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1 EURAXESS Country in Focus: Croatia

1.1 Introduction

EURAXESS – Researchers in Motion is an initiative of the European Research Area (ERA) that addresses barriers to the mobility of researchers and seeks to enhance their career development. This pan-European effort is currently supported by more than 40 countries, of which we will profile one in our quarterly EURAXESS India e-newsletter. In this edition we focus on Croatia.

Croatia is situated in South East Europe, at the crossroads of Central Europe and the Mediterranean, neighbouring five countries on land border: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Hungary, Serbia, and Montenegro. The Croatian Adriatic coastline is one of the most indented coastlines in Europe, next to the Norwegian fjords.

The International Monetary Fund classified Croatia as an open and developing economy and the World Bank defined it as a high-income economy.

1.2 Croatian S&T Funding Agencies

Scientific research in Croatia is monitored and conducted in six fields of science: natural sciences, technical, biomedical, biotechnical and social sciences, and humanities. The entire system of science and technology is financed through direct project financing with a mechanism of annual monitoring of results, through financing of junior researchers on concrete projects, with multi-year monitoring of their progress and financing of equipment.

The main funding bodies, in addition to the Ministry of Science and Education (MSE), are the Croatian Science Foundation (CSF) and the
Croatian Agency for SMEs, Innovations and Investments (HAMAG-BICRO). Through the Regional Competitiveness Operational Programme and Operational Programme Human Resources Development, Croatia is combining European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and European Social Fund (ESF) for funding development of science and research.

Croatian Science Foundation (CSF)

Croatian Science Foundation was established by the Croatian Parliament in December 2001 under the name The National Foundation for Science, Higher Education and Technological Development of the Republic of Croatia. Its mission is to promote science, higher education and technological development in Croatia in order to ensure the economic development and to support employment. The Foundation provides support to scientific, higher education and technological programmes and projects, fosters international cooperation, and supports the realization of scientific programmes of special interest in the field of fundamental, applied and developmental research.

Croatian Agency for SMEs, Innovations and Investments (HAMAG-BICRO)

HAMAG-BICRO is the Croatian Agency for SMEs, Innovation and Investments established by the Government of the Republic of Croatia with the purpose of enhancing SME development and promoting investment and innovation. The Agency is an independent institution under the supervision of the Ministry of Entrepreneurship and Crafts.

1.3 Croatian Research and Innovation Institutions

The Croatian research and innovation system has evolved over the last decade into a complex system of various institutions and measures directed to build innovation-driven growth. The basic principles and guidelines of science and higher education policy are determined by the Croatian Parliament. The Ministry of Science and Education (MSE) is the main administrative body responsible for planning, funding and monitoring of the
entire science and education system while the highest advisory body for the scientific research system is The National Council of Science, Higher Education and Technological Development with the aim to harmonize the overall development of the R&D and innovation system. The Ministry of Economy, Entrepreneurship and Crafts complements the national innovation policy related to innovation-based entrepreneurship and business infrastructure. The role of the Ministry of Regional Development and European Funds has increased upon the Croatian accession to EU. Scientific activity in Croatia is performed at the universities, public research institutes, research institutes, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts and other legal persons duly registered in the Register of Scientific Organisations.

**Investment in R&D and employment in Science and Technology**

The Croatian science and technology sector employed 38.2% of the active population (aged 25-64) in 2016 according to the Eurostat report which is close to the EU-28 average (46%). The public R&D sector, with universities playing a leading role, is the largely dominant sector research manpower (56.5% of total researchers HEI in 2016). As reported by Eurostat in 2016, the business sector employs a modest 21% of total researchers and invests 0.44% of GDP in R&D. On the other hand, the business enterprises sector is leading in R&D performing activities (49.4%), followed by the higher education sector (31%). Furthermore, the total investment into R&D was 0.85% of the GDP in 2016 and has been fluctuating around 1% in the past 10 years, marking Croatia as one of the most advanced R&D performers in the region, but not at the EU level. However, according to ERAWATCH, Economic Programme of Croatia envisaged increasing the investment in research and development to achieve a share of GERD of 1.4% of the GDP by 2020 in order to overcome the gap in science funding between Croatia and the EU countries (0.85% of GDP vs. 2.03% of GDP in 2016).

