

Submission to the
Department of
Industry, Science
and Resources

October 2025



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE

Submission on Possible Association to Horizon Europe

Executive Summary

The University of Melbourne welcomes the invitation to provide a submission to the Department of Industry, Science and Resources' request for information for possible association to Horizon Europe.

Association to Horizon Europe Pillar II would transform Australia's position within the global research landscape, unlocking access to large international and cross-sectoral R&D consortia through the final years of a €53.5 billion funding pool. Importantly, the thematic clusters of Pillar II are well-aligned with Australia's National Science and Research Priorities and could be weaved in as a collaboration tool under any new national R&D coordination framework, such as the one proposed through the Strategic Examination of R&D, to maximise return on investment to Australia.

Australia and the University of Melbourne are well positioned to lead and participate in research consortia through Horizon Europe, by activating a strong network of existing trusted partnerships and collaborations with research organisations and industries in Europe and other associate member countries.

The pathway to association is clear and presents low risk, with the current framework program active until the end of 2027. Comparable major economies, such as Canada and New Zealand, have recently associated to Pillar II, providing an effective implementation blueprint.

The Australian government has an opportunity to move quickly through to association and set the foundations in place for fuller participation in the next Framework Program.

In summary, our key recommendation is that Australia secures association to Horizon Europe Pillar II as quickly as possible, to enable global connectivity and large-scale economy of scale for Australian research, that adds to and enhances, existing domestic funding for R&D.

Specific responses to the questions posed are provided below, including case studies articulating how access to Horizon Europe would add value to Australia's R&D.

For further information or to discuss these submissions, Professor Mark Cassidy, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), can be contacted at dvc-research@unimelb.edu.au.

What benefit would association to Horizon Europe bring to your organisation or Australia?

Explain how you calculated the benefit, including monetary value, timeframe, intangible value.

Association to Horizon Europe Pillar II would deliver substantial strategic, economic, research and innovation benefits for both Australia and the University of Melbourne (UoM/the University). For the remainder of the Horizon Europe framework program (2021-2027), association would elevate Australia's status from a Third Country Participant to a full member with leadership rights, enabling Australian researchers to lead international consortia, access European expertise and infrastructure, increase knowledge exchange, and elevate Australia's research impact.

Europe as a bloc is the largest global producer of R&D and is Australia's (and UoM's) top international R&D collaborator. According to the European Commission Horizon dashboard, association has been shown to increase both the number and size of funded projects involving the associated country, strengthening international networks, boosting research citations and impact, and enabling stronger academia-industry partnerships, including with large multinational organisations with significant R&D budgets.

Association reduces Australia's dependency on a small set of international funders, helping mitigate geopolitical or policy shocks to other funders of Australian R&D, such as the USA. Through association, Horizon Europe is extending its reach to include like-minded democracies, including Canada and others in our region such as New Zealand and South Korea (with Japan and Singapore in negotiations). Although association does not come with voting rights, it allows associate members to influence EU committee discussions and decisions on the topics of Pillar II calls to ensure mutual alignment with Australia's priorities – particularly relevant to future Framework Programs.

Horizon Europe Pillar II requires the involvement of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), which would allow the University's spinouts to benefit from exposure to the European market and subcontracting opportunities, as demonstrated by large international projects such as Large Hadron Collider experiments. Association would also be a tool for product development and market access for the University's start-ups and spinouts. Horizon Europe demonstrates credibility to European customers and partners, as well as an effective mechanism for developing in-market networks which can grow from research partnerships to commercial partnerships. Similarly, it would increase the University's translation of its research into global markets by working with European and other associate member SMEs.

Pooling resources and risks with partners would allow Australia to tackle more ambitious, high-risk/high-reward projects than we could alone. It would also help to avoid duplication and foster complementarity between EU and Australian research priorities. Association would increase global connections, recognition, reputation, and standing of Australia's R&D-active organisations – including Australian expertise and infrastructure.

Association to Horizon Europe should be funded with new money, with existing funding to Australian R&D retained. This would deliver additional funding for Australian R&D, received by Australian participants directly through the European Commission. Assumptions are:

1. Association would take place by mid-2026, i.e. 18 months remaining of Horizon Europe Framework Program.
2. If total budget of Horizon Europe Pillar II is 53.5 billion Euro for the 2021-2027 period, then remaining budget access granted by association for Australian participants would be ~11.5 billion Euro.
3. [Funded participation for New Zealand and Canada in Horizon Europe Pillar II as of October 2025 has been approximately 8M and 10M Euro respectively](#). Australian participants in Horizon Europe may stand to secure similar amounts for their research during the remainder of the current Horizon Europe framework program, noting that this monetary investment would be borne by the Australian government after it has also covered other fees required by the European Commission. A similar

investment from the Australian government would be a welcome boost that adds to and enhances, existing domestic funding for R&D.

