

Funding possibilities for ex ante designed internationally comparative empirical research

Roger Henke

SISWO, Netherlands Institute for the social Sciences
Plantage Muidersgracht 4
1018 TV Amsterdam
rhenke@siswo.uva.nl

Report prepared for the **Metropolis International Steering Committee**

June 2001/October 2001

Contents

Executive summary

1. Introduction

- 1.a background of the project
- 1.b Structure of the report
- 1.c Methodology

2. Lack of cross-national empirical research

Box 1: State, school and ethnicity, a Volkswagen Stiftung funded project

3. Existing funding opportunities

3.a EU framework programmes

Table 1: Relevant research projects funded under the 4th and 5th framework programme

Box 2: Networking as a prerequisite for successful EACER applications

Box 3: Average profile of a Research Training Network funded under the 4th or 5th framework programme

3.b Other EU sources: budget lines and tenders

Box 4: An EC grant towards establishing a European secretariat for Metropolis International

Table 2: Summary of EC funding possibilities in terms of their current and future relevance and accessibility for a Metropolis RB programme of EACER

3.c European Science Foundation

Box 5: a EUROCORES application on Human smuggling and trafficking in migrants

3.d Other international organisations

3.e National research councils and governments

Box 6: bi-lateral collaborative agreements

3.f Cooperation between Metropolis countries and other areas

3.g Foundations

3.g.1 Introduction

3.g.2 Bilateral comparisons

Box 7: From bi-lateral dialogue to a multilateral project

3.g.3 Multi-country comparisons

3.g.4 Corporate funders

3.g.5 Current limitations and hindrances

3.g.6 Encouraging developments

Box 8: AICE and the Ethnobarometer project

4. Strategic recommendations for Metropolis

- 4.a Introduction
- 4.b.1 Institutionalising the intermediary role
Box 9: The Oxford University Refugee Studies Centre
- 4.b.2 Co-ordinating a EUROCORES application
- 4.b.3 Lobbying foundations to establish research co-funding arrangements
Box 10: What can be accomplished, at what level, by whom, with what means?
- 4.b.4 Establishing common research needs amongst Metropolis' governmental partners and facilitate the establishment of co-funding arrangements
- 4.b.5 The advantages of a multi-track strategy

Annexes

- A. ToR
- B. Relevant Projects and networks funded under the 4th and 5th framework programme
- C. How to keep informed about the framework and other R&D programmes and opportunities
- D. How to prepare successful framework proposals
- E. How to keep informed about relevant EU budget lines
- F. The Eurocores programme
- G. Directory of potentially EACER relevant foundations
- H. Sources of information on foundations
- I. How to prepare successful grant applications
- J. Browser facilities for quick accessibility of favourite links

Executive Summary

At the origins of this report was the intuition that the lack of information about funding sources for internationally comparative ex ante designed empirical research is a major stumbling block for developing an international Metropolis research programme. An inventory of existing comparative projects fully confirmed the underlying suspicion that there is lots of talk about the need for proper comparative empirical research, but all this talk has not (yet) been translated into a substantial corpus of comparative work. And in interviews with researchers, who have hands-on experience with internationally comparative research, funding was, indeed, unanimously mentioned as the major and definite barrier.

The aim of the report is to chart the current possibilities for funding internationally comparative research in the field of migration and integration research, and to make strategic recommendation to the Metropolis International Steering Committee (ISC) on how to open up new sources of funding.

Apart from being a useful instrument for the Metropolis ISC, it is also meant to be helpful to individual researchers and research groups within Metropolis. To accomplish this, the report contains annexes on how to keep informed on funding possibilities, and on how to write successful proposals. On top of that, the report is very much a hyperlinked document, that gives direct access to much of the background information referred to in the text.

The bulk of the report is devoted to an overview of the existing sources, starting with the EU Framework programme. Within the framework programme, the Socio-Economic Research activity is the main source of support for the social sciences. However, it has only funded 11 directly relevant research projects during the last six years. Nevertheless, the report argues against a defeatist attitude towards this funding opportunity and highlights the need for taking a long-term perspective, and the need for having an international network in place. Also, the relevance of other activities, Research Training Networks, Thematic programmes, and the INCO, COST and INTAS programmes are discussed. Two important trends are signalled. The first is the increasing awareness amongst (national, non-EU) funders that co-ordination of calls for their own programmes with Framework programme calls is important. And the second is the disturbing fact that although the framework programme is without doubt the best documented source of money for internationally comparative research, with numerous ways to be alerted when a call in an area of one's interest is announced, interested researchers still lack sufficient access to relevant information. Also the development of the sixth Framework programme is given some attention.

Next, other EU sources (budget lines and tenders) are being discussed. Their relevance is limited at present but some of them might hold future potential. Of the international organisations programmes in the Metropolis area of interest, the Council of Europe, ILO, OECD, UNESCO, NATO and the European Science Foundation, only the last one has a very promising funding modality: EUROCORES. With respect to this programme, the issue of call co-ordination is elaborated further. In terms of funding criteria, national research councils and governments have by definition a national focus, but this does not exclude all possibilities for foreign collaboration. However, again the story is one of future potential rather than current possibilities. A separate chapter is devoted to the funding opportunities offered by the world of foundations. The number of foundations that have priority areas and funding criteria that might allow for Metropolis relevant comparative research projects is very limited. Current limitations of the world of

foundations are listed and encouraging developments are described. Like national research councils and governments foundations are becoming increasingly aware of the need for international co-ordination and the establishment of co-funding arrangements.

The main text concludes with a series of strategic recommendations for Metropolis. The first of these is a very general one, based on the truism that, without proper information reaching the right people at the right time, opportunities cannot be made use of: every research organisation should have someone who is good at finding her way around funding possibilities, and who keeps (the rest) updated on all the changes, new options, calls for proposals, and other relevant information. This person should be closer to the shopfloor than is now customary. The second is quite specific: prepare an application for the next call of the EUROCORES programme that on 1 June 2002. The third and fourth are both based on the growing interest among different kinds of research funders for co-funding arrangements. Metropolis is advised to lobby particular networks of foundations as well as its own governmental partners to establish co-funding arrangements for internationally comparative empirical research. The last is again based on a truism: nothing ventured, nothing gained. Rather than debating which of these possibilities is most promising and should be pursued, going for a multi-track strategy will increase chances for success. And as one's track record is an important factor in the evaluation of any funding proposal, success will breed success.

1. Introduction

1.a background of the project

In the spring of 2000, the Metropolis International Steering Committee (ISC) came to the conclusion that *the lack of information about funding sources for internationally comparative ex ante designed empirical research is a major stumbling block for developing an international Metropolis research programme*. The information that the average researcher is aware of is either discouraging or too non-specific to be of much practical help. Obviously, all Europeans are aware of at least some of the possibilities that the EC's framework programme offers. However, many consider the balance between the cost of necessary pre-investment versus the chances for success rather prohibitive. Apart from the framework programme, hear'say would suggest that the world of foundations might harbour unsuspected pots of gold. Ford, Volkswagen, ... maybe, but how does it work? Some ISC members decided to co-fund and supervise a consultancy project to *chart the current possibilities for funding internationally comparative research*. The ToR of the project¹ show that the RB expected interviewing researchers that have hands-on experience with internationally comparative research to be the best strategy to unearth possible (under-exploited) sources. Therefore, in this project, knowledge about funding sources is approached as "expert" knowledge². Next to the hope that these interviews would deliver knowledge about existing sources, the choice for this strategy had a second motivation. There is lots of talk about the need for ex ante designed, internationally comparative empirical research, but most find it hard to come up with more than a few examples of existing projects that actually fit the criteria. *An inventory of existing comparative projects* can confirm, or disconfirm for that matter, the suspicion that all the talk has not (yet) been translated into a substantial corpus of research. Such confirmation would be useful ammunition in the lobbying of potential funders to become more open to comparative projects. The consultancy project also contains an analytic part, including *recommendations to the ISC about how to open up new sources of funding*.

1.b Structure of the report

The *analytic section* constitutes the *main body* of the report. The main body also contains *boxes* describing respondents' experiences with, and advice regarding the funding of internationally comparative research. These *concrete examples* are not only meant to add some spice to an otherwise quite technical text, but also to entice those within the Metropolis community who have never tried (and those who have given up) to become active (again) as grant seekers for internationally comparative research. The *annexes* contain the purely *informative part*.

¹ See Annex A

² That is to say, it takes time to acquire, proper acquisition presupposes practical involvement, it is difficult to communicate (to non-experts) in a jargon-free, systematic, and empowering fashion, it is often jealously guarded, etc.

1.c Methodology

The comparative research of interest to the project

The RB is primarily interested in creating a programme of *ex ante designed internationally comparative empirical research by persons or teams actually (institutionally) based in different countries, on topics relevant to the Metropolis network, especially issues of migrant integration within an urban context.*

First of all, one should realise that this interest *excludes* a lot of comparative research: comparisons for which the material is all gathered by a team based in a single country, or less rigorous *ex post* comparisons, or comparisons that depart from one particular national setting, be it to compare it with secondary material on other countries, gathered during short visits, or by way of inviting a colleague from another country to reflect upon the situation within one's country, etc. The ambition is thus to facilitate the kind of work that comes to mind when one ideal-typically defines serious cross-national research. In this report I will use the acronym *EACER* to denote this Ex Ante designed internationally Comparative Empirical Research that is the focal interest to this project.

Also, the focus on integration issues limits the search for existing research. The need to keep the project feasible within the time available was a major reason for this limitation. Although research on other Metropolis-relevant issues was taken account of when encountered, only integration research was systematically searched for. Nevertheless, on the basis of the near perfect fit between the systematic information on integration research and by integration researchers on the one hand, and the more anecdotal information on other topics that are of interest to the Metropolis community on the other, I claim validity for the conclusions reached beyond integration research.

Information sources

- ⇒ Researchers well placed in the field, i.e. with a broad overview of what research is available and ongoing, preferably with personal comparative experience;
- ⇒ Research managers/research liaison officers within relevant government departments;
- ⇒ Research support staff of some major universities;
- ⇒ Programme officers of major funding agencies: national research councils, relevant foundations, relevant transnational organizations (EC, ESF, UNESCO, etc);
- ⇒ Printed and on-line information on funding sources and grant seeking.

Geographical focus

The countries specified in the ToR are the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, France, Sweden, the US, and Canada. In the course of interviewing researchers I have also talked with informants knowledgeable beyond this selection of countries (Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Austria, Italy, Portugal, Japan, Australia). As all the researchers were chosen on the basis of their expert knowledge of the field in general *and* being well informed about the existence of any (comparative) study with active involvement from their country, I claim validity for the conclusions underneath beyond the original geographical scope.

2. Lack of cross-national empirical research

A search of the (review) literature, databases of (ongoing) research and interviews with more than 30 senior researchers with very different national bases, nearly all of them with a strong comparativist interest can lead to but one conclusion: *there is an appalling lack of EACER in the field of interest to Metropolis*. In other words, the project fully confirms the suspicion of the Metropolis RB.

The *literature search* of the project proved to be the easiest part, as the field of integration research has been reviewed thoroughly in two related consecutive publications of Adrian Favell: “Integration policy and integration research in Europe: a review and critique”, In: *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices* edited by Alex Aleinikoff and Doug Klusmeyer Washington DC: Brookings Institute 2001, and its update “The ‘integration’ of immigrants in Western Europe: contours and constraints of a research paradigm”, to be published in: Michael Bommes and Ewa Morawska (eds), *Reflections on Migration Research: Constructions, Omissions and Promises of Interdisciplinarity*, University of California Press. These reviews unequivocally show that EACER is virtually non-existent.

The former has 164 references of which only a couple can be called proper examples of EACER. The update does not add any. As is to be expected, both reviews mention the EC’s 4th and 5th framework programmes as major sources of comparative work (without giving references; however, see below). Two well known monitoring-type international projects that may be labelled EACER, but neither of which is relevant in terms of what it can teach us about funding sources are mentioned: the EC’s Eurobarometer³ and the OECD’s SOPEMI-reports⁴. A less well known monitoring project referred to, more difficult to classify as EACER, but interesting from a funding point of view is the Ethnobarometer project⁵. This project is described in more detail in Box 8. The UNESCO-MOST Multicultural Policies and Modes of Citizenship in European Cities (MPMC) project⁶ is also mentioned, but again this does not have much to offer as far as funding is concerned. The last EACER-type project mentioned is a study, coordinated by Harald Waldrauch, that developed an index to measure the legal obstacles to the integration of migrants⁷. This contract-research project for the Austrian Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Culture paid for subcontractors, in all countries included, to gather the legal information that the design required⁸. Lessons to be drawn from the above projects will be addressed in various paragraphs of the section on existing funding opportunities below.

