



Funding opportunities for Ukrainian researches in social sciences and humanities

European Commission | Swiss National Science Foundation | Research Council of Norway



The 2026 landscape in three routes

key filter is Expectation + host + role + project logic

Horizon Europe route	Swiss & Norwegian host route	Continuity & safety route
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cluster 2 for thematic SSH consortia• MSCA for mobility and training• ERC for strong single-PI agendas <p>Ukraine is associated to Horizon Europe & Erasmus+.</p> <p>best first scan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent funding exists, but the institutional anchor usually comes first.• SNSF Project Funding and Starting Grants need a Swiss base.• RCN funding is normally submitted by a Norwegian organisation. <p>host-driven</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• If stability is the immediate problem, do not force a prestige scheme.• Scholars at Risk is rolling.• MSCA4Ukraine is worth monitoring for a next phase.• Recruitment into ongoing projects can be a realistic bridge. <p>protect continuity</p>

In practice: EC first; Switzerland and Norway next when a host is real.

Funding landscape in one view

map

This is a route map, not an exhaustive catalogue. The point is to identify realistic entry points fast.

	Independent agenda	Mobility / training	Partnership / consortium	Safety / continuity
EC European Commission	ERC bottom-up, single PI	MSCA PF • Erasmus + (K1) fellow + host	Cluster 2 • DN • Staff Exchanges • Erasmus + (K1, JM project) consortium routes	MSCA4Ukraine* watch next phase
SNSF Swiss National Science Foundation	Starting Grants • Ambizione Swiss base required	— no main direct route	Project Funding Swiss PI / host	Scholars at Risk host applies
RCN Research Council of Norway	— Norwegian organisation usually applies	— not a main route	Joint calls / Researcher Projects Norwegian host	Recruit into ongoing project* pilot closed

*not currently open; monitor follow-up announcements

Reality check

Why: Most false starts happen because researchers start from the funder name or scheme instead of the route type

How to identify realistic entry points fast:

- Independent agenda?
- Mobility/training?
- Partnership/consortium (due to solid topic, institution)?
- Safety/continuity

European Commission: 2026

funder

Ukraine's association to Horizon Europe is the legal reason this is the widest route.
 Support channel: [Horizon Europe Office in Ukraine](#) and [National Contact Points](#).
 Legal access is not the main barrier; host quality and proposal quality are.

<u>Cluster 2</u>	<u>MSCA</u>	<u>ERC</u>
<p>thematic SSH consortium calls</p> <p>Natural SSH fit: democracy and governance, cultural heritage and the cultural and creative sectors, social and economic transformations. SSH WP26-27</p> <p>2026 call opens 12 May and the main deadline is 23 Sep 2026.</p> <p>Ukraine-relevant examples: post-conflict democracy, media viability, citizenship education, linguistic diversity, and migration/inclusion.</p>	<p>mobility, training, network-building</p> <p>Best when the real need is mobility, supervision, secondments, or structured career development.</p> <p>2026 call pages list: Staff Exchanges 16 Apr* (!brokerage event), Postdoctoral Fellowships 9 Sep*, and Doctoral Networks 24 Nov*.</p> <p>COFUND is institutional but still matters because researchers can later join funded programmes.</p>	<p>frontier research, single PI</p> <p>Any nationality. Host institution must be in an EU member state or associated country.</p> <p>For the 2026 calendar, the remaining upcoming call is Advanced Grant on 27 Aug 2026; Starting and Consolidator deadlines have already passed.</p> <p>Use ERC only if the project is genuinely independent and ambitious.</p>
<p>Best fit if...</p> <p>a thematic SSH problem</p> <p>capacity to build a credible consortium.</p>	<p>Best fit if...</p> <p>need for movement, training, supervision, or a structured international network.</p>	<p>Best fit if...</p> <p>a project really is a frontier single-PI agenda rather than a dressed-up network bid.</p>

The applicant normally needs to be based at an eligible Swiss institution.

Strategic question is not “Can I apply to SNSF from Ukraine?” but “Can I secure a Swiss affiliation strong enough to carry the grant?”

For most applicants, Swiss money becomes realistic only once a Swiss host institution is real.