Explain how it would unlock benefits in important sectors for Australia and how it would further the productivity agenda.

Association to Pillar II supports the Australian government's productivity agenda by increasing access to global innovation and accelerating the translation of research into economic and social impact. The mission-oriented structure of Pillar II, and the requirement to include collaborators across sectors, is explicitly designed to bridge the gap between discovery and application in critical sectors.

By participating in Pillar II consortia, Australian SMEs, local/state governments, and researchers can integrate into global value chains, co-develop intellectual property with leading European firms, and gain access to the European single market. Such collaborative environments would accelerate the commercialisation of Australian innovation.

The broader Australian economy also stands to benefit from increased productivity through Australian companies boosting their R&D activities. Researchers at the Swinburne University of Technology, the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, University of Melbourne, and ANU, have compiled a Report for the Strategic Examination of R&D titled "Estimating R&D Spillovers by technology and industry". Here, they estimated the rate of return to firms of their own R&D and the impact (i.e., productivity) on all other for-profit firms in the Australian economy¹. They found that \$1 of R&D investment by firms will lead to a \$5 rise in productivity for the firm undertaking the R&D over a 10-year period (assuming a discount rate, i.e., interest rate, of 5%). The benefits of R&D can spread to other firms in the economy through workers leaving the R&D firm to work for other firms, exchange of ideas, and other firms buying better inputs from the R&D firm. These additional improvements to productivity amount to a further \$2.50 over 10 years.

Although the research teams have not directly modelled the impact of university research on firm productivity, they have traced the effects of workers from Cooperative Research Centres (CRCs) on firms not directly involved in the CRC and found that the impact of CRC workers on productivity is greater than ordinary R&D workers. Given Pillar II's focus on innovation and industry involvement, similar productivity improvements to the Australian economy could be assumed through the movement of talent between consortia partners and the Australian R&D ecosystem.

¹These estimates are based on economic models (using an augmented Cobb-Douglas production function). Data is annual since 2001-02 and is drawn from a census of all firms in the Australian economy [the Business Longitudinal Analysis Data Environment (BLADE)]. These models involve about 700,000 firms over a 20-year period. These estimates are the most robust estimates in Australia and use the best econometric techniques available internationally.

If you already participate in Horizon Europe as a Third Country Participant, what return on investment have you received?

The University of Melbourne holds numerous active and past awards through Horizon Europe schemes as a Third Country Participant. These include schemes through Pillars I and II, such as:

- Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions for doctoral education and postdoctoral training of researchers;
- EU Joint Programme for Neurodegenerative Disease Research which was co-funded by the NHMRC under Horizon 2020; and
- An active 2M Euro European Research Council (ERC) project where the University is a named (but unfunded) collaborator.

UoM's participation on these projects was provided in-kind and sometimes supported through ad-hoc external means.

Some financial income has been received for equipment or field experiment expenses, which enabled upscaling of relevant projects funded through Australian sponsors, though most of these awards did not deliver large financial return on investment in the form of cash from Europe.

However, many of these schemes enabled global exchange of personnel whose salaries or PhD stipends were paid for by the European Commission, who spent significant time at the University of Melbourne and contributed to UoM's research.

Further return on the University's in-kind investment was delivered through the intangible benefits of accessing European research consortia, such as ongoing collaborations and increased research impact, as articulated above.

The University continues to pursue avenues through Horizon Europe (e.g. ERC Synergy grants and NHMRC-Horizon Europe co-funding schemes) and other European Commission avenues (e.g. Erasmus+).

Explain what difference association would provide you, if any.

Association would provide welcome funding for UoM's participation in European research consortia, and enable the University's researchers, and our domestic collaborators across the research, private, and public sectors, to lead international research consortia.

Association would position Australian infrastructure as global collaboration hubs, increase our participation in European networks and better tap into European and global expertise and industries that do not exist in Australia, helping grow our own domestic R&D capabilities and sectors of national interest.

Association would also help attract and retain world-class talent from Europe who cannot currently transfer their Horizon Europe grants to Australia as part of their recruitment package while Australia is a Third Country Participant.

