CoG scheme is designed to support researchers at the stage of consolidating their independent careers in Europe and to help them strengthen their recently created research teams or programmes (7-12 years of post-doctoral research experience). This grant scheme was established in 2013 by creating two separate calls out of the two streams of the initial StG scheme, which targeted researchers with a post-doctoral research experience of 2-12 years. This step was taken simply because the number of applications to the single StG call was becoming too high for the panels to adequately evaluate. The scheme provides funds of up to EUR 2.75 million for a maximum period of 5 years.
- > The AdG scheme is designed to support established and outstanding scientists (with an excellent scientific track record during the last 10 years) in performing transformative, high-risk, and often unconventional and cross-disciplinary research that opens new directions in their scientific fields and expands the frontiers of scientific and technological knowledge. This scheme provides funding of up to EUR 3.5 million for a maximum period of 5 years. The StG and the AdG have formed the core of the ERC funding activities since its establishment under FP7.

- > The SyG pilot scheme was established in 2012 to support small teams of scientists (two to four Principal Investigators and their research teams), who wish to jointly address research problems at the frontiers of knowledge by bringing together complementary expertise, knowledge and resources. It is increasingly recognised that for complex scientific problems, collaboration between different researchers and their teams, often on an interdisciplinary basis and using shared facilities, can lead to outstanding new ideas and unexpected discoveries. The scheme provides funds of up to EUR 15 million for a period of up to 6 years.
- > The PoC scheme was launched in 2011 to provide existing ERC grantees with additional funding of up to EUR 150,000 for a maximum period of 18 months to establish the innovation potential of ideas arising from their ERC-funded frontier research projects. The funding can cover activities such as establishing intellectual property rights, mapping out commercial and business opportunities, and technical validation.

3.1.2 Evolution of funding scheme conditions

In the course of FP7, the Scientific Council chose to modify the eligibility and funding conditions of the ERC grant schemes several times from one call year to another in response to experience and changing circumstances.

The initial StG scheme in 2007 envisaged the provision of EUR 0.1-0.4 million per year for a maximum period of 5 years, hence a total of EUR 0.5-2 million. In order to be considered eligible, the applicant should have received his/her first doctoral degree more than 2 and less than 9 years prior to the deadline of the ERC call for proposals. With the 2009 StG call, funding was consolidated to up to EUR 2 million for the entire grant period of 5 years, while the applicant should have received his/her first doctoral degree more than 3 and less than 8 years prior to the publication date of the ERC call for proposals. In 2010 the StG eligibility window was extended to 2-10 years and streaming was introduced to better compare applicants with different levels of experience (2-6 for 'starters', 6-10 for 'consolidators'). Funding for StG grants was limited to EUR 1.5 million with the option of an additional EUR 0.5 million if the funded project involved the establishment of a new research activity in EU Member States or Associated Countries by a grantee who was moving there from a third country. With the 2011 StG, call the required post-doctoral experience band for applicants was extended to a maximum of 12 years prior to the publication date of the ERC call (2-7 for 'starters', 7-12 for 'consolidators'). In 2012 the terms for the additional funding of EUR 0.5 million were modified to cover (a) eligible 'startup' costs for Principal Investigators moving from a third country to an EU Member State or an Associated Country,









or (b) the purchase of major equipment. In 2013 these terms were modified again to cover (a) eligible 'start-up' costs for Principal Investigators moving from a third country to an EU Member State or an Associated Country as a consequence of receiving the ERC grant, and/or (b) the purchase of major research equipment, and/or (c) to obtain access to large research facilities. In 2013 the StG call, which had been streamed since 2010, was now split into two separate calls, with the 2013 StG call restricted to applicants with 2–7 years eligible post-doctoral experience.

In order to be eligible, for the new CoG scheme, the applicant must have been awarded his/her first doctoral degree more than 7 and less than 12 years prior to the publication date of the ERC call for proposals. CoG provided funding of up to EUR 2 million for a period of 5 years. This amount can be increased by an additional EUR 0.75 million to cover, similarly to the 2013 StG (a) eligible 'start-up' costs for Principal Investigators moving from another country to an EU Member State or an Associated Country as a consequence of receiving the ERC grant, and/or (b) the purchase of major research equipment, and/or (c) access to large research facilities.

Throughout the period, extensions of the eligibility period were allowed for applicants to the StG and CoG in case of eligible career breaks such as maternity, long-term illness and national service.

The first AdG in 2008 provided funding of up to EUR 3.5 million for a period of 5 years. However, funding would normally be limited to a maximum of EUR 2.5 million unless specific features of the research project required a higher level of support. Similarly, the 2010 AdG call envisaged the provision of a maximum of EUR 2.5 million for a period of

up to 5 years, with the possibility of additional funding of EUR 1 million if the project (a) involved the establishment of a new research activity in an EU Member State or an Associated Country by a Principal Investigator who was moving from a third country, and/or (b) was a 'co-investigator

Box 3.1: Restrictions on submission of proposals

The Scientific Council has applied restrictions on applications since 2009. The restrictions are designed to manage the number of applications, by making all (even first-time) applicants consider seriously the quality and competitiveness of their proposals and by restricting unsuccessful applicants below the quality threshold from submitting again immediately.

Without such restrictions the burden on the evaluation panels of the ERC would be even higher which could affect the quality and integrity of the ERC's evaluation process. The restrictions also give time to unsuccessful applicants to improve substantially their proposals and their profiles before they resubmit.

According to the general rule established since the first ERC work programme, an applicant may submit only one proposal per work programme period (calendar year) and a Principal Investigator may hold only one ERC grant at any time. The main restriction is that an applicant who has submitted a proposal to a given call may not apply to calls in the following years, unless his/her proposal was evaluated above the quality threshold at the end of the first step of the evaluation process.

21

project, and/or (c), required the purchase of major research equipment. The 2011 AdG call modified the terms for the provision of additional funding of EUR 1 million, this time to cover (a) eligible 'start-up' costs for Principal Investigators moving from a third country to an EU Member State or Associated Country, (b) 'co-investigator projects', and/or (c) the purchase of major research equipment. Finally, the 2013 AdG call modified the terms of the additional EUR 1 million to cover (a) eligible 'start-up' costs for Principal Investigators moving from another country to an EU Member State or an Associated Country as a consequence of receiving the ERC grant, and/or (b) the purchase of major research equipment, and/or (c) access to large research facilities.

3.2 Proposal selection

3.2.1 Calls for proposals

During the course of FP7 the ERC launched a total of 18 calls for proposals, of which six were for the StG scheme, six for the AdG scheme, three for the PoC scheme (starting in 2011), two for the SyG scheme (starting in 2012), and one for the CoG scheme (in 2013).

The very first ERC call (ERC-2007-StG) was published in December 2006. The initial date for accepting proposals was 1 April 2007 with a first-stage deadline of 25 April. The corresponding grants were awarded in the fiscal year 2008. That call was the only one to be launched in two stages, allowing for a pre-selection of the most promising research projects on the basis of shorter proposals submitted in the first stage. This call design was abandoned as it probably contributed to an unexpectedly large number of proposal submissions in the first call, along with other factors such as the novelty of the scheme.

In all subsequent ERC calls the applicants were required to submit in a single stage an 'extended synopsis' of their research project together with their full project proposal, while the peer-review evaluation takes place in two steps, as explained in the following subsection. The number of applications decreased dramatically with the second StG call (by 73%), but has been steadily rising in each subsequent call.

3.2.2 Proposal submission

Following the publication of ERC calls, applicants can submit their project proposals via a dedicated electronic portal. The call specifications provide information on the submission deadlines, the applicant eligibility criteria, and the formal requirements that the proposal must fulfil. All proposals introduced in the submission system before the call closure date are considered 'submitted'. After the call closure date ERCEA staff members check the submitted proposals for completeness and for compliance with the eligibility criteria set in the work programme of the calls for proposals. Proposals which either are incomplete or fail to meet all eligibility criteria are declared 'ineligible' and are not retained for evaluation. In some cases, applications are withdrawn by the applicants themselves before, or in some cases after, undergoing evaluation. We define proposals which are neither ineligible nor withdrawn as 'evaluated'. These proposals undergo the evaluation process foreseen by the work programme of each call.

3.2.3 Evaluation experts and panels

The peer-review evaluation of eligible proposals is carried out by independent experts, i.e. experts who are external to the ERC and the European Commission, are working in their personal capacity and, in performing their tasks, do not represent any organisation or scientific community. An independent expert may be requested to perform one of the following tasks with or without remuneration:

- > to participate as a member in one of the ERC peer-review evaluation panels (see Table 4.01 in Chapter 4 for a full list of these panels), carrying out the individual evaluation of proposals, usually remotely, and attending and contributing to panel meetings;
- > to act as chair-person in one of the ERC peer-review evaluation panels, organising the work of the panel, chairing panel meetings, and attending the final consolidation meeting (chair-persons may also perform individual evaluation of proposals, usually remotely, in preparation for panel meetings);
- > to act as external referee to an ERC peer-review evaluation panel, whose task is the remote evaluation of individual proposals;
- > to act as observer of an evaluation panel, examining the peer-review evaluation process from the point of view of its implementation;
- > to carry out the ethics review process and the ethics monitoring of projects, if the expert has the appropriate skills in ethics;
- > to assist the ERC in assessing cases of breach of research integrity (scientific misconduct) during all stages of evaluation, granting and project implementation.

The peer-review evaluation panels are ultimately collectively responsible for the evaluation of the eligible proposals. The panels for the evaluation of the StG, CoG and AdG calls are composed of 12 to 16 members including the chairperson. Their members and chairs are nominated by the Scientific Council and selected on the basis of their scientific standing by a Committee on Panels, which consists of the ERC President and six members of the Scientific Council, representing the three ERC scientific domains. The maximum mandate period of panel members is four ERC calls, serving for one year at a time, which can be repeated in no less than two years following the last call, while for panel



• • • • • • • • • • •

chairs this period is limited to three ERC calls. In exceptional circumstances the mandate period of a panel member may be extended to 5 years.

The peer-review process is supported by written reports of external referees. These are independent experts appointed by the panels to provide additional (remote) evaluation for all proposals reaching step 2 of the evaluation, which fall within the core of their scientific expertise. The external referees can also be members of other ERC peer-review evaluation panels.

3.2.4 Proposal evaluation

Each eligible proposal is allocated to a panel on the basis of the subject-matter of the proposal, as indicated by the applicant, the title and content of the proposal and/or information, possibly in the form of keywords, provided in the proposal. Proposals may be reallocated to a different panel with the agreement of both panel chairs concerned.

Proposals are then assessed by at least three independent experts qualified in the scientific fields related to the proposal, who participate in the evaluation panels, prepare individual assessment reports and award scores. The reports must provide sufficient justification for the scores and, where appropriate, recommendations for modifications to the proposal, should the proposal be retained. In the case of remote evaluation, the results are communicated electronically to the ERCEA.

Box 3.2: Scoring of proposals

Since 2012, proposals are scored on a A-B-C scale.

In first step, evaluated proposals are marked:

- > A when its quality is deemed sufficient to pass to step 2;
- > B when its quality is deemed high but not sufficient to pass to step 2;
- > C when its quality is deemed not sufficient. In this case, the applicant will also be subject to restrictions on future proposal submissions to ERC calls (see above).

In Step 2, proposals are marked with

- > A, if it fully meets the ERC excellence criterion. This proposal is recommended for funding if sufficient funds are available, in priority order based on its rank;
- > B, if it meets some but not all elements of the ERC excellence criterion. This proposal will not be funded.

Panels have the duty to examine consistently proposals falling within their area of competence and to operate in a coherent manner with other panels to ensure consistency of treatment of proposals across the range of panels within their scientific domain. The sole overarching evaluation criterion for all proposals, which is applicable to both the proposed research project and the applicant's profile, is excellence. The elements to be considered in relation to the excellence of the proposals are set in the work programme of each call. The judgement of a panel on a proposal and its position in the ranked list is based on the individual assessments and discussion in the panel, and is decided by majority vote. The outcome of the panel assessment phase is a rank order list. In the final step of the peer review evaluation, the panel identifies those proposals which are recommended for funding if sufficient funds are available.

All grant schemes, with the exception of PoC, involve a twostep evaluation process, whereby the outcome of the first step is the input for the second step. At the end of each evaluation step, the proposals will be ranked on the basis of the scores they have received against the specific selection and award criteria defined in the work programme of the call, and their overall strengths and weaknesses. Only proposals which attain evaluation scores above the established thresholds on each specific criterion are deemed to be 'satisfactory' and considered further. Proposals whose evaluation score is below the established threshold are defined as 'unsatisfactory'. Proposals retained through each evaluation step are those which have attained not only above-threshold scores but also the highest overall scores within their groups.

The assessment is done on a scale which has changed over time. Box 3.2 describes the new scoring that the panels have used since 2012.

The group of proposals retained from the first evaluation step to the second should have a combined project budget of approximately three times the allocated budget of the call. This rule of thumb, which defines the cut-off threshold for 'retained' proposals, is applied by the scientific panels with a certain amount of flexibility, as the emphasis is placed on the overall quality of the proposals. Proposals retained for funding are placed on the basis of their rank in the second evaluation step either on the 'main list' (those projects with a budget equal to the budget of the call), in which case they directly enter the granting phase, or on the 'reserve list', in which case they are earmarked for funding in cases of failures at the granting stage or on the condition that additional funds become available during the course of the implementation of the programme.

3.2.5 Evolution of submitted and evaluated proposals in numbers

As already explained above, ERC-2007-StG is the only call that was designed to have two separate proposal submission stages, while the PoC scheme is the only type of grant in which proposals are evaluated in a single step.

· · · · · · · · · · · ·



In the course of FP7, the 18 completed calls for proposals under the five ERC grant schemes received a total of 44,867 applications. As Figure 3.03 and Table A3.01 in Appendix show, there are considerable differences in the numbers of proposals submitted under the various grant schemes. The one which has attracted by far the largest number of applications is StG (26,693 applications or 59.5% of the total), followed by AdG (12,756 applications or 28.4% of the total). The first StG call alone accounts for more than a third of all proposals submitted under the StG scheme (9,167 applications), and has been unequalled since. The number of applications decreased dramatically with the second StG call (by 73%), but has been steadily rising in each subsequent call. The fall in the number of proposals submitted under the last StG call (ERC-2013-StG) should not be interpreted as a reversal of this upward trend, as it is due to the separation of the StG scheme into two separate calls with the introduction of the CoG scheme, which absorbed the upper segment (in terms of research experience) of applicants to the old StG scheme. These two 2013 calls (ERC-

2013-StG and ERC-2013-CoG) taken together and compared to the ERC-2012-StG call, exhibit a significant rise in the number of applications of 47.7%. The evolution of applications under the AdG scheme follows a similar but more moderate pattern: while in the second call (ERC-2009-AdG) the number of applications fell by 27%, in all subsequent calls it has been rising, but at a more modest pace.

Out of 44,867 submitted proposals, 1,375 (or 3%) have been either declared ineligible or withdrawn by the applicants before or, in some occasions, after evaluation. The share of ineligible and withdrawn proposals is slightly higher in StG (3.2%) and in SyG (3.2%) than in AdG (2.8%), which can be attributed to the stricter eligibility criteria in the case of StG and the greater number of Principal Investigators per project in the case of SyG. The share of ineligible proposals has been declining, probably as a result of the applicants' increasing familiarity with ERC submission rules and eligibility criteria.



24

Source: ERC statistical database



Table 3.01: Proposals in the evaluation process by funding scheme and year

SCHEME (Year)	Evaluated	Evaluated	Retained	Funded	Success rate	Success rate	Success rate
StG	25,858	4,492	2,350	2,332	17.4%	52.3%	9.0%
2007	8,787	552	299	299	6.3%	54.2%	3.4%
2009	2,392	457	256	245	19.1%	56.0%	10.2%
2010	2,767	775	440	436	28.0%	56.8%	15.8%
2011	4,005	946	488	486	23.6%	51.6%	12.1%
2012	4,652	1,074	567	566	23.1%	52.8%	12.2%
2013	3,255	688	300	300	21.1%	43.6%	9.2%
CoG	3,604	694	318	313	19.3%	45.8%	8.7%
2013	3,604	694	318	313	19.3%	45.8%	8.7%
AdG	12,404	4,025	1,776	1,709	32.4%	44.1%	13.8%
2008	2,034	648	294	282	31.9%	45.4%	13.9%
2009	1,526	553	285	245	36.2%	51.5%	16.1%
2010	1,967	660	280	271	33.6%	42.4%	13.8%
2011	2,245	705	304	301	31.4%	43.1%	13.4%
2012	2,269	759	321	319	33.5%	42.3%	14.1%
2013	2,363	700	292	291	29.6%	41.7%	12.3%
SyG	1,124	143	25	24	12.7%	17.5%	2.1%
2012	697	32	11	11	4.6%	34.4%	1.6%
2013	427	111	14	13	26.0%	12.6%	3.0%
PoC	538		179	178			33.1%
2011	139		52	51			36.7%
2012	120		60	60			50.0%
2013	279		67	67			24.0%
Total	43,528	9,354	4,648	4,556	21.5%	49.7%	10.5%

Source: ERC statistical database

In the case of the funding schemes involving a two-step evaluation process, because the number of proposals taken through to the second step is related to the available budget, on average only 21.5% of the proposals evaluated in the first evaluation step make it through to the second evaluation step. The 'first-step success rate' (defined as the number of proposals retained for second-step evaluation over the number of proposals evaluated in the first step) varies greatly among the different funding schemes, being by far higher for AdG (32.4%), followed by CoG (19.3%), StG (17.4%) and SyG (12.7%). The 'second-step success rate' (defined as the number of proposals retained for the main or the reserve lists over the number of proposals evaluated in the second step), is on average more than twice as high as the first-step success rate, but here variation is much smaller among StG, CoG and AdG, with the StG scheme exhibiting the highest values (52.3%) and SyG still showing the lowest (17.5%). Finally, the largest part of proposals on the main and reserve lists (on average 98%) make it through the granting phase and receive funding.

Table A3.01 in Appendix gives an overview of the numbers of proposals in the various stages of submission, evaluation and funding by funding scheme and call year.

3.3 Proposal success rates

Competition for ERC grants is intense. A common measure of the intensity of competition is the success rate of applicants. This is defined as the ratio of the number of funded proposals, i.e. submitted proposals which have successfully passed the entire peer-review evaluation process described in previous paragraphs, over the number of evaluated proposals in the first step of the evaluation process, i.e. submitted proposals after excluding ineligible or withdrawn ones.

Success rates vary significantly among the various ERC grant schemes. As Table 3.01 shows, SyG exhibits by far



Source: ERC statistical database



the lowest (2.1% on average). StG and CoG on average exhibit a considerably lower success rate (9.0% and 8.7% respectively) than AdG (13.8%), Some of this variation is due to the very low success rate of the first StG call but, in general, AdG receives less proposals in relation to the number that can be funded than the other calls.

3.3.1 Success rates of A-scored proposals

As already noted in a previous subsection, only A-scored proposals are considered for funding conditionally on budget availability, but not all A-scored proposals are finally retained or funded. Since the first implementation of the new categorical scoring system in 2012, it is estimated that under the StG scheme, 73% of all A-scored proposals were finally approved for funding in the 2012 call, and 71% in the 2013 call; under the AdG scheme this success rate is just 60% in the 2012 call and 70% in the 2013 call. Under the SyG scheme it is 67% in the 2013 call. Under the SyG scheme all A-scored proposals were funded in the 2012 call and 81% in the 2013 call.

3.3.2 ERC success rates from a comparative perspective

As Figure 3.05 shows, success rates in ERC competitions are significantly lower than those of any other FP7 SP – actually about half, including Marie Curie Actions ('People'). In terms of thematic areas, ERC success rates are the third lowest after 'Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities' under 'Cooperation', and 'Research Potential' under 'Capacities'. ERC success rates are also well below those of other similar funding organisations. As a measure of comparison, the average proposal success rate of the US NSF was reported to be 24% in fiscal year 2012, that of the entire US NIH was 21% in fiscal year 2014, that of the DFG was 31.3% in 2013, and that of the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council was 32% in the year 2013-2014, and comparable to those of the other Research Councils UK.

The low ERC proposal success rates is due to the very high level of applications to the ERC calls relative to the call budgets. There a number of factors which explain this. Firstly, from the start ERC grants are seen as highly prestigious within the scientific communities, given their international visibility, the high level of the evaluation panels and the high level of competition to get a grant. And secondly the ERC grants provide funding which is qualitatively different from that offered by most national schemes both in terms of the freedom given to researchers to propose projects of their own devising in any field of research, and in terms of the size and length of funding offered, which are among the biggest available. The very high demand for ERC grants cover a real gap in the European research landscape.

3.4 Proposal funding

The requested funds are the aggregated project costs of all evaluated proposals, while the committed funds are the aggregated project costs of all funded proposals. The funding success rate is defined as the ratio of committed funds to



Source: ERC statistical database



• • • • • • • • • • •

that of requested funds. Table 3.02 presents these figures by funding scheme in the course of FP7.

3.4.1 Time-to-grant

Time-to-grant (TTG) is defined as the time, expressed in numbers of calendar days, lapsed from a call's closing date (deadline for submission of proposals) to that of a grant signature by the European Commission. In the case of twostage calls for proposals, it is the second stage call deadline that is used in the calculation of the TTG. At the moment of data extraction for the purposes of this report all ERC calls had a very high completion rate (defined as the ratio of signed grant agreements to funded proposals). On average 99.2% of all funded ERC proposals have been signed. At this stage, the average TTG for ERC calls is 363 days. This time was considerably lower for the PoC calls, which is explained by the fact that this type of grants are awarded to existing ERC grantees and are of a significantly smaller size. By contrast, TTG has been considerably higher for the SyG calls, which can be attributed to the higher complexity of projects and of project team compositions. Table 3.03 shows these figures in detail.

Table 3.02: Requests, cor	mmitments and payments (€M) and funding success	rates by funding scheme	and call year
	REQUESTS	COMMITMENTS	PAYMENTS	SUCCESS RATE
StG	33,054.7	3,136.7	1,791.7	9.5%
2007	9,865.5	333.8		3.4%
2008			130.7	
2009	3,338.3	323.0	97.8	9.7%
2010	3,583.6	571.2	252.9	15.9%
2011	5,376.4	681.5	413.6	12.7%
2012	6,361.1	796.1	443.0	12.5%
2013	4,529.8	431.2	453.7	9.5%
CoG	6,388.6	573.3	2.4	9.0%
2013	6,388.6	573.3	2.4	9.0%
AdG	26,912.9	3,732.1	1,964.3	13.9%
2008	4,003.8	548.8	96.4	13.7%
2009	3,255.9	517.6	123.6	15.9%
2010	4,310.2	599.5	289.0	13.9%
2011	4,966.2	677.7	345.1	13.6%
2012	5,010.2	713.0	466.4	14.2%
2013	5,366.7	675.4	643.9	12.6%
SyG	9,511.9	274.3	50.8	2.9%
2012	5,833.8	126.3		2.2%
2013	3,678.1	148.0	50.8	4.0%
PoC	80.4	26.1	15.0	32.5%
2011	20.4	7.5		36.6%
2012	19.0	8.8	8.2	46.3%
2013	41.0	9.9	6.9	24.1%
Total	75,948.6	7,742.4	3,824.3	10.2%

(data at the end of 2014) Source: CORDA

Table 3.03: Time-to-grant by call

CALL	FUNDED	SIGNED	COMPLETION	TTG MEAN	TTG STD	TTG MAX	TTG MIN
StG-2007	299	299	100%	324	51	459	203
StG-2009	245	245	100%	355	64	666	264
StG-2010	436	436	100%	378	84	672	230
StG-2011	486	486	100%	365	71	749	257
StG-2012	566	566	100%	370	77	733	261
StG-2013	300	294	98%	371	79	659	253
CoG-2013	313	294	94%	398	62	545	274
AdG-2008	282	282	100%	313	77	629	214
AdG-2009	245	245	100%	331	64	596	238
AdG-2010	271	271	100%	399	67	628	271
AdG-2011	301	301	100%	388	79	649	265
AdG-2012	319	319	100%	374	65	617	268
AdG-2013	291	284	98%	406	81	635	267
SyG-2012	11	11	100%	520	70	638	406
SyG-2013	13	9	69%	554	12	571	530
PoC-2011	51	51	100%	240	93	524	110
PoC-2012	60	60	100%	213	81	529	120
PoC-2013	67	66	99%	247	59	391	146
ALL CALLS	4556	4519	99%	363	82	749	110

(data as of 21/08/2014) Source: CORDA



· · · · · · · · · · · ·

Table 3.04: Time-to-grant by FP7 thematic area

SP	THEMATIC AREA	SIGNED	TTG MEAN	TTG STD	TTG MAX	TTG MIN
	Health	967	351	125	804	142
	Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, and Biotechnology	509	366	103	650	204
_	Information and Communication Technologies	2,316	259	47	629	141
NO	Nanosciences, Nanotechnologies, Materials	793	329	110	755	146
AT	Energy	333	343	139	1,206	142
Ш	Environment (including Climate Change)	483	373	127	651	185
6	Transport (including Aeronautics)	609	409	158	1,997	154
8	Socio-economic sciences and Humanities	243	394	95	748	223
-	Space	240	399	79	724	281
	Security	289	524	121	914	228
	General Activities	20	341	131	493	112
IDEAS	ERC	4,519	363	82	749	110
PEOPLE	Marie-Curie Actions	10,089	271	97	671	107
	Research Infrastructures	318	342	102	641	200
ŝ	Research for the benefit of SMEs	953	370	91	809	202
Ë	Regions of Knowledge	64	317	84	589	229
ACI	Research Potential	176	326	58	473	239
AP	Science in Society	153	385	96	696	210
S	Support for the coherent development of research policies	10	300	101	538	180
	Activities of International Cooperation	150	307	82	717	227
(data as o	f 21/08/2014)					

Source: CORDA

Compared to the other components of FP7, the ERC average TTG is higher than the overall average (314 days), but in the case of the ERC the majority of this time is spent on the two-step evaluation process and the 'time to pay' following evaluation is one of the fastest in the research family. For the other components of FP7, the reverse is true, and most of the time is spent negotiating the grant agreement after evaluation. Overall, as Table 3.04 shows, ERC TTG is still lower than several other FP7 thematic areas, ranking in the 12th position.



• • • • • • • • • • •

• • • • • • • • • • •







ERC research areas

research areas

This chapter focuses on statistical evidence concerning evaluated and funded proposals, their success rates and related project costs on the basis of the ERC evaluation panel structure. The ERC's frontier research grants operate on a 'bottom-up' basis without predetermined priorities and applications may be made to the ERC in any field of research. In order to organise the evaluations the Scientific Council decided on a structure of panels grouped into three main domains: Life Sciences (LS), Physical Sciences and Engineering (PE), and Social Sciences and Humanities (SH). The three main domains are further divided into 25 panels (9 in LS, 10 in PE and 6 in SH), each of which has a title and a series of panel descriptors.

In general, the SH domain receives a smaller number of (eligible) applications and exhibits lower success rates than LS and PE because of the indicative and actual allocation of the ERC budget by domain.

4.1 Scientific domains and ERC peer-review evaluation panel structure

In the current ERC panel structure the three main domains are further divided into 25 subdomains or panels (9 in LS, 10 in PE and 6 in SH), each of which has a title and a series of panel descriptors. The panel titles are listed in Table 4.01 as of 2013.

The current ERC panel structure for the evaluation of the StG, CoG and AdG calls utilises 150 panels, two per scientific subdomain and funding scheme (2 x 25 x 3). This allows panel members to alternate each year, both to reduce their workload and to allow them to apply to the ERC themselves in years when they are not serving. Five more panels (two in the LS domain, two in the PE domain, and one in the SH domain) were formed for the first-step evaluation and one for the second-step evaluation of the SyG calls. Finally, one panel for the evaluation of the PoC calls is formed from a different pool of experts, notably experts in innovation and technology transfer.

In addition to the panel structure above, the Scientific Council also decided an indicative budget per domain in each work programme (see Figure 4.01). An indicative budget was then allocated to each panel within each domain, in proportion to the budgetary demand of its assigned proposals.

In 2012 the Scientific Council increased the indicative domain budget for SH to 17% to address the increased demand from applications in this domain. For 2013, for the

Box 4.1: ERC Panel structure

For the first ERC call (2007 StG) the three scientific domains were divided into only 20 subdomains. The current structure of 25 panels was introduced in 2008. For the purposes of this analysis the 20 subdomains of the 2007 StG call have been mapped onto the current structure of 25 subdomains on the basis of corresponding panel descriptors. The reader should also be aware that the detailed panel titles and descriptors were in some cases modified from one work programme to another, so the thematic coverage of each panel is not exactly the same in all work programmes. However the variation is not enough to substantially affect the aggregate statistics.

StG, CoG and AdG calls, the Scientific Council established the following indicative percentage budgets for each of the three main research domains: 44% for PE, 39% for LS, and 17% for SH.

4.2 Funding

The levels of funding awarded to proposals in the three domains were therefore pre-allocated according to the indicative budgets decided by the Scientific Council. Reflecting this, over FP7 in the three main funding schemes (StG, CoG, AdG), the PE domain received 41.2% of the budget (EUR 3.2 billion in commitments), the LS domain 36.2% (EUR 2.8 billion in commitments), and the SH domain 15.4% (EUR 1.2 billion in commitments). Finally 3.3% of the total

Table 4.01: Peer-review evaluation panel codes and descriptors							
19		Life sciences					
L3	1 601	Molecular and structural biology and biochomistry					
	1000	Constinue conserving historemetics and systems history					
	1.502	Cellular and developmental biology					
	L303	Dhusialary, nathanhusialary, and and arringlary					
	L304	Neurophysiology and endocrinology					
	L305						
	LS06	Immunity and infection					
	LS07	Diagnostic tools, therapies and public health					
	LS08	Evolutionary, population and environmental biology					
	LS09	Applied life sciences and non-medical biotechnology					
PE		Physical sciences and engineering					
	PE01	Mathematics					
	PE02	Fundamental constituents of matter					
	PE03	Condensed matter physics					
	PE04	Physical and analytical chemical sciences					
	PE05	Materials and synthesis					
	PE06	Computer science and informatics					
	PE07	Systems and communication engineering					
	PE08	Products and process engineering					
	PE09	Universe sciences					
	PE10	Earth system science					
SH		Social sciences and humanities					
	SH01	Individuals, institutions and markets					
	SH02	Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour					
	SH03	Environment and society					
	SH04	The human mind and its complexity					
	SH05	Cultures and cultural production					
	SH06	The study of the human past					

Source: ERC Work Programme 2013











ERC budget (EUR 256 million in commitments) was allocated to 'interdisciplinary' projects (ID), while the remaining 3.9% (EUR 301 million in commitments) corresponds to the SyG and PoC funding schemes, and to support actions (see Figure 4.02 below).

Budget allocation among different scientific disciplines as mapped by the ERC evaluation panel structure, by contrast, is determined by actual demand in relation to project quality, within the limits of the pre-determined budget allocations by domain. This explains the larger variation in the amount of funding among panels. Projects in LS05 (Neurosciences and neural disorders) receive the largest amount of funding (5.6% of the total budget for StG, CoG and AdG), closely followed by PE05 (Materials and synthesis) (5.5%) and LS07 (Diagnostic tools, therapies and public health) (5.3%). At the other end of the scale, projects in SH03 (Environment and society) receive 1.5% of the total budget, followed (in reverse order) by two more SH panels, SH05 (Cultures and cultural production) (1.8%) and SH01 (Individuals, institutions and markets) (2.3%). Interestingly, the budget shares of the panels are more or less similar among the three funding schemes (StG, CoG and AdG) (see Figure 4.03).

4.3 Proposals and success rates

One can see that the original indicative domain budgets decided by the Scientific Council matched rather well the demand by domain in terms of applications. However, the indicative domain budget for SH was increased in the final two years of the programme to cover the rising demand from this domain. Over FP7, the PE domain received the highest number of evaluated applications and awarded the highest number of grants under all three funding schemes (StG, CoG, AdG), namely around 45% of the total, followed by LS, which on aggregate received 35% of evaluated applications and awarded 36% of grants, and SH, which received just under 21% of all evaluated applications and awarded 19% of all grants (see Figure 4.04).

The panels receiving the highest volume of evaluated applications for funding in all funding schemes (between 5.4 and 5.1% of the total each) are PE06 (Computer science and informatics), PE03 (Condensed matter physics), and SH02 (Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour), while the ones which actually award the highest number of grants (between 5.6 and 5.4% of the total each) are PE02 (Fundamental constituents of matter), PE01 (Mathematics), and PE05 (Materials and synthesis). The panel with the lowest numbers of eligible and funded proposals (below 2% of the



Source: ERC statistical database

33

total), under all funding schemes, is SH03 (Environment and society) (see Figure 4.05).

The variation of success rates across scientific domains is relatively small overall. But a closer look at the different funding schemes shows some differences. As Figure 4.06



Figure 4.04: Number of evaluated and funded proposals by scientific domain and grant scheme



Source: ERC statistical data



Figure 4.05: Number of evaluated and funded proposals by panel and grant scheme





• • • • • • • • • • •

shows, SH exhibits the lowest success rates under all funding schemes, and the largest difference under the AdG scheme. Under the StG scheme success rates are almost equal (around 9%) across all three domains, while more variation occurs under the other two funding schemes, from 7.4% (SH) to 9.7% (LS) under the CoG scheme, and from 11% (SH) to 15.2% (LS) under the AdG scheme. In aggregate terms, the two largest fields, PE and LS, have success rates close to the overall average (10.5 and 10.8% respectively), while SH exhibits a lower than average success rate (9.4%).

By contrast, the variation of success rates across different scientific disciplines as mapped by the scientific panels assigned to the evaluated proposals, is considerably larger, ranging on aggregate for all funding schemes from 8.5% in SH02 (Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour) to 11.3% in SH01 (Individuals, institutions and markets) in the SH domain, from 9.7% in LS09 (Applied life sciences and biotechnology) to 11.7% in LS04 (Physiology, pathophysiology and endocrinology) in the LS domain and from 9.3% in PE10 (Earth system science) to 13.1% in PE01 (Mathematics) in the PE domain (see Figure 4.07).





Figure 4.07: Proposal success rates by panel and grant scheme

Source: ERC statistical data

35


ERC grant characteristics

ERC grant characteristics

This chapter provides detailed statistical evidence on the characteristics of ERC grants, and in particular their duration and size, and on how these compare to the characteristics of the grants awarded by other public-research funding organisations (wherever information is available). In most cases, statistical data on the totality of evaluated proposals is also provided together with the statistical data on grants (i.e. funded proposals) for comparison purposes.

The statistical evidence provided below confirms that the average duration of ERC-funded projects is close to the maximum project duration set in the work programmes of the corresponding calls. Similarly, on average, applicants tend to request close to the maximum amount of funding envisaged for each funding scheme in the work programmes of the corresponding calls. The vast majority of proposals request funding equal to their total project costs, and even in the relatively few exceptions of projects which are co-funded from other sources, the requested funding is, on average, equal to at least four fifths of the total project

Table 5.01: Project duration in evaluated and funded proposals by call (in months)

		EVALU	JATED			FUN	DED	
CALL	AVG	STD	MIN	MAX	AVG	STD	MIN	MAX
StG	56.5	7.8	5	72	59.0	3.9	24	72
2007	54.2	9.5	5	72	57.7	6.2	24	72
2009	56.4	8.0	12	72	58.3	5.2	24	60
2010	57.2	6.9	6	72	59.1	3.6	36	60
2011	57.6	6.5	6	72	59.3	3.2	36	72
2012	58.2	5.7	5	72	59.4	3.2	24	60
2013	58.6	5.1	12	60	59.7	1.8	48	60
CoG	59.0	4.3	18	60	59.7	1.9	48	60
2013	59.0	4.3	18	60	59.7	1.9	48	60
AdG	57.5	6.9	3	60	59.3	3.4	24	60
2008	55.6	8.8	3	60	58.4	5.2	24	60
2009	56.8	7.6	12	60	59.0	4.0	36	60
2010	57.5	6.7	10	60	59.6	2.4	36	60
2011	57.7	6.6	5	60	59.6	2.4	36	60
2012	58.1	6.3	4	60	59.5	3.0	36	60
2013	58.7	5.0	3	60	59.6	2.3	36	60
SyG	65.7	10.6	12	72	69.9	5.8	48	72
2012	66.0	10.5	12	72	68.7	7.8	48	72
2013	65.4	10.7	16	72	70.9	3.3	60	72
PoC	12.0	0.3	8	12	12.0	0.1	10	12
2011	11.9	0.5	8	12	12.0	0.3	10	12
2012	12.0	0.0	12	12	12.0	0.0	12	12
2013	12.0	0.3	8	12	12.0	0.0	12	12

Source: ERC statistical data

Table 5.02 funding s	2: Projec scheme a	t durations and scier	on in eva ntific do	aluated a main (in	and fund months	led prop ;)	osals by	'	
		EVALU	JATED			FUN	DED		
	AVG	STD	MIN	MAX	AVG	STD	MIN	MAX	
StG									
LS	57.0	7.4	6	72	59.4	3.0	36	60	
PE	57.0	7.1	5	72	59.4	2.9	36	72	
SH	54.6	9.4	6	72	57.3	6.4	24	72	
CoG									
LS	59.4	3.1	36	60	59.9	1.1	48	60	
PE	59.3	3.6	36	60	59.8	1.4	48	60	
SH	57.7	6.3	18	60	58.9	3.2	48	60	
AdG									
LS	57.8	6.6	3	60	59.7	2.2	36	60	
PE	58.1	6.2	3	60	59.6	2.7	24	60	
SH	55.8	8.4	5	60	57.8	5.8	36	60	

Source: ERC statistical data



costs. On average, the project budget is allocated according to a more-or-less standard cost estimate breakdown, with little variation from one call to another, but with some variation among projects in different scientific domains. Personnel costs, which include the segments of the salaries of the Principal Investigator(s) and all other researchers and technical staff involved in the project, which correspond to the work time allocated to the project, constitute the biggest budgetary line item, on average taking up between half and two thirds of the project budget.

5.1 Project duration

The average project duration in both evaluated and funded proposals is close to the maximum duration set in the work programme of each call in all funding schemes. As Table 5.01 shows, even though the average project duration increases slightly from year to year converging to the maximum duration set in the work programmes, the trend does not seem to be significant.

As Table 5.02 shows, there is no significant variation in the duration of the projects by scientific domain either. Social Sciences and Humanities projects have a marginally lower average duration than those in the two other scientific domains.

It is interesting to note that, in all three scientific domains, funded proposals seem to have a slightly higher project duration than non-funded proposals.

5.2 Project costs

On average, requested funding is almost equal to total project costs in all schemes and calls, both in evaluated and funded proposals. As shown in Table A5.01 in Appendix, the average project cost in funded proposals is EUR 1,476,253 for a StG (with average requested funding at 97.8% of this amount), EUR 1,921,125 for a CoG (average requested funding at 99.6%), EUR 2,401,905 for an AdG (average requested funding at 97.6%), EUR 12,245,679 for a SyG (average requested funding at 98.2%) and EUR 149,921 for a PoC grant (average requested funding at 97.9%).

On average, 85.6% of funded proposals in StG, 94.5% in CoG, 86.7% in AdG, 95.8% in SyG and 79.8% in PoC have requested funding equal to 100% of the total project costs. Funded proposals which do not request the totality of their project costs, request, on average, 86.3% of their costs in the case of StG, 94.5% in the case of CoG, 84.6% in the case of AdG, 83.7% in the case of SyG, and 90.6% in the case of PoC.

It is worth noting that in all calls the average total cost of funded projects exceeds the average total cost of evaluated • • • • • • • • • • •



Figure 5.01: Project cost breakdown in funded proposals by scientific domain and funding scheme

Source: ERC statistical database

projects, which indicates that the cost of a project does not influence the evaluation outcome. On the contrary, the evaluation process seems to marginally favour costlier projects. This effect could partly be due to the fact that personnel costs in countries with high proposal success rates are, in general, larger than in countries with low proposal success rates. The difference between average total project cost in funded compared to evaluated proposals is large and significant in the case of SyG, where the average total cost of funded projects is about 40% higher than that of evaluated projects (EUR 8,746,065).

By scientific domain, average project costs in all funding schemes in both evaluated and funded proposals are higher for LS, followed by PE and SH (see Table A5.02 in Appendix).

5.2.1 Project cost breakdown

For ERC grants the Union financial contribution takes the form of the reimbursement of up to 100% of the total eligible and approved direct costs and of flat-rate financing of indirect costs on the basis of 20% of the total eligible direct costs. The level of the awarded grant represents a maximum overall figure. The final amount to be paid must be justified on the basis of the costs actually incurred for the project. We distinguish four types of project costs: personnel costs, which are the most significant fraction of direct costs, other direct costs, indirect costs, and subcontracting costs, which despite being a type of direct costs, are here reported and accounted separately. When examined by call and funding scheme, personnel costs are found to range on average from 50 to 60% of total project costs, with relatively little variation from year to year and from one funding scheme to another. Only SyG and PoC schemes exhibit on average a lower share of personnel costs compared to the other schemes (see Table A5.01 in Appendix for details). Other direct costs represent, on average, about a quarter, while indirect costs around 16% of total project costs, with the exception of the PoC scheme, for which indirect costs are on average just about 5-6% of the total. Finally, subcontracting costs represent a very small fraction of the average total project costs in all schemes with the exception of PoC scheme, for which they are, on average, close to 15% of the total. Under the SyG scheme subcontracting is negligible (on average around 0.6% of the total).

When the breakdown of average project costs is examined by scientific domain, as shown in Figure 5.01, the highest share of personnel costs is found in SH, where, on average, this type of cost represents two thirds of the total project cost,



Source: ERC statistical database



followed by PE at around 60%, and LS slightly above half of the total project cost (see also Table A5.02 in Appendix for the exact figures). For all budget line items, the variation of their budget shares among the different funding schemes or between evaluated and funded proposals is insignificant.

As shown in Figure 5.02, more variation is present in the breakdown of average project costs when examined by the scientific subdomains corresponding to the ERC peerreview evaluation panels. The subdomain corresponding to PE06 (Computer science and informatics) narrowly followed by PE01 (Mathematics) and SH05 (Cultures and cultural production) exhibit on average the highest share of personnel costs in their project budgets (71.9%, 70.5%) and 69.6% respectively). By contrast the lowest shares of personnel costs (just below 50%) are found in LS04 (Physiology, pathophysiology and endocrinology), LS06 (Immunity and infection) and LS02 (Genetics, genomics, bioinformatics and systems biology). A similar variation, but in the opposite direction, is present in the budget share of 'other direct' costs, while the share of 'indirect' costs exhibits insignificant variation across the subdomains (between 15.7 and 17.5%). Finally, subcontracting is highest (above 3%) in LS08 (Evolutionary, population and environmental biology), SH03 (Environment and society) and LS07 (Diagnostic tools, therapies and public health), and lowest (0.4%) in PE02 (Fundamental constituents of matter) and PE03 (Condensed matter physics).



• • • • • • • • • • •

• • • • • • • • • • •





Demographic profiles of applicants

Demographic profiles of applicants

This chapter focuses on specific demographic characteristics of ERC applicants, notably gender, age, post-doctoral research experience, nationality and country of residence, and presents aggregate statistical data on the distribution of evaluated and funded applicants and funding, and the associated success rates, on the basis of these demographic characteristics.

The overall lower success rates of female applicants and the considerably lower numbers of applications from female researchers has received a lot of attention and already in 2008, the Scientific Council decided to set up a working group dedicqted to monitoring gender balance. The group has drafted the ERC gender equality plan 2007-2013 - endorsed by the Scientific Council in December 2010 - based on the view that women and men are equally able to perform excellent frontier research. This is also the core of the ERC Gender Equality Plan 2014-2020.

However, these results alone do not prove the existence of gender selection bias in the ERC peer-review evaluation

Figure 6.02: Applicant success rates by gender and grant scheme

process, as other parameters may influence this discrepancy, such as academic seniority and overall scientific performance of female ERC applicants as measured by their publication output and impact, in comparison to that of their male peers. In particular the different level of applications from men and women to some extent reflects the strong vertical segregation of women in research.

6.1 Gender

Fewer female than male researchers apply for ERC grants. As Figure 6.01 below shows, female applicants in evaluated proposals represent just 30% of all applicants under the StG and the CoG funding schemes, and as little as 15% of all applicants under the AdG scheme.

Female applicants are not only much less numerous than male applicants, but also exhibit considerably lower success rates under all frontier research funding schemes. This success rate differential is slightly above two percentage points under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes, but this difference is significant, as it means that on average a male applicant



Source: ERC statistical database



Source: ERC statistical database



has a 28% higher success rate than a female applicant for a StG, 34% for a CoG, and 19% for a AdG. Male applicants have a 94% higher success rate than female applicants under the SyG funding scheme, while, on the other extreme, under the PoC funding scheme female applicants have a 6% higher success rates than their male peers (see Figure 6.02).

The picture is similar when we examine the volume of applications and the associated success rates of women in comparison to those of men by scientific domain. In PE only 16.7% of all evaluated and 14.8% of all funded proposals under all funding schemes (StG, CoG, AdG) come from women applicants, who exhibit a success rate of 9.3%. The corresponding success rate of male applicants is 10.8%. In LS these percentages are 30% and 20.9% respectively, and the success rate for women is just 7.5%, while for men it is 12.2%. In SH the percentages of female applicants are 36.1% and 31.3% respectively, and their success rate 8.2%, while for men it is 11.1%.

Figure 6.03 below shows the numbers of female and male applicants in the three scientific domains also by funding scheme. Moreover, as Figure 6.04 below shows, women are less successful than men in obtaining ERC grants under all funding schemes and in all scientific domains, with the exception of the CoG scheme (one call in 2013) in SH, in which female applicants achieve a slightly higher success rate than male applicants (7.7% as compared to 7.2%). In some cases, gender differentials are large and substantial, notably in LS both under the StG (6.4% compared to 10.4%) and the CoG scheme (5.9% compared to 11.8%). Gender differentials become generally less pronounced for AdG, but still exist and are sizeable. Besides, female applicants in AdG calls are considerably fewer in absolute numbers than are male applicants.

The variation in numbers of proposals and success rate differentials between female and male applicants is even larger at the level of the scientific subdomains corresponding to the ERC peer-review evaluation panels. The lowest percentage of female applicants in funded proposals, 9%, is exhibited by PE02 (Fundamental constituents of matter), closely followed by PE01 (Mathematics) at 9.7%, PE03 (Condensed matter physics) at 11.2%, and SH01 (Individuals, institutions and markets) at 12%. By contrast, the highest percentage of female applicants in funded proposals, 44%, is exhibited by SH05 (Cultures and cultural production), followed by SH02 (Institutions, values, beliefs and behaviour) at 42.1%, SH06 (The study of the human past) at 33.8% and SH04 (The human mind and its complexity) at 29.3% (see Figure 6.05).



Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database



Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database

The largest success rate differential between female and male applicants, namely seven percentage points, is exhibited by SH01, followed by LS09 (Applied life sciences and nonmedical biotechnology) and LS06 (Immunity and infection), where the success rate of male applicants is higher than that of women by six percentage points. Success rates are equal in PE07 (Systems and communication engineering), and female applicants have higher success rates than their male peers only in SH02 by just 3%, in PE08 (Products and process engineering) by 5%, and in PE09 (Universe sciences) by 13% (see Figure 6.06 and Table A6.01 in Appendix for a detailed comparison of success rates of female and male applicants by scientific subdomain and funding scheme).

6.2 Age and research experience

This subsection presents descriptive statistics on the age and the research experience of ERC grantees. Age refers to the declared age of ERC grantees on the closure date of the call to which they applied. Research experience is defined as the elapsed time between the award date of the grantee's first doctoral degree and the call closure date. Research experience is an eligibility criterion only for StG and CoG call applicants, and it is therefore not reported in the case of AdG grantees. Given that the CoG scheme was only introduced in the 2013 ERC work programme and that this scheme, together with the 2013 StG scheme, essentially cover a similar research experience range to the pre-2013 StG schemes, they are grouped together in most parts of this subsection.

















Figure 6.07 presents the age distribution of two groups of ERC grantees, namely the StG/CoG and the AdG groups. In the StG/CoG group the mean is 36.9 years (36.8 for men and 37.3 for women) and the median is 37 (same for both sexes). In the AdG group the mean is 52.5 (52.5 for men and 52.3 for women) and the median is 52 (51 for women and 52 for men). It is worth noting that the age distributions of ERC applicants and the related statistics are very similar for the two sexes (see Figure 6.08) and between evaluated and funded proposals (see Figure 6.09), while women applicants under the AdG scheme are, on average, slightly younger than men.

As can be observed in Figure 6.10, the introduction of the CoG scheme in 2013 and the modification of the research experience eligibility criterion for the 2013 StG scheme do not seem to have significantly affected the average age of ERC applicants and grantees. The average age of StG grantees was 35.7 years in 2007. It reached a peak of 37.4 years in 2012 and dropped to 35.4 years in 2013, while the average age of CoG grantees was 40 years.

By contrast, as Figure 6.11 shows, during the period 2007-2012 the average research experience of both ERC applicants

47



Figure 6.10: Evolution of average age of grantees by call

Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 6.11: Evolution of average post-doctoral research experience of ERC applicants by call

Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database

and grantees exhibits an upward trend as the Scientific Council successively opened up the eligibility window from 3-8 years in 2009 to 2-10 years in 2010 and 2-12 years in 2011 (it was originally 2-9 years in 2007) and introduced certain other extensions to the StG eligibility window, in particular for maternity leave, of 18 months per child born before or after a PhD award, which was introduced in 2010. In the case of grantees, average research experience increased from 6.5 years in 2007 to 8.1 years in 2012. In the case of evaluated applicants, the trend is similar but the marginally lower average research experience in evaluated proposals compared to funded proposals could indicate that research experience affects positively the evaluation outcome. Unsurprisingly, with the introduction of the CoG scheme and the modification of eligibility criteria for the StG scheme in 2013 the average research experience for StG grantees fell to 6 years while for CoG it was 10.7 years.



•••••

The average post-doctoral research experience has been persistently longer for female compared to male grantees in all calls from 2007 to 2013, by a difference ranging from 1% to 9% under the StG scheme, and 17% under the CoG scheme.

6.3 Nationality and country of residence

In the course of FP7, the ERC received 41,866 eligible applications for the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes from researchers belonging to 113 different nationalities in total. The researchers who received ERC grants under these schemes as Principal Investigators are of 63 different nationalities in total, including those of all 28 EU Member States, and at the time of application, they declared a total of 40 countries of residence, including 27 EU Member States. As is discussed more extensively in the next chapter, ERC grant recipients are currently (as of 21 August 2014) hosted by research organisations located in a smaller group of 30 countries (hereafter referred to as 'host countries'), consisting of 25 EU Member States (all but Lithuania, Malta and Romania) and 5 Associated Countries (Iceland, Israel, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey). The largest number of evaluated proposals come from applicants with Italian nationality (15.1%), followed by German (12.1%), British (10.6%), Spanish (8%) and French (7.7%) nationalities. Out of 4,354 grantees under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes, 16.1% are of German nationality, followed by grantees of British (13.9%), French (11.4%), Dutch (7.7%) and Israeli (5.9%) nationalities. Without counting countries of nationality with none or very few grantees, the highest success rates are attained by applicants of non-EU nationalities, namely of Swiss (18.2%), Israeli (17.5%) and US (16.7%) nationalities. Figure 6.13 shows the numbers of evaluated and funded applicants under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes in the course of FP7 by nationality. Figure 6.14 shows the applicant success rates by country of nationality only including countries of nationality with at least two successful applicants. Finally, Table A6.02 in Appendix presents counts and success rates of applicants for all nationalities.

The proportion of ERC grantees with non-ERA nationality is about 7.1%. However, many of these were already based in Europe at the time of application. The proportion of ERC grantees that were resident outside the ERA at the time of application is about 2.6% (most being ERA nationals in



Source: ERC statistical database



· · · · · · · · · · ·

Figure 6.14: Applicant success rates by nationality



Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 6.15: Current host country by nationality of grantees (StG, CoG and AdG)

the USA). Researchers tend to be very mobile early in their careers, but they are less likely to move at the stage when they have received tenure from their Host Institution, which is the stage where many researchers in the ERC target population are at. For example, around 17% of the PhD and postdoctoral researchers in ERC teams (estimated at 2,700 over FP7) were from outside Europe, the largest number of whom were from China, the USA and India. This shows the potential of ERC Principal Investigators to attract talented early-stage researchers to Europe from around the world.

Out of the 4,354 ERC grants awarded under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes, 2,964 (or 68%) have been awarded to recipients whose country of nationality coincides with the country of their current Host Institution, 3,915 (or 90%) to recipients whose declared residence is in the country of their current Host Institution, and 3,001 (or 69%) to recipients whose country of declared residence coincides with the country of their nationality.



•••••••

Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 6.16: Nationality of grantees by current host country (StG, CoG and AdG)



Source: ERC statistical database





Figure 6.18: Residence of grantees by current host country (StG, CoG and AdG)

Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database



.

Within the group of countries whose research organisations are eligible to host ERC grantees (i.e. the EU Member States and the Associated Countries), more than 80% of grantees of Israeli, British, Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian or French nationality under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes are currently (as of 21 August 2014) hosted by a research organisation located in their country of origin, while all grantees of Lithuanian, Luxembourgish, Romanian and Serbian nationality are hosted by research organisations located in foreign countries, without counting countries of nationality with just a single grant (see Figure 6.15).

The majority of ERC grantees under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes currently hosted by Swiss (74%) and Austrian (70%) research organisations are of foreign nationality, while, in some host countries, all ERC StG, CoG and AdG recipients are own nationals (see Figure 6.16).

In absolute terms, the countries whose research organisations host the largest numbers of ERC grantees of foreign nationality under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes were the United Kingdom (433), Switzerland (238), Germany (164), France (154) and the Netherlands (92). The countries with the largest numbers of nationals hosted abroad as ERC grantees, again in absolute terms, were Germany (250), Italy (178), the USA (140), France (81), the Netherlands (72) and the United Kingdom (68).

The countries that host more foreign nationals than their nationals hosted abroad in absolute terms are the United Kingdom (365), Switzerland (212), France (73), Austria (39) and Sweden (31), while the countries with the highest numbers of nationals hosted abroad compared to the numbers of foreign nationals they host are Italy (154), Germany (86), Greece (40), Belgium (33) and Portugal (18), without countring third countries (see Figure 6.17).

Finally, more than 80% of ERC grantees in the countries hosting significant numbers of ERC grants were also residents in these countries at the time of application (see Figure 6.18 and Table A6.03 in Appendix).

The country of nationality with the highest percentage of female grantees is Romania (50%), followed by Croatia (39%) and Portugal (37%), taking into account countries of nationality with at least 10 grantees (see Figure 6.19). At the other end of the spectrum, the countries of nationality with the lowest percentages of female grantees are Norway (6.3%), Hungary (8%), Denmark (12.8%) and Sweden (13%).



• • • • • • • • • • •





Host Institutions of applicants

Host Institutions of applicants

This chapter focuses on the research organisations which act as Host Institutions to ERC grant recipients, and presents statistical data aggregated on that basis.

7.1 Overview

Overall, the ERC has funded researchers at about 600 Host Institutions in 30 countries (see Box 7.1). However there has also been a noticeable concentration of funding at a small group of Host Institutions. Out of 4,354 StG, CoG and AdG, 1,779 have been awarded to researchers based at the top 31 Host Institutions.

