



**GOUVERNEMENT**

*Liberté  
Égalité  
Fraternité*

AGENCE NATIONALE DE LA RECHERCHE  
**ANR**

## Investments for the Future



## Call for Proposals

### AUTONOMY: AGEING AND DISABILITY

Closing date of call for proposals

**2 November 2021 at 11 am**

Consultation address for the call for proposals

<http://anr.fr/ppravh>

# 1. Contents

<b>Contacts.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. GENERAL CONTEXT AND GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PRIORITY RESEARCH PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. BACKGROUND .....	6
1.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PRIORITY RESEARCH PROGRAMME .....	6
<b>2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXTS OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1. CHALLENGE 1: DEFINING THE NOTION OF AUTONOMY, METHODS FOR UNDERSTANDING AND MEASURING IT.....	7
2.1.1 OBJECTIVES.....	7
2.1.2 CONTEXT PER THEME .....	8
2.2. CHALLENGE 2: DESIGNING PUBLIC POLICIES ON AUTONOMY.....	11
2.2.1 OBJECTIVES.....	11
2.2.2 CONTEXT PER THEME .....	12
<b>3. EXPECTED PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 CHARACTERISTICS COMMON TO BOTH CHALLENGES .....	15
3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECTS ON CHALLENGE 1 .....	15
3.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECTS ON CHALLENGE 2 .....	16
3.4 PARTNERSHIPS.....	17
3.5 PROJECT DURATION AND AMOUNT OF FUNDING .....	17
3.6 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT OF THE PPR.....	17
<b>4. REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECTS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 SELECTION PROCEDURE .....	18
4.2 ADMISSIBILITY CRITERIA.....	18
4.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	19
4.3.1 CRITERIA COMMON TO ALL PROJECTS.....	19
4.3.2 SPECIFIC CRITERIA .....	20
<b>5. GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FUNDING .....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1 FUNDING .....	20
5.2 CONSORTIUM AGREEMENTS.....	21
5.3 OPEN SCIENCE .....	21
<b>6 SUBMISSION CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER SUBMITTED.....	21
6.2 SUBMISSION PROCEDURE .....	22
6.3 ADVICE FOR SUBMISSION.....	22

# ABSTRACT

This call for proposals falls under a new Priority Research Programme (PPR) on the theme of autonomy (ageing and disability). This PPR, coordinated by the CNRS and directed by Claude Martin, director of research at the CNRS, in association with a multidisciplinary scientific council of 16 members from a range of establishments, aims to structure the research community and finance long-term and ambitious collaborative research projects on under-explored fronts in science. These projects will lead to significant progress in terms of understanding and the development of innovations in the field of autonomy. This PPR has identified four scientific challenges.

**This first call for proposals relates to the first two challenges, challenge 1: definition, scope and measures of autonomy and challenge 2: public policies on autonomy**

This call for proposals has a budget of €7 M.

## **Challenge #1: Defining the notion of autonomy, methods for understanding and measuring it**

The proposed projects should explore the wealth of meanings behind the notion of autonomy, beyond its simple administrative definition; in other words, the diverse ways in which it is used by those affected, whether the beneficiaries of policies on autonomy, their carers, family and friends, the professionals responsible for implementing these policies, the public decision-makers who choose to finance them or society as a whole. There are two preferred methods for deconstructing/reconstructing this notion, each of which requires interdisciplinary cooperation:

**Theme 1: Historical and genealogical analysis of the notion, controversies and criticism it has generated, of its legal or regulatory definitions in different fields, with a particular focus on the historical points of any redefinitions or normative turnarounds.**

**Theme 2: Empirical analysis of its administrative uses and of its individual and collective appropriations in the field of autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term, with a particular focus on the issue of measuring individual autonomy.**

## **Challenge #2: Designing public policies on autonomy**

The proposed projects should provide for a different perspective on the subject of “autonomy policies” by exploring the categories of public action that structure legislative and regulatory texts, public institutions and professional practices. There are two preferred methods for the projects, each of which requires interdisciplinary cooperation:

**Theme 1: Genealogical and comparative analysis of the different “public action models” in terms of support for autonomy, on different levels of comparison of political territories (between different countries, between local authorities or federated states within a single country or in different countries, etc.).**

**Theme 2: Closely study and compare the regional arrangements and local mechanisms implemented for people identified as requiring support for autonomy, i.e. the very concrete ways in which policies are implemented in “territories”, where the various services available are articulated with varying levels of success, on the one hand, and on the other, the people at whom these services are aimed.**

The maximum duration of the projects is 3 years for projects that fall under challenge 1 and 5 years for projects that fall under challenge 2. The aid requested for projects that fall under challenge 1 must be between €350 and €500K and between €1 and 1.5M for projects on challenge 2. The aid requested for projects that address both challenges 1 and 2 must be between €1.35 and 2 M.