Provide case studies that illustrate how you or your organisation would engage with Horizon Europe

Case Study 1: Attracting and accessing world-class talent, enabling knowledge and technology transfer

A/Prof Michael Menden (Computational Biology) was required to terminate his €1.5 million ERC Starting Grant when relocating to Melbourne, as ERC funding must be hosted by an EU or Associated Country institution. Association could enable ERC grants to be hosted in Australia, unlocking multimillion-euro opportunities and positioning Melbourne as a destination for attraction and recruitment of globally competitive researchers.

Prof Steven Prawer (Physics) was part of an EU Framework Program 6 EQUIND project with colleagues from Germany and the UK, with Australian participation supported through the International Science Linkages Program of the Australian Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (Project No. CG110039). Participating in a world-leading consortium in diamond quantum information processing led to some of Prof Prawer's most cited papers and inspired much of the foundation of the diamond quantum activities at UoM. For example, one of the leading participants came to Australia to help us set up Prof Prawer's first quantum measurement lab, saving his group endless hours of trial and error. His postdocs and students travelled to partners and the 'technology transfer' was very rapid, and his group was subsequently able to provide opportunities for our students to get to see and hear the very best world experts.

Association to Horizon Europe would bring enormous value in linking to some of the best talent in the world. This includes the attraction and retention of world-class talent from European and Associate member countries, by allowing them to retain their active Horizon Europe grants as part of their recruitment package and relocation deal to Australia, thereby contributing to a stronger pool of R&D talent based in Australia.

Case Study 2: Positioning Australian infrastructure as a hub for international collaboration

Prof Elisabetta Barberio (Physics) is participating in the Horizon Europe NEXUS project, which strengthens international collaborations across Europe, the USA, Canada, Australia, and South Africa in underground physics. The project enhances technical capabilities in ultra-sensitive detectors and underground laboratories, including the [Stawell Underground Physics Laboratory \(SUPL\)](#), and provides early-career researchers with advanced training and skills.

As a Third Country Participant, Prof Barberio's team currently receives only modest support (a few thousand euros) to host researchers. Full association would allow Australian researchers to lead consortia, access funding directly, and position SUPL as a hub for international collaborations. This would enable support for projects of international significance, such as SABRE, fully leveraging SUPL's unique geographical position. As the only underground laboratory in the Southern Hemisphere, Australia could provide critical infrastructure and expertise to global initiatives.

UoM Experimental Particle Physics has developed the international standing and technical capabilities to establish and lead a Horizon Europe project focused on underground physics, dark matter detection, and neutrino physics, involving several EU countries, research institutions, and underground laboratories. In addition to capacity and international standing, they have strong support from key European research institutions (such as the INFN and the CNRS), and geographical uniqueness to lead such a project. Already, CDM-led research such as the SABRE experiment (a dual Italy–Australia dark matter experiment) and the ORGAN experiment (a dark matter experiment at UWA) are both featured in the European Strategy for Particle Physics as priority experiments over the next several years.

Through leading a Horizon Europe project, SUPL would be positioned as the infrastructure hub for international collaborations, integrating Australian infrastructure into global experiments and participating in the underground laboratory network to share personnel, expertise, and capabilities. Early-career researchers

would benefit from fellowships, mobility programs, and hands-on training. Australian SMEs and industry partners would be involved in technology development, gaining exposure to European markets.

Case Study 3: Accessing emerging geothermal technologies in exchange for access to a lower-cost world-class resource for pilot projects

The EU has been investing heavily in geothermal energy technology and policy development for over a decade to decarbonise heating and cooling. Many of the advances made in the EU are applicable to Australia in industries such as food production and space heating but collaboration between Australia and the EU is piecemeal. Australia lacks a critical mass of researchers to carry out broad-based geothermal R&D in Australia, as well as lack of appreciation in the wider community of the opportunities for geothermal. Broad engagement with the EU geothermal research community would mitigate those shortcomings.

The University of Melbourne has been developing the case for significant investment in natural gas replacement with geothermal energy for industries in the Latrobe Valley. Modest support from Regional Development Victoria has demonstrated that the available hot aquifer geothermal resource is potentially amongst the best in the world.

Through enhanced collaboration with relevant EU research institutions and industries through association to Horizon Europe, Prof Rachel Webster (Physics) and Dr Graeme Beardsmore (Crustal Heat Flow and Geothermal Energy) could gain access to knowledge and emerging geothermal technologies by providing access to a world class resource for pilot projects at substantially lower cost than European resources. In addition, strong support has been provided in the EU for research into the development of high temperature geothermal resources for electrical power generation. World class, untapped resources are also available as test beds in Australia. In the future, they would be an active participant in such proposals. Given Horizon has funded at least €72M of geothermal programs over six years (2022–2028)—an average of €12M per year—it is reasonable to estimate possible benefit to UoM for involvement on the order of €1M per year.