**Ruđer Bošković Institute**

The Ruđer Bošković Institute is regarded as Croatia’s leading scientific institute in the natural and biomedical sciences as well as marine and environmental research, owing to its size, scientific productivity, international reputation in research, and the quality of its scientific personnel and research facilities. The Institute is the leading and internationally most competitive Croatian institute by virtue of its participation in international research projects.

**Croatian Academy of Science and Arts**

The Academy promotes and organizes scientific research and encourages the application of the findings of this research, develops artistic and cultural activities, and is concerned with Croatian cultural heritage and its affirmation throughout the world. It publishes the results of scientific research and artistic creation and makes proposals and gives its opinion on the promotion of sciences and arts in the fields which are of special importance to the Republic of Croatia.
1.4 Study in Croatia

The portal “Study in Croatia” ([www.studyincroatia.hr](http://www.studyincroatia.hr)) is owned and managed by the Croatian Agency for Mobility and EU Programmes. It contains information about higher education in Croatia aimed at prospective international students. You can find an overview of the Croatian higher education system, practical information about application procedures, student life, visas and accommodation and scholarships. Furthermore, the portal provides information on learning Croatian as a foreign language, as well as general information about Croatia. More information can be found at: [http://www.studyincroatia.hr/](http://www.studyincroatia.hr/)

1.5 Important information for incoming researchers: EURAXESS Croatia

The Agency for Mobility and European Union Programmes is coordinator (Bridgehead Organization) of the EURAXESS programme in Croatia as well as a EURAXESS Service Centre. The EURAXESS Service Centre (ESC) assists researchers and their families during their period of mobility, in all matters relating to their professional and daily lives, helping them to reach adequate services for their needs, as well as assists the core contact points in research institutions and informs a wider group of contact points about matters of interest to mobility. For all required information, incoming researchers should contact Croatian EURAXESS Service Centre, or check our website ([https://www.euraxess.hr](https://www.euraxess.hr)).
Interview with Dr Jiangyang You (China)
Research Associate, Laboratory of Magnetic Resonance, Division of Physical Chemistry, Institute Ruđer Bošković, Zagreb, Croatia

How did you decide to come to Croatia?

In 2009, a Croatian research team got in contact with me and after overcoming a series of initial administrative difficulties, I finally came to Rudjer Boskovic Institute (RBI) in 2011 as a postdoc, sponsored by the Croatian Science Foundation (CSF). In the following years I worked under a few more postdoc level contracts at Rudjer Boskovic Institute (RBI), in the division of theoretical physics, until joining the laboratory for magnetic resonances, division of physical chemistry, as a research associate in May 2017 and starting in a whole new research area which I am working on now.

How would you describe everyday life and work in Croatia?

I currently live a usual researcher's life in Zagreb: intensive at work while simple and peaceful otherwise. The workload is not low, but thankfully the working environment is flexible so I can set up the schedule that is most suitable for me. After work, I spend most of my time doing sports, playing badminton as well as doing the physical training necessary for it.

What advice would you give to your fellow researchers who are thinking of coming to Croatia?

I would like to say that Croatia is a good place to start developing something for and on your own. You are coming to a country with a solid high education tradition as basis, and a country seeking all chances to catch up to the highest standard in the European Union right now. From my point of view such a scenario presents many opportunities, but of course challenges, too.

Interesting Reads:
Nature Index Croatia
OpenAIRE Croatia
Croatia become member of CERN (article)
2 Hot topic “Horizon 2020 proposal template guide – understanding the inner logic and structure”

Winning a Horizon 2020 grant is no easy task. Such a feat constitutes an impeccable project proposal which presents the project in the best possible way to its reviewers. As an applicant, having a deep understanding of the Horizon 2020 proposal template and structure will undoubtedly help to write such an outstanding proposal. Therefore, a logical first step to developing the Horizon 2020 project proposal is to first and foremost review and understand the template’s requirements. Attempting to do so often results with one main issue. Time and again, we bore witness to the tremendous “logic gap” which exists between what researchers assume the proposal template requires of them and what we know reviewers are most definitely looking for. Therefore, our team has put together years of shared experience into one complete guide. This will help you navigate the proposal template space using our offered inner logic.