#### Key words

Autonomy; Accessibility; dependence; capacity/incapacity; invalidity; independence; interdependence; care; activity limitation; capabilities; agency; participation; participation restriction; discrimination; stigmatisation; quality of life; individual; disabilities; ageing; disability; disability studies; universal design; universality; public policies; public action; international comparison; regional comparison; site monographs; evaluation; prevention; forward-looking.

## IMPORTANT DATES

### **CLOSE OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

The elements of the submission dossier must be submitted in electronic form on the website:

<https://investissementsdavenir.agencerecherche.fr/ppr-avh>

by:

**2 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 11 AM (PARIS TIME)**

### **LETTERS OF COMMITMENT**

Those entitled to represent the Coordinating Establishment and the Project Partner Institutions must sign a letter of commitment that will confirm, among other things, the contributions (financial, human, local, etc.) over the duration of the project as specified in the submission documents by:

**15 NOVEMBER 2021 AT 11 AM (PARIS TIME)**

To be submitted on the website: <https://investissementsdavenir.agencerecherche.fr/ppr-avh>

A commitment letter template is available on the website

## Contacts

**SCIENTIFIC PROJECT MANAGER: GABRIEL MATHERAT**

**PROGRAMME MANAGER: MICHEL ISINGRINI**

[ppr-avh@agencerecherche.fr](mailto:ppr-avh@agencerecherche.fr)

Please carefully read this entire document  
along with the instructions available on the dossier submission site:  
<https://investissementsdavenir.agencerecherche.fr/ppr-avh>  
For any questions: [ppr-avh@agencerecherche.fr](mailto:ppr-avh@agencerecherche.fr)

# 1. GENERAL CONTEXT AND GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PRIORITY RESEARCH PROGRAMME

## 1.1. BACKGROUND

Having been launched by the President of France on 11 February 2020 at the National Disability Conference (CNH), the government entrusted the CNRS with the scientific management of a Priority Research Programme (PPR) on autonomy, with up to 30 million euros in funding over the period from 2021 to 2026, conducted in close partnership with the national research community and with the French National Research Agency (ANR) as the operator, as part of the Investments for the Future Programmes (PIA). Claude Martin is the director of programmes at the CNRS. A multidisciplinary scientific council of 16 members from a variety of establishments, as well as a programme committee made up of foreign experts and stakeholder representatives, will follow the implementation of this Programme.

The aim of this programme is to help reinforce research structures in all fields relating to autonomy, with priority given to a few key challenges to action. The priority is to mobilise the resources of the PPR in order to reinforce teams and infrastructures for research in these fields. While new data is needed in order to gain insight into the heterogeneity of populations in terms of age, generation, state of health, environment and resources alike, it is also important to have an overall strategy for mobilising the large amount of data already available and the numerous and varied sources (quantitative and qualitative data, cohort data, administrative data) and improving the way in which it is used. Four scientific challenges have been identified. This call for proposals covers the first two challenges.

## 1.2. OBJECTIVES OF THE PRIORITY RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The first challenge covers the **definition of the notion of autonomy** and the methods for understanding and measuring it. The environments in which people live (their working and housing conditions, the proximity of services or lack thereof, etc.) may compromise their ability to act and decide by and for themselves. Understanding what autonomy means according to different scientific approaches can enable research to question established social requirements and representations in terms of autonomy, and to better understand the obstacles faced by some people in their attempt to meet these requirements.

The second challenge consists of studying the **design of public policies** on autonomy on a national and international level, be they policies nominally dedicated to autonomy, or other public policies that contribute to it (urban, housing, employment, education, etc. policies), taking account of the stakeholders involved, public officials, families, the private sector and community-based organisations.

The third challenge explores **situations and experiences of increased and reduced autonomy**. The best way to understand the ways in which current social transformations or some of life's challenges affect one's sense of autonomy and ability to act and choose consists of precisely studying the experiences of those affected, whether or not they face disabilities or some of the effects of ageing. The aim is to think in terms of prevention and of developing communities in order to best identify the environmental conditions of autonomy.

The fourth challenge relates to the **design, receipt and uses of innovative systems and experiments** in compensation, replacement, accessibility and adaptation of the environment and person-to-person support with a view to autonomy, particularly in the biomedical, social, technological, information and communication fields.