Given the aims of the ERC, which include channelling resources to the most promising researchers, supporting the best new ideas, conferring status and visibility on the best research leaders working in Europe, offering attractive funding conditions to attract and retain outstanding researchers, providing benchmarks for individual research institutions, and ultimately creating economic and societal benefits, then this distribution could be seen as a strong sign that the ERC is achieving its aims. It should be no surprise that many of Europe's top researchers are already at some of Europe's top research institutions.

On the other hand, the fact that 60% of the grants have gone to a further 550+ research institutions (over 200 of which host only one ERC grant) could be seen as evidence that the ERC can recognise excellence wherever it is to be found.

In the course of FP7, 2,181 research entities (with a unique participant identification code (PIC) in the Beneficiary Register after eliminating duplications and redundancies) were recorded as prospective Host Institutions of ERC applicants in evaluated proposals. These entities are or belong to 1,912 research organisations, located in 39 different countries, including all EU Member States and 11 Associated Countries. Grants were awarded to applicants hosted at the application stage by 644 research organisations located in 29 different countries, namely in all EU Member States except Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta and Romania, and in 5 Associated Countries (Iceland, Israel, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey). Due to grant portability (see Box 7.1), 600 Host Institutions actually signed the grant agreements with the ERC, while 586 research organisations were recorded as Host Institutions of ERC grantees on the date of the last data extraction for this report (21 August 2014).

In evaluated proposals 60% of these entities were characterised as 'research organisations' (RES), 57% as 'public bodies' (PUB), 45% as 'higher education institutions' (HEI), and only 7% as 'private enterprises' (ENT), while in funded proposals the corresponding percentages were 74%, 70%, 63% and 3.5% respectively. These types of activity are not mutually exclusive with the obvious exception of public bodies versus private enterprises (see Table 7.01)

Box 7.1: Portability in grant life cycle

It is important to note that a specific feature of ERC grants, namely grant portability, may affect statistics related to the location of the ERC funded Principal Investigators. In particular it is possible for ERC Principal Investigators to change Host Institution between the time of application and the signing of the grant, as well as after grant signature. In the aggregate organisation, country, region and locality statistics presented in the following sections, it is always indicated which stage of the proposal or grant life cycle these statistics refer to, i.e. whether they refer to: (i) the 'applicant legal entity', i.e. the prospective Host Institution providing the 'binding statement of support' to the applicant when the application is submitted; (ii) the 'first legal signatory' of the grant, i.e. the research organisation with which the ERC grant agreement is signed; or (iii) the current Host Institution of the grantee (where 'current' refers to the date of last data extraction). As a rule, success rates are calculated in this section on the basis of data on applicant legal entities, i.e. Host Institutions at the stage of proposal submission, while grant statistics are calculated on the basis of current Host Institutions (as of the date of last data extraction for this report, 21 August 2014).

7.2 Applicants and success rates by Host Institution

The French CNRS is the research organisation which hosts by far the largest number of ERC applicants and grantees in all funding schemes both at application and at the current stage. The top-10 research organisations (at application stage) in terms of total numbers of funded applicants – with more than 60 grantees each – also include the German Max Planck Society, the British Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, UCL and Imperial College, the Swiss Federal Institutes of Technology of Zurich (ETHZ) and Lausanne (EPFL), and the Israeli Weizmann Institute and Hebrew University.

Researchers based at different research organisations have very different success rates. Looking at the group of Host Institutions with 10 or more grantees, researchers based at the Research Institute of Molecular Pathology in Vienna have a stunning success rate of 71%, followed by researchers based at the Spanish Institute of Photonics Science and the Centre for Genomic Regulation, the Netherlands Cancer Institute, the British Cancer Research UK and Medical Research Council UK, the German Max Delbrueck Centre for Molecular Medicine and European Molecular Biology Laboratory, the French Toulouse School of Economics, Pasteur Institute, Curie Institute and École Normale Supérieure, the Israeli Weizmann Institute, and the Swiss



. . . .

Table 7.01: Number of host institutions in evaluated and fu	nded
proposals by country and type of activity	

	EVALUATED FUNDED										
	Total	HEI	PUB	RES	ENT	Total	HEI	PUB	RES	ENT	
AL	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
AT	51	20	20	28	10	18	12	13	9	1	
BA	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
BE	34	15	15	24	2	15	11	9	12	1	
BG	52	14	32	28	0	3	2	2	2	0	
СН	43	17	24	24	4	20	11	16	13	1	
CY	16	7	2	7	6	3	2	1	3	0	
cz	51	16	43	37	1	7	3	6	6	0	
DE	235	113	140	168	14	104	70	77	83	3	
DK	26	9	15	16	1	11	7	9	10	0	
EE	7	4	6	6	0	2	2	2	2	0	
EL	60	32	39	34	5	15	8	10	12	0	
ES	234	63	100	161	9	64	26	37	58	2	
FI	38	15	22	18	3	14	9	9	7	0	
FR	171	100	111	98	8	72	44	50	50	3	
HR	22	16	21	14	1	2	2	2	1	0	
HU	55	16	28	24	3	15	6	10	6	1	
IE	24	16	18	10	1	9	9	9	5	0	
IL IS	37	16	13	14	9	11	9	1	1	1	
IS	6	3	2	3	2	1	1	1	1	0	
	247	83	110	160	22	63	35	39	53	3	
	16	(10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	
LU	2	1	2	2		0	0	0	0	0	
	1	5	6	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	
ME	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MT	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NI	61	23	20	38	5	33	20	17	23	0	
NO	43	17	23	23	5	6	5	6	2	0	
PI	115	62	91	66	5	8	4	7	5	0	
PT	73	31	34	53	3	19	11	10	16	1	
RO	73	24	40	28	1	0	0	0	0	0	
RS	18	11	13	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	
SE	42	25	26	27	3	13	10	9	6	1	
SI	30	9	13	16	3	2	1	2	2	0	
SK	26	10	19	17	0	1		1	1	0	
TR	61	45	39	27	3	3	3	3	2	0	
UK	167	116	114	96	13	77	63	59	52	3	
Total	2,153	966	1,217	1,295	144	612	387	424	450	21	

Source: ERC statistical database

University of Basel, ETHZ and EPFL, all with a total success rate of more than 30%.

Table 7.02 and Table A7.01 in Appendix provide a complete list of the top-100 Host Institutions in terms of numbers of applicants (at application stage with the corresponding success rates) and of grantees (at the current stage) respectively.

7.3 Research areas of applicants by Host Institution

In the PE domain, the CNRS, the University of Cambridge, the ETHZ, the Max Planck Society, the EPFL, the University of Oxford, the Imperial College, the French Alternative Energies and Atomic Energy Commission (CEA), the Weizmann Institute, the French INRIA, and the University of Bristol are the top Host Institutions at the application stage in terms of numbers of grantees. The highest success rates within the group of Host Institutions with 10 or more grantees in this domain are attained by researchers from the Spanish Institute of Photonics Science, the Weizmann Institute, the University of Bonn, the ETHZ, the EPFL, the University of Cambridge, the Hebrew University, the University of Oxford, Leiden University, and the Technical University of Berlin. In the LS domain, the top Host Institutions at the application stage in terms of numbers of grantees are the Max Planck Society, the French INSERM and CNRS, the Weizmann Institute, the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford and UCL, the Hebrew University and the Swedish Karolinska Institute. The highest success rates within the group of Host Institutions with 10 or more grantees in this domain are attained by researchers from the Viennese Research Institute of Molecular Pathology, the University of Basel, the EPFL, the Spanish Centre for Genomic Regulation, the University of Lausanne, the Netherlands Cancer Institute, Cancer Research UK, the ETHZ, the Max Delbrueck Centre for Molecular Medicine, and the French Pasteur and Curie Institutes.

Finally, in the SH domain, the top Host Institutions at the application stage in terms of numbers of grantees are the University of Oxford, the CNRS, the UCL, the Universities of Amsterdam (UvA), Cambridge, and Leiden, the Free University of Amsterdam (VU), the Hebrew University, the University of Edinburgh, the Radboud University of Nijmegen, and the London School of Economics. The highest success rates within the group of Host Institutions with 10 or more grantees in this domain are attained by researchers from the Toulouse School of Economics, Goldsmiths and King's Colleges of the University of London, the London School of Economics, the UCL, the Max Planck Society,

Box 7.2: Identification and comparison of Host Institutions

When comparing aggregate statistics at the level of research organisations it is important to bear in mind the different types of organisations covered by the data. In particular it is difficult to compare single research organisations with national 'umbrella' research organisations, such as the French CNRS and INSERM, the German Max Plank Society, the Spanish CSIC, the Italian CNR, several East European National Academies of Science, or universities with a collegiate structure (e.g. University of London). A similar issue is the attribution problem emerging when individual schools, faculties, departments or research institutes of universities or of other types of research organisations are registered in the 'Beneficiary Register' as distinct entities with their own 9-digit Participant Identification Code (PIC), which is generally used for the identification of all research organisations participating in the Framework Programmes. Research organisations with own unique PICs are generally considered as individual entities, even when they are integral parts of larger research-performing entities. However, in order to make organisation-level comparisons more meaningful for the purposes of this chapter, in some cases we subsume research-performing entities with distinct PICs under the single 'supra-entity' to which they are known to belong administratively or functionally, and we calculate the related statistics on that basis.



Table											
Tabl											
_	7.02: Submitted and selected proposals in top-100 host institutions at application stage	oy scientific o	domain								
	HOST INSTITUTION	EVAL.	LS FUND.	SR	EVAL.	PE FUND.	SR	EVAL. FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FU
FR	FRENCH NATIONAL CENTRE FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (CNRS)	434	55	12.70%	838	112	13.40%	166 33	19.90%	1438	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	178	42	25.10%	224	55 61	27.20%	43 10	23.30%	504	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	221	36	16.30%	201	48	23.90%	159 35	22.00%	581	
CH	SWISS FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ZURICH (ETHZ)	202	26	37.10%	155	56	30.60%	132 32	15.80%	489	
L	WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE	126	45	35.70%	95	32	33.70%	6 1	16.70%	227	
L IL	HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM	118	23	28.00%	108	27	26.00%	72 14	19.40%	251	
JK	IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON	143	23	16.10%	208	37	17.80%	8 1	12.50%	359	
ES	SPANISH NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CSIC)	361	56	15.50%	317	22	25.00%	113 5	25.00%	765	
BE	UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN	129	12	9.30%	146	23	15.80%	110 10	9.10%	385	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	79	9	11.40%	130 140	20 27	15.40%	63 14 39 7	22.20%	272	
FR	FRENCH ALTERNATIVE ENERGIES AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (CEA)	39	7	17.90%	147	33	22.40%	4 1	25.00%	190	
NL	UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM	23	3	13.00%	79	9	11.40%	123 26	21.10%	225	
NL	RADBOUD UNIVERSITY NIJMEGEN	93	14	15.10%	53	10	18.90%	79 13	16.50%	200	
NL	LEIDEN UNIVERSITY	52	1	1.90%	68	16	23.50%	81 17	21.00%	201	
CH	UNIVERSITY OF ZURICH	106	21	19.80%	45	5	11.10%	33 7	21.20%	184	
NL	UTRECHT UNIVERSITY	80	9	11.30%	104	16	15.40%	90 8	8.90%	274	
SE	KAROLINSKA INSTITUTE	84 290	9 29	10.70%	56	8	0.00%	96 15 7 2	28.60%	236	
СН	UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA	61	19	31.10%	62	9	14.50%	18 3	16.70%	141	
FR	FRENCH NAT. INST. FOR RES. IN COMPUTER SC. AND AUTOM. CONTR. (INRIA)	5	0	0.00%	146	30	20.50%	82 3	3 70%	151	
FI	UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI	181	21	11.60%	107	7	6.50%	107 2	1.90%	395	
UK	KING'S COLLEGE LONDON	99	12	12.10%	41	5	12.20%	46 12	26.10%	186	
DK	UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN	155	11	7.10%	99	12	12.10%	72 5	6.90%	326	
E	HELMHOLTZ ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN RESEARCH CENTRES	91	15	16.50%	110	9	8.20%	2 1	50.00%	203	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD	38 61	12	15.80%	81	19	9.90%	51 5	9.80%	146	
	UPPSALA UNIVERSITY	126	16	12.70%	81	7	8.60%	46 2	4.30%	253	
DK	AARHUS UNIVERSITY	56	10	17.90%	74	13	17.60%	35 1	2.90%	165	
R	PASTEUR INSTITUTE	66	24	36.40%	3	0	0.00%	27 2	0.0070	69	
IK	UNIVERSITY OF EXETER	41	7	17.10%	51	5	9.80%	83 12	14.50%	175	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS	56	5	8.90%	99	12	12.10%	58 7	12.10%	213	
E	FLANDERS INSTITUTE FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY (VIB)	74	22	29.70%	1	0	0.00%	50	7 500/	75	
NO	UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER	69 76	6	2.60%	117	12	10.30%	53 4	7.50%	239	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	15	0	0.00%	105	17	16.20%	42 5	11.90%	162	
₹ H	CURIE INSTITUTE	55	20	36.40%	7	1	14.30%	10 1	10.00%	62	
DE	UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG	34	7	20.60%	56	12	21.40%	27 2	7.40%	117	
ſ	ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR)	147	3	2.00%	313	15	4.80%	35 2	5.70%	495	
SE	ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (KTH)	18	19	5.60%	134	19	14.20%	15 0	0.00%	167	
AT	UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA	54	6	11.10%	106	10	9.40%	56 4	7.10%	216	
BE FI	AALTO UNIVERSITY	60 15	3	5.00%	84 146	11	9.60%	20 3	7.50%	211 181	
NL	EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	9	0	0.00%	117	17	14.50%	11 1	9.10%	137	
ĸ	UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM	5	1	20.00%	89 73	12	13.50%	38 5	13.20%	132	
NL	UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE	24	1	12.50%	86	17	19.80%	21 0	0.00%	115	
DE	EUROPEAN MOLECULAR BIOLOGY LABORATORY (EMBL)	48	16	33.30%	1	1	100.00%	57 40	21 100/	49	
BE	ULB - FREE UNIVERSITY OF BRUSSELS	20	2	9.10%	67	8	11.90%	38 6	15.80%	138	
DE		15	1	6.70%	39	12	30.80%	9 4	44.40%	63	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF EAUSAININE UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM	39	15 5	38.50% 9.40%	3 57	6	10.50%	45 5	11.80%	155	
DE	UNIVERSITY OF TUEBINGEN	52	6	11.50%	37	5	13.50%	25 5	20.00%	114	
SE	CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY	40	15	37.50%	126	15	11.90%	4 0	0.00%	40 134	
FR	ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE	9	4	44.40%	21	8	38.10%	17 3	17.60%	47	
DE	UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT	23	6	26.10%	26	4	15.40%	28 5	17.90%	250	
NL	ERASMUS MEDICAL CENTER ROTTERDAM	78	13	16.70%	1	0	0.00%	3 1	33.30%	82	
IE	TRINITY COLLEGE DUBLIN	53	6	11.30%	53	5	9.40%	25 3	12.00%	131	
SE	UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG	71	5	7.00%	36	6	16.70%	32 3	9.40%	145	
DE	UNIVERSITY OF HAMBURG	16	0	0.00%	40	7	17.50%	34 7	20.60%	90	
ES HU	HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES	33	13	39.40% 8.50%	95	7	7.40%	28 0	0.00%	33 194	
UK	LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE (LSE)	1	0	0.00%	9	0	0.00%	52 13	25.00%	62	
SE	STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG	52	2	3.80%	84 45	3	3.60%	50 8 14 2	16.00%	186	
BE	UNIVERSITY OF LOUVAIN	34	4	11.80%	55	6	10.90%	29 3	10.30%	118	
UK	UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON	21	1	4.80%	75	11	14.70%	22 1	4.50%	118	
IT	INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - TRIESTE	25	2	15.40%	46	4	17.40%	6 2	33.30%	65	
СН	UNIVERSITY OF BERN	56	7	12.50%	37	5	13.50%	33 0	0.00%	126	
UK FR	UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS 6 - PIERRE AND MARIE CURIE	46	8	17.40%	41	4	9.80%	36 0	0.00%	123	
IT	UNIVERSITY OF ROME - TOR VERGATA	35	3	8.60%	62	8	12.90%	22 1	4.50%	119	
IT		22	1	4.50%	91	4	4.40%	53 7	13.20%	166	
IL IL	BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY	41	6	14.60%	38	4	10.50%	24 1	4.20%	103	
IL	BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV	42	4	9.50%	49	6	12.20%	6 1	16.70%	97	
IT FL	FOUNDATION FOR RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS	1	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	59 11 6 0	18.60%	62 113	
LIK	GOLDSMITHS - UNIVERSITY OF LONDON	2	0	0.00%	4	1	25.00%	32 10	31.30%	38	
UI	NETHERLANDS CANCER INSTITUTE	29	11	27.000/						_	
NL	ROYAL NETHERLANDS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES	44	0	10 500/				10 3	30.00%	29	
NL NL DK	ROYAL NETHERLANDS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF DENMARK	41	8	19.50% 21.10%	104	7	6.70%	10 3 2 0	30.00% 0.00%	29 51 125	

Source: ERC statistical database



. • . • . . • • • • • • • • • • •

and the Universities of Cambridge, Edinburgh, Oxford, Amsterdam (UvA), and Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona.

7.3 Gender of applicants by Host Institution

Among the top-100 Host Institutions in terms of total numbers of grantees (at application stage), the highest success rates for female applicants are exhibited by the Weizmann Institute (54%), followed by the European Molecular Biology Laboratory, the Medical Research Council UK, the Netherlands Cancer Institute, the French Curie and Pasteur Institutes, Goldsmiths College, the EPFL, the INRIA and the Hebrew University. In all but one of these cases (the Netherlands Cancer Institute), the success rates of women are higher than that of men. At the other extreme, the Swedish Chalmers University of Technology, the Spanish Centre for Genomic Regulation, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the International School for Advanced Studies in Trieste, and the University of Rome - Tor Vergata exhibit zero success rates for female applicants.

The highest percentage of female grantees within this group of Host Institutions is exhibited by Goldsmiths College (55%), which is the only Host Institution with a majority of female grantees, followed by the Universities of Birmingham and of Newcastle, the Spanish CSIC, the London School of Economics, the French Curie Institute, the Bocconi University in Milan, the Erasmus Medical Centre in Rotterdam, the Medical Research Council UK, and the University of Amsterdam (UvA), in all of which female grantees form more than a third of the total.







Host countries

Host countries

This chapter presents statistics on evaluated and funded ERC applicants and on requested and received funding for their projects, aggregated at the level of the countries where their Host Institutions are located. It also presents country-level statistics by research area (i.e. scientific domain or subdomain corresponding to an ERC peer-review evaluation panel), and with regard to the gender of the applicants.

It should be noted that country of origin, nationality, residence and institutional affiliation of ERC grantees do not always coincide. The convention when calculating country-level participation in ERC competitions, funding allocation, and the associated success rates, is to attribute ERC grants, and therefore to aggregate the corresponding grant statistics, by the country of the Host Institution with which the ERC grantee is affiliated for the purposes of the grant. The same convention applies to the calculation of regional and sub-regional statistics: ERC grants are attributed to and aggregated at the level of regions and localities in which the Host Institutions of the ERC grantees are located.

In addition, as with statistics at the level of the Host Institution, a specific feature of ERC grants, namely grant portability, may also affect country and regional level statistics (see Box 7.1). In particular it is possible for ERC Principal Investigators to change Host Institution between the time of application and the signing of the grant, as well as after grant signature. It is estimated that changes of Host Institutions are relatively few, and inter-country changes are even fewer, and therefore, there is no significant overall country-level variation from one stage of the grant life cycle to the other. However, for individual research organisations, countries, regions or localities which have only received a small number of grants, even this small variation caused by grant portability may considerably affect their aggregate statistics.

In this section, country- or organisation-level statistics on the SyG and PoC funding schemes are reported separately from those on StG, CoG and AdG schemes. In the case of SyG projects, the reason is that they involve more than one Principal Investigator, potentially from different countries or research organisations. This particularity makes country- or organisation-level SyG statistics not directly comparable to those of other funding schemes, but it does not affect the comparability of statistics on proposal counts or amounts of funding, which were reported in previous chapters.

8.1 Applicants and success rates by host country

This subsection examines the distribution of evaluated and funded ERC applicants and the corresponding success rates by country of Host Institution in the course of FP7.

Evaluated ERC applicants were supported at the time of application by research organisations located in 39 countries, including all EU28 Member States and 11 Associated Countries (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Former





• • • • • • • • • • •

Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Israel, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and Turkey), while funded ERC applicants were supported, at the time of application, by research organisations in 29 countries, of which 24 are EU Member States (all but Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta and Romania) and 5 Associated Countries (Iceland, Israel, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey). The composition of the latter group of countries changed with the addition of Luxembourg due to portability after the signature of the grant agreement.

In the course of FP7, research organisations from six countries supported at the application stage about two thirds of all ERC evaluated applicants under the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes. About 17% of all evaluated proposals came from applicants whose Host Institutions were located in the United Kingdom, 12.8% in Italy, 11.2% in Germany, 8.7% in France, 8.5% in Spain, and 6.2% in the Netherlands. Five countries at the application stage hosted about two thirds of all ERC funded proposals under the StG, the CoG and the AdG funding schemes: 22.1% of all ERC grants were awarded to applicants who were supported by research organisations located in the United Kingdom, 13.9% in Germany, 13% in France, 8.4% in the Netherlands, and 7.2% in Switzerland. Under the StG scheme 21.7% of all grants

were awarded to applicants hosted by UK, 13.8% by German, 13.2% by French, 8.6% by Dutch and 6.2% by Israeli research organisations. Under the CoG scheme 19.5% of grantees were hosted by UK, 13.7% by German, 13.4% by French, 9.3% by Dutch and 7% by Swiss research organisations. Under the AdG scheme 23.2% by UK, 14.2% by German, 12.6% by French, 8.8% by Swiss, and 8% by Dutch research organisations. In the particular case of the SyG funding scheme, grant recipients were hosted at the stage of grant agreement signature by research organisations from 12 countries in total, of which three accounted for about two thirds of all grantees, namely Germany for 26.5%, the United Kingdom for 25.3%, and the Netherlands for 13.3%.

Figure 8.01 and Table A8.01 in Appendix present the numbers of evaluated and funded applicants by host country at the application stage for the StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes. Table A8.02 in Appendix presents the numbers of grantees by current host country (as of 21August 2014) under StG, CoG and AdG funding schemes. Figure 8.02 presents the numbers of grantees by host country at the grant agreement signature stage (first legal signatory) and by call for the SyG and PoC funding schemes.

As Figure 8.03 shows, country-level success rates at the



Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 8.03: Applicants success rates by host country at application stage (StG, CoG and AdG)

Source: ERC statistical database

. . 63

•••



•

.

.

.





. . .

. . .

64

.

. . . • . .



Figure 8.05: Requested and granted funds by host country at application stage and funding scheme (€M)

Source: ERC statistical database

stage of application under the StG, CoG and AdG schemes vary significantly. As this figure shows, researchers based in Switzerland (with an overall success rate of 22.7%) and Israel (with 17.3%), followed by France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom had the highest overall success rates. Under the StG scheme, the highest overall success rates were for researchers based again in Israel (20.4%) and Switzerland (18.8%). Under the CoG scheme (one call in 2013) researchers based in these two countries retain their top position, while researchers based in another non-EU country, Turkey, occupy the third position in the rankings (with 2 awarded grants out of 12 evaluated proposals), despite ranking low overall in other schemes. Under the AdG scheme, researchers based in Switzerland are again the top performers (28.5%), followed this time by researchers based in the Netherlands, Germany and Austria. Figure 8.03 only includes countries with at least one research organisation supporting a successful ERC applicant, i.e. with non-zero overall success rates, for the three main ERC funding schemes (StG, CoG and AdG).



Source: ERC statistical database

65

The choropleth maps in Figure 8.04 give an overview of country-level success rates in ERC competitions under the three main funding schemes (StG, CoG and AdG) in all EU Member States and Associated Countries.

8.2 Funding by host country

Unsurprisingly, in terms of the amounts of funding requested by and granted to ERC applicants, aggregated at the level of host country, the picture is very similar to that described in the previous subsections: 17.7% of all requested funding involved applicants who at the application stage were supported by research organisations in the United Kingdom, 11.6% in Germany, 11.2% in Italy, 9.2% in France, and 8.6% in Spain. Overall country shares in terms of received ERC funding were 22% for the United Kingdom, 14.9% for Germany, 12.4% for France, 9.4% for the Netherlands, and 7.5% for Switzerland, while Spain, Italy and Israel received between 5 and 6% each. Under the StG scheme the United Kingdom received 21.3% of total funding, Germany 14.1%, France 13.1%, the Netherlands 9%, and Switzerland, Israel and Spain between 6 and 6.5% each. Under the CoG scheme, the United Kingdom received 19%, Germany 14.5%, France 13.3%, and the Netherlands 10%. Under the AdG scheme, the United Kingdom led again with 23.2% of total funding, followed by Germany with 14.8%, France with 12.4%, and Switzerland with 8.8% and the Netherlands with 8.6%. These statistics are presented in Figure 8.05.

The corresponding funding success rates aggregated by host country of ERC applicants at the stage of application are shown in Figure 8.06. Similarly to the proposal success rates, Switzerland has by far the highest overall funding success rate (23%) followed by Israel (17%), France and the Netherlands (15%), and the United Kingdom (14%). The exact amounts of requested and granted funding and overall funding success rates by host country at the application stage are presented in Table A8.03 in Appendix.





Source: ERC statistical database and "Innovation Union Competitveness report 2011"



Figure 8.08: Ratios of ERC applicants to all researchers by host country at the application stage

Source: ERC statistical database



•••••

8.3 Alternative indicators of country participation in ERC competitions

There are several limitations in the use of success rates for country rankings and therefore for inter-country comparisons of this type. A host country with very few submitted and evaluated proposals, which is successful in obtaining a grant, may rank higher than a country with many submitted proposals and several grants. All countries without grants rank the same in terms of their success rates, irrespective of their numbers of submitted and evaluated proposals; however, a country with a large number of submitted proposals and no grants should be considered less successful than a country with only a few submitted proposals and no grants. Success rates are, therefore, not the most appropriate indicators for inter-country comparisons. Moreover, there are significant differences between the application patterns of researchers based in different countries, which may be attributed to a wide range of factors such as the availability of national funding, the availability of competitive funding, and the levels of support and awareness for applications at national level.

An alternative way of comparing the number of ERC grantees hosted by each country is to look at the ratio of ERC grantees to the total number of researchers in a country. As Figure 8.07 shows, if we plot the ERC participation rate of public sector researchers against the ERC success rate at the country level, the quadrants of the plot define four groups of countries: those with a high participation/high success rate (I), those with a low participation/low success rate (II), and those with a high participation/low success rate (IV).



.

Figure 8.08 shows the ratios of both evaluated and funded applicants during the course of FP7 (2007-2013) to the average number of researchers (in headcounts) for the same period. Figure 8.09 presents the same ratios in choropleth maps. The first ratio indicates the intensity of demand for ERC grants by researchers in a country, while the second ratio shows the extent to which they have received ERC grants. In this ranking, Switzerland is again the top-ranking country, with 0.71% of its total population of researchers receiving an ERC grant, followed by the Netherlands (0.62%), Cyprus (0.60%), Belgium (0.28%) and the United Kingdom (0.25%). The countries with the highest proportion of researchers applying for ERC grants are Cyprus (10%), the Netherlands (4.2%), Italy (3.8%), Switzerland (3.1%) and Ireland (3%).

It is also possible to compare the number of ERC grants hosted in a particular country to its level of research investment. As Figure 8.10 shows, there is very high correlation between a country's GERD and the number of ERC grants it receives. The plot also reveals that some countries perform in ERC competitions better than what would be expected given their level of GERD, even though they have relatively low participation or success rates.

Figure 8.11 presents in the form of choropleth maps the ratios of total ERC funding received during the course of FP7 by country of Host Institution to civil GBAORD in that country during the same period (2007-2013). For comparison purposes, it also presents the ratios of GBAORD to the total number of researchers (by headcount) in EU Member States and Associated Countries, and the ratios of total ERC funding to the total number of researchers in those countries.

8.4 Gender of applicants by host country

This subsection presents gender statistics at the level of host country at the stage of application. For all countries, the ratio of male to female applicants for StG, CoG and AdG, even at the early stage of proposal submission, ranges from 1.6 to 6, or in other words, female applicants represent just between 14.3% (in Malta and Hungary, closely followed by the Czech Republic, Luxembourg, Austria and Switzerland) and 38.9% (in Romania, followed by Portugal, Iceland, Serbia and Bulgaria) of total applicants (see Figure 8.12). This ratio becomes even less favourable for women after the evaluation stage: it ranges from 1.7 to 8, or, as a percentage of female grantees in the total (see Figure 8.13), from 11.1% (in Hungary, followed by Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria) to 37.1% (in Portugal, followed by Greece, Finland, Ireland, the United Kingdom and Italy), without counting countries with very few grants.

With regard to the proposal success rates at the level of host country at the stage of application, as Figure 8.14 shows, there are only five countries in which the success rate of female applicants exceeds that of male applicants, namely Croatia (3 times higher for women), Slovenia (2.2), Greece (1.6), Ireland and the Czech Republic, where it is marginally higher. Among the countries hosting at least 5 grantees, the ones with the most unequal success rates in favour of male applicants are, in reverse order, Norway (2.9 times higher for men), Sweden (2.2), Cyprus (2), Turkey (1.9), and Poland (1.7). In some countries there are no female grantees. However, these countries received very few grants.



Source: ERC statistical database and "Innovation Union Competitveness report 2011"



Figure 8.11: Ratios of ERC funding, civil GBAORD and researchers (2007-2013)

• • • • •

.

....

• • •

•

• • • • • • • • • •



8.5 Research areas of applicants by host country

This subsection examines the distribution of ERC proposals and grants across the three scientific domains and the 25 subdomains corresponding to the ERC peer-review evaluation panels, aggregated at the level of the host country of the applicant. Figure 8.15 presents the numbers of evaluated and funded applicants in the three main funding schemes (StG, CoG and AdG) in the three scientific domains (LS, PE and SH) by host country at the stage of application, and Figure 8.16 presents the corresponding success rates.

As Figure 8.16 shows, researchers based in Switzerland were the most successful in LS with a success rate (across all funding schemes) of 28.1%, followed by researchers based in Israel with 19.8%, Austria with 16.9%, France with 15.5% and Germany with 14.3%. Researchers based in Switzerland with 22.3%, Israel with 19%, the Netherlands with 17.2%, France with 15.1% and Germany with 13% were the most successful in PE. Researchers based in France with 16.5%, the United Kingdom with 14.6%, the Netherlands with 12.5%, Belgium with 10.2%, Switzerland with 9.8% and Germany with 9.4% were the most successful in SH.

Table A8.07 in Appendix presents the distribution of grants awarded across the ERC peer-review evaluation panels by current host country. On the basis of ERC grants awarded by panel at the country level, a 'concentration index' is calculated and presented in Table A8.08 in Appendix and visualised in Figure 8.18. This index shows the research areas, as demarcated by the ERC panels, in which a certain country exhibits a relative strength.

8.6 Inter-country grant portability

One important feature of the ERC's grants is that they allow for portability between Host Institutions. Portability can happen either before or after the signature of the grant. Figure 8.19 presents the aggregate numbers of ERC grants by country, which were transferred between research organisations in different countries with the signature of the grant agreement. The numbers in light orange represent the counts of outgoing grants, i.e. the grants which were transferred from a research organisation of the country to a different one, while the numbers in dark orange represent the counts of incoming grants, i.e. the grants which were transferred to a research organisation in the country from a different one. The country with the biggest net number of incoming grants at that stage is Austria, followed by the United Kingdom, France and Belgium, while the country with the biggest net number of outgoing grants is Germany, followed (in reverse order) by Norway, Finland and Spain.

Figure 8.20 presents the aggregate numbers of ERC grants transferred between research organisations in different countries after the signature of the grant agreement (as of 21 August 2014). At this stage, the country with the biggest net number of incoming grants gains is Germany, followed by Switzerland, Austria and France, while the country with the biggest net outgoing grants is the Netherlands, followed (in reverse order) by Italy, Spain and Israel. More detailed data on inter-country grant portability is presented in Table A8.09 (at signature) and Table A8.10 (after signature) in Appendix.



Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database

Figure 8:14 Applicant success rates by host country at application stage and gender



Source: ERC statistical database

. . . .











Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 8.17 Grants by current host country and scientific domain

Source: ERC statistical database



· · · · · · · · ·


Figure 8.18 Grants by current host country and scientific domain



Source: ERC statistical database

Figure 8.19: Host country changes at grant signature



40 30 20 10 0 -10 -20 -30 ES DK IE NL NO BE FI LU PL PT DE UK CH FR AT IT CZ IL SE TR Source: ERC statistical database

Figure 8.20: Host country changes after grant signature

• • • • • • • • • •



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013



Host regions and localities

· · · · · · • • • •

Host regions and localities

This chapter presents statistics on evaluated and funded proposals at the level of regions in which the Host Institutions are located. From a geographical perspective, we consider the distribution of ERC grants and the associated statistics at three territorial levels of aggregation, namely the nomenclature of territorial units for statistics (NUTS) 2 and 3 regional levels, and the level of localities, i.e. cities, towns or other types of settlements (see Box 9.1).

9.1 Applicants and success rates at the regional level

At first glance, ERC grants seem to be geographically dispersed across the macro-regions of the ERA: ERC Host Institutions are located in 181 out of a total of 317 NUTS-2 regions, which means that almost 60% of all NUTS-2 regions host at least one ERC grantee. Figure 9.01 shows two choropleth maps of current-stage ERC grant counts and success rates at the NUTS-2 level, Figure 9.02 presents three choropleth maps of the NUTS-2 distribution of ERC funded proposals at the application stage by funding scheme, while Figure 9.03 does the same by scientific domain.

When examined more closely and on smaller territorial scales, the geographical distribution of ERC grants is much more concentrated and uneven: 43% of ERC grantees under the StG, CoG and AdG schemes are hosted in 100 NUTS-2 regions, while 80% of all grants are concentrated in the top-50 NUTS-2 regions. The top-10 NUTS-2 regions are those of Île-de-France (encompassing the Parisian metropolitan area), Inner London, East Anglia (and in particular Cambridgeshire), the Lake Geneva region (encompassing the Swiss cantons of Geneva, Vaud and Valais), Oxfordshire, Zurich, Catalonia (and in particular the province of Barcelona), Upper Bavaria (which encompasses the city of Munich), South Holland (which includes the cities of Leiden, Delft and Rotterdam), and Rhône-Alpes (with the metropolitan area of Lyon).

Table A9.01 in Appendix lists the 181 NUTS-2 regions of the ERA which host at least one ERC grantee at the application stage with the corresponding numbers of evaluated and funded applicants and their success rates by funding scheme (StG, CoG and AdG), while Table A9.02 in Appendix does the same by scientific domain.

ERC Host Institutions are concentrated in a much smaller percentage of micro-regions. Only 287 NUTS-3 regions out of a total of 1,462 (less than 20%) are home to an ERC Host Institution and only 103 (7%) of those host 10 or more ERC grantees. The most successful micro-regions in that respect are the ones that encompass in their territory important

Box 9.1: NUTS regions and localities

The NUTS (Nomenclature des unités territoriales statistiques) classification system is the geocoding standard used by EUROSTAT for statistical purposes, which extends to all EU28 Member States, as well as to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey, but is not applicable in other Associated Countries of the ERA which have not yet adopted the standard (e.g. Israel, Serbia, etc.). The NUTS-2 regional level roughly corresponds to the OECD territorial level 2, which is the most typical country sub-division in macro-regions (although this does not apply to all OECD countries; for example, in the cases of Belgium and Germany the OECD TL-2 coincides with the NUTS-1 level - régions and länder respectively). The NUTS-3 level roughly corresponds to the OECD territorial level 3, which describes micro-regions often coinciding with 'provinces'. The localities considered in this report are the various types of urban settlements identified from the registered addresses of the Host Institutions, which range from large metropolitan areas to villages, but do not consistently correspond to the sub-regional LAU divisions (Local Administrative Units). LAU are defined at two sub-regional levels, LAU-1 (usually districts or counties) and LAU-2 (usually municipalities or wards), corresponding to the obsolete NUTS-4 and NUTS-5 levels, and are part of the NUTS geocoding standard.

urban agglomerations. The top-10 most successful NUTS-3 regions in hosting ERC grantees are those of Paris, West Inner London, Munich, Cambridgeshire, Zurich, Oxfordshire, Barcelona, Greater Amsterdam, the Swiss canton of Vaud (which encompasses the city of Lausanne), and Madrid. These 10 micro-regions alone account for 38% of the total number of ERC grants under the StG, CoG and AdG schemes. In terms of success rates within the group of the top-50 NUTS-3 regions (with at least 20 grants each), researchers based in Basel, the Swiss canton of Vaud, Zurich, Cambridgeshire, Bonn, the French department of Essone in the Parisian Basin, Munich, Oxfordshire, Geneva, and Heidelberg are the most successful. Figure 9.04 presents a choropleth map of current-stage ERC grant counts at the NUTS-3 level.

9.2 Applicants and success rates at the sub-regional level

At the sub-regional level, the evaluated applicants were affiliated for the purposes of their ERC application with research institutions located in 827 different localities of which only 312 were home to an institution with at least one successful ERC application.



• • • • • • • • • • • •

The 10 most successful localities in hosting ERC grantees are the cities of London, Paris, Amsterdam, Oxford, Barcelona, Cambridge, Milan, Leiden, Jerusalem, and Munich, with varying success rates. Figure 9.05 presents the numbers of funded applicants by funding scheme in the top-50 most successful localities and the corresponding total success rates, while Table A9.03 in Appendix presents the numbers of evaluated and funded applicants and the corresponding success rates in the top-100 localities by funding scheme. It is interesting to observe that in some countries certain localities, usually the capital cities, concentrate the large majority of applicants and grantees of the entire country. The most notable cases are those of Nicosia, which concentrates 100% of grantees hosted (at application stage) by research organisations located in Cyprus, Warsaw with 92.3% of those in Poland, Prague with 83.3% of those in the Czech Republic, Budapest with 82.2% of those in Hungary, Paris with 73.5% of those in France, Vienna and Dublin with 71.4% of those in Austria and in Ireland respectively, and Lisbon with 60% of those in Portugal (see Table A9.04 in Appendix for the national percentages of funded applicants at application stage in the top-100 localities by funding scheme, and Table A9.05 in Appendix for the same by scientific domain).

Figure 9.06 presents the numbers of funded applicants and the corresponding success rates in the top-50 localities in the PE domain, while Figure 9.07 and Figure 9.08 do the same for the LS and SH domains respectively. Table A9.05 in Appendix presents the numbers of evaluated and funded applicants and the corresponding success rates in the top-100 localities by scientific domain.

Figure 9.01: Number of grantees and success rate at NUTS-2 level (current stage) NUTS-2 regio Total current of 1-20 .d. 1 NUTS-2 reg * . e . ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013



.

.

•

.







.

· · · · ·

.

. • • .

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

Figure 9.03: Applicants in funded proposals at NUTS-2 level by domain

.

• • • • • •

.

.



.



: dal



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

....



•



. . . •



Source: ERC statistical database



Source: ERC statistical database





Source: ERC statistical database



Figure 9.08: Funded applicants and success rates in top-50 localities in the SH domain (at application stage)

Source: ERC statistical database

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013



Appendix

· · · · · · · · · · ·

	2007	2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		FP7	
	COMM.	COMM.	PAYM.	COMM.	PAYN										
StG	334		131	323	98	571	253	682	414	796	443	431	454	3,137	1,7
ID				23	7	24	5	23	20		8		8	71	
LS	130		52	117	33	210	101	255	148	310	166	168	182	1,191	6
PE	154		59	135	44	248	112	291	186	353	197	189	192	1,369	7
SH	49		20	48	14	89	35	113	60	133	73	74	71	506	2
CoG												573	2	573	
LS												223		223	
PE												253		253	
SH												97		97	
AdG		549	96	518	124	599	289	678	345	713	466	675	644	3,732	1,9
ID		64	7	33	18	39	20	49	25		39		20	185	1
LS		189	17	189	55	220	102	244	121	281	170	265	247	1,388	7
PE		217	58	216	32	251	124	279	148	309	188	296	280	1,569	8
SH		79	14	79	19	90	43	105	52	123	69	114	97	590	2
SyG										126		148	51	274	
PoC								7		9	8	10	7	26	
Total	334	549	227	841	221	1.171	542	1.367	759	1.644	917	1.838	1.158	7.742	3.8

Table A3.01: Proposals at the various stages of evaluation by funding scheme and call year

				STEP 1				STEP 2						
	Submitted	Ineligible	Withdrawn	Evaluated	Unsatisfactory	Non-funded	Failed	Evaluated	Unsatisfactory	Non-funded	Failed	Reserve list	Main list	Funded
StG	26,693	758	99	25,858	4,988	8,143	21,366	4,492	592	1,297	2,142	273	2,077	2,332
2007	9,167	372	8	8,787	-	-	8,235	552	-	-	253	99	200	299
2009	2,503	111	6	2,392	629	1,306	1,935	457	6	195	201	37	219	245
2010	2,873	84	22	2,767	613	1,379	1,992	775	2	333	335	41	399	436
2011	4,080	56	22	4,005	965	2,094	3,059	946	5	453	458	18	470	486
2012	4,741	70	29	4,652	1,602	1,976	3,578	1,074	309	198	507	52	515	566
2013	3,329	65	12	3,255	1,179	1,388	2,567	688	270	118	388	26	274	300
CoG	3,673	60	9	3,604	1,292	1,618	2,910	694	235	141	376	35	283	313
2013	3,673	60	9	3,604	1,292	1,618	2,910	694	235	141	376	35	283	313
AdG	12,756	300	63	12,404	3,415	4,964	8,379	4,025	539	1,710	2,249	154	1,622	1,709
2008	2,167	129	7	2,034	677	709	1,386	648	12	342	354	41	253	282
2009	1,584	58	3	1,526	342	631	973	553	6	262	268	55	230	245
2010	2,009	32	10	1,967	370	937	1,307	660	0	380	380	14	266	271
2011	2,284	29	11	2,245	488	1,052	1,540	705	1	400	401	11	293	301
2012	2,304	31	4	2,269	723	787	1,510	759	230	208	438	25	296	319
2013	2,408	21	28	2,363	815	848	1,663	700	290	118	408	8	284	291
SyG	1,159	33	5	1,124	292	689	981	143	116	2	118	1	24	24
2012	710	11	2	697	182	483	665	32	21	0	21	0	11	11
2013	449	22	3	427	110	206	316	111	95	2	97	1	13	13
PoC	586	48	0	538	265	94	359	-	-	-	-	-	179	178
2011	151	12	0	139	87	0	87	-	-	-	-	-	52	51
2012	143	23	0	120	60	0	60	-	-	-	-	-	60	60
2013	292	13	0	279	118	94	212	-	-	-	-	-	67	67
Total	44,867	1,199	176	43,528	10,252	15,508	33,995	9,354	1,482	3,150	4,885	463	4,185	4,556



.

. .



Table A5.01: Average project cost breakdown in evaluated and funded proposals by call

C/	ALL	REQUESTED	TOTAL	PERSONNEL	OTHER DIRECT	INDIRECT	SUBCONTRACT
		EVALUATED					
StG		1,283,624	1,312,842	764,864	321,087	206,443	20,571
	2007	1,136,837	1,152,788	643,596	316,088	174,730	18,374
	2009	1,396,798	1,439,732	822,457	370,622	225,026	21,759
	2010	1,295,578	1,343,518	799,974	312,138	212,952	18,231
	2011	1,337,796	1,372,994	810,424	322,586	218,611	21,765
	2012	1,367,396	1,390,126	831,694	313,784	222,878	22,176
	2013	1,391,644	1,431,841	861,434	314,120	232,562	23,730
CoG		1,772,637	1,785,885	1,068,313	396,116	288,630	32,322
	2013	1,772,637	1,785,885	1,068,313	396,116	288,630	32,322
AdG		2,169,873	2,281,808	1,301,369	530,918	390,345	58,879
	2008	1,968,456	2,029,180	1,124,635	541,133	320,893	41,961
	2009	2,133,612	2,211,331	1,268,601	543,348	351,197	48,185
	2010	2,191,240	2,462,407	1,324,676	520,499	566,366	49,743
	2011	2,212,109	2,382,493	1,380,265	532,877	363,973	105,398
	2012	2,208,088	2,281,686	1,343,107	516,184	371,311	50,079
	2013	2,272,101	2,298,907	1,340,237	535,059	372,213	52,202
SyG		8,462,535	8,746,065	4,591,601	2,535,624	1,383,156	235,684
	2012	8,369,916	8,751,346	4,547,757	2,590,398	1,375,181	238,010
	2013	8,613,719	8,737,444	4,663,167	2,446,215	1,396,173	231,889
PoC		149,510	152,054	81,456	43,336	8,715	18,546
	2011	146,941	156,701	82,041	46,466	8,674	19,520
	2012	158,070	150,141	76,264	45,397	8,937	19,543
	2013	147,109	150,561	83,397	40,891	8,640	17,633
		FUNDED					
StG		1,443,218	1,476,253	865,584	355,998	237,812	16,929
	2007	1.312.998	1.348.007	776.891	357.673	204.385	9.058
	2009	1.530.491	1.549.711	906.147	379.142	245.417	19.687
	2010	1.399.728	1.445.755	851,147	352.119	230,492	11,996
	2011	1,468,229	1.510.644	878,859	366,727	246,114	18,934
	2012	1,452,713	1.478.246	878.217	340.569	241.622	17.838
	2013	1.504.772	1.527.225	895.315	352,816	254,469	24.625
CoG		1,913,927	1.921.125	1.122.008	451.049	313,909	34,158
	2013	1 913 927	1 921 125	1 122 008	451 049	313 909	34 158
AdG	2010	2.344.595	2.401.905	1.381.491	587,286	393.657	39,443
Auo	2008	2 253 186	2 298 503	1 271 300	619 935	368 593	38 675
	2009	2,200,100	2,200,000	1 301 214	626 408	381 077	35 120
	2010	2 342 993	2 400 486	1 421 751	543 708	386 119	48 908
	2010	2 383 480	2,400,400	1 410 011	595 280	399 249	33 120
	2012	2,356,530	2,444,776	1 446 848	552 585	411 083	33 361
	2012	2,000,000	2,444,770	1 /17 220	502,000	411,505	48 220
SUC	2013	2,410,079	2,400,340	6 679 460	3 460 002	409,002	40,220
зув	2012	12,025,512	12,245,6/9	0,0/8,109	3,409,093	2,029,454	08,963
	2012	11,477,891	11,477,891	5,953,471	3,585,585	1,907,811	31,025
	2013	12,488,883	12,895,345	7,291,375	3,370,522	2,132,382	101,065
POC	00.11	146,834	149,921	81,307	39,091	8,251	21,272
	2011	146,552	152,442	79,570	42,944	8,104	21,824
	2012	146,488	150,367	81,536	37,821	8,270	22,740
	2013	147,357	147,602	82,425	37,296	8,344	19,536

Table A5.02: Average project cost breakdown in evaluated and funded proposals by domain and scheme

		REQUESTED	τοται	PERSONNEL	OTHER DIRECT	INDIRECT	SUBCONTRACT
		EVALUATED	IUIAL	TEROORALE	OTTIER DIREOT	INDIALOT	00000HINAO1
LS	StG	1.358.305	1.395.198	733.255	421.325	216.502	24.114
	CoG	1,883,091	1,902,014	1,017,057	536,846	304,238	42,988
	AdG	2,325,650	2,485,523	1,275,081	729,573	385,967	93,813
PE	StG	1,288,382	1,313,151	784,256	305,366	209,391	14,424
	CoG	1,777,162	1,790,905	1,095,488	381,149	292,651	21,143
	AdG	2,181,709	2,229,883	1,332,865	502,363	360,023	35,002
SH	StG	1,134,359	1,159,611	778,733	171,663	181,026	28,171
	CoG	1,600,976	1,604,857	1,087,207	220,437	257,356	39,857
	AdG	1,919,775	2,084,381	1,279,155	295,929	455,054	53,821
		FUNDED					
LS	StG	1,545,069	1,592,950	840,644	478,529	254,304	19,467
	CoG	2,024,606	2,034,571	1,054,341	602,380	329,445	48,404
	AdG	2,487,646	2,599,281	1,322,243	791,170	428,924	56,945
PE	StG	1,431,800	1,460,076	881,300	330,413	237,379	10,984
	CoG	1,881,634	1,889,615	1,149,822	410,688	312,090	17,014
	AdG	2,326,010	2,355,919	1,421,927	525,943	384,405	23,579
SH	StG	1,278,655	1,295,012	875,357	186,011	207,816	26,203
	CoG	1,778,027	1,778,084	1,186,080	256,300	288,442	47,262
	AdG	2,102,267	2,117,984	1,400,692	328,314	345,492	43,486



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

.

.