2.1 Horizon 2020 Proposal Templates

All Horizon 2020 project proposals are required to be presented in a specific outline. This is dictated by the Horizon 2020 proposal templates. There are unified templates dedicated to RIA/IA projects proposals, CSAs project proposals, MSCA project proposals, ERC project proposals, etc.

Off the bat, the idea behind the templates is in fact positive. It provides applicants with a clear and uniform structure to all competing projects. Still, there are some discrepancies associated with these templates and the inner logic does not always make sense intuitively. While this article focuses on the inner logic of the most “popular” template for the Horizon 2020 RIA/IA project proposals, most of the insights can be easily adapted to all other proposal templates (except for ERC grants).

2.2 How not to tell the same story 3 times – The typical Horizon 2020 proposal template mistake

In many cases, applicants approach the Horizon 2020 grant writing process with a very premature idea for their project. Equipped only with this early-stage idea, they hit the ground running drafting an initial work plan that is then divided into work packages.

Though this seems like the most natural approach, this is usually not a good starting point for writing the Horizon 2020 project proposal. As explained in more detail below, the Horizon 2020 project proposal should first and foremost offer a clear presentation the project’s concept. Only after should it present its detailed work plan for execution. Generally, starting with the work plan means the concept itself is far from being truly articulated.

Therefore, a very typical and frequent mistake which stems from the above approach is a project presentation that revolves around its work plan.
Unfortunately, the ‘other parts’ (the highly important ‘Excellence’ and ‘Impact’ sections) may end up being derived from the work plan and lack the conceptual thinking they demand. Roughly speaking, we can say that such a project proposal resembles the following “story”:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXCELLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 RELATION TO THE WORK PROGRAMME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 CONCEPT AND APPROACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 AMBITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 EXPECTED IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 MEASURES TO MAXIMISE IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Dissemination and exploitation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Communication activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 WORKPLAN — WORKPACKAGES, DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1 — Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP10 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP11 — Dissemination and Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1: List of work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2: List of Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 CONSULTANTS AS A WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 RESOURCES TO BE COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4: Summary of indirect costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Our objective is our plan and we will have results”
“The impact is that we will have results”
“This is our plan”
```

Needless to say that this is not a good “feeding the reviewer” practice. The reviewers simply won’t find the answers to what they are looking for (in both ‘Excellence’ and ‘Impact’ sections) in such a project proposal presentation.

Instead, a good practice should present a project in the following manner:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table of Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXCELLENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 OBJECTIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 RELATION TO THE WORK PROGRAMME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 CONCEPT AND APPROACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 AMBITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 EXPECTED IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 MEASURES TO MAXIMISE IMPACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Dissemination and exploitation of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Communication activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 WORKPLAN — WORKPACKAGES, DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1 — Project Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP10 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP11 — Dissemination and Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.1: List of work package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.2: List of Deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 CONSULTANTS AS A WHOLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 RESOURCES TO BE COMMITTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4: Summary of indirect costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The What - Concept
What is the project about?

The Impact - Value
What is the value of the project?

The How - Execution
How to meet the project’s objectives?
```

This kind of presentation respects the template structure and provides the reviewers with the right information in the right place.
To achieve this foreseen logic of the template, we must first disassemble the template in its entirety and strip it of all assumptions and understandings. Moving forward, we’ll reassemble the template section by section, creating a new and holistic inner-logic approach.

2.3 The inner logic of the Horizon 2020 proposal template: “The What” and “The How”

The first and highly important stop in this process is the call text. The project proposal must be in line with all the requirements of the call text. In the competitive environment of Horizon 2020 – we strongly recommend not to neglect any piece of the call text when constructing your project proposal. Having an excellent project at hand may not be enough. If it does not refer to all the elements of the call text – the project might not be ranked high compared to other projects that do cover all the elements. As a rule of thumb, we advise to have the call text handy throughout the proposal development process and to revisit it often. This will help in verifying that the proposal presentation does not divert from the call text requirements as the proposal develops.

Our most high-level distinction in the Horizon 2020 proposal template makes a clear divide between what we’ve termed as “The What” and “The How” of the project. As we continue, we’ll define each high-level section, and identify which sub-sections belong to each part.

As a general starting point, meaning the call text, should lead first to the project’s definition of “The What”, and only after that we should attend to “The How” of the project at hand.