These four challenges will lead to calls for proposals and calls for expressions of interest launched by the ANR.

## 2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND CONTEXTS OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

This first call for proposals relates to the first two challenges, *challenge 1: definition, scope and measures of autonomy* and *challenge 2: public policies on autonomy*. Each of these two challenges is split into two themes.

Proposals will meet one of the two challenges, or both challenges and, within one challenge, will relate to one or both themes.

### 2.1. CHALLENGE 1: DEFINING THE NOTION OF AUTONOMY, METHODS FOR UNDERSTANDING AND MEASURING IT

#### 2.1.1 OBJECTIVES

Beyond its simple administrative definition, this component of the call for proposals aims to restore the wealth of meanings behind the notion of **autonomy** and the flexibility with which it is used by those affected, whether the beneficiaries of policies on autonomy, their carers, family and friends, the professionals responsible for implementing these policies, the public decision-makers who choose to finance them or society as a whole.

As indicated by the title and scope of the National Solidarity Fund for Autonomy (CNSA), the term “autonomy” became established in France around the year 2000 in reference both to the ways in which those with disabilities access autonomy and the ways in which those with chronic age-related illnesses can maintain their autonomy. This administrative definition of autonomy, as an ideal to be achieved or abilities to be preserved in specific situations (disability, dependence of the elderly), represents a specific crystallisation of a notion with a rich conceptual and theoretical history. Moreover, it has been subject to a host of individual and collective interpretations within the framework of autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term. The aim here is to construct a twofold map – conceptual and empirical – of the notion of autonomy and its uses, in order to identify the foundations with which to build a new set of “policies on autonomy”.

**There are two preferred research methods or themes for deconstructing/reconstructing this notion, each of which requires interdisciplinary cooperation.**

**Theme 1: Historical and genealogical analysis of the notion, controversies and criticism it has generated, of its legal or regulatory definitions in different fields, with a particular focus on the historical points of any redefinitions or normative turnarounds**

**Theme 2: Empirical analysis of its administrative uses and of its individual and collective appropriations in the field of autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term, with a particular focus on the issue of measuring individual autonomy**

### **2.1.2 CONTEXT PER THEME**

#### **Theme 1: Historical and genealogical analysis of the concept of autonomy**

This analysis will consider the controversies and criticism it has generated, of its legal or regulatory definitions in different fields, with a particular focus on the historical points of any redefinitions or normative turnarounds

During the 20th century, the notion of autonomy became established in different spheres: biomedicine, law, social policies, education policies, collective initiatives, etc., opening towards a whole range of theoretical directions and practical implications. While making no claim to be exhaustive, some of these, which are more directly associated with the social treatment of disability and vulnerability, can be briefly presented and may be of use for the proposals.

In the late 1960s, in North America, there was a new focus on the ethics of research and human experimentation with an emphasis on the principle of respecting autonomy first in terms of experiments and then in care situations. This reference to the idea of autonomy played a key role in the emergence of patient rights, within certain limits that are themselves the subject of debate. Autonomy is also seen as a value that takes the focus away from the complexity of the medical decision, particularly in care situations where the patient is considered cognitively incompetent, or even unable to articulate an opinion on a required decision.

Furthermore, studies on disability have evolved, again since the 1960s, in line with the various ways in which those with disabilities and their families have mobilised. Both these studies and these movements have triggered a clarification and a championing of disability rights, demanding true equality (as opposed to purely equal rights, for which current positive rights offer little guarantee). In terms of research, these studies and mobilisations have emphasised a principle – “nothing about us without us” – that is central to contemporary participatory approaches in research, even though this comes with the pitfall of disregarding the social circumstances in which an individual may or may not find themselves, in a “we” that risks being imposed upon them.

In certain societies, research projects and rights movements have been able to adhere to a liberal concept of autonomy in order to put an end to practices of segregation and discrimination, and representations of disability that are above all compassion-based or even bleak. However, this work has faced criticism, particularly from feminist philosophy, which champions a concept of connected autonomy and care-based ethics. These two movements have come up against several sociological theories that criticise the contradiction between “methodological individualism” and “holism” while championing the interdependency of individuals. They encourage us to consider autonomy as part of a host of relationships within collectives (couples, households, relatives, etc.) and even beyond human societies to the entire living world. Considerations on socialisation and education have also provided room to develop this model of an individual that is autonomous but connected, and these deserve attention.

