

## International Panel meeting on Oct. 21, 2022

### 1. Motivation of private funding in R&D:

Tax incentives, reputation effects (use public PR to generate "PR rewards" to private companies), France devoted a billion Euros (LabEx) of public funding for a foundation that supports very risky projects (akin to VC funding?) that would not be funded by regular grant agencies.

Singapore: 1:1 matching of industry and public funds. Problem with support for basic research in Czech Republic: small companies do not have the means for significant support of basic research and large companies are usually foreign-owned and prefer to support basic research in their own country. Some foundations exist and provide support in the form of awards and scholarships.

Which areas are already strong in international competition (IT, AI)? Could associations of strong areas of business or science (without division into applied research or basic research) be interested in projects of general interest? One could then approach these CZ associations in order to acquire additional funds directly from the industry.

The situation is better in the area of applied research. Perhaps the most systematic are the activities of TACR, which requires industry participation in grants it awards.

### 2. Evaluation of the effects of prior recommendations:

GACR: accepted several of our recommendations over the years, albeit some only in the EXPRO program and not universally. Prof. Michl will provide a list of recommendations made over the years.

An urgent need: clarify the roles of the presidium relative to the scientific board in the new legislation. We recommended that the scientific board should formulate general policies and the presidium should implement them in practice, but the opinion of the board is apparently frequently ignored. It seems that the current law does not specify sufficiently clearly whether the board or the presidium has the final word.

AZV: we are awaiting a response of the Ministry of Health to our recommendations and their implementation. Could a meeting of IAB representatives, Marian Hajduch, and the Ministry of Health be arranged to continue the discussion of the IAB recommendations?

General: The key to further improvement is the composition of the panels that evaluate proposals and final reports. Panel membership needs to be viewed as a prestigious appointment and not a bothersome chore. The selection of the best scientists should be performed by the granting agency. The amount of work required needs to be reduced (cf. unnecessary yearly evaluations) and the panelists should be compensated by a reduced administrative load in their institutions. People in charge on those institutions should be motivated by inclusion of service on evaluation panels as one of the criteria in the national evaluation of research organizations.

Could the RR&D&I Council ask that the presidium of AZV consults with a member of the R&D&I council when selecting panelists the way that GACR does?



### **3. Support of excellence - Metodika 17+ :**

The general principles and the outputs of the national R&D evaluation (Methodology 2017+) were presented and have been discussed in the international context. The Methodology 2017+ is in agreement with the principles of the international declarations on assessment (San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) – 2013, Leiden Manifesto – 2015, The Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment (ARRA) – 2022). However, the following questions about the implementation of the methodology on the level of providers and research organization were raised: is the actual local implementation associated with an unnecessary administrative burden? How will the next full five-year evaluation be used by both providers and research organizations (incl. finance distribution on the level of providers and within universities)? What are the consequences of evaluation, and are expectations and strategies in place for this?

### **4. National priorities VaVal - the current role of research:**

Specific priorities within fields of basic research are very difficult to identify, but prioritizing fields is reasonable (e.g., addressing sustainable energy, effects and mitigation of climate change, public health, etc.). Setting priorities in terms of having minimum capacity in select (society-needs based priority) disciplines would be useful.