The *databases* of the COmmunity Research & Development Information Service (CORDIS)⁹ is the place to locate relevant research projects and networks that are funded under the 4th and 5th framework programmes. Annex B contains the result of this search. Although networks as such are not EACER, they have been included for the

³ See: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo/eb.html>

⁴ See: <http://www.oecd.org/els/migration/pubs.htm>

⁵ See: <http://www.ethnobarometer.org/index.htm>

⁶ See: <http://www.unesco.org/most/p97.htm> ; all partners are looking after their own project funding.

⁷ See: Çinar, D., Hofinger, C. & Waldrauch, H. (1995) *Integrationsindex. Zur rechtlichen Integration von Ausländerinnen in ausgewählten europäischen Ländern*. Political Science Series no. 25. Vienna: Institute for Advanced Study (see also <http://www.ihs.ac.at/pol/papers/abstract/abst25.html>) and Waldrauch, H. & Hofinger, C. (1997) An index to measure the legal obstacles to the integration of migrants, *New Community*, vol 23 (2), pp.271-86. Obviously, constructing an index is only a first step towards EACER.

⁸ Information from dr. Bernard Perchinig, ECSW (Vienna)

⁹ See: <http://www.cordis.lu/en/home.html> and <http://www.cordis.lu/improving/socio-economic/selected.htm>

sake of providing a comprehensive overview of the Metropolis-relevant research-related portfolio of the Commission's R&D programmes. The list shows that calling this research portfolio impressive would be stretching it. Other databases checked were the ESRC database REGARD¹⁰, the Metropolis virtual library, the Ercomer virtual library, and a couple of the so-called national Current Research Information Systems (CRIS)¹¹, like the FORIS database of the German Informationszentrum Sozialwissenschaften¹². However, this did not add projects to the (very short) list of projects that were mentioned in the interviews¹³ (see below).

The *interviews* generated lots of interesting views on how to organise cross-national comparisons in ways that do *not* necessitate the funding of individual researchers or teams based in different countries. But when probed for proper EACER most informants could only come up with the odd fourth or fifth framework funded research project and nothing else. In all, just a few non-framework programme projects were mentioned that really fit the definition:

Two foundation funded EACER:

- ⇒ A Volkswagen Stiftung funded project on *The relationship between national civic culture and minority identifications, compared among Turkish Youth in France, Britain, The Netherlands and Germany* (see box 1);
- ⇒ The *Cooperative Efforts to Manage Emigration (CEME)* project, with the support of the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, examines ways in which immigration destinations can work more effectively with source and transit countries to coordinate movements and reduce emigration pressures¹⁴. This project is described in more detail in box 7.

And two national research council funded EACERs:

- ⇒ A project of the ESRC's Transnational Communities programme on *Transnational communities and the transformation of Citizenship*, a comparison involving the UK, Germany and Canada, that involves Canadian partners¹⁵; sometime into the project these Canadian partners did secure substantial additional funding in the form of a Strategic Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council to extend their part to Australia and Hong Kong.
- ⇒ A project funded by the Nordic Research Council, a kind of European Science Foundation like organisation for the Scandinavian countries¹⁶, on *the reception of Bosnian refugees in the Nordic countries*¹⁷.

¹⁰ See: <http://www.regard.ac.uk/regard/home/index.html>

¹¹ For an overview with hyperlink access to many important CRISs, see: <http://www.nsd.uib.no/english/research/eucris>; Another gateway is the EC's European Research Gateways On-line interface, see:

<http://www.cordis.lu/ergo/home.html>

¹² See: <http://www.gesis.org/Information/FORIS/index.htm>

¹³ This might be due to the fact that none of these databases has anything like "international comparison" or similar entries in its thesaurus of search terms. This is a serious limitation when consulting CRIS for information on comparative work or opportunities. See the paragraph on "how to keep informed" on foundations' network, I vouch for the fact that the CRIS databases do not contain important, but otherwise unknown EACER.

¹⁴ See: <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/ceme/index.html>

¹⁵ See: <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk/citizens>

¹⁶ Which means it only provides money for the additional costs of comparative projects; the actual data gathering and analysis in the various countries being paid by the respective national research councils.

¹⁷ See: <http://www.dep.no/krd/engelsk/publ/rapporter/016005-990117/index-dok000-n-n-a.html>

Evidently, the basic reason for this remarkable lacuna in EACER is the absence of funding opportunities. When probed for an explanation most interviewees would point to conceptual, methodological and pragmatic reasons other than funding, but funding was unanimously mentioned as the major and definite barrier to proper comparative work.

Box 1: State, school and ethnicity, a Volkswagen Stiftung funded project

“State, school and ethnicity: The relationship between national civic culture and minority identifications, compared among Turkish Youth in France, Britain, The Netherlands and Germany”¹⁸ is premised on the proposition that “the collective identifications of youth from post-migration backgrounds are crucially co-shaped by the dominant civic cultures of their countries of residence. These civic cultures, which continue to differ between the various nation-states..., are primarily received and absorbed through explicit and implicit curricula at school...Operationally, the research is to begin with observations at schools, in order to identify the contents, means, and implications of socialization into the civic culture of each country...[the identificatory choices, identity options, and collective self-understandings of the youths themselves] are to be approached by means of participant observation which spirals out from the school premises to the wider fields of interaction in families, peer groups, neighbourhoods, and voluntary associations. In the final phase, the project will allow for a comparative assessment”¹⁹. The budget covers the costs of four researchers, and one part-time research assistant for two years, and included money for project meetings, and a conference.

What are the factors that determine the chances of a proposal like this to get a grant from the Volkswagen Stiftung? One of the researchers, Thijs Sunier, pointed out that:

- ⇒ The proposal has to fit one of the foundation’s priority areas;
- ⇒ The proposal has to include a German partner; this partner has to be a proper participant, in practice even a co-initiator of the project, not just a window-dressing addition to the project;
- ⇒ The German partner has to be a well-known and well-connected professor. Her being familiar with the secretary general and/or members of the board of governors helps;
- ⇒ Contact (of the German partner) with and feedback from the programme officer during proposal preparation ensures the best possible fit between proposal characteristics and the foundation’s criteria (matching the priority area, scientific originality);
- ⇒ Only scientifically sound and original proposals by teams with a proven track record of serious work will survive the selection procedure that includes peer reviews, and programme officer advice.

What are characteristics of Volkswagen Stiftung projects?

- ⇒ Although project feasibility is a necessary condition, the foundation’s primary interest is its scientific originality; there is no negative bias against qualitative projects. This implies that the foundation’s lists of funded projects show quite a few exploratory studies that break new ground but are risky - i.e. the kind of project that many national research councils will shy away from²⁰ - in the various priority areas;
- ⇒ The foundation’s programme officers, scientists with an active involvement in the projects that they attend to, have a good sense of what international collaboration comes down to. Therefore, they ensure sufficient funds for regular meetings and other facilities to optimise the conditions for successful comparative work;
- ⇒ The programme officer’s close involvement means that the foundation is well aware of the actual progress of the project, and expects (and enforces) a professional attitude, both in terms of the work (to be) done and in terms of (financial) accountability.

¹⁸ Prof.dr. Werner Schiffauer (Europa-Universität Viadrina) proposed the project; dr. Gerd Bauman (University of Amsterdam), dr. Riva Kastoryano (CNRS) and prof.dr. Steven Vertovec (then CRER, now Oxford) were co-supervisors.

¹⁹ From the draft project proposal, p.16

²⁰ Obviously, no research council will admit to this...

3. Existing funding opportunities

3.a EU framework programmes

By far the most important existing funding opportunity is the framework programme of the EC. The part of the programme that most will be familiar with is the *Socio-Economic Research* activity.

This activity is indeed the main source of support for the social sciences within the Fifth Framework Programme.

Its overall objectives are: to increase understanding of EU structural changes, to identify ways of managing these changes and to involve EU citizens more actively in shaping their own futures. Applicants will essentially be *European social science researchers*. Annex C provides more information about how to inform oneself about the framework and other R&D programmes and opportunities.

Three calls for this activity funded a total of 162 comparative “projects” under the fourth framework programme (1994-1998), where the activity was called “Targeted Socio-Economic Research” (TSER); however, only part of these were research projects (the rest being networking projects). Of the research projects 13 of those 162 can be called relevant to Metropolis, but this figure includes 5 projects that are only partially relevant (ethnicity being one of the various themes). The first call for its successor, the so-called “Key Action Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base”, under the fifth framework programme (1998-2002) funded 43 projects, only 2 of which were really Metropolis relevant research projects. As a result of the second call for proposals launched in 2000, 71 projects were selected. Information about these is only available by word of mouth because the contract negotiations with many projects are ongoing or just concluded²¹. I know of one *directly* relevant project because Ercomer is involved. A check with the Dutch EC liaison office - that has access to the titles of selected projects - suggest that this might be the only one. The recent funding of an accompanying measures project, with the objective to make an inventory of integration relevant (survey) datasets and official statistics and analyse their cross-national comparability, is very good news, but does not qualify as proper *EACEResearch*.

Table 1 gives an overview of all 11 directly relevant research projects funded under the calls of the 4th and 5th Framework programmes during the last six years. For a field as important as immigrant integration this should be considered a meagre result indeed. Annex B gives a list of all projects with any relevance to Metropolis that have been funded under these two framework programmes.

²¹ See: <http://www.cordis.lu/improving/socio-economic/selected.htm>

Table 1 Relevant research projects funded under the 4th and 5th framework programme

Project Title	Startdate	Metropolis relevance ²²
Migrant insertion in the informal economy	February 1996	+++
“Muslim voices” in the European union	February 1997	++
Child Immigration project	December 1997	++
Effectiveness of national integration strategies towards second generation migrant youth in a comparative European perspective	December 1997	++
Immigration as a challenge for settlement policies and education	November 1998	++
Les nouvelles formes de gestion publique de la deviance en Europe	December 1998	++
The spatial dimensions of urban social exclusion	December 1998	++
Family reunification evaluation project	January 1999	++
The education of the Gypsy childhood in Europe	March 2000	++
Does implementation matter? Informal administration practices and shifting immigrant strategies in four member states	March 2000	++
The political economy of migration in an integrating Europe (PEMINT)	June 2001	++

Many reputable research teams look upon this activity of the framework programme as not worth the necessary investment.

- ⇒ Proposals have to comply with very elaborate format requirements;
- ⇒ Although the programmes have a five-year lifespan, one only knows for sure if one’s *specific* research topic qualifies when a particular call is opened, leaving only a couple of months for preparing an application (f.e. because the first call of the fourth framework programme received many migration-related applications this field was explicitly excluded from the second call);
- ⇒ And even if both topic and format are right, chances for succes are limited; across several calls maybe 15 % on average;

I would argue against this defeatist attitude (see Annex D) but the above barriers are undeniably real. A success factor for the FP Socio-Economic Research programme (and for other EACER possibilities for that matter), that I feel needs explicit attention, is being able to *take a long-term perspective*. Although, it is considered common knowledge that networking in the long run pays off, it is difficult to be patient.

Something to be realised is the importance of *having a network in place* – i.e. a network that for whatever reason gets together regularly – as a prerequisite for the ability to formulate successful applications for EACER. However, getting a network in place takes time and effort. An important motive underlying the ToR of this report was dissatisfaction with the disparity between the wealth of sources for funding networking activities (that are cheap compared to research) and the lack of sources for actual comparative research. Although the dissatisfaction mirrors a real disparity, it runs the risk of discounting the value of networking, and thus the risk of looking upon the investment of time necessary to create networking opportunities (small money, but nevertheless it involves writing applications, organisational hassles, etc., etc.) as not

²² The relevance to the Metropolis area of interest has been operationalised as follows:

- ⇒ A project on the integration of migrants with a cities-focus: +++
- ⇒ A project on the integration of migrants without a cities-focus, or ++
- ⇒ A project with a cities focus, and migrants being one of the independant variables ++
- ⇒ A project without a cities focus, migrants being one of the independant variables +

worth the trouble. Box 2 gives some examples of how establishing networks *eventually* makes for success in grant seeking for comparative research.