Through Association, the UoM team would (i) derive direct benefit by partnering with EU research organisations and industries to co-develop and/or transfer specific technologies and knowledge applicable to the Australian situation; (ii) obtain direct funding and/or release matching funds for critical research and development projects; (iii) participate in and/or host training joint training programs to build Australian local expertise.

Case Study 4: Enabling a stronger space sector for Australia

The European Space Agency (ESA), like NASA, runs operational missions that are beyond the capability of Australia, given our size. These missions have great benefit to natural resources management in Australia. Stronger participation in Horizon Europe programs would enable the transfer of substantive application-oriented technology and knowhow to Australia, for Australia's national benefit.

Access to ESA's Earth observation data could fill the gap in Australia-led space missions. This can also mitigate impacts of US government's reduced investment on space missions, particularly Earth observation missions. NASA has been increasingly developing new space missions (particularly Earth observation) in partnership with Europe (Germany and France) and India. New upcoming missions are developed and operated by ESA. Considering the weakening momentum in space borne Earth observation and Climate research in the US, their impact will probably grow for the time being.

Currently, there are limited mechanisms in the Australian research grants landscape to lead or participate in international space missions with Australian contributions from AUD \$5M upwards, as these are too large for ARC LIEF grants, and the Australian Space Agency does not have any (stable) line of funding.

Associating to Horizon Europe would allow Australian researchers and industries to better contribute to space research as one of the most rapidly growing areas of the global economy with "made in Australia"

technology and innovation through strengthened ties with the ESA and other relevant organisations and industries in Australia, Europe and associated countries.

Case Study 5: Unlocking access to scale, partners and funding for the arts and creative industries

Prof Felicity Baker (music therapy) was an external participant on an unsuccessful Horizon bid that provided the platform to repurpose and secure funding through the Joint Programme on Neurodegenerative Disease Research (JPND) co-funded through the NHMRC.

Without the initial Horizon collaboration, this outcome would not have been possible. Building on this, a second JPND application, led from Australia and involving five countries, was awarded €2.4M. This outcome demonstrates the tangible return from engaging in Horizon-type frameworks.

While JPND is specific to neurodegenerative diseases, Association to Horizon Europe Pillar II would open a broader suite of calls and schemes in *Culture, Creativity and Inclusive Society*. This would allow Prof Felicity Baker and her Faculty of Fine Arts and Music to participate more systematically across disciplines, either as lead or partner, expanding the scope and scale of their research contributions.

The benefits of association to Horizon Europe in the arts and creative industries can be understood in terms of market access, talent mobility, and reputation. Inclusion would provide entry into Europe's extensive cultural and creative sectors, including screen industries, festivals, galleries, design. It would expand opportunities for talent mobility through joint PhDs, artist–researcher residencies, and staff exchanges, creating pipelines for the next generation of researchers. It would also raise Australia's reputation as a global hub for creative research.

Case study 6: Strengthening collaboration not only with Europe but in our region

Associate Professor Nick Thieberger (linguistics), helped with conversion of the Tahitian dictionary, and is supporting the development of a language archive in Tahiti, in collaboration with French scholars in New Caledonia and French Polynesia and aims to expand this work through Horizon Europe, leveraging the impact of linguistic preservation efforts in the Pacific region.

As Horizon Europe funds participation of partners in low and middle-income countries, Australian association can also benefit Australia's strengthened collaborations beyond Europe, including those in our Asia-Pacific region.

Case Study 7: Tapping into environmental advantages of season offsets and climatic overlaps

In research involving the environment, the ability to work on sites with seasons offset by 6 months can significantly accelerate work. Southern Europe (Mediterranean) and the southern half of Australia have significant overlaps in terms of climatic characteristics, making work transferrable between the two regions, so the same work can be designed to benefit both.

With several Horizon Europe Pillar II Clusters funding research consortia in climate and the environment, association would enable Australian researchers to benefit from strengthened collaborations that bring environmental and climatic advantages.

If Australia associates to Horizon Europe, what implementation models do you suggest for maximising the benefit from the Horizon Europe funding and alignment with Australian science priorities?