2.3.1 “The What” of the Horizon 2020 proposal template

“The What” is essentially the conceptual presentation of the project proposal. In other words: What is it that you want to do and achieve with this project? “The What” consists of the following sections in the Horizon 2020 proposal template: Objectives (section 1.1), Concept and Approach (section 1.3) and Ambition (section 1.4). Let’s examine the requirements of each section, as well as their inter-relations.

Section 1.1 – Having a clear distinction between “The What” and “The How”, the project objectives in section 1.1 should be conceptual rather than operational or technical (don’t worry, we’ll get to these later on in section 3.1). Typically, we recommend allocating no more than 2-3 pages for this section.

This leads to a typical issue around the correct spot for the inclusion of the background information of the project. Section 1.1 does not need to include background information, most certainly not the opening text. Surprising as it may sound – the background information is expected as part of the Ambition section (section 1.4) next to the description of the State of the Art and the need for the project.

The role of the Ambition section (section 1.4) is to provide the rationale for the project. Indeed, its position (being the 4th section in the “Excellence” section) does not make much sense, but this is where it was located and this
is where the reviewers expect to read this kind of information. Keep in mind the following: one of the things reviewers don’t like is reading lengthy background texts before getting a clear understanding about the project concept and main idea. Therefore, don’t place the background in section 1.1 and instead get to the point as soon as possible.

Section 1.3 – The concept and approach in section 1.3 should give a conceptual presentation of what the project is about. This is one of the most important sections in the proposal. It links the project objectives to the full project presentation, and serves as the portal to “The How”: it is perfectly fine to make an initial reference to the work plan in section 1.3, but keep the fine details of “The How” for later. Use section 1.3 to explain scientific and technological methods that you may employ in the project. This is also a good place to stress out the innovative aspects of the project, but without overlapping with section 1.4. A well written section 1.3 can make a difference in the eyes of the reviewers and serve as a defining factor during their decision making.

Section 1.4 – As already mentioned above, this section essentially provides the rationale of the project. It refers to the need, the state of the art, and how this project will progress beyond the state of the art. Section 1.4 is the place to clearly explain the innovative nature of the project. The state of the art should provide all the required references to prior work or existing findings. It is imperative to be very clear about the progress this project will have compared to the state of the art without repeating text from previous sections. Some may recommend putting this kind of comparison in the form of a table, to make it easier for the reviewer to read. As a personal preference, we believe that clear, logical texts prevail over anything else.

2.3.2 “The How” of the Horizon 2020 proposal template

“The How” essentially gives very practical information about the actual project structure and its execution. Its role is telling the reviewers what the project will contain: tasks, milestones, deliverables, budget, etc.
It is imperative to have a well-thought execution plan in the proposal. This is done for two complementary reasons: 1. to make sense in the eyes of the reviewers and help them realize how the requested budget was constructed. 2. to make it easy to actually execute the project, once retained for funding.

Experience shows many applicants that were all too focused on creating a competitive project plan in order to stand out in the eyes of the reviewers. The result was a substantial neglect to how they will actually execute the project once funded. To no surprise, they had complex difficulties with the execution plan once they began work. Make sure the plan both makes sense to the reviewers and yourself.

“The How” includes various sections in the proposal templates. Not all of them carry the same weight or importance, but all must be attended to. The full list includes the entirety of section 3 in addition to section 2.2, found under the “Impact” section.

Section 3.1 – We’d recommend opening section 3.1 with a work plan overview which formulates the following two points:

- Links the objectives (section 1.1) and concept (section 1.3) to the work packages (WPs) structure – explain how the WPs structure stems from the objectives and concept;
- Explains how the WPs will actually lead to reaching the project objectives – loopback to the project goals and objectives.

This text should be about one page long. If possible, we’d recommend adding graphical representations of these links.

The work packages are the main place for conveying practical information about the project execution. For each WP we are required to list operational objectives, followed by the content of work (tasks or any other form of description) and then a set of deliverables.