Box 2: Networking as a prerequisite for successful EACER applications

COST A2, *Migration - Europe's integration and the labour force - Brain Drain*²³, one of the first social sciences COST actions ever²⁴, is a good example of what networking *in the long run* can accomplish. COST is a framework for scientific and technical cooperation, allowing for the co-ordination of national research on a European level. COST Actions consist of basic and precompetitive research as well as activities of public utility. COST A2 has not been a great success in terms of its immediate output. During its early years the objectives of the scheme were pretty vague and the scheme's infrastructure was not up to the standards necessary²⁵. By the time the network had figured out what the best way forward was, the Action was close to its end. However, the Action facilitated the emergence of a couple of thematic sub-networks of researchers with similar interests and a willingness to work together. Several have been successful in using their network as the basis for research applications. One of the networks gave birth to the UNESCO-MOST MPMC programme. Another one wrote an application for a follow-up COST Action on the needs of the European labour market for highly-skilled non-EU immigrants. When this proposal turned out to be too politically sensitive for the tastes of the COST decision making body (Committee of Senior Officials that consists of governmental representatives) they rewrote their proposal and submitted it successfully as an application (PEMINT; see Annex 2) under the 2nd call of FP5's IHP programme. A major reason for the proposal's success was its quality which was largely due to the fact that it had matured in the course of several rounds of drafting. Its partners had been able to do that because of their long-lasting co-operation, the mutual trust and understanding that comes with that, and a series of face-to-face meetings in which the project's focus could be sharpened.

Another example of a network that has facilitated the creation of funding applications by its members, by the fact that it enabled them to get together regularly, and by enhancing visibility in Brussels, is EUROFOR²⁶. Although the academic community is not entirely enthusiastic about EUROFOR, the main funder (DG research) of its core activity, young researcher conferences and summerschools, seems quite content and even approached the network to organise additional summerschools to make use of underspent budgets at the end of the year²⁷. All the comparative projects in which the EUROFOR co-ordinator, the European Migration Centre (EMZ/Berlin) participates²⁸ have grown out of the networking made possible through the conference grants.

²³ For more general information on COST, see: <http://www.belspo.be/COST>

²⁴ It ran from 1991- end 1995.

²⁵ In the same way that the administrative infrastructure of the TSER programme in the beginning was substandard.

²⁶ See: <http://www.emz-berlin.de/start.htm>

²⁷ Information from Jan Hjarno.

²⁸ See: <http://www.emz-berlin.de/e/project/proj01.htm> ; EMZ seems to focus on applied research.

What is the critical success factor of EUROFOR that turns this network into an instrument of enhancing visibility in Brussels? The major reason for the positive evaluation of this network's activities is the fact that its organiser sticks to the rule that one has to satisfy a funder's legitimate expectation of visibility and tangible output. The conferences are widely advertised, and he ensures that soon after a summerschool or young researchers' conference has taken place, the papers presented by the participants are compiled between two covers and send to DG Research²⁹.

In addition to the Socio-Economic Research activity, the framework programme has another directly relevant funding category: *Research Training Networks* (RTN). This category is much less known. The last call under the current fifth framework programme has closed, but given the fact that the successor activity under the sixth framework programme (2002-2006) can legitimately be expected to become only *more* important³⁰ I include some tantalising information about RTNs.

The primary objective of these Networks is to promote training-through-research, especially of young researchers, both pre- and post-doctoral level, within the frame of high quality transnational collaborative research projects. Funding is provided primarily for the appointment of young researchers with modest support for networking, overheads and certain direct costs. In other words, RTN's are very interesting combinations of the research project and the networking funding modalities. The average profile of RTN's that have received funding shows that the combination, in financial terms, boils down to something that indeed comes close to adding a network grant to a project grant *and*, to date, has a very good ratio between applications received and grants awarded (see box 3).

Box 3: Average profile of a Research Training Network funded under the 4th or 5th framework programme³¹

Number of teams	- 8
Number of Researchers	- 50 actively involved
Number of Countries	- 6
Duration	- 3.5 years
Financing	- 1.2 Meuros (150Keuro per partner)
Proportion for fellows	- 65%
Network fellows appointed	- 24 researcher years
Ratio applications/selected RTNs	- 3:1

What makes this modality even more interesting from a Metropolis point of view, is the fact that it's the only one within the social sciences area for which the national research council of one of our North-American partner countries, the US NSF, has created a *co-*

²⁹ Information from Jan Hjarno.

³⁰ For more information about the importance attached to Mobility activities, see the cordis site on the development of the sixth framework programme: <http://www.cordis.lu/rtd2002>. This site gives full-text access to all relevant preparatory documents, of the Commission and of advisory bodies. It also gives access to the official reactions of the various member states to the proposals. On this site, the development of the sixth FP can, as it were, be monitored on-line. DG Research also hosts a site on the development of FP6, publishing documents that are not always available on the Cordis site. For real monitoring both have to be checked! <http://europe.eu.int/comm/research/nfp.html>

³¹ Information received from Debbie Foy-Everett and Ross Dowsett of the Research Services Division of the University of Sussex.

*ordinated opportunity to hand in grant-supplement requests*³². Although this opportunity was only publicised at a time when the call was nearly closed (and therefore ineffective), and although it was only open to researchers or research teams who are already grant holders and want to link up with European RTN's (and is therefore quite limited), it is still very encouraging *that* the NSF was willing to launch a co-ordinated call³³. This holds promises for the successor activity within the sixth framework programme.

Also, given this precedent of *call co-ordination* between a country with a *R&D cooperation agreement with the EC*, the fact that several other Metropolis partner countries have similar agreements (Australia, Canada, South africa: in force, Argentina: conclusion under way)³⁴, is reason to be optimistic about mobility programmes becoming the first funding category that is open to Metropolis proposals - with partners from the breath of its membership - from 2002 onwards. Paragraph 3.c on the European Science Foundation also addresses this.

Until now, the calls for these RTN's have provided a total of 400 networks, across 7 areas of science, with funding. 34 of those 400 are in the area of "economic, social and human sciences". None of these 34 addresses issues of interest to Metropolis³⁵. The last call, that is going to result in grants to another 150 RTN's, generated at least one application addressing a Metropolis relevant topic, but what the actual outcome will be is not yet known. All in all, an even more *meagre portefolio* for an important area of research. Thus, the framework programme activity with the best ratio for success, and the highest average budget per grant, has been most under-utilised by the research community in the Metropolis field.

Given the fact that the Framework programmes are without doubt the best documented source of money for internationally comparative research, with numerous ways to be alerted when a call in an area of one's interest is announced, this disturbing fact signals a structural problem in the access of interested researchers to relevant information. I will address this issue in a recommendation and in annex C.

Both the Socio-Economic Research activity and RTN's are part of one the FP5's three so-called "horizontal programmes", called IHP³⁶. There is, in fact, a lot more money in its four *thematic programmes*: the quality of life, the information society, the growth, and the ecosystem programme. In theory, these programmes harbour possibilities for social scientists³⁷. EC legitimacy rhetoric about the (negligible) financial share that has been reserved for the Socio-Economic Research activity³⁸ in FP5, stresses the need

³² See: <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2001/nsf0191/nsf0191.html>

³³ Interviews with NSF officials involved (Jean Hudson and Daniel Newlon) made it absolutely clear that the willingness to co-ordinate with EC programmes has to come from the (funding organisation of the) non-EU country. The basis for co-ordination is a shared call date. Others may co-ordinate their dates with the FP dates, it will never be the other way round.

³⁴ For an overview of the current situation, see:

<http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/management/particip/v-gfpbox4.htm#BOX%204>

³⁵ See: <http://improving-rtn.sti.jrc.it/network>

³⁶ Improving Human Research Potential & the Socio-economic Knowledge base, see:

<http://www.cordis.lu/improving>

³⁷ In principle, a key-action like the "ageing population" of the Quality of Life theme, should offer plenty of opportunities for Metropolis relevant research questions. For a general feel one only has to browse through a more detailed programme overview, listing all the various priority areas defined under particular key-actions within a theme like Quality of life. See <ftp://ftp.cordis.lu/pub/focus/docs/fp5-en.pdf>

³⁸ See: <http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/budget.htm>

to mainstream the social sciences and ensure the inclusion of the social in the thematic programmes. However, all evaluations to date³⁹ show that mainstreaming has not been very successful. Furthermore, in as far as a social science perspective has entered other themes, it usually takes an auxiliary form. The present development of FP6 does not seem to change this⁴⁰.

Therefore, from the perspective of their potential for funding EACER in the Metropolis field, thematic programmes not explicitly labelled “socio-economic”, do hold few promises⁴¹.

Next to IHP programme, there is another potentially relevant horizontal programme: the “confirming the INternational role of COmmunity research” (INCO) programme, funds R&D co-operation with pre-accession states, Mediterranean partner countries, and developing countries.

At present, thematic priorities do not include Metropolis interests, but this might change in the future⁴².

Outside the framework programme two other DG Research-related programmes are of relevance to Metropolis: COST and INTAS.

COST, “COoperation in the field of Scientific and Technical research” is a framework for scientific and technical cooperation, allowing the co-ordination of national research on a European level. COST Actions consist of basic and pre-competitive research as well as activities of public utility.

However, as it is a networking programme, it does not fund research⁴³.

INTAS, “International Association for the promotion of cooperation with scientists from the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union”, is an independent association formed by the European Community, its Member States and like minded countries acting to preserve and promote the valuable scientific potential of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union (NIS) through East-West Scientific co-operation.

INTAS funds research but at present its research themes are not Metropolis relevant. This might change again in the future (in the past, the programme allow for Metropolis relevant research proposals)⁴⁴.

The EC is presently debating the form of the *sixth framework programme*⁴⁵. The current discussions are dominated by those advocating a very substantial cut in project money in favour of money for so-called “Networks of Excellence”. Were this structural change of the framework programme to happen, it would mean that the most important funding

³⁹ E.g. see: TSER 003 (1997) Five Year Assessment of the Specific Programme: Targeted Socio-economic Research (EUR 17596EN)

⁴⁰ For an overview of the proposed themes of FP6 and the accompanying budget breakdown, see: <http://www.cordis.lu/rtd2002/fp-legal/budget.htm>

⁴¹ The proposed FP6 has included the socio-economic interest for the first time as a thematic programme, called “Citizens and governance in the European knowledge-based society” but still does not allocate real money to it (2% of the actual research budget); see: <http://www.cordis.lu/rtd2002/fp-legal/budget.htm>

⁴² For more information, see: <http://www.cordis.lu/inco2/src/res-a-1.htm>

⁴³ For more information, see: <http://www.belspo.be/cost>

⁴⁴ For more information, see: <http://www.cordis.lu/intas/home.html>

⁴⁵ see the cordis site on the development of the sixth framework programme:

<http://www.cordis.lu/rtd2002> and the site of DG Research: <http://europe.eu.int/comm/research/nfp.html>

source of comparative projects, however meagre it defacto was, would dry up. On the other hand, Metropolis might benefit hugely from such a development if it would manage to become (part of) the Network(s?) of Excellence in its field. Annex D on “How to prepare successful framework proposals” will give some (sources of) tips for writing proposals.

3.b Other EU sources: budget lines and tenders

The main source of funding for research at EU level is the European Commission. The EC has one Directorate specifically in charge of research (formerly known as DG12). As described above, the programme funds of this DG are the largest source of funds for comparative work. However, they do not exhaust the money for research that is available within the Commission. Annex E on “How to keep informed about relevant EU budget lines” lists the best sources of information about the other possibilities.

Some of this money is to be found in so-called budget lines that do not fund research projects as such, but rather investments to promote a particular EC policy aim (improve employment opportunities, combat racism, etc.). Such budget lines sometimes provide opportunities for researchers to participate in (internationally comparative) action projects. Research cannot participate but as minor partner. However, funding for projects can be very substantial and research opportunities are definitely under-utilised. Participation opportunities presuppose existing strong partnership links with policy and practice actors. The most important sources here are the EQUAL and URBAN community initiatives that are part of the so-called *European Structural Funds*, and various budget lines of the DG’s Employment and Social Affairs, and Justice and Home Affairs.

However, from the perspective of a Metropolis comparative research programme, at present, these are definitely not easily accessible funds.