•

• • •



Table A6.01: Applican	t success rates by	gender, evaluation	panel and funding	scheme
-----------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-------------------	--------

Table Applicant success rates by gender, evaluation panel and funding scheme StG CoG AdG Female Male Total Female Male LS01 6.90% 10.70% 9.50% 6.70% 10.40% 9.30% 19.20% 14.30% LS02 5.30% 10.80% 9.30% 10.20% 9.70% 18.70% 18.60% LS03 8.00% 9.40% 8.90% 2.80% 13.30% 9.90% 12.70% 18.60% LS04 6.40% 13.20% 10.50% 2.00% 14.60% 10.00% 14.60% LS06 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.00% 9.90% 10.00% 18.40% LS06 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 3.50% 14.90% LS08 7.30% 10.20% 9.30% 5.60% 12.10% 9.60%	Table A6.01:								
Remain Male Total Female Male Total Female Male LS01 6.90% 10.70% 9.50% 6.70% 10.40% 9.30% 19.20% 14.30% LS02 5.30% 10.80% 9.30% 8.30% 10.20% 9.70% 18.70% 15.60% LS03 8.00% 9.40% 8.80% 2.80% 13.30% 9.90% 12.70% 18.60% LS04 6.40% 13.20% 10.50% 2.00% 14.60% 10.40% 13.20% 14.60% LS05 6.30% 10.30% 9.00% 2.10% 14.60% 10.40% 13.20% 14.60% LS05 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.00% 9.90% 11.60% 14.90% LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 9.60% 3.60% 14.90% LS08 7.30% 10.00% 8.30% 8.60% 3.60% 14.90% LS09 5.40%		Applicant success rat	es by gender, eva	aluation panel and	a funding scheme				
LS01 6.90% 10.70% 9.90% 6.70% 10.40% 9.30% 14.30% LS02 5.30% 10.80% 9.30% 8.30% 10.20% 9.70% 18.70% 15.60% LS03 8.00% 9.40% 8.80% 2.80% 13.30% 9.90% 12.70% 18.00% LS04 6.40% 13.20% 10.50% 2.00% 14.60% 10.00% 14.60% LS05 6.30% 10.30% 9.00% 2.10% 14.20% 10.40% 13.20% 14.50% LS06 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.20% 9.90% 10.00% 18.10% LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 9.50% 15.80% 14.90% LS08 7.30% 10.20% 9.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS08 7.30% 10.00% 8.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.00% 14.90% PE01		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male
LS025.30%10.80%9.30%8.30%10.20%9.70%18.70%15.60%LS038.00%9.40%8.90%2.80%13.30%9.90%12.70%18.00%LS046.40%13.20%10.50%2.00%14.60%10.00%14.60%14.00%LS056.30%10.80%9.00%2.10%14.20%10.40%13.20%14.50%LS066.30%10.80%9.20%7.10%12.00%9.90%10.00%18.10%LS076.00%8.70%7.60%10.40%8.80%9.50%15.80%14.90%LS087.30%10.20%9.30%5.10%12.40%10.30%9.90%17.00%LS095.40%10.00%8.30%5.60%12.10%9.60%3.50%14.90%PE0110.30%11.90%11.60%4.20%10.30%9.60%13.60%14.90%PE028.20%10.70%10.30%5.30%9.40%8.70%11.10%15.50%PE036.80%8.30%8.10%8.80%8.80%13.60%14.40%PE0410.00%8.90%9.80%7.40%8.80%13.60%14.40%PE055.80%11.20%9.80%9.70%8.80%18.30%12.50%PE067.70%8.80%8.80%3.40%9.70%8.80%18.30%12.50%PE0611.00%7.90%6.60%5.30%8.80%8.80%13.20%14.30%PE06 <td>LS01</td> <td>6.90%</td> <td>10.70%</td> <td>9.50%</td> <td>6.70%</td> <td>10.40%</td> <td>9.30%</td> <td>19.20%</td> <td>14.30</td>	LS01	6.90%	10.70%	9.50%	6.70%	10.40%	9.30%	19.20%	14.30
LS038.00%9.40%8.90%2.80%13.30%9.90%12.70%18.00LS046.40%13.20%10.50%2.00%14.60%10.00%14.60%14.00%LS056.30%10.30%9.00%2.10%14.20%10.40%13.20%14.50%LS066.30%10.80%9.20%7.10%12.00%9.90%10.00%18.10%LS066.30%10.80%9.20%7.10%12.40%10.30%9.90%11.00%LS087.30%10.20%9.30%5.10%12.40%10.30%9.90%14.90%LS095.40%10.00%8.30%5.60%12.10%9.60%3.50%14.90%PE0110.30%11.90%11.60%4.20%10.30%9.20%17.00%PE028.20%10.70%10.30%5.30%9.40%8.70%11.10%15.50%PE036.80%8.30%8.10%8.30%8.90%8.80%13.60%14.40%PE0410.00%8.90%9.80%9.80%7.40%8.00%10.70%14.50%PE055.80%11.20%9.80%3.40%9.70%8.80%18.30%12.50%PE067.70%8.80%8.60%3.40%9.70%8.80%18.30%12.50%PE0711.60%7.20%7.80%7.10%7.70%4.20%13.20%PE0811.10%7.80%7.00%8.80%13.20%13.20%PE0911.10%	LS02	5.30%	10.80%	9.30%	8.30%	10.20%	9.70%	18.70%	15.60
LS046.40%13.20%10.50%2.00%14.60%10.00%14.60%14.00%LS056.30%10.30%9.00%2.10%14.20%10.40%13.20%14.50%LS066.30%10.80%9.20%7.10%12.00%9.90%10.00%18.10%LS076.00%8.70%7.60%10.40%8.60%9.50%15.80%14.90%LS087.30%10.20%9.30%5.10%12.40%10.30%9.90%14.60%LS095.40%10.00%8.30%5.60%12.10%9.60%3.50%14.90%PE0110.30%11.90%11.60%4.20%10.30%9.20%10.50%17.00%PE028.20%10.70%10.30%5.30%9.40%8.70%11.10%15.50%PE036.80%8.30%8.10%8.30%8.80%8.80%13.60%14.30%PE0410.00%8.90%9.20%14.30%6.30%8.80%10.70%14.50%PE055.80%11.20%9.80%3.40%9.70%8.80%13.60%14.30%PE067.70%8.80%8.60%3.40%9.70%8.80%13.60%13.20%PE0711.60%7.20%7.80%7.10%7.80%7.70%8.80%13.20%PE0811.10%7.90%8.80%3.40%9.70%8.80%13.20%PE0911.10%7.90%8.80%3.10%11.20%13.20%PE09	LS03	8.00%	9.40%	8.90%	2.80%	13.30%	9.90%	12.70%	18.00
LS05 6.30% 10.30% 9.00% 2.10% 14.20% 10.40% 13.20% 14.50% LS06 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.00% 9.90% 10.00% 18.10% LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 9.50% 15.80% 14.90% LS08 7.30% 10.00% 8.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS09 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.10% 12.10% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% LS09 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.10% 12.10% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% LS09 5.40% 11.00% 11.60% 4.20% 10.30% 9.20% 11.50% 9.70% 11.00% 15.50% PE01 10.30% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.80% 13.60% 14.40% PE02 8.60% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.80% 13.60% 14.40%<	LS04	6.40%	13.20%	10.50%	2.00%	14.60%	10.00%	14.60%	14.00%
LS66 6.30% 10.80% 9.20% 7.10% 12.00% 9.90% 10.00% 18.10% LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 9.50% 15.80% 14.90% LS08 7.30% 10.20% 9.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS08 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS08 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.10% 12.0% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% LS08 5.40% 11.90% 11.60% 4.20% 9.60% 3.50% 11.00% 9.60% 11.00% 9.60% 11.00% 9.60% 11.00% 9.60% 14.40% 9.60% 13.60% 14.40% 9.60% 14.40% 9.60% 14.40% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60% 14.60% 9.60%	LS05	6.30%	10.30%	9.00%	2.10%	14.20%	10.40%	13.20%	14.50
LS07 6.00% 8.70% 7.60% 10.40% 8.60% 9.50% 15.80% 14.90 LS08 7.30% 10.20% 9.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00% LS09 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.60% 12.10% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% PE01 10.30% 11.90% 11.60% 4.20% 10.30% 9.20% 10.50% 11.90% 14.90% PE02 8.20% 10.70% 10.30% 5.60% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 15.50% PE03 6.80% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.90% 8.80% 14.40% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 8.90% 8.80% 14.40% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 8.20% 8.60% 14.40% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06	LS06	6.30%	10.80%	9.20%	7.10%	12.00%	9.90%	10.00%	18.10
LS08 7.30% 10.20% 9.30% 5.10% 12.40% 10.30% 9.90% 17.00 LS09 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.60% 12.10% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% PE01 10.30% 11.90% 11.60% 4.20% 10.30% 9.20% 10.50% 17.00% PE02 8.20% 10.70% 10.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 17.00% PE03 6.80% 10.70% 10.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 11.60% PE04 10.00% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.80% 8.80% 14.30% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.20% 14.30% 8.30% 8.20% 10.70% 14.30% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 7.40% 8.80% 10.80% 12.50% PE05 11.10% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.20% PE05	LS07	6.00%	8.70%	7.60%	10.40%	8.60%	9.50%	15.80%	14.90
LS09 5.40% 10.00% 8.30% 5.60% 12.10% 9.60% 3.50% 14.90% PE01 10.30% 11.90% 11.60% 4.20% 10.30% 9.20% 10.50% 17.00% PE02 8.20% 10.70% 10.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 15.50% PE03 6.80% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.80% 3.60% 14.30% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.20% 16.60% 14.40% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 10.20% 11.60% 12.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 18.30% 13.20% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30%	LS08	7.30%	10.20%	9.30%	5.10%	12.40%	10.30%	9.90%	17.00
PE01 10.30% 11.90% 11.60% 4.20% 10.30% 9.20% 10.50% 17.00 PE02 8.20% 10.70% 10.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 15.50% PE03 6.80% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.90% 8.80% 13.60% 14.30% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.80% 13.60% 14.40% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 7.40% 8.00% 11.50% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 8.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.60% 13.80% PE09 11.10% 7.20% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 13.20% PE09 11.70%	LS09	5.40%	10.00%	8.30%	5.60%	12.10%	9.60%	3.50%	14.90
PE02 8.20% 10.70% 10.30% 5.30% 9.40% 8.70% 11.10% 15.50% PE03 6.80% 8.30% 8.10% 8.30% 8.90% 8.80% 13.60% 14.30% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.80% 8.80% 13.60% 14.40% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 6.30% 8.20% 8.60% 14.40% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 10.30% 12.50% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.60% 8.70% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 13.20% PE09 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 13.20% PE10	PE01	10.30%	11.90%	11.60%	4.20%	10.30%	9.20%	10.50%	17.00
PE03 6.80% 8.30% 8.10% 8.80% 8.90% 8.80% 11.30% 14.30% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.20% 8.80% 11.30% 14.30% PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.20% 8.80% 11.40% PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 11.20% 9.80% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 10.70% 14.50% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.70% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.80% 5.30% 8.80% 8.80% 13.80% PE09 11.70% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.60% 6.40% 6.40% 6.40%	PE02	8.20%	10.70%	10.30%	5.30%	9.40%	8.70%	11.10%	15.50
PE04 10.00% 8.90% 9.20% 14.30% 6.30% 8.20% 8.60% 14.40 PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 18.30% 12.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE07 11.10% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 13.20% PE09 11.70% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.00% 14.30% SH01 5.50% 7.40% 6.50% 11.40% 12.40% 13.20% 13.20% 13.20%	PE03	6.80%	8.30%	8.10%	8.30%	8.90%	8.80%	13.60%	14.30
PE05 5.80% 11.20% 9.80% 9.80% 7.40% 8.00% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 10.70% 14.50% PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 18.30% 12.50% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 18.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 13.20% PE09 11.70% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.40% 14.30% SH01 5.00% 14.00% 14.00% 14.30% 14.30% 14.30% SH02 9.10% 7.40% 6.50% <	PE04	10.00%	8.90%	9.20%	14.30%	6.30%	8.20%	8.60%	14.40
PE06 7.70% 8.80% 8.60% 3.40% 9.70% 8.80% 18.30% 12.50% PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 18.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 14.20% 13.20% PE09 11.70% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 4.00% 14.30% 14.30% SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 11.40% 12.40% 4.00% 14.30%	PE05	5.80%	11.20%	9.80%	9.80%	7.40%	8.00%	10.70%	14.50
PE07 11.60% 7.20% 7.80% 7.10% 7.80% 7.70% 4.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 18.20% 13.80% PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 18.20% 13.20% PE09 11.10% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.40% 14.30% SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 11.40% 12.40% 4.00% 14.30% SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.60% 6.40% 6.50% 7.50%	PE06	7.70%	8.80%	8.60%	3.40%	9.70%	8.80%	18.30%	12.50
PE08 11.10% 7.90% 8.60% 5.30% 8.80% 8.10% 18.20% 13.20° PE09 11.10% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50° PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.00% 14.30% SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 15.80% 11.40% 12.40% 4.20% 13.20° SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.50% 6.40% 6.40% 4.20% 13.20° SH03 6.60% 10.40% 9.10% 7.40% 6.50% 6.40% 4.20% <td>PE07</td> <td>11.60%</td> <td>7.20%</td> <td>7.80%</td> <td>7.10%</td> <td>7.80%</td> <td>7.70%</td> <td>4.20%</td> <td>13.80</td>	PE07	11.60%	7.20%	7.80%	7.10%	7.80%	7.70%	4.20%	13.80
PE09 11.70% 9.40% 9.90% 11.10% 7.50% 8.20% 14.30% 12.50% PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.00% 14.30% SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 15.80% 11.40% 12.40% 4.20% 13.20% SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.60% 6.40% 6.40% 10.10% 9.50% SH03 6.60% 10.60% 9.10% 7.40% 7.50% 7.50% 12.20% 10.50% SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.60% 12.40% 11.40% SH04 6.60% 3.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30%	PE08	11.10%	7.90%	8.60%	5.30%	8.80%	8.10%	18.20%	13.20
PE10 9.50% 6.50% 7.40% 6.70% 9.00% 8.40% 8.00% 14.30 SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 15.80% 11.40% 12.40% 4.20% 13.20% SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.60% 6.40% 10.10% 9.50% SH03 6.60% 10.40% 9.10% 7.40% 7.50% 7.50% 12.20% 10.50% SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.70% 9.50% 11.40% SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30%	PE09	11.70%	9.40%	9.90%	11.10%	7.50%	8.20%	14.30%	12.50
SH01 5.00% 12.60% 10.20% 15.80% 11.40% 12.40% 4.20% 13.20% SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.50% 6.40% 6.40% 10.10% 9.50% SH03 6.90% 10.40% 9.10% 7.40% 7.50% 7.50% 12.20% 10.50% SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.70% 9.50% 11.40% SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30%	PE10	9.50%	6.50%	7.40%	6.70%	9.00%	8.40%	8.00%	14.30
SH02 9.10% 7.70% 8.30% 6.50% 6.40% 6.40% 10.10% 9.50 SH03 6.90% 10.40% 9.10% 7.40% 7.50% 7.50% 12.20% 10.50 SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.70% 9.50% 11.40 SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30	SH01	5.00%	12.60%	10.20%	15.80%	11.40%	12.40%	4.20%	13.20
SH03 6.90% 10.40% 9.10% 7.40% 7.50% 7.50% 12.20% 10.50 SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.70% 9.50% 11.40 SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30	SH02	9.10%	7.70%	8.30%	6.50%	6.40%	6.40%	10.10%	9.50
SH04 6.60% 10.60% 8.80% 6.30% 7.10% 6.70% 9.50% 11.40 SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30%	SH03	6.90%	10.40%	9.10%	7.40%	7.50%	7.50%	12.20%	10.50
SH05 7.90% 8.20% 8.10% 6.50% 7.00% 6.80% 12.40% 10.30°	SH04	6.60%	10.60%	8.80%	6.30%	7.10%	6.70%	9.50%	11.40
	SH05	7.90%	8.20%	8.10%	6.50%	7.00%	6.80%	12.40%	10.30

Table A6.02: Applicants by nationality

	StG			CoG			AdG			All		
	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR
DE	3,235	392	12.10%	495	48	9.70%	1,352	260	19.20%	5,082	700	13.80%
UK	2,019	227	11.20%	379	31	8.20%	2,049	346	16.90%	4,447	604	13.60%
FR	1,880	271	14.40%	280	33	11.80%	1,057	194	18.40%	3,217	498	15.50%
IT	4,229	221	5.20%	500	46	9.20%	1,597	140	8.80%	6,326	407	6.40%
NL	1,425	173	12.10%	214	27	12.60%	639	136	21.30%	2,278	336	14.70%
IL	737	153	20.80%	92	18	19.60%	642	86	13.40%	1,471	257	17.50%
ES	2,068	134	6.50%	399	16	4.00%	897	71	7.90%	3,364	221	6.60%
BE	882	113	12.80%	125	17	13.60%	364	53	14.60%	1,371	183	13.30%
05	397	50	10.00%	70	5	7.10%	370	69	18.60%	1 244	140	16.70%
SE	044	59	15.00%	95	1	7.40%	405	50	14.30%	1,344	124	9.20%
DK	394	36	9.10%	49	6	12 20%	200	36	18 00%	643	78	12 10%
FI	949	45	4 70%	100	3	3.00%	359	28	7.80%	1 408	76	5 40%
AT	445	32	7 20%	72	5	6.90%	190	32	16.80%	707	69	9.80%
FI	690	38	5.50%	95	5	5.30%	339	23	6.80%	1,124	66	5.90%
PT	456	37	8,10%	86	5	5.80%	104	9	8.70%	646	51	7.90%
HU	403	29	7.20%	64	2	3.10%	126	19	15.10%	593	50	8.40%
IE	324	31	9.60%	53	4	7.50%	109	12	11.00%	486	47	9.70%
NO	213	11	5.20%	29	1	3.40%	134	20	14.90%	376	32	8.50%
CA	133	18	13.50%	20	4	20.00%	61	9	14.80%	214	31	14.50%
PL	527	20	3.80%	38	0	0.00%	252	8	3.20%	817	28	3.40%
RU	313	17	5.40%	29	1	3.40%	98	8	8.20%	440	26	5.90%
AU	101	17	16.80%	16	2	12.50%	37	4	10.80%	154	23	14.90%
CZ	265	14	5.30%	30	1	3.30%	92	4	4.30%	387	19	4.90%
IN TD	157	10	9.60%	14	3	21.40%	10	2	0.30%	107	19	2 20%
IP	78	11	14 10%	16	2	12 50%	16	1	6.30%	110	14	12 70%
HR	73	10	13 70%	9	0	0.00%	33	3	9.10%	115	13	11.30%
RO	466	10	2.10%	26	1	3.80%	122	1	0.80%	614	12	2.00%
CY	93	6	6.50%	10	1	10.00%	32	5	15.60%	135	12	8.90%
CN	201	7	3.50%	10	1	10.00%	8	0	0.00%	219	8	3.70%
AR	40	8	20.00%	5	0	0.00%	14	0	0.00%	59	8	13.60%
BG	152	4	2.60%	11	0	0.00%	80	3	3.80%	243	7	2.90%
UA	79	7	8.90%	11	0	0.00%	16	0	0.00%	106	7	6.60%
NZ	31	3	9.70%	5	0	0.00%	18	3	16.70%	54	6	11.10%
EE	35	4	11.40%	8	0	0.00%	20	1	5.00%	63	5	7.90%
51	144	2	7 10%	10	1	20.00%	/5	2	1.30%	229	4	14 20%
PS	77	3	3 90%	1	0	20.00%	13	2	22.20%	20	4	3 20%
IT	54	3	5.60%	- 3	0	0.00%	14	0	0.00%	71	3	4 20%
MX	34	3	8.80%	4	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	40	3	7.50%
KR	34	2	5.90%	3	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	39	3	7.70%
BY	17	2	11.80%	2	0	0.00%	6	1	16.70%	25	3	12.00%
SG	18	3	16.70%	2	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	22	3	13.60%
SK	107	2	1.90%	11	0	0.00%	23	0	0.00%	141	2	1.40%
IS	32	1	3.10%	5	0	0.00%	18	1	5.60%	55	2	3.60%
BR	43	2	4.70%	6	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%	53	2	3.80%
MA	4	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	1	1	100.00%	/	2	28.60%
	3	2	4 20%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	3	2	2 90%
	20	1	4.30%	0	0	0.00%	5	1	16 70%	20	1	3.80%
MY	14	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	4	0	0.00%	20	1	5.00%
MT	11	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	14	1	7.10%
ZA	8	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	4	1	25.00%	13	1	7.70%
МК	7	1	14.30%	2	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%	12	1	8.30%
TN	10	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	1	100.00%	12	1	8.30%
со	8	1	12.50%	1	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	11	1	9.10%
DZ	7	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	9	1	11.10%
PK	7	1	14.30%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	7	1	14.30%
VE	6	1	16.70%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	6	1	16.70%
GE	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%	4	1	25.00%



.

•

. . . • .

			• •									
		• •	• •									
											_	
Table A6.02:	Applicants by	nationality (c	ontinued)									
	StG			CoG			AdG			All		
	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR
СМ	2	1	50.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%
C	2	1	50.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	1	50.00%
G	11	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	15	0	0.00%
w	11	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	15	0	0.00%
L	9	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	5	0	0.00%	14	0	0.00%
U	11	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	13	0	0.00%
M	10	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	12	0	0.00%
(VI	10	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	11	0	0.00%
	11	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	11	0	0.00%
:	7	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%	10	0	0.00%
,	7	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	9	0	0.00%
c	6	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	7	0	0.00%
	4	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	6	Ő	0.00%
	3	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%	6	0	0.00%
	5	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	5	0	0.00%
	3	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	5	0	0.00%
	5	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	5	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%
	3	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%
	3	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	4	0	0.00%
	3	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	3	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	2	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	2	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	Ő	0.00%	Ő	Ő	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
	1	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	0	0	0.00%	1	0	0.00%
al	25,858	2,332	9.00%	3,604	313	8.70%	12,404	1,709	13.80%	41,866	4,354	10.40%



•

• • •

. . .

											•	•••	•	• •	•	•	•••				
Table	A6.03: Cou	ntry of n	ationali	ty and c	urrent l	nost cou	intry of	ERC S	tarting, (Consoli	dator a	nd Adva	nced g	rantees	(as of 2	21/08/20	14)				
		¥	ш	ę.	¥	Ŧ	F	_	Countr ပ္ပ	y of hos 띴	t institu	ution	¥	π.	9		⊇	ш	F	her	tal
	AR	2	1	2	-	0	_	_	1	.,	ш	1	1	_	2		-	_	-	ð	P
	AT	7	17	2		9			1			32					1				e
	AU	10	3	2	45	1			-	1	400	2	2		2						2
	BG	2	2	1	15	8	2		2	2	128	1	1						1	2	18
	BR	1		1																	
	BY		2	1		-							,								
	CA	14	6	3	4	3 84	1		1	1		2	1					2	1		3
	СМ		J	1		0.			_			-						-			
	CN	2	3		2	1															
	CO	2							1												
	CY	2							2							1				7	1
	CZ	3	2	1		3						3								7	1
	DE	77	450	24	20	59	5	1	10	9	2	39	1		1			1		1	70
	DK DZ	/	2	1		3			1	6			59								(
	EC					1															
	EE	2																		3	
	EL	17	6	3	3	12	1	1	174	2		1				35				1	22
	FI	6	1	'	5	1			1/4	2				56							6
	FR	23	7	417	9	27	2	1	2	3	3		1				1	1		1	49
	GE	0	1																		
	HU	4	4			3			1	2		2					33			3	1
₽	IE	19	2	1	2					1								22		~	4
ona	IL	6	5	2		4	1	237		1								1			25
5	IN	9	1	2	1	2					1	1			2						1
ō	IS										1									1	
ntr	IT	54	19	30	12	30	229		16	3	5	3	1		2			3			40
Col	NB 15	5	2	2	1	1					1	2	1		1						1
	LT	1			'							2	'								
	LU	1	1		1	1															
	LV			2																1	
	MK			2		1															
	MT	1																			
	MX		1	1									1								
	NL	26	13	5	264	5	2	1	4	4	4	3	2	1					1	1	33
	NO			1	107	Ŭ	2		, in the second s	1	Ĺ	1	_		27						3
	NZ	4			1	1															
	PK	1	1	2		1	1	2	2											14	
	PT	6	3	7	1			2	2	1	1	1		1					29	14	5
	RO	2	2	3	2	1	1										1				1
	RS	1		1	-	1			1	2	1	1	1								
	SE	0	4	4	2	3			1	∠ 107	1	3	1	2	2						12
	SG	2	J	_	1							Ŭ		_	_						
	SI	2													1					1	
	SK			1								1								1	
	TR	3		1	2	4			1						1					6	1
	UA	2	2			2			1											Ĵ	
	UK	536	18	13	4	13	2	1	4	2	2	2	3	2				2			60
	US	53	17	13	8	25	3	1	4	3		2	4	2	1			2	1	1	14
	ZA								(1						
	Total	000	64.4	F74																	



• • • • •

. • . .

.

. . . • • • • • • • • • . . . • . • •

			•	•	•	•••	•	•••	•	•											
A6	.04: Coun	trv of re	sidence	e and ci	urrent h	ost cou	ntrv of I	ERC Sta	artina. C	Consolic	lator an	d Advar	nced ar	antees	(as of 2	1/08/201	4)				
		.,					····, ···		Countr	v of hor	tinctitu	tion	3				.,				
						_			Country	y or nos	st institu	luon			-		_			5	-
		ž	DE	Ë	ľ	공	F	2	ES	SE	BE	AT	Ă	Ē	N	Ц	로	ш	Ъ	Othe	Tota
	AR	1																			1
	AT	2			1	1						89					1				94
	AU	1			1			1					1								4
	BE	1	2	4	11	1	1				138	1			1						160
	BG																			2	2
	CA	1			1									1							3
	СН	5	8	1	3	265	1	1	1		1	2	2			1		1			292
	CY																			7	7
	cz	1																		8	9
	DE	17	540	7	10	8	5		2	1	1	7	1	1	1		1		1	1	604
	DK		2										68								70
	EE																			2	2
	EL	2		1		1										31					35
	ES	11	1	1		1	1		217			1									233
	FI	4		1						2				59							66
	FR	4	5	532	2	11	2				1		1						1		559
	HR					1														1	2
	HU	1	1														31			1	34
	IE	3	1															30			34
	IL IN	1	1	2		1		237													242
	IN IT	-	1	0		0	000		0						1						2
	11	5	8	3		6	230		2		1		1								256
	JP			1		1															1
				1																	1
		1																			1
	1.	,																		1	1
	MK					1															1
	NL	11	8	1	317	1	1				4	2	1	1							347
	NO	1	0		1	1					1	_			36						40
	PL		1																	14	15
	РТ			1							1								29		31
	RO		1		1																2
	RU			1																	1
	SE	1	3							149			2								155
	SI																			2	2
	SK											1								1	2
	TR	1				1														6	8
	UK	873	17	6	5	10	4	2	3		2	4	2		1			1	1	4	935
	US	21	14	8	3	11	8	4	8	3		1	1	2	2	4	3	2	1	3	99
	Total	969	614	571	356	322	253	245	233	155	150	108	80	64	42	36	36	34	33	53	4,354



•

• • •

. . · · · · · · · · · ·

		TOTAL	DOMESTIC	% DOMESTIC
		257	237	02 22%
		604	536	88 74%
	SE	124	107	86.20%
	FL	66	56	84.85%
	NO	32	27	84.38%
ŝ	FR	498	417	83.73%
itie	ES	221	174	78.73%
nal	NL	336	264	78.57%
tio	CH	110	84	76.36%
nat	DK	78	59	75.64%
٦ آ	BE	183	128	69.95%
E H	HU	50	33	66.00%
	DE	700	450	64.29%
A.0		51	29	56.27%
5	IE	407	229	20.27%
Ľ.	AT	47	32	46.38%
pu	EL	76	35	46.05%
Са	Other	110	45	40.91%
Ξ	RO	12		0.00%
	LU	4		0.00%
	LT	3		0.00%
	RS	3		0.00%
	MK	1		0.00%
		1		0.00%
	CA	140		
	RU	26		
	AU	23		
	IN	19		
	JP	14		
	AR	8		
	CN	8		
	UA	7		
Se	NZ	6		
I	BT	3		
na	KR	3		
tio	MX	3		
na	BR	3		
RA	CR	2		
Ψ	MA	2		
lon	VE	1		
z	ZA	1		
	CM	1		
	CO	1		
	DZ	1		
	EC	1		
	GE	1		
	IR	1		
	PK	1		
	TN	1		

Table A	5.06: Numb	per of grants by h	nost country and % of	national grants
	TOTAL	NATIONALS	NON-NATIONALS	% NATIONALS
LU	1		1	0.00%
СН	322	84	238	26.09%
AT	108	32	76	29.63%
UK	969	536	433	55.31%
NO	42	27	15	64.29%
IE	34	22	12	64.71%
SE	155	107	48	69.03%
FR	571	417	154	73.03%
DE	614	450	164	73.29%
DK	80	59	21	73.75%
NL	356	264	92	74.16%
ES	233	174	59	74.68%
BE	150	128	22	85.33%
FI	64	56	8	87.50%
PT	33	29	4	87.88%
IT	253	229	24	90.51%
HU	36	33	3	91.67%
IL	245	237	8	96.73%
EL	36	35	1	97.22%
Other	52	45	7	86.54%

Table A6.07:	Proposals	bv	evaluation	panel	and	fundina	scheme
	····poodio	~,	oranaanon	pano			000

	StG			CoG			AdG			Total		
	Evaluated	Funded	SR									
LS01	1,004	95	9.46%	107	10	9.35%	471	71	15.07%	1,582	176	11.13%
LS02	1,101	102	9.26%	134	13	9.70%	395	64	16.20%	1,630	179	10.98%
LS03	1,048	93	8.87%	111	11	9.91%	360	61	16.94%	1,519	165	10.86%
LS04	882	93	10.54%	140	14	10.00%	495	70	14.14%	1,517	177	11.67%
LS05	1,317	118	8.96%	154	16	10.39%	587	84	14.31%	2,058	218	10.59%
LS06	926	85	9.18%	131	13	9.92%	432	71	16.44%	1,489	169	11.35%
LS07	1,335	102	7.64%	158	15	9.49%	617	93	15.07%	2,110	210	9.95%
LS08	915	85	9.29%	136	14	10.29%	441	70	15.87%	1,492	169	11.33%
LS09	775	64	8.26%	94	9	9.57%	333	43	12.91%	1,202	116	9.65%
PE01	1,066	124	11.63%	131	12	9.16%	613	102	16.64%	1,810	238	13.15%
PE02	1,235	127	10.28%	218	19	8.72%	639	97	15.18%	2,092	243	11.62%
PE03	1,433	116	8.09%	181	16	8.84%	583	83	14.24%	2,197	215	9.79%
PE04	1,134	104	9.17%	146	12	8.22%	459	64	13.94%	1,739	180	10.35%
PE05	1,309	128	9.78%	162	13	8.02%	650	92	14.15%	2,121	233	10.99%
PE06	1,534	132	8.60%	194	17	8.76%	525	69	13.14%	2,253	218	9.68%
PE07	881	69	7.83%	104	8	7.69%	400	53	13.25%	1,385	130	9.39%
PE08	1,097	94	8.57%	185	15	8.11%	599	81	13.52%	1,881	190	10.10%
PE09	786	78	9.92%	147	12	8.16%	472	60	12.71%	1,405	150	10.68%
PE10	1,068	79	7.40%	178	15	8.43%	503	69	13.72%	1,749	163	9.32%
SH01	748	76	10.16%	89	11	12.36%	423	56	13.24%	1,260	143	11.35%
SH02	1,331	111	8.34%	187	12	6.42%	623	60	9.63%	2,141	183	8.55%
SH03	453	41	9.05%	80	6	7.50%	231	25	10.82%	764	72	9.42%
SH04	1,233	109	8.84%	178	12	6.74%	642	70	10.90%	2,053	191	9.30%
SH05	534	43	8.05%	133	9	6.77%	345	38	11.01%	1,012	90	8.89%
SH06	713	64	8 98%	126	9	7 14%	566	63	11 13%	1 405	136	9.68%



• • • • • • •

M. M. <thm.< th=""> M. M. M.<!--</th--><th></th><th>HOST INSTITUTION</th><th>StG</th><th></th><th></th><th>900 000</th><th></th><th></th><th>AdG</th><th></th><th></th><th>Total</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></thm.<>		HOST INSTITUTION	StG			900 000			AdG			Total			
And way			EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	
No. State Sta	£	FRENCH NATIONAL CENTRE FOR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH (CNRS)	874	120	13.70%	133	14	10.50%	431	66	15.30%	1438	200	13.90%	
Notesting Notesting <t< td=""><td>ш</td><td>MAX PLANCK SOCIETY</td><td>436</td><td>75</td><td>17.20%</td><td>46</td><td>9</td><td>13.00%</td><td>128</td><td>47</td><td>36.70%</td><td>610</td><td>128</td><td>21.00%</td><td></td></t<>	ш	MAX PLANCK SOCIETY	436	75	17.20%	46	9	13.00%	128	47	36.70%	610	128	21.00%	
1 1 <td>¥</td> <td>UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE</td> <td>275</td> <td>70</td> <td>25.50%</td> <td>37</td> <td>7</td> <td>18.90%</td> <td>192</td> <td>49</td> <td>25.50%</td> <td>504</td> <td>126</td> <td>25.00%</td> <td></td>	¥	UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE	275	70	25.50%	37	7	18.90%	192	49	25.50%	504	126	25.00%	
Mergensity model Constrained (marking) Constrained (marking) <thc< td=""><td>×</td><td>UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD</td><td>310</td><td>56</td><td>18.10%</td><td>59</td><td>თ</td><td>15.30%</td><td>212</td><td>54</td><td>25.50%</td><td>581</td><td>119</td><td>20.50%</td><td></td></thc<>	×	UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD	310	56	18.10%	59	თ	15.30%	212	54	25.50%	581	119	20.50%	
Test Standard 10 <td>~</td> <td>UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON</td> <td>261</td> <td>48</td> <td>18.40%</td> <td>69</td> <td>ъ.</td> <td>13.00%</td> <td>159</td> <td>29</td> <td>18.20%</td> <td>489</td> <td>86</td> <td>17.60%</td> <td></td>	~	UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON	261	48	18.40%	69	ъ.	13.00%	159	29	18.20%	489	86	17.60%	
merestationalizati a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	т	SWISS FEDERAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ZURICH (ETHZ)	134	33	24.60%	16	4	25.00%	122	89	39.30%	272	85	31.30%	
mean mean <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>40 40</td><td>1 4 J</td><td>43.60%</td><td>/L</td><td>0.0</td><td>58.8U%</td><td>91.1</td><td>17</td><td>23.30%</td><td>221</td><td>10</td><td>34.40%</td><td>•</td></th<>			40 40	1 4 J	43.60%	/L	0.0	58.8U%	91.1	17	23.30%	221	10	34.40%	•
Exercise Cut California 20	F			00	%00°.70	0,8	N	15.000%	871	000	%06.12	107	0,1	30.3U%	
Sector Mindle RESCHOOL 201 2			671	4 c	32.00%	0 0	n 0	%00.CI	140	000	20.10%	234	<u></u>	%07.CZ	•
Exerction for constraints 25 <td></td> <td></td> <td>208</td> <td>32</td> <td>%04.GL</td> <td>2</td> <td>N</td> <td>9.10%</td> <td>671</td> <td>77</td> <td>×06.02</td> <td>905</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>%00.71</td> <td></td>			208	32	%04.GL	2	N	9.10%	671	77	×06.02	905	1.0	%00.71	
Transmission T	~	FRENCH NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH (INSERM)	177	32	14.50%	88	χ	24.20%	119	9 I G	16.00%	3/3	59	15.80%	•
Marcel volte Marcel volte<	0	SPANSH NAIJONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CSIC)	442	25	5.70%	88	Ω.	5.70%	235	15	6.40%	765	45	5.90%	
Operation Operation <t< td=""><td></td><td>UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN</td><td>253</td><td>25</td><td>9.90%</td><td>28</td><td>5</td><td>17.90%</td><td>104</td><td>15</td><td>14.40%</td><td>385</td><td>45</td><td>11.70%</td><td>•</td></t<>		UNIVERSITY OF LEUVEN	253	25	9.90%	28	5	17.90%	104	15	14.40%	385	45	11.70%	•
Constraint Constra	~	UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH	173	20	11.60%	25	m 1	12.00%	74	20	27.00%	272	43	15.80%	
Rescalation	~	UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	132	17	12.90%	25	e	12.00%	95	22	23.20%	252	42	16.70%	•
Mandel Norm Mand	~	FRENCH ALTERNATIVE ENERGIES AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (CEA)	119	30	25.20%	19	0	10.50%	52	o	17.30%	190	4	21.60%	
Constraint Constra	Ĩ	UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM	127	9	14.20%	27	en 1	11.10%	71	17	23.90%	225	æ	16.90%	•
Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction Instruction			115	15	13.00%	11	0	0.00%	4	53	31.10%	200	89	19.00%	
Increation watering Markering Markering <td>Ĩ</td> <td>RAUBOUD UNIVERSITY NUMEGEN</td> <td>501 104</td> <td>77</td> <td>14.40%</td> <td>7 ¢</td> <td>4 C</td> <td>10.40%</td> <td>40</td> <td>= 4</td> <td>23.90%</td> <td>677</td> <td>10</td> <td>10.40%</td> <td>•</td>	Ĩ	RAUBOUD UNIVERSITY NUMEGEN	501 104	77	14.40%	7 ¢	4 C	10.40%	40	= 4	23.90%	677	10	10.40%	•
University Ansatz University Ans			133	23	17 30%	2	NC	%00.11	114	<u>ς</u> α	2000%	201	58	10.00 %	
Unrestritt Unrestritt 0000 000	-	INIVERSITY OF ZURICH	68	15	16.90%	, (4 03	25 00%	83	о С	18 10%	184	3 8	17 90%	•
NUMERSINY AMETERIAM 22 2		UTRECHT UNVERSITY	167	2 2	10.80%	23		8.70%	84	<u>, 6</u>	15.50%	274	33	12.00%	•
Reconstructure instruction Constructure construction Construction Construction <td></td> <td>VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM</td> <td>162</td> <td>18</td> <td>11.10%</td> <td>16</td> <td></td> <td>12.50%</td> <td>58</td> <td>12</td> <td>20.70%</td> <td>236</td> <td>32</td> <td>13.60%</td> <td></td>		VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM	162	18	11.10%	16		12.50%	58	12	20.70%	236	32	13.60%	
NETRUTE SCH ACHAN COMPUTER SCHERE AND AUTOWARD CONTROL 8 1 1 2 200% 47 3 200% 47 13 200% 47 13 200% NETRUTE SCHERE AND AUTOWARD CONTROL 8 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 1 1</th1<>		KAROLINSKA INSTITUTE	212	18	8.50%	19	2	10.50%	67	7	16.40%	298	31	10.40%	•
TEWIUTE/ER RESCAPENT CONTROL 18 18 10 2005 11 10 2005 12 2105 210 20 2005 TEWIUTE/ER RESCAPENT CONTROL 18 10 2005 11 10 2005 21 20 20 2005 TEWIUTE/ER RESCAPENT 11 2005 12 10 2005 12 10 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 11 2005 12 2005 20 2005 20 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 11 2005 20 2005 20 2005 20 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 10 10 2005 10 2005 20 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 10 10 2005 10 2005 10 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 10 2005 10 2005 10 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 10 2005 20 2005 20 2005 20 2005 REST ONDER 10 2005 20 2005 20 2005 20 2005 <		UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA	85	10	11.80%	7	e	42.90%	49	18	36.70%	141	31	22.00%	
TRUENTOME 10 <td></td> <td>INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND AUTOMATIC CONTROL</td> <td>88</td> <td>18</td> <td>20.50%</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>%00.0</td> <td>52</td> <td>12</td> <td>23.10%</td> <td>151</td> <td>30</td> <td>19.90%</td> <td></td>		INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND AUTOMATIC CONTROL	88	18	20.50%	1	0	%00.0	52	12	23.10%	151	30	19.90%	
Mintensity Exercision Constraint Constraint		TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY	140	15	10.70%	12	~	8.30%	133	,	10.50%	285	8	10.50%	
Rives Outlease Environment Environmen		UNIVERSITY OF HELSINK	240	16	6.70%	32	0	0.00%	123	4	11.40%	395	8	7.60%	
And Construction 211 1 0 0 1 0<		KING'S COLLEGE LONDON	118	17	11.80%	52	0	0.00%	43	× ×	18.60%	186	67	15.60%	
Technology Technology <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>/ /</td> <td>%05.GL</td> <td><u>0</u></td> <td>N</td> <td>13.30%</td> <td>47</td> <td>، ر</td> <td>21.40%</td> <td>108</td> <td>87 87</td> <td>0.0%0</td> <td></td>				/ /	%05.GL	<u>0</u>	N	13.30%	47	، ر	21.40%	108	87 87	0.0%0	
TCONNOL		UNIVERSITT OF COFENITAGEN HEI MHOT 72 ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN RESEARCH CENTRES	133	4 7	12 80%	24	n a	14 30%	00	= v	%0001	203	25	0.00.70	
UNCESSITY OF REFIREID 10 61 1 4.00% 17 15 16 16 17 15 16 160 23 23 200% UNCESSITY UNCESSITY 17 10 160 1 17.0% 16 14 40% UND UNCESSITY 17 17 10 160 1 17.0% 16 14 10% UND UNCESSITY 17 15 7 200% 17 17 16 16 14 10% UND UNCESSITY 17 15 7 200% 17 17 10% 17 10% 16 14 10% UND EXERTER 17 16 17 17 200% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 17 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11		TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH	94	13	13.80%	12	0 0	16.70%	64	, 6	25.00%	146	25	17.10%	
UPEXALUNIVERSITY ARPHUS UNIVERSITY ARPHUS UNIVERSITY STATE 17 167 14 84.0% 22 1 156.0% 253 25 24 45.0% ARPHUS UNIVERSITY ARPHUS UNIVERSITY STATE 17 17 167 17 167 155 14 45.0% ARPHUS UNIVERSITY FIXTE 27 1 120% 17 17 165 255 24 45.0% ARSTELRIS 27 1 200% 66 1 17.7% 255 24 34.0% ANSTELRI INSTITUT 28 1 17.4% 19 2 10.00% 17 2 13.0% UNIVERSITY OF ERADING 14 30.0% 19 2 10.00% 17 2 13.0% UNIVERSITY OF ERADING 14 30.0% 14 1 7.1% 17 2 13.0% UNIVERSITY OF ERADING 1 30.0% 13 3 30.0% 17 1 13.0% UNIVERSITY OF EXAND 28 1 17.0% 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 UNIVERSITY OF EXAND 28 1 3 30.0% 13 3 3 1 1 1 UN		UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD	105	6	8.60%	1	-	9.10%	77	15	19.50%	193	25	13.00%	
ARHUST ARHUST INDUNIVERSITY ARHUST INDUNIVERSITY I I 2006 I 4 I 450% I 55 I 4 I 50% I 55 I 4 I 50% I 55 I 4 I 50% I 55 I 1 100% I 75 I 100% I 100% I		UPPSALA UNIVERSITY	167	14	8.40%	22	-	4.50%	64	10	15.60%	253	25	9.90%	
Martensity Pastensity Astrentistic Bastensity Diversity of excitter UNUERSITY of EACITER UNUERSITY OF EACITER UNUERSIT		AARHUS UNIVERSITY	98	11	11.20%	14	-	7.10%	53	12	22.60%	165	24	14.50%	
WINERSIN OF EXERT Matching		LUND UNIVERSITY	172	12	2.00%	17		5.90%	66	; ⇒	16.70%	255	24	9.40%	
UNVERSITY OF EACH 1 </td <td></td> <td>PASIEUK INSTITUTE</td> <td>29</td> <td>4 r</td> <td>48.30%</td> <td>Ω Υ</td> <td>- 0</td> <td>20.00%</td> <td>35</td> <td>1 1</td> <td>25.70%</td> <td>69</td> <td>24</td> <td>34.80%</td> <td></td>		PASIEUK INSTITUTE	29	4 r	48.30%	Ω Υ	- 0	20.00%	35	1 1	25.70%	69	24	34.80%	
UNVERSITY OF ILEDS 1 710% 17 1 1 100% 17 2 100% 17 UNVERSITY OF ILEDS 0 000% 87 1 200% 29 203% UNVERSITY OF MACHERIER 0 000% 87 1 200% 29 203% UNVERSITY OF MACHERIER 13 980% 20 000% 80 1 500% 29 22 300% UNVERSITY OF MACHERIER 13 10 70% 14 0 000% 80 17 16 100% UNVERSITY OF MACHERIER 10 100% 14 0 100% 80 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 100% 12 22 290% 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 21 21 20 21 21 20 21 21 20 <td></td> <td>UNIVERSITY OF CRONINCEN</td> <td>00</td> <td>5 FC</td> <td>11.40%</td> <td><u>, d</u></td> <td>V •</td> <td>10.50%</td> <td>5 5</td> <td>- 0</td> <td>11 00%</td> <td>0/1</td> <td>47 7</td> <td>13.10%</td> <td></td>		UNIVERSITY OF CRONINCEN	00	5 FC	11.40%	<u>, d</u>	V •	10.50%	5 5	- 0	11 00%	0/1	47 7	13.10%	
FLANDERS INSTITUTE FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY (MB) 73 74 73 73 70 70 <td></td> <td></td> <td>122</td> <td>- CF</td> <td>8 20%</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td>7 10%</td> <td>22</td> <td>4 (</td> <td>16.90%</td> <td>213</td> <td>24</td> <td>11.30%</td> <td></td>			122	- CF	8 20%	5		7 10%	22	4 (16.90%	213	24	11.30%	
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY OF MARCH LINER ISTURE UNIVERSITY OF MARCH UNIVERSITY OF MARCH ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) ITALIAN		EI ANDERSI INSTITUTE FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY (VIB)	43	5 (30.20%	: ¢	- cr.	25.00%	. 02		30.00%	75		29.30%	
UNIVERSITY OF COSLO UNIVERSITY OF COSLO 131 10 750% 18 0 0.00% 80 12 15.00% 229 22 9.60% UNIVERSITY OF NAMICK 29 10 0.20% 13 2 4.60% 62 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF NAMICK 29 10 0.20% 14 4 2.60% 62 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF NAMICK 29 10 0.20% 13 2 4.60% 67 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF NAMICK 29 10 0.20% 10 3 3.00% 16 17 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF NAMICK 29 16 10 2.0% 10 3 3.00% 17 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF HEDELBERG 3 16 10 2 1 4.00% 17 21 17.30% UNIVERSITY OF HEDELBERG 3 10 4 3.10% 21 4.00% 17 21 17.30% ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCLI (CNR) 3 16 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 17 21 17.30% ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCLI (CNR) 3 3		UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER	132	<u>5</u>	9.80%	20	0	0.00%	87	00	10.30%	239	52	9.20%	
UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK 50 6 16 00% 12 23 13.00% 18 26.70% 50 8 16.00% 12 23 33.00% 18 26.70% 50 10 22.00% 17 20 21 33.30% 101 75.00% 15 2.0% 17 21 17.30% 15 2.0% 17 21 17.30% 15 2.0% 17 21 17.30% 15 2.0% 16 22.0% 17 21 17.30% 15 1.0% 107 14 3.70% 45 20 4.00% 117 LIAIN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 56 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 45 20 4.00% 17 LIAIN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 56 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 45 20 4.00% 107 4 0.0% 107 10 100% 100 10.0% 100 100% 100 100% 100 100% 100 100% 100 100		UNIVERSITY OF OSLO	131	10	7.60%	18	0	%00.0	80	12	15.00%	229	22	9.60%	
CURE RINTIONE 20 11 3700% 3 2 66.70% 30 62 21 33.300% UNURESITY OF FABELLERG 73 12 8 19.50% 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 31.30% UNIVESITY OF FABELLERG 73 12 14 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 2 1		UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	98	10	10.20%	14	4	28.60%	50	80	16.00%	162	22	13.60%	
UNIVERSITY OF IBASEL 10 3 30.00% 16 10 62.56% 67 21 31.30% UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG 73 12 16.40% 11 1 91.0% 33 8 24.20% 117 21 17.90% UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG 0 4.00% 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 455 20 4.00% TALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 455 20 4.00% TALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 455 20 4.00% TALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 4.00% 4.00%		CURIE INSTITUTE	29	11	37.90%	m	2	66.70%	30	∞	26.70%	62	21	33.90%	
UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG 73 12 16.40% 11 17 21 17.90% ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 495 20 4.00% ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 495 20 4.00%		UNIVERSITY OF BASEL	41	ø	19.50%	10	e	30.00%	16	10	62.50%	67	21	31.30%	
ITALIAIN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR) 363 15 4.10% 25 1 4.00% 107 4 3.70% 495 20 4.00%		UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG	73	12	16.40%	7	-	9.10%	33	ø	24.20%	117	21	17.90%	
		ITALIAN NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (CNR)	363	15	4.10%	25	-	4.00%	107	4	3.70%	495	20	4.00%	

Table A7.01: Submitted and selected proposals in top-100 host institutions at application stage by funding scheme (StG, CoG and AdG)

. ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

91

Sector best interactions are poly lucting service (E.G. Code and AG) (certification Sec. Code Texp Texp <th>Operation and pyromalizations Sec. Cond. Fund. Res Mod. Fund. Res Mod. Fund. Fund.</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>l</th> <th></th> <th>l</th> <th>l</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Operation and pyromalizations Sec. Cond. Fund. Res Mod. Fund. Res Mod. Fund.				l		l	l						
ORTINITION Sol TAD Sol TAD Sol TAD Sol TAD Sol	ORTINITION State Total State State Total	op-100 host institutions at application stage by funding scheme (S	tG, CoG and AdG) (continue	d)										
Conduction 3 1 3 7 3 7 3 7 3 7 3 7 3 7 3	CODENDLAK CODENDLAK <thcodendlak< th=""> <thcodendlak< th=""> <thc< th=""><th>HOST INSTITUTION</th><th>StG FVAI</th><th>FLIND</th><th>a.</th><th>CoG FVAI</th><th>FLIND</th><th>æ</th><th>AdG</th><th>FLIND</th><th>B.</th><th>Total FVAI</th><th>FLIND</th><th>a.</th></thc<></thcodendlak<></thcodendlak<>	HOST INSTITUTION	StG FVAI	FLIND	a.	CoG FVAI	FLIND	æ	AdG	FLIND	B.	Total FVAI	FLIND	a.
TETHOLOGY (FTI) TETHOLOGY (FTI) MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA	TECHNOLOOY (FU) TECHNOLOOY (FU) MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA MA	I COUNCIL UK	30	1	36.70%	2	0	0.00%	25	6	36.00%	57	20	35.10%
M. M. <thm.< th=""> M. M. M.<!--</td--><td>M. M. <thm.< th=""> M. M. M.<!--</td--><td>= TECHNOLOGY (KTH)</td><td>113</td><td>∞ α</td><td>7.10%</td><td>4</td><td>ლ ა</td><td>21.40%</td><td>40</td><td>0</td><td>22.50%</td><td>167</td><td>50</td><td>12.00%</td></thm.<></td></thm.<>	M. M. <thm.< th=""> M. M. M.<!--</td--><td>= TECHNOLOGY (KTH)</td><td>113</td><td>∞ α</td><td>7.10%</td><td>4</td><td>ლ ა</td><td>21.40%</td><td>40</td><td>0</td><td>22.50%</td><td>167</td><td>50</td><td>12.00%</td></thm.<>	= TECHNOLOGY (KTH)	113	∞ α	7.10%	4	ლ ა	21.40%	40	0	22.50%	167	50	12.00%
Sinter intermediation District intermediation Distrintermediation Distrintermediation<	Sinternal Sinternal <t< td=""><td>INA</td><td>131</td><td>ΩĻ</td><td>6.10%</td><td>53</td><td>- c</td><td>4.30%</td><td>29</td><td>5</td><td>11./0%</td><td>216</td><td>50 50</td><td>9.30%</td></t<>	INA	131	ΩĻ	6.10%	53	- c	4.30%	29	5	11./0%	216	50 50	9.30%
NO TECHNOLOOY Z <thz< th=""> Z <thz< th=""> Z Z <thz<< td=""><td>NO TECHNLOOY T</td><td></td><td>1/0</td><td>5 5</td><td>8.80%</td><td>8L 00</td><td>7 7</td><td>5 00%</td><td>23</td><td>N U</td><td>8./U%</td><td>181</td><td><u>5</u></td><td>9.00% 0 00%</td></thz<<></thz<></thz<>	NO TECHNLOOY T		1/0	5 5	8.80%	8L 00	7 7	5 00%	23	N U	8./U%	181	<u>5</u>	9.00% 0 00%
MMM MMM <td>MMM MMM MMM<td>SITY OF TECHNOLOGY</td><td>92</td><td>7</td><td>%00°.1</td><td>12</td><td>- m</td><td>25.00%</td><td>33.9</td><td>n œ</td><td>24.20%</td><td>137</td><td><u>0</u></td><td>13.10%</td></td>	MMM MMM <td>SITY OF TECHNOLOGY</td> <td>92</td> <td>7</td> <td>%00°.1</td> <td>12</td> <td>- m</td> <td>25.00%</td> <td>33.9</td> <td>n œ</td> <td>24.20%</td> <td>137</td> <td><u>0</u></td> <td>13.10%</td>	SITY OF TECHNOLOGY	92	7	%00°.1	12	- m	25.00%	33.9	n œ	24.20%	137	<u>0</u>	13.10%
NOTE NOTE <th< td=""><td>NUME NUME <th< td=""><td>HAM</td><td>76</td><td>- -</td><td>14.50%</td><td>15</td><td>0</td><td>13.30%</td><td>41</td><td>o o</td><td>12.20%</td><td>132</td><td>9 2</td><td>13.60%</td></th<></td></th<>	NUME NUME <th< td=""><td>HAM</td><td>76</td><td>- -</td><td>14.50%</td><td>15</td><td>0</td><td>13.30%</td><td>41</td><td>o o</td><td>12.20%</td><td>132</td><td>9 2</td><td>13.60%</td></th<>	HAM	76	- -	14.50%	15	0	13.30%	41	o o	12.20%	132	9 2	13.60%
NH. Correlation of the contract of the contrac	NT Electron Langevonder (endu) Fandselectron Langevonder (endu) Electron Langevonder (NDREWS	60	80	13.30%	6	2	22.20%	56	80	14.30%	125	18	14.40%
MRR NOLTY LECONTRACT (FILE) 31 9 3000 1 0 7000 17 6 7100 6 7100 6 7100 6 71000 7100 7100	MRR Holor Labor/Tory (End) T </td <td>INTE</td> <td>81</td> <td>1</td> <td>13.60%</td> <td>18</td> <td>e</td> <td>16.70%</td> <td>16</td> <td>4</td> <td>25.00%</td> <td>115</td> <td>18</td> <td>15.70%</td>	INTE	81	1	13.60%	18	e	16.70%	16	4	25.00%	115	18	15.70%
Tendent Tendent <t< td=""><td>Tendent: Constrain <th< td=""><td>ILAR BIOLOGY LABORATORY (EMBL)</td><td>31</td><td>o 0</td><td>29.00%</td><td>- ç</td><td>•</td><td>0.00%</td><td>17</td><td>~ ç</td><td>47.10%</td><td>49</td><td>; 1</td><td>34.70%</td></th<></td></t<>	Tendent: Constrain Constrain <th< td=""><td>ILAR BIOLOGY LABORATORY (EMBL)</td><td>31</td><td>o 0</td><td>29.00%</td><td>- ç</td><td>•</td><td>0.00%</td><td>17</td><td>~ ç</td><td>47.10%</td><td>49</td><td>; 1</td><td>34.70%</td></th<>	ILAR BIOLOGY LABORATORY (EMBL)	31	o 0	29.00%	- ç	•	0.00%	17	~ ç	47.10%	49	; 1	34.70%
Removacue/up Removacue/up<	Revenues (up) Revenues		10	0 ç	11.80%	5. C	- c	10.000/	47	01	23.80%	00L	/1	10.00%
SAME Same Simple	SAME Same S S75% S S S75% S S S75% S		900	2 ∝	22 20%	5 5	4 67	27 30%	9	n c	37 50%	63	1	%00 ZC
MIGHAM Microsoftante (C. 1997)	MINEL MODE 24 3 250% 35 1 370% 155 16 100% NIGEN V 750% 3 0 0.00% 2 16 0.00% 2 300% 14 15 750% NICEN 750% 3 7 0.00% 2 16 0.00% 2 16 10.05% PEREURE 7 50% 4 2.00% 4 1<70%	SANNE	23	∞	34.80%	∞	ი ი	37.50%	28	9 0	21.40%	59	17	28.80%
NICATION TERMANEL TO TABLE TO TABLE	NICATING TATA TATA TATA TATA TATA TATA TATA TA	AINGHAM	92	10	10.90%	24	ę	12.50%	39	ę	7.70%	155	16	10.30%
III OF TECHNOLOGY III OF TECHN	ITY OF TECHNOLOGY ITY OF TECHN	BINGEN	20	6	12.90%	12	-	8.30%	32	9	18.80%	114	16	14.00%
II PO FLEMOLOGY FIENDEL NETRONACTION NETRONA	IP Pri ELeNOLOGY EN 71 mode	UK	15	4 (26.70%	ი <u>(</u>	0	0.00%	22	€ (50.00%	40	15	37.50%
Neurona Neurona <t< td=""><td>Antimization Antimization Antimization<</td><td>IIY OF LECHNOLOGY</td><td>80</td><td>9 C</td><td>7.50%</td><td>13</td><td></td><td>7.70%</td><td>41</td><td>ω «</td><td>19.50%</td><td>134</td><td>15</td><td>11.20%</td></t<>	Antimization Antimization<	IIY OF LECHNOLOGY	80	9 C	7.50%	13		7.70%	41	ω «	19.50%	134	15	11.20%
E. U.SARERA, E. U.S.A. E. U.S.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.	E. U.SAPERVA. E. U.SAPERVA E. U.SAPERVA. E. U.SAPE	I ENEORE NKFI IRT	50 51	οσ	32.00%	τ σ	- 0	33 30%	2	o e	17 60%	41	υç	19 50%
ENTER NOTTERDAM EA 7 590% 4 7 590% 4 7 100% 32 7 2100% 14 0 710% BLN Colom 5 100% 5 100% 5 100% 5 100% 14 1710% BLN Colom 5 100% 5 100% 5 100% 14 1710% 16 100% 14 1710% ENDRO Colom 5 100% 2 1 200% 14 1710% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 16 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	ENTERPOIM 14 7 59% 6 0 00% 32 7 210% 81 170% BIN SOW 7 0 00% 33 6 110% 13 14 170% SOW SOW 7 0 00% 33 6 110% 13 14 170% SOW SOW 7 0 00% 33 6 110% 13 14 170% SOW 0 00% 1 1 0 00% 33 2 23.0% 13 10.0% CECONICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 1 0 00% 2 1 00% 33 2 23.0% 13 10.0% MC FECONICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 1 <td>IE - LA SAPIENZA</td> <td>157</td> <td>ົດ</td> <td>5.70%</td> <td>9 (2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.00%</td> <td>84</td> <td>9 0</td> <td>7.10%</td> <td>259</td> <td>5 5</td> <td>5.80%</td>	IE - LA SAPIENZA	157	ົດ	5.70%	9 (2	0	0.00%	84	9 0	7.10%	259	5 5	5.80%
BILIN BILIN <th< td=""><td>BLIN TEAL TO THE TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY TAY</td><td>CENTER ROTTERDAM</td><td>44</td><td>7</td><td>15.90%</td><td>9</td><td>0</td><td>0.00%</td><td>32</td><td>7</td><td>21.90%</td><td>82</td><td>14</td><td>17.10%</td></th<>	BLIN TEAL TO THE TAY	CENTER ROTTERDAM	44	7	15.90%	9	0	0.00%	32	7	21.90%	82	14	17.10%
Bit No. Tit No. <t< td=""><td>BINBURG BING BING BING BING BING BING BING BIN</td><td>JBLIN</td><td>84</td><td>ω</td><td>9.50%</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td>0.00%</td><td>43</td><td>9</td><td>14.00%</td><td>131</td><td>14</td><td>10.70%</td></t<>	BINBURG BING BING BING BING BING BING BING BIN	JBLIN	84	ω	9.50%	4	0	0.00%	43	9	14.00%	131	14	10.70%
BIRG Constant 4 5 10.90% 1 1 10.00% 33 32 32 30 14 16.00% M CPESCINCINC NO FREGULATION 1 4 20 9 45.00% 2 1 91.0% 33 33 39.4% M CPESCINCINC 12 5 39.0% 2 1 4.00% 13 1 30.4% M CPESCINCINC 13 2 25.00% 16 3 18.80% 16 13 10.0% SITN 16 7 16.00% 1 4 20% 16 3 13 10.0% SITN 16 7 16.00% 1 4 10 3 10.0% 14 10	Chronov Construction	SGOW HENBIBE	78	∞ o	10.30%	ر 13	•	0.00%	54 26	9 4	11.10%	145	4	9.70%
MCREGULATION Z T S000% T Z Z T Z <thz< th=""> Z Z</thz<>	MCRECULTION	BLIRG	16 46	0 10	10.90%	, 5		9 10%	88	o «	24 20%	06	1	15.60%
MOF SCIENCES 127 5 390% 24 1 4.00% 4.3 7 16.30% 194 13 6.10% ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 16 7 6.00% 12 1 4.00% 55 8.60% 194 13 7.00% SIT 7 6.00% 12 1 4.30% 25 8.60% 18 13 7.00% SIT 7 6.00% 12 1 4.30% 23 4.40% 31 14.00% SIT 7.00% 65 8 9.50% 16 1 13.0% 21.00% 13 13.0% AIN 7.00% 65 8 1.20% 1.2 1.4 1.0% 1.1 1.0% 1.1 1.0% AIN 7.00% 65 7.0% 1.2 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1	Nr OF SCIENCES Nr OF SCIENCES Nr OF SCIENCES 16 7 6.00% 12 7 6.00% 13 14.00% 13 17.00% 13 13 13 13 1	AIC REGULATION	20	00	45.00%	5	. –	50.00%	7		27.30%	33	13	39.40%
ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 38 8 2 10% 18 7 13 100% BICNOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE 16 7 80.0% 16 3 180.% 16 13 100% BURG 0 10 7 00% 17 1 130% 28 1 40% MANTON 65 1 100% 27 1 130% 28 1 40% MANTON 65 8 12.30% 12 1 13.30% 28 1 100% 31 100% MANTON 65 8 12.30% 12 1 8.30% 16 16.0% 18 13 100% MANTON 65 8 12.30% 12 1 8.30% 16 13 120% 10% 13 120% MOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - TRESTE 01 8 7.30% 14 16 7.30% 16 13 120% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10%	SITY 2 25.00% 16 3 13 7.10% 13 7.10% 13 7.10% 13 7.10% SITY SITY 6.00% 12 1.00% 2 5.60% 16 3 14.0% SITY BIRG 1 1.30% 2 5.00% 16 13 7.00% BIRG 11 11.00% 11 13 2.50% 17 14.30% 13 1.00% BIRG 11 11.30% 16 10 13 13.0% 16 13 1.00% BIRG 11 11.30% 12 11.30% 16 1 13 1.00% Distribution 55 6 9.50% 16 1 13.0% 13 1.00% Sit 100 6 50% 16 1 16.70% 16 13 1.20% Sit 100 11 16.70% 16 1 10.0% 16 10 10 Sit 100 10 1 16.70% 16 1 10.0% 12 10.0% Sit 100 10 1 16.70% 16 1 10.0% 10 10 </td <td>AY OF SCIENCES</td> <td>127</td> <td>5</td> <td>3.90%</td> <td>24</td> <td>-</td> <td>4.20%</td> <td>43</td> <td>7</td> <td>16.30%</td> <td>194</td> <td>13</td> <td>6.70%</td>	AY OF SCIENCES	127	5	3.90%	24	-	4.20%	43	7	16.30%	194	13	6.70%
NIT CONTRACT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NOT NO	Name Name <th< td=""><td>ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE</td><td>38</td><td>n 00</td><td>21.10%</td><td>ω ς</td><td>~ ~</td><td>25.00%</td><td>16</td><td>ς τ</td><td>18.80%</td><td>62</td><td>ლ ჭ</td><td>21.00%</td></th<>	ECONOMICS AND POLITICAL SCIENCE	38	n 00	21.10%	ω ς	~ ~	25.00%	16	ς τ	18.80%	62	ლ ჭ	21.00%
Intervet Total	Direction Direction <thdirection< th=""> <thdirection< th=""> <thdirection< th=""></thdirection<></thdirection<></thdirection<>	4511Y	116	~ 0	6.00%	12		8.30%	28	Ω •	8.60%	186	<u>5</u>	/.00%
THAMPTON 67 6 9.00% 16 1 6.30% 39 6 7.40% 113 15.30% SEX SEX 35 8 17.30% 12 1 8.30% 27 4 4.80% 104 13 15.00% SEX SEX 35 8 17.30% 12 1 8.30% 27 4 4.80% 104 13 12.50% No COSTIE 100 8 7.90% 6 1 6.70% 13 12.50% 12 9.50% N 101 8 7.90% 6 1 10.70% 19 3 15.60% 16 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 9.50% 12 13.60% 13 10.0% 12 10.10% 13 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12 10.10% 12	THAMPTON 67 6 9.50% 16 7 6.30% 39 6 15.40% 118 13 100% SEX SEX 330 6 9.50% 12 1 8.30% 16 1 8.30% 16 13 12.50% 16 13 12.50% 13 13.60% 16 13 12.50% 13 13.60% 16 13 13.60% 13 13.60% 16 13 13.60% 16 10		02	o 5	13 00%	- 0	- c	0.00%	30%	, t	6 70%	90 118 118	<u>5</u> ¢	11 00%
SEX SEX 14 12 16 12 16 16 16 17 260% 16 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 18.30% 12 13.50% 10 12 13.50% 12 13.50% 12 13.50% 10 12 13.50% 10 12 10.0% 12 10.0% 12 10.0% 12 10.0% 12 10.0% 12 10.0% 12 10.0% <td>SEX 3 1 130% 12 1 12.50% 12 18.0% 104 13 12.50% OOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES- TRESTE 35 4 1140% 4 1 16.70% 19 3 15.80% 165 12 950% N 000L FOR ADVANCED STUDIES- TRESTE 18 7.90% 16 1 25.00% 15 35.90% 15 950% 12 950% N MCASTLE 6 5 7.90% 6 1 2 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 12 10.0% 104 13 104 13 104 13 104 13 12.90% 104 13 1</td> <td>JTHAMPTON</td> <td>63</td> <td><u> </u></td> <td>9.50%</td> <td>ء 16</td> <td>- c</td> <td>6.30%</td> <td>39</td> <td>4 6</td> <td>15.40%</td> <td>118</td> <td><u>5</u> 6</td> <td>11.00%</td>	SEX 3 1 130% 12 1 12.50% 12 18.0% 104 13 12.50% OOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES- TRESTE 35 4 1140% 4 1 16.70% 19 3 15.80% 165 12 950% N 000L FOR ADVANCED STUDIES- TRESTE 18 7.90% 16 1 25.00% 15 35.90% 15 950% 12 950% N MCASTLE 6 5 7.90% 6 1 2 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 12 9.60% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 104 13 12.90% 12 10.0% 104 13 104 13 104 13 104 13 12.90% 104 13 1	JTHAMPTON	63	<u> </u>	9.50%	ء 16	- c	6.30%	39	4 6	15.40%	118	<u>5</u> 6	11.00%
HOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - TRIESTE 35 4 11.40% 4 1 25.00% 26 7 26.90% 65 12 18.50% N CASTLE 101 8 7.90% 6 1 16.70% 19 3 15.60% 12 18.50% 12 98.0% N CASTLE 6 14.30% 16 1 16.70% 3 15.60% 12 12 98.0% ICASTLE 6 16 7 26.90% 65 12 12 12.00% ICASTLE 6 1 16.70% 1 2 33.30% 36 6 16.00% 12 10.00% IS - PIERE AND MARIE CURIE 1 8 7 20.00% 14 16 12 10.00% NOT 17 6 7.80% 16 2 33.30% 13 10 10.70% NOT 0000% 2 3 10 10.00% 2 5 10 10.00% NOT 0 0000% 1 1 1	HOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - TRIESTE 35 4 1140% 4 1 25,00% 26 7 26,30% 65 12 9,80% N CASTLE 101 8 7,90% 6 1 16,70% 19 3 15,80% 126 12 9,80% N CASTLE 6 4 8 7,90% 6 1 16,70% 18 12 9,80% N CASTLE 6 7,80% 16 7 3 5,80% 16 17 9,90% S6 - FIERE AND MARIE CURIE 6 4 8 70% 6 2 3,30% 36 6 6,70% 88 12 10,00% fc - TOR VERGATA 12 1 0 0.00% 3 2 2 10,0% 17 10 10% fc - TOR VERGATA 12 1 1 0 0.00% 22 3 3 10 10 10% fc - TOR VERGATA 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <	SEX	65	00	12.30%	5	-	8.30%	27	4	14.80%	104	13	12.50%
N CASTLE Ge FJEREAND MARIE CURIE Ge S-FJEREAND MARIE CURIE Ge FJEREAND MARIE CURIE F - TON VERGATA F - TON VER	N CASTLE	HOOL FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - TRIESTE	35	4	11.40%	4	-	25.00%	26	7	26.90%	65	12	18.50%
ICASTLE ICA <	CASTLE CCASTLE 68 4 5.80% 14 2 14.30% 40 6 15.00% 123 13.60% IS - PIERREANDMARIE CURIE F 7.80% 1 0 0.00% 35 6 16.70% 88 12 13.60% IS - FORKEANDMARIE CURIE 7.80% 1 0 0.00% 35 6 14.60% 19 12 13.60% IN - TOX VERGATA 17 6 7.80% 10 1 10.00% 32 6 18.80% 16 12 13.60% NTO 17 6 7.80% 10 1 10.00% 32 5 22.70% 112 10.70% NTO 17 0 13.50% 11 1 13.60% 11 1 10.70% 11 11.070% VIO 17 11 10.3.50% 11 1 12.50% 33 2 39% 97 11 17.70% VINLAN 11 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 1	N	101	8	7.90%	9	-	16.70%	19	e	15.80%	126	12	9.50%
IS 6 - PIERE AND MARIE CURIE 46 4 8.70% 6 2 33.30% 36 6 16.70% 88 12 10.0% 70 10 10% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 71 10.00% 72 72.0% 71 10.00% 72 72.0% 71 10.00% 72 5 22.70% 71 10.70% 71 10.70% 71 10.00% 72 5 22.70% 71 10.70% 71 10.70% 71 10.70% 71 10.00% 72 5 23.70% 71 10.7	IS 6 - PIERE AND MARIE CURIE 15 0% 16 2 33.30% 36 6 16.70% 88 12 13.60% 10 10% 10 10% 10.0% 16 13.00% 16 13.00% 16 13.00% 16 13.00% 17 200% 16 12 7.20% 10 10% 10 10.00% 12 10.10% 11 10.00% 12 10.10% 11 10.00% 12 10.00% 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 16 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 16 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 16 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 16 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 16 11 11.00% 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 17 12 10.70% 15 11 10.70% 15 10.70% 15 11 1	VCASTLE	69	4	5.80%	14	0	14.30%	40	9	15.00%	123	12	9.80%
If: - TOR VERGATA 77 6 7.80% 1 0 0.00% 41 6 1460% 119 12 10.10% NTO OF TECHNOLOGY 125 6 4.80% 9 0 0.00% 22 6 18.80% 166 12 7.20% NTO OF TECHNOLOGY 22 6 4.80% 9 0 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 13 11 10.70% NTO 7 0 13.10% 8 1 12.50% 34 2 5 23.0% 13 10.70% NTN 7 20.00% 1 0 0.00% 2 4 13.10% 11 10.70% NILAN 7 20.00% 1 1 10 0 0.00% 17 1 11.70% SEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 0 0.00% 1 1 4 30% 11 17.70% SEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 0 0.00% 1 1 14.30% 30 4 1 17.70% SEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 0 0.00% 1 1 14.30% 30 1 27.00% <td>The TOR VERGATA T/2 0 0.00% 21 6 7.80% 11 0 12 10.10% The TOR VERGATA 12 6 7.80% 9 0 0.00% 32 6 18.80% 166 12 7.20% OF TECHNOLOGY 8 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 112 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.6% 10 1 1 0 0.00% 17 4 2.50% 13 11 27.70% T 7.10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 20% Strip VeLUND 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 17</td> <td>IS 6 - PIERRE AND MARIE CURIE</td> <td>46</td> <td>4</td> <td>8.70%</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>33.30%</td> <td>36</td> <td>9</td> <td>16.70%</td> <td>88</td> <td>12</td> <td>13.60%</td>	The TOR VERGATA T/2 0 0.00% 21 6 7.80% 11 0 12 10.10% The TOR VERGATA 12 6 7.80% 9 0 0.00% 32 6 18.80% 166 12 7.20% OF TECHNOLOGY 8 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 112 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.50% 10 1 10.00% 22 5 22.70% 113 11 10.70% T 7.6% 10 1 1 0 0.00% 17 4 2.50% 13 11 27.70% T 7.10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 20% Strip VeLUND 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 13 11 2.50% 17	IS 6 - PIERRE AND MARIE CURIE	46	4	8.70%	9	0	33.30%	36	9	16.70%	88	12	13.60%
NIC CFTECHNOLOGY 22 6 18.00% 106 12 /2.0% TC FTECHNOLOGY 22 5 5 27.0% 105 11 01.00% TC FTECHNOLOGY 12 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 12 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 12 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 12 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 11 /2.0% TS 12 /2.0	NIC 125 12 7.20% 10 10.00% 32 16 12 7.20% OF TECHNOLOGY 10 1 10.00% 32 5 27.0% 112 12 10.70% OF TECHNOLOGY 11 12.00% 10 1 12.00% 12 10.70% NIT 11 11.2.60% 11 12.50% 13 11 10.70% NTMLAN 74 10 13.50% 11 0 0.00% 12 1 11.70% TYMLAN 77 1 12.50% 7 2 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% TYMLAN 77 1 13.30% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% TYMLAN 770% 2 1 13.30% 17 11.3.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 13.00% TYMLAN 770% 3 1 14.3.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 12 10.70% TYMLAN 770% 3 1 14.3.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 12 20% ES	AE - TOR VERGATA	22	9	7.80%	- (0	0.00%	41	9	14.60%	119	12	10.10%
OF TECHNOLOGY 22 22 22 22.10% 112 12 12 112 12 102 RTY OF THE NEGEV 7 7 10 13 36 7 10 11 30% 97 11 113.00% TY MILAN 35 7 20.00% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% FESERRCH AND FECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 35 7 2 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% FESERRCH AND FECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 30 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% FESERRCH AND FECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 30 11 14.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 27.90% FESERRCH AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 10 <td>OF TECHNOLOGY 22 5 22.10% 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 113</td> <td>NTO</td> <td>120</td> <td>9</td> <td>4.80%</td> <td>ວາ ເ</td> <td>- C</td> <td>%00.0</td> <td>32</td> <td>ю I</td> <td>18.80%</td> <td>160</td> <td>22</td> <td>7.20%</td>	OF TECHNOLOGY 22 5 22.10% 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 112 113	NTO	120	9	4.80%	ວາ ເ	- C	%00.0	32	ю I	18.80%	160	22	7.20%
Internation No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. No. RITY OF THE NEGEV 7 10 13.50% 11 0 0.00% 12 1 83.30% 97 11 11.30% TY MILAN 7 20.00% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 62 11 17.70% TY MILAN 35 7 20.00% 17 11 14.30% 30 13 11 9.70% FESTRY OF LONDON 7 1 14.30% 3 1 14.30% 38 11 27.00% CER INSTITUTE 33.10% 1 14.30% 3 1 17.70% 38 11 27.90% CER INSTITUTE 33.0% 16 1 33.30% 10 6 64.00% 51 11 21.60% DS ACDEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 10 6 40.00% 51 11 21.60% SITY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 12 4 12.90% 15 11 21.60%	IV IV 10 13.50% 10 1 12.30% 34 2 330% 103 11 11.30% VMLAN VMLAN 35 7 200% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 67 11 11.30% YMLAN 35 7 200% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 67 11 11.30% YMLAN 55 7 200% 10 0 0.00% 17 4 23.50% 67 11 11.30% YMLAN 55 7 200% 17 1 14.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 27.0% FESERRCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 23.60% 7 1 14.30% 30 4 13.30% 11 27.0% CERNISTIONE 23 9 3.00% 2 1 14.30% 30 4 13.70% CERNISTIONE 23 1 11.00% 13 16 4 25.00% 11 11 21.0% SITY OF LONDON 33.00% 13 1 10.00% 15 0 0.00% 51 11 21.0% SITY OF DENMAR	OF TECHNOLOGY	80	:o o	7.50%	10		10.00%	27	ۍ ۵	22.70%	112	12	10.70%
Contribution C	Mail Of The Negev Mail Of The Ne	ר אוניביע אוניביע	01	γ	13.10%	- -	- c	12.50%	\$ C	ч г	0%08.C	501 70	= ±	10.70%
ERSERCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 6 7 7 1 1.30% 1.3 1.1 1.1 ERSITY OF LONDON 7 7 1 1.4.30% 30 4 1.3.30% 1.3 11 9.70% ERSITY OF LONDON 23 9 39.10% 2 1 5.00% 13 1 7.70% 38 11 28.00% CERSITY OF LONDON 1 1 5.00% 3 1 15.70% 38 11 28.00% CERSITY OF LONDON 1 1 5.00% 3 1 15.70% 29 11 28.00% SSACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 1 16.70% 51 11 21.60% SITY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 12 11 8.60%	Figure Reserved and TechnoLogy - HELLAS 7 6 7 7 1 14,30% 30 4 13,30% 13 11 11 11 RESRACH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS 7 6 6 7,90% 7 1 14,30% 30 4 13,30% 13 11 3,10% 2 1 3,00% 13 11 2,10% 28 11 3,00% 13 11 2,10% 28 11 3,00% 29 11 3,00% 13 11 28,90% CER INSTITUTE 23 9 3,01% 5 1 3,30% 10 6 60.00% 29 11 3,30% SIZ CADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 3 4 13,30% 6 1 16,70% 31 4 12,90% 216 11 21,60% SIZ COR 3 12 0 0.00% 51 11 21,60% 216 21,60% SIZ COR 3 12 0 0.00% 51 12 21,00% 14 21,90% 169 11 6,50%	TV MILDE INEGEV	35	2	%0000c	= 6	> c	0.00%	1	- 4	23 50%	10 6	= =	17 70%
ERSITY OF LONDON 23 9 39.10% 2 1 50.00% 13 1 7.70% 38 11 28.90% CER INSTITUTE 16 4 25.00% 3 1 33.30% 10 6 60.00% 29 11 37.90% SS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 51 11 21.60% SITY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 126 11 8.00%	ERSITY OF LONDON 23 9 39.10% 2 1 50.00% 13 1 7.70% 38 11 28.90% CER INSTITUTE 16 4 25.00% 3 1 33.30% 10 6 60.00% 29 11 37.90% SIS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 29 11 27.10% SIS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 15 6 40.00% 29 11 21.60% SIS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 15 11 8.80% SIT ON 9 10.00% 15 0 0.00% 64 2 3.10% 169 11 6.50%	ESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY - HELLAS	22	. y	2 90%	2 ~	o ←	14 30%	30	4	13 30%	113	÷	%02.6
CER INSTITUTE 16 4 25.00% 3 1 33.30% 10 6 60.00% 29 11 37.90% DS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 15 6 40.00% 51 11 21.60% DS ACADEMY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 125 11 8.80%	CER INSTITUTE 16 4 25.00% 3 1 33.30% 10 6 60.00% 29 11 37.90% SIS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 11 21.60% 51 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 51 50% 51 50% 51 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 51 50% 50% 50% 50% 50% 50	ERSITY OF LONDON	23	ວ ດ	39.10%	- 7		50.00%	9 (-	7.70%	38	= ₽	28.90%
DS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES 30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 15 6 40.00% 51 11 21.60% SITY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 125 11 8.80%	30 4 13.30% 6 1 16.70% 15 6 40.00% 51 11 21.60% SITY OF DENMARK 0 0.00% 12 0 0.00% 64 2 31 4 12.90% 155 11 8.80% SITY OF DENMARK 0 0.00% 51 0 0.00% 64 2 3.10% 165 11 6.50% O 0.00% 51 0 0.00% 64 2 3.10% 169 11 6.50%	CER INSTITUTE	16	4	25.00%	ę	-	33.30%	10	9	60.00%	29	7	37.90%
SITY OF DENMARK 31 4 12:90% 125 11 8.80% 32 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12:90% 125 11 8.80%	SITY OF DENMARK 82 7 8.50% 12 0 0.00% 31 4 12.90% 125 11 8.80% CELONA 0.00% 64 2 3.10% 169 11 6.50% CELONA	DS ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES	30	4	13.30%	9	-	16.70%	15	9	40.00%	51	7	21.60%
	ACELONA 30 0 0.00% 64 2 3.10% 16 0.50%	SITY OF DENMARK	82	2	8.50%	12	0	0.00%	31	4	12.90%	125	7	8.80%

92

. • .

•

. • . . • . .

> . •

Table A7.02:		CNRS	UCAM	MPG	UOXF	ncr	ETHZ	NIS	EPFL	IUUH	ICL	INSERM	CSIC	KUL	UEDIN	CEA	UBRIS	NVA	LMU	RUN	LEI
Fund	FSO	7	e	13	œ	-	9	5	2	-	-	e	-	0	0	2	2		9	-	0
ed app	70SJ	80	7	80	4	2	4	14	-	7	4	9	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	e	0
licant	50SJ	6	5	14	e	e	4	9	4	0	-	2	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0
s in to	70SJ	0	5	e	2	5	2	5	5	e	4	13	-	-	0		0		0	-	0
0-20 h(50SJ	9	9	6	5	15	0	6	e	6	0	15	9	2	-	-	2	0	e	0	0
ost ins.	90SJ	თ	0	ŝ	4	-	-	2	4	2	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	-	e	0
titutio	20SJ	2	8	0	0	2	2	-	2	2	4	7	-	2	-	ო	0		2	4	0
ns at a	80SJ	4	9	8	7	-	e	-	2	2	9	-	2	2	e	0	2	e	-	2	-
pplicat	60SJ	0	2	e	e	2	e	2	0	4	-	0	4	-	-	0	2	0	-	0	0
tion st	PE01	13	5	-	9	-	5	-	9	12	2		7	e	2	0	4	2	0	0	2
age by	PE02	21	4	15	œ	0	9	S	-	-	4		-	2	0	6	5	-	9	0	0
evalu	PE03	21	6	e	4	-	∞	9	7	-	-	0	2	0	-	7	-	0	2	e	2
ation p	PE04	2	7	6	4	e	9	7	e	2	4	-	e	e	-	0	2	-	2	e	e
Danel	PE05	S	6	9	9	2	7	2	7	2	9	0	2	2	4	2	4	e	e	2	e
	PE06	œ	4	e	9	2	œ	4	13	4	e		0	e	2	-	4	0	0	-	0
	203d	œ	e	0	-	-	e		9	0	9		0	e	-	2	0	0	0		
	PE08	6	9	-	2	-	7		9		9	0	e	4	0	2	0			0	
	603d	12	7	1	e	2	0	2	-	7	0		e	7	4	9	0	7	0	-	9
	0134	10	7	-	œ	2	9	2	-	0	0		-	-	2	-	7	0	e		0
	LONG	0	0	0	2	14	-		0	4			0	2			0	0	0	0	0
	20115	e	2	ო	6	7	-	0	0	2		0	0	e	9		-	19	-	2	-
	50H0	2	2	e	2	2				0	0	-	0		2	0			0	0	
	90HS	9	4	4	0	2	-	-	0			-	0	- -	4	-	с С	22	e	о 0	22
	90HS	10	6	0	1 13	2	0	0	-	2			3	1	-	-	-	0	0	0	4

• • • •

•

. . . .

. . .

.

 Total

 1126

 1128

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

 1119

• • • • • •

. .

• • • •

• ٠

.

• •

Table A7.03: Applicant success rates in top-20 host institutions at application stage by evaluation panel

al	8%	%0	2%	5%	6%	6%	4%	3%	2%	%0	8%	%6	7%	9%	%0	7%	9%	2%	6%	9%			
6 Tot	6% 13.	0% 25.	0% 21.	7% 20.	1% 17.	0% 31.	0% 34.	30.	8% 25.	17.	15.	2% 5.	7% 11.	7% 15.	0% 22.	1% 16.	0% 16.	0% 19.	0% 16.	0% 16.			
5 SHO	2% 28.0	3% 25.0	0.0	0% 27.	0% 24.	0.0	0.0	3%	0% 23.			3% 5.2	3% 8.	0% 16.	100.	.6 %0	1% 0.0	0.0	0.0	1% 30.I			
4 SH0	5% 18.2	35.3	7% 0.0	3% 20.0	1% 0.(0.0	%(0% 14.3	1% 25.0		%(0% 11.8	2% 4.8	0.0	3%	3% 40.(7% 11.	1% 20.0	3% 20.0	1% 36.4			
3 SHO	0% 23.5	3% 19.0	0% 26.7	3% 27.6	3% 7.4	%(25.(0.0	9.7	%(0% 20.0	0.0	1% 4.2	0% 25.0	33.3	33.3	% 14.7	9% 23.7	0% 24.3	16.7			
2 SHO	% 40.0	% 33.3	% 60.0	% 13.3	.% 11.8	% 20.0	%	% 10.0	% 0.0	0.0	% 100.0	% 0.0	% 25.0	% 25.0	0.0	%	.% 6.7	% 0.0	% 0.0	.% 50.0			
CHS I	% 7.3	% 11.8	% 23.1	% 18.4	% 30.4	% 33.3	0.0	% 0.0	% 13.3	%	0.0	% 0.0	% 15.0	% 25.0		% 8.3	% 40.4	% 33.3	% 11.8	% 6.7			
OHS	% 0.0	0.0 %	% 0.0	14.3	.% 48.3	% 20.0	%	% 0.0	% 28.6	% 16.7		% 0.0	% 11.8	% 14.3	%	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	0.0	% 0.0			
9 PE1	11.2	9% 26.9	3% 5.5	5% 33.3	5% 15.4	0% 24.0	3% 25.0	9% 5.6	0.C	0.C		% 2.5	% 12.5	1% 20.C	% 11.1	1% 28.C	3% 0.C	30.0	%	0.C %C			
3 PEO	13.C	1% 25.9	12.6	3.11.5	18.5	0.0 %	28.6	1% 25.C	25.0	0.0 %	%	1% 9.7	% 8.7	1% 44.4	1% 20.7	% 0.G	28.6	0.0	11.1	30.0			
PEO	% 17.6	% 27.3	% 50.0	% 20.0	% 12.5	% 58.3		% 33.3	%	% 20.0	0.0	% 8.8	% 18.2	% 0.0	% 33.3	% 0.0	%	%	0.0				
DE01	% 16.7	% 42.9	% 0.0	% 25.0	% 7.7	% 20.0	%	% 37.5	% 0.0	% 35.3		% 0.0	% 21.4	% 14.3	% 41.7	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 0.0	%	%			
PEOG	% 16.0	% 15.4	% 20.0	% 21.4	% 10.5	% 44.4	% 57.1	% 40.6	% 28.6	% 14.3	%	% 0.0	% 15.0	% 15.2	% 33.3	% 33.3	% 0.0	% 0.0	% 12.5	% 0.0			
PEOS	% 5.7	% 31.0	% 19.4	% 20.7	% 9.5	% 36.8	% 25.0	% 33.3	% 41.7	% 22.2	% 0.0	% 3.8	% 28.6	% 18.2	% 14.3	% 16.7	% 30.0	% 37.5	% 22.2	% 42.9			
PE04	% 7.5	% 43.8	% 22.59	% 33.3	% 17.69	% 31.69	% 41.2	% 15.89	% 28.69	% 26.79	% 100.09	% 7.7	% 23.19	% 20.09	% 0.0	% 12.5	% 20.09	% 33.35	% 50.09	% 25.09			
PE03	% 13.89	% 23.79	% 9.4	% 23.5	% 5.9	% 29.69	% 46.2	% 33.39	% 11.19	% 7.7	0.0	% 4.7%	% 0.0	% 16.79	% 25.9	% 6.3	% 0.0	% 20.09	% 33.3	% 16.79			
PE02	% 14.3%	% 25.0%	% 28.39	% 30.8%	% 0.0%	% 37.5%	% 27.8%	% 16.7%	% 7.19	6 13.39		% 2.8%	% 25.0%	% 0.0%	6 23.19	% 41.79	% 8.39	6 31.6%	% 0.0%	% 0.0%			
PE01	6 22.89	6 29.49	6 11.19	6 24.0%	6 10.09	6 23.89	6 20.09	6 46.29	6 52.29	6 25.0%	Ŷ	6 50.09	6 17.69	6 12.5%	6 0.0 ^o	6 25.0%	6 13.39	% 0.0%	6 0.0 ^o	6 20.09			
LS09	°0.0%	6 33.3%	6 37.5%	60.09	6 40.09	6 37.5%	6 33.3%	6 0.0%	6 40.09	6 7.7%	6 0.0%	6 5.6%	6 9.1%	6 16.7%	6 0.0%	6 33.3%	6 0.0%	6 50.09	6 0.0%	6 0.0%			
LS08	6 18.9%	6 24.0%	52.2%	6 20.6%	6 12.5%	6 27.3%	50.0%	66.7%	6 20.0%	6 25.0%	6 100.0%	6 3.1%	6 16.7%	37.5%	0.0%	9.5%	33.3%	6 14.3%	6 40.0%	6 8.3%			
LS07	13.3%	61.5%	%0.0%	%0.0	21.7%	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	5 26.7%	19.4%	2.9%	15.2%	25.0%	37.5%	%0.0%	. 0	18.2%	21.1%	0.0%			
LS06	5 22.0%	\$ 0.0%	, 45.5%	6 10.3%	5 10.0%	5 20.0%	5 14.3%	\$ 80.0%	5 31.3%	9.5%	6 11.8%	9.5%	%0.0 %	%0.0%	%0.0 %	%0.0 %	%0.0%	6 8.3%	6 21.4%	%0.0%			
LS05	8.8%	19.4%	, 22.5%	5 16.1%	5 18.1%	%0.0 %	32.1%	33.3%	36.0%	%0.0%	5 20.3%	5 14.0%	, 10.5%	5 16.7%	11.1%	5 14.3%	%0.0	5 21.4%	%0.0 %	0.0%			
LS04	0.0%	35.7%	42.9%	15.4%	20.0%	100.0%	50.0%	71.4%	21.4%	. 30.8%	18.8%	10.0%	7.7%	0.0%		0.0%		. 0.0%	12.5%	. 0.0%			
LS03	13.4%	13.2%	. 31.1%	23.1%	. 17.6%	44.4%	23.1%	40.0%	. 0.0%	7.7%	4.5%	3.1%	. 9.1%	16.7%	. 33.3%	0.0%	. 0.0%	. 0.0%	. 0.0%	. 0.0%			
LS02	13.8%	41.2%	18.6%	15.4%	11.8%	44.4%	70.0%	14.3%	36.8%	17.4%	17.1%	%0.0	%0.0	18.2%	%0.0	%0.0	%0.0	18.2%	23.1%	%0.0			
LS01	8.6%	17.6%	24.1%	17.0%	12.5%	54.5%	29.4%	40.0%	6.3%	6.7%	13.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	33.3%		37.5%	14.3%	0.0%			
	CNRS	UCAM	MPG	UOXF	ncL	ETHZ	WIS	EPFL	IUUH	СL	INSERM	CSIC	KUL	UEDIN	CEA	UBRIS	UVA	LMU	RUN	LEI			

 Table A7.04: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by funding scheme (StG, CoG and AdG) as of 21/08/2014

HOST INSTITUTION	StG	CoG	AdG
National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)	130	15	
University of Oxford	55	10	
University of Cambridge	61	7	-
Max Planck Society	54	5	
University College London	51	8	
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne (EPFL)	44	2	:
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich)	31	4	4
Weizmann Institute	41	10	;
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	40	3	:
Imperial College	37	2	1
National Institute of Health and Medical Research (INSERM)	31	8	
French Alternative Energies and Atomic Energy Commission	33	2	
University of Leuven	24	5	
University of Edinburgh	19	2	;
Spanish National Research Council (CSIC)	21	4	
University of Bristol	16	3	
Radboud University Nijmegen	22	3	
University of Munich (LMU)	11		
Leiden University	19	1	
University of Amsterdam	13	4	
University of Zurich	15	3	
Technion - Israel Institute of Technology	23	2	
University of Copenhagen	16	4	
King's College London	21		
National Institute for Research in Computer Science and Automatic Control (INRIA)	19		
University of Geneva	11	3	
Free University of Geneva	16	2	
Karolineka Institute	16	2	
	10	1	
Iniversity of Helsinki	15		
	15	3	
Delft Liniversity of Technology	15	3	
Liniversity of Manchester	14	5	
	14	1	
Technical University of Munich	15	2	
	13	2	
Pactour Institute	13	1	
	15	1	
	10	2	
	12	4	
Admus Oniversity	11		
University of Groningen	22		
	11	1	
University of Sheffield	8	1	
University of Leeds	9	1	
University of Usio	10		
Curie Institute	11	2	
Eindhoven University of Technology	10	2	
Flanders Institute for Biotechnology (VIB)	12	3	
Ghent University	17	2	
University of Basel	9	3	
	0	2	



. . . • . • . .

. .

• • • • • • • • • . •

Table A7.04: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by funding scheme (StG, CoG and AdG) as of 21/08/2014 (continued)

Table A7 04: Grantees in ten 100 current best institutions by funding scheme (Sto. CoC	and AdG) as of 24/09/2014	(continued)		
Table A7.04: Grantees in top-100 current nost institutions by funding scheme (StG, CoG	and AdG) as of 21/08/2014	(continued)		
HOST INSTITUTION	StG	CoG	AdG	Total
Pompeu Fabra University	7	2	10	19
University of Heidelberg	11	1	7	19
University of Sussex	12	2	4	18
Chalmers University of Technology	7	1	9	17
London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)	11	2	4	17
Medical Research Council UK	9		8	17
National Research Council (CNR) - Italy	14	1	2	17
University of Durham	10	2	5	17
University of Lausanne	8	3	6	17
University of Tuebingen	11	1	5	17
Aalto University	10	1	5	16
ULB - Free University of Brussels	9	2	5	16
University of Frankfurt	10	3	3	16
University of Glasgow	10		5	15
University of Roma - La Sapienza	9		6	16
University of St Andrews	6	2	7	15
	9	3	3	15
patitute of Science and Technology Austria	9	1	3	1/
Diarra and Maria Curia University - Daria 6	5	2	7	14
	5	2	1	14
	5	3	0	14
University of Freiburg	9	1	4	14
	6	2	0	14
Jniversity of Southampton	8	1	5	14
Jniversity of Trento	8	1	5	14
Bocconi University Milan	8		5	13
Cancer Research UK	2	1	10	13
Jniversity of Barcelona	9		4	13
Jniversity of Louvain	11		2	13
/ienna University of Technology	7	1	5	13
Bar Ilan University	9	1	2	12
European University Institute	3		9	12
National University of Ireland - University College Dublin	8	1	3	12
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences	5	1	6	12
Jniversity of Bern	8	1	3	12
Jniversity of Birmingham	8	3	1	12
Jniversity of Hamburg	5		7	12
Jniversity of Nottingham	7	1	4	12
Jniversity of Padua	8	3	1	12
Centre for Genomic Regulation	7	1	3	11
Free University of Berlin	4	1	6	11
Helmholtz Center Munich - German Research Center for Environmental Health	8	2	1	11
nstitute of Genetics and Molecular and Cellular Biology - Strasbourg	6		5	1
nstitute of Photonics Science	7	1	3	1.
Vetherlands Cancer Institute	4	1	6	1
Normal Superior School (ENS)	6		5	1
Stockholm I Iniversity	6	1	4	1
Fechnical University of Dresden	Q	1	7	1
	0		5	1
	7		3	1
Initiaty obligge	1	1	4	1
University of Gottlefibuly	6	1	4	1
	9	1	1	11
vageningen University	4		7	11



• . • • • Table A7.05: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by scientific domain as of 21/08/2014

Table A7.05: Grantees in top-100 current nost institutions by scientific domain as of 21/08/2014	•		
HOST INSTITUTION	LS	PE	SH
National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)	58	122	31
Iniversity of Oxford	38	53	35
University of Cambridge	44	55	22
Max Planck Society	57	44	6
University College London	40	22	28
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne (EPFL)	25	56	2
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich)	26	52	۵
Weizmann Institute	45	33	1
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	34	25	14
Imperial College	25	38	
National Institute of Health and Medical Research (INSERM)	54	1	2
French Alternative Energies and Atomic Energy Commission	8	35	-
University of Leuven	12	22	1(
University of Edinburgh	11		11
Spanish National Research Council (CSIC)	13	21	
University of Bristol	8	24	-
Radboud Liniversity Niimegen	15	11	1.
	15	16	
	10	17	1
Liniversity of Amsterdam	3	11	21
	20	6	21
Technion Israel Institute of Technology	10	22	
University of Conenhagen	10	14	
Kingle College London	12	5	1.
Ning's College London	12	21	1.
	10	31	,
Free University of Geneva	19	10	4
Karelineke Institute	9	0	1.
	20	10	4
	11	10	
	20	1	
	5	15	
Dent University of Technology	2	23	4
University of Manchester	1	13	
Uppsala University	17	7	
	6	20	
Luna University	11	12	
Pasteur Institute	25	-	
University of Exeter	8	5	1.
	40	19	e
Aamus University	10	13	
University of Groningen	1	13	
University of Vienna	6	13	ł
University of Sheffield	10	8	Ę
University of Leeds	6	11	Ę
	2	10	1(
Curie Institute	20	1	
Eindhoven University of Technology		20	
Flanders Institute for Biotechnology (VIB)	21		
Ghent University	3	11	
University of Basel	13	7	1
Royal Institute of Technology (KTH)	1	19	
European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL)	18	1	



.

.

.

.

• • • • • • • • • •				
Table A7.05: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by scientific domain as of 21/08/2014 (con	tinued)			
	10	DE	C LI	Total
HOST INSTITUTION	LS	PE	SH	Iotai
Pompeu Fabra University	3	4	12	19
University of Heidelberg	6	10	3	19
University of Sussex	3	4	11	18
Chalmers University of Technology		17		17
London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)			17	17
Medical Research Council UK	17			17
National Research Council (CNR) - Italy	2	14	1	17
University of Durham	1	12	4	17
University of Lausanne	14		3	17
University of Tuebingen	8	5	4	17
Aalto University	1	13	2	16
ULB - Free University of Brussels	3	7	6	16
University of Frankfurt	6	4	6	16
University of Glasgow	7	3	5	15
University of Roma - La Sapienza	3	11	1	15
University of St. Andrews	3	10	2	15
University of Twente	1	14		15
Institute of Science and Technology Austria	7	7		14
Pierre and Marie Curie University - Paris 6	2	12		14
University of Bonn	1	9	4	14
University of Freiburg	4	8	2	14
University of Newcastle	9	5		14
University of Southampton	1	11	2	14
University of Trento	1	5	8	14
Bocconi University Milan			13	13
Cancer Research UK	13			13
University of Barcelona	2	6	5	13
University of Louvain	4	6	3	13
Vienna University of Technology		13		13
Bar Ilan University	6	5	1	12
European University Institute			12	12
National University of Ireland - University College Dublin	2	7	3	12
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences	8		4	12
University of Bern	7	5		12
University of Birmingham	3	6	3	12
University of Hamburg		5	7	12
University of Nottingham	1	10	1	12
University of Padua	4	6	2	12
Centre for Genomic Regulation	11			11
Free University of Berlin	1	6	4	11
Helmholtz Center Munich - German Research Center for Environmental Health	9	2		11
Institute of Genetics and Molecular and Cellular Biology - Strasbourg	11	_		11
Institute of Photonics Science		11		11
Netherlands Cancer Institute	11			11
Normal Superior School (ENS)	3	5	3	11
Stockholm University	1	3	7	11
Technical University of Dresden	5	3	3	11
Toulouse School of Economics	5	5	11	11
Trinity College	4	6	1	11
University of Gothenburg	4	0	2	11
University of Contendury	5	4	10	11
Wageningen University	0	1	10	11
Tragoriningori orintoronty	0	1	2	11



• . . . • . .

Table A7.06: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by evaluation pane	el as of 2	1/08/20	14																								
HOST INSTITUTION	LS01 LS	502 L	S03 L	S04 LS	05 LS0	s LS07	LS08	LS09	PE01 F	PE02 P	E03 PI	E04 PI	:05 PE	06 PE(7 PEO	B PE09	PE1	D SH01	SH02	SH03	SH04	SH05	SH06	Total			
National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS)	7	œ	7		9	6	16		14	21	23	9	9	10	80	9	-	4	e	7	15	2	6	211			
University of Oxford	00 r	4 0	n 1	2 4	ۍ م	4	1 00	4 0		r .	ۍ م	4 4	9 0	ი .		0 0	4 1	0 1	90	4		с ч	12	126			
University of Carnorage Max Planck Society	0°	ο (c	- 0	0 0	n σ	` 	- 10	ດ ເ	ο -	° (1	2 0	ດແ	ۍ د	4 -	_	7 0		- 0	N C		0 0	n	o	107			
University College London	<u>1</u> 0	0	o 4	ი თ	17	0 0	0	0		1	1 01	ი ო	ი ო	- ო	2		- 4	3 10	, ~	2) 4		S	06			
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne (EPFL)	1 01	·	. 4	2 2	4	14	0 0	'	9	7	9	2 2	0 00	12	1 00	. 9	. –	2 01		I -		-)	88			
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETH Zurich)	7	е	e	2		-	4	с	9	5	7	9	5	7	e	7		6	-	2				82			
Weizmann Institute	5	14	9	5	ი	2	-	2	-	9	9	7	5	4			N	8			-			79			
Hebrew University of Jerusalem	- 0	~ .	(4	6	22	~ ~	4 0	÷ 1	- I	-	~ ~	5	ი ი	(N	7	5		-	7	5	73			
Imperial College	N C	4 u	N +	ο Ç	16		4 4	n	~	۵		، ۵	٥	n	ø	ø					-			63			
National insulute of reatin and medical research (INSERIM) French Alternative Frencies and Atomic Frency Commission	2	n		2	0 -	ວ ຕ. ກ	-	-		σ	~	-	~	-	LC.		~	~		-				1C			
University of Leuven	1			-	- 2	, .,	2		e	0	>	ę	1 0	- თ	0 0	14			e	-		-	2	4			
University of Edinburgh		4	-		-		2	-	0		-	-		2	-		4	. 01	2	0	ŝ		-	43			
Spanish National Research Council (CSIC)	-		-		5	2	-	2	7	-	7	e	7			e	2	-				2	e	39			
University of Bristol	2				2		2	2	4	4	-	-	ო	4				7	-		e	2	-	39			
Radboud University Nijmegen	-	4		-	÷	0	0			1	e	4	2	-			-		-		00	0		37			
University of Munich (LMU)	2	7		-	ო	-	-			7	~ ~	~ .	ო ი					N	~ ~		~ ~	- ('	36			
Leiden University University of Amsterdam							~		NC	¢	N	4 -	ກຕ				0 0		7 6		טע	N T	`	34			
University of Zurich	7	ę	-	-	4	-	° ∩	-	1 01	c			° ∾		-		J	4,	2	-	о с	- 2		5 25			
Technion - Israel Institute of Technology			-	-			4	-	m	-	-	-	<i>с</i> о	œ	4	-				-				33			
University of Copenhagen	4	2		2		-	-	-	4	4		-		-			2	2	e		-	e		32			
King's College London				2	4	с С		-	- 0	-			-	L	-	-			4	2	2	5	-	31			
Institute for Research in Computer Science and Automatic Control	۲	c	٣	~	Ľ	0			9 4	¢	-		-	25							c			31			
Free University and Medical Center Amsterdam (VU-VUmc)	+ ~	v	c	o –	0 0	v.	-		C	0	-	-	-	~	-	-			~	c.	4 (2)	-		30	•		
Karolinska Institute	ı –	ę	2	. 7	1 6	20				•									'	>	0 01			30			
Tel Aviv University		5		-	2	-		-	9	-		7		4	-		N	-	-				-	30	•	•	
University of Helsinki		7	•	ę	-		4	4 .	4		•						-	- 1	0				1	29	•		
Utrecht University Delft I Iniversity of Technology	- ~		v			-		-	-	-		ς Σ	- ~	-	4	α			n	с С	-		n	57			
University of Manchester	ı –	-		-	-				-	-	. 0	1	14	-			4		e	1 ←	-		2	27	•	•	
Uppsala University		9		-			80				2	2	-		-			-	-		-			27	•	•	
Technical University of Munich	7			(0 0	-		-	n	- (2 2	с о		4	e									26			
Lund University Destair institute	4	- "	¢		ء بن ب	4				2	2	N	-	-		N	_	_	-		-			92	•	•	
University of Exeter	r	c	4	4		2	9	-									10		e		4	2	2	25	•	•	
University of Warwick									80	-		4	2			2	N	-	2		-	-	-	25			
Aarhus University	2		-		-		4		-	4		4		-		-	-	-			-			24	•	•	
University of Groningen	7	-	1		,	-		7			-	S C	с ч	,	-		<i>с</i>				n d	-	c	24	•	•	
University of Vienna University of Sheffield	-		-				4 C	~	4	4	-	N	- 0	-	.	e	-	_	-	~	m ≁		N +	24			
University of Leeds	. 01			7		-)				•		1 01		2	0 01		4		1 01	-	2	•	22	•	•	
University of Oslo			-			-			4			-					2	cu cu	5	-	ę	-	-	22			
Curie Institute	-	9	5	2	-	5					-													21			
Eindhoven University of Technology	•	•	•	•					7				5	-	<i>с</i> о	0				-				21			
Flanders Institute for Biotechnology (VIB)	-	4	-	9	2	~ ~		- c								L					c	-	c	12			
Gnent University I Iniversity of Rasel	-	-		-	0	- ~	4	7 4			٣.		~		4	n	-		-		J		S	21			
Roval Institute of Technology (KTH)					1	5			-	-	, -	- ~		- m	5	4								3			
European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL)	5	9	5	-	-							(-											19			

98

• • • . .

.

. . • .

.

Table A7.06: Grantees in top-100 current host institutions by evaluation panel as of 21/08/2014 (continued)

.

HOST INSTITUTION	S01 LS0	12 LSG	33 LSG	4 LS05	LS06	LS07	S08 L5	309 PE0	1 PE02	PE03	PE04 F	E05 P	EO6 PE0	17 PE08	3 PE09	1 PE10	C SH01	SH02	SH03	SH04 S	SH05 S	H06 To	le.		
Pomneu Fahra University		0					-						~	F			LC.	-		LC.		-	19		
University of Heidelberg		-	c						3		-	-				-					-	2	19		
University of Sussex	-		, -				-		-			-						9		4		1	18		
Chalmers University of Technology									1	-	4	-	2	e	2								17		
I ondon School of Fconomics and Political Science (I SF)													'				~	e e	¢.			-	17		
Medical Research Council UK	4	-	e 0	1	3			-										2	>			•	17		
National Research Council (CNR) - Italy					0				2 6	4	-				-						-		17		
University of Durham								-	e	-	2				.,	6	0	1	-		-	-	17		
University of Lausanne		-	4	2	2		7										0	~.	-				17	•	_
University of Tuebingen			-		1	2	-	-	1	-				-			2			e		-	17	•	
Aalto University									1	2		2	2	1	2		1	-		-			16		
ULB - Free University of Brussels			7						1 2				e				1 3	3 2		-			16	•	
University of Frankfurt	2		-	3				-	1		-		-				2	3		-			16		
University of Glasgow					2	2	2		2			-						2		-	2		15	•	
University of Roma - La Sapienza	-		-					-	2 3	e	-		-		-							-	15		
University of St. Andrews	-						7			-	-	4		-	.,	9					-	-	15	•	
University of Twente						-				9	-	ო	-	7	-								15	•	
Institute of Science and Technology Austria			с	. 1	0.		2		+	-			5										14	•	
Pierre and Marie Curie University - Paris 6					-		-		3 2	-	-	-	-	-		-	-						14	•	
University of Bonn								-	1 5			-	-				1 4						14		
University of Freiburg			-	,-	-			-	-			2	2	2	-							2	14	•	
University of Newcastle	-			2	2	2	-	-			-		-		1		2						14		
University of Southampton							-		2		2	-		2	2	N			-			-	14	•	
University of Trento						-			1				-		2			-		7			14		
Bocconi University Milan																	6	~	e			-	13	•	
Cancer Research UK	9	2	2	2	-																		13		
University of Barcelona						-	-		-	-		-	-	-	,	-		2		-	-	-	13		
University of Louvain	-			2					e				-				2	-		-			13		
Vienna University of Technoloav									4	2	-		-	-	0								13		
Bar Ilan University	-	-		-		-	-	-					5							-			12		
Euronean University Institute																		~	-			2	12		
National University of Ireland - University College Dublin		2							-		-	-			9		1					0	12		
Roval Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences		2	2	1			2												2	0			12		
University of Bern	2		2		2		-		-		-				-	-	C			1			12		
University of Birmingham	1			,	-	-			3						F		-	-		-	-		12		
University of Hamburg									-	2	-						1			2	e	2	12		
University of Nottingham								-	2	-	-	9					-	_					12		
University of Padua	-		-			-		-			-	2				-	2			2			12		
Centre for Genomic Regulation		7	4																				11		
Free University of Berlin							-		2 1	2	-										4		11		
German Research Center for Environmental Health			2	ب	-	7		2						-			-						11		
Institute of Genetics and Molecular and Cellular Biology - Strasbourg	5	-	e	-																			11		
Institute of Photonics Science									7	4													11		
Netherlands Cancer Institute	4	с			4																		11		
Normal Superior School (ENS)					01		-		1		-		7							e			1		
Stockholm University	-											-					2	4	-				1		
Technical University of Dresden			m	-		-				-		N						-			N		1		
Tuinity, College					•	•	•			•	•	c					=						= :		
	•			c	-	-				- •	- (N	•		N								= ;		
	-		-	N			-			-	N							- (•		c	-	= ;		
University of London - Goldsmittis Conege			0				¢	¢					-					D		-	N	-	= =		
			7				2	c				-													

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

99

278 0 0.0% 11 0 0.0% 14 0 0 10% 406 0 0 1 <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> <th1< th=""> <t< th=""></t<></th1<></th1<></th1<>
38 0 0.0% 1 0 0.0% 46 0 1,185 83 7.0% 127 10 7.9% 431 63 14.743 156 145 1 0.7% 9 0.0% 74 15 228 2
145 1 0.7% 9 0 0.0% 74 1 1.4% 228 2
71 1 1.4% 8 0 0.0% 23 0 0.0% 102 1 304 3 10% 12 2 167% 96 2 21% 412 7



.

. •••••

. . .

Table A8.02: Number and value of grants by current host cou	intry and
č ,	

	10 01 2 1/0	0/2014)		
StG	CoG	AdG	Total	EC contribution (Eur)
503	62	404	969	1,664,925,824
327	43	244	614	1,086,711,025
316	42	213	571	953,337,280
192	28	136	356	647,548,267
147	23	152	322	584,553,322
124	21	108	253	398,062,851
142	18	85	245	403,186,666
132	20	81	233	379,857,942
81	10	64	155	276,287,652
97	15	38	150	242,598,251
65	5	38	108	180,105,147
40	6	34	80	139,694,097
37	4	23	64	109,722,281
17	1	24	42	81,652,926
20	2	14	36	55,708,877
19	2	15	36	50,567,080
23	3	8	34	56,916,796
21	4	8	33	52,042,022
11	0	3	14	21,722,370
4	1	5	10	14,396,546
4	1	4	9	14,037,873
3	2	1	6	11,244,024
1	0	2	3	3,275,699
2	0	1	3	4,259,297
1	0	1	2	3,254,897
1	0	1	2	1,999,082
0	0	1	1	2,399,634
1	0	0	1	1,343,955
0	0	1	1	1,360,980
1	0	0	1	1,155,970
2,332	313	1,709	4,354	7,443,928,631
	StG 503 327 316 192 147 124 132 81 97 65 40 37 17 20 19 23 21 11 4 3 1 2 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 1	StG CoG 503 62 327 43 316 42 192 28 147 23 124 21 142 18 132 20 81 10 97 15 65 5 40 66 37 4 17 1 20 2 19 2 23 3 21 4 17 1 20 2 19 2 23 3 21 4 11 0 4 1 3 2 1 0 4 1 3 2 10 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0	StG CoG AdG 503 62 404 327 43 244 316 42 213 192 28 136 147 23 152 124 21 108 147 23 152 124 21 108 142 18 85 132 20 81 142 18 85 132 20 81 65 5 38 65 5 38 40 6 34 37 4 23 37 4 23 38 21 4 19 2 15 23 3 8 21 4 8 11 0 3 2 0 1 3 2 1 4 1 4	StG CoC AdG Total 503 62 404 969 327 43 244 614 316 42 213 571 192 28 136 356 147 23 152 322 124 21 108 253 142 20 81 233 81 10 64 155 97 15 38 108 40 6 34 80 37 4 23 64 17 1 24 42 20 2 14 36 40 6 34 80 37 4 23 64 17 1 24 42 20 2 14 36 19 2 15 36 21 4 8 33 11 0

Table A8.05: Grantees by current host country and scientific domain (as of 21/08/2014)

	LS	PE	SH	Total
UK	313	388	268	969
DE	245	293	76	614
FR	204	283	84	571
NL	111	151	94	356
СН	144	156	22	322
г	70	114	69	253
IL	111	109	25	245
ES	84	105	44	233
SE	69	68	18	155
BE	52	65	33	150
AT	43	48	17	108
DK	30	38	12	80
FI	28	28	8	64
NO	14	15	13	42
EL	12	23	1	36
HU	10	17	9	36
IE	10	17	7	34
РТ	17	10	6	33
PL	3	9	2	14
cz	1	9	0	10
CY	2	4	3	9
TR	1	5	0	6
BG	0	0	3	3
EE	2	0	1	3
HR	1	1	0	2
SI	0	2	0	2
IS	1	0	0	1
LU	0	1	0	1
LV	0	1	0	1
SK	1	0	0	1
Total	1,579	1,960	815	4,354

•

• • •

• • •

Table A8.03: Requested and granted funds by h stage	nost	coui	ntry a	t app	licatio	on	

Slaye			
	REQUESTED	GRANTED	FUNDING SR
AL	616,911	0	0.0%
AT	1,488,626,299	167,519,569	11.3%
BA	11,712,882	0	0.0%
BE	2,255,018,445	244,403,317	10.8%
BG	189,181,920	3,275,699	1.7%
СН	2,779,287,561	585,516,268	21.1%
СҮ	326,607,338	14,150,457	4.3%
cz	532,176,064	16,245,472	3.1%
DE	8,829,224,513	1,156,173,195	13.1%
DK	1,535,499,473	141,876,986	9.2%
EE	92,304,846	4,259,297	4.6%
EL	1,705,185,339	58,469,877	3.4%
ES	6,531,289,100	434,853,662	6.7%
FI	2,416,292,923	118,882,811	4.9%
FR	6,987,535,943	964,825,560	13.8%
HR	97,639,476	3,254,897	3.3%
HU	666,412,588	60,799,674	9.1%
IE	1,091,705,551	57,104,440	5.2%
IL	2,656,844,622	406,234,183	15.3%
IS	95,273,929	2,399,634	2.5%
ΙТ	8,474,456,508	416,031,993	4.9%
LT	60,835,812	0	0.0%
LU	36,291,884	0	0.0%
LV	43,888,936	1,360,980	3.1%
MD	19,647,876	0	0.0%
ME	7,574,518	0	0.0%
мк	9,102,788	0	0.0%
мт	9,048,617	0	0.0%
NL	5,123,896,942	734,111,872	14.3%
NO	1,261,514,312	100,878,159	8.0%
PL	1,009,246,827	20,999,790	2.1%
РТ	1,190,813,586	55,024,276	4.6%
RO	512,766,203	0	0.0%
RS	74,056,090	0	0.0%
SE	3,372,389,014	277,520,639	8.2%
SI	356,508,144	1,999,082	0.6%
sĸ	143,495,902	1,155,970	0.8%
TR	512,339,058	12,124,584	2.4%
UK	13,442,283,894	1,710,851,667	12.7%

.