Tips for WPs:

- In the past, in some instances, the EC had limited each WP text to no more than two pages. This rule is no longer applied, but we still recommend adhering to it. The two pages rule will assist you in presenting clearer messages and an efficient WPs structure.
- The WPs is not the place to present conceptual objectives or aspects of the project. For that there exists sections 1.1 and 1.3.
- The best way to present the work plan is by listing concise tasks that refer to the methods described in section 1.3 (without repeating them).
- Deliverables should be listed per WP. We’d recommend having no more than 2-3 deliverables per WP. It is quite common to present more deliverables than that, but what you have to know (or remember), is that unlike many other elements in the proposal text, the deliverables will turn to be contractual obligations once the grant is selected for funding and the agreement is signed. This means that if you list more deliverables in the proposal development phase, you will be obliged to produce more deliverables in the execution phase as well.
- The above point also goes for the Milestones (in section 3.2), as they turn to be contractual obligations once the grant agreement is
signed. Typically 3-5 milestones in a 3-year project should be enough. No need for more than that.

- Add a Gantt and PERT charts as required, which corresponds to the suggested WPs structure. We recommend using a dedicated software for that (not Excel). Make sure the charts are understandable to the reviewer (many times they are not due to overload of fine details in small fonts).

Section 3.3 – Consortium as a whole. In this section the reviewers are expecting to learn about the synergetic nature of the project and why the consortium partners were selected to participate. A typical mistake is to replicate in section 3.3 texts from partners profiles in section 4.1. Instead, make sure to focus on the functions that the consortium partners fulfil and how these functions contribute to reaching the project’s objectives. It is important to ensure there are no gaps in functionality but also that there are little to no overlaps between the partners in functionality. From experience, many choose to mention the consortium’s geographical distribution as an explanation. While it can be mentioned, it only holds real value in that case that it is linked to the functionality of the partners.

Section 3.4 – Officially: “Resources to be committed”, or simply put: “the budget”. This section quantifies the actions mentioned earlier in the text into a monetary representation. The tasks are translated into person-months allocations and other budget requirements. Section 3.4 is the place where the reviewers should assess whether the “price tag” of the project is accurate and that the costs are justified. Make sure to link well the content of section 3.4 to the actual execution plan described mainly in section 3.1 as it will strengthen the overall case for the requested budget.

Section 3.2 – This section presents the project’s management structure, which will be responsible for orchestrating all the pieces presented in section 3 (+ section 2.2). It should include lists of project executives and their roles, such as project coordinator, scientific leader, admin & financial manager, exploitation manager, etc.; committees such as ethics, IPR, etc.; and boards advisory, exploitation, etc (as needed). It should also list the project’s bodies, such as the general assembly, task forces, steering committee and/or executive board (as needed). Finally, this section should also include a list of management procedures, such as decision making, production of deliverables and reports, project meetings, communication flow, conflict resolution, etc. Section 3.2 should be represented in the work plan as one of the Work packages (typically as WP1).

Section 2.2 – Although it officially ‘belongs’ to the “Impact” section, its nature is in fact an operational one, hence it is listed here under “The How”. In this section we are requested to present the Dissemination, Exploitation and Communication plans, which in turn should be referred to from the respective Work package under section 3.1.

2.4 What’s left?

Section 2.1 – We’ve covered “The What” and “The How” so far. The main missing part is the Impact, which is presented in section 2.1. This section is highly important in Horizon 2020 and should be regarded as such.
When writing the impact section (section 2.1) keep in mind the following:

- The impact text should be very different than any other text in the proposal, as it has different goals and points of focus.
- It is a typical mistake to confuse impact with outputs of the project, when the two are greatly different. Make sure you create a unique case for each.
- The impact of the project represents the value of the project.
- The impact must correspond to the expected impact listed in the call text, but also to the Horizon 2020 key performance indicators and cross cutting issues.
- There are various dimensions to impact: scientific, academic, socio-economic, environmental, public and commercial. Attend to all that are relevant to the project.

Section 1.2 – Relation to the call text. We left this one to the end to close the loop. Since we started with the call text, leading the proposal development process, and in line with our recommendation to keep the call text next to you in the process and revisit it often, we believe that this section should be addressed last in the writing process. This is the point in time when you have a much better overview of the project, compared to the beginning of the process. The role of this section is not to tell the project’s story again, as many do. The role of this section is to hand out a clear and concise summary to the reviewer, reflecting why this project proposal addresses the call text requirements. When doing so, use the call text lingo, but don’t be too direct in referring to the call text. A good section 1.2 should not be more than 1 page long.