The above programmes have specific guidelines, clear procedures etc. Like national ministries, the EC bureaucracy has *ad hoc* “project” budgets for facilitating something that fits its objectives but does not fit into any existing grant programme. However, it is not enough to have a policy relevant proposal. As the way to access these funds is only known to (experienced) officials, proposal development only makes sense when done in close cooperation with the official concerned. The DG Research grant for a start-up year for a European arm for the International Metropolis secretariat (1997-1998) was a school example of how this works (see box 4).

Given present contacts of Metropolis with DG Justice and Home Affairs, this possibility should not be discounted.

Box 4: An EC grant towards establishing a European secretariat for Metropolis International

The one-year, non-renewable EC project grant towards establishing a European secretariat for Metropolis International was part of the FP but for activities to be conducted upon the initiative of the Commission itself. It was intended to “valorise” or interpret existing research as a resource for policy makers and practitioners. This budget can be called a “budget line” but not in the sense that it was an open or closed call for proposals. Commission officials may respond to proposals deemed supportive of particular EC objectives and having involved themselves actively in project formulation, lobby for the grant within the organisation. In this particular case the grant needed inter-directorate approval implying quite extensive lobby work for the official involved as well as numerous drafts by the originators of the proposal.

What is particular about this type of money?

- ⇒ Even if it is part of a regular programme, the programme documentation will only mention it as a budget to be used by the Directorate upon its own discretion to further particular policy objectives.
- ⇒ The outside world is not informed about criteria or procedures. *The only way to become eligible is through personal contact with and support from a programme officer.* The basic idea may come from her or him or it may come from you. Her or his advice on how to develop the idea into an application is essential.
- ⇒ Even though the idea may be yours, and the resulting project is yours, the Commission will consider it to be a contract activity aimed at furthering their objectives, and will interpret your relationship in principal-agent terms⁴⁶.

Some of this money is in *contract research budgets* that all *DG*'s have at their disposal. These budgets are used to commission studies, on the *DG*'s own initiative, to meet one of its policy objectives. The tenders for these are officially published⁴⁷, but often one's institutional or personal CV information has to be in a database of potential contractors to be eligible. It is undeniably true that sometimes quite interesting comparative research projects are contracted out through these budgets⁴⁸. However, the initiative is squarely with the respective *DG*. Sometimes some individual researcher – known to the *DG* official in charge - is commissioned to produce a design, and this is then used for a tender to select parties for the data gathering and national analyses for the various countries involved. Sometimes cross-national projects are contracted out “wholesale”, but *always* with detailed *ToR*'s.

⁴⁶ Although nearly all research grants *de jure* create principal-agent relationships, the *de facto* manifestations of such relationships cover the broad range from “grant giver enables grant seeker to do what the grant seeker considers worthwhile doing”, what one would call *subsidising*, to “grant giver hires grant seeker to do what grant giver considers worthwhile doing”, best called *(sub)contracting*. The argument made here is that from the Commission's perspective this type of money is closer to the contract than the subsidy pole of the relationship.

⁴⁷ The arrangements for funding of studies vary between *DGs*. However, a notice must be published in the *Official Journal* for contracts worth more than 12 000 euros, and a call for tender must be issued for funding above 100 000 euros. Below the 12 000 euros threshold, researchers are generally invited to submit a proposal following selection from the relevant *DG*'s database of potential contractors. See: http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/eu/discretionary_eurofunding.html

⁴⁸ A recent example would be the call for Proposals aimed at supporting the Commission's research work in the area of social affairs: http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/docs/vp2001_002_en.pdf

Besides DG's, so-called *Agencies* also have such budgets. For the field of Metropolis, three are important: The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions⁴⁹, The European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training⁵⁰, and The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia⁵¹.

Last but not least, three other bodies relevant to the Metropolis field and in charge of contract research budgets are the Institute for Prospective Technology Studies (*IPTS*)⁵², of the EC's Joint Research Centre (JRC)⁵³, the EUROpean STATistical office *EUROSTAT*⁵⁴, and the Scientific and Technological Options Assessment Unit (STOA)⁵⁵ of the European parliament⁵⁶.

ToR's of all of these contract research commissioning bodies are only available when the call is opened. Potential contractors usually have something like 6 to 8 weeks to apply.

From the perspective of a Metropolis comparative research programme, at present, these are definitely not easily accessible funds.

The table below *summarises* the above funding possibilities in terms of their current and future relevance and accessibility for a Metropolis RB programme of EACER.

I consider the "Network of Excellence" development to be the key to maximise the future potential of the sources labelled potentially relevant in the table. Being recognised by DG Research as (part of) the network(s?) combining the most relevant expertise in a particular field, seems the most plausible key to open up the contract research doors of the other possibilities.

At present it is impossible to predict the content of the expected mix between current FP style research projects, current FP style RTN's and the new (much larger) Networks of Excellence. The future of other specific programmes, like INCO, is also unclear. The appraisal below reflects the currently available information

⁴⁹ See: <http://www.eurofound.ie>

⁵⁰ See: <http://www.cedefop.eu.int>

⁵¹ See: <http://www.eumc.eu.int>

⁵² E.g. see its "Futures" project,

http://www.jrc.cec.eu.int/default.asp?sIdSz=our_organisation&sIdStSz=ipts

⁵³ JRC actually has the status of a Directorate General, and provides the scientific advice and technical know-how to support EU policies. For more information, see: <http://www.jrc.cec.eu.int/index.asp>

⁵⁴ See: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/Public/datashop/print-catalogue/EN?catalogue=Eurostat&collection=11-Calls%20for%20tenders%20and%20grants>

⁵⁵ See: http://www.europarl.eu.int/stoa/default_en.htm

⁵⁶ See: http://www.europarl.eu.int/home/default_en.htm

Table 1 Summary of EC funding possibilities in terms of their current and future relevance and accessibility for a Metropolis RB programme of EACER

Funding body/programme	Application content: Open/thematic/tender	Current Metropolis relevance & access	Potential future Metropolis relevance & access
FP Socio-Economic Research activity	Thematic	+++	++ (?)
FP Research Training Networks	Open	+++	+++
FP Networks of Excellence	Open/Thematic (?)	NA	++++
FP thematic programmes	Thematic	+	+
FP INCO	Thematic	-	++ (?)
COST	Open	-	-
INTAS	Thematic	-	++
Structural Funds Community initiatives & other Action programmes	Thematic	+	+
DG contract research	Tender	+	+++
Ad Hoc budgets	Open	+	+++
Agency contract research	Tender	+	+++
IPTS, Eurostat and STOA contract research	Tender	+	+++

3.c European Science Foundation

The European Science Foundation (ESF) is an association of national research councils, royal academies, and related organisations, that has as its aim to act as a catalyst for the development of science by bringing together leading scientists and research funding agencies to debate, plan and implement pan-European initiatives⁵⁷.

The ESF's activities in the social sciences are directed and managed by the Standing Committee for the Social Sciences (SCSS) which promotes European collaborative research, and acts as an important forum for identifying and financing multilateral basic research programmes in the social sciences⁵⁸. This is done through research programmes, funded on an a la carte basis by participating member organisations, networks, conferences and workshops. For the network modality, ESF has guidelines on how to go about establishing one⁵⁹, for *research programmes* such guidance does not exist. Pressure for co-operation comes from a variety of sources. In many cases, the scientific proposals considered by the SCSS emanate “bottom-up” from scientists. In other cases they may come from Member Organisations and reflect “top-down” national priorities. In both instances the Foundation will support the proposals provided they satisfy the main criteria of scientific excellence and European added value. An interesting example of a Social Sciences programme was the Blueprint for a European Social Survey (ESS)⁶⁰.

Good contacts and guidance at the level of your national research council are a prerequisite for any effort in this direction.

⁵⁷ See: <http://www.esf.org/about/about.htm>

⁵⁸ See: <http://www.esf.org/social/social.htm>

⁵⁹ See: http://esf.esf.org/networks/net_preparation.htm

⁶⁰ See: <http://www.esf.org/social/sp/ESS/ESSa.htm>

However, since last year, the ESF has a research programme funding modality that *has* guidelines and procedures: The *EUROCORES* (ESF Collaborative Research Programmes) is a new instrument, which is designed to provide an effective and efficient collaboration mechanism at a multinational level within Europe and to mobilise national funding in basic research to tackle issues that have European-wide relevance and are, preferably, multi-disciplinary. Participating ESF Member Organisations jointly agree on a research programme, specify the Call for Proposals and peer review the applications, with funding decisions residing with participating national bodies. ESF acts as a catalyst by offering its administrative support and project management by networking scientists involved in the programmes. One of the 7 possible topics suggested at the outset was “comparative studies in the social sciences”. The aim is to initiate several (sic) *EUROCORES* within each year.

European Collaborative Research Project proposals submitted under the scheme will compete for funds in each national funding body alongside projects with a national focus. Responsibility for decision-making and financing of the projects will rest at the national level. The scheme represents a co-operative approach amongst national funding bodies towards the financing of international research. A co-ordinated system of decision-making has been put in place concerning deadlines for applications, peer review and consultation between participating national funding bodies. The operational arrangements of the scheme will vary from country to country reflecting the different procedures concerning research grant applications and financing.

The first call has just closed. In this first call, at least⁶¹ one group of researchers handed in a Metropolis relevant application. It has a very policy relevant but quite circumscribed topic: human smuggling and trafficking in migrants. Box 5 describes this programme and its history in more detail. The next two calls will close on the first of June 2002 and 2003. It is evidently clear that chances of success⁶² will be greater if the national contact persons are closely involved with proposal preparation from the start, i.e. can be in contact with each other already before the application is actually handed in, etc.

*This opportunity cannot do without guidance from the relevant officials of your national research council⁶³ and the others envisioned to co-fund the proposal. Annex F provides additional factual information about the *EUROCORES* programme.*

Given the limited number of programmes that will be initiated across all fields of science this exercise at co-ordinating the funding of national research councils does not seem to be the panacea for the lack of funding opportunities for proper comparative work in the Metropolis field.

⁶¹ There might be more Metropolis relevant proposals than the one I happen to know of.

⁶² That is to say, *given* a scientifically sound proposal idea *and* a plausible argument for European added value.

⁶³ See: <http://www.esf.org/social/EuroResearch/EuroResearch2.htm>

Box 5: a EUROCORES application on Human smuggling and trafficking in migrants⁶⁴

A group of six institutes⁶⁵, several of them part of the Metropolis community, submitted a EUROCORES proposal on *Human smuggling and trafficking in migrants: types, origins, and dynamics in a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective*:

IMES (Amsterdam), EFMS (Bamberg), Centro Studi di Politica Internazionale (Rome), ÖFM/ICMPD (Vienna), Instituto Universitario de Estudios sobre Migraciones (Madrid), and SFM (Neuchâtel)⁶⁶.

The objective of the programme is to study the complex nature of the phenomenon of illegal migration and human smuggling. The consensus on it having become a mass phenomenon⁶⁷, the lack of control over migration flows, both in the perception of political decision makers and in the eyes of the public, and the interwovenness of smuggling practices and restrictive admission policies, make the fundamental lack of hard evidence relating to most aspects of the problem, let alone systematic transnational evidence, hard to bear. By linking more differentiated and sophisticated perspectives in migration theory with systematic empirical research, including both the collection of primary data and the analysis of secondary data, the programme intends to fill the present evidence vacuum.

Each partner is in charge of a national project, some of which involve more than one researcher (e.g. one PhD student and one Postdoc).

The core group of partners in this programme know each other for quite some time, and have collaborated on other comparative projects in the past, or do so at present. This particular proposal has been in the air since 1997. Both comparative (UK-NL) and single country (NL) variants have been submitted to various funders (ESRC, the Dutch national research council, the Falcone programme of DG Justice and Home Affairs⁶⁸, the Dutch Ministry of Justice) and never made it, policy relevance always losing out to political expediency.

If the genesis of this proposal has any major lessons to teach, these are lessons that are encountered throughout this report:

- ⇒ One's network and proposal outline has to be in place before a call for proposals is up. Without that much in place, time between the opening and closing of the call is too short to develop a potentially successful application;
- ⇒ Stamina pays off.

⁶⁴ Information provided by the proposed co-ordinator of the programme: Jeroen Doomernik (IMES)

⁶⁵ Because of time constraints during the proposal preparation the envisioned 7th partner (UK: MRU/UCL, London) could not join.

⁶⁶ The Swiss partner is not part of the EUROCORES application, but has been invited by the Swiss National Science Foundation to submit their part of the programme to an administrative agency of the Confederation.

