

# ANR-NSF bilateral cooperation in the framework of ICC and MWN

### Sophie Ferrand, ANR

BILAT-USA Symposium "Ways of successful science, technology and innovation cooperation between Europe and the USA" 23-24 April 2012



www.agence-nationale-recherche.fr

### French National Research Agency (ANR)

• A public organisation:

Devoted to competitive project-based funding in both fundamental and applied research and based on international standards

- Objectives:

  - bringing more flexibility and, subsequently, reactivity
  - increasing competitiveness while maintaining a good balance between fundamental research and applied research
- 2011 budget: **728 M€**

### ANR – Key figures

Instruments:
✓ 55 - 60 calls for proposals /year (in average)

### Peer-review evaluation of projects:

About:

✓ 6 000 projects submitted yearly (6 237 in 2011)

1 300 projects funded yearly (1 260 in 2011)

✓ Success rate: **20.5%** in average for 2011

- Substantial funding to the selected projects:
  - ✓ Academic Projects: <430 k€>
  - ✓ Public-Private Partnership Projects: <870 k€>

### **ANR-NSF** Collaboration

- Since **2009**: ANR participation in two NSF international programmes:
  - ✓ MWN: Materials World Network
    - 5 co-funded projects, ~3 M€ of funding (1.6 M€ from ANR)
  - ✓ ICC: International Cooperation in Chemistry
    - 6 co-funded projects ~4 M€ of funding (1.9 M€ from ANR)
- Cooperation implemented within ANR Blanc international programme
- Goals:

 Funding high-level French-US collaborative research projects in the field of Chemistry and Materials and reinforce French-US cooperation in those fields

### Modalities of collaboration

#### • Separate submission:

- Submission of proposals in parallel to ANR and NSF, with separate templates, call texts, <u>modalities and deadlines</u>:
  - NSF:
    - MWN: One-step submission, deadline: mid-November
    - ICC: Two-step submission, pre-proposals deadline: early November (eligibility)
  - ANR: One-step submission. Blanc programme usually launched in October and closed in January
  - ightarrow Necessity to inform the community beforehand

#### Separate evaluation:

- Peer review on each side (ad-hoc reviews and/or panel evaluation meeting)
- Common selection meeting
- Joint funding decision
- NSF evaluation earlier. However all proposals must go through ANR process, even the proposals that received a low rating on NSF side
- As far as possible: Exchange of ad-hoc reviews and panel reviews
  - ANR reviews feed NSF decision process
  - NSF reviews feed ANR panels

### Room for improvement?

- **Different calendars**: low flexibility on both sides
- Double evaluation/"double jeopardy"
  - Share and exchange of ad-hoc reviews and panel reviews
    - Confidentiality issue
    - Depending on programme directors, practices...
  - Amendments to existing MoU
    - Legal framework for exchange of reviews and tackling confidentiality issues
- Extension of projects (discussed)
- Follow-up of projects (on-going discussions)

### Challenges

- Other European countries participate (or have participated) in ICC and MWN calls:
  - MWN: Austria, Finland, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Netherlands, UK...

✓ ICC: Austria, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Spain, UK...

#### • Different modalities:

- ✓ ICC example:
  - Netherlands (NWO): classical lead agency process (submission to NSF, evaluation by NSF: NWO proposes reviewers, NWO follows NSF decision)
  - Luxembourg (FNR) and Austria (FWF): process handled by NSF but FNR and FWF make their own funding decision
  - France (ANR): double submission / evaluation
- Possibility to constitute a "critical mass" on European side to co-discuss and co-construct the call with NSF, to have a consensus (inter-agency discussions) on the way to collaborate within ICC and MWN?
- Keep the bilateral model but a unique way to cooperate? (lead agency model vs double submission / evaluation model to be improved)

## Thank you for your attention!

www.agence-nationale-recherche.fr/en