Having defined all sections of the Horizon 2020 proposal template, it is clear why a comprehensive understanding must be the first step in the proposal writing process. As you continue to write, make sure to adhere to the Horizon 2020 proposal development timeline

You may contact directly Enspire Science Ltd for any additional assistance.
Prabahan Chakraborty grew up in Kolkata in a family of academicians, and his parents always supported his desire to explore both science and the arts. While he was in school, he received the prestigious Balashree Presidential Honour (2004-2005) for creative scientific innovation. Simultaneously, he was also training and performing regularly under the tutelage of one of the doyens of modern Bengali theatre, Ramaprasad Banik. Since completing his undergraduate training in Zoology from erstwhile Presidency College in 2011, he has been pursuing PhD trying to understand how stress affects the brain, at National Centre for Biological Sciences, Bangalore. Theatre has been Prabahan’s constant companion throughout – the last few years have not only led to the publication of two scientific manuscripts but also two anthologies of one act plays.

**What motivated you for contesting in the EURAXESS Science Slam?**

Science Slam was the perfect platform to combine my love for theatre with my passion for science. For me, it was a real challenge to bring in the entertainment factor into the nitty-gritties of science, while keeping the magic of science alive. Moreover, the possibility of a research trip to Europe seemed to be an exciting opportunity at that point of time, given that I was nearing the end of my PhD and looking for future career opportunities.

**How did you use your background in theatre as a way to communicate scientific research in your presentation on how ‘stress affects the brain’?**

A key part of theatre is storytelling, which is also a tool the most eloquent of scientific speakers use in talks. While this provided the common backbone of the performance, my experience with theatre also allowed me to experiment with stage space, music and creative movements in my act, while using rhyme, rhythm and humour to keep my audience engaged. My academic experience with PowerPoint, on the other hand, helped me use visuals to enhance my on-stage performance.

**The Science Slam helps to promote young Indian researchers in Europe. In what ways was the trip to Europe important for your career?**

My trip to Europe allowed me to visit a total of ten laboratories, in four different countries. This one of a kind opportunity not only provided me with an exposure to leading research institutions, but also to discuss future career possibilities with each individual scientist. These avenues will certainly help me transition into the next phase of my journey in academia. I can also say with conviction that many people opened their doors and cordially invited me in simply because I was a Science Slam winner – something which wouldn’t
have been possible otherwise, and speaks volumes about the international impact of this competition.

What did you learn about European research environments, in particular during your guest visit at the Max Planck Institute in Munich?

Across all institutes, research environments were really congenial and welcoming. In the seminars I gave or the one-on-one discussions I had, I really felt an encouraging, supportive and positively-critical environment. My guest visit at Prof. Carsten Worjak’s laboratory at MPI, Munich, was particularly excellent – fuelled by exciting discussions with both him as well as a new bunch of peers, and culminating in a departmental research trip to Burghausen as the perfect finish!

Will you continue with research with or in Europe?

Yes, absolutely! With all the positive interactions I have had during my trip, I really look forward to that possibility.

What motivates you as a researcher?

As a researcher, I am intrigued by interesting questions and puzzles, which are often simple curiosities at heart. Specifically, pursuing scientific questions which may benefit the society in some little way motivates me to do science. Often providing answers to even the simplest of queries we might have (for instance, is depression an actual disease, or can we ‘get over it’?) feeds a lot into the social thinking-box. Deep down, I’ve always thought of myself as a storyteller, so I’m constantly on the search for stories to tell– sometimes of successful adventures, other times of interesting defeats!

(Prabahan Chakraborty at the Science Slam Live Finals in Bangalore)
Which research path do you envision for your future career?

I plan to continue my journey in academia with a focus on trying to solve the elegant mystery of how brain dictates behaviour. For instance, how do social behaviours develop? How are they orchestrated by the brain? Also, how do we learn and remember something, and how is it regulated by the brain? This apart, I also want to engage more in science communication, particularly using theatre as a tool to communicate science more effectively. Stories of discovery, challenges that scientists face, environmental concerns of the hour as well as cutting edge scientific research needs to be put forth to the common man. What best than to make it an entertaining experience at the same time?

The Science Slam promotes creative means for communicating research to larger audiences. How helpful was the training you received from EURAXESS before your successful performance?