⁶⁷ E.g. Salt, J. (2000) *Migrant trafficking and human smuggling in Europe. A review of the evidence with case studies from Hungary, Poland and Ukraine*. Geneva: IOM.

⁶⁸ See: http://europa.eu.int/comm/justice_home/project/falcone_en.htm

However, were the European Metropolis (research) partners to succeed in getting an EUROCORES proposal funded, especially if it is on a broader theme and would consist of national sub-programmes rather than projects, this would indeed be a very substantial core for a Metropolis RB programme of EACER. On top of that, the fact alone that this co-ordinating scheme exists is very much good news. It shows that it can be done, and I'm sure that others will follow. The argument above, about the importance of the NSF linking itself to the FP5 RTN scheme applies here too. And, in as far as the Metropolis proposal would convincingly profit from non-European (Canada, US, etc.) participation, the ESF would certainly be open to linkage arrangements with the relevant non-European research councils. See also 3.e National research councils and governments.

At this moment, it is unclear if EUROCORES is envisioned to replace the existing, less structured research programme modalities.

3.d Other international organisations

International organisations sometimes commission proper international comparisons. Usually, both the initiative for comparative work, and the projects' ToR are internally generated. Organisations that off and on fund comparative work of interest to Metropolis are:

- ⇒ The *Council of Europe*⁶⁹, an intergovernmental organisation with a strong human rights focus, has several institutions that contract out comparative projects with relevance to Metropolis: The European Commission against Racism and Inequality (ECRI)⁷⁰, and a Committee for Social Cohesion⁷¹. Most projects have a legal orientation, are based on secondary material and are conducted on small budgets. The council tends to approach experts already known to its staff, which means that researchers/organisations that do contract work for the Council belong to an incrowd.
- ⇒ The *ILO*'s international migration section⁷² initiates comparative research projects, contracting out design, data gathering etc. to outside consultants.
- ⇒ The *OECD*'s Migration section (part of the Directorate for Education, Employment, Labour and Social affairs)⁷³ co-ordinates the SOPEMI network and produces a yearly report that outlines recent developments with respect to migration movements and policies in their countries, including analyses of the immigrant population and its role in the labour market. The network consist of experts on migration from Member countries and selected non-member countries who are all responsible for their own funding.

⁶⁹ See: [http://www.coe.int/portal.asp?strScreenType=100&L=E&M=\\$t/1-1-1-1/EMB1.asp](http://www.coe.int/portal.asp?strScreenType=100&L=E&M=$t/1-1-1-1/EMB1.asp)

⁷⁰ See: <http://www.ecri.coe.int/en/sommaire.htm>

⁷¹ See: http://social.coe.int/default_en.htm

⁷² See: <http://www.ilo.int/public/english/protection/migrant>

⁷³ See: <http://www.oecd.org/els/migration/about.htm>

- ⇒ The *UNESCO* has the Management of Social transformations Programme (MOST)⁷⁴, designed to promote international comparative social science research. Its primary emphasis is on supporting large-scale, long-term autonomous research and to transfer the relevant findings and data to decision-makers. It does this by providing *networking* money. Through National UNESCO Commissions network partners can apply for Participation programme grants; but these subsidies normally do not go beyond US \$10,000/grant⁷⁵.
- ⇒ The *NATO* supports a variety of activities that promote communication and coordination between NATO member nations and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. These activities include conferences and study institutes, among others. None of its current programmes are in the Metropolis area of interest⁷⁶

The conclusion is that one has to look elsewhere for funding possibilities for a Metropolis programme of EACER.

3.e National research councils and governments

National research councils and governments have by definition a national focus. Research council funding conditions are explicit about this.

- ⇒ The Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's (SSHRC) programme information entry page starts off with "Only Canadian citizens or permanent residents of Canada may apply for and receive SSHRC funding"⁷⁷.
- ⇒ The UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) "responsive mode schemes (Research Grants, Research Seminars, ROPAs and Fellowships under the Research Grants Board) are open to the following: UK universities; colleges of higher education; independent institutes approved by the ESRC"⁷⁸.
- ⇒ The German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschafts (DFG) eligibility criterium is: "Antragsberechtigt ist jeder Wissenschaftler, der seinen Wohnsitz und seine Arbeitsstelle nicht nur vorübergehend in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland hat. Deutsche, die ihren Wohnsitz im Ausland haben, können nur ausnahmsweise Beihilfen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft erhalten"⁷⁹.

And this can be repeated for all similar bodies. However, it does not exclude all possibilities for foreign collaboration:

- ⇒ All national research councils have schemes for networking money. It does not fund EACER, but it does permit projects funded nationally to link up through face-to-face meetings. Often specific programmes funded by national research councils include the possibility to fund international collaboration. For collaboration with researchers in developing countries there are usually specific programmes.

⁷⁴ See: <http://www.unesco.org/most>

⁷⁵ For an English language description of this programme, see: <http://www.unesco.org.uk/355.htm> ; for a list of websites of National Unesco Commissions, see: <http://www.unesco.org/ncp/natcom/pages/resources.html>

⁷⁶ See: <http://www.nato.int/science>

⁷⁷ See: <http://www.sshrc.ca/english/programinfo/gateway.htm>

⁷⁸ See: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/resfund.htm>

⁷⁹ See: <http://www.dfg.de/aufgaben/antragstellung.html>

- The SSHRC has the Canada in the World Grants programme⁸⁰.
- The Dutch national research council (NWO) has the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO)⁸¹.
- The French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) has its Programme International de Coopération Scientifique (PICS)⁸².

⇒ But also nationally oriented programmes have sometimes collaborative possibilities built into them.

- The SSHRC's strategic programme "Exploring Social Cohesion in a Globalizing Era" allows for covering travelling and subsistence costs of foreign collaborators: "SSHRC does not cover any costs incurred in the conduct of research or research-related activity by research collaborators (but some travel and subsistence costs may be claimed)"⁸³
- The ESRC's funding conditions allow for the hiring of foreign researchers creating an administrative opening for funding EACER: "There is no barrier to the recruitment of research staff from overseas, providing that they have permission to work in the United Kingdom". Particular programmes, with explicit comparative objectives, like the Transnational communities programme, also allow for substantial subcontracting arrangements, to enable research to be done in country X without the researcher having to become a staff member of the UK institution that receives the grant⁸⁴

⇒ National funding organisations also have bi-lateral collaborative agreements; Box 6 gives some directions.

⁸⁰ See: <http://www.sshrc.ca/english/programinfo/grantsguide/idrc.htm>

⁸¹ See: <http://www.nwo.nl/english/wotro>

⁸² See: <http://www.cnrs.fr/DRI/AOffres/PICS2001.htm>

⁸³ See: <http://www.sshrc.ca/english/programinfo/grantsguide/definitions.htm#rc>

⁸⁴ See: <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk>

Box 6: bi-lateral collaborative agreements

National funding organisations have bi-lateral collaborative agreements, most of which are for exchanges, fellowships, conference organisation, etc. They are therefore no solution to the funding of EACER problem. However, being aware of these schemes does help when going for piece-meal funding of comparative work or studies on a less ambitious scale.

To give a feel for what is available, take a couple of German examples:

- ⇒ For co-operation with North America (US and Canada) the German-American Academic Council foundation (GAAC) has all kinds of funding modalities; see www.gaac.org
- ⇒ For co-operation between the US and Germany (and Europe in general) the German Marshall Fund of the United States is an interesting organisation. See: <http://www.gmfus.org/Apps/GMF/GMFUSWebwelcome.nsf/GMF?OpenFrameset> ;
- ⇒ For collaboration between Germany and the UK, the Anglo-German Foundation for the study of Industrial Society offers opportunities: <http://www.agf.org.uk>

The German Marshall fund has a links page on organizations with *transatlantic programs* giving access to the above and other potential sources for bilateral funding: click on “transatlantic resources” on their webpage.

Websites to check for locating these bi-lateral resources are those of national research councils, Royal Academies and Ministries of Education and Science. Some examples:

- ⇒ The Direction des Relations International (DRI) of the French CNRS has a database that contains all schemes available listed per country: <http://www.cnrs.fr/DRI/index.html>
- ⇒ All about the international co-operation of the German DFG is accessible at: <http://www.dfg.de/english/coop>
- ⇒ The UK’s ESRC schemes are at: <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/international/inter.htm>
- ⇒ The US NSF international programmes are to be found at: <http://www.nsf.gov/home/int> ; for Europe the NSF has an office in Paris with its own website that gives user-friendly information about US-European co-operation: <http://www.nsf.gov/home/int/europe/index.htm>
- ⇒ The Canadian SSHRC is an exception, only offering a links page to its constituency of researchers. The easiest way to get a bilateral agreements between country X and Canada is therefore to start with country X and look for Canada. Some schemes linking Canada to the outside world are:
 - The exchange programmes of The Royal Society of Canada, the Canadian Academy of the Sciences and Humanities: http://www.rsc.ca/english/programs_relations.html
 - The US-Canadian Fulbright programme: www.usembassycanada.gov/content/content.asp?section=fulbright&document=foundation

The issue of *call co-ordination* is going to be a difficult one for a long time to come. National research councils are very bureaucratic organisations, not in the least because their role presupposes procedural integrity, accountability, efficiency, etc. One cannot blame them for being less than enthusiastic to change proven procedures that are known in the field. There *are* differences in the extent that research councils are open to the issue of call co-ordination. Within Europe, the councils of the North-Western countries are more easy going about the issue than those of the Southern and Eastern countries. In North-America, the NSF is more easy-going than the SSHRC.

The EUROCORES programme is a major step. Participating research councils *and* others (NSF) consider it an important test case. The sixth Framework programme has co-ordination of national research efforts high on its agenda too. Both developments strengthen each other because pushing for cross-national co-ordination is a win-win strategy for both the European Science Foundation and DG Research. *The* way for the ESF to obtain more influence on EC science policy is to make sure it takes the lead in this effort. And *the* way for DG Research to really acquire European-wide decision-making powers is through getting a hold on the programming of national research funds.

As with other policy developments, once it is done somewhere, and shown to be viable, others will follow, even if only because they will now have to legitimise a refusal to think about this instrument; obviously, call co-ordination presupposes a shared programme interest. As migration and integration issues, are and will be interests shared by most research councils, it is going to be increasingly difficult to stay clear from call co-ordination.

In pragmatic terms, the “easiest” way forward is for European Metropolis partners to go for a major EUROCORES application and for non-European partners (US, Canada,) to simultaneously go for co-funding from their national research council. This would give these non-European councils an opportunity for try-out, especially if the applicants would not stress co-ordination of dates too much and would accept a difference of a couple of months.

Obviously, national governments, i.c. ministries, have an explicitly national focus in most of their research contracts. The importance of international comparison, or benchmarking as it is often called in the policy arena, sometimes makes for projects with a comparative objective. Most of these do not involve foreign collaborators⁸⁵. But sometimes they do, as the Waldrauch et.al. Integration-index study mentioned earlier⁸⁶ shows.

The conclusion is that both national research councils and ministries are aware of the potential of international comparison⁸⁷ but have, apart from EUROCORES, no real facilities for Metropolis relevant EACER. However, Metropolis could become a platform for discussing co-funding arrangements by ministries. This thought is further developed as recommendation 4.d “Establishing common research needs amongst Metropolis’ governmental partners and facilitate the establishment of co-funding arrangements”.

⁸⁵ A Dutch example: National Urban Policy in the European Union, See <http://www.minbzk.nl/international/documents/pub64.htm>

⁸⁶ See paragraph 2 “Lack of cross-national empirical research”

⁸⁷ Obviously, for national research councils, EUROCORES is the best indicator for this awareness.