Finally, the approach associated in France with the philosopher Georges Canguilhem, addresses central issues regarding loss of autonomy on a physiological, functional, cognitive etc. level. This approach refers to the idea that human beings experience health and ageing-related incidents over the course of our lifetime and, successfully or not, are part of a process of determining our own standard of living



in line with our environment. With this in mind, a deteriorated physiological state does not necessarily go hand-in-hand with a negative view of life, one that also stems from what the person considers their own needs and values, what they wish to achieve, what they are prepared to give up, etc. This dynamic is also individual by nature.

Beyond all these considerations, responses to this theme of the call for proposals may also focus on **social movements, policies, legal developments, theories based on alternatives to the notion of autonomy**, which therefore draw on other principles, standards, categories or analytical tools, at times related to but not synonymous with autonomy, such as “independence”, or which open up perspectives that are entirely different to those bound up in the notion of autonomy, for example with the notions of abilities/inabilities, aptitude, adaptation, human functioning, capabilities or **social participation**.

In this context, this theme of the call also seeks to **address the challenge raised by criticism of the notion of autonomy**, in particular those who have questioned the atomised vision of the individual with which it is associated. This criticism leads us to investigate the following issue: in order to recognise the multiple relationships that underpin our existences, should we expand the concept of autonomy towards a mesological or situational autonomy, in other words one that is ultimately rooted in the communities in which the person is connected to other human beings, and perhaps also animals, or even technical objects, and linked to institutions and services? What could provide us with such a broadened vision of autonomy?

## **Theme 2: Empirical analysis of the administrative uses of the notion of autonomy and its individual and collective appropriations in France**

This analysis will take place in the sphere of disability policies and policies that support the elderly in their autonomy, with a particular focus on the issue of measuring individual autonomy and its practical consequences.

The different configurations of autonomy may be understood within the frameworks of disability policies and dependence policies; they may be analysed in different “places of care” but also in the diverse uses of public space.

### **1/ Configurations in which the ideal of individual autonomy represents a resource for beneficiaries**

A person may be more or less autonomous according to their situation or their own environment, and may over time experience different degrees or steps in the reduction or loss of autonomy. How are the tools for measuring individual autonomy – which entitle people to certain rights – adapted by implementation officers to take into account the requests and fears expressed by the individual and their close personal and professional circle? How can these implementation officers avoid the effects of stigmatisation or control that these tools may cause and make them a resource for users or beneficiaries?

### **2/ Configurations in which the ideal of autonomy backfires on beneficiaries, some of their close family and friends or certain professionals**

Responses to this theme of the call for proposals may relate to the perceived or experienced limitations of using the notion of autonomy as a standard or principle to guide action. We observe that situations are qualified as “limitations”, in relation to the promotion of or respect for autonomy, limitations that may arise from circumstances (such as a context of crises versus a so-called ordinary time), ethical or

political purposes that appear compatible with autonomy but are in fact antagonistic when applied to people in particular or linked to the people themselves.

Regardless of the configuration encountered, responses **must explore the content given to this notion of autonomy, which is necessary in order to measure, assess or at least confirm it.** Institutions and stakeholders that support people losing their autonomy need tools for understanding autonomy and its dynamics and for designing tailored mechanisms. However, lending content to the notion of autonomy is complex, especially when taking account of the social and cultural variations that transcend the uses of this notion, as well as the potential variations related to life as it happens, the different ages a human being lives through and their identity. Moreover, there are fundamental objections to the intention of lending “standardised” content to the notion of autonomy which, it should be remembered, evokes the idea of self-determination. Might any determined meaning of autonomy, especially if conveyed through standards (social, treatment, etc.) risk stymieing this self-determination?

## 2.2. CHALLENGE 2: DESIGNING PUBLIC POLICIES ON AUTONOMY

### 2.2.1 OBJECTIVES

This second component pursues two types of objective.

First, on a scientific level, to **provide for a different perspective on the subject of “policies in support of autonomy” by moving away from the categories of public action** that structure legislative and regulatory texts, public institutions and professional practices. There are two preferred methods for this deconstruction/reconstruction, each of which requires interdisciplinary cooperation (within human and social sciences, as well as with biomedical and technological sciences) on the very definition of the general problematics of the proposed projects:

- Genealogical and comparative analysis of the different “public action models”, in which the level of comparison of political territories may be situated between different countries, between local authorities or federated states within a single country or in different countries, etc.
- Closely study and compare the regional arrangements and local mechanisms implemented for people identified as requiring support for autonomy, i.e. the very concrete ways in which policies are implemented in “territories”, where the various services (structures and professions) available are articulated with varying levels of success, on the one hand, and on the other, the people at whom these services are aimed.