The training by Prof. Arnab Bhattacharya had been really helpful in bringing into focus the different nuances of communicating science. In particular, I got a detailed insight into how to structure a talk, and how to use PowerPoint more effectively as a tool – both of which then helped me fine-tune various aspects of my final performance.

Could you kindly share some tip to this year’s EURAXESS Science Slam participants?

Be creative, be entertaining, and keep it simple. There is a fine balance between ‘putting too many details’ and ‘including too less science’ into your talk - keep that in mind. While preparing, try out your act in front of your friends and family and see if they understand the science, or if it’s too science-y for them. Don’t experiment too much (if you can’t sing, don’t sing) and exploit your strengths to the maximum (if you can sing, please sing!). And lastly, have fun – because if you don’t have fun doing this, no one else will find it enjoyable! So put your best face on, go out there, and break a leg!

Thank You Prabahan!

“Science Slam was the perfect platform to combine my love for theatre with my passion for science.”

“Don’t experiment too much (if you can’t sing, don’t sing) and exploit your strengths to the maximum (if you can sing, please sing!).”
4   In case you missed it...

4.1   From our Flashnotes (April - June)

(click on the respective link for more details)

Selected News and still open Calls (in order of publication on EURAXESS India website):

Call: Funding Opportunities for Indo-German Fundamental Research Projects in the Life Sciences

News: Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions: over 20 years of European support for researchers’ work

News: EU Funded Scientists Unveil First Ever Image of a Black Hole

Call: Spain: 150 Postdoctoral offers for Marie Skłodowska -Curie Individual Fellowships

Call: India-Sweden Collaborative Industrial Research & Development Programme

Call: Hosting offers for H2020-MSCA-IF Call - UCLouvain, Belgium

News: How to Submit a Proposal for a MSCA Individual Fellowship 2019

Call: 15 Early Stage Researcher Positions in Virology, Immunology and Immunometabolism

Call: UJA Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowships (IF) Hosting Offers 2019

Call: Open Call for Indo-German Bilateral Workshops

News: Doctoral Training in Europe - MSCA Innovative Training Networks

Call: The German Chancellor Fellowship for tomorrow’s leaders

Call: Hosting offers for H2020-MSCA-IF Call - Silesian University of Technology, Poland

Call: European Research Council (ERC) Advanced Grants - long-term funding for frontier research in Europe

Call: BIMTECH Research Fellowship for Young Global Scholars

Call: NAWA: Bilateral Exchange with India

Call: Czech Republic: MUNI Award in Science and Humanities

Call: MSCA ITN DohART-NET – PhD positions in Embryology/Cell Biology

Call: 15 PhD Positions on MSCA ITN "Healthage - Lifespan Regulation Mechanisms in Health and Disease"

News: EC publishes foresight study - 100 radical Innovation Breakthroughs for the future
News: 17 European Universities selected in effort to build European Education Area

Call: Post-doc in Chemical Biology and Material Sciences hosting for MSCA-IF at the University of Santiago de Compostela

Call: Belgium: Postdoctoral Individual Fellowships at Université libre de Bruxelles

News: 2019 European and Regional Innovation Scoreboards

4.2 Event Outlook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event (click on event title for more details)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date in 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Europe/Outside India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering PhD Summit</td>
<td>Lausanne, Switzerland</td>
<td>2-4 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany: Postdoctoral Researchers’ Networking Tour 2019</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>22-28 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel Life 2019</td>
<td>Basel, Switzerland</td>
<td>9-12 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Research and Innovation Days in Brussels</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>24-26 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the Research and funding opportunities in Europe</td>
<td>Guntur, M.P.</td>
<td>30 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EURAXESS Science Slam India</td>
<td>Trivandrum, Kerala</td>
<td>30 November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About us

EURAXESS India is a networking tool for European researchers active in India and for Indian and international researchers wishing to collaborate with and/or pursue a career in Europe. EURAXESS India provides information about research in Europe, European research policy, opportunities for research funding, for EU-India and international collaboration and for transnational mobility. Membership is free.

Visit us at india.euraxess.org and Join the EURAXESS India community.

EURAXESS Worldwide has dedicated teams in the following countries and regions ready to assist you: ASEAN (focus on Singapore, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Vietnam), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC, focus on Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, and Colombia), China, India, Japan, Korea, and North America (USA and Canada). Additionally, a
EURAXESS information website for Australia and New Zealand went online in June 2018.