Australia and UoM are well positioned to maximise the benefit from Horizon Europe funding. UoM conducts more than \$1.6B AU worth of R&D each year, and hosts world-leading researchers, laboratories, and infrastructure (for research, and in the form of research support for grants, contracts, and the development of cross-sectoral and international partnerships). UoM's strong international partnerships and collaborations extend globally. For example, UoM hosts the Oceania Representative Office of the French Centre national de la recherche scientifique, CNRS (the leading organisational recipient of Horizon Europe funding) on campus. Through this Oceania Office, UoM and other Australian institutions can partner with the CNRS as a springboard and knowledge resource to lead and participate in Horizon Europe Pillar II consortia ([Attachment 1](#)).

The University of Melbourne recommends that Australia's association model itself should emulate New Zealand's "Pay-as-you-go" operational contribution model, where payments are linked to successful grants. This would be a financially low-risk approach for Australia, even if Australian researchers' success rates exceed those of Canada or New Zealand, given the remaining pool of funding in Pillar II is only available until the end of 2027.

An implementation framework could include the following components to ensure success:

1. National Facilitation Hub and National Contact Points (NCP) network: Establish a national facilitation hub that connects to a network of National Contact Points (NCPs). NCPs should be subject-matter experts in the thematic clusters of Pillar II with experience in Horizon Europe administration, who provide researchers and SMEs with guidance and hands-on support, facilitate matchmaking with European partners, offer strategic advice on proposal development, and reduce administrative friction for Australian applicants.

2. National Overheads Scheme: The full economic cost of research, which includes essential university infrastructure, administration, and support services, is not sustainably addressed in Australia, creating increasing financial risk for universities and research institutes. The New Zealand model, which includes a domestic scheme to fund these indirect costs, has had a successful implementation due to addressing this critical aspect of funding. A commitment to cover indirect costs would help minimise block grant dilution to ensure long-term sustainability of Australia's participation.

3. Destination Horizon Grants: While Australian institutions are already well positioned to apply to Horizon Europe, Canada found that ~\$15-20k AU of seed funding (distributed [through its national funding agencies](#)) helped build capacity, foster existing partnerships, and further develop networks and consortia with EU and Associated Country researchers, with the ultimate goal of applying to Horizon Europe—Pillar II calls for proposals. The Australian government has an opportunity to establish such schemes, prior to commencement of association, to maximise the remaining timeframe of the current Horizon Europe (2021-2027) framework program.

4. Timeframes clarity: Provide ample lead time and certainty of timeframes for Association to Horizon Europe and the next Horizon program, FP10 (2028-2034) to allow Australian R&D organisations to invest in building in-house administrative capacity to lead and collaborate on Horizon Europe applications.

5. Mobility and visas: Work with relevant government departments to fast-track visas for 6-24-month secondments and PhD mobility tied to Horizon Europe projects.

6. Visibility and awareness raising: Support a "Team Australia" R&D branding and promotion approach in Europe, and ensure visible and high-level participation in key fora in Brussels, leaning on [learnings from New Zealand](#).

A number of countries from outside Europe have associated to Horizon Europe (such as Canada, New Zealand and the Republic of Korea), what are the pros and cons of their implementation models for Australia to consider?

New Zealand:

- Pros: New Zealand's model is the most relevant for Australia. It is a "pay-as-you-go" operational contribution, where payments are linked to successful grants. To support this approach, establishment of a domestic top-up scheme for overheads was a critical innovation to ensure institutional financial viability and sustainability. This is a key recommendation for the Australian government.
- Cons: This implementation model is restricted to Pillar II. As such, access to Pillar I schemes like the prestigious ERC grants would remain limited to Third Country status. However, this may be more appealing to the Australian government as a pragmatic trade-off to facilitate a faster and more affordable entry into the programme.

Canada:

- Pros: Canada's model has been efficient at providing clarity for the research sector through a centralised government agency (Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada) leading coordination of participation in Horizon Europe, with additional expert NCP support from Canadian agencies. Canada also established "Destination Horizon Funding" which it distributed through national funding councils, to raise awareness of, and promote uptake, of Horizon Europe Association.
- Cons: Limited to Pillar II.

Given the Republic of Korea only signed their Association Agreement in July 2025, the University considers their model the newest and least tested to date.

UoM recommends a hybrid of New Zealand's financial prudence and Canada's central coordination and seed funding, to provide the most effective and sustainable model.

If Australia does not associate to Horizon Europe, what alternative models do you suggest for international science collaboration that might deliver similar outcomes to Horizon Europe?