3.f Cooperation between Metropolis countries and other areas

There are funding possibilities that are beyond the ToR of this report as such, but nevertheless worth mentioning:

- ⇒ Collaboration with *Eastern Europe and the Countries Of the former Sovjet union (COS)* is in a league of its own. Although the current state of affairs is way below the level of the initial hausse of programmes that followed the disappearance of the Iron Curtain, there are still lots of specific programmes (of national research councils, foundations) that focus on this part of the world.
- ⇒ The same applies to collaboration with *developing countries*. The possibilities for EACER funding are a lot better if one's partners are in the "South". Major international funders like, the Andrew Mellon, Ford and Bill Gates foundations, very much define their grant programmes in these terms. A look at the funders of current projects of a *European* institution with a developing countries' focus like the Oxford University Refugee Studies Centre, is revealing⁸⁸: Andrew W Mellon Foundation, Save the Children Sweden (Rädda Barnen), UNICEF ROSA, John D and Catherine T MacArthur Foundation. See box 11 for more information.
- ⇒ A *regional focus*, like Asia, or the Americas, opens up specific Japanese and US possibilities. Take for example the funding portfolio of the UNESCO-MOST Asia Pacific Migration Research Network that includes sponsors like the Ford foundation (because of its developing countries' interest, but also the Japan foundation (formerly known as the Sasakawa foundation)⁸⁹.
- ⇒ An *interregional focus* – comparable to the transatlantic collaboration addressed in Box 5. An example would be the collaboration between Europe and Asia. Although not yet succesful, the Programme for Europe-Asia Research Linkages (PEARL)⁹⁰ network is trying to arrange for EACER funding possibilities.

⁸⁸ See: <http://www.qeh.ox.ac.uk/rsp/indexrsp.html>

⁸⁹ See: <http://www.unesco.org/most/apmrn.htm> and <http://www.uow.edu.au/research/centres/capstrans/apmrn/apmrn.html>

⁹⁰ see <http://www.iias.nl/iias/pearl/proposal.html> and <http://iias.leidenuniv.nl/iiasn/22/general/22G1.html>

3.g Foundations

3.g.1 Introduction

Foundations are expected to be the undiscovered source for EACER funding, but turn out to be no less difficult to tap than other possibilities. There is only a limited number of foundations that fund social science research, even less that allow for cross-national/international research projects, and hardly any of those with programmes in the Metropolis field of interest. Staying updated on national research council options is not difficult for an individual researcher, the EC programmes are already in a different ball park, staying in touch with wider EC possibilities requires institutional support, and the world of foundations is impossible to monitor without someone in your organisation having that in her task description. This issue is explicitly addressed in one of the report's recommendations.

This section is accompanied by three annexes: Annex G contains a "Directory of potentially EACER relevant foundations", Annex J lists "Sources of information on foundations", and Annex I provides guidance on "How to prepare successful funding proposals".

3.g.2 Bilateral comparisons

If one is after bilateral comparisons there are opportunities in the foundation world. Some of these were already described in paragraph 3.e (national research councils and governments): the German Marshall fund and the German-American Academic Council Foundation for US-German comparisons, and the Anglo-German Foundation for UK-German comparisons. Another one, well-known in Metropolis circles, is the Luso-American Development Foundation that allows for US-Portuguese collaborations⁹¹. Obviously not all of these bilateral foundations fund research, e.g. the Fench-American foundation.

What makes the ones that do interesting is that their bilateral orientation does not necessarily mean that their mission is limited to this. E.g. the mission of the German Marshall Fund of the United States is to stimulate the exchange of ideas and promote co-operation between the United States and *Europe*. Box 7 describes the results of longer-term collaboration between a group of researchers and this foundation.

Box 7: From bi-lateral dialogue to a multilateral project

The *Migration Dialogue*, initiated by Philip Martin of the University of California Davis, together with others like Roger Waldinger (UCLA) started with organising seminars in 1994⁹². This happened within an institutional context that had a comparative mission, and matching funds: Martin's Comparative Immigration and Integration Program (CIIP) is funded by the Center for German and European Studies (CGES) with funds from a 10-year grant from the German government to promote German and European studies⁹³. Early 1995, they organised a workshop on Recent Immigration Developments in Germany: Lessons and Implications for the US, co-funded by the Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung, enabling the participation of German colleagues⁹⁴.

⁹¹ See: <http://www.flad.pt>

⁹² See: <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/index.html>

⁹³ See: http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/oct1994_ciip.html

⁹⁴ See: http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/mar1995_ciip.html

This co-operation was continued and with additional funds from the German American Academic Council in 1997-98 more workshops in Germany and California were held⁹⁵. The bilateral contacts developed into a proposal for a series of conferences on migration issues, successfully submitted to and co-funded by the German Marshall fund and the Bertelsmann Stiftung. This *Transatlantic Learning Community* project ran from 1998-2000 and sought best practice ways to manage immigration, promote immigrant integration, and foster relations with sending and transit countries⁹⁶. Out of the final conference of this project grew a follow-up proposal for the *Cooperative Efforts to Manage Emigration* (CEME) project⁹⁷, that got support from the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The project aims to examine ways in which immigration destinations can work more effectively with source and transit countries to co-ordinate movements and reduce emigration pressures. CEME seeks models and best practices for:

- ⇒ spurring economic development and democratization/respect for human rights in the countries of origin, with special focus on programs targeted at specific communities and population groups with large numbers of actual and potential migrants;
- ⇒ ways in which migrants in destination countries can work with their communities of origin to reduce emigration pressures, by e.g. strengthening programs that match remittances with other funds to speed up job-creating development; and
- ⇒ promoting co-operation between countries of origin, transit and destination during the transition period.

The *co-chairs* are Philip Martin, University of California, Davis, Susan Martin, Georgetown University, Thomas Straubhaar, HWWA-Hamburgisches Welt-Wirtschafts-Archiv, and Patrick Weil, University of Paris1-Sorbonne.

The proposed activities include:

- ⇒ *Research and options papers*. The co-chairs of CEME will investigate the mechanisms available to reduce emigration pressures, ranging from large-scale aid, trade and investment programs to remittances and micro-enterprise development. They will also look at the various mechanisms introduced to stimulate greater cooperation in management of migration. They will summarize the findings of the most recent research in this area, some of which the co-chairs have themselves conducted.
- ⇒ *Site Visits*. The site visits are the principal activity of CEME. They enable CEME members to do fact-finding and reach consensus on effective practices. Six site visits between 2000 and 2002, are proposed, with one of the site visits held in conjunction with Migration Dialogue and including all CEME members. The other site visits will involve smaller teams, of no more than 8 members each.
- ⇒ *Commissioned Expert Papers*. CEME anticipates commissioning expert papers to highlight developments in specific countries or with respect to specific mechanisms to reduce emigration pressures and promote co-operation in managing migration.

The above shows that having stamina and patience, and building active networks, helps in getting support from funders. Although none of the above qualifies as EACER, it does show that network funding can develop into the funding of follow-up projects with more research content. The funders were already thoroughly familiar with the network: the German Marshall Fund was one of the donors of the Transatlantic Learning Community. And the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation supported one of Migration dialogue's institutional partners, the University of California San Diego's Center for Comparative Immigration Studies⁹⁸.

⁹⁵ See: http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/oct1999_ciip.html

⁹⁶ See: <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/index3.html>

⁹⁷ See: <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/ceme/index.html>

⁹⁸ See: http://migration.ucdavis.edu/cmpr/feb2001_ciip.html

3.g.3 Multi-country comparisons

Major foundations may occasionally fund proper comparative work. However, in terms of concrete examples, I have only come across one example of funding of proper multi-country comparative work in our field of interest: a four country comparison on the relationship between national civic culture and minority identifications, financed by the Volkswagen Stiftung, and described in box 1. The example in box 7 does not really qualify as EACER. The foundations that may hold promise are listed in Annex G: Directory of potentially EACER relevant foundations.

The number of foundations that have *priority areas* and funding criteria that *might* allow for applications for EACER in Metropolis relevant areas is very limited:

- ⇒ The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- ⇒ The Volkswagenstiftung
- ⇒ The German Marshall Fund of the United States
- ⇒ The Nippon Foundation

The list of foundations with relevant *current programmes* is even shorter:

- ⇒ The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- ⇒ The Volkswagenstiftung

Luckily, the universe of potentially relevant foundation is larger and includes, amongst others, foundations that are part of “formalised” networks of foundations that have co-funding of (research) projects as one of their objectives, and/or are already part of a larger Metropolis relevant co-funding project arrangement.

Nearly all of the success-factors mentioned in the Volkswagenstiftung box will apply to other potential sources:

- ⇒ The proposal has to fit one of the foundation’s priority areas;
- ⇒ The proposal has to include a partner from the country X where the foundation is located; this partner has to be a proper participant, in practice even a co-initiator of the project, not just a window-dressing addition to the project;
- ⇒ The partner from country X has to be a well-known and well-connected professor. Her being familiar with the secretary general and/or members of the board of governors (or whatever the designations may be) helps;
- ⇒ Contact (of the partner from country X) with and feedback from the programme officer during proposal preparation ensures the best possible fit between proposal characteristics and the foundation’s criteria.

All in all, the best way to describe the current situation is that there is no big difference between the problem of seeking EACER funding from *one foundation* and seeking funding through *co-funding arrangements*. In both cases, the issue at stake is more comparable to a lobby, than to straightforward grantseeking. The issue of lobbying for co-funding arrangements is addressed in more detail in paragraph 4.b.3 on “lobbying foundations to establish research co-funding arrangements”.

The above means that the advice contained in Box 10 on “what can be accomplished, at what level, by whom, with what means?” about the kind of qualifications one would hope the person approaching a network of foundations to have, also applies to those approaching a single foundation for EACER funding. It has to be someone who:

- ⇒ Has an impeccable academic reputation, *and*
- ⇒ Is well known in and with the world of foundations, *and*
- ⇒ Knows at least some of the relevant decision makers personally.

Given this state of affairs, and the fact that “grant makers like to partner on a project (if you have one grant maker willing to invest in your project, it's likely you can attract more)”⁹⁹ plain common sense dictates that:

- ⇒ in general, aiming at co-funding arrangements is the best strategy,
 - ⇒ unless one of the EACER project partners has preferential access to the executive of a particular foundation (that is able to make sufficiently large grants)
- In practice, the second option, might end up as a co-funding arrangement too.

3.g.4 Corporate funders

Foundations can be classified according to various criteria: their sources of income, the kinds of programmes they fund and/or run, the legal status they hold, etc. Many of these classifications overlap¹⁰⁰. From a pragmatic point of view it is important to realise that databases of funder profiles and programmes often hold foundations of a certain kind.

E.g. the Foundation Center has *different* databases for¹⁰¹:

- ⇒ *Private foundations*: non-governmental, nonprofit organizations with an endowment (usually donated from a single source, such as an individual, family, or corporation) and program managed by its own trustees or directors. Private foundations are established to maintain or aid social, educational, religious, or other charitable activities serving the common welfare, primarily through the making of grants.
- ⇒ *Corporate grantmakers*: including both company-sponsored foundations and corporate giving programs. A company-sponsored foundation (also referred to as a corporate foundation) is a private foundation whose assets are derived primarily from the contributions of a for-profit business. While a company-sponsored foundation may maintain close ties with its parent company, it is an independent organization with its own endowment and as such is subject to the same rules and regulations as other private foundations. Corporate giving programs are grantmaking programs established and administered within a for-profit business organization. Some companies make charitable contributions through both a corporate giving program and a company-sponsored foundation.
- ⇒ *Grantmaking Public charities*: public foundations are non-governmental public charities that operate grants programs benefiting unrelated organizations or individuals as one of their primary purposes. There is no legal definition of a public foundation, but such a designation is needed to encompass the growing number of grantmaking institutions that are “not a private foundation.”
- ⇒ *Community Foundations*: organizations that make grants for charitable purposes in a specific community or region. The funds available to a community foundation are usually derived from many donors and held in an endowment that is independently administered; income earned by the endowment is then used to make grants. Although a community foundation may legally be classified as a private foundation, most are classified as public charities and are thus eligible for maximum tax-deductible contributions from the general public.

⁹⁹ E.g. see: <http://www.polarisgrantscentral.net/tips.html> ; this “tips and hints” type of practical advice is substantiated by both the increase in self-initiated collaborative arrangements between foundations (see paragraph 3.g.6) and by an analysis of trends in international grantmaking by the Foundation Center in cooperation with the Council on Foundations , see (2000) *International Grantmaking II. An Update on U.S. Foundation Trends*, p. xxi, and 9-11.

¹⁰⁰ For a glossary of foundation terms see: http://fdncenter.org/learn/ufg/ufg_gloss1.html

¹⁰¹ See: <http://fdncenter.org/funders/grantmaker/index.html>

This means that information about all of them is equally easy or difficult to find. Therefore, a sometimes expressed expectation or hope that corporate foundations are the real hidden source is unfounded.