						•	•••	•••	•••	•	
Table A8.04	: Submitted and	l selected prop	osals by hos	st country at a	application sta	ge and scien	tific domain				
	19			DE			сц			A11	
	EVAI	FUND	SR	FL	FUND	SR	FVAI	FUND	SR	FVAI	FUND
AL	0	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	2	
AT	237	40	16.9%	401	42	10.5%	173	16	9.2%	811	g
ва	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	3	
BE	429	52	12.1%	514	66	12.8%	325	33	10.2%	1.268	15
BG	31	0	0.0%	76	0	0.0%	44	3	6.8%	151	
СН	509	143	28.1%	672	150	22.3%	194	19	9.8%	1,375	31
СҮ	30	2	6.7%	73	4	5.5%	49	3	6.1%	152	
cz	103	1	1.0%	194	10	5.2%	47	1	2.1%	344	
DE	1,684	241	14.3%	2,251	293	13.0%	767	72	9.4%	4,702	60
DK	306	30	9.8%	340	39	11.5%	163	9	5.5%	809	7
EE	21	2	9.5%	18	0	0.0%	12	1	8.3%	51	
EL	342	12	3.5%	556	24	4.3%	133	1	0.8%	1,031	:
ES	1.361	86	6.3%	1.485	108	7.3%	694	47	6.8%	3.540	2
FI	490	32	6.5%	511	29	5.7%	244	8	3.3%	1,245	
FR	1,302	202	15.5%	1,823	276	15.1%	527	87	16.5%	3,652	5
HR	20	1	5.0%	45	1	2.2%	11	0	0.0%	76	
HU	181	10	5.5%	195	17	8.7%	121	9	7.4%	497	:
IE	195	11	5.6%	239	15	6.3%	151	9	6.0%	585	:
IL	560	111	19.8%	585	111	19.0%	274	24	8.8%	1,419	2
IS	14	1	7.1%	13	0	0.0%	15	0	0.0%	42	
п	1,748	76	4.3%	2,494	122	4.9%	1,112	65	5.8%	5,354	2
LT	19	0	0.0%	27	0	0.0%	8	0	0.0%	54	
LU	7	0	0.0%	10	0	0.0%	6	0	0.0%	23	
LV	7	0	0.0%	15	1	6.7%	7	0	0.0%	29	
MD	0	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	3	
ME	0	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	
MK	2	0	0.0%	3	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	6	
МТ	3	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%	7	
NL	936	115	12.3%	873	150	17.2%	805	101	12.5%	2,614	3
NO	230	13	5.7%	194	17	8.8%	174	14	8.0%	598	
PL	214	3	1.4%	332	8	2.4%	137	2	1.5%	683	
PT	237	19	8.0%	276	9	3.3%	136	7	5.1%	649	:
RO	91	0	0.0%	237	0	0.0%	78	0	0.0%	406	
RS	17	0	0.0%	24	0	0.0%	5	0	0.0%	46	
SE	827	70	8.5%	670	68	10.1%	246	18	7.3%	1,743	1
SI	52	0	0.0%	100	2	2.0%	76	0	0.0%	228	
SK	31	1	3.2%	51	0	0.0%	20	0	0.0%	102	
TR	149	1	0.7%	201	6	3.0%	62	0	0.0%	412	
1114	2 2 1 2	304	13 7%	2 1 2 1	202	10.00/	1 0 1 6	266	14 60/	7 450	



• • • • •

. . . . • . . • • • • • • • • • •

.

Table A8.06: Applicant success rates by host country at application stage and evaluation panel (LS)

	LS01	LS02	LS03	LS04	LS05	LS06	LS07	LS08	LS09
AT	12.5%	16.1%	26.9%	17.9%	31.0%	11.1%	0.0%	19.4%	6.7%
BE	5.4%	9.3%	13.2%	17.9%	15.8%	7.7%	12.5%	7.9%	15.8%
BG	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
СН	36.5%	31.3%	27.7%	36.8%	26.6%	26.7%	17.2%	26.8%	25.9%
CY		14.3%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	7.1%		0.0%
CZ	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DE	13.7%	11.9%	18.2%	18.1%	11.5%	15.2%	12.6%	11.9%	20.9%
DK	12.8%	7.5%	3.4%	9.5%	3.6%	0.0%	16.3%	15.2%	13.8%
EE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	20.0%	
EL	4.2%	0.0%	4.3%	12.5%	3.3%	5.1%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ES	5.6%	9.0%	7.5%	8.1%	4.9%	5.8%	4.8%	6.2%	5.4%
FI	2.9%	5.6%	5.9%	11.4%	3.0%	0.0%	8.5%	5.9%	13.0%
FR	12.6%	14.6%	13.8%	13.8%	15.2%	22.0%	17.3%	16.7%	8.6%
HR	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%		0.0%
HU	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.2%	6.7%	5.6%	6.3%	5.9%
IE	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	2.9%	10.7%	6.7%	10.0%
IL	12.3%	30.7%	11.9%	25.6%	19.2%	15.1%	17.9%	15.1%	27.3%
IS	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
IT	4.1%	1.4%	2.5%	4.8%	2.8%	8.1%	8.5%	0.0%	3.1%
LV		0.0%		0.0%	0.0%		0.0%		
NL	16.5%	15.5%	15.0%	9.4%	4.4%	9.8%	13.5%	14.1%	15.7%
NO	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	13.5%	4.3%	9.1%	4.8%	14.3%
PL	8.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
PT	6.7%	0.0%	17.9%	7.1%	14.8%	16.7%	2.9%	5.6%	0.0%
SE	3.1%	11.8%	6.0%	11.5%	11.8%	3.2%	10.2%	10.2%	3.6%
SI	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
SK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%
TR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UK	16.3%	13.7%	10.5%	15.2%	11.8%	10.6%	13.8%	15.5%	18.1%
All	11.1%	11.0%	10.9%	11.7%	10.5%	11.3%	10.0%	11.3%	9.7%

Table A8.06: Applicant success rates by host country at application stage and evaluation panel (PE) - continued

	PE01	PE02	PE03	PE04	PE05	PE06	PE07	PE08	PE09	PE10
AT	7.7%	18.4%	7.8%	11.9%	0.0%	7.2%	5.9%	18.2%	0.0%	11.1%
BE	16.7%	8.7%	2.2%	11.6%	7.7%	12.9%	22.4%	19.7%	9.3%	11.4%
BG	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
СН	29.5%	21.1%	22.7%	21.9%	23.8%	25.0%	25.0%	36.8%	7.7%	11.7%
CY	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	5.9%	100.0%	20.0%
CZ	5.9%	0.0%	3.6%	6.1%	3.8%	6.7%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	16.7%
DE	13.3%	15.8%	11.4%	14.2%	17.5%	12.8%	12.4%	13.4%	8.6%	8.8%
DK	21.2%	18.6%	2.4%	11.1%	2.9%	7.4%	23.8%	10.0%	12.5%	12.5%
EE	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%			0.0%	0.0%		0.0%
EL	3.1%	2.4%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	6.3%	2.8%	10.5%	6.7%	2.0%
ES	13.8%	11.0%	7.7%	6.3%	10.2%	2.8%	2.5%	9.9%	5.2%	1.9%
FI	11.4%	5.0%	8.6%	2.4%	4.3%	2.5%	2.2%	6.5%	8.3%	6.5%
FR	17.0%	15.5%	16.4%	8.7%	8.5%	20.8%	17.3%	13.2%	14.0%	15.6%
HR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
HU	18.2%	10.5%	14.3%	4.0%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
IE	5.0%	4.8%	2.5%	5.0%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	0.0%	4.5%
IL	32.8%	12.7%	13.0%	24.0%	19.3%	28.3%	18.9%	3.0%	16.7%	4.2%
IS	0.0%		0.0%			0.0%	0.0%			0.0%
IT	11.6%	8.4%	4.2%	3.1%	3.3%	3.1%	1.9%	4.3%	4.7%	3.8%
LV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	33.3%		0.0%		0.0%
NL	7.9%	10.6%	20.2%	22.0%	26.6%	6.6%	26.0%	20.7%	23.9%	13.1%
NO	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	8.3%	7.1%	0.0%	9.5%	17.1%
PL	0.0%	5.4%	2.4%	2.3%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%
PT	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	3.7%	0.0%
SE	4.5%	7.1%	7.8%	12.4%	9.7%	8.9%	18.3%	17.6%	13.3%	4.7%
SI	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		9.1%
SK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
TR	11.1%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	5.3%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
UK	13.0%	11.6%	11.6%	15.4%	14.6%	8.9%	12.1%	9.8%	13.0%	16.0%
All	13.1%	11.6%	9.8%	10.4%	11.0%	9.7%	9.5%	10.1%	10.7%	9.3%

Table A8.06: Applicant success rates by host country at application stage and evaluation panel (SH) - continued

.

	SH01	SH02	SH03	SH04	SH05	SH06	All
AT	0.0%	2.3%	36.4%	7.7%	0.0%	11.8%	12.1%
BE	12.5%	12.3%	12.5%	5.0%	8.7%	11.1%	11.8%
BG	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.6%	2.0%
CH	18.4%	2.4%	13.6%	10.0%	12.1%	0.0%	22.7%
CY	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
CZ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	3.5%
DE	11.3%	7.1%	10.9%	9.6%	11.7%	8.4%	12.9%
DK	3.7%	10.5%	12.5%	4.5%	5.0%	0.0%	9.8%
EE	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	5.9%
EL	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%
ES	13.6%	1.6%	6.3%	6.8%	6.2%	4.6%	6.8%
FI	4.0%	4.5%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%
FR	23.1%	12.3%	12.1%	19.5%	9.3%	16.7%	15.5%
HR	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
HU	25.0%	2.9%	0.0%	11.5%	0.0%	3.6%	7.2%
IE	15.4%	4.4%	4.3%	0.0%	3.3%	14.3%	5.8%
IL	13.5%	6.1%	3.6%	10.0%	7.7%	10.5%	17.3%
IS	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%
IT	9.0%	4.3%	6.4%	6.1%	7.4%	3.1%	4.9%
LV		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	3.4%
NL	0.9%	14.8%	16.0%	13.5%	14.3%	15.3%	14.0%
NO	20.0%	6.8%	7.1%	8.2%	4.2%	11.1%	7.4%
PL	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.9%
PT	5.6%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	11.1%	5.4%
SE	13.2%	8.1%	4.5%	6.1%	0.0%	5.6%	9.0%
SI	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
SK	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
TR	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
UK	16.0%	13.9%	12.1%	12.5%	15.0%	19.1%	13.5%
All	11.3%	8.5%	9.4%	9.3%	8.9%	9.7%	10.4%



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

																															•	•	
																								•	•	•		•	•		•	•	•
		Total	108	150	S	322	6	10	614	80	3	36	233	64	571	2	36	34	245	-	253	-	-	356	42	14	33	155	2	-	9	696	4,354
•		SH06	5	9	ε				13				7		16		-	с	9		9			13	2	-		-				53	136
		SH05		4		4			15	З			5		4			-	2		12			7	-		2					30	6
		SH04	4	9		4	-		21	2			7	e	26		e		9		16			35	4			4				49	191
		SH03	7	-		4			4	-			З		4			-	-		7			£	-			-				26	72
		SH02	-	6		7			13	2	-	-	°	4	14		-	-	4		£			27	3	-	e	7				72	183
		SH01		7		œ	2		10	-			19	-	20		4	-	9		17			-	7		-	5				38	143
		PE10	2	5		7	-	-	23	5		-	2	e	29			-	2		6			7	4			4	-			48	163
		E09 F		4		ო	-		17	e		-	5	2	25	-			9		80			17	2	2	-	4				48	150
		E08 F	4	13		4	-	-	20	ę		6	17	e	15		-	80	-		12	-		19			9	ი			-	32	190
		E07 F	-	13		12	-		16	2		2	4	-	19				7		5			12	-			10			2	22	130
		E06 P	7	80		24		2	27	e		9	9	2	46		-		26		9		-	7	2	e	-	7				33	218
		E05 P	-	4		18		-	45	-		-	20	2	16			ę	16		80			25				7			-	64	233
		E04 P	5	5		16		2	33	5			10	-	ŧ		-	2	12		9			21	2	-		12				35	180
		E03 P	9	-		20		-	33	-		-	14	7	45		4	-	6		12			23		-		80	-			27	215
	14)	E02 PI	16	4		19			46	80		-	15	2	36		2	-	6		25			6		7	2	5			-	40	243
	1/08/20	EO1 PE	9	80		19		-	33	7		-	12	5	41		80	-	21		23			7	4			7				39	238
	(as of 2	3d 603	-	9		9			19	4			10	5	ო		-	-	12		9			80	-			-		-		31	116
	n panel	508 LS	7	e	7	16			20	£	-		80	4	21		-	7	80					7	7		-	ი				50	169
	aluatior	07 LS		6		7	-		24	80	-	ო	10	80	15		-	ę	10		27			23	ი		-	12				40	210
	and eva	06 LS		4		19			30			2	7		40	-	-	-	80		10			7	-		5	e				24	169
	ountry	05 LS	6	6		21			35	-		-	5	2	34		5	-	20		9			5	9		4	14				40	. 18
	host ce	04 LSI	4	10		15			26	2		4	16	4	19				12		6			1			-	13			-	30	77 2
	current	03 LSI	6	4		17			35	-		-	10	2	26				7		4			7	-		5	4				28	65 1
	ees by	12 LS(9	5		4	-		21	e			12	2	25			7	27	-	e			15		-		10				31	79 1
	: Grant	11 LSC	5	2		25		-	35	9		-	9	-	21		-		7		5			16		2		e				39	76 1
	9 A8.07.	LS0																															1
	able		Þ	щ	Ö	ж	×	N	ш	¥	щ		ŝ		Ř	¥	⊋	ш	_	s	F	Ę	>	Ŧ	9	2	F	щ		¥	Ř	¥	Fotal



. • • • . . .

.

æ
7
Ő.
1
õ
7
2
ъ
(as
>
닅
5
ō
2
S
2
÷
eu
Ĕ
3
2
æ
×
8
Ĕ
-
ō
Ţ
Ĕ
Ľ,
ő
5
8
Ú
ati
Ĕ
e
£
5.
8
8
Ā

Table

SH06	1.5	1.3	32	0	0	0	0.7	0	0	0	-	0	0.9	0	0.9	2.8	0.8	0	0.8	0	0	1.2	1.5	2.3	0	0.2	0	0	0	1.8
SH05	0	1.3	0	0.6	0	0	1.2	1.8	0	0	-	0	0.3	0	0	1.4	0.4	0	2.3	0	0	-	1.2	0	2.9	0	0	0	0	1.5
SH04	0.8	0.9	0	0.3	2.5	0	0.8	0.6	0	0	0.7	1.1	-	0	1.9	0	0.6	0	1.4	0	0	2.2	2.2	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	1.2
SH03	3.9	0.4	0	0.8	0	0	0.4	0.8	0	0	0.8	0	0.4	0	0	1.8	0.2	0	1.7	0	0	1.9	1.4	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	1.6
SH02	0.2	1.4	0	0.1	0	0	0.5	1.5	7.9	0.7	0.3	1.5	0.6	0	0.7	0.7	0.4	0	-	0	0	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.2	1.1	0	0	0	1.8
SH01	0	1.4	0	0.8	6.8	0	0.5	0.4	0	0	2.5	0.5	1.1	0	3.4	0.9	0.7	0	2	0	0	0.1	1.4	0	0.9	-	0	0	0	1.2
PE10	0.5	0.9	0	0.9	e	2.7	-	1.7	0	0.7	0.2	1.3	1.4	0	0	0.8	0.2	0	-	0	0	0.8	2.5	0	0	0.7	13.4	0	0	1.3
E09	0	0.8	0	0.3	3.2	0	0.8	1.1	0	0.8	0.6	0.9	1.3	14.5	0	0	0.7	0	0.9	0	0	1.4	1.4	4.1	0.9	0.7	0	0	0	1.4
PE08	0.8	2	0	-	2.5	2.3	0.7	0.9	0	5.7	1.7	1.1	0.6	0	0.6	5.4	0.1	0	1.1	22.9	0	1.2	0	0	4.2	1.3	0	0	3.8	0.8
E07	0.3	2.9	0	1.2	3.7	0	0.9	0.8	0	1.9	0.6	0.5	1.1	0	0	0	-	0	0.7	0	0	1.1	0.8	0	0	2.2	0	0	11.2	0.8
E06 F	1.3	<u>+</u>	0	1.5	0	4	0.9	0.7	0	3.3	0.5	0.6	1.6	0	0.6	0	2.1	0	0.5	0	20	0.4	-	4.3	0.6	0.9	0	0	0	0.7
E05 F	0.2	0.5	0	-	0	1.9	1.4	0.2	0	0.5	1.6	0.6	0.5	0	0	1.6	1.2	0	0.6	0	0	1.3	0	0	0	0.8	0	0	3.1	1.2
E04 F	1.1	0.8	0	1.2	0	4.8	1.3	1.5	0	0	-	0.4	0.5	0	0.7	1.4	1.2	0	0.6	0	0	1.4	1.2	1.7	0	1.9	0	0	0	0.9
E03 P	1.1	0.1	0	1.3	0	2	1.1	0.3	0	0.6	1.2	2.2	1.6	0	2.3	0.6	0.7	0	-	0	0	1.3	0	1.4	0	-	10.1	0	0	0.6
E02 F	2.7	0.5	0	1.1	0	0	1.3	1.8	0	0.5	1.2	0.6	1.1	0	-	0.5	0.7	0	1.8	0	0	0.5	0	2.6	1.1	0.6	0	0	e	0.7
E01 P	-	~	0	1.1	0	1.8	-	1.6	0	0.5	0.9	1.4	1.3	0	4.1	0.5	1.6	0	1.7	0	0	0.4	1.7	0	0	0.2	0	0	0	0.7
S09 F	0.3	1.5	0	0.7	0	0	1.2	1.9	0	0	1.6	2.9	0.2	0	-	1.1	1.8	0	0.9	0	0	0.8	0.9	0	0	0.2	0	37.5	0	1.2
S08 L	1.7	0.5	0	1.3	0	0	0.8	1.6	8.6	0	0.9	1.6	0.9	0	0.7	1.5	0.8	0	0	0	0	0.8	1.2	0	0.8	1.5	0	0	0	1.3
-S07 L	0	1.2	0	0.7	2.3	0	0.8	2.1	6.9	1.7	0.9	2.6	0.5	0	0.6	1.8	0.8	0	2.2	0	0	1.3	1.5	0	0.6	1.6	0	0	0	0.9
-S06 L	0.5	0.7	0	1.5	0	0	1.3	0	0	1.4	0.8	0	1.8	12.9	0.7	0.8	0.8	0	-	0	0	0.8	0.6	0	3.9	0.5	0	0	0	0.6
S05 L	1.7	1.2	0	1.3	0	0	1.1	0.2	0	0.6	0.4	0.6	1.2	0	2.8	0.6	1.6	0	0.5	0	0	0.3	2.9	0	2.4	1.8	0	0	0	0.8
S04 L	0.9	1.6	0	1.1	0	0	-	0.6	0	2.7	1.7	1.5	0.8	0	0	0	1.2	0	0.9	0	0	0.8	0	0	0.7	2.1	0	0	4.1	0.8
S03 L	2.2	0.7	0	1.4	0	0	1.5	0.3	0	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.2	0	0	0	0.8	0	0.4	0	0	0.8	0.6	0	4	0.7	0	0	0	0.8
S02 L	1.4	0.8	0	1.1	2.7	0	0.8	0.9	0	0	1.3	0.8	1.1	0	0	1.4	2.7	24.3	0.3	0	0	-	0	1.7	0	1.6	0	0	0	0.8
S01 L	1.1	0.3	0	1.9	0	2.5	1.4	1.9	0	0.7	0.6	0.4	0.9	0	0.7	0	0.7	0	0.5	0	0	1.1	0	3.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	-
Ĺ	L	Į.	(7)	Ŧ	>	N		¥			6		~	œ	2					_		_ 1	0		_			~	~	¥
	A	8	Ő	Ū	ΰ	Ü	ō	ō	ш	ū	ш	Ξ	Ē	Ĩ	Í	Щ	4	S	E	Ľ	1	z	ž	đ	È	S	S	ŝ	F	5

• • • • • • • • •

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

• • • • • • • • • •



· · · · · · · · · · ·

Table A8.09: Cl	nanges of h	lost country at grant agre	ement signature

Та	ble A	8.09: Changes	of host co	untry at gra	ant agreeme	ent signatu	re									
								Signatu	re stage							
			AT	BE	СН	DE	DK	ES	FR	IL	IT	NL	PT	SE	UK	Total
		AT										1			1	2
		BE							1			2				3
		СН	2	2		3						1			2	10
		cz	1													1
		DE	3		1		1	1	4		1	1	1		9	22
	age					2										2
	lstå	EL							1						1	1
	Į I	E-5 E1							1					2	0	1
-		FR				1		1			1	3		2	2	8
	Apt	т			1			1	1			Ū			2	5
		NL		3	1	1	1		. 1		1				3	11
		NO		1					1			1			1	4
		РТ							1							1
		SE													1	1
		UK	2		7	6	1	1	1	3	1	2				24
		Total	8	6	10	13	3	4	11	3	4	11	1	2	29	105

Table A8.10: Changes of host country after grant agreement signature

								Current	stage								
		AT	BE	СН	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	IE	П	LU	NL	NO	PL	UK	Total
	AT			1												1	2
	BE	2			1				1					1			5
	СН				2	1	1			1	1						6
	cz															1	1
	DE	3		2					2		1					3	11
	DK				1												1
ge	ES			1	1						1					5	8
sta	FI															3	3
Inre	FR			4													4
Jnat	IE				1											2	3
Siç	IL			1	1				2								4
	п			2	5	1	1		1						1	2	13
	NL	1		1	4			1								5	12
	PT				1				1								2
	SE				2												2
	TR			1													1
	UK		1	3	9		1			1	1	1	2	1			20
	Total	6	1	16	28	2	3	1	7	2	4	1	2	2	1	22	98



• • • • • • • • • . • . • •

NUTS		StG			CoG			AdG			A 11		
1013		EVAL	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR
R10	Île de France	1565	264	16.9%	259	39	15.1%	949	173	18.2%	2773	476	17.2%
(1	Inner London	901	153	17.0%	161	15	9.3%	508	97	19.1%	1570	265	16.9%
21	Oberbayern	624	106	17.0%	77	10	13.0%	263	81	30.8%	964	197	20.4%
11	East Anglia	351	83	23.6%	45	8	17.8%	232	57	24.6%	628	148	23.6%
1	Région Lémanique	251	58	23.1%	37	8	21.6%	231	65	28.1%	519	131	25.2%
J1	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire	374	59	15.8%	72	9	12.5%	254	61	24.0%	700	129	18.4%
4	Zürich	247	51	20.6%	32	8	25.0%	214	65	30.4%	493	124	25.2%
1	Cataluña	649	62	9.6%	122	9	7.4%	316	43	13.6%	1087	114	10.5%
2	Noord-Holland	399	47	11.8%	63	9	14.3%	174	42	24.1%	636	98	15.4%
3	Zuid-Holland	377	48	12.7%	58	5	8.6%	175	36	20.6%	610	89	14.6%
)	Comunidad de Madrid	728	43	5.9%	176	7	4.0%	386	28	7.3%	1290	78	6.0%
	Lazio	826	47	5.7%	85	3	3.5%	367	23	6.3%	1278	73	5.7%
2	Eastern Scotland	323	35	10.8%	49	5	10.2%	175	33	18.9%	547	73	13.3%
	Wien	350	40	11.4%	56	4	7.1%	133	26	19.5%	539	70	13.0%
	Stockholm	455	33	7.3%	49	6	12.2%	170	26	15.3%	674	65	9.6%
	Lombardia	542	27	5.0%	56	7	12.5%	246	29	11.8%	844	63	7.5%
	Karlsruhe	291	36	12.4%	26	1	3.8%	103	24	23.3%	420	61	14.5%
	Etela-Suomi	489	32	6.5%	79	3	3.8%	246	21	8.5%	814	56	6.9%
	Gioucestershire, Wiltshire and Bristol/Bath	196	23	11.7%	38	4	10.5%	130	25	19.2%	364	52	14.3%
	Utrecht	249	30	12.0%	34	2	5.9%	115	19	16.5%	398	51	12.8%
	Prov. Vlaams-Brabant	263	26	9.9%	32	6	18.8%	109	16	14.7%	404	48	11.9%
	Berlin	2/1	23	8.5%	34	3	8.8%	100	21	21.0%	405	47	11.6%
	Celderland	327	20	0.0%	49	4	0.2%	140	17	11.0%	322	47	9.0%
	Kölp	195	20	12.0%	34	4	18.0%	12	17	23.0%	314	40	10.3%
	Rrow Oost Vlaanderen	216	22	13.4%	30	5	16.7%	43	10	18.6%	280	44	14.0%
	West Midlands	208	20	9.6%	44	7	15.9%	102	12	11.8%	354	30	11.0%
	Östra Mellansverige	269	21	7.8%	29	1	3.4%	88	13	14.8%	386	35	9.1%
	Nordwestschweiz	71	15	21.1%	16	5	31.3%	27	14	51.9%	114	34	29.8%
	Freiburg	142	16	11.3%	21	3	14.3%	51	12	23.5%	214	31	14.5%
	Southern and Eastern	325	20	6.2%	47	2	4.3%	143	9	6.3%	515	31	6.0%
	Groningen	179	25	14.0%	28	1	3.6%	29	5	17.2%	236	31	13.1%
	Közép-Magyarország	247	14	5.7%	37	2	5.4%	90	13	14.4%	374	29	7.8%
	Västsverige	184	14	7.6%	20	2	10.0%	78	13	16.7%	282	29	10.3%
	Toscana	394	7	1.8%	29	0	0.0%	182	20	11.0%	605	27	4.5%
	Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire	145	17	11.7%	24	2	8.3%	104	8	7.7%	273	27	9.9%
	Bruxelles-Capitale / Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest	145	16	11.0%	23	3	13.0%	65	6	9.2%	233	25	10.7%
	Midtjylland	102	12	11.8%	15	1	6.7%	63	12	19.0%	180	25	13.9%
	South Yorkshire	107	9	8.4%	11	1	9.1%	77	15	19.5%	195	25	12.8%
	West Yorkshire	129	10	7.8%	16	1	6.3%	86	14	16.3%	231	25	10.8%
	Darmstadt	118	15	12.7%	17	4	23.5%	50	5	10.0%	185	24	13.0%
	Rhône-Alpes	132	14	10.6%	18	2	11.1%	61	8	13.1%	211	24	11.4%
	Oslo og Akershus	188	11	5.9%	29	1	3.4%	96	12	12.5%	313	24	7.7%
	Sydsverige	1//	12	6.8%	1/	1	5.9%	68	11	16.2%	262	24	9.2%
	LISDOA	196	14	7.1%	37	4	10.8%	53	5	9.4%	286	23	8.0%
	Greater Manchester	140	13	8.9%	24	0	0.0%	91	9	9.9%	201	22	8.4%
	South Western Scotland	129	12	9.5%	21	1	4.0%	57	9	0.10/	207	22	0.1%
	Hamburg	130	13	8.2%	23	1	4.3%	88	12	9.1%	241	22	9.1%
	Noord-Brahant	126	7	6.3%	23	2	4.3%	47	12	18 / 19/	101	20	10.5%
	Tübingen	106	10	9.4%	10	1	5.9%	49	9	16.0%	173	10	11.0%
	Friuli-Venezia Giulia	106	5	4 7%	11	1	9.1%	70	12	17.1%	187	19	9.6%
	Overijssel	82	11	13.4%	18	3	16.7%	16	12	25.0%	116	18	15.5%
	Tees Valley and Durham	76	11	14 5%	15	2	13.3%	41	4	12.2%	132	18	13.6%
	Espace Mittelland	150	12	8.0%	18	2	5.6%	45	4	8.9%	213	17	8.0%
	Alsace	60	.2	15.0%	.0	0	0.0%	39	8	20.5%	105	17	16.2%
	Braunschweig	98	13	13.3%	17	1	5.9%	30	2	6.7%	145	16	11.0%
	Attiki	270	8	3.0%	25	0	0.0%	149	8	5.4%	444	16	3.6%
	Piemonte	241	10	4.1%	26	1	3.8%	74	5	6.8%	341	16	4.7%

• • • •

•



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

		•	•	•	•	•

able A0.01: Submitted and colocted a	proposale in MUTS 2 regions	by funding cohome (StG	CoC AdC) at a	nullication stage (continued	۱.
able A5.01. Sublinited and Selected	proposais in No 13-2 regions	by fulluling scheme (Ste	, COG, AUG) al a	application stage (continued	

Table A9												
TUDIC AU	.01: Submitted and selected proposals in NUTS	-2 regions by fundin	g scheme	(StG, Co	G, AdG)	at applica	tion stag	e (continu	ued)			
NUTS		StG			CoG			AdG			All	
		EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUN
UKJ3	Hampshire and Isle of Wight	78	8	10.3%	27	2	7.4%	51	6	11.8%	156	
FR62	Midi-Pyrenees	47	/	14.9%	2	0	0.0%	33	8	24.2%	82	
AT12	Niederösterreich	160	9	37.5%	30	2	50.0%	13	5	46.2%	300	
FI 43	Kriti	134	7	5.2%	13	2	15.4%	54	5	9.3%	201	
BE31	Prov. Brabant Wallon	79	11	13.9%	10	0	0.0%	31	2	6.5%	120	
ITD5	Emilia-Romagna	328	5	1.5%	23	0	0.0%	133	8	6.0%	484	
DE92	Hannover	63	8	12.7%	8	0	0.0%	19	4	21.1%	90	
ITD2	Provincia Autonoma Trento	147	6	4.1%	12	0	0.0%	42	6	14.3%	201	
PL12	Mazowieckie	126	10	7.9%	11	0	0.0%	64	2	3.1%	201	
UKC2	Northumberland and Tyne and Wear	73	4	5.5%	17	2	11.8%	40	6	15.0%	130	
BE21	Prov. Antwerpen	99	7	7.1%	4	1	25.0%	13	3	23.1%	116	
DEB3	Rheinhessen-Pfalz	61	4	6.6%	9	0	0.0%	29	7	24.1%	99	
DED2	Dresden	86	7	8.1%	7	0	0.0%	14	4	28.6%	107	
ES21	País Vasco	95	7	7.4%	16	1	6.3%	27	3	11.1%	138	
UKF1	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire	111	6	5.4%	21	1	4.8%	53	4	7.5%	185	
CZ01	Praha	134	4	3.0%	16	1	6.3%	59	5	8.5%	209	
DE25	Mittelfranken	47	3	6.4%	7	1	14.3%	17	6	35.3%	71	
DEA3	Münster	48	4	8.3%	8	2	25.0%	24	4	16.7%	80	
DEA5	Arnsberg	/8	8	10.3%	12	1	8.3%	40	1	2.5%	130	
AT22	Tirol	60	3	3.0%	11	0	0.0%	47	2	0.5%	141	
CY00	Kýpros / Kibris	105	4	3.8%	14	1	7.1%	32	4	12.5%	151	
DE26	Unterfranken	47	2	4.3%	6	2	33.3%	27	- 5	18.5%	80	
DE50	Bremen	63	5	7.9%	12	1	8.3%	24	3	12.5%	99	
ES11	Galicia	82	6	7.3%	12	1	8.3%	30	2	6.7%	124	
UKM5	North Eastern Scotland	60	6	10.0%	5	0	0.0%	29	3	10.3%	94	
DE11	Stuttgart	37	4	10.8%	6	0	0.0%	17	4	23.5%	60	
DEA1	Düsseldorf	62	2	3.2%	9	0	0.0%	24	6	25.0%	95	
FI19	Länsi-Suomi	152	5	3.3%	18	1	5.6%	58	2	3.4%	228	
FR82	Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur	50	3	6.0%	14	1	7.1%	37	4	10.8%	101	
PT11	Norte	130	6	4.6%	14	0	0.0%	26	2	7.7%	170	
UKE2	North Yorkshire	49	5	10.2%	10	0	0.0%	34	3	8.8%	93	
UKL2	East Wales	58	4	6.9%	17	0	0.0%	42	4	9.5%	117	
BE33	Prov. Liège	43	6	14.0%	8	0	0.0%	11	1	9.1%	62	
DE23	Oberpfalz	22	4	18.2%	3	1	33.3%	13	2	15.4%	38	
ES61	Andalucia	140	7	5.0%	32	0	0.0%	48	0	0.0%	220	
NL 40		117	3	2.6%	6	3	50.0%	41	1	2.4%	164	
	Limburg (NL)	70	4	5.7%	6	1	10.7%	24	2	8.3%	100	
DE24	Oberfranken	05	2	6.7%	9	0	0.0%	40	5	38.5%	32	
DECO	Saarland	30	3	10.0%	5	0	0.0%	10	3	30.0%	41	
DEGO	Thüringen	50	2	3.1%	14	2	14.3%	38	2	5.3%	117	
ES52	Comunidad Valenciana	140	5	3.6%	23	0	0.0%	62	1	1.6%	225	
FR51	Pays de la Loire	25	2	8.0%	0	0	0.0%	13	4	30.8%	38	
ITF3	Campania	186	3	1.6%	18	0	0.0%	80	3	3.8%	284	
NO06	Trøndelag	54	2	3.7%	10	0	0.0%	29	4	13.8%	93	
UKL1	West Wales and The Valleys	69	3	4.3%	8	0	0.0%	35	3	8.6%	112	
DE72	Gießen	33	4	12.1%	4	0	0.0%	20	1	5.0%	57	
ES22	Comunidad Foral de Navarra	30	3	10.0%	5	0	0.0%	19	2	10.5%	54	
ES24	Aragón	56	3	5.4%	7	1	14.3%	21	1	4.8%	84	
FR81	Languedoc-Roussillon	28	1	3.6%	3	0	0.0%	14	4	28.6%	45	
ITE2	Umbria	45	1	2.2%	5	2	40.0%	27	2	7.4%	77	
UKN0	Northern Ireland	66	2	3.0%	8	0	0.0%	33	3	9.1%	107	
CH07	licino	11	1	9.1%	4	0	0.0%	9	3	33.3%	24	
DE00	Meckienburg-Vorpommern	26	3	11.5%	5	1	20.0%	11	0	0.0%	42	
	Leipzig Dutiki Ellada	57	3	5.3%	3	0	0.0%	24	1	4.2%	84	
EL23		57	3	5.3%	4	0	0.0%	21	1	4.8%	82	
11132	DerAndia								4	16 70/	15	
	Porder Midland and Western	50	0	6.0%	10	0	0.0%	6	1	16.7%	45	
HU33 IE01	Border, Midland and Western	50	3	6.0%	12	1	8.3%	6	1	16.7% 0.0%	45 69	



. • . • . . .

.

.
• • • • • • • • • • • • • . • • • . •

StG CoG AdG I StG CoG AdG I III StG CoG AdG III III III StG CoG AdG III IIII IIII IIII IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	
StG CoG AdG IIII IIII StG CoG AdG IIII StG EVAL FUND. SR CoG AdG FUND. SR EVAL FUND. SR EVAL FUND. SR CoG O O CoG O O SR EVAL F	
StG CoG AdG All FUND. StG FUND. SR FVAL. FUND. SR FVAL. FUND. SR EVAL. FUND. SR EVAL. <th colsp<="" th=""></th>	
StG CoG AdG FUND. SR EVAL.	
StG CoG AdG Value EVAL. FUND. SR EVAL. FUND. <th cols<="" td=""></th>	
StiGVCGVCGAdGVAllVEVALFUND.SREVAL.FUND.SREVAL.FUND.SREVAL.FUND.SREVAL.FUND.SREVAL.FUND.SREVAL.FUND.SR </th	
FVALFUNDSRFVALFUNDSREVALFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRFUNDSRF	
Derive (P) 96 3 3.1% 17 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 129 4 3.1 stanbul 85 1 1.2% 7 1 14.3% 39 2 5.1% 131 4 3.1 yrov. Namur 9 1 1.1.1% 2 1 50.0% 7 1 14.3% 18 3 16.7 //ugozapaden 66 1 1.5% 6 0 0.0% 56 2 3.6% 128 4 3.1 Schleswig-Holstein 40 3 7.5% 9 0 0.0% 16 1 8.8% 53 3 5.7 Syddanmark 33 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 16 1 8.8% 53 3 5.7 Syddanmark 33 0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 10 2 2.0.0% 39 3 7.7 Zesti 2.7 7.4% 5 0 0.0.0% 16 1 6.3%	
stanbul 85 1 1.2% 7 1 14.3% 39 2 5.1% 131 4 3.1 rov. Namur 9 1 1.1% 2 1 50.0% 7 1 1.43% 18 3.1 4.8 3.1 rov. Namur 9 1 1.1% 2 1 50.0% 7 1 1.43% 18 3 16.7 fugozapaden 66 1 1.5% 6 0 0.0% 56 2 3.6% 128 3.4 3.5 Schleswig-Holstein 30 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 16 1 8.8% 53 6.3 7.7 Soddanmark 23 0.0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 10 2 2.0% 3.5 7.7 Setsi 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 6.6 3.57 7.7 Setsi 2 7.7 2 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 16 1	
Prov. Namur 9 1 1.1.1% 2 1 50.0% 7 1 1.4.3% 18 3 16.7 fugozapaden 66 1 1.5% 6 0 0.0% 56 2 3.6% 128 3 2.3 Schleswig-Holstein 40 3 7.5% 9 0 0.0% 20 0 0.0% 68 2.3 3.8.8% 5.3 3.5.3 Schleswig-Holstein 23 0.0 0.0% 66 1 16.7% 10 2.2 20.0% 3.9 3.5.7 Sorddynamark 33 0 0.0% 66 1 16.7% 10 2.2 20.0% 3.9 3.5.7 Syddamark 23 0.0 0.0% 66 1 16.7% 11 5.3% 5.9 3.5.7 Steistin 27 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 6.7 3.4.5 Aquitaine 27 2 4.3% 5.5 0 0.0% 16	
Tugbyzgaden 66 1 1.5% 6 0 0.0% 56 2 3.6% 126 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.8 3 2.3 3 4.3 3 0 0.0% 40 0 0.0% 16 3 18.8% 553 3 5.7 7 Sextheswig-Holstein 23 0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 10 2 2.0.0% 3.9 3 7.7 Eesti 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 66 3 4.5 Aquitaine 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 67 3 4.5 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 0 0.0% 18 2 11.1% 48 3 6.3 3.0% 3.0% 12 0.0% 11 1.83% 10 3.3	
Syddamark 33 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 16 3 18.8% 53 3 5.7 Nordjylland 23 0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 10 2 20.0% 39 3 7.7 Eesti 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 5.3% 5.7 Aquitaine 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 19 1 5.3% 5.9 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 67 3 4.5 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 0 0.0% 18 2 11.1% 48 63 63.3 4.5 Aquitaine 27 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 3.0 0.0% 18 2 11.1% 48 3 63.3 1.7.7 Social 15 2 0.0% 17 0 0.0%	
Nordjylland 23 0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 10 2 20.0% 39 3 7.7 Eesti 27 22 7.4% 55 0 0.0% 19 1 5.3% 55.9 ta-Suomi 46 2 4.3% 55 0 0.0% 18 1 6.3% 67 3 5.9 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 00 0.0% 18 1 6.3% 67 3 5.9 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 00 0.0% 18 2 11.1% 48 3 6.3 Vogla 77 2 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 11 5.9% 3.0 0.0% 11 5.9% 3.0 1.7 Socialia 135 2 1.5% 99 0 0.0% 11 1.9% 48 3.0 1.7 Socialia 77 2 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 1.16% 100 1.0%	
268th 27 2 7.4% 5 0 0.0% 19 1 5.3% 51 3 5.3 ta-Suomi 46 2 4.3% 5 0 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 67 3 4.5 Aquitaine 27 1 3.7% 3 0 0.0% 18 2 11.1% 48 3 6.3 Vugla 77 2 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 99 3 3.0% Sicilia 135 2 1.5% 9 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 106 3 2.8% Ankara 82 2 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 107 3 2.8% Steiermark 22 9.1% 0 0 0.0% 11 1 9.1% 33 9.1 Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2	
action 1 1 1 0	
Puglia 77 2 2.6% 5 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 99 3 3.0 Sicilia 135 2 1.5% 9 0 0.0% 36 1 2.8% 180 3 1.7 Dvre Norrland 77 3 3.9% 12 0 0.0% 17 0 0.0% 106 3 2.8% Ankara 82 2 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 107 3 2.8% Essex 22 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 107 3 2.8% Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 11 1 9.1% 33 9.1 Oberosterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 29 2 6.9% Centriki Makedonia <td< td=""></td<>	
Sicilia 135 2 1.5% 9 0 0.0% 36 1 2.8% 180 3 1.7 Dvre Norrland 77 3 3.9% 12 0 0.0% 17 0 0.0% 106 3 2.8% Ankara 82 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 100 3 2.8% Essex 22 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 100 3 2.8% Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2 2.3% Oberodsterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 29 2 6.9% Centriki Makedonia 85 1 1.2% 15 0 0.0% 35 1 2.9% 1.5 1.5%	
Ankara 82 2 2.4% 3 1 33.3% 22 0 0.0% 100 3 2.8 Sesex 22 2 9.1% 0 0.0% 11 1 9.1% 33 3 9.1 Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2 2.3 Decrosterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2 2.3 Kentriki Makedonia 85 1 1.2% 15 0 0.0% 35 1 2.9% 15 2 1.5	
Ssex 22 2 9.1% 0 0 0.0% 11 1 9.1% 33 3 9.1 Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2 2.3 Derösterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 29 2 6.9 Kentriki Makedonia 85 1 1.2% 15 0 0.0% 35 1 2.9% 135 2 1.5%	
Steiermark 57 0 0.0% 8 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 86 2 2.3 Dberösterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 29 2 6.9 Kentriki Makedonia 85 1 1.2% 15 0 0.0% 35 1 2.9% 135 2 1.5%	
Deprösterreich 17 1 5.9% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 29 2 6.9 Kentriki Makedonia 85 1 1.2% 15 0 0.0% 35 1 2.9% 135 2 1.5%	
Principado de Asturias 22 2 9.1% 5 0 0.0% 9 0 0.0% 36 2 5.6	
Región de Murcia 25 0 0.0% 1 1 100.0% 7 1 14.3% 33 2 6.1	
Pohjois-Suomi 74 1 1.4% 13 0 0.0% 42 1 2.4% 129 2 1.6	
Vord - Pas-de-Calais 28 1 3.6% 2 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 47 2 4.3 orraine 15 1 6.7% 5 0 0.0% 17 1 5.9% 47 2 4.3	
Uname 15 1 0.7% 5 0.0% 2 1 0.0% 22 2 0.1 Juvergne 12 2 16.7% 0 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 16 2 12.5	
Zahodna Slovenija 128 1 0.8% 9 0 0.0% 70 1 1.4% 207 2 1.0	
ancashire 8 1 12.5% 0 0 0.0% 4 1 25.0% 12 2 16.7	
Juter London 45 1 2.2% 5 0 0.0% 15 1 5.7% 55 2 3.0 Sent 41 1 2.4% 2 0 0.0% 14 1 7.1% 57 2 3.5	
Devon 13 1 7.7% 7 0 0.0% 6 1 16.7% 26 2 7.7	
Yarnten 4 1 25.0% 0 0 0.0% 1 0 0.0% 5 1 20.0%	
rov.Limburg (B) 9 1 11.1% 0 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 13 1 7.7 Tow Hainaut 6 1 16.7% 0 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 8 1 125	
Stedni Čechy 9 1 11.1% 1 0 0.0% 3 0 0.0% 13 1 7.7	
lihovýchod 40 1 2.5% 9 0 0.0% 10 0 0.0% 59 1 1.7	
Nederbayern 4 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 3 1 33.3% 7 1 14.3	
o I I I U	
Kassel 9 1 11.1% 2 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 15 1 6.7	
Lüneburg 3 0 0.0% 1 1 100.0% 4 1 25.0	
Jetmoid 36 U U.U% 6 U 0.0% 16 1 6.3% 58 1 1.7 Koblenz 1 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 1 1 1.00.0% 2 1 50.0	
Image: Control of the state of the	
peiros 40 1 2.5% 2 0 0.0% 7 0 0.0% 49 1 2.0%	
Dastila y León 56 1 1.8% 10 0 0.0% 24 0 0.0% 90 1 1.1 Castila y León 26 1 2.6% 10 0 0.0% 24 0 0.0% 90 1 1.1 Castila y León 2.6% 10 0 0.0% 24 0 0.0% 90 1 1.1	
Zantanas 23 1 3.0% 10 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 47 1 2.1 Dente 9 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 6 1 116.7% 15 1 6.7	
Basse-Normandie 5 1 20.0% 1 0 0.0% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1	
3retagne 25 0 0.0% 4 0 0.0% 7 1 14.3% 36 1 2.8	
Sjeverozapadna Hrvatska 33 1 3.0% 2 0 0.0% 16 0 0.0% 51 1 2.0 Jadranska Hrvatska 10 0 0.0% 3 0 0.0% 9 1 11 1% 22 1 4.5	
Dél-Dunántúl 6 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 17 1 5.9	
Eszak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0	
Eszak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0 sland 24 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 12 1 8.3% 41 1 2.4	
Essak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0 sland 24 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 12 1 8.3% 41 1 2.4% vlarche 42 1 2.4% 2 0 0.0% 22 0 0.0% 66 1 1.5 bruzzo 43 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 23 0 0.0% 73 1 4.4	
Essak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0 sland 24 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 12 1 8.3% 41 1 2.4 vlarche 42 1 2.4% 2 0 0.0% 22 0 0.0% 66 1 1.5 Abruzzo 43 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 23 0 0.0% 7 1 4.0 atvija 17 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 9 1 11.1% 26 1 3.8	
Essak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0 sland 24 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 12 1 8.3% 41 1 2.4% vlarche 42 2 0 0.0% 0.2% 0.0% 0.2% 0.0% 0.1 1.1 8.3% 41 1 2.4% Abruzzo 43 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 23 0.0% 0.0% 1.1 4.0% Abruzzo 43 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 1.11.1% 26 1 1.4% Autija 1 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.11.1% 26 1 3.1 Pomorskie 19 0.0% 0.0% 0 0.0% 0.0% 1.3 1.7% 3.2 1 3.1	
Eszak-Alföld 21 1 4.8% 2 0 0.0% 2 0 0.0% 25 1 4.0 sland 24 0 0.0% 5 0 0.0% 12 1 8.3% 41 1 2.4 vlarche 42 1 2.4% 2 0 0.0% 22 0 0.0% 66 1 1.5 Abruzzo 43 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 23 0 0.0% 73 1 1.4 Activija 17 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 9 1 1.1% 26 1 3.8 Pomorskie 19 0 0.0% 0 0 0.0% 13 1 7.7% 32 1 3.1 Stratsizský kraj 44 1 2.3% 7 0 0.0% 14 0 0.0% 1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1 3.1	

• . . . •



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

Table A9.0	2: Submitted and selected proposals	in NUTS-2 regions by scientific dom	iain at appli	cation stage							•				
NUTS		LS LS		1	PE		1	SH		8	All		1		
FR10	lle de France	EVAL. 1018	FUND.	17 5%	EVAL. 1388	732	16 7%	EVAL. 367	FUND.	5K 18.0%	EVAL.	476	17 2%		
UKI1	Inner London	631	112	17.7%	535	69	12.9%	404	84	20.8%	1570	265	16.9%		
DE21	Oberbayern	405	97	24.0%	477	86	18.0%	82	14	17.1%	964	197	20.4%		
	East Anglia Déciser Lémonique	219	55 50	25.1% 34.3%	267	66 65	24.7%	142	27	19.0%	628 510	148	23.6%		
UKJ1	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfo	ordshire 240	37	15.4%	264	3 2	20.5%	196	38 -	19.4%	002	129	18.4%		
CH04	Zürich	184	49	26.6%	255	65 i	25.5%	54	10	18.5%	493	124	25.2%		
ES51	Cataluña	428	38	8.9%	385	45	11.7%	274	31	11.3%	1087	114	10.5%		
NL32	Zuid-Holland	233	23	10.3%	212	45	21.2%	175	21	12.0%	610 610	00 68	14.6%		
ES30	Comunidad de Madrid	499	31	6.2%	557	37	6.6%	234	9	4.3%	1290	78	6.0%		
ITE4	Lazio	360	16	4.4%	757	50	6.6%	161	7	4.3%	1278	73	5.7%		
UKM2	Eastern Scotland	172	20	11.6%	258	35	13.6%	117	9	15.4%	547	73	13.3%		
A113 SF11	Vien	16U 365	34	21.3% 8 8%	192	3 20	0.0% 0 7%	118 82	5 5	8.5%	539 674	0/	13.0%		
ITC4	Lombardia	346	33	9.5%	301	12	4.0%	197	9	9.1%	844	83	7.5%		
DE12	Karlsruhe	189	33	17.5%	177	21	11.9%	54	7	13.0%	420	61	14.5%		
FI18	Etelä-Suomi	315	26	8.3%	331	24	7.3%	168	9	3.6%	814	56	6.9%		
UKK1	Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Bristol.	/Bath 104	12	11.5%	207	33	15.9%	33	r 0	13.2%	364	52 54	14.3%		
RF24	Durecht Prov Vlaams-Brahant	100	10	0.1.1	163	26	16.0%	111	0	0.0% 0.0%	404	10	11.9%		
DE30	Berlin	142	19	13.4%	141	20	14.2%	120	<u>∞</u>	6.7%	403	47	11.7%		
DK01	Hovedstaden	211	19	9.0%	214	21	9.8%	97	7	7.2%	522	47	9.0%		
NL22	Gelderland	145	20	13.8%	64 165	7	17.2%	92 70	15	16.3%	301	46	15.3%	•	
BE23	Prov. Oost-Vlaanderen	103	25	18.7%	85	4	12.9%	70	n u	8.6%	289	44	14.5%	•	
UKG3	West Midlands	12	2	7.0%	185	24	13.0%	88	9	10.2%	354	39	11.0%	•	
SE12	Östra Mellansverige	176	21	11.9%	143	12	8.4%	67	7	3.0%	386	35	9.1%		
CH03 DF13	Registre Ereiburg	100 100	12	39.3% 11 8%	43	9 C	20.9%	37		10.0%	214	34	29.8%	•	
IE02	Southern and Eastern	167	<u>1</u> 0	5.4%	215	14	6.5%	133	. ∞	6.0%	515	31	6.0%	•	
NL11	Groningen	98	12	12.2%	99	33	19.7%	72	9	8.3%	236	31	13.1%	•	
HU10 CE23	Kozep-Magyarorszag	116	χu	6.9% 6.6%	151 160	13	8.6%	10/	n 00	70 F 0	3/4	67.	10.2%		
JE 1	Vasisvenge Toscana	201	o ←	0.5%	215	10	4.7%	189	ں 16	0.1% 8.5%	505 605	27	4.5%	•	
UKF2	Leicestershire, Rutland and Northam	ptonshire 69	7	10.1%	66	9	6.1%	106	4	13.2%	274	27	9.9%	•	
BE10	Bruxelles-Capitale / Brussels Hoofdst	tedelijk Gewest	5	9.1%	115	12	10.4%	63	ω,	12.7%	233	25	10.7%	•	
DK04	Midtjylland	67	10	14.9%	75	<u>ლ</u> ი	17.3%	8	~ 4	5.3%	180	55 25	13.9%		
UKE4	West Yorkshire	57	2	8.8%	109 2	ہ ہ	9.0% 11.9%	91 92	c ~	9.0% 10.8%	231	25 25	10.8%	•	
DE71	Darmstadt	43	8	18.6%	66	7	11.1%	48	5	10.4%	190	24	12.6%		
FR71	Rhône-Alpes	61	Ω.	8.2%	126	18	14.3%	54	-	4.2%	211	24	11.4%		
NO01 SE27	Oslo og Akershus Svideverige	115	4 5	3.5%	11	÷ ÷	9.9%	87	o c	10.3%	313 262	24	7.7%		
ЭС 44 РТ17	oydsverige I ishoa	110	16	14.5%	ع 105	<u>ז</u> מ	2.9%	57 71	14	0.0 % 5.6%	202 286	23 23	8.0%		
UKD3	Greater Manchester	74	9	8.1%	119	12	10.1%	68	4	5.9%	261	22	8.4%		
UKJ2	Surrey, East and West Sussex	36	2	5.6%	106	8	7.5%	65	12	18.5%	207	22	10.6%		
UKM3	South Western Scotland	22	10	13.0%	113	7	6.2%	51	Q	9.8%	241	22	9.1%		

110

•

. •

. .