An alternative to Horizon Europe is for the Australian government and its research councils to negotiate reciprocal access to research funding with like-minded countries in Europe and in our region by applying the “**Money Follows Cooperation**” principle (MFC).

Under MFC, research councils agree to reciprocally open their agreed national research funding opportunities to collaborative applications involving researchers from the other country as co-investigators.

This has been demonstrated a successful collaboration tool by R&D funders in the UK, Japan, South Korea, Switzerland, Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, who have adopted bilateral [MFC agreements](#) and [multilateral co-funding arrangements](#) to allow reciprocal access to funding for international collaboration.

When a funding council applies MFC, an eligible lead organisation can allocate a proportion of its award to any named co-investigator, regardless of domestic or international location. Co-investigator contributions would be clearly defined and costed in the grant application, and all projects would follow existing merit-based review and approval processes of the awarding research funder or council.

In this model, the number and value of national competitive grants available for Australian domestic R&D would remain unchanged, the MFC mechanism would simply enable the leads on these grants to attract international expertise and collaboration where they add value to their research. Conversely, MFC would allow Australian researchers to be paid as international collaborators on their partners’ grants.

This makes MFC administratively light-touch, low cost, and transformational by generating impact from research that needs to connect with the expertise and capability that is dispersed across the domestic and global R&D system. This way, Australian researchers could convene and fund the best performing research teams (across sectors and borders) to address Australia’s social, environmental, and industrial challenges, and could receive funding from MFC partners to participate on their research too.

By extending MFC to our international Science and Technology and Free Trade Agreement discussions, Australia would have the tools to open up access to global R&D funding that is currently closed. This “Free Trade” approach would allow our researchers to access far more funding than they could ever “give” to their international partners from Australia’s relatively smaller funding pool.

This approach is both highly strategic and sustainable. It does not mandate investment of new funds, nor the redistribution of existing funds, towards any specific international partnership or initiative now, or in the future. It also allows Australia to make the most of our national R&D capabilities as well as our international connections, to address our productivity challenges at a time of geopolitical uncertainty and an increasingly constrained domestic economy. MFC would allow us to strengthen collaboration across sectors in our domestic R&D system, and to negotiate reciprocal access to international R&D funding – with partners in Europe and elsewhere in the world, including in our neighbouring Asia-Pacific region.

Other models of international research collaboration include **scaling existing co-funding mechanisms** with Horizon Europe (such as those that already exist between the NHMRC and EU Health Cluster) or **negotiating bilateral agreements** with individual EU member states through **Lead Agency** agreements or bilateral **co-funding** mechanisms. However, these collaboration models only support a handful of joint projects, have a high administrative transactional cost, require either codification of existing research budgets or commitment of entirely new funds, are smaller in scale and impact than MFC, and would not be able to match the financial or strategic advantages of Horizon Europe association.

Attachment 1: CNRS as an Australian springboard – and knowledge resource - for Horizon Europe Pillar II collaborations

The CNRS is the leading research organisation in Europe in terms of the budgets obtained through Horizon Europe calls, and staffs an [Oceania Representative Office](#), tasked with growing regional R&D collaborations, on the UoM campus.

CNRS has implemented measures to encourage the design of projects suited to Pillar II calls. A unit dedicated to interdisciplinarity has been in place for around fifteen years. The currently called MITI (“Mission for Transverse Initiatives and Interdisciplinarity”) supports emerging interdisciplinary projects through calls for proposals that encourage the formation of interdisciplinary consortia. It also coordinates 26 Interdisciplinary Technical Networks — interdisciplinary communities that share methods, techniques and expertise.

The CNRS has also set up a project engineering service to assist researchers with the technical, financial and legal aspects of their applications. In particular, “European Project Engineers” are available to provide support to researchers in preparing their proposals.

The CNRS strengthens its partnerships for innovation. It provides support in creating start-ups, in setting up joint public and private research structures, and for patenting. Additionally, a position of General Director for Innovation was established for stronger support for innovation.

The implementation of these measures may explain why, compared to Horizon 2020 (2014-2020), the funds awarded to CNRS in the equivalent of Pillar II have more than doubled (Horizon 2020: €76 million; Horizon Europe: €159 million), even though the Horizon Europe program will not end until 2027.

The University of Melbourne

Grattan Street, Parkville, Victoria 3010 Australia

t 13 MELB (13 6352)

+61 3 9035 5511 (International)

unimelb.edu.au



THE UNIVERSITY OF
MELBOURNE