3.g.5 Current limitations and hindrances

In general the following important caveats can be made against premature optimism about foundations as the panacea for the lack of funding opportunities for proper comparative work:

- ⇒ *Most foundations are not primarily research focussed.* That is to say that many wealthy foundations with “Metropolis” areas of interest are primarily action-oriented and whatever research they are willing to fund has to be very applied. Information from association type entities like the European Foundation Centre in Brussel suggests that the current universal emphasis on accountability is forcing more and more foundations into the whatever-we-fund-must-show-immediate-practical-results-mode;
- ⇒ Amongst the research oriented foundations, *none has internationally comparative research as its main focus*, let alone, internationally comparative work within the Metropolis field of interest;
- ⇒ Most foundations have *circumscribed areas of interest*. It only makes sense to apply for funding when the proposal suits the mission of the foundation. Furthermore, the areas of interest are usually further specified in terms of programmes that have one or two calls. Often, one therefore only knows if a particular topic fits the profile of a foundation within the relatively short period between the publishing and closing date of a call;
- ⇒ Furthermore, most foundations are *nationally oriented*. This is not an “attitudinal” restriction but a material one: most only fund research by applicants institutionally based in their country of operation, thereby excluding the possibility of collaborative projects by individuals/teams institutionally based in different countries. Exceptions to this rule are foundations with an explicit international orientation, *but* in general this means an *orientation towards developing countries* that lack basic academic infrastructure (prominent examples are the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation), or *Central and Eastern Europe* (a prominent example being the Soros Foundation). This normally excludes funding for partners outside their geographical focus.
- ⇒ Most foundations work with programmes that have a limited period during which one can apply, often only one call. The basic problem with this is *keeping oneself informed*. Anyone familiar with the EC framework programmes – and if there is any funding source well-documented, with numerous ways to be alerted in case a call in an area of one’s interest is announced, it is the framework programme! – will agree with the statement that being informed about a realistic funding opportunity *in time* to be able to put together an application, is quite time-consuming in itself.

University research support offices concentrate their liaison efforts on the major funding sources. In practice, in Europe, this means that they focus on national research councils and the EC framework programme. US/Canadian research support offices offer subscription-based access to funding databases. Some European universities, especially in the UK, offer the same. However, these databases are not geared towards searching for EACER type research (see annex H). Apart from this general tool, on either side of the Atlantic only information on a couple of big research oriented foundations is readily available through support offices. These are either exclusively nationally oriented (f.e. the largest UK research foundation Nuffield) or only fund non-Metropolis relevant research (f.e. the Wellcome trust: only biomedical research).

Because of the above, any overview of foundation funding opportunities in the Metropolis area of interest will become outdated very quickly. Staying updated on national research council options is not difficult for an individual researcher, the EC programmes are already in a different ball park, staying in touch with wider EC possibilities ask for institutional support, and the world of foundations is impossible to monitor without the someone in your organisation having that in her task description. This issue is explicitly addressed in one of the report's recommendations.

3.g.6 Encouraging developments

Foundations have become aware of the negative consequences that result from the absence of (international) *co-ordination between foundations*. The European Foundation Centre has several platforms with information exchange and co-ordination objectives but only one of these has actually reached the stage of co-ordinated funding activities. Box 8 describes the liaison between the Association for Innovative Cooperation in Europe (AICE) and the Ethnobarometer project.

Last autumn the Carnegie Foundation called a meeting of CEO's of the major foundations and foundation networks worldwide to discuss future collaboration. At this meeting inter-foundation funding co-ordination was an issue on the agenda, but one can only interpret this as the first stages of a process that will undoubtedly take more time before making a real impact.

The following EFC co-ordinated networks are clearly relevant¹⁰²:

- ⇒ *The Association for Innovative Cooperation in Europe (AICE)*¹⁰³: a non-profit making organisation which focuses upon strengthening the co-operation between foundations, associations, voluntary bodies and other non-governmental organisations in Europe. In particular, it aims to act as a launching pad for new initiatives linking major European foundations, focusing on projects which place the emphasis on innovative approaches in the social and the political fields. See box 8.
- ⇒ *Trans-Atlantic Donors Dialogue (TADD)*: helps build bridges between European and US private and public donors who actively support and promote the development of people-to-people links and the strengthening civil society on both sides of the Atlantic. The TADD is led by the Luso-American Development Foundation of Portugal and the German Marshall Fund of the United States. Last

¹⁰² It is important to realise that the EFC has non-European members too. To name the most important ones: the Ford foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers fund, the Charles Steward Mott foundation, The American Express foundation, the Japan Foundation. Also, the EFC and the FC have close working relationships. Therefore, the EFC foundation networks reflect the relevant current activity in the area of inter-foundation co-ordination.

¹⁰³ See: <http://www.efc.be/aice>

March TADD organised a transatlantic donor forum on migration, integration and asylum.

⇒ *The Minorities and Multiculturalism Interest Group*,¹⁰⁴ the mission of which is to work towards improving the quality of life for minorities and reducing ethnic-based discrimination and conflict. Their programme objectives include:

- Development of joint funding projects;
- Seeking solutions to specific questions amongst independent funders and with relevant partners (Soros Foundations, EFC Funding East, the Carpathian Foundation, the Roma Pakiv Fund, Vienna Institute, Ethnobarometer, European Bureau of Lesser Used Languages)

These are the obvious targets if one thinks about a Metropolis lobby for co-funding arrangements. This theme is further developed as a recommendation in 4.b.2 “lobbying foundations to establish research co-funding arrangements”.

Other EFC coordinated networks include:

⇒ *The Trans-Mediterranean Civil Society Dialogue*¹⁰⁵ (TMCD) is a platform on which to build mutual understanding and co-operation as a basis for practical initiatives and projects in the Greater Mediterranean Region;

⇒ *The Grantmakers East Group*¹⁰⁶, the mission of which is to promote the development of civil society in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and the Newly Independent States (NIS);

⇒ The *Europe-Asia Civil Society Dialogue*¹⁰⁷, spearheaded by Fundação Oriente, sets out to map, network, convene and promote civil society exchanges between Europe and Asia.

One can imagine EACER proposals that would make these networks the possible doors for a lobby, but given three much more appropriate starting points, this seems unlikely.

¹⁰⁴ See: <http://www.efc.be/projects/minorities>

¹⁰⁵ See: <http://www.efc.be/projects/tmcd/index.asp>

¹⁰⁶ See: <http://www.efc.be/projects/GEG/geg.htm>

¹⁰⁷ See: <http://www.efc.be/projects/eacs/index.htm>

Box 8: AICE and the Ethnobarometer project¹⁰⁸

Ethnobarometer is a network of social scientists and experts providing independent reports on inter-ethnic relations and migration flows in Europe. It aims to monitor events, highlight areas of tension and identify relevant topics for further inquiry.

The project was promoted by the CSS, Consiglio Italiano per le Scienze Sociali (Italy). It started operating in December 1997. In 1998-99 its programme was developed as a joint venture between CSS and CEMES, Centre for European Migration and Ethnic Studies (UK). It has now been set up as a separate, distinct non profit entity. Participation in the network is open to all interested centres and individual scholars. Participation does not entail any financial obligation. Members must agree to exchange information on their research priorities, current projects and other information relevant to scholars working on interethnic relations and migration issues.

The objectives of Ethnobarometer are:

- ⇒ To monitor migration flows and interethnic relations in Europe, where these are taken to include human rights violations and expressions of racism and xenophobia
- ⇒ To gather and circulate information of research and training programmes dealing with migration, interethnic relations, as well as human rights as they relate to minority groups
- ⇒ To promote empirical research on the social, political, economic and cultural environments which affect ethnic tensions and conflict

The central staff of Ethnobarometer collects first-hand information from a network of correspondents (country associates) located in European countries. It relies for information also on a network of research centres and NGOs. All its research projects are organized in partnership with local institutions. An EACER relevant example is a three-year project on Perceptions, Self-perceptions and Social Organisation of Roma in Central and East European Countries that started in the autumn of 2001¹⁰⁹.

Ethnobarometer does not see itself primarily as offering specific policy advice. Rather it seeks to lay out an accurate interpretation of the issues in a manner which is sensitive to the historical contexts in which they occur, and thus establish the bedrock upon which effective policy can be made.

Ethnobarometer was launched initially thanks to a significant grant from the Human Rights Directorate of what was then DG 1 of the Commission of the European Union. This start up grant covered half of the project's budget and was conditional upon the Ethnobarometer initiators' capability to match this grant with other sources of funding. Both Malcolm Cross (CEMES) and Alessandro Silli (CSS) managed to get additional foundation funding. They did not approach foundations randomly but limited themselves to members of the Association for Innovative Cooperation in Europe (AICE): European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam, King Baudouin Foundation, Brussels and the Mott Foundation, Prague. AICE had been established¹¹⁰ as a non-profit making organisation which focuses upon strengthening the cooperation between foundations, associations, voluntary bodies and other non-governmental organisations in Europe. In particular, it aims to act as a launching pad for new initiatives linking major European foundations, focusing on projects which place the emphasis on innovative approaches in the social and the political fields.

¹⁰⁸ The project information is taken from Ethnobarometer's own website:

<http://www.ethnobarometer.org/index.htm> ; the information on the Association for Innovative Cooperation in Europe is taken from AICE's website on the European Foundation webserver:

<http://www.efc.be/aice> ; the information on its funding history is provided by CEMES director Malcolm Cross.

¹⁰⁹ See: <http://www.ethnobarometer.org/pagine/forthcoming.htm>

¹¹⁰ On 1st January 1996 AICE took over the activities of the European Cooperation Fund created in 1977 in Brussels

The successful Ethnobarometer applications to individual AICE members and AICE's cooperation mission dovetailed and the association adopted the project officially as the first of its "activities and achievements". The status of an officially recognised co-funded project now ensures easier access to follow-up funding, and makes the project less dependant upon individual foundations. The AICE members presently funding it overlap with but do not coincide exactly with the original group: the Compagnia di San Paolo (Italy), the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation (US), the Freudenberg Stiftung (Germany), the King Baudouin Foundation (Belgium) and the Adriano Olivetti Foundation (Italy).

The potential of such arrangements couldn't be better illustrated than by quoting how AICE itself describes the funding issue: "Presently, the project's main effort is focused on raising funds to match a contribution (\$125,000) which the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the US Department of State has awarded for the project's Southeast Europe Program (for the period 2001-2003). The matching has to be 2-to-1 (that is, we must raise \$250,000). Project partners appeal to institutions, and especially European foundations that have provided funding in the past to continue supporting the project. If successful, this would allow most of the planned projects within the programme to be carried out, including that on illegal trafficking and smuggling of human beings in Central and Eastern Europe". Matching the original EC grant had been a burden of the project co-ordinators alone, by now the burden is defined as a shared responsibility.

4. Strategic recommendations for Metropolis

4.a Introduction

At present, expectations that “one-off” inventory exercises of existing funding opportunities, might come across “hidden” possibilities seem unfounded. One may take solace in the thought that both at the level of national research councils, and at the level of major foundations, the need for cross-national co-ordination and co-funding arrangements has been recognized and is on the agenda of decision-makers. But, apart from EUROCORES, no programme arrangements exist.

As such, the intuition that the world of foundations might harbour unsuspected possibilities still seems correct, but given the non-existence of foundations focused on funding internationally comparative research in the Metropolis area (in fact any social sciences field), let alone with programmes that are open for applications over a period of several years, makes this world difficult to access because of the investment needed to locate potential sources.

However, from the perspective of Metropolis, not all is bleak. Metropolis as an international network could itself play a role in the further development of co-funding arrangements. My advice is to consider a multi-track strategy of developing initiatives in all arenas mentioned in this report: national research councils, foundations, government ministries, and the EC. See also 4.b.5 (The advantages of a multi-track strategy).

4.b.1 Institutionalising the intermediairy role

The first recommendation addresses a precondition that has to be fulfilled for any particular EACER funding strategy to be successful: without proper information reaching the right people at the right time opportunities cannot be made use of. The reason for repeating this truism here is that the exercise of charting existing possibilities for EACER taught me two important lessons:

- ⇒ It takes a lot of time to find your way around the world of funding possibilities for a particular field, i.c. the Metropolis area of interest. But, once you’ve reached the stage of being good at it, staying updated is neither very difficult, nor prohibitively time consuming¹¹¹.
- ⇒ Existing possibilities are outdated before one even knows it. Information about them has a shelf life of 6 to 12 months, often less.