Humine Eval Ford <	NUTS		rs			БЕ			HS			AII			
Herrory Herrory <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th></th></t<>			EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	
A Devolution Diametric Diamotric <thdiametric< th=""> <thdiamotr< th=""><th>E60</th><th>Hamburg</th><th>49</th><th>e</th><th>6.1%</th><th>61</th><th>7</th><th>11.5%</th><th>45</th><th>10</th><th>22.2%</th><th>155</th><th>20</th><th>12.9%</th><th></th></thdiamotr<></thdiametric<>	E60	Hamburg	49	e	6.1%	61	7	11.5%	45	10	22.2%	155	20	12.9%	
14 Tuburgen 14<	-41	Noord-Brabant	14	0	0.0%	124	17	13.7%	53	e	5.7%	191	20	10.5%	
AT Fundament dula 9 5 6/0 10 7	14	Tübingen	62	ω	10.1%	58	9	10.3%	36	2	13.9%	173	19	11.0%	
21 Constrained 5 1 C20 C30 C30<	04	Friuli-Venezia Giulia	58	5	8.6%	104	10	9.6%	25	ო	12.0%	187	18	9.6%	
Circ Tesses Methand 5 1 2.00 6 1 2.00 6 1 2.00 1 </td <td>-21</td> <td>Overijssel</td> <td>ω</td> <td>~</td> <td>12.5%</td> <td>86</td> <td>17</td> <td>19.8%</td> <td>22</td> <td>0</td> <td>%0.0</td> <td>116</td> <td>18</td> <td>15.5%</td> <td></td>	-21	Overijssel	ω	~	12.5%	86	17	19.8%	22	0	%0.0	116	18	15.5%	
C.E. Exame Methed E 7 7 7 0	ç	Tees Valley and Durham	2	-	20.0%	89	12	13.5%	38	2 2	13.2%	132	18	13.6%	•
No. No. <td>102</td> <td>Espace Mittelland</td> <td>81</td> <td>œ</td> <td>9.9%</td> <td>85</td> <td>б</td> <td>10.6%</td> <td>47</td> <td>0</td> <td>%0.0</td> <td>213</td> <td>17</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>•</td>	102	Espace Mittelland	81	œ	9.9%	85	б	10.6%	47	0	%0.0	213	17	8.0%	•
31 Runstmende 32 1 </td <td>142</td> <td>Alsace</td> <td>64</td> <td>1</td> <td>17.2%</td> <td>32</td> <td>9</td> <td>18.8%</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>%0.0</td> <td>105</td> <td>17</td> <td>16.2%</td> <td></td>	142	Alsace	64	1	17.2%	32	9	18.8%	6	0	%0.0	105	17	16.2%	
3.1 Tentime 3.2	<u>1</u>	Braunschweig	65	10	15.4%	57	9	10.5%	23	0	%0.0	145	16	11.0%	•
11 Plentoine 25 273 25 273 25 56 34	30	Attiki	174	2 2	2.9%	221	10	4.5%	49	-	2.0%	444	16	3.6%	
13 Humanitie and flee of Wolft 2 1 1.32 2.3 3.33 3.35 1.5 1.5 1.5 3 Nethonic 1 2 2 1 3.25 2.35 3.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 3 Nethonic 1 2 2 1 2 3.3 3.25 3.5 1.5 1.5 3 Nethonic 1 2 2 1 2 3.5 <td>5</td> <td>Piemonte</td> <td>96</td> <td>S</td> <td>5.2%</td> <td>162</td> <td>9</td> <td>3.7%</td> <td>83</td> <td>2 2</td> <td>6.0%</td> <td>341</td> <td>16</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>•</td>	5	Piemonte	96	S	5.2%	162	9	3.7%	83	2 2	6.0%	341	16	4.7%	•
8. Wolf-prictes 61 0 0 0 3	(J3	Hampshire and Isle of Wight	24	-	4.2%	106	14	13.2%	26	-	3.8%	156	16	10.3%	
3. Vencio 13. 13	62	Midi-Pyrénées	16	0	0.0%	32	2	6.3%	34	13	38.2%	82	15	18.3%	•
1 Name 1 A metrostruction 1 A metrostruction 3 Col 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	ñ	Veneto	113	S	4.4%	102	7	6.9%	06	ო	3.3%	305	15	4.9%	•
A: Ford A: A	12	Niederösterreich	14	4	28.6%	10	5	50.0%	б	2 2	55.6%	33	14	42.4%	
31 From Extension 35 4 1.43 55 6 1.03 3 2.03 2.03 3 2.03 2.03 3 2.03 <th<< td=""><td>43</td><td>Kriti</td><td>54</td><td>4</td><td>7.4%</td><td>134</td><td>10</td><td>7.5%</td><td>13</td><td>0</td><td>%0.0</td><td>201</td><td>14</td><td>7.0%</td><td>•</td></th<<>	43	Kriti	54	4	7.4%	134	10	7.5%	13	0	%0.0	201	14	7.0%	•
Bin Hendrongan Entile-Foraga Entile-	31	Prov. Brabant Wallon	35	4	11.4%	55	9	10.9%	30	ო	10.0%	120	13	10.8%	Ĩ
2 Partmone Intermeting 2 3 5% 4% 8 1%% 6% 7 1% 5% 1%	05	Emilia-Romagna	149	ო	2.0%	216	7	3.2%	119	ო	2.5%	484	13	2.7%	
2 Provincial Automa Trento 3 1 2 3 <td>92</td> <td>Hannover</td> <td>42</td> <td>4</td> <td>9.5%</td> <td>42</td> <td>ø</td> <td>19.0%</td> <td>9</td> <td>0</td> <td>%0.0</td> <td>06</td> <td>12</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>Ĩ</td>	92	Hannover	42	4	9.5%	42	ø	19.0%	9	0	%0.0	06	12	13.3%	Ĩ
12 Notwinteriand and Tyne and Wear 5 3 5/3 4/1 7 7/3 5/2 3/3 1/1 1/2 6/3 12 Notwinteriand and Tyne and Wear 2 3 8/3 3/3 <td>22</td> <td>Provincia Autonoma Trento</td> <td>34</td> <td>-</td> <td>2.9%</td> <td>108</td> <td>4</td> <td>3.7%</td> <td>59</td> <td>7</td> <td>11.9%</td> <td>201</td> <td>12</td> <td>6.0%</td> <td></td>	22	Provincia Autonoma Trento	34	-	2.9%	108	4	3.7%	59	7	11.9%	201	12	6.0%	
Zit Description AI A AI A AI	12	Mazowieckie	58	с С	5.2%	91	7	7.7%	52	2	3.8%	201	12	6.0%	
21 Prov. Antenenie 21 Cov. Antenenie 21 Prov. Antenenie 22 53 50% 716 711 103% 21 Pison Pison 2 5 50% 50 3 50% 70 71 103% 21 Pison Pison 2 5 50% 70 3 50% 71 103% 25 Pison 2 5 50% 73 5 5 50% 70 40 41 25 Pison 2 0 00% 71 14 80% 25 0 0.00% 44 4 9 20% 71 14 80% 26 0.00% 7 1 14 80% 71 14 80% 26 0.00% 1 1 2 6 9 17 14 26 0.00% 1 1 1 2 6 9	3	Northumberland and Tyne and Wear	46	8	17.4%	44	4	9.1%	40	0	%0.0	130	12	9.2%	
B3 Reinfusen-Pfaiz 20 3 15.0% 53 6 13.6% 2 0 000 11 11.1% Present/faiz 20 3 15.0% 53 6 13.6% 5 1 20.0% 10 11 11.1% Present/arx 20 0 0 1 2.3% 64 8 1.5% 20 0.0% 10 11 10.3% A1 Preson 20 0 0.0% 130 11 10.3% 10 11 10.3% A1 Preson 20 0 0.0% 130 14 13 20% 138 11 10.3% A1 Numer 20 0 0.0% 130 14 13 20% 138 11 11.1% A1 Numer 20 0 0.0% 130 14 10 17.1% A1 11 11.1% 20 11 11.1%	21	Prov. Antwerpen	41	4	9.8%	40	4	10.0%	35	ო	8.6%	116	7	9.5%	
Discretion Discretion <thdiscretion< th=""> Discretion Discreti</thdiscretion<>	B3	Rheinhessen-Pfalz	20	ო	15.0%	59	ω	13.6%	20	0	0.0%	66	1	11.1%	
Tit Para vasion P	5 2	Dresden	29	· ۲	17.2%	73	0 Q	6.8%	0 0 0	ر (20.0%	107	53	10.3%	
FI Derrystine and Notingiansnine 50 1 20% 30% 31% 31% 20% 10 41% As Mittelianken 50 0 20% 30% 21% 20% 10 41% As Mittelianken 50 0 00% 30% 21% 21% 20% 10 41% As Mittelianken 20% 0 00% 30% 21%	21	Pais Vasco	4	-	2.3%	64	0	12.5%	02	N	6.7%	138	11	8.0%	
Diff Tara Diff Tara Diff Tara Diff Diff <thdiff< th=""> Diff Diff <th< td=""><td>Ē</td><td>Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire</td><td>20</td><td>, (</td><td>2.0%</td><td>95</td><td>ω (</td><td>8.4%</td><td>39</td><td>N .</td><td>5.1%</td><td>184</td><td>11</td><td>6.0%</td><td></td></th<></thdiff<>	Ē	Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire	20	, (2.0%	95	ω (8.4%	39	N .	5.1%	184	11	6.0%	
2.0 0 0.00% 44 9 2.05% 1 14.3% 17 10 14.3% A5< Antifaration 20 0 0.0% 29 1 34% 13 10 14.3% 17 10 14.3% A5< Antifaration 20 0 0.0% 29 1 34% 13 10 12.5% A5< Antifaration 20 7 34 41 9 2.05% 17 10 141 10 17.8% 33 Troid Ventifaration 20 1 4.8% 55 8 11.5% 14 10 17.8% 10 17.8% 34 14 17 14.8% 55 8 15.7% 4 55% 4 3 60% 9 9 10.0% 13 <	5	Praha	25	0	0.0%	130	ວ ເ	6.9%	-	- ,	3.7%	507	10	4.8%	
A3 Mutster A3 Mutster A3 Mutster A4A13441344110 1736 6565101366754511176554 736 101 1736 60 Versionet 502066411176554 7366 4111765541 7366 50101 17366 61 Versionet 5021465147554 7366 40101 17366 611071765541176554117655411765641178611021766516151664117655417765166517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666517666 </td <td>22</td> <td>Mittelfranken</td> <td>50</td> <td>э ·</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>44 :</td> <td>ົ້</td> <td>20.5%</td> <td>~ !</td> <td></td> <td>14.3%</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>14.1%</td> <td></td>	22	Mittelfranken	50	э ·	0.0%	44 :	ົ້	20.5%	~ !		14.3%		10	14.1%	
5 Amsterig 28 1 38% 75 8 10.7% 29 1 34% 130 10 17,1% 33 Triol Constrained 29 1 43% 56 8 14.3% 57 10 17,1% 34 Triol Constrained 20 1 44 10 17,1% 74 7 74 71% 30 Triol Constrained 29 10,3% 56 8 14,3% 6 0 0.0% 80 9 10,3% 30 North Eastern Southand 39 2 10,3% 57 10,3% 11 10 77,3% 31 Bernen 33 2 12,5% 57 10,3% 11 10 00% 33 32 Color 33 23% 34 35% 34 35% 34 35% 35% 35% 36% 36% 33% 33 North Eastern Southand 33 33% 33% 34 35% 35% 35%	A3	Münster	29	-	3.4%	41	o '	22.0%	9	0	0.0%	80	6	12.5%	
05 Vestandet 2 4.0% 35 8 11,1% 35 4 7.3% 141 10 7.1% 06 Kynos / Khrs 21 4.0% 35 8 14.1% 10 7.3% 141 10 7.1% 06 Kynos / Khrs 29 2 6.9% 73 4 5.5% 49 3 6.1% 13 00 Kynos / Khrs 29 2 6.9% 73 4 5.5% 49 3 6.1% 51 9 6.0% 11 Galcia 33 2.3% 28 7 11.1% 14 0 0.0% 99 133% 11 Galcia 3 3.3% 28 2 7.1% 36 4 13.3% 9 2.3% 13.3% 12 Suttgater Southand 8 1 1.3% 36 1 1.1% 6 1.1% 1 1.1% 1.3% 1.3% 13 Suttgater Suttgater Suttgater 3 2.1% 3	A5	Arnsberg	26	- (3.8%	75	∞ •	10.7%	29		3.4%	130	9	7.7%	
30 Irrol 31 170% 32 1 4.5% 15 4 0.0% 90 91	02	Vestlandet	09 20		4.0%	9 <u>9</u>	4 (11.1%	55 ;	4 (1.3%	141	01	7.1%	
Off Norse/ Monis Description Description <thdescription< <="" td=""><td>22</td><td>1 Irrol</td><td>12</td><td>- (</td><td>4.8%</td><td>22 10</td><td>×α</td><td>14.5%</td><td>14</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>06</td><td>ວ່</td><td>10.0%</td><td></td></thdescription<>	22	1 Irrol	12	- (4.8%	22 10	×α	14.5%	14	0	0.0%	06	ວ່	10.0%	
Definition	3 3	Kypros / Kibris	87 8	N 1	0.9%	13	4 r	%C.C	04 I	n o	0.1%	1.61	ס מ	0.0%	
0 1 2 1 1 0 1 0 1 0 <th0< th=""> <th0< th=""> <th0< th=""></th0<></th0<></th0<>	9 2	Untertranken	5 5 7 7 7 7 7	4 (10.3%	φ. Έ	1 വ	14.1%	- * *	-	%0.0 0	000	ກດ	0.10%	
NorthEastern Scotland $\frac{1}{10}$ 1	10	Deliteit	0	V <	70 F O	202	- u	10.1%	<u>ד מ</u>		%0.0	99.6	ກເ	9.1% 7.2%	
Non-construction 0 1 125% 43 6 141% 00 313% AI Disseldor 3 2 6 10% 5 0 11% 00 8 13% B Lansi-Suomi 33 2 6 10% 57 6 10% 56 2 36% 25% 8 84% B Lansi-Suomi 33 2 6 10% 57% 5 0 00% 3 32% B Lansi-Suomi 33 2 6 10% 3 2 6 10% 3 2 6 10% 3 3 2 6 10% 3 2 6 10% 3 3 2 6 10% 3 2 6 10% 3 2 6 10% 11 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 11 10% <th< td=""><td>ME</td><td>Galicia North Erstern Scotland</td><td>41</td><td>4 C</td><td>9.1% 0.20/</td><td>4 2 2</td><td>0 C</td><td>7 10/0</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>13 20/2</td><td>54</td><td>ກເ</td><td>0/201</td><td></td></th<>	ME	Galicia North Erstern Scotland	4 1	4 C	9.1% 0.20/	4 2 2	0 C	7 10/0	0	-	13 20/2	54	ກເ	0/201	
Instruction Distruction Distruction <thdistruction< th=""> <thdistruction< th=""></thdistruction<></thdistruction<>	CM 11	NUITI EASTETT SCUTATIO	ç °	o ≁	0.3.70	07 70	V (1.1.70	ς γ	, t	10.070	4 0 0	ກດ	9.070	
Difference Difference <td>41</td> <td>Diisealdorf</td> <td>33 0</td> <td>- 0</td> <td>6 1%</td> <td>6 7</td> <td>ິ</td> <td>10.5%</td> <td>יח מ</td> <td>- c</td> <td>%UU</td> <td>OF OF</td> <td>α</td> <td>8 4%</td> <td></td>	41	Diisealdorf	33 0	- 0	6 1%	6 7	ິ	10.5%	יח מ	- c	%UU	OF OF	α	8 4%	
2 F1.0ence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur 39 2 5.1% 46 4 8.7% 16 2 12.5% 101 8 7.9% 11 Norte 62 3 4.8% 93 4 4.3% 15 1 6.7% 170 8 4.7% 12 Norte 20 2 1 2.7% 2 2.2% 1 6.7% 170 8 4.7% 12 Norte 20 2 1 2.7% 26 5 19.2% 93 8 8.6% 12 Status 3 5.7% 3 5.7% 26 5 11.7% 8 6.6% 13 Prov. Liege 3 5.7% 3 5.7% 26 4 11.1% 6.7% 11 8 6.8% 33 Prov. Liege 3 1.1.1% 26 3 1.1.1% 6.7% 1.1.3% 6.2% 1 1.1.1% 6.8% 33 Prov. Liege 9 1 1.1.1% 6.2 1 1.1.1%	σ	Länsi-Suomi	8 1	1 00	4 7%	108	о «	2.8%	99		3.6%	228		3.5%	
In Norte E2 3 4.8% 93 4 4.3% 15 1 6.7% 170 8 4.7% E2 North Vorkshire 20 2 10.0% 47 1 2.1% 26 5 19.2% 93 8 8.6% L2 East Wales 38 1 2.6% 53 3 5.7% 26 5 10.7% 93 8 8.6% 33 Prov Liège 21 1 2.6% 53 3 5.7% 26 4 117% 8 6.8% 33 Prov Liège 21 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 6.7 11.3% 33 Prov Liège 2 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 6.7 1 13.8%	82	Provence-Alnes-Côte d'Azur	68	0	5 1%	46	9 4	8 7%	9 9		12.5%	101	0 00	7.9%	
E2 North Yorkshire 20 2 10.0% 47 1 2.1% 26 5 19.2% 93 8 8.6% L2 East Wales 38 1 2.6% 53 3 5.7% 26 4 15.4% 117 8 6.8% 33 Prov Liège 21 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 6.2 7 11.3% 33 Prov Liège 9 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 62 7 11.3%	4	Norte	3 6	l ea	4 8%	63	4	4.3%	2 12	1 -	6.7%	170	0 00	4.7%	
L2 East Wales 38 1 2.6% 53 3 5.7% 26 4 15.4% 117 8 6.8% 33 Prov. Liège 21 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 62 7 11.3%	E2	North Yorkshire	20	2	10.0%	47	· -	2.1%	26	- LO	19.2%	63	∞	8.6%	
33 Prov Liège 21 1 4.8% 32 5 15.6% 9 1 11.1% 62 7 11.3%	L2	East Wales	38	-	2.6%	53	° m	5.7%	26	4	15.4%	117	~	6.8%	
	33	Prov. Liège	21	-	4.8%	32	ъ	15.6%	6	-	11.1%	62	7	11.3%	

Table A9.02: Submitted and selected proposals in NUTS-2 regions by scientific domain at application stage (continued)

. . •

•

• . .

• .

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

111

											•			
able A9.	02: Submitted and selected proposals in NUTS-2 r	gions by scientific dom	ain at applic	ation stage	(continued)									
NUTS		ទា			PE			HS			AII			
		EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	
:23	Oberpfalz	13	2	15.4%	19	S	26.3%	9	0	0.0%	38	7	18.4%	
61	Andalucía	107	4 (3.7%	79	1 17	2.5%	34 94	- c	2.9%	220	- 1	3.2%	
2		99	⊃ ≂	%0.0 0	100	~ c	0.0%	19) C	0.0%	164	~ ٢	4.3%	
44	LIMBUIG (NL)	41	4 +	9.8%	0 <mark>7</mark> 0	» C	0.0%	2C	n c	0.4%	114	~ ~	1.0% 6.1%	
57	Oberfranken	S ra		3.0%	23	טע	0.1%	- U	⊃ .	20 0C	33	- «	18.7%	
5	Saarland	о С	-→ -	7 7%	23	о к а	21.7%	n ru	- C	0.0%	41	ى د	14.6%	
3 8	Thüringen	26		3.8%	72	0 4	5.6%	000	, ,	5.3%	117	o c	5.1%	
23	Comunidad Valenciana	82	ŝ	3.7%	111	ŝ	2.7%	32	0	0.0%	225	9	2.7%	
51	Pays de la Loire	13	0	%0.0	18	e	16.7%	7	n	42.9%	38	9	15.8%	
	Campania	105	0	%0.0	130	4	3.1%	49	2	4.1%	284	9	2.1%	
90	Trøndelag	43	9	14.0%	36	0	0.0%	1 4	0	%0.0	93	9	6.5%	
5	West Wales and The Valleys	34	0	%0.0	51	2	3.9%	27	4	14.8%	112	9	5.4%	
2	Gießen	33	4	12.1%	14	F	7.1%	10	0	%0.0	57	5 2	8.8%	
2	Comunidad Foral de Navarra	21	2	9.5%	7	0	%0.0	26	က	11.5%	54	5	9.3%	
4	Aragón	50	0	%0.0	55	5	9.1%	o :	0	%0.0	84	5	6.0%	
5	Languedoc-Roussillon	15	т. Т	20.0%	20		5.0%	10	- c	10.0%	45 1	Ω	11.1%	
	Umbria	24	4 C	10.1%	43	- c	2.3%	0.4		%0.0 %0.0	20	Ω T	0.0%	
	Macklanhurg-Vornommarn	. C	V +	40.0% F 0%	7 1	V .	7 1%	nα	2 0	25.0%	47 70	7 4	0.1.%	
2		£ €	- ~	6.7%	44	- ~	4.5%	0	1 C	0.0%	27 77 77	14	4 8%	
	Dutiki Ellada	23		8.7%	55		3.6%	9 4	0	0.0%	82	4	4.9%	
5	Dél-Alföld	30	2	6.7%	12	0	16.7%	°.	0	0.0%	45	4	8.9%	
	Border, Midland and Western	28	2	7.1%	23	-	4.3%	18	F	5.6%	69	4	5.8%	•
e	Drenthe	0	0	%0.0	œ	4	50.0%	-	0	%0.0	ດ	4	44.4%	
2	Nord-Norge	18	-	5.6%	4	2	50.0%	12	F	8.3%	34	4	11.8%	•
9	Centro (P)	42	0	%0.0	57	0	3.5%	30	2	6.7%	129	4	3.1%	•
0	Istanbul	38	0	%0.0	73	4	5.5%	20	0	0.0%	131	4	3.1%	
22	Prov. Namur	5	0	0.0%	10	-	10.0%	en i	2	66.7%	18	m	16.7%	•
1	Yugozapaden	88	- C	%0.0 %	2 2		%0.0	89.99	n o	%6.1 2000	128	m o	2.3%	•
2 2	Schleswig-Holstein	57 7		3.4%	07	N	1.1%	23		%0.0 0	201	n o	4.3%	
2	Syddanmark	16	- (6.3%	50	N	1.1%	11	0	0.0%	53	m o	5.7%	•
22	Nordjylland	12	0	0.0%	18	n o	16.7%	5) (0	0.0%	39	n o	1.1%	
2	Eesti	21	N	9.5%	18	0	%0.0	12	-	8.3%	51	m i	5.9%	•
~	Ita-Suomi	90	N	4.0%	15	-	6.7%	2	O	%0.0	67	m	4.5%	
2	Aquitaine	16	-	6.3%	29	7	6.9%	n	0	0.0%	48	ო	6.3%	•
4	Puglia	27	-	3.7%	55	2	3.6%	17	0	0.0%	66	n	3.0%	•
	Sicilia	22	0	0.0%	9/	N	2.6%	25	- (1.9%	180	m o	1.7%	
2	Ovre Norrland	50		3.6%	97	- (3.8%	24	0	0.0%	106	m (2.8%	•
51	Ankara	. 33	- 0	3.0%	/q	N	3.5%	/1	0	0.0%	101	n o	2.8%	
Ë S	Essex	4 i	. כ	%0.0	9	. כ	%0.0 0	57	n o	13.0%	ς. Σ	n u	9.1%	
3 3	Stelerinark	07 u		4.0%	0 4	- c	2.0%	<u>v</u>		%0.0 0	8 6	NC	Z.3%	
	ObelOstelleloll Kontriki Makadonia	n 00		%0.0 %0.0	202	NC	0.0.0	30 t		%0.0 %0.0	135	ИC	0.3%	
1 0	Principado de Asturias	67		14.3%	26	V ~	3.8%	S a		%0.0 0 0%	98	10	5.6%	
									Í		-	Í		

112

• • •

. •

.

. . •

• . . .

NUTS		LS			ЪЕ			HS			AII		
		EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR
FI1A	Pohjois-Suomi	57	~	1.8%	57	-	1.8%	15	0	0.0%	129	0	1.6%
FR30	Nord - Pas-de-Calais	12	0	%0.0	29	2	6.9%	9	0	%0.0	47	2	4.3%
FR41	Lorraine	2	0	0.0%	14	-	7.1%	с	~	33.3%	22	2	9.1%
FR72	Auvergne	9	0	0.0%	ω	7	25.0%	2	0	0.0%	16	2	12.5%
SI02	Zahodna Slovenija	48	0	0.0%	06	2	2.2%	69	0	0.0%	207	2	1.0%
UKD4	Lancashire	-	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%	7	2	28.6%	12	7	16.7%
UKI2	Outer London	19	-	5.3%	30	0	0.0%	17	-	5.9%	99	2	3.0%
UKJ4	Kent	15	-	6.7%	19	0	%0.0	23	-	4.3%	57	2	3.5%
UKK4	Devon	10	0	0.0%	1	2	18.2%	5	0	0.0%	26	2	7.7%
AT21	Kärnten	0	0	0.0%	-	0	%0.0	4	-	25.0%	5	-	20.0%
BE22	Prov. Limburg (B)	9	-	16.7%	5	0	%0.0	2	0	0.0%	13	~	7.7%
BE32	Prov. Hainaut	-	0	0.0%	7	~	14.3%	0	0	%0.0	ø	-	12.5%
CZ02	Střední Čechy	9	0	0.0%	7	-	14.3%	0	0	0.0%	13	~	7.7%
CZ06	Jihovýchod	25	-	4.0%	27	0	%0.0	7	0	0.0%	59	-	1.7%
DE22	Niederbayern	0	0	0.0%	2	0	%0.0	5	~	20.0%	7	-	14.3%
DE27	Schwaben	-	0	0.0%	13	-	7.7%	0	0	0.0%	14	-	7.1%
DE42	Brandenburg - Südwest	15	-	6.7%	68	0	%0.0	20	0	0.0%	103	-	1.0%
DE73	Kassel	-	0	0.0%	ი	~	11.1%	5	0	%0.0	15	-	6.7%
DE93	Lüneburg	~	0	0.0%	0	0	%0.0	с	~	33.3%	4	~	25.0%
DEA4	Detmold	12	0	0.0%	27	-	3.7%	19	0	%0.0	58	-	1.7%
DEB1	Koblenz	0	0	0.0%	2	-	50.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	~	50.0%
DEB2	Trier	-	0	0.0%	0	0	%0.0	7	~	14.3%	œ	-	12.5%
EL21	Ipeiros	7	-	9.1%	28	0	%0.0	10	0	0.0%	49	~	2.0%
ES41	Castilla y León	42	0	0.0%	34	-	2.9%	16	0	0.0%	92	-	1.1%
ES70	Canarias	12	0	0.0%	33	~	3.0%	2	0	%0.0	47	-	2.1%
FR24	Centre	4	0	0.0%	ω	-	12.5%	с С	0	%0.0	15	-	6.7%
FR25	Basse-Normandie	0	0	0.0%	7	-	14.3%	2	0	%0.0	თ	~	11.1%
FR52	Bretagne	ი	0	0.0%	24	-	4.2%	С	0	%0.0	36	~	2.8%
HR01	Sjeverozapadna Hrvatska	12	0	0.0%	31	-	3.2%	ω	0	0.0%	51	~	2.0%
HR03	Jadranska Hrvatska	ω	-	12.5%	7	0	%0.0	С	0	%0.0	22	-	4.5%
HU23	Dél-Dunántúl	б	0	0.0%	n	0	0.0%	2J	~	20.0%	17	~	5.9%
HU32	Észak-Alföld	14	0	0.0%	1	-	9.1%	0	0	%0.0	25	-	4.0%
1S00	Ísland	13	-	7.7%	13	0	%0.0	15	0	0.0%	41	-	2.4%
ITE3	Marche	33	-	3.0%	22	0	0.0%	1	0	0.0%	99	-	1.5%
ITF1	Abruzzo	33	-	3.0%	26	0	%0.0	14	0	0.0%	73	~	1.4%
LV00	Latvija	9	0	0.0%	14	-	7.1%	9	0	%0.0	26	-	3.8%
PL63	Pomorskie	14	0	0.0%	15	-	6.7%	ς	0	%0.0	32	-	3.1%
SK01	Bratislavský kraj	20	-	5.0%	37	0	0.0%	8	0	0.0%	65	-	1.5%
UKG2	Shropshire and Staffordshire	7	0	0.0%	ω	-	12.5%	Ω	0	0.0%	24	~	4.2%
UKH2	Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire	1	0	0.0%	38	0	0.0%	33	~	3.0%	82	-	1.2%

.

. . .

• •

•

Table A9.02: Submitted and selected proposals in NUTS-2 regions by scientific domain at application stage (continued)

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

113

_											•				
ble A9.(3: Submitted and selected proposation of the selected p	als in top-100 locali SfG	ities at application	stage by fu	Inding schem	ie (StG, CoG and	d AdG)	AdG			Al				
		EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR		
	PARIS	1346	231	17.2%	234	35	15.0%	831	148	17.8%	2411	414	17.2%		
	LONDON	946	154	16.3%	167	15	9.0%	523	80	18.7%	1636	267	16.3%		
	CAMBRIDGE	283	71	10.8% 25.1%	37	- 0	11.0%	193	80 20	31.9% 25.9%	903 513	128	20.5%		
	OXFORD	318	56	17.6%	60	. O	15.0%	217	55	25.3%	595	120	20.2%		
	ZÜRICH	225	48	21.3%	28	7	25.0%	208	63	30.3%	461	118	25.6%		
	BARCELONA	562	53	9.4%	101	o (8.9%	278	39	14.0%	941	101	10.7%		
	AMSTERDAM	398	47	11.8% 35.3%	63 28	סע	14.3%	170	42	24.7%	631 375	98 99	15.5%		
	MADRID	728	47	5.9%	176	0 1-	4 0%	386	28	7.3%	1290	26 82	6.0%		
	REHOVOT	36	41	43.2%	17	10	58.8%	118	27	22.9%	230	78	33.9%		
	JERUSALEM	133	42	31.6%	20	ю	15.0%	165	31	18.8%	318	26	23.9%		
	WIEN	350	40	11.4%	56	4 (7.1%	133	26	19.5%	539	20	13.0%		
	KOMA MI ANO	133	45 24	6.1%	11	N C	2.8%	328	19 26	5.8% 14.5%	1132	66	5.8%		
	UTRECHT	248	30	12.1%	34	0 01	5.9%	115	10	16.5%	397	51	12.8%		
	HEIDELBERG	166	26	15.7%	16	-	6.3%	70	22	31.4%	252	49	19.4%		
	LEUVEN	258	25	9.7%	30	9	20.0%	109	16	14.7%	397	47	11.8%		
	EDINBURGH	2/10	23	0.2% 11 0%	28 28	ი ლ	0.0% 10.7%	83	202	24.1%	321	46	14.3%		
	GENT	216	29	13.4%	30	2	16.7%	43	γœ	18.6%	289	42	14.5%		
	BRISTOL	134	17	12.7%	25	e	12.0%	98	22	22.4%	257	42	16.3%		
	LEIDEN	171	21	12.3%	29 26	m ∠	10.3%	74	17	23.0%	274	41	15.0%		
		106	1 5	10.4%	07	t c.	33.3%	47 64	- 22	34.4%	179	30.00	20.1%	•	
	HAIFA	164	25	15.2%	3.0	0 01	15.4%	140	ດ	6.4%	317	36	11.4%		
	HELSINKI	274	18	6.6%	40	÷ .	2.5%	133	16	12.0%	447	35	7.8%	•	
	SIOCAHOLM	239	16	0.3%	31	4 4	12.3%	501 96	0 5	13.5%	351	33 33	9.7%	•	
	BASEL	60	15	25.0%	12	4	33.3%	24	13	54.2%	96	32	33.3%	•	
	GRONINGEN	179	25	14.0%	28	ر ر	3.6%	29	2 Q	17.2%	236	31	13.1%	•	
	SOLIVA LE CHESNAY	212	0 00	21.4%		N 0	%0.0 %0.0	49	- 12	24.5%	230 144	30.0	20.8%		
	TELAVIV	143	15	10.5%	12	~	8.3%	139	14	10.1%	294	30	10.2%	•	•
	BUDAPEST	240	14	5.8%	37	2	5.4%	89	13	14.6%	366	29	7.9%	•	•
	GOTEBORG	178	14	7.9%	19	01 0	10.5%	11	13	16.9%	274	29	10.6%		
	LIPPSALA	183		8 2%	2 22	v ←	4 3%	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	10 %	14.5%	275	26	9.5%	•	•
	BRUSSEL	145	16	11.0%	23	· က	13.0%	65	9	9.2%	233	25	10.7%	•	•
	ÅRHUS	102	12	11.8%	15	← .	6.7%	63	12	19.0%	180	25	13.9%	•	•
	DUBLIN	210	90	0,9% 0 1%	587		3.6%	96	хо г	8.3%	334	22 72	1.5%		
		167	12	7.2%	17		5.9%	65	2 =	16.9%	249	24	9.6%		
	LEEDS	124	10	8.1%	4	~ 1	7.1%	22	13	16.9%	215	24	11.2%		
	EXETER Sei S	86	15	17.4%	19	~ 17	10.5%	02	7	10.0%	175	24	13.7%		
	OSLO BONN	10/	₽ €	0.0% 16.9%	24 16	2 -	31.3%	20	2 1-	35.0%	280 95	22	23.2%		
	MANCHESTER	140	13	9.3%	21	0	0.0%	88	σ	10.1%	250	22	8.8%		
	COVENTRY	103	10	9.7%	16	4 ·	25.0%	53	ω (15.1%	172	52	12.8%		
		26 26	13	10.1%	1 23	- 0	4.3%	38 œ	- α	9.1%	146	27	9.2%		
	I ISROA	141	: 6	9 2%	32	14	12.5%	47	• 4	8.5%	220	. 5	9.5%		
											í				

114

• • •

•

. .

> . .