<u>Project Funding</u>	<u>SNSF Starting Grants</u>	<u>Scholars at Risk</u>
<p>Experienced researchers at eligible Swiss institutions.</p> <p>SSH is fully eligible.</p> <p>Covers staff, research costs, collaboration, and networking. Up to CHF 250,000 per applicant per year; projects run 1–4 years.</p> <p>Submission deadlines:</p> <p>1 Apr and 1 Oct, 17:00 Swiss time.</p>	<p>All disciplines and topics. Up to CHF 1 million over 5 years, and the PI’s salary may be funded.</p> <p>Good fit only if you have the career-stage profile, a Swiss link, and a genuine independence case.</p> <p>2026 deadline: 5 May.</p>	<p>Rolling deadline: anytime. The scholar does not apply directly; the Swiss host or SAR coordinator applies.</p> <p>Funding: CHF 75,000 for the first 12 months, with a possible CHF 25,000 extension for year two.</p> <p>Deadline: rolling</p>

To consider but don’t build plans around schemes that are closed, paused, or not currently available:

- The Ukrainian-Swiss Joint Research Programme has no further calls at present.
- Spark is suspended until at least end-2027. SPIRIT is paused through 2028.
- Federal budget cuts also mean tighter competition in 2026.

mainly a host market, partnership channel, plus one explicit Ukraine call

First real task is usually finding the right Norwegian organisation and PI, not polishing text.

Collaborative Researcher Project on Mental Health in Ukraine During and After Wartime ([Webinar 26 Feb 26](#))
the clearest 2026 Ukraine-specific RCN route, [Link to the call](#)

Exactly one Norwegian and one Ukrainian partner. The Norwegian partner submits.

Project length: 24–36 months. Maximum grant: NOK 6 million. **Deadline:** 29 Apr 2026, 13:00 CEST.

Purpose: improve mental health among Ukrainians affected by war and build lasting Ukrainian–Norwegian collaboration. Neither partner may receive more than 60% of the total budget.

Other SSH-relevant thematic routes

still usually via Norwegian organisations

Agendas: Democracy, SSH, policy and administration

[Democracy as a form of government and way of life](#)

[Events Focused on the Functioning of the Financial Market and](#)

[Ethical Awareness](#)

[Public Sector PhD Project](#)

Why the 2025 pilot still matters

[RCN's 2025 pilot to recruit researchers from Ukraine into ongoing Researcher Projects](#) is closed, but it funded 11 applications.

It signals interest for bridge-type schemes. If you already have Norwegian partners, watch for follow-ups.

How to choose the call

By project logic, not by funder prestige!

A strong idea in the wrong scheme often dies before real evaluation even begins

What your needs: continuity/salary now; strategic 2-5 years build; single PI/own agenda; network

<p>Continuity + single PI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MSCA PF• Scholars at Risk <p><i>Use these when continuity, mobility, or protected time is the real need.</i></p>	<p>Continuity + partnership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RCN-Ukraine joint call• Recruitment into existing projects• MSCA Staff Exchanges <p><i>Use these when linkage to a live host ecosystem matters most.</i></p>
<p>Strategic + single PI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• ERC• SNSF Starting grants• Ambizione <p><i>Use only if the case for independence is real and the host can carry it.</i></p>	<p>Strategic + consortium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cluster 2 Pillar II• MSCA DN• SNSF Project funding• RCN thematic projects <p><i>Use when the host network is part of the value</i></p>

How evaluators read: why this argument, where is the action (not activities)

The evaluator should be able to see “why this call, why this project, why this team, why now?” in a few seconds.

1 Fit

Show why this exact instrument fits better than the obvious alternatives.

2 Question

One problem. One research question. One credible contribution.

3 Methods

Design, data, risks, ethics, and milestones must be concrete.

4 Host / consortium

Explain why these people and this institution are necessary, not decorative.

5 Impact

Name users, outputs, and the route from results to uptake.

6 Budget / admin

The budget must mirror the work plan. Forms, letters, and approvals start early.

1-page sketch/scheme → host / partner check → full narrative → budget → team review → portal submission

Avoid

- Wrong call fit or wrong applicant role
- Question too broad, too generic, or too safe
- Consortium built for geography rather than complementarity
- Impact section with no users and no route to uptake
- Admin started too late: ethics, letters, budgets, approvals

Do in the next 2 weeks

- Shortlist at most two calls
- Check eligibility with the host, NCP, or programme contact
- Draft a proposal one-page and force a clear answer “why this call for this problem?”
- Make an early no-go decision if the host or partners are weak unless you know what to do with your experience
- Build the budget, letters, and approvals backwards from the deadline

Do not chase five opportunities badly. Two realistic calls are enough.

Questions???

Re-check the official portal immediately before submission. Dates and rules can move.

For live eligibility questions: use the host research office, National Contact Points, or the call contact address early.

Thank you!

Contact:

Administration for Research and Innovation in Social Sciences and Humanities, ARISSH, funding@arissh.com