Both point in the same direction: every research organisation should have someone who is good at finding her way around funding possibilities, and who keeps (the rest) updated on all the changes, new options, calls for proposals, and other relevant information. The level at which grantseeking support is currently available to most researchers – the level of their university – is too far removed from specific programmes and resources relevant to their particular area of interest. University level resource persons can be great sources of information and updates, but usually have a limited portfolio of funding possibilities that they monitor, and their updates are call-based, meaning they often reach one too late for properly developing an EACER proposal.

The attractiveness of having a more immediate and proactive resource person is not only suggested by considerations of *efficiency and effectiveness*. As the example of the

¹¹¹ This is not to say, that it does not cost time. It is just to say that it becomes worth your while: the balance between time invested and potential return becomes sufficiently attractive.

EC Research Training Networks shows, given the fact that the Framework programmes are without doubt the best documented source of money for internationally comparative research, with numerous ways to be alerted when a call in an area of one's interest is announced, the disturbing fact that this funding possibility seems undiscovered signals a *structural* problem in the access of interested researchers to relevant information.

Structural problems ask for structural solutions and my advice is to institutionalise the resources function at a much lower organisational level than is now customary.

This recommendation is obviously of a more general nature than the following Metropolis-specific proposals. It is more directed at individual researchers and research groups within Metropolis than at the ISC. It is to support this recommendation that the report contains annexes on how to keep informed on funding possibilities, and on how to write successful proposals. And, this is also why the report is very much a hyperlinked document¹¹².

However, all of this presupposes that there is someone within one's organisation who serves as the "development officer". Box 9 describes a best practice example of an institute that successfully applies this strategy.

Box 9: The Oxford University Refugee Studies Centre¹¹³

The Refugee Studies Centre (RSC) is part of the University of Oxford's International Development Centre at Queen Elizabeth House. Its objectives are to carry out multidisciplinary research and teaching on the causes and consequences of forced migration; to disseminate the results of that research to policy makers and practitioners, as well as within the academic community; and to understand the experience of forced migration from the point of view of the affected populations. The RSC has a development officer on its staff and even an assistant development and information officer. This indicates the importance that this small organisation - i.e. small compared to the scale of institutions that are expected to have fundraisers/grantseekers on their pay'roll like universities or business schools – attaches to having grantseeking knowledge in-house. That this policy pays off is evident when one peruses their list of current projects, which include grants from the Andrew W Mellon Foundation for infrastructural facilities (a Catalogue and Digital Library that can be accessed at <http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/rsc> and is working on the full text availability of documents from the grey literature collection the WWW; a Forced Migration Portal Project) and for research projects from Mellon, from Nuffield, from the John D and Catherine T MacArthur Foundation. The funding portfolio includes several co-funding arrangements, some of two funders, but also of quite big "consortia" (Refugee voices in Europe: refugees from former Yugoslavia in Italy and the Netherlands - experiences of integration, is a project funded by Lisa Gilad Initiative, Lisa Gilad Trust, European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE), British Council, Oppenheimer Fund and Hayter Fund).

4.b.2 Co-ordinating a EUROCORES application

As described in paragraph 3.e (European Science Foundation) and Annex F (the EUROCORES programme) the ESF has cross-national coordination very high on its

¹¹² By way of these hyperlinks it (especially its electronic version) becomes a helpful tool for accessing the original sources with their additional and/or new information. They are just a double (mouse) click away. Annex J gives some guidance on how to use browser facilities for quick accessibility of favourite links.

¹¹³ See: <http://www.qeh.ox.ac.uk/rsp>

agenda, also with an eye on substantially influencing European research policy (down to the actual shape of future framework programmes). The train towards collaborative arrangements is therefore on its tracks (be it with “British Rail” in charge).

The next call will close on 1 June 2002.

European Metropolis partners could decide to go for an application, preferable one based on (more ambitious) national (sub-)programmes of several PhD’s and one or two postdocs. Given the present piloting stage of the EUROCORES programme,

- ⇒ national research council officials of the countries participating in the application should be involved from the earliest possible moment onwards;
- ⇒ Participants should have a good relationship with their national research council, preferably hold management positions and/or be regularly consulted;
- ⇒ If it is decided to go for national programmes, these should be based on the collaboration of several of country X’s leading experts;
- ⇒ Non-European countries that want to participate should at the earliest stage possible liaise with their own national research council, and discuss the best way to link a sub-programme to the EUROCORES proposal; (an) officer(s) of the national research council(s) of (a) European participant(s) may be enlisted to support a lobby for some kind of linkage and co-funding arrangement by approaching their colleague at the non-European research council.
- ⇒ The EUROCORES proposal would have to show clear evidence of being the kind of programme that the ESF is aiming at¹¹⁴:
 - The basic purposes of the new funding scheme is to support high quality research proposals which (a) test new innovative ideas and approaches, (b) pool national expertise and research investment, and (c) strengthen research capacity and infrastructure. The scheme aims to promote the development of social sciences disciplines at the European level and to offer an incentive for researchers to move towards interdisciplinary collaboration within the social sciences where the research topic requires this approach.
 - Research project proposals can be defined widely to encompass theory development, empirical research and data collection or secondary analysis involving research manpower costs, where necessary, and are not restricted to solely networking activities. The scheme provides researchers with the opportunity to take the lead in identifying promising new research directions and tackling international research issues and problems, not exclusively those in the European domain.
- ⇒ Participation from non-European partners, funded by their own national research council, should in principle be possible, but presupposes that this participation can be shown to create added value from a European perspective, or even better, if it can be made plausible that this promising line of research can only be done with the help of one or two non-European research teams.

4.b.3 Lobbying foundations to establish research co-funding arrangements

A lobby for a co-funding arrangement with a network of foundations is an interesting option because of a series of reasons:

- ⇒ Traditionally, foundations like to partner on projects and the trend is towards more partnerships (see note 102);
- ⇒ Foundations have become aware of the negative consequences that result from the absence of (international) co-ordination between foundations (see 3.g.6: encouraging developments);

¹¹⁴ See: <http://www.esf.org/social/EuroResearch/EuroResearch1.htm>

- ⇒ Three relevant EFC co-ordinated networks of foundations are up and running, only one of which has been “tapped” (see 3.g.6: encouraging developments);
- ⇒ Co-funding by foundations is less hampered by the Europeans-versus-the-rest-of-the-world difficulty;
- ⇒ Metropolis co-chairs or research members could present the network to a handpicked selection of foundations as a pilot for how to develop, monitor, evaluate, etc. co-funding arrangements of real research projects;
- ⇒ Metropolis has several direct contacts with potentially interested foundations (Luso-American, German Marshall Fund);

Box 10: What can be accomplished, at what level, by whom, with what means?

In general all grantseeking from foundations tips & tricks resources stress that¹¹⁵ “there are a number of steps in the Project Development Process, including, but not exclusive of: Identify Needs, Specify Problems, Design the Project Idea to Solve the Problem, Determine Fundability, Fully Develop the Project, Profile the Project, Find a Matching Funder, Write Goals and Objectives, Develop a Project Budget, Develop the Funding Request Budget”. In other words “Never write a proposal if you have not first fully developed the project. Otherwise, you have nothing to write about”. At the same time they emphasise that “to be fundable, a project proposed must solve a problem in which the grant maker is interested”.

Under normal circumstances the chances to be successful for the individual(s) approaching a potential funder are dependant upon the closeness of the match between the foundation’s interest and the specific, fully developed proposal of the grantseeker. In case of persons that are highly regarded and personally known to relevant decision-makers within the grantgiving body, a more open approach is possible. The approach can be made on the basis of a less developed proposal, just indicating a topic and an angle. The closer the relationship (and the higher the esteem) the more influence can be exerted¹¹⁶, up to the point that a grantgiving body is persuaded to include an interest hitherto absent from its priority list.

We are not talking about the normal situation here; when the issue is approaching a network of foundations, there is no list of priorities, or programmes. As indicated above, decision makers of the network will not be willing to discuss matters at this level with just anybody. It is telling that the EFC network meetings explicitly exclude parties that might look for funding. In other words, There are not many within the Metropolis community that the International Steering Committee might turn too for approaching a network. It has to be someone who has

⇒ Has an impeccable academic reputation, *and*

⇒ Is well known in and with the world of foundations, *and*

⇒ Knows at least some of the relevant decision makers personally.

At the same time, it would not be wise to forget the general advice described earlier. Suppose a network of foundations can be convinced that considering a co-funding arrangement is interesting, turning that interest into actual negotiations, one would still need one, or preferably even several fairly developed proposals on the table. Proposals that tell the potential funder(s) *how* Metropolis intends to solve a problem that they consider worthy of their attention, and *why* they should invest in Metropolis instead of in other consortia. This implies that the International Steering Committee would have to have a programme of several EACER projects ready and be able to convince potential co-funding networks that on their (applicant’s) side, the necessary conceptual and practical preparation has been done. Funders - minding their own accountability - only invest in organisations that look established enough to actually make happen what they promise, whatever the personal credentials of the one promoting their cause may be.

The persons spearheading the lobby are a crucial success factor. Box 10 (What can be accomplished, at what level, by whom, with what means?) gives some general thoughts on the who, how and what of a lobby. Suppose the lobby is a joined North-American-European effort, from both sides one person fitting the demanding profile given in box 8 should join in. For the American side it is difficult to find a stronger lobbyist than Demetri Papademetriou; advice on the European side is more difficult to give but one would have to think of people like Jan Niessen or Rainer Münz (both granttakers of the German Marshall Fund).

¹¹⁵ For this box I have made use of the tips and hints of Polaris grants central:

<http://www.polarisgrantscentral.net/tips.html>

¹¹⁶ The phrasing here might suggest a manipulative scenario, but that is not what is intended here; one could argue, that the more open the discussion agenda is, the more the outcome can become a genuinely co-developed project.

4.b.4 Establishing common research needs amongst Metropolis' governmental partners and facilitate the establishment of co-funding arrangements

I have encountered no examples of what seems a co-funding possibility ideally suited to Metropolis: a co-ordinated commitment of government departments (or equally interesting but given the present constitution of the Metropolis network less feasible: cities) to fund internationally comparative work. Interviews unearthed particular interests for international comparison, that are shared by several Home offices (or their functional equivalents in terms of responsibility for e.g. integration issues). These interests have the following characteristics:

- ⇒ They shift as frequently as the “programmes” of other funders of research;
- ⇒ They are quite specific;
- ⇒ These specific interests are shared by specific countries; e.g.¹¹⁷ the comparative measurement of racism (UK and Norway), the new minority groups (UK and the Netherlands).
- ⇒ Ministries or cities would definitely want to define their relationship with researchers in principal-agent terms (see note 49).

Metropolis could be a forum (with both researchers and policy people around the table) to collaboratively elaborate these interests into actual cross-national projects, the national parts of which could be funded by each respective government department.

Another possibility is a staged process, e.g.:

- ⇒ Policy partners determine areas of overlapping interest and form subgroups around one or more of such areas;
- ⇒ The subgroup(s) elaborate(s) the overlapping interest into a ToR for a research project;
- ⇒ The research side of Metropolis responds to this “call” with a proposal.

It seems appropriate that one or two Metropolis members from the policy world should take the lead in establishing common research needs of Metropolis' governmental partners and facilitate the establishment of co-funding arrangements.

4.b.5 The advantages of a multi-track strategy

The most obvious advantage of following a multi-track strategy is the truism that shooting more than once increases chances of a hit. But the recommendations above would also profit in another sense from simultaneous implementation: successful implementation of one recommendation could strengthen the chances for success at another. In other words, one can imagine various recommendations to have a mutually reinforcing character:

- ⇒ An enhanced visibility of ongoing (research) collaborations between Metropolis members would strengthen chances for success for both EUROCORES and foundation (co-)funded EACER proposals, as well as make Metropolis research partners a more attractive contractor for any

¹¹⁷ Information provided by Peter Ward, Home office (UK), Chan Choenni, Ministry for the Interior (NL), Eva Haagensen, Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development (No)

outcome of exchanges on common research needs of Metropolis participants from the policy world¹¹⁸.

- ⇒ Success in either of these arenas (ESF, foundation funded EACER, policy funded EACER) will increase the actual research co-operation between Metropolis members, and thus strengthen claims of the network to further EACER funding on the basis of its proven operational cooperation and management capacity.

¹¹⁸ As policy partners will be thinking in contractual terms and consider dependability in terms of the delivery of agreed output very important – being (politically) accountable for the proper spending of their research budgets, and under higher than normal pressure for spending money on unconventional (because not exclusively national) work.