Ext. FML FML <th>Member Internet Sectores Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Fund Former</th> <th>Mutuality Instruction Sectors Protocol Protocol</th> <th>HAMBURG</th> <th>StG</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>000</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>AdG</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>AII</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Member Internet Sectores Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former Eu. Fund Former	Mutuality Instruction Sectors Protocol Protocol	HAMBURG	StG			000			AdG			AII			
Member Member Member F 1 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 1 5 1 1 5 1	MARRIE E T COL	MARRING Instruction Initial (1) Initial (1) <thinitial (1)<th>HAMBURG</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th>EVAL.</th><th>FUND.</th><th>SR</th><th></th></thinitial 	HAMBURG	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	
ENERGIE FI T TODE FI TODE TODE FI TODE TODE FI TODE TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE FI TODE TODE FI F	Construction Construction<	Enscription Description Station Stations 0 1 0.00		85	7	8.2%	23	-	4.3%	47	12	25.5%	155	20	12.9%	
Endoncie/ End	Embolicity Exponent End F T	Promotion 0 1 7 7.13 <th7.13< th=""> <th7.13<< td=""><td>ENSCHEDE</td><td>81</td><td>1</td><td>13.6%</td><td>18</td><td>с</td><td>16.7%</td><td>16</td><td>4</td><td>25.0%</td><td>115</td><td>18</td><td>15.7%</td><td></td></th7.13<<></th7.13<>	ENSCHEDE	81	1	13.6%	18	с	16.7%	16	4	25.0%	115	18	15.7%	
Contrant 0 1<	Common Common<	Province Diame Diame <thdiame< th=""> Diame Diame <</thdiame<>	EINDHOVEN	94	2	7.4%	12	n i	25.0%	33	∞ 1	24.2%	139	18	12.9%	
Enconcrete Enconcre Enconcrete Enconcrete Enconcrete Enconcrete Enconcrete E	Secondition Between Between Between Endower 10	Endocrete Endocrete Endocrete 110 0 </td <td>DURHAM</td> <td>9/</td> <td>5</td> <td>14.5%</td> <td>5 0</td> <td>N</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>41</td> <td>ο Ω</td> <td>12.2%</td> <td>132</td> <td><u>8</u></td> <td>13.6%</td> <td></td>	DURHAM	9/	5	14.5%	5 0	N	13.3%	41	ο Ω	12.2%	132	<u>8</u>	13.6%	
Immontant (i) (Image Image <th< td=""><td>Diminicional 00</td><td>FSPOO</td><td>111</td><td>0 5</td><td>10.8%</td><td>9 18 18</td><td>N C</td><td>%0.0 0</td><td>9 G</td><td>ט ע</td><td>8.2%</td><td>190</td><td>17</td><td>8 0%</td><td></td></th<>	Diminicional 00	FSPOO	111	0 5	10.8%	9 18 18	N C	%0.0 0	9 G	ט ע	8.2%	190	17	8 0%	
FUNDER/FLAMMAN 75 9 1136 12 3 13	TuberContrant 7 <	Terrentication 7 0 1 3 1 3 1	BIRMINGHAM	105	: 6	9.5%	27	, w	11.1%	49	9 4	8.2%	181	17	9.4%	•
FERANCIANAL EG 10 153 11 3 2733 25 3 205 01 10	FAMACULATIANANA 25 1 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2</th2<>	TANNEL 51 10 543 11 2 <th< td=""><td>TÜBINGEN</td><td>76</td><td>6</td><td>11.8%</td><td>12</td><td>-</td><td>8.3%</td><td>34</td><td>9</td><td>17.6%</td><td>122</td><td>16</td><td>13.1%</td><td></td></th<>	TÜBINGEN	76	6	11.8%	12	-	8.3%	34	9	17.6%	122	16	13.1%	
THINS 21 2 0 0.05 13 6 4.1 16 13% CUTIENS 21 0 0.05 13 0 13 0 13% CUTIENS 23 4 2 0 0.05 33 8 55% 41 16 13% CUTIENS 5 4 13% 2 0 0.05% 33 8 55% 41 16 13% COMMULATION 6 1 13% 2 0 0.05% 33 8 53% 16 17% 16 13% COMMULATION 6 1 1 2% 1 <td>MTHER 21 2<td>MTHER 31 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 1<td>FRANKFURT AM MAIN</td><td>65</td><td>10</td><td>15.4%</td><td>11</td><td>ო</td><td>27.3%</td><td>25</td><td>с С</td><td>12.0%</td><td>101</td><td>16</td><td>15.8%</td><td></td></td></td>	MTHER 21 2 <td>MTHER 31 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 1<td>FRANKFURT AM MAIN</td><td>65</td><td>10</td><td>15.4%</td><td>11</td><td>ო</td><td>27.3%</td><td>25</td><td>с С</td><td>12.0%</td><td>101</td><td>16</td><td>15.8%</td><td></td></td>	MTHER 31 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 1 <td>FRANKFURT AM MAIN</td> <td>65</td> <td>10</td> <td>15.4%</td> <td>11</td> <td>ო</td> <td>27.3%</td> <td>25</td> <td>с С</td> <td>12.0%</td> <td>101</td> <td>16</td> <td>15.8%</td> <td></td>	FRANKFURT AM MAIN	65	10	15.4%	11	ო	27.3%	25	с С	12.0%	101	16	15.8%	
MOTTERIAM 90 8 100 22 0 001 25 6 14 14 16 113 TOUTERIAM 70 7 7 0 001 25 0 001 25 14 16 113 TORTER 75 1 200 7 1 161 200 <td>Matrix Function 80 7 100 12 0 0000 15 15 14 16 15 FUNCTIERDAT FUNCTIER COMMERT 70 7 100 7 100 75 14 16 16 16 FUNCTIER FUNCTIER 70 1 2000 70 10 2000<td>Morrename Final Final</td><td>ATHENS</td><td>251</td><td>80</td><td>3.2%</td><td>21</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>139</td><td>œ</td><td>5.8%</td><td>411</td><td>16</td><td>3.9%</td><td>•</td></td>	Matrix Function 80 7 100 12 0 0000 15 15 14 16 15 FUNCTIERDAT FUNCTIER COMMERT 70 7 100 7 100 75 14 16 16 16 FUNCTIER FUNCTIER 70 1 2000 70 10 2000 <td>Morrename Final Final</td> <td>ATHENS</td> <td>251</td> <td>80</td> <td>3.2%</td> <td>21</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>139</td> <td>œ</td> <td>5.8%</td> <td>411</td> <td>16</td> <td>3.9%</td> <td>•</td>	Morrename Final	ATHENS	251	80	3.2%	21	0	0.0%	139	œ	5.8%	411	16	3.9%	•
TOULOUSE 7 143 2 0 033 8 243% 65 15 133% TOULOUSE 33 8 243% 5 1 60% 33 8 243% 65 133% TOWING 39 8 220% 5 1 00% 33 8 243% 65 133% CONMULA-RUNC 39 8 220% 5 1 00% 33 8 243% 65 133% CONMULA-RUNC 8 2 20% 1 6 130% 33 1	TIRUNUSE r/r r/	Trestre trestre possibilitation r/r	ROTTERDAM	80	80	10.0%	12	0	%0.0	52	œ	15.4%	144	16	11.1%	
THERIE 53 4 6.34 6 1 1633 53 4 533 5 5 5 7 13	Tistical Decimination 0 4 20% 1 10% 22 72 12 12 12 Districation 0 3 4 20% 1 10% 12 <t< td=""><td>Timestication 0 1 0.000 <th< td=""><td>TOULOUSE</td><td>47</td><td>7</td><td>14.9%</td><td>7</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>33</td><td>80</td><td>24.2%</td><td>82</td><td>15</td><td>18.3%</td><td>•</td></th<></td></t<>	Timestication 0 1 0.000 <th< td=""><td>TOULOUSE</td><td>47</td><td>7</td><td>14.9%</td><td>7</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>33</td><td>80</td><td>24.2%</td><td>82</td><td>15</td><td>18.3%</td><td>•</td></th<>	TOULOUSE	47	7	14.9%	7	0	0.0%	33	80	24.2%	82	15	18.3%	•
DOWNORI 33 8 2.9% 5 1 2.0% 2.7% 6.2 7.3% 6.2 7.3%	Normation 35 1 2.0% 5 1 2.0% 2 5 3	NOMMONE 33 3 230% 5 1 200% 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2 <</th2<>	TRIESTE	63	4	6.3%	9	-	16.7%	55	10	18.2%	124	15	12.1%	
Construction 79 11 2336 9 0 0014 27 6731 11	Low Low <thlow< th=""> <thlow< th=""> <thlow< th=""></thlow<></thlow<></thlow<>	Low T	NORWICH	35	œ	22.9%	2 Q	~	20.0%	22	9	27.3%	62	15	24.2%	•
Riak Fixal	FIX FIX <td>Flak Fig 3 10% 3 10% 3 10% 30% 27 10 30% 23% 13 23% FAME FIG 3 10% 3 10% 30% 7 10 30% 23% 30% 23% 30</td> <td>LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE</td> <td>29</td> <td>1</td> <td>13.9%</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>%0.0</td> <td>30</td> <td>~</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>118</td> <td>13</td> <td>11.0%</td> <td></td>	Flak Fig 3 10% 3 10% 3 10% 30% 27 10 30% 23% 13 23% FAME FIG 3 10% 3 10% 30% 7 10 30% 23% 30% 23% 30	LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE	29	1	13.9%	6	0	%0.0	30	~	6.7%	118	13	11.0%	
FALME 61 8 2.3% 12 8.3% 27 4 4.4% 104 13 7.2% ERN 61 8 7.3% 6 1 67.% 27 4 4.4% 104 13 7.2% ERN 001 8 7.3% 6 1 67.% 20 3 64.% 104 13 7.3% ERN 13 6.3 1 6.7% 20 2 104 13 7.3% MANNER 13 6.3 1 6.7% 10 0.0% 30 2 2.3% 10 12 12 13	FAURE International definitional d	FOUNDER Solution CONTRAME Contrant CC	PISA	167	ę	1.8%	80	0	0.0%	77	10	13.0%	252	13	5.2%	
RUTIVARTON EA T/3 E/3 E/3 <the 3<="" th=""> E/3 <the 3<="" th=""> <the 3<<="" th=""><td>SOUTIMATION EA C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> <thc< <="" td=""><td>SOTIVANFON EI C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C C <thc<< td=""><td>FALMER</td><td>65</td><td>ω</td><td>12.3%</td><td>12</td><td>-</td><td>8.3%</td><td>27</td><td>4</td><td>14.8%</td><td>104</td><td>13</td><td>12.5%</td><td>•</td></thc<<></thc<></thc<></td></thc<></thc<></thc<></thc<></thc<></td></the></the></the>	SOUTIMATION EA C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> <thc< <="" td=""><td>SOTIVANFON EI C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C C <thc<< td=""><td>FALMER</td><td>65</td><td>ω</td><td>12.3%</td><td>12</td><td>-</td><td>8.3%</td><td>27</td><td>4</td><td>14.8%</td><td>104</td><td>13</td><td>12.5%</td><td>•</td></thc<<></thc<></thc<></td></thc<></thc<></thc<></thc<></thc<>	SOTIVANFON EI C <thc< th=""> C <thc< th=""> C C <thc<< td=""><td>FALMER</td><td>65</td><td>ω</td><td>12.3%</td><td>12</td><td>-</td><td>8.3%</td><td>27</td><td>4</td><td>14.8%</td><td>104</td><td>13</td><td>12.5%</td><td>•</td></thc<<></thc<></thc<>	FALMER	65	ω	12.3%	12	-	8.3%	27	4	14.8%	104	13	12.5%	•
FERN Cold 8 77% 6 1 67% 20 2 10% 31 21 21%	REN 014 8 7.7% 6 1 6.3% 2 0.0% 30 2 2.3% 2.3% RENV TRINUCER 33 6 7.7% 15 1 6.3% 2 1.0% 30 12 2.3% <th2.3%< th=""> <th2.3%< th=""> <th2.3%< th=""></th2.3%<></th2.3%<></th2.3%<>	FERN 104 8 7.3% 6 1 6.7.3% 2.0 3 0.04 9.3 0.04 1.2 2.3.3% ANNORFE TERNO 1.4 8 7.3% 6 1 6.7.3% 2.0 3 1.04 9.3 1.2 2.3.3% TRNO 1.4 0.01 2.4 1.1 0 0.03 2.3 1.03 1.2 2.3.3% ANNORME 1.4 0 2.4 1.1 0 0.03 2.4 1.1 0 0.3 2.3 2.3 3	SOUTHAMPTON	64	9	9.4%	16	-	6.3%	39	9	15.4%	119	13	10.9%	
Chrones 61 9 141% 15 1 67% 2 100% 99 12 133% Annones 63 8 14% 11 0 00% 13 6 71% 99 12 133% Territo Territo 13 6 7 % 11 0 00% 13 6 71% 99 12 133% Merschund 13 6 7 8 11 0 00% 13 12 133% Merschund 13 6 7 7 %% 11 0 00% 13 12 133% Merschund 16 7 8 7 14 1 25 26% 11 23% Merschund 116 6 5% 12 13% 26% 13 11 23% Merschund 116 6 7% 14 167% 36 11 12 23%	HANNOLEN 61 9 1/1 67/1 62 2 21/3 1/2 21/3 1/3 </td <td>HANNOREN 61 9 14/16 16 0 14/16 0 12 12/15</td> <td>BERN</td> <td>104</td> <td>8</td> <td>7.7%</td> <td>9</td> <td>-</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>20</td> <td>ო</td> <td>15.0%</td> <td>130</td> <td>12</td> <td>9.2%</td> <td>•</td>	HANNOREN 61 9 14/16 16 0 14/16 0 12 12/15	BERN	104	8	7.7%	9	-	16.7%	20	ო	15.0%	130	12	9.2%	•
HANOLER 63 8 7.7% 8 0 0 2 0.3 2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 1.2 0.3 0.3 1.2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 1.2 0.3	Hankover Instruction 13 6 12% 13 0 026 13 14 13 13 14 13 13 14 13 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 13 14 <td>HANOUCE 13 8 2.7% 18 0 0.0% 13 4 7.1% 100 12 13.3% TERNO 13 6 7.5% 11 0 0.0% 13 4 7.1% 100 12 13.3% TERNO 13 6 7.5% 11 0 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 <!--</td--><td>GÖTTINGEN</td><td>64</td><td>6</td><td>14.1%</td><td>15</td><td>-</td><td>6.7%</td><td>20</td><td>2</td><td>10.0%</td><td>66</td><td>12</td><td>12.1%</td><td></td></td>	HANOUCE 13 8 2.7% 18 0 0.0% 13 4 7.1% 100 12 13.3% TERNO 13 6 7.5% 11 0 0.0% 13 4 7.1% 100 12 13.3% TERNO 13 6 7.5% 11 0 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 12 0.0% 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 0 13 </td <td>GÖTTINGEN</td> <td>64</td> <td>6</td> <td>14.1%</td> <td>15</td> <td>-</td> <td>6.7%</td> <td>20</td> <td>2</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td>66</td> <td>12</td> <td>12.1%</td> <td></td>	GÖTTINGEN	64	6	14.1%	15	-	6.7%	20	2	10.0%	66	12	12.1%	
Trento, trento, merterera 134 6 7,35 6 7,13 100 12 6,73 Trento, merterera 71 7 7 7 7 7 100 12 6,73 Mervastre mervastre mervastre mervastre poterer 71 1 7 5 11 0 0.0% 55 11 11 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 13 11 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 6,73 12 12 6,73 12 12 6,73 12 12 12 6,73 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 <t< th=""><td>TRENTO TRENTO 134 16 74% 11 0 0.0% 35 2 7.1% 100 12 6.0% NEWSZMAC TEM TO TEM TO TEM TO 11 0 0.0% 35 2 3.1% 2.00 12 6.0% NEWSZMAC 13 4 5.0% 14 2.0% 14 4.0% 11 10.0% 2.0% 11 10.0% Access 13 14 7.0% 14 1 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 10.0% <</td><td>TREATION TIM C 7.5 TI C <thc< th=""> C C <!--</td--><td>HANNOVER</td><td>63</td><td>ω</td><td>12.7%</td><td>∞</td><td>0</td><td>%0.0</td><td>19</td><td>4</td><td>21.1%</td><td>06</td><td>12</td><td>13.3%</td><td>•</td></thc<></td></t<>	TRENTO TRENTO 134 16 74% 11 0 0.0% 35 2 7.1% 100 12 6.0% NEWSZMAC TEM TO TEM TO TEM TO 11 0 0.0% 35 2 3.1% 2.00 12 6.0% NEWSZMAC 13 4 5.0% 14 2.0% 14 4.0% 11 10.0% 2.0% 11 10.0% Access 13 14 7.0% 14 1 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 11 10.0% 10.0% <	TREATION TIM C 7.5 TI C <thc< th=""> C C <!--</td--><td>HANNOVER</td><td>63</td><td>ω</td><td>12.7%</td><td>∞</td><td>0</td><td>%0.0</td><td>19</td><td>4</td><td>21.1%</td><td>06</td><td>12</td><td>13.3%</td><td>•</td></thc<>	HANNOVER	63	ω	12.7%	∞	0	%0.0	19	4	21.1%	06	12	13.3%	•
WARSZAWA 12 10 7.9% 11 0.0% 63 2 3.2% 2.00 12 6.0% WARSZAWA 13 10 7.9% 11 0.0% 63 2 3.2% 2.00 12 6.0% ANTWERFL 0.0 10 7.9% 11 2.0% 12 6.0% 13 2.3% 2.00 12 6.0% ANTWERFL 0.0 10 12 5.0% 11 2.0% 12 2.0% 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0% 13 2.3% 2.0 13 2.3% 2.0% 13 13 2.3% 2.0% 13 2.3% 2.0% 13 2.3% 2.0% 13 2.3% 2.0% 13	MNRSZNAM KURASTIE UPONTYNE 12 10 73% 11 0 03% 23% 20 12 64% MINASTIE UPONTYNE ANTWGERE UPONTYNE 73 7 73% 11 20 20% 20 12 64% ANTWGERE UPONTYNE 73 73% 6 1 26% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 13 20% 20% 13 20% <t< td=""><td>Merszyma T38 11 2 738 11 2 2378 20 12 648 Merszyma 7 3 7 7 1 7 7 1 2 648 2378 20 12 648 Acters 5 7 738 1 2 500 13 20 12 648 Acters 5 7 738 7 738 23 7 738 23 23 20 13 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 24 25 26 27 28 23 26 23 26 27 26 23 26 27 26 23 26 27 26 27 26 27 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26</td><td>TRENTO</td><td>134</td><td>9</td><td>4.5%</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>0.0%</td><td>35</td><td>9</td><td>17.1%</td><td>180</td><td>12</td><td>6.7%</td><td>•</td></t<>	Merszyma T38 11 2 738 11 2 2378 20 12 648 Merszyma 7 3 7 7 1 7 7 1 2 648 2378 20 12 648 Acters 5 7 738 1 2 500 13 20 12 648 Acters 5 7 738 7 738 23 7 738 23 23 20 13 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 24 25 26 27 28 23 26 23 26 27 26 23 26 27 26 23 26 27 26 27 26 27 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26 26	TRENTO	134	9	4.5%	1	0	0.0%	35	9	17.1%	180	12	6.7%	•
NUCASTIE UPONTYNE 71 4 56% 16 2 25% 40 6 10% 11 12 12 91% ANTWERSTIE UPONTYNE 71 4 56% 7 56% 16 1 16%% 24 4 16% 11 103% ANTWERSTIE UPONTYNE 71 8 7 74% 6 1 16%% 24 4 16% 11 103% DRESDEN 76% 6 7 6 7 1 16% 2 2.5% 24 4 26% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 12%% 11 <th12%< th=""> 12% 11</th12%<>	ATTWCAFFIE Vol 1 4 55% 16 1 56% 16 1 56% 17 1 56% 17 1 56% 17 1 56% 17 1 56% 16 17 16% 17 1 98% ATTWCAFFIE ONDERNS TYNGAF 16 7 1 167% 16 1 167% 16 1 167% 16 1 1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 11 10 <t< td=""><td>Arrikerte 71 4 7.3% 1 2 7.2% 1 2 2.3% 1 2 3.4% Arrikerte 7 7 7.3% 7 7.3% 7 7.3%<</td><td>WARSZAWA</td><td>126</td><td>10</td><td>7.9%</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>%0.0</td><td>63</td><td>2</td><td>3.2%</td><td>200</td><td>12</td><td>6.0%</td><td></td></t<>	Arrikerte 71 4 7.3% 1 2 7.2% 1 2 2.3% 1 2 3.4% Arrikerte 7 7 7.3% 7 7.3% 7 7.3%<	WARSZAWA	126	10	7.9%	1	0	%0.0	63	2	3.2%	200	12	6.0%	
ANTERFEN 50 7 74% 4 1 250% 13 3 231% 112 111 93% ACHEN 56 7 74% 4 1 250% 13 3 231% 112 111 93% DRESDEN 56 7 81% 7 0 00% 14 4 25% 10 11 13% DRESDEN 56 7 81% 7 0 00% 14 4 25% 11 10% 11 <	ATIVITEPEN S 7 7.4% 4 1 5.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% ACIVITEPEN S 7 7.4% 4 1 5.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 2.0% 1 1 1 2.0% 1 1 2.0%	ATVVERFER 3	NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE	71	4	5.6%	16	0	12.5%	40	9	15.0%	127	12	9.4%	
Accher 56 6 10.7% 6 1 16.7% 24 4 16.7% 86 11 123% RACHEN 86 7 81% 17 0 0.0% 32 4 16.7% 86 11 123% RENALCION 101 64 8 17 0 0.0% 32 4 126% 107 11 103% RAMATGAN 86 11 64 8 12 64 8 11 103% RAMATGAN 110 64 8 1 12.5% 25 5.7% 104 10 103% RAMATGAN 110 64 8 1 1.4% 3 1.4 2.5% 1.4 1.6% 1.4 1.0% RAMATGAN 110 64 8 1 4 2.5% 1.4 1.6% 1.1 1.0% RAMATGAN 134 134 134% 14 1.6%	Achterix 55 6 107% 7 4 167% 7 11 123% Decoders 55 6 107% 7 4 167% 73 11 123% REXACtion 55 7 15% 12 13% 14 15% 11 13% REXACtion 13 5 5 12 13% 14 15% 11 13% RAMATSHEM 61 5% 12 14 3% 12 11 13% 14 15% 11 15% RAMATSHEM 11 13 2 14 13% 2 14 12% 11 13% RAMATSHEM 13 4 30% 14 16% 11 13% 21 14% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% 11 13% <	Actifix Actifix <t< td=""><td>ANTWERPEN</td><td>95</td><td>7</td><td>7.4%</td><td>4</td><td>-</td><td>25.0%</td><td>13</td><td>e</td><td>23.1%</td><td>112</td><td>7</td><td>9.8%</td><td></td></t<>	ANTWERPEN	95	7	7.4%	4	-	25.0%	13	e	23.1%	112	7	9.8%	
Messels Nessels 7 81% 7 0 0.0% 14 4 2.6% 17 10 11 13% Rescuences 16 7 8.1% 7 1 13% 17 10 11 10% 10% 11 10% 10% 11 <td>NCNCINGY 88 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 11 13% RENALEION 76 10 7 11 13% 2 51% 12% 11 10% 11 10% RANAL 100 11 103 11 13% 2 51% 12% 11 10% 11 10% RANAL 13 14 2 51% 2 143% 2 25% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11<!--</td--><td>International metanticity B 7 8/18 7 0 0/24 1/2 1/2 1/1 1/13 Internation metanticity 0 1<td>AACHEN</td><td>56</td><td>9</td><td>10.7%</td><td>9</td><td>-</td><td>16.7%</td><td>24</td><td>4</td><td>16.7%</td><td>86</td><td>=</td><td>12.8%</td><td></td></td></td>	NCNCINGY 88 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 81% 7 11 13% RENALEION 76 10 7 11 13% 2 51% 12% 11 10% 11 10% RANAL 100 11 103 11 13% 2 51% 12% 11 10% 11 10% RANAL 13 14 2 51% 2 143% 2 25% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 </td <td>International metanticity B 7 8/18 7 0 0/24 1/2 1/2 1/1 1/13 Internation metanticity 0 1<td>AACHEN</td><td>56</td><td>9</td><td>10.7%</td><td>9</td><td>-</td><td>16.7%</td><td>24</td><td>4</td><td>16.7%</td><td>86</td><td>=</td><td>12.8%</td><td></td></td>	International metanticity B 7 8/18 7 0 0/24 1/2 1/2 1/1 1/13 Internation metanticity 0 1 <td>AACHEN</td> <td>56</td> <td>9</td> <td>10.7%</td> <td>9</td> <td>-</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>24</td> <td>4</td> <td>16.7%</td> <td>86</td> <td>=</td> <td>12.8%</td> <td></td>	AACHEN	56	9	10.7%	9	-	16.7%	24	4	16.7%	86	=	12.8%	
HEXALEDIA 02 1 02 1 030 12 0 12 0 12 1 1336 12 1 1336 13 11 1336 11 1336 11 1336 13 11 1336 13	Montality No	FICAMENDE 100 1	URESUEN KONCENS I VAICEN	00	- 1	8.1% 0.5%	~ ;	-	0.0%	14 7	4 4	28.6%	101	= 3	10.3%	
Increment 10 1.2.% 1 1.2.% 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.2 1 1.2.% 1.1 1.1 1.2.% 1.1 1.1 1.2.% 1.2 1.1 1.2.% 1.2 1.1 1.2.% 1.2 1.1 1.1 1.2.% 1.2 1.1 1.1 1.2.% 1.2 1.1 1.1 1.2.% 1.1 <td>Freewartion between admit (a) 0 (1) 10 (1) 10 (1)<td>FERSWEICH 7 1</td><td></td><td>07</td><td>- 4</td><td>%C.0</td><td><u>v</u> r</td><td></td><td>11 20/</td><td>20</td><td>→ t</td><td>%C.71</td><td>151</td><td>= \$</td><td>0/ 1/0</td><td></td></td>	Freewartion between admit (a) 0 (1) 10 (1) 10 (1) <td>FERSWEICH 7 1</td> <td></td> <td>07</td> <td>- 4</td> <td>%C.0</td> <td><u>v</u> r</td> <td></td> <td>11 20/</td> <td>20</td> <td>→ t</td> <td>%C.71</td> <td>151</td> <td>= \$</td> <td>0/ 1/0</td> <td></td>	FERSWEICH 7 1		07	- 4	%C.0	<u>v</u> r		11 20/	20	→ t	%C.71	151	= \$	0/ 1/0	
HAMMATCAM 67 7 613 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 103 113 603 NONINST	Main control 0 1 1 2 0 1 0 </td <td>Constration 64 7 7.260 7.5 7.573 7.6 7.5 7.6 7.7 <t< td=""><td>BEEDSLIERA</td><td>78</td><td>D É</td><td>10.0%</td><td>- 5</td><td></td><td>0.000</td><td>5 5</td><td>, t</td><td>0.U/0 8 30/</td><td>101</td><td>= 5</td><td>10.80/</td><td></td></t<></td>	Constration 64 7 7.260 7.5 7.573 7.6 7.5 7.6 7.7 <t< td=""><td>BEEDSLIERA</td><td>78</td><td>D É</td><td>10.0%</td><td>- 5</td><td></td><td>0.000</td><td>5 5</td><td>, t</td><td>0.U/0 8 30/</td><td>101</td><td>= 5</td><td>10.80/</td><td></td></t<>	BEEDSLIERA	78	D É	10.0%	- 5		0.000	5 5	, t	0.U/0 8 30/	101	= 5	10.80/	
MONVALIAN 11 7 61% 21 3 143% 38 1 26% 13 14 11 63% NOTIVICIAN 110 65% 21 1 43% 53 1 26% 14 11 63% 53 1 26% 14 11 63% 53 1 26% 14 11 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 16 63% 53 14 11 63% 53 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 11 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16 13 16	Monutation 11 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 0 <th< td=""><td>Acconstant 11 7 6.6% 2 1 1.6% 1 2.6% 1.1 0.0% Acconstant 11 1 6.6% 2 1 1.6%</td><td>PAMAT GAN</td><td>64</td><td><u>⊃</u> ∝</td><td>12 5%</td><td><u>v</u> α</td><td></td><td>12 5%</td><td>ק ק ג</td><td>- ~</td><td>5.7%</td><td>107</td><td>= =</td><td>10.0 /0</td><td></td></th<>	Acconstant 11 7 6.6% 2 1 1.6% 1 2.6% 1.1 0.0% Acconstant 11 1 6.6% 2 1 1.6%	PAMAT GAN	64	<u>⊃</u> ∝	12 5%	<u>v</u> α		12 5%	ק ק ג	- ~	5.7%	107	= =	10.0 /0	
MOTTINGHAM 110 6 55% 21 1 4.8% 53 4 7.5% 14 1 6.0% RAHA 134 4 8.3% 57 4 7.5% 16 1 4.8% 53 4 7.5% 16 1 4.8% 53 4 7.5% 16 1 4.8% 53 6.5% 7.7% 16 1 4.8% 53 6.5% 7.7% 17 6.0% 17 6.0% RUHERBEG 30 7 2.33% 4 7.1% 17 10 14% 7.3% 10 14% NUNSER 30 7 2.33% 2 0.0% 2 2.0% 11 11% 10 13% NUNSER 30 7 14.3% 2 2.0% 11 13% 10 2.3% NUNSER 31 3 33.5% 7 4 37.4% 11 13% 10 11	MorTinicialam 110 6 55% 21 1 43% 55 4 75% 161 11 60% MorTinicialam 134 6 55% 16 111 60% 16 111 60% Mortinicial 134 6 55% 16 111 60% 16 111 60% Konstanz 45 7 23% 7 23% 7 13% 13 60% 10 13% 10 14% 10 10 14% 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 13% 10 10% 10 13% 10 10 13% 10 10% 10 13% 10 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% 10% <td>NOTTINGHM 10 6 55% 21 1 48% 55 4 75% 181 11 60% NOTTINGHM 103 6 55% 1 11/% 13 6 75% 13 1 60% NONSTART 45 7 7 1 11/% 13 6 55% 67 10 143% NONSTART 45 7 4 83% 57 1 11/% 13 6 53% 67 10 143% NONSTRR 46 3 65% 7 1 13% 13 10 13% 13 10 13% 10 143% NONSTRR 21 3 23% 21 13% 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 23% 21</td> <td>PADOVA</td> <td>115</td> <td>0 F</td> <td>6 1%</td> <td>, t<u>c</u></td> <td>- e.</td> <td>14.3%</td> <td>88</td> <td>1 ←</td> <td>2.6%</td> <td>174</td> <td>= =</td> <td>6.3%</td> <td></td>	NOTTINGHM 10 6 55% 21 1 48% 55 4 75% 181 11 60% NOTTINGHM 103 6 55% 1 11/% 13 6 75% 13 1 60% NONSTART 45 7 7 1 11/% 13 6 55% 67 10 143% NONSTART 45 7 4 83% 57 1 11/% 13 6 53% 67 10 143% NONSTRR 46 3 65% 7 1 13% 13 10 13% 13 10 13% 10 143% NONSTRR 21 3 23% 21 13% 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 23% 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 23% 21	PADOVA	115	0 F	6 1%	, t <u>c</u>	- e.	14.3%	88	1 ←	2.6%	174	= =	6.3%	
FRMM 13 4 3.0% 16 1 6.3% 59 5 8.5% 209 10 4.0% KONSTANZ 45 4 3.0% 16 1 6.3% 59 5 8.5% 209 10 4.0% KUNSTANZ 33 7 2 3.3% 4 2 50.0% 13 67 10 4.0% KUNSTANZ 33 7 2 3.0% 1 11.1% 13 67 10 4.0% RUUHERER 30 7 2.3% 4 2 5.0% 7 11.1% 43 10 13.3% RUUHERER 30 20 5.0% 5 0 0.0% 27 11.1% 43 10 13.3% RUUHERER 31 3 3.7% 11 3.3% 7 14.3% 10 12.3% RUUNS 212 3.3% 21 3.3% 21 4.4% 2	FAMA 13 4 30% 16 1 6.3% 20 10 4.8% FAMA 13 4 30% 16 1 6.3% 20 10 4.8% NEUHERSE 30 7 2.3% 4 30% 11% 13 4 11% 13 NEUHERSE 30 7 2.3% 4 3.0% 17 6 3.5% 70 10 1.3% NEUHERSE 30 7 2.3% 8 2 50% 71 11% 71 10 2.3% NEUHERSE 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 7 11 3 4 4 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% <	FRANM. 13 3 000 16 1 133% 16 1 133% 16 10 149% RNSTARK 45 3 000 16 1 113% 16 16 16 16 149% RUHFEREK 46 7 233% 7 2 333% 7 7 131% 46 16	NOTTINGHAM	110	. y	5.5%	2) ~	4.8%	53	- 4	7.5%	184	÷	6.0%	
KONSTANZ 45 4 89% 9 1 11.1% 13 5 36.5% 67 10 14.9% NEUHERBERG 30 7 2.3.3% 7 1 11.1% 7 10 14.9% NEUHERBERG 30 7 2.3.3% 7 1 11.1% 7 10 14.9% NEUHERBERG 30 7 67 10 14.3% 7 11.1% 7 11.1% 7 10 14.9% NEUHERBERG 48 3 65% 7 1 11.1% 17 11.1% <	KONSTANZ 45 16 69% 6 1 111% 13 55 67 10 149% KUNSTANZ 46 7 233% 65% 7 233% 67% 10 149% RELANGEN 30 7 533% 7 1 111% 6 536% 67 10 143% MUNSTER 33 5 550% 5 230% 67 10 143% MUNSTER 33 5 50% 5 550% 2 550% 2 550% 4 33% 7 10 143% MUNSTER 21 33% 21 0 00% 27 2 250% 4 43% 2 250% 4 43% 2 250% 4 43% 10 133% KUSTENDING 21 33% 21 33% 27 2 250% 35 210% 36 10 133% </td <td>KONSTANZ 45 4 89% 9 1 11% 13 55% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 133% 11 10 0 0 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 10 133% 10 133% 1</td> <td>PRAHA</td> <td>134</td> <td>9 4</td> <td>3.0%</td> <td>16</td> <td>· -</td> <td>6.3%</td> <td>28</td> <td>Ω.</td> <td>8.5%</td> <td>209</td> <td>10</td> <td>4.8%</td> <td></td>	KONSTANZ 45 4 89% 9 1 11% 13 55% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 67 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 133% 11 10 0 0 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 139% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 133% 10 10 133% 10 133% 1	PRAHA	134	9 4	3.0%	16	· -	6.3%	28	Ω.	8.5%	209	10	4.8%	
NEUHERBER 30 7 23.3% 4 2 50.% 9 1 11.1% 43 10 23.3% REUHERBER 46 3 6.5% 7 1 14.3% 11 6.3% 70 10 23.3% ERLANGEN 48 5 2.5.0% 5 2.5.0% 5 2.6.0% 70 10 2.3.3% ILLIKIRHERSTADEN 212 7 3.3.% 21 1 14.3% 71 14.3% 70 10 2.3.3% ILLIKIRHERSTADEN 21 3 3.7% 11 0 0.0% 24 4 50 70 10 2.3.3% TORINO 212 7 3.3% 20 0.0% 21 7 7 14.3% INSPRUCK 53 7 11.3% 7 14.3% 7 14.3% 7 14.3% INSPRUCK 53 5 5.3.3% 27 6.7 4.5% 2.9<	Inturference 30 7 233% 7 233% 7 1	REUNERERG 30 7 233% 7 1 11% 73 10 233% 11 1 134% 10 233% 11 233% 11 2 45% 20 0 0 233% 10 233% 11 2 34% 33 34% 33 34% 33 34% 33 34% 33 34% 30 31 33% 34% 33 34% 33 34% 33 34% 33 34% 34% 30 31	KONSTANZ	45	4	8.9%	ი ე	~	11.1%	13	2 L	38.5%	67	10	14.9%	
ERLANGEN 46 3 6.5% 7 1 14.3% 17 6 35.3% 70 10 14.3% INUNSTER 48 4 8.3% 7 6 35.3% 70 10 14.3% INUNSTER 48 4 8.3% 5 0 0.0% 24 4 16.7% 80 10 12.5% INUNSTER 21 3.3% 21 0 0.0% 24 4 10 22.3% INUNSTER 21 3.3% 11 0 0.00% 57 26 29 10 12.5% INUNSTER 21 3.3% 11 0 0.00% 57 14.9% 10 10 22.3% INUNSTER 52 3 3.7% 10 0 0.00% 21 4.5% 29 10 13.3% INUNSTER 53 4.7% 10.0% 21 21 21 21 21 21	ERLANGEN 66 7 1 143% 17 6 35.3% 70 10 143% ILINICATE 48 5 5 0 0 0 10 143% ILINICATE 48 5 5 0 0 0% 24 6 53.3% 70 10 133% ILINICATERATE 23 5 5 5 5 0 0 0% 45 5 50% 45 10 10 133% RENEND 23 7 4 4.4.4% 3 1 0.00% 47 7 4.5% 10 10 10 10 13% RENEND 23 7 1 0 0.00% 27 2 2.50% 4.5 10 10 13% RENEND 33 7 1 0.00% 27 2 5.5% 2.5% 2.5% 10 10 13% NICOSIA	FRANCEN 46 3 65% 7 1 143% 17 6 35.3% 70 10 143% NUSTER 48 3 65% 7 1 143% 70 10 143% LLKIRCH-GRAFENSTADEN 28 5 25.0% 5 25.0% 24 4 16.7% 80 10 73% TCILIKIRCH-GRAFENSTADEN 20 5 25.0% 24 4 16.7% 80 10 73% TCILIKIRCH-GRAFENSTADEN 23 3.3% 11 0 0.0% 27 25.0% 29 10 73% TCILIKIRCH-GRAFENSTADEN 23 3.3% 11 0 0.0% 27 2 25.0% 29 10 73% TCINCPIG 33 4 1.19% 33 7 4 57.1% 10 10 13% KLOSTERNEUBURG 33 4 1.19% 33.3% 27 6 5.1% 1	NEUHERBERG	30	7	23.3%	4	0	50.0%	σ	-	11.1%	43	10	23.3%	
MÜNSTER 48 4 8.3% 8 2 25.0% 24 4 16.7% 80 10 12.5% LLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 21 7 33 5 25.0% 5 25.0% 45 10 12.5% TLLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 212 7 33 25.0% 5 45 25.0% 45 10 10 22.2% TLLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 212 7 0 0.0% 47 7 14,9% 10 10 22.2% TLLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 23 3 3 3 3 3 3 47.4% 3 47.4% 10 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 27.4% 13 10 13.3% 10 10 10 17.4% 10 10 17.4% 10 10 17.4% 10 10 10 10.3% 1	MÜNSTER 48 4 8.3% 8 2 25.0% 24 6 10 12.5% LIKIRH-IGRAFENSTADEN 212 7 3 5 5 0 0.0% 5 55.0% 45 10 22.3% TORINO 212 7 3.3% 21 7 3.3% 27 3.4 45.6 45 10 7.1% BERGEN 212 7 3.3% 21 0 0.0% 27 4 55.0% 45 10 7.1% BERGEN 212 7 3.3% 21 0 0.0% 27 4 45% 10 7.1% BERGEN 33.3% 7 3.33% 27 7 4 57.1% 199 9 101% NICOSIA 33 5.8 7 0 0.0% 27 4 57.1% 10 13% NICOSIA 35 5.2 5 2.3 5 10	MUNSTER MONSTER 48 48 80 10 125% MUNSTER 20 5 0 0 223% 80 10 223% MULKIRH-GRAFFENSTIDEN 21 7 33% 20 0 00% 67 3 45% 29 10 223% TORINO 212 7 33% 21 0 00% 67 7 45% 29 10 23% TORINO 212 3 3 1 0 00% 67 7 45% 29 10 33% KLOSTERUNG 9 4 7 0 00% 27 45% 29 10 33% NUSSENCK 9 4 7 7 4 57.1% 19 9 13% NUSSENCK 9 119% 7 0 00% 23 25.5% 36 10 35% NUSSENCK 35 4 <	ERLANGEN	46	с	6.5%	7	-	14.3%	17	9	35.3%	20	10	14.3%	
ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 20 5 25.0% 5 25.0% 5 25.0% 45 10 22.2% PORINO 212 7 3.3% 20 0 0.0% 67 3 45% 299 10 2.22% PORINO 212 7 3.3% 21 7 3.45% 299 10 7 3.3% Broten 29 7 119% 3 1 3.3% 7 4.45% 10 7.1% 10 7 7 7 4.45% 10 7.1% 19 9 47.4% NINSBRUCK 59 7 11.0% 21 1 3.3% 27 4 4.7% 10 7.1% 10 7.4% NINSBRUCK 59 7 11.0% 23.3% 27 2 9.5% 10.1% 7.4% 10 10.1% 10 13.4% NINSBRUCK 52 5 7 10 0.0%	TULIKICH-GRAFFENSTADEN 20 5 2.50% 5 2.50% 45 46 46 47 45 47 45 46 46 47 45 46 46 46 46 47 <th< td=""><td>TURING-INAFFENSTADEN 20 5 50% 5 50% 45 10 323% TURING-INAFFENSTADEN 212 7 3.3% 20 0 00% 20 4 45 10 323% DERGEN 212 7 3.3% 20 0 00% 47 7 14.9% 10 7.1% NINSBRUCK 59 7 119.% 3 7 4 57.1% 19 9 17.4% NINSBRUCK 59 7 119.% 3 7 4 57.1% 19 9 10 7.1% NUCSIA 93 7 10 33.3% 27 6 13.6% 13 9 11.3% NUCSIA 93 68 7 0 0.0% 27 6 16.9% 80 9 11.3% NUCSIA 55 5 7 0 0.0% 27 2 26.5% 13 10</td><td>MÜNSTER</td><td>48</td><td>4</td><td>8.3%</td><td>ω</td><td>7</td><td>25.0%</td><td>24</td><td>4</td><td>16.7%</td><td>80</td><td>10</td><td>12.5%</td><td></td></th<>	TURING-INAFFENSTADEN 20 5 50% 5 50% 45 10 323% TURING-INAFFENSTADEN 212 7 3.3% 20 0 00% 20 4 45 10 323% DERGEN 212 7 3.3% 20 0 00% 47 7 14.9% 10 7.1% NINSBRUCK 59 7 119.% 3 7 4 57.1% 19 9 17.4% NINSBRUCK 59 7 119.% 3 7 4 57.1% 19 9 10 7.1% NUCSIA 93 7 10 33.3% 27 6 13.6% 13 9 11.3% NUCSIA 93 68 7 0 0.0% 27 6 16.9% 80 9 11.3% NUCSIA 55 5 7 0 0.0% 27 2 26.5% 13 10	MÜNSTER	48	4	8.3%	ω	7	25.0%	24	4	16.7%	80	10	12.5%	
TORINO 212 7 3.3% 20 0.0% 67 3 4.5% 299 10 3.3% BERGEN 82 3 7.1% 11 0 0.0% 67 3 4.5% 299 10 3.3% KLOSTENEUBUG 9 4 4.4% 3 1 0 0.0% 7.1% 19 9 4.4% KLOSTENEUBUG 9 7 11.9% 11 33.3% 27 4 57.1% 19 9 4.4% NUSERUCK 59 7 11.9% 9 0 0.0% 27 4 57.1% 19 9 4.4% NICOSIA 93 7 11.9% 9 0 0.0% 27 4 57.1% 19 9 10.1% NICOSIA 53 5.8% 10 0.0% 27 2 9 56.1% 89 9 11.3% MICOSIA 52 5 6	TORINO 212 7 3.3% 20 0.0% 67 3 4.5% 299 10 7.3% BRCENT 21 7 3.3% 10 0.0% 67 3 4.5% 299 10 7.3% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 4.3% 11 0 0.0% 47 7 4.5% 299 10 7.3% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 4.3% 11 0 0.0% 47 7 4.5% 10 7.1% KLOSTENC 93 4 4.3% 10 10.0% 29 10.1% 13.3% NUCSING 93 6 2 3.3.3% 27 4 57.1% 139 132 9 13.3% MINZ 53 58% 7 0 0.0% 23 2 25.1% 13 9 13.6% MINZ 51 6 13.3% 23 6 23 14.4%	TORINO 212 7 3.3% 20 0.0% 67 3 4.4% 2.99 10 7.3% TORINO Enclusion 212 7 3.3% 210 0.0% 67 3 4.4% 10 7.3% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 4.4% 3 1 3.3% 7 4 57.1% 10 7.3% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 4.4% 3 1 3.3% 7 4 57.1% 10 71.3% 9 47.4% NINSBRUCK 59 4 4.4% 3 1 3.3% 27 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.4% 7 4 4.7% 7 9 6.6% 8 9 1.1% 4.1% 4.1% 4.1% 4.1% 4.1% 4.1% 4	ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADE	N 20	5	25.0%	5	0	0.0%	20	5	25.0%	45	10	22.2%	
BERGEN 82 3 3.7% 11 0 0.0% 47 7 14.9% 140 10 7.1% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 7 4 44.4% 3 3 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% NINDSRUCK 59 7 10 0 0.0% 21 2 9 6.1% NINDSRUCK 9 47 1 0 0.0% 21 2 9 6.1% NICDSRUCK 59 47 1 10.0% 21 2 9 6.1% WINDSRUC 52 3 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 80 9 11.0% MAINZ 52 4 11.1% 2 33.3% 27 5 16.8% 80 9 11.3% MAINZ 5	BERGEN 82 3 37% 11 0 0.0% 17 149% 140 10 71% INUSSTERNEUBURG 9 4 44.4% 3 1 13.3% 7 14 10 71% INUSSTERNEUBURG 9 7 11.9% 33.3% 27 4 43.4% 3 3<.3% 7 4 3<.1% 10 7.1% 19% 10 7 7 NUSSTERNEUBURG 59 7 11.9% 3 6 3<.3% 27 6 13.3% 27 6 13.3% 27 8 9 11.3% NUCCSIA 52 5 4 11.4% 1 10.0% 27 6 13.3% 12 3 13.3% 13 6 8% NUCCSIA 5 5 3 5 27 6 13.3% 13 6 8% NUCCSIA 5 5 3 16 3	BERGEN B2 3 3.7% 11 0 0.0% 47 10 0 0.0% 21 2 3.3% 27 2 3.3% 27 2 3.3% 27 2 3.3% 27 2 3 11.0% 3 11.0% 3 11.0% 3 11.3% 3 3 3.3% 27 3 11.3% 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	TORINO	212	7	3.3%	20	0	0.0%	67	e	4.5%	299	10	3.3%	
KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 44.4% 3 31 1 33.3% 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% KLOSTERNEUBURG 59 7 1 33.3% 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% NINSBRUCK 59 7 11.9% 9 0.01% 21 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NINSBRUCK 59 7 1 10.9% 21 1 23.3% 21 2 9.5% 80 9 10.1% NINSBRUCK 53 47 1 10.0% 21 1 13.2% 13.3% 27 9 6.8% 9 11.3% NUNCSURG 44 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 89 9 11.3% MANZ 52 4 11.3% 23 23 6 26.1% 89 9 11.3% MANZ 56	KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 44.% 3 1 3.3.% 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% NINDSRUCK 59 7 4 57.1% 19 9 10.1% NINDSRUCK 59 7 1.9% 9 0.1% 19 9 17.4% NINDSRUCK 59 7 1.9% 10 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 89 9 17.4% NINDSRUCK 59 7 1 0.0% 21 0 0.0% 21 2 9 17.4% WINZBURG 9 7 1 10.0% 21 0 0.0% 21 21 26 18.5% 89 11.3% WINZBURG 56 6 7 0 0.0% 23 26 26.1% 78 9 14.5% WINZBURG 36 1 13 3 17.6% 10 9 16%	KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 4 4.4% 3 1 3.3.% 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% KLOSTERNEUBURG 9 7 14.4% 3 1 3.3.% 7 4 57.1% 19 9 47.4% NUSBRUCK 93 4 4.3% 10 1 10.0% 21 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NUCSIA 33 4 7.1% 10 0 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 80 9 10.1% NUCSIA 33 4 7.1% 10 0 0.0% 21 2 35% 27 5 11.3% 133 WIRZBURG 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 14.5% WIRZBURG 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 11.6	BERGEN	82	ę	3.7%	11	0	0.0%	47	7	14.9%	140	10	7.1%	
INNSRUCK 59 7 119% 9 0 0.1% 21 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NINSRUCK 93 4 4.3% 10 1 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NINCSIA 93 2 4 4.3% 10 1 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NINCSIA 93 2 4 4.3% 10 1 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% NINCSIA 47 2 2 4.3% 7 0 0 0 13.3% 27 5 6 11.3% MINZ 5 5 7 0 0 0 0 13.3% 27 5 13.6% 78 9 11.3% MAINZ 5 5 13 0 0 0 11.3% 78 9 11.3% MAINZ 5 5 15 0	INUSRUCK 59 7 119% 9 0 0.0% 21 2 95% 89 9 10.1% INUSRUCK 53 4 4.3% 10 0.0% 21 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% INUSRUCK 93 4 4.3% 10 1 0.0% 21 5 9 6.8% WURZBURG 47 2 4.3% 10 0 0.0% 23 6 21.1% 9 11.0% WINZBURG 52 3.3% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% MANZ 78 6 7 10 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 78 9 11.5% MANZ 76 9 10.1% 23 6 26.1% 78 9 14.5% MANZ 76 9 11.4% 9 0.0% 17 2 15.6%	INNSRUCK 59 7 11.9% 9 0 10.1% INNSRUCK 59 7 11.9% 9 0 10.1% INNSRUCK 93 4 4.3% 10 2 9.5% 89 9 10.1% VICTORIA 93 4 4.3% 10 1 0 0.0% 29 4 132 9 6.8% WINZ 52 5 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 23 27 5 11.3% MANZ 52 5 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 23 6 21.7% 82 9 11.3% MANZ 55 5 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 23 5 11.5% 11.3% MANZ 5 6 7.8% 13 0 0.0% 23 5 11.5% MANZ 5 1 11.4% 3 11.4% 3 11.6% 11.5% MANZ 5 5 15.6% 76 9 9.0% 14.5% Constrained 5 11.4% 9 0.0% 23 5 15.6% 76 9 DUNDE 5 <td>KLOSTERNEUBURG</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>44.4%</td> <td>ς</td> <td>-</td> <td>33.3%</td> <td>7</td> <td>4</td> <td>57.1%</td> <td>19</td> <td>6</td> <td>47.4%</td> <td></td>	KLOSTERNEUBURG	6	4	44.4%	ς	-	33.3%	7	4	57.1%	19	6	47.4%	
NICOSIA 93 4 4.3% 10 1 10.0% 29 4 13.8% 132 9 6.8% NICOSIA 97 6.8% 7 10.0% 29 4 13.8% 132 9 6.8% NICOSIA 47 2 2 4.3% 6 2 3.3% 27 5 13.6% 80 9 16.8% MIXZBURG 5 5 6 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 27 5 5 11.3% 9 11.3% MAIXZ 5 5 6 7 8 7 9 16.8% 78 9 11.3% GRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 3 15.8% 78 9 11.3% GRENOBLE 36 6 7.8% 6 0 0.0% 23 15.8% 78 9 14.5% GRENOBLE 37 17.6%	NICOSIA 93 4 4.3% 10 1 10.0% 29 4 13.8% 132 9 6.8% NICOSIA 93 47 2 4.3% 73 10 1 10.0% 29 4 13.8% 132 9 6.8% MUZZBURG 5 5 43.5% 7 8 73 80 9 11.3% MUZZBURG 5 5 13.6% 7 8 7 8 9 11.3% MUZZBURG 5 5 13.6% 73 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 11.3% MUZZBURG 77 6 7.8% 73 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 11.8% UNDEE 3 17.6% 78 3 17.6% 76 9 9.6% DUNDEE 3 10.3% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6% ABERDEN 60 6 0.0% 29 3 10.3%	NICOSIA 93 4 4.3% 10 1 100% 29 4 133% 132 9 6.8% NICOSIA 47 23 5.8% 7 2 4 13.8% 132 9 16.8% 80 9 16.8% 133% 27 5 16.5% 82 9 16.8% 82 9 11.3% MNZEBURG 5 5 5 8.8% 7 7 0 0.0% 27 5 16.8% 82 9 11.3% MANZEBURG 75 5 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 27 5 16.8% 78 9 11.3% MANZEDURE 77 6 71.1% 3 76.8% 78 2 78 78 9 16.8% 100% UNDEE 37 6 10.1% 37 10.3% 34 16.8% 76 9 36.8% DUNDE 3 10.3%	INNSBRUCK	59	7	11.9%	6	0	0.0%	21	2	9.5%	89	o	10.1%	
WURZBURG 47 2 4.3% 6 2 3.3.% 27 5 18.5% 80 9 11.3% MAINZ 52 3 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 80 9 11.3% MAINZ 52 3 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% TARRAGONA 46 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.5% CRENDILE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0 0 10.0% 17 8 9 14.5% CINCONDLE 77 6 7.8% 6 0 0.0% 3 17.6% 100 9 14.5% DUNDEE 5 10.0% 22 5 15.6% 76 9 11.8% ABERDEN 60 6 10.0% 29 0	MUNZEBURG 47 2 4.3% 6 2 3.3.3% 2.7 5 18.5% 80 9 11.3% MUNZEBURG 52 3 3.3.3% 2.7 5 18.5% 80 9 11.3% MUNZEBURG 52 3 3.3.3% 2.7 5 18.5% 80 9 11.3% TARRAGUA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 23 6 2.1.7% 82 9 11.0% TARRODILE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 17.6% 76 9 11.6% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 15.6% 76 9 9.6% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 3 0.0% 23 3 10.3% 94 9.6% ABERDEN 60 60 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9.6%	WURZBURG 47 2 4.3% 6 2.33% 2.7 6 16.5% 80 9 11.3% WURZBURG 52 3 6 6 6 6 16.5% 80 9 11.3% MINZ 52 3 5 1 3 5 1 6 6 16.5% 80 9 11.3% MINZ 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 11.5% GRENOBLE 77 6 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 17.6% 100 9 11.5% UNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 23 12.6% 76 9 9.6% BUNDEE 3 10.3% 23 10.3% 23 10.3% 9.6% 9.6% 9.6% BUNDE <td>NICOSIA</td> <td>93</td> <td>4</td> <td>4.3%</td> <td>9</td> <td>-</td> <td>10.0%</td> <td>29</td> <td>4</td> <td>13.8%</td> <td>132</td> <td>o</td> <td>6.8%</td> <td></td>	NICOSIA	93	4	4.3%	9	-	10.0%	29	4	13.8%	132	o	6.8%	
MANZ 52 3 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% TRRAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.0% CRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.6% LINRODUL 77 6 11.1% 3 0.0% 17 3 15.8% 16 9 14.5% DUNDER 35 4 11.4% 9 0 0.0% 33 15.8% 76 9 11.8% ABERDEN 55 0 0.0% 22 5 15.6% 76 9 11.8%	MANZ 52 3 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% TARRAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% TARRAGONA 7 6 1<1.0% 13 0 0.0% 13 13 6 26.1% 82 9 11.6% GRENOIS 77 6 7.8% 6 0 0.0% 17 3 17.6% 76 9 11.6% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 32 5 15.6% 76 9 9.6% ABERDEEN 60 6 10.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	MANZ 52 53 5.8% 7 0 0.0% 23 6 26.1% 82 9 11.0% TARAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 13 0 9 14.5% GRENOLS 76 3 6 7.1% 3 17.6% 76 9 14.5% GRENOLS 77 6 7.8% 6 0 0.0% 17 6 14.5% UNXÖPING 77 6 7.8% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 11.8% DUNDEE 35 11.4% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 15.6% 76 9 9.6% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 3 0 0.0% 23 76 9 9.6% ABERDEN 60 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	WURZBURG	47	2	4.3%	9	2	33.3%	27	2	18.5%	80	ი	11.3%	
TARRAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.5% CRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.5% CRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 14.5% LINNOF 77 6 0 0.0% 17 3 17.6% 100 9 90.% DUNDER 5 5 16 0 0.0% 23 5 17.6% 100 9 90.% ABERDEN 55 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 96%	TARRAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 19 3 15.8% 78 9 11.5% CINRCIPIC 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 6 9 14.5% LINROPING 77 6 7 1 3 17.6% 76 9 11.5% CINNCPING 37 5 1 1 3 17.6% 76 9 9.0% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0 0.0% 32 5 16.6% 76 9 9.6% ABERDEN 60 0 0.0% 23 25 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	TARRAGONA 46 6 13.0% 13 0 0.0% 19 3 16.8% 78 9 11.5% CRNOBLE 77 6 2 3 16.8% 78 62 9 9.0% LINKOPDE 77 6 7 6 0 0.0% 23 5 1.7% 62 9 9.0% LINKOPDE 35 4 11.4% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 16.8% 76 9 9.0% DUNDE 35 4 11.4% 5 0 0.0% 23 5 16.8% 76 9 9.6% ABENDEN 60 6 0.0% 29 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	MAINZ	52	m i	5.8%	7	0	0.0%	23	9	26.1%	82	o	11.0%	
GRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 14.5% ILINGPIG 77 6 17.8% 6 0 0.0% 17 3 17.6% 100 9 9.0% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 23 5 17.6% 100 9 9.0% DUNDEE 35 6 10.0% 32 5 10.3% 94 9 9.0%	GRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 14.5% LINKÖPING 77 6 7 6 7 6 7 9 14.5% LINKÖPING 77 6 7 6 7 3 17.6% 76 9 9.0% JUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 23 5 15.6% 76 9 9.6% ABERDEN 60 6 10.0% 23 2 5 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	GRENOBLE 36 4 11.1% 3 0 0.0% 23 5 21.7% 62 9 14.5% LINKÖPING 77 6 7.1% 3 17.6% 10 9 10.3% ZI LINKÖPING 35 4 11.1% 3 17.6% 76 9 10.3% ZI LINKÖPING 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 17 3 17.6% 76 9 10.3% DUNDE 35 6 10.0% 23 5 10.3% 94 9 9.6% ABENDEEN 66 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	TARRAGONA	46	9	13.0%	13	0	%0.0	19	ς Γ	15.8%	78	o '	11.5%	
LINKOFING // 6 // 6 0 0.0% 1/ 3 1/.6% 100 9 9.0% DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0 0.0% 32 5 16.6% 9 11.8% ABERDEE 60 6 0.0% 32 5 16.6% 9 11.8%	LINKOPING // b $1/8\%$ b $1/8\%$ b $1/18\%$ 3 $1/16\%$ 100 9 9.0% JBUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0.0% 32 5 11.8% 76 9 9.0% ABERDEN 60 6 10.0\% 5 0 0.0% 29 3 9.6% 96%	LINKOPING $1/1$ 6 $1/13\%$	GRENOBLE	36	4 (11.1%	ლი ი	0	0.0%	53	υ Ω	21.7%	62	о (14.5%	
DUNUEE 35 4 11.4% 9 0 0.0% 32 5 10.18% 11.8% ABERDEEN 60 6 10.0% 5 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	DUNDEE 35 4 11.4% 3 11.0% 32 9 11.0% ABERDEEN 60 6 10.0% 5 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	DUNDEE 32 1.4% 9 1.14% 9 1.0% 1.0% 22 9	LINKOPING	10	• •	1.8%	0 0	0	0.0% 0.0%	/1.	γ	%0.1L	00 F	סמ	9.0%	
ABERDEEN 60 6 10.0% 5 0 0.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	ABERDEN 60 6 10.0% 29 3 10.3% 94 9 9.6%	ABERDEN 50 00 00% 29 00% 29 00% 29 00%	DUNDEE	35	4	11.4%	ית	0	0.0%	32	Ω	15.6%	9/	ית	11.8%	
			ABERDEEN	60	9	10.0%	5	0	0.0%	29	e S	10.3%	94	6	9.6%	

. • . .

•

•

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

115

			••••	•	
Table AS	0.04: National percentage of grantees in top-100 localities by	funding scheme at application s	stage		
	LOCALITY	StG	CoG	AdG	All
FR	PARIS	75.5%	83.3%	68.8%	
DE		30.3%	24.0%	24.7%	
	CAMBRIDGE	14 1%	11.5%	12.6%	
UK	OXEORD	14.176	14.8%	13.9%	
CH	ZÜRICH	35.0%	31.8%	41.7%	
ES	BARCELONA	37.9%	45.0%	48.1%	
NI	AMSTERDAM	23.6%	31.0%	30.9%	
СН	LAUSANNE	34.3%	22.7%	28.5%	
ES	MADRID	30.7%	35.0%	34.6%	
IL	REHOVOT	28.5%	55.6%	32.1%	
IL	JERUSALEM	29.2%	16.7%	36.9%	
AT	WIEN	72.7%	66.7%	70.3%	
IT	ROMA	34.9%	10.0%	16.7%	
п	MILANO	18.6%	30.0%	22.8%	
NL	UTRECHT	15.1%	6.9%	14.0%	
DE	HEIDELBERG	8.1%	2.3%	9.1%	
BE	LEUVEN	25.5%	37.5%	43.2%	
DE	BERLIN	7.2%	7.0%	8.7%	
UK	EDINBURGH	4.6%	4.9%	5.1%	
BE	GENT	29.6%	31.3%	21.6%	
UK	BRISTOL	3.4%	4.9%	5.6%	
NL	LEIDEN	10.6%	10.3%	12.5%	
NL	NIJMEGEN	11.6%	13.8%	8.1%	
СН	GENÈVE	8.0%	13.6%	14.6%	
IL	HAIFA	17.4%	11.1%	10.7%	
FI	HELSINKI	45.0%	25.0%	64.0%	
SE	STOCKHOLM	18.1%	40.0%	23.8%	
DK	KØBENHAVN	42.1%	66.7%	38.2%	
СН	BASEL	10.9%	18.2%	8.6%	
NL	GRONINGEN	12.6%	3.4%	3.7%	
SE	SOLNA	21.7%	20.0%	17.5%	
FR	LE CHESNAY	5.9%	0.0%	5.6%	
IL		10.4%	5.6%	16.7%	
HU	BUDAPEST	77.8%	100.0%	86.7%	
3E		16.9%	20.0%	20.6%	
NL	DELFI	8.5%	6.9%	6.6%	
SE	UPPSALA	18.1%	10.0%	15.9%	
BE	ADUUS	10.3%	18.8%	16.2%	
		51.0%	10.7%	35.3%	
		1 90/	1 60/	00.970	
SE		14.5%	10.0%	17 5%	
	LEEDS	2.0%	1.6%	3 3%	
lik	EXETER	2.0%	3.3%	1.8%	
NO		5.0%	100.0%	1.0 %	
DE	BONN	3 10/	11.6%	40.0%	
IIK	MANCHESTER	3.1% 2.6%	0.0%	2.9%	
UK	COVENTRY	2.0%	6.6%	2.3%	
lik	GLASGOW	2.0%	1.6%	2.0%	
DE		2.0%	1.070	2.0 %	
DT		5.770	100.0%	2.370 E0.00/	
	LIUDUA	50.5%	100.0%	50.0%	



. • . .

.

Table A9.04: National	percentage of granter	as in top-100 localities	s by funding scheme a	t application stage (continued)
	percentage er grantet	io in top ioo ioounnoo		(continued)

	• • • • • • • • •				
	Is National percentage of grantees in ten 100 localities by funding	a cohome at application a	tage (continued)		
e A9.04	Realized and the second s	scheme at application s	stage (continued)		
		StG	CoG	AdG	All
	HAMBURG	2.2%	2.3%	5.0%	3.3%
	ENSCHEDE	5.5%	10.3%	2.9%	4.9%
	EINDHOVEN	3.5%	10.3%	5.9%	4.9%
	DURHAM	2.2%	3.3%	1.3%	1.9%
	ST ANDREWS	1.6%	3.3%	2.0%	1.9%
	ESPOO	30.0%	0.0%	20.0%	24.6%
	BIRMINGHAM	2.0%	4.9%	1.0%	1.8%
	TÜBINGEN	2.8%	2.3%	2.5%	2.6%
	FRANKFURT AM MAIN	3.1%	7.0%	1.2%	2.6%
	ATHENS	40.0%	0.0%	53.3%	43.2%
	ROTTERDAM	4.0%	0.0%	5.9%	4.4%
	TOULOUSE	2.3%	0.0%	3.7%	2.7%
	TRIESTE	3.1%	5.0%	8.8%	5.7%
	NORWICH	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%
	LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE	11.2%	0.0%	5.4%	8.6%
	PISA	2.3%	0.0%	8.8%	4.9%
	FALMER	1.6%	1.6%	1.0%	1.4%
	SOUTHAMPTON	1.2%	1.6%	1.5%	1.4%
	BERN	5.8%	4.5%	2.0%	3.9%
	GÖTTINGEN	2.8%	2.3%	0.8%	2.0%
	HANNOVER	2.5%	0.0%	1.7%	2.0%
	TRENTO	4.7%	0.0%	5.3%	4.6%
	WARSZAWA	100.0%	0.0%	66.7%	92.3%
	NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE	0.8%	3.3%	1.5%	1.2%
	ANTWERPEN	7.1%	6.3%	8.1%	7.3%
	AACHEN	1.9%	2.3%	1.7%	1.8%
	DRESDEN	2.2%	0.0%	1.7%	1.8%
	KONGENS LYNGBY	18.4%	0.0%	11.8%	14.1%
	HERAKLEION	30.0%	50.0%	26.7%	29.7%
	BEERSHEBA	6.9%	0.0%	1.2%	4.5%
	RAMAT GAN	5.6%	5.6%	2.4%	4.5%
	PADOVA	5.4%	15.0%	0.9%	4.2%
	NOTTINGHAM	1.2%	1.6%	1.0%	1.1%
	PRAHA	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	83.3%
	KONSTANZ	1.2%	2.3%	2.1%	1.7%
	NEUHERBERG	2.2%	4.7%	0.4%	1.7%
	ERLANGEN	0.9%	2.3%	2.5%	1.7%
	MÜNSTER	1.2%	4.7%	1.7%	1.7%
	ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN	1.6%	0.0%	2.3%	1.8%
	TORINO	5.4%	0.0%	2.6%	3.8%
	BERGEN	16.7%	0.0%	28.0%	22.7%
	KLOSTERNEUBURG	7.3%	16.7%	10.8%	9.2%
	INNSBRUCK	12.7%	0.0%	5.4%	9.2%
	NICOSIA	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	WÜRZBURG	0.6%	4.7%	2.1%	1.5%
	MAINZ	0.9%	0.0%	2.5%	1.5%
	TARRAGONA	4.3%	0.0%	3.7%	3.7%
	GRENOBLE	1.3%	0.0%	2.3%	1.6%
	LINKÖPING	7.2%	0.0%	4.8%	5.8%
	DUNDEE	0.8%	0.0%	1.3%	0.9%
	ABERDEEN	1.2%	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%

. . . • . . . • . . • .



ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

ble A9.0	5: Submitted and selected proposal	ls in top-100 local	ities at applicatic	on stage by se	cientific doma	<u>.</u>									
	LOCALITY	LS			E			HS			AII				
		EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR	EVAL.	FUND.	SR		
	PARIS	977	174	17.8%	1105	177	16.0%	329	63	19.1%	2411	414	17.2%		
	LONDON	650 364	113 80	17.4% 24 6%	565 467	88	12.2%	421 82	85 11	20.2%	1636 003	267 186	16.3%		
	CAMBRIDGE	183	44	24.0%	227	61 61	26.9%	103	23 1	22.3%	513	128	25.0%		
	OXFORD	226	36	15.9%	206	49	23.8%	163	35	21.5%	595	120	20.2%		
	ZÜRICH	178	47	26.4%	229	61	26.6%	54	10	18.5%	461	118	25.6%		
	AMSTERDAM	398	3/ 35	9.3%	300 163	45 10	11.3%	243	30 44	12.3%	941 631	101	10.1%		
	LAUSANNE	108	60	37.0%	172	51	29.7%	45	4	8.9%	325	60 60	29.2%		
	MADRID	499	31	6.2%	557	37	6.6%	234	10	4.3%	1290	78	6.0%		
	REHOVOT	128	45 0.1	35.2%	96	32	33.3%	9	÷ ۲	16.7%	230	78	33.9%		
	JERUSALEM	132	34	25.8%	108 761	27	25.0%	110	15	19.2%	318	9/2	23.9%		
	ROMA	342	4 16	4 7%	201 635	43	6.8%	155	0	4 5%	1132	07 99	5.8%		
	MILANO	293	31	10.6%	217	çω	3.7%	167	17	10.2%	677	56	8.3%		
	UTRECHT	163	19	11.7%	141	24	17.0%	93	ω	8.6%	397	51	12.8%		
	HEIDELBERG	159	32	20.1%	65	15 Or	23.1%	28	си ç	7.1%	252	49	19.4%		
	LEUVEN BEDI IN	130	12	9.2%	157	22 20	15.9%	110	0 0 a	9.1% 6.6%	397	47	11.8%		
	EDINBURGH	85	<u>6</u> 0	10.6%	171	23 23	13.5%	65	0 1	21.5%	321	46	14.3%		
	GENT	134	25	18.7%	85	1	12.9%	20	9	8.6%	289	42	14.5%		
	BRISTOL	73	1 00	11.0%	143	27	18.9%	41	7	17.1%	257	42	16.3%		
	NUMEGEN	93	14	15.1%	53	2 0	18.9%	82	- 1	17.1%	278	38	16.7%		
	GENÈVE	8.63	19	30.2%	88	5 4	15.9%	58		10.7%	179	36	20.1%	•	
	HAIFA	88	10	11.2%	164	24	14.6%	64	5	3.1%	317	36	11.4%	•	
	HELSINKI STOCKHOLM	209	22 6	10.5%	125 223	3 10	8.0% 0.0%	113	mo	2.7% 12 5%	447 370	35	7.8% 0.2%		
	KØBENHAVN	165	, 1	8.5%	107	14	13.1%	2.62	2	6.3%	351	33	9.4%	•	•
	BASEL	28	24	40.7%	27	7	25.9%	10	- I	10.0%	96	32	33.3%	•	
	GRONINGEN SOLINA	98	12	12.2%	99	<mark>.5</mark>	19.7%	77	o c	8.3% 70 6%	236		13.1%	•	
	LE CHESNAY	2 2	0	0.0%	139	30	21.6%	-	J	0.02	144	00	20.8%		
	TEL AVIV	105	1	10.5%	107	16	15.0%	82	ę	3.7%	294	30	10.2%	•	•
	BUDAPEST	109	ο I	7.3%	151	13	8.6%	106	ω (7.5%	366	29	7.9%	•	
	GOTEBORG	75	ດ	6.7%	163	21	12.9%	36	τ, 03	8.3%	274	50	10.6%		
	UELT LIPPSALA	143	17	0.3%	85	C2 7	8 2%	47	- ~	4.2%	275	26	9.5%		
	BRUSSEL	55	22	9.1%	115	12	10.4%	63	00	12.7%	233	25	10.7%	•	
	ÅRHUS	67	10	14.9%	75	13	17.3%	38	2	5.3%	180	25	13.9%	•	
	DUBLIN	119 64	7	5.9%	143	13	9.1% 0.6%	72	n U	6.9%	334	25	1.5%		
		137	₫ ₽	7.3%	88	12 0	9.0% 13.6%	24	0 0	9.0% 8.3%	249	24	9.6%		
	LEEDS	56	5	8.9%	100	12	12.0%	59	7	11.9%	215	24	11.2%		
	EXETER	41	- 2	17.1%	51	; Ω	9.8%	83	12	14.5%	175	24	13.7%		
	OSLO	105 41	א מ	2.9%	91 40	11	30.0%	84	ש ת	35.7%	280	23	8.2% 23.2%		
	MANCHESTER	73	9 0	8.2%	118	15	10.2%	29	9 4	6.8%	250	12	8.8%		
	COVENTRY	16	0	%0.0	111	17	15.3%	45	5	11.1%	172	22	12.8%		
		76	6 5	13.2%	113	r 0	6.2%	51	ົດ	9.8%	240	22	9.2%		
		: 5	, t	18.5%	71	, 0	2.8%	2 89	14	5 9%	220	22	9.5%		
			2	2/2.2-		1	2/2/1	22	r	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	110	.1	>>>>>		

118

• • •

. . . . •

.

. . .

MARRIES I C </th <th>Control Control <t< th=""><th>MANDERE 0<!--</th--><th>7 11.5% 45 10 22.2%</th><th>SR EVAL. FUND.</th><th></th><th>EVAL</th></th></t<></th>	Control Control <t< th=""><th>MANDERE 0<!--</th--><th>7 11.5% 45 10 22.2%</th><th>SR EVAL. FUND.</th><th></th><th>EVAL</th></th></t<>	MANDERE 0 </th <th>7 11.5% 45 10 22.2%</th> <th>SR EVAL. FUND.</th> <th></th> <th>EVAL</th>	7 11.5% 45 10 22.2%	SR EVAL. FUND.		EVAL
Democritation 0 1 0 1 0 <	Description 1 <th< td=""><td>Tense 1</td></th<> <th>100 01</th> <td>6.1% 61</td> <td>49 3</td> <td>AMBURG</td>	Tense 1	100 01	6.1% 61	49 3	AMBURG
Entrowers 1	Democriation 0 1 0 </td <td>Display Display <t< td=""><th>17 19.8% 21 0 0.0%</th><td>12.5% 86</td><td></td><td>INSCHEDE</td></t<></td>	Display Display <t< td=""><th>17 19.8% 21 0 0.0%</th><td>12.5% 86</td><td></td><td>INSCHEDE</td></t<>	17 19.8% 21 0 0.0%	12.5% 86		INSCHEDE
Constration 5 1 2001 1	Constration 3 1 2 <th< td=""><td>FEADER 1 2010 <!--</td--><th>17 14.4% 11 1 9.1%</th><td>0.0% 118</td><td>10 0</td><td>EINDHOVEN</td></td></th<>	FEADER 1 2010 10 </td <th>17 14.4% 11 1 9.1%</th> <td>0.0% 118</td> <td>10 0</td> <td>EINDHOVEN</td>	17 14.4% 11 1 9.1%	0.0% 118	10 0	EINDHOVEN
Extrometeres 2 0.000 10 0.000 <th< td=""><td>Find Find <th< td=""><td>RENOUTING 21</td><th>12 13.5% 38 5 13.2%</th><td>20.0% 89</td><td>5</td><td>DURHAM</td></th<></td></th<>	Find Find <th< td=""><td>RENOUTING 21</td><th>12 13.5% 38 5 13.2%</th><td>20.0% 89</td><td>5</td><td>DURHAM</td></th<>	RENOUTING 21	12 13.5% 38 5 13.2%	20.0% 89	5	DURHAM
Entronum 19 2 0.00 19 2 0.00 19 2 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 10 0.00 </td <td>Encode Internation <t< td=""><td>Resolution 13 2 0.15 13</td><th>11 15.1% 28 4 14.3%</th><td>12.5% 73</td><td>24 3</td><td>ST ANDREWS</td></t<></td>	Encode Internation Internation <t< td=""><td>Resolution 13 2 0.15 13</td><th>11 15.1% 28 4 14.3%</th><td>12.5% 73</td><td>24 3</td><td>ST ANDREWS</td></t<>	Resolution 13 2 0.15 13	11 15.1% 28 4 14.3%	12.5% 73	24 3	ST ANDREWS
Memory in the second	Hammedord Fig F	BIRNIGHAM 5 5 9/1 7 7 9/3 5 9/3 7 1/3 5 9/3 1/3 5 9/3 1/3	13 8.4% 16 2 12.5%	10.5% 155	19 2	ISPO0
Turnerset 97 10 1000 <t< td=""><td>TURNER 27 7 700<td>TUBING 57 7 70</td><th>7 9.5% 52 5 9.6%</th><td>9.1% 74</td><td>55 5</td><td>BIRMINGHAM</td></td></t<>	TURNER 27 7 700 <td>TUBING 57 7 70</td> <th>7 9.5% 52 5 9.6%</th> <td>9.1% 74</td> <td>55 5</td> <td>BIRMINGHAM</td>	TUBING 57 7 70	7 9.5% 52 5 9.6%	9.1% 74	55 5	BIRMINGHAM
Pressent 12 7 219 139 7 219 139 14 139 14 139 14 149 140	Method 1 <td>TRANKEURT AM MAN 32 7 2101 33 5 5 5 4 115 33 5 5 4 115 33 5 5 33 5 5 33 5 5 33 10 101</td> <th>5 13.5% 28 5 17.9%</th> <td>10.5% 37</td> <td>57 6</td> <td>UBINGEN</td>	TRANKEURT AM MAN 32 7 2101 33 5 5 5 4 115 33 5 5 4 115 33 5 5 33 5 5 33 5 5 33 10 101	5 13.5% 28 5 17.9%	10.5% 37	57 6	UBINGEN
MTHENA 19 2 30 11 2 31 2 31 3 31<	MTHEN 10 2 30 10 2 30 41 2.93 41 10	Affilts Titles 5 30% 190 5 30% 190 5 30% 41 41 41 DOULOUSE 2 0 00% 22 2 03% 23 23% 41 10 DOUNOUSE 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 10 0 10	4 11.1% 33 5 15.2%	21.9% 36	32 7	FRANKFURT AM MAIN
Montione Internation Internatio	Chilicate 1	Contribute T	10 5.0% 43 1 2.3%	3.0% 199	169 5	ATHENS
Trontome Total	Trontome 1 2 3<	Telescolar Telesco	n nn% 64 3 47%	16.7%	78 13	DUTTERDAM
Constration Constration <thconstration< th=""> <thconstration< th=""></thconstration<></thconstration<>	Indexter Indexter DOMML-Areture Indexter Indexter Indexter Index	Three Three <th< td=""><th></th><td>2 0 00 0</td><td>0</td><td></td></th<>		2 0 00 0	0	
Mercelle 0.0 0.	Constrained Constrained <thconstrained< th=""> <thconstrained< th=""></thconstrained<></thconstrained<>	Metric 3 213 1 2 213 1 2 213 1 Modificitii 3 1 3 213 3 213 2 213 2 213 2 213 2 <th2< th=""> 2 2 <!--</td--><th>C 0.0.70 04 10 00.2 10 00.2 10 00.2 10</th><td>0.0%</td><td>0 C</td><td>DULUUSE</td></th2<>	C 0.0.70 04 10 00.2 10 00.2 10 00.2 10	0.0%	0 C	DULUUSE
Construction D <thd< th=""> D <thd< th=""> D <thd< th=""> D <thd< th=""> <thd< <="" td=""><td>Mercine 1 1333 13 1 1333 13</td><td>MONICAL NON CAL <t< td=""><th>9 11.5% 14 3 21.4%</th><td>9.4% /8</td><td>32 3</td><td>RIESTE</td></t<></td></thd<></thd<></thd<></thd<></thd<>	Mercine 1 1333 13 1 1333 13	MONICAL NON CAL NON CAL <t< td=""><th>9 11.5% 14 3 21.4%</th><td>9.4% /8</td><td>32 3</td><td>RIESTE</td></t<>	9 11.5% 14 3 21.4%	9.4% /8	32 3	RIESTE
Construction 3 1 <t< td=""><td>CONVERTMENT 34 1 <!--</td--><td>LOUNULAMENCE 34 1 <</td><th>3 23.1% 19 2 10.5%</th><td>33.3% 13</td><td>30 10</td><td>VORWICH</td></td></t<>	CONVERTMENT 34 1 </td <td>LOUNULAMENCE 34 1 <</td> <th>3 23.1% 19 2 10.5%</th> <td>33.3% 13</td> <td>30 10</td> <td>VORWICH</td>	LOUNULAMENCE 34 1 <	3 23.1% 19 2 10.5%	33.3% 13	30 10	VORWICH
Fixed Fixed <th< td=""><td>Fixed Fixed <th< td=""><td>FISA Edite <the< td=""><th>6 10.9% 29 3 10.3%</th><td>11.8% 55</td><td>34 4</td><td>-OUVAIN-LA-NEUVE</td></the<></td></th<></td></th<>	Fixed Fixed <th< td=""><td>FISA Edite <the< td=""><th>6 10.9% 29 3 10.3%</th><td>11.8% 55</td><td>34 4</td><td>-OUVAIN-LA-NEUVE</td></the<></td></th<>	FISA Edite Edite <the< td=""><th>6 10.9% 29 3 10.3%</th><td>11.8% 55</td><td>34 4</td><td>-OUVAIN-LA-NEUVE</td></the<>	6 10.9% 29 3 10.3%	11.8% 55	34 4	-OUVAIN-LA-NEUVE
Churker Entrome Z <thz< th=""> Z <thz< th=""> <</thz<></thz<>	Humanian 22 2 40% 51 1 71% 22 7 2004 104 13 7204 Diffusion 22 2 40% 51 4 70% 22 7 2004 Diffusion 22 1 <	FLURE 25 2 8/b 5/1 1 4/b 7/b 5/2 2 6/b 1/b	5 4.1% 60 8 13.3%	0.0% 123	69 0	DISA
SUTINITION 21 1 45% 7 145% 7 145% 7 145% 7 100	CONTINUENTION Z T <	Contranteriou 21 1	4 7.8% 28 7 25.0%	8.0% 51	25 2	ALMER
Effective Intervention 6 7 11% 37 5 13% 5 13% 5 13% 5 13% 1	Contraction	BEEN Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thde< td=""><th>11 14.5% 22 1 4.5%</th><td>A 8% 76</td><td>24</td><td>CULTHAMPTON</td></thde<></thdescription<>	11 14.5% 22 1 4.5%	A 8% 76	24	CULTHAMPTON
Contraction C T <th< td=""><td>Control Control <t< td=""><td>CTINNER 0 7 11,73 37 5 13,35 13</td><th></th><td></td><td>- 1</td><td></td></t<></td></th<>	Control Control <t< td=""><td>CTINNER 0 7 11,73 37 5 13,35 13</td><th></th><td></td><td>- 1</td><td></td></t<>	CTINNER 0 7 11,73 37 5 13,35 13			- 1	
Head Constration	Image: balance Image:	COTINGER 42 7 72.% 24 7 73.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 16 71.% 76 7 76.% 7 </td <th>0.0.0 0 0.0%</th> <td>11.1% 3/</td> <td>- 100</td> <td>BERN</td>	0.0.0 0 0.0%	11.1% 3/	- 100	BERN
HANOCRE 2 4 40% 5 7 6 7 0.06 9 7 73% MANOCRE 2 1 4.06 2 1 6.06 1 2 1 2 1 3.06 MANOCRE 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 3.06 2 1 3.06 2 1 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 3.06 2 3.06 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06 2 2 3.06	THENTOR 2 4 95% 42 4 95% 42 4 95% 42 43% 46 7 13% 10% 10% 12 13% THENTO 2 4 95% 52% 90 4 10% 10% 12 13% 10% 10% 11 10% 10% </td <td>Hannover Hannover Hannover</td> <th>5 14.7% 19 0 0.0%</th> <td>15.2% 34</td> <td>46 7</td> <td>BOTTINGEN</td>	Hannover	5 14.7% 19 0 0.0%	15.2% 34	46 7	BOTTINGEN
Tretro 2 1 4.5% 9.8 4 4.0% 5.8 7 1.9% 1.0% 1.2 6.7% Messares 3 5.3 5.3 5.4% 9.8 7 1.9% 2.0% 2.7% 2.6% 2.7% 2.6% 2.7% <t< td=""><td>Trikerio 22 1 5/3 90 7 7/15<!--</td--><td>TRENTO 22 1 4.5% 9.6 7 7.1% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11%</td><th>8 19.0% 6 0 0.0%</th><td>9.5% 42</td><td>42 4</td><td>HANNOVER</td></td></t<>	Trikerio 22 1 5/3 90 7 7/15 </td <td>TRENTO 22 1 4.5% 9.6 7 7.1% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11%</td> <th>8 19.0% 6 0 0.0%</th> <td>9.5% 42</td> <td>42 4</td> <td>HANNOVER</td>	TRENTO 22 1 4.5% 9.6 7 7.1% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.10% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11% 1.11%	8 19.0% 6 0 0.0%	9.5% 42	42 4	HANNOVER
Merrostruture 8 3 7.3% 40 7 7.8% 30 20 70 7 80% Antrestre 37 4 17.3% 47 7.8% 30 7 30% 17.3% <	MRXSAME 68 3 7.5% 40 7 7.8% 30 20	WARSZWAM 58 3 52% 90 7 78% 52 3 52% 10 12 <	4 4.0% 59 7 11.9%	4.5% 99	22	IRENTO
Antime 1 <td>microstric ir bour Nue 4 10% 4 0.0% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11</td> <td>NEWCASTTE UPONTYNE 46 774 75 7 633 63 7<th>7 7 8% 52 2 38%</th><td>5.2% 90</td><td>58</td><td>NARSZAWA</td></td>	microstric ir bour Nue 4 10% 4 0.0% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 57 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11% 11% 10% 11	NEWCASTTE UPONTYNE 46 774 75 7 633 63 7 <th>7 7 8% 52 2 38%</th> <td>5.2% 90</td> <td>58</td> <td>NARSZAWA</td>	7 7 8% 52 2 38%	5.2% 90	58	NARSZAWA
Antificient 3 1 10% 3 6 1 0 RetArrent 2 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Antificient 21 0 6 1 0 6 1 0 </td <td>ARTWREPEN 37 100% 37 100% 37 100% 37 3 100% 37 3 100% 37 3 30% 112 113</td> <th>4 9.3% 38 0 0.0%</th> <td>17.4% 43</td> <td>46 8</td> <td>VEWCASTLE UPON TYNE</td>	ARTWREPEN 37 100% 37 100% 37 100% 37 3 100% 37 3 100% 37 3 30% 112 113	4 9.3% 38 0 0.0%	17.4% 43	46 8	VEWCASTLE UPON TYNE
Attorner	Machelie Name	Addition 24 7 125% 75 6.8% 7 7.0% <th7.0%< th=""> <th7.0%< th=""> <th7.0%< td="" th<=""><th>A 10.0% 35 3 86%</th><td>10.8%</td><td>37</td><td></td></th7.0%<></th7.0%<></th7.0%<>	A 10.0% 35 3 86%	10.8%	37	
Mexateria 22 7.2%	Ameneric Decorrection 2 1/2/20 7/2 6 6/2 7 0/00 0/01	MACHIN DESDEN Za 3 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 5 12.33 13		10.0 /0	+ c	
Kursusti Kondeski fundit Compositi Freekistione Compositiene Compositene Compositiene Co	NEWSOLS 12 1 12 1 12 <th1< td=""><td>Merzien 29 71.2% 73 6.7% 2 0 0.0% 10/ 11/ Konstein 14 4 21.3% 10 7 7.0% 2 0 0.0% 16/ 11/ HERALLION 44 4 21.3% 10 7 7.0% 2 0 0.0% 16/ 11/ <th11 <="" th=""> 11/ <th11 <="" th=""></th11></th11></td><th>1 0 1.0%</th><td>AC %C.71</td><td>24 0 0 1 0</td><td>AUTEN</td></th1<>	Merzien 29 71.2% 73 6.7% 2 0 0.0% 10/ 11/ Konstein 14 4 21.3% 10 7 7.0% 2 0 0.0% 16/ 11/ HERALLION 44 4 21.3% 10 7 7.0% 2 0 0.0% 16/ 11/ <th11 <="" th=""> 11/ <th11 <="" th=""></th11></th11>	1 0 1.0%	AC %C.71	24 0 0 1 0	AUTEN
Kenkers 1 4 211% 105 7 6% 1 10% 11 8.3% Kenkers 4 211% 106 7 6% 7 6% 1 10% 11 13% Retriction 44 6 13% 106 7 6% 1 16% 11 10% Retriction 44 6 13% 6 13% 2 0 00% 12% 11 10% Retriction 36 6 13% 6 13% 2 0 00% 12% 11 10% NTHOMA 50 1 20% 36 2 10% 11 60% 12% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11 10% 11	HENALISTIV 19 2 71% 70% 7 70% 73% 73% HENALENABY 19 4 211% 100 7 70% 73%<	MERAKLENGBY 19 4 21.1% 105 7 6.7% 7 0 0.0% 126 111 HERAKLEN 43 4 21.1% 105 7 6.7% 7 0 0.0% 126 111 HERAKLEN 43 4 21.1% 105 113% 5 2 0 0.0% 126 111 REFERSHER 43 5 13% 53 6 1 6.7% 12 111 16.7% 107 111 REFERSHER 55 6 9 6 9.4% 32 1 4.0% 107 111 REMAKLEN 55 8 0.0% 130 2 6.4% 2 2 13 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 111 117 117 111 117 <t< td=""><th>5 0.8% 5 1 ZU.0%</th><td>11.2% /3</td><td>G 67</td><td>DRESDEN</td></t<>	5 0.8% 5 1 ZU.0%	11.2% /3	G 67	DRESDEN
HERNALLEION H 4 3 3 5 7 7.0% 7 0 0.0% 151 11 7.3% RENALLEION 43 4 3.0% 53 6 7 7.0% 7.0% 151 11 7.3% RANT GAN 38 4 1.3% 53 6 7 7.0% 7.1 100 11 0.3% RANT GAN 52 1 2.0% 53 6 6 6 9.4% 27 10 11 0.3% PATHA 5 2 3 4 0 0.0% 151 11 0.3% PATHA 5 2 3 2 4 0.0% 27 2 24 <td>HERNALLEION 44 9 91% 100 7 7 7 0 0 11 7 7 RERNALLEION 44 9 91% 100 7 7 0 0 0 11 7 7 RANT GAN 73 4 9 33 5 5 7 11 7 7 11 100 100</td> <td>HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7 7.0% 7 0 0.0% 151 111 HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7 7.0% 7 7.0% 151 111 HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7.0% 52 6 1 4.0% 107 RAMATGAN 55 6 1 2.0% 51% 8 8.4% 32 1 4.0% 107 RAMATGAN 55 0 10.5% 53 6 1 4.05% 17 4.0 NOTTINEME 55 0 0 0.0% 130 2 4.05% 2 114 111 NOTTINEME 25 0 0 0.0% 137 13 137</td> <th>7 6.7% 2 0 0.0%</th> <td>21.1% 105</td> <td>19 4</td> <td>KONGENS LYNGBY</td>	HERNALLEION 44 9 91% 100 7 7 7 0 0 11 7 7 RERNALLEION 44 9 91% 100 7 7 0 0 0 11 7 7 RANT GAN 73 4 9 33 5 5 7 11 7 7 11 100 100	HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7 7.0% 7 0 0.0% 151 111 HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7 7.0% 7 7.0% 151 111 HERARLEON 44 9.1% 100 7.0% 52 6 1 4.0% 107 RAMATGAN 55 6 1 2.0% 51% 8 8.4% 32 1 4.0% 107 RAMATGAN 55 0 10.5% 53 6 1 4.05% 17 4.0 NOTTINEME 55 0 0 0.0% 130 2 4.05% 2 114 111 NOTTINEME 25 0 0 0.0% 137 13 137	7 6.7% 2 0 0.0%	21.1% 105	19 4	KONGENS LYNGBY
REFISITE 41 6 13 6 13 6 13 6 13 16 11 103% REFISITE 43 6 136 13 6 13 6 13 16 17 10 11 103% NDOUX 78 1 27% 64 8 34% 32 1 16% 11 03% NDOUX 50 1 27% 64 8 34% 32 1 16% 11 03% NDOUX 50 1 27% 64 9.4% 32 1 16% 11 03% NDOUX 50 1 27% 51 3 43% 27 1	REFER 41 0 33% 53 6 113% 16 1 16% 102 11 103% REFER 5 1 0.5% 53 6 13.6% 16 1 16% 102 11 103% NDT0XAL 55 1 21% 64 8 33 25 1 31% 17 11 0.5% NDT0XAL 55 1 21% 5 2 1 31% 73 26 1 6.6% 23% 23% 20% 23% <	BEERSHEA 43 64 113% 6 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 102 113% 103	7 7.0% 7 0 0.0%	9.1% 100	44 4	HERAKLEION
AMAT GAN 74 6 135% 38 4 105% 25 1 40% 107 11 03% PDONG 55 1 2,1% 1 2,0% 1 2,0% 1 1 103% PDONG 55 1 2,0% 51% 64 6 4 105% 11 103% PANA 55 0 0.0% 130 9 64% 23 1 1,4% 11 63% PANA 55 1 2,0% 130 9 64% 23 1 1,0% 11 63% RUNSERIO 23 1 2,4% 21 2 4 13% 21 2 23% 10 13% RUNSERIO 23 2 1 3 2 1 1 1 1 10% 10% 13% RUNSERIO 23 3 2 1 3 2 3	Kanar Gan H 1 5 1 4 1 0.03% bit for the	RAMT GAN 44 6 136% 38 4 105% 25 1 4,0% 107 111 NOTINGIAM 57 1 27 51% 71% 71% 71% 71% NOTINGIAM 57 1 20% 56 8 8,4% 32 1 4,0% 71% 114 111 NOTINGIAM 57 2 8,0% 27 2 6,0% 27 1 4,0% 71 411 NOTINGIAM 56 1 2,0% 33 4,3% 21% 27 6,0% 27 114 114 NENHAR 29 1 3,4% 41 9 2,0% 10 21%	6 11.3% 6 1 16.7%	9.3% 53	43 4	BEERSHEBA
DOUM 61 6 64	DOUM 61 61 61 64 6	PADOVA F 51% 64 6 9.4% 32 1 31% 114 114 PRUN E 51% 64 6 9.4% 32 1 31% 114 114 PRHA 52 0 0.0% 130 9 6.9% 21 5 2.3% 614 114 PRHA 52 0 0.0% 130 9 6.9% 21 5 2.3% 114 114 PRHA 20 0 0.0% 130 9 6.9% 21 7 2.9% 114 PRHA 20 0 0.0% 44 9 20.3% 21 6 7 20% 10 ERCEN 11 3 3.6% 14 11 3 2.3% 10 2.3% 11 ORNOR 20 3 14 11.1% 5 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3% 2.3%	4 10.5% 25 1 4.0%	13.6% 38	44 6	RAMAT GAN
MOTTINGHAM 50 1 20% 36 8 84% 39 2 51% 184 11 60% PATTINGHAM 50 1 20% 39 2 51% 78 11 60% RUNISTER 25 2 8.0% 21 3 4.3% 27 5 33% 67 10 14.9% KONSTARZ 25 2 0.0% 45 2 2.0% 67 10 14.9% KUNISTER 20 0 0.0% 45 2 2.0% 67 10 13.3% KUNISTER 20 0 0 2.0% 14 9 2.0% 4.3% 2.7% 2.3% 10 12.3% RUNISTER 11 2.3% 15 3.2% 14 1 6.7 10 13.3% RUNISTER 2.3% 5 3.2% 5 3.2% 5 2.3% 6.7 10 12.3% </td <td>PATHAL 50 1 20% 30 8 84% 33 2 5 % 10 60% PATHAL 50 1 20% 30 6 7 10 40% RAHA 50 1 20% 30 2 6.% 27 6 23% 67 10 40% KONSTAX 20 0 0.0% 30 2 4.3% 27 6 23% 67 10 14.9% KONSTAX 20 0 0.0% 30 2 4.3% 27 0 23% 27 10 12.3% 27 10 12.3% KUNSEX 20 0 0.0% 36 2.3% 67 10 13% KUNSEX 20 0 0.0% 36 2.1% 2.4% 2.4% 10 10 10% KUNSEX 20 3 3.4% 3 3.4% 3.4% 3.4% 3.4%<!--</td--><td>NOTTINGHAM 50 1 2.0% 95 8 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 PRINIGHAM 52 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 11 PRINIATION 25 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 27 1 3.7% 209 10 RONSTANC 25 0 0.0% 130 9 2.0% 11 5 2 4.0% 3 1 3.7% 209 10 NONSTANC 23 8 2.1.1% 5 2 4.0% 1 3.7% 209 10 NUNSTANC 20 0 0 0.0% 14 9 2.05% 10 0<th>6 9.4% 32 1 3.1%</th><td>5.1% 64</td><td>78 4</td><td>ADOVA</td></td></td>	PATHAL 50 1 20% 30 8 84% 33 2 5 % 10 60% PATHAL 50 1 20% 30 6 7 10 40% RAHA 50 1 20% 30 2 6.% 27 6 23% 67 10 40% KONSTAX 20 0 0.0% 30 2 4.3% 27 6 23% 67 10 14.9% KONSTAX 20 0 0.0% 30 2 4.3% 27 0 23% 27 10 12.3% 27 10 12.3% KUNSEX 20 0 0.0% 36 2.3% 67 10 13% KUNSEX 20 0 0.0% 36 2.1% 2.4% 2.4% 10 10 10% KUNSEX 20 3 3.4% 3 3.4% 3.4% 3.4% 3.4% </td <td>NOTTINGHAM 50 1 2.0% 95 8 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 PRINIGHAM 52 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 11 PRINIATION 25 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 27 1 3.7% 209 10 RONSTANC 25 0 0.0% 130 9 2.0% 11 5 2 4.0% 3 1 3.7% 209 10 NONSTANC 23 8 2.1.1% 5 2 4.0% 1 3.7% 209 10 NUNSTANC 20 0 0 0.0% 14 9 2.05% 10 0<th>6 9.4% 32 1 3.1%</th><td>5.1% 64</td><td>78 4</td><td>ADOVA</td></td>	NOTTINGHAM 50 1 2.0% 95 8 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 PRINIGHAM 52 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 33 2 5.1% 184 11 PRINIATION 25 0 0.0% 130 9 8.4% 27 1 3.7% 209 10 RONSTANC 25 0 0.0% 130 9 2.0% 11 5 2 4.0% 3 1 3.7% 209 10 NONSTANC 23 8 2.1.1% 5 2 4.0% 1 3.7% 209 10 NUNSTANC 20 0 0 0.0% 14 9 2.05% 10 0 <th>6 9.4% 32 1 3.1%</th> <td>5.1% 64</td> <td>78 4</td> <td>ADOVA</td>	6 9.4% 32 1 3.1%	5.1% 64	78 4	ADOVA
FAMA. 52 0 000 130 690 27 13 270 10 480 FAMA. 25 2 0 000 130 6 0 480 CONSTENC 25 2 0 0 0 0 10 480 CONSTENC 25 2 0 0 0 0 0 10 130 MUNSTEN 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 10 130 MUNSTEN 20 0 </td <td>FANIA 55 0 0.0% 130 0 6.0% 130 0.0% 100 130% 0.0% 100 143% 200 101 143% KUNKISTANZ 38 2.11% 5 2.04% 10 14.3% 200 10 14.3% KUNKISTANZ 38 2.11% 5 2.0% 10 1.0% 10 14.3% KUNKISTANZ 28 2.11% 5 2.0% 10 1.0% 10 13.3% KUNKISTANDEN 29 10 2.3% 11% 5 2.0% 10 13.3% KUNKISTANDEN 20 10 2.3% 11% 2.0% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3%</td> <td>FRAHA FORM <t< td=""><th>8 84% 39 2 51%</th><td>2.0% 95</td><td>50</td><td>UDTTINGHAM</td></t<></td>	FANIA 55 0 0.0% 130 0 6.0% 130 0.0% 100 130% 0.0% 100 143% 200 101 143% KUNKISTANZ 38 2.11% 5 2.04% 10 14.3% 200 10 14.3% KUNKISTANZ 38 2.11% 5 2.0% 10 1.0% 10 14.3% KUNKISTANZ 28 2.11% 5 2.0% 10 1.0% 10 13.3% KUNKISTANDEN 29 10 2.3% 11% 5 2.0% 10 13.3% KUNKISTANDEN 20 10 2.3% 11% 2.0% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3% 10 2.3%	FRAHA FORM FORM <t< td=""><th>8 84% 39 2 51%</th><td>2.0% 95</td><td>50</td><td>UDTTINGHAM</td></t<>	8 84% 39 2 51%	2.0% 95	50	UDTTINGHAM
KONSTANZ 25 2 0.00 10 14.00 14.00 14.00 KONSTANZ 25 2 0.00 11.05 2 10.05 2 10.05 14.05 KONSTANZ 20 0.00 11.05 2 10.05 2.03 0.00 10.05 14.05 ELUNERER 20 0.00 44 1 16.7% 2 2.0% 0.0 10.05 2.3% ELUNER 20 0.00% 44 2 2.0% 10 2.3% 670 10 2.3% ELUNE 20 0.00% 44 5 2.0% 67 10 2.3% ELUNE 20 0.00% 44 5 2.0% 67 10 2.3% ELUNE 20 0.0 2.1% 5 2.0% 67 10 2.3% 67 10 2.3% 67 10 2.3% 67 10 2.3% 11.6% 10 10	KONSTANZ Z 0.0% 1.0% <t< td=""><td>KUNSTANZ Z<</td><th>0 6 00. 07 1 3 70.</th><td>0.0%</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	KUNSTANZ Z<	0 6 00. 07 1 3 70.	0.0%		
NUMERIA 2 2 10,0 13,3 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 14,3% 10,0 13,3% 10,0 10,0	NULHERRAG 20 0.00% 10 0.00% 10 0.00% 10 0.00% 10 0.00% 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00 10 0.00% 00	NONSTER Z3 Z 11, 3 14, 3% Z1 3 14, 3% Z1 3 23, 3% 23, 3% 43 10 NUNSTER Z3 3 21, 1% 5 2 40, 3% 21 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 41 3 23, 3% 43 10		0.0%	27	
NEUNERERG 38 8 71% 5 2 200% 6 1 16.7% 73 10 233% RANGER 38 8 71% 43 10 233% 10 233% LUNSTER 29 10 34% 11 34% 10 133% LUNSTER 29 10 34% 11 34% 10 133% LUNSTER 29 20% 16 0 00% 80 10 133% TORIO 83 3 30% 15 5 32% 11% 54 4 10 133% LUNSTERG 10 333% 7 5 32% 14% 10 33% 10 33% LUNSTERG 20 3 30% 55 32% 14 10 10 33% LUNSTERG 20 3 415% 14 5 32% 29% 10 33% <td>NUNERER 38 8 2.11% 5 2 2.00% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 2.33% NUNERER 23 0 0.33% 41 9 2.00% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 2.33% NUNSTER 23 10 2.34% 41 9 2.00% 10 0.33% NUNSTER 33 3 34% 14 9 2.0% 10 2.33% NUNSTER 33 3 36% 154 5 3.2% 154 9 2.0% 10 7.3% NUNSTER 12 3 36% 154 5 14.7% 14 0 0.0% 3.3% NUNSTER 23 36% 55 44 65 4 7.4% 10 3.3% NUNSTER 3 4 133% 34 133% 34 34 34 34 34 34 NUNSTE</td> <td>NEUHERBEG 38 2 21.1% 5 2 40.0% 6 1 1.6.7% 4.3 NEUHERBEG 20 0 0.0% 45 2 40.0% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 NEUHERBEG 20 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 NULLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 25 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 TORINO 83 3 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 209 10 TORINO 50 1 2.2.2% 154 5 7.4% 140 1</td> <th>3 14.3% 21 5 23.8%</th> <td>8.0%</td> <td>25 25</td> <td>KONSTANZ</td>	NUNERER 38 8 2.11% 5 2 2.00% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 2.33% NUNERER 23 0 0.33% 41 9 2.00% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 2.33% NUNSTER 23 10 2.34% 41 9 2.00% 10 0.33% NUNSTER 33 3 34% 14 9 2.0% 10 2.33% NUNSTER 33 3 36% 154 5 3.2% 154 9 2.0% 10 7.3% NUNSTER 12 3 36% 154 5 14.7% 14 0 0.0% 3.3% NUNSTER 23 36% 55 44 65 4 7.4% 10 3.3% NUNSTER 3 4 133% 34 133% 34 34 34 34 34 34 NUNSTE	NEUHERBEG 38 2 21.1% 5 2 40.0% 6 1 1.6.7% 4.3 NEUHERBEG 20 0 0.0% 45 2 40.0% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 NEUHERBEG 20 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 NULLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 25 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 1.6.7% 73 TORINO 83 3 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 209 10 TORINO 50 1 2.2.2% 154 5 7.4% 140 1	3 14.3% 21 5 23.8%	8.0%	25 25	KONSTANZ
Intracted Monstret Monstret Monstret Nunstret Runds 20 0 0.00 14.3% brown 16.7% brown 70 10 13.3% brown 13.3% brown 14.3% brown 16.7% brown <	Instruction 20 0 0.0% 44 9 2.0% 0 1 1.4% 70 10 1.4% Instruction 25 10 2.2% 14 9 2.0% 16 10 1.5% 10 13.3% ILukrch-tarkFenstaben 55 10 2.2% 14 9 2.0% 15 3.3% 14 9 2.0% 10 1.3% ILukrch-tarkFenstaben 56 10 2.2% 14 9 2.0% 13 4 1 3.4% 4 1 3.4% 20 10 13 3.4% Instruction 50 5 4 11.1% 5 3.2% 5 3.4% 11 3.4% <td>ERLANGEN 20 0 0.0% 44 9 205% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 MUNENTER 29 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 MUNENTER 45 10 2.2.0% 14 9 2.0% 10 0 0.0% 80 0 TORINO 50 23 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 65 2 3.2% 140 10 TORINO 50 2 3.3% 154 5 3.2% 65 4 11.1% 54 45 140 10 TORINO 20 12 4 3.3% 55 14.1% 54 45 140 110 INDERTER/EUBIRG 2 3 3.3% 55 4 14.1% 140 140 INDERTER/EUBIRG 2 3 3.3% 52.0% 55 14.7% 14</td> <th>2 40.0%</th> <td>21.1% 5</td> <td>38</td> <td>VEUHERBERG</td>	ERLANGEN 20 0 0.0% 44 9 205% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 MUNENTER 29 1 3.4% 41 9 2.05% 6 1 16.7% 70 10 MUNENTER 45 10 2.2.0% 14 9 2.0% 10 0 0.0% 80 0 TORINO 50 23 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 65 2 3.2% 140 10 TORINO 50 2 3.3% 154 5 3.2% 65 4 11.1% 54 45 140 10 TORINO 20 12 4 3.3% 55 14.1% 54 45 140 110 INDERTER/EUBIRG 2 3 3.3% 55 4 14.1% 140 140 INDERTER/EUBIRG 2 3 3.3% 52.0% 55 14.7% 14	2 40.0%	21.1% 5	38	VEUHERBERG
INURSTER 29 1 3.34% 41 9 2.0% 10 0 0.0% 80 10 2.3% ILKIRGH-GRAFENSTADEN 55 1 0 2.0% 15 0 0.0% 80 10 2.3% DERGEN 50 2 3.3% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.3% 179 9 7.1% 10 2.3% DERGEN 50 2 3.3% 7 5 7.1% 62 2 3.3% 7 3.3% 7 7 5 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 7.1% 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 13 9 9 9	UNSTER 29 1 23.4% 41 9 22.0% 10 22.5% 17.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 22.5% 10 23.3% 11.5	MUNSTER 29 1 3.4% 41 9 2.0% 10 0.0% 80 10 LLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 2.2.0% 10 2.0.% 80 45 10 LLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 83 36% 15 2.2.0% 10 2.2.0% 10 0.0.% 80 45 10 LLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 50 2.2.0% 15 2.2.0% 15 2.2.0% 10 0.0.% 80 45 10 REGEN 50 2.0 2.4.0% 36 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 4 33.3% 7 5 7.1.4% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 KLOSTERNEUBURG 24 1 50% 55 8 14.7% 7 7 9 9 9 10 KLOSTERNEUBURG 21 23 5 71.4% 7 <t< td=""><th>9 20.5% 6 1 16.7%</th><td>0.0% 44</td><td>20 0</td><td>ERLANGEN</td></t<>	9 20.5% 6 1 16.7%	0.0% 44	20 0	ERLANGEN
ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 22.2% 10 22.2% 10 22.2% ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 63 3 36% 154 5 32.% 299 10 32.2% ERGEN 50 2 40% 36 4 11.1% 54 2 32.% 299 10 71% ERGEN 50 2 40% 36 4 11.1% 54 2 32.% 10 71% INUSSTERNEUBURG 12 4 53.3% 5 4 11.1% 54 2 32.% 9 10 71% INUSSTERNEUBURG 33 4 10.3% 55 4 65% 46 7 9 11.3% NUSSTERNEUBURG 33 4 10.3% 55 4 65% 46 7 7 9 11.3% NUSSTERNEUBURG 33 4 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 80 11.3% <td>LILKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 22.2% 45 10 22.2% 45 10 22.2% TORINO 83 36 154 5 32.4% 299 10 71% DRING 50 2 40% 36 154 5 32.4% 149 10 71% NINSBURG 50 1 53.3% 5 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 19 10 71% NINSBURG 20 1 5 3.3% 5 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 19 10 7.1% NUSSBURG 20 1 5 8 7.1% 7 0 0.0% 83 9 11.3% NUCSIA 20 3 6.5% 5 1 1 7 1 0 7.1% NUCSIA 20 20 0 1 1 3 6.5% 1 1 1</td> <td>ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 222.2% 154 65 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 164 16 TORINO 83 3.3% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 19 10 TORINO 83 3.3% 7 5 7.1,% 54 7 7 299 10 REOFENENDURG 12 4 3.3% 7 5 71,4% 54 7 7 7 140 19 10 10 10 10 10 140 10 10 10 11 10</td> <th>9 22.0% 10 0 0.0%</th> <td>3.4% 41</td> <td>29 1</td> <td>AÜNSTER</td>	LILKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 22.2% 45 10 22.2% 45 10 22.2% TORINO 83 36 154 5 32.4% 299 10 71% DRING 50 2 40% 36 154 5 32.4% 149 10 71% NINSBURG 50 1 53.3% 5 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 19 10 71% NINSBURG 20 1 5 3.3% 5 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 19 10 7.1% NUSSBURG 20 1 5 8 7.1% 7 0 0.0% 83 9 11.3% NUCSIA 20 3 6.5% 5 1 1 7 1 0 7.1% NUCSIA 20 20 0 1 1 3 6.5% 1 1 1	ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN 45 10 222.2% 154 65 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 164 16 TORINO 83 3.3% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 19 10 TORINO 83 3.3% 7 5 7.1,% 54 7 7 299 10 REOFENENDURG 12 4 3.3% 7 5 71,4% 54 7 7 7 140 19 10 10 10 10 10 140 10 10 10 11 10	9 22.0% 10 0 0.0%	3.4% 41	29 1	AÜNSTER
TORINO 83 3 36% 154 5 32% 59 10 71% EREGEN 12 3 36% 154 5 32% 62 2 32% 10 71% KLOSTERNUBURG 12 3 3 7 5 7 11% 54 7 76 10 71% KLOSTERNUBURG 12 3 3 7 5 7 11% 54 7 76 10 71% KLOSTERNUBURG 12 60% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0 0% 9 11% NUSSBRUCK 20 3 6.5% 6.5 8 14.5% 13 9 133 9 133 MAIZ 20 0 0.0% 47 5 9 133% 9 9 133% MAIZ 20 3 6.5% 13 2 14 13 9 <	TORNIO B3 3 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 10 7.1% KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 2 3.2% 5 3 3 6 10 7.1% KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 2 3.2% 5 3 7.1% 19 9 4.14% KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 4 3.3% 5 7.14% 14 0 10.3% KLOSTERNEUBURG 24 2 8.33% 5 7.14% 14 0 10.3% 14.4% NUSSBURG 24 1 5.7% 14 7 9 11.3% WINSBURG 29 4 4.5% 14 7 7 9 11.3% WINSBURG 29 4 7.4% 14 7 7 9 11.3% WINSBURG 29 1 7 7 7 9 14.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11	TORINO B3 3 3.6% 154 5 3.2% 62 2 3.2% 140 10 BERGEN 50 2 4.0% 36 4 11.1% 54 2 3.2% 140 10 BERGEN 50 2 4.0% 36 5 4 7.4% 140 10 BERGEN 20 12 4 5.0% 36 5 11.1% 54 4 140 10 INNSBUCK 20 12 4 10.3% 56 8 14.5% 14 0 0 0 16 17 16 17		22.2%	45 10	LLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN
BERGEN 50 2 4.0% 36 4 11.% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 7.1% KUCSTRENEUBURG 12 1 5.0% 55 7.14% 14 10 7.1% KUCSTRENEUBURG 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 9 10.1% KUCSTRENEUBURG 21 5 7.14% 14 0 0.0% 89 9 10.1% VICZBURG 23 5 6 14.5% 7 7 0 0.0% 89 9 10.1% MINZBURG 24 2 6 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 88 9 11.3% MINZBURG 14 1 1 7.1% 27 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MINZBURG 3 4 1 1 7.1% 27 0 0.0% 12 9 <	BERGEN 50 2 4.0% 7.1% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 7.1% INUSSTUCK 20 1 4 7.1% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 7.1% INUSSTUCK 20 1 50% 55 8 14.1% 1 0 0% 9 17.4% INUSSTUCK 20 1 50% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0% 10 71% INUSSTUCK 20 1 6 51% 55 8 14.5% 132 9 10.1% INUSSTUCK 20 3 150% 52 4 6.5% 132 9 11.5% INUSSTURG 3 10.3% 22 0 0.0% 132 9 11.5% INUSSTURG 33 4 1 14.5% 11 1 14.5% INUSSTURG 33 8 14.3% 20	BERGEN 50 2 4.0% 36 4 11.1% 54 4 7.4% 140 10 KLOSTERNEUBUGG 12 4 33.3% 7 5 71.4% 64 4 7.4% 140 19 19 19 KLOSTERNEUBUGG 12 4 33.3% 5 71.4% 14 0 0.0% 89 9	5 3.2% 62 2 3.2%	3.6% 154	83 3	TORINO
KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 4 33.3% 7 5 71.4% 1 10 10 14 NINSBUCK 20 1 50.% 55 8 14.7% 14 0 0,0% 89 9 101% NINSBUCK 20 1 50.% 55 8 14.7% 14 0 0,0% 89 9 101% NINSBUCK 24 6 33,% 55 47.7% 16 0 0% 89 9 101% NINSBUC 24 6 33 34 5 14.7% 1 0 0% 132 9 11.3% WINZBUG 6 0 0.73% 34 5 14.7% 1 0 0% 132 9 11.3% MINZ 5 14 17.3% 27 0 0 0 11.3% 11.3% MINZ 5 14 1 1 1 1 0 0% 10 10 10% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% </td <td>KLOSTERNEUBING 12 1 333% 7 1</td> <td>KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 4 33.3% 7 5 71.4% 1 19 9 NUNSBRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 NUNSBRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 NUNSBRUCK 24 2 8.3% 56 4 4 3 6.5% 89 30 80 80 90<!--</td--><th>4 11.1% 54 4 7.4%</th><td>4.0% 36</td><td>50 2</td><td>BERGEN</td></td>	KLOSTERNEUBING 12 1 333% 7 1	KLOSTERNEUBURG 12 4 33.3% 7 5 71.4% 1 19 9 NUNSBRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 NUNSBRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 NUNSBRUCK 24 2 8.3% 56 4 4 3 6.5% 89 30 80 80 90 </td <th>4 11.1% 54 4 7.4%</th> <td>4.0% 36</td> <td>50 2</td> <td>BERGEN</td>	4 11.1% 54 4 7.4%	4.0% 36	50 2	BERGEN
INNSRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 0.0% 89 9 101% NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 9 101% NICOSIA 33 6.0% 62 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 9 11.3% NICOSIA 33 15.0% 42 6 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 83 6.8% NICOSIA 33 15.0% 52 4 6.5% 7 0 0.0% 83 11.3% MIXZ 14 0 0.0% 52 9 11.3% 7 9 11.5% MIXZ 14 0 0.0% 52 9 11.3% 7 9 14.5% MIXZ 14 1 7.1% 53 20 0 0.0% 76 9 14.5% CRENOBLE 56 8 1.3% 24 1 7.1% 7 9 9.0% UNINCE 56 8 1.3% 28 7 14 1 7.1% 9 9.6% <t< td=""><td>INNSFRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 145% 14 0 0.0% 89 0 NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 65 8 46 3 6.5% 132 9 10.1% NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 14 7 0 0.0% 89 9 11.3% NICOSIA 3 15.0% 42 6 6.5% 7 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MINZ 14 0 0.0% 42 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAINZ 14 1 0 0.0% 42 2 9.4% 14.3% 7 9 11.3% TARAGONA 5 9.4% 14 1 0 0.0% 78 9 11.3% MAINZ 14 1 17.3% 20 0 0 0.0% 78 9 14.5% INCONDIC 5 9.4% 14 1 7.1% 30 0 0 0.1% DUNDE 5 9.4% 1 7.1% 30 1 1<td>INNSBRUCK 20 1 50% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 00% 89 NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 65 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 29 4 10.3% 54 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 3 15.0% 52 4 6.5% 7 3 6.5% 132 MAINZ 20 0 0.0% 52 9 14.3% 7 9 14.3% 7 8 9</td><th>5 714%</th><td>33.3% 7</td><td>12 4</td><td>(LOSTERNEUBURG</td></td></t<>	INNSFRUCK 20 1 5.0% 55 8 145% 14 0 0.0% 89 0 NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 65 8 46 3 6.5% 132 9 10.1% NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 14 7 0 0.0% 89 9 11.3% NICOSIA 3 15.0% 42 6 6.5% 7 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MINZ 14 0 0.0% 42 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAINZ 14 1 0 0.0% 42 2 9.4% 14.3% 7 9 11.3% TARAGONA 5 9.4% 14 1 0 0.0% 78 9 11.3% MAINZ 14 1 17.3% 20 0 0 0.0% 78 9 14.5% INCONDIC 5 9.4% 14 1 7.1% 30 0 0 0.1% DUNDE 5 9.4% 1 7.1% 30 1 1 <td>INNSBRUCK 20 1 50% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 00% 89 NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 65 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 29 4 10.3% 54 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 3 15.0% 52 4 6.5% 7 3 6.5% 132 MAINZ 20 0 0.0% 52 9 14.3% 7 9 14.3% 7 8 9</td> <th>5 714%</th> <td>33.3% 7</td> <td>12 4</td> <td>(LOSTERNEUBURG</td>	INNSBRUCK 20 1 50% 55 8 14.5% 14 0 00% 89 NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 65 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 3 6.5% 132 WURZBURG 29 4 10.3% 54 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 3 15.0% 52 4 6.5% 7 3 6.5% 132 MAINZ 20 0 0.0% 52 9 14.3% 7 9 14.3% 7 8 9	5 714%	33.3% 7	12 4	(LOSTERNEUBURG
NICOSIA Z Z S <ths< th=""> S <ths< th=""> <ths< td="" th<=""><td>NICOSIA Z B <t< td=""><td>NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 132 5 6.5% 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 <t< td=""><th>R 14 FW 0 00%</th><td>F 0% FF</td><td>1</td><td>NNSBRIICK</td></t<></td></t<></td></ths<></ths<></ths<>	NICOSIA Z B <t< td=""><td>NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 132 5 6.5% 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 <t< td=""><th>R 14 FW 0 00%</th><td>F 0% FF</td><td>1</td><td>NNSBRIICK</td></t<></td></t<>	NICOSIA 24 2 8.3% 62 4 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 46 5 6.5% 132 5 6.5% 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 132 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 133 <t< td=""><th>R 14 FW 0 00%</th><td>F 0% FF</td><td>1</td><td>NNSBRIICK</td></t<>	R 14 FW 0 00%	F 0% FF	1	NNSBRIICK
WIXZBURG 39 4 10.3% 34 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 9 11.3% WIXZBURG 20 3 15.0% 42 6 14.3% 7 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAIZ 20 3 15.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAIZ 20 0 0.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.5% TARRAGONA 14 0 0.0% 47 1 0 0.0% 7 9 9.16% INKOPING 33 4 12.1% 53 9 14.15% 16 9 11.8% DUNDEE 56 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 9 9.6% ABERDEIN 36 3 3 2 7.1%	WIXZBIRG 39 4 10.3% 34 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 9 11.3% WIXZBIRG 39 4 10.3% 34 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 9 11.3% MAIXZ 20 3 16.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAIXZ 20 3 16.0% 47 9 11.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.3% MAIXZ 20 3 14 12 14 12 14 12 14 12 16 12.3% 20 0 0.0% 12.3% DIVIDER 53 8 14.3% 12 14 12 11.3% 12 12.3% 12.3% 12.3% 11.3% DIVIDER 53	WINZERIG 39 4 10.3% 34 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 WINZERIG 39 4 10.3% 34 5 14.7% 7 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 3 15.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 3 15.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 0 0.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 80 MAINZ 20 0 0.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 GRENOBLE 14 1 7.1% 5 94.% 1 0 0.0% 78 LINKOPING 33 4 12.1% 5 94.% 1 0 0.0% 76 DUNDEE 5 7.1% 30 <t< td=""><th>4 65% 46 3 65%</th><td>8 3% 67</td><td>24</td><td></td></t<>	4 65% 46 3 65%	8 3% 67	24	
WUNCEDUC 33 160.3 3 160.3 3 11.3% 20 0 0.03 30 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.3% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 11.5% 12.1%	MUNZEDUC 33 15.0% 42 6 14.7% 10.0% 82 9 11.0% MUNZEDUC 2 10.0% 32 15.0% 42 6 14.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.0% MUNZEDUC 16 0 0.0% 52 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 82 9 11.5% FRRAGONA 14 0 0.0% 52 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 78 9 11.5% GRENOBLE 14 1 7 1	WWXZEDRG 33 10.3% 34 10.3% 34 10.3% 34 10.3% 34 10.3% 34 10.3% 36 10.3% 36 10.3% 36 10.3% 37 10.3% 32 10.3% 32 </td <th></th> <td>20 00 01 10 00 01</td> <td>- T</td> <td></td>		20 00 01 10 00 01	- T	
MANZ Z0 3 15.0% 4Z 6 0 0.0% 8Z 9 11.0% MANZ 6 0 0.0% 5Z 6 17.3% Z0 0 0.0% 6Z 9 11.5% GRENDICA 14 0 0.0% 47 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 11.5% GRENDICA 13 0 0.0% 47 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 11.5% GRENDICA 33 4 12.1% 53 4 1 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 14.5% DUNDEE 36 3 1.4.3% 14 1 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 96.% DUNDEE 36.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 96.% ABERDIEN 36 3 3.1 3 2 7.1% 30 4 </td <td>MANZ Z0 3 15.0% 4Z 6 0 0.0% 8Z 9 11.0% GRENDIA 6 0 0.0% 52 9 17.3% Z0 0 0.0% 73 9 11.5% GRENDIA 14 0 0.0% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 76 9 14.5% GRENDIA 56 3 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 76 9 11.8% DUNDE 56 3 13.3% 28 3 13.3% 94 13.3% 94 94 9 96% DUNDE 56 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 96% BERDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 9 9 96% SERDEN 36<td>MANZ ZU 3 75.0% 4Z 6 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 17.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 14 1 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 9 9 9 14 1</td><th></th><td>10.3%</td><td>00 4</td><td>VUKZBURG</td></td>	MANZ Z0 3 15.0% 4Z 6 0 0.0% 8Z 9 11.0% GRENDIA 6 0 0.0% 52 9 17.3% Z0 0 0.0% 73 9 11.5% GRENDIA 14 0 0.0% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 76 9 14.5% GRENDIA 56 3 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 76 9 11.8% DUNDE 56 3 13.3% 28 3 13.3% 94 13.3% 94 94 9 96% DUNDE 56 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 96% BERDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 9 9 96% SERDEN 36 <td>MANZ ZU 3 75.0% 4Z 6 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 17.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 14 1 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 9 9 9 14 1</td> <th></th> <td>10.3%</td> <td>00 4</td> <td>VUKZBURG</td>	MANZ ZU 3 75.0% 4Z 6 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 17.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14.3% ZU 0 0.0% 8Z 9 9 14 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 14 1 1 0 0.0% 6Z 9 9 9 9 9 14 1		10.3%	00 4	VUKZBURG
TRRAGONA 6 0 0.0% 52 9 11.3% 20 0 0.0% 78 9 CRENCOLE 14 0 0.0% 47 9 11.3% 1 0 0.0% 62 9 9.0% LINKÖPING 33 4 12.1% 14 0 0.0% 76 9 9.0% DUNDE 56 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.0% ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9.6%	TRRAGONA 6 0 0.0% 52 9 11.3% 20 0 0.0% 78 9 TRRAGONA 14 0 0.0% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 62 9 9.0% LINKOPING 33 4 12.1% 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.0% DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 96% ABENDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3%	TARRAGONA 6 0 0.0% 52 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 78 9 GRONDLE 14 0 0.0% 47 9 17.3% 20 0 0.0% 78 9 Increase 14 0 0.0% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 78 9 LINCPING 33 4 12.1% 54 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 92	0 14.3% ZU U U.U%	15.U% 4Z	20 3	MAINZ
GRENOBLE 14 0 0.00% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 62 9 14.5% JUNKÖPING 33 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 700 9 9.0% JUNKÖPING 56 8 14.3% 14 0 0.0% 70 9 9.0% Stor 56 3 8.14.3% 14 1 3 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.1% ABENDER 56 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 36 4 13.3% 9.6% ABENDER 36 28 2 7.1% 36 4 13.3% 9.6%	GRENOBLE 14 0 10.0% 14 0 0.0% 14 0 0.0% 14 0 9 145% JUNCPING 53 4 12.1% 53 5 54,% 14 0 00,% 700 9 9.18% DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 00,% 76 9 9.0% ABENDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 9.6% 9.6%	GRENOBLE 14 0 0.0% 47 9 19.1% 1 0 0.0% 62 9 LINKÖPING 33 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 62 9 DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9	9 17.3% 20 0 0.0%	0.0% 52	6 0	TARRAGONA
LINKÕPING 33 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 100 9 9.0% DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 0 0.0% 76 9 9.1.8% DUNDEE 56 3 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.6% ABERDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9.6%	LINKÖPING 33 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 100 9 9.0% DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.0% ABERDEEN 36 3 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9.0% ABERDEEN 36 3.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9.0%	LINKÖPING 33 4 12.1% 53 5 9.4% 14 0 0.0% 100 9 DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 700 70 ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 2	9 19.1% 1 0 0.0%	0.0% 47	14 0	GRENOBLE
DUNDE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.6% ABENDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9.6%	DUNDE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 9.1.8% ABENDEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9.6% ABENDEN 38 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 96% 9 9.6% 9 9.6% 9 9.6% 9 9.6% 9 9.6% 9 9.6% 9	DUNDEE 56 8 14.3% 14 1 7.1% 6 0 0.0% 76 9 ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9 9	5 9.4% 14 0 0.0%	12.1% 53	33 4	INKÖPING
ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9	ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 9	ABERDEEN 36 3 8.3% 28 2 7.1% 30 4 13.3% 94 6	1 7.1% 6 0 0.0%	14.3% 14	56 8	DUNDEE
			2 7.1% 30 4 13.3%	8.3% 28	36 3	ABERDEEN

.

Table A9.05: Submitted and selected proposals in top-100 localities at application stage by scientific domain (continued)

.

•

119

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

Table As	9.06: National percentage of grantees in top-100 localities a	t application stage by scientific do	main		
	LOCALITY	LS	PE	SH	Α
FR	PARIS	87.0%	64.1%	72.4%	
UK	LONDON	37.2%	17.6%	32.0%	
DE	MÜNCHEN	36.9%	28.0%	19.4%	
UK	CAMBRIDGE	14.5%	15.6%	8.6%	
UK	OXFORD	11.8%	12.5%	13.2%	
CH		33.1%	40.7%	55.6%	
ES	BARCELONA	43.0%	31.5%	63.8%	
		30.7%	12.7%	44.0%	
CR ES	MADRID	20.270	34.0%	22.270	
1	REHOVOT	40.5%	28.8%	4.2%	
1L 11		40.5%	20.070	4.2 /0 62 5%	
	WIEN	85.0%	61.9%	62.5%	
IT	ROMA	21.1%	35.2%	10.8%	
 IT	MILANO	40.8%	6.6%	26.2%	
NL	UTRECHT	16.7%	16.0%	8.0%	
DE	HEIDELBERG	13.3%	5.1%	2.8%	
BE	LEUVEN	23.1%	37.9%	30.3%	
DE	BERLIN	7.9%	6.8%	11.1%	
UK	EDINBURGH	3.0%	5.9%	5.3%	
BE	GENT	48.1%	16.7%	18.2%	
UK	BRISTOL	2.6%	6.9%	2.6%	
NL	LEIDEN	6.1%	11.3%	17.0%	
NL	NIJMEGEN	12.3%	6.7%	14.0%	
СН	GENÈVE	13.4%	9.3%	16.7%	
IL .	HAIFA	9.0%	21.6%	8.3%	
FI	HELSINKI	68.8%	34.5%	37.5%	
SE	STOCKHOLM	4.3%	32.4%	50.0%	
DK	KØBENHAVN	46.7%	35.9%	55.6%	
СН	BASEL	16.9%	4.7%	5.6%	
NL	GRONINGEN	10.5%	8.7%	6.0%	
SE	SOLNA	41.4%	0.0%	11.1%	
FR	LE CHESNAY	0.0%	10.9%		
IL 	TEL AVIV	9.9%	14.4%	12.5%	
HU	BUDAPEST	80.0%	81.3%	88.9%	
SE	GOTEBORG	7.1%	30.9%	16.7%	
NL	DELFI	1.8%	16.7%	1.0%	
JE DE	BDUSSEL	24.3%	10.3%	11.1%	
	ÅDUUS	33.3%	10.2 %	24.270	
	DUBLIN	63.6%	86.7%	55.6%	
IIK I	SHEEFIELD	3.0%	2.0%	1 9%	
SE		14.3%	17.6%	11.1%	
UK	LEEDS	1 6%	3.1%	2.6%	
UK	EXETER	2.3%	1.3%	4.5%	
NO	051.0	23.1%	64.7%	64.3%	
DE	BONN	20.1%	4 1%	6.9%	
UK	MANCHESTER	2.1%	3.1%	1.5%	
UK	COVENTRY	0.0%	4.3%	1.9%	
UK	GLASGOW	3.3%	1.8%	1.9%	
DE	FREIBURG IM BREISGAU	4 1%	3.1%	2.8%	
				2.070	



. •



lable A9.06: National percentage of grantees in top-100 localities at application stage by scientific domain (continu

	• • • • • • • • •				
	• • • • • • • • •	•			
	06: National percentage of grantees in ten 100 localities at a	polication stage by scientific d	omain (continued)		
able A5.	o. National percentage of grantees in top-100 localities at a	ophication stage by scientific ut	omani (continueu)		
	LOCALITY	LS	PE	SH	All
F	HAMBURG	1.2%	2.4%	13.9%	3.3%
-	ENSCHEDE	0.9%	11.3%	0.0%	4.9%
-	EINDHOVEN	0.0%	11.370	1.00/	4.0%
		0.0%	11.370	1.0%	4.9%
n K		0.3%	3.1%	1.9%	1.9%
ĸ	STANDREWS	1.0%	2.8%	1.5%	1.9%
	ESPOO	6.3%	44.8%	25.0%	24.6%
ĸ	BIRMINGHAM	1.6%	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%
÷	TUBINGEN	2.5%	1.7%	6.9%	2.6%
-	FRANKFURT AM MAIN	2.9%	1.4%	6.9%	2.6%
	ATHENS	41.7%	41.7%	100.0%	43.2%
	ROTTERDAM	11.4%	0.0%	3.0%	4.4%
२	TOULOUSE	0.0%	0.7%	14.9%	2.7%
	TRIESTE	3.9%	7.4%	4.6%	5.7%
(NORWICH	3.3%	0.8%	0.8%	1.6%
	LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE	7.7%	9.1%	9.1%	8.6%
	PISA	0.0%	4.1%	12.3%	4.9%
	FALMER	0.7%	1.0%	2.6%	1.4%
	SOUTHAMPTON	0.3%	2.8%	0.4%	1.4%
	BEDN	4.9%	3 3%	0.9%	3.0%
	CÖTTINGEN	4.5%	1 70/	0.0%	3.9%
	UANNOVED	2.9%	1.770	0.0%	2.0%
	HANNOVER	1.7%	2.7%	0.0%	2.0%
	IRENIO	1.3%	3.3%	10.8%	4.6%
	WARSZAWA	100.0%	87.5%	100.0%	92.3%
	NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE	2.6%	1.0%	0.0%	1.2%
	ANTWERPEN	7.7%	6.1%	9.1%	7.3%
	AACHEN	1.2%	2.7%	0.0%	1.8%
	DRESDEN	2.1%	1.7%	1.4%	1.8%
	KONGENS LYNGBY	13.3%	17.9%	0.0%	14.1%
	HERAKLEION	33.3%	29.2%	0.0%	29.7%
	BEERSHEBA	3.6%	5.4%	4.2%	4.5%
	RAMAT GAN	5.4%	3.6%	4.2%	4.5%
	PADOVA	5.3%	4.9%	1.5%	4.2%
	NOTTINGHAM	0.3%	2.0%	0.8%	1.1%
	PRAHA	0.0%	90.0%	100.0%	83.3%
	KONSTANZ	0.8%	1.0%	6.9%	1.7%
	NEUHERBERG	3.3%	0.7%		1.7%
	ERLANGEN	0.0%	3.1%	1.4%	1.7%
	MÜNSTER	0.4%	3.1%	0.0%	1.7%
	ILLKIRCH-GRAFFENSTADEN	5.0%			1.8%
	TORINO	3.9%	4.1%	3.1%	3.8%
	BERGEN	15.4%	23.5%	28.6%	22.7%
	KLOSTERNEUBURG	10.4%	11 0%	20.070	Q 2%
	INNSBRIICK	2.5%	10.0%	0.0%	Q 2%
	NICOSIA	2.3%	100.0%	100.0%	9.2 % 100.0%
		100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		1.7%	1./%	0.0%	1.5%
		1.2%	2.0%	0.0%	1.5%
	IARKAGONA	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	3.7%
	GRENOBLE	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	1.6%
	LINKOPING	5.7%	7.4%	0.0%	5.8%
	DUNDEE	2.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.9%
K	ABERDEEN	1.0%	0.5%	1.5%	0.9%

. . . •

•





· · · · · · · · · · ·

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013



· · · · · · · · · · ·

• • • • • • • • • • •

• • •

. .

. . . .

123

ERC funding activities 2007 - 2013

"The European Research Council has, in a short time, achieved world-class status as a funding body for excellent curiosity-driven frontier research. With its special emphasis on allowing top young talent to thrive, the ERC Scientific Council is committed to keeping to this course. The ERC will continue to help make Europe a power house for science and a place where innovation is fuelled by a new generation."

Jean-Pierre Bourguignon ERC President and Chair of its Scientific Council



European Research Council Established by the European Commission

http://erc.europa.eu

EuropeanResearchCouncil

@ERC_Research