The next step is to **contribute to a new structure for research** on autonomy and the loss of autonomy. The selected teams will be sure to **develop innovative and multidisciplinary research consortia in order to bring about profound changes to research in this field.**

The fields that can be grouped into policies on autonomy have been taken into account and structured into targeted, distinct policies rooted in various concerns relating to health, assistance or social security. They have undergone significant transformations over the past 50 years, the best-known aspect of which is undoubtedly the emergence of the category of “autonomy policies”, a recent categorisation that encompasses the fields of ageing and disability and attempts to go beyond them. Analysing autonomy policies means defining their scope, in other words what they include and exclude, their overlap, their similarity, their individual specificities. To do this, it is important to draw on international and inter-regional comparative contributions and a historical perspective that sheds light on the way in which public problems have been constructed in terms of autonomy and their related normative dimensions.

This historical or genealogical perspective could broaden our current understanding of the genesis of recent transformations in policies on both disability and ageing, in terms of their links to rights and anti-discrimination movements and the decline in welfare states, and particularly the ways in which international bodies have translated them into regulations of varying scopes on the aspect of disability. This process has led the issue of disability to move beyond the narrow field of category-based policies into common law and inclusion. It shifts the baseline from integration to accessibility, which is extended no more exclusively in its material dimension (physical accessibility of buildings, public spaces and transport), but broadened to cover such services as education, work, healthcare, culture, etc. The result of these transformations is that a new class of laws (anti-discrimination, general or universal accessibility) has, in the case of France, been added to specific social law (compensation policies, allocation of resources [AAH] and employment quotas, to name a few).

It would be salutary to study the genesis of these new laws, their inclusion in a historical heritage and the potential hybridisation between protective and egalitarian approaches, as well as the effectiveness of these laws, how they are received and achieved on an individual level, and the ways in which people choose or decline to invoke them. It would also be pertinent to open research up to the sectors of education, environment (architecture, urban planning), communication, etc. Using the term “policies on autonomy” in this context means refusing to restrict the scope of the challenge to policies and systems based on the compensation of individual needs in order to fully include an analysis of policies that strive for universal accessibility to facilitate autonomy for all, as well as other hybrid policies that attempt to combine the universal dimension with the individual one.

This “challenge” also aims to address public action models through the representations on which they are based (legal categories, collective representations, scientific objectifications, etc.), as well as through organic systems and the institutions that structure them (public authorities, services, mobilisation bodies, operators and professions). One could explore regional levels and relevant policies for comparison (federal states, for example, come to mind). Depending on the models observed, one could also identify any points at which their political and social legitimacy has been called into question and, more widely, the ways in which they have been transformed.

It appears that work on autonomy policies remain segmented not only in terms of communities, but also in terms of the relevant disciplinary approaches that are difficult to relate to one another. More often than not, they also remain confined to the most recent periods and to Western societies, which underuses the wealth of very recent foreign research on other periods and continents. Finally, this work mostly covers the “macro” and “meso” levels, or arrangements and structures on a national level and/or those that mobilise local authorities, but does little to address the “micro” level of how these policies function as an interface between stakeholders in the field, including associations and the “beneficiaries”.

It would also appear useful to both revisit – in a much more systematic and in-depth way – work comparing national policy systems relating to autonomy (“theme 1”) and to strive to develop an understanding of how these policies work in concrete terms among those at whom they are aimed, in the case of France (“theme 2”). Regardless of the chosen theme, a forward-looking reflection is also expected in order to identify development scenarios, from what can be classed as the inertia of existing systems to the exploration of alternative paths to reform and their consequences, particularly in terms of cost or impact on current support arrangements.

## **2.2.2 CONTEXT PER THEME**

### **Theme 1: An in-depth comparison of the national systems of policy on autonomy**

#### **General framework**

National systems of autonomy policy are composed of “models” that are relatively coherent in terms of function and in line with the level of representations and standards. Systems consist of general forms of introducing solidarity (nationalised, insurance-based, private patrimonial, domestic) that operate according to “needs”, as identified through the framework of representations and resources that can be mobilised in order to meet them. Each of these models also involves the participation of support mechanisms (public, association-based, commercial) to varying degrees. Finally, there is a variety of ways that beneficiaries access resources: funds made directly available, the right to material provisions funded by a third party or a combination of the two, which is in turn linked to forms of regulating access to resources, such as objective rights defined on a regulatory basis, rights quantified and assessed by local agencies, the regional organisation and control over the offer of services.

As observed in discussions of the various levels composing policies, these different areas are naturally interconnected in each national configuration, meaning these policies have minimal consistency and coherence. One theory is that this organises specific “models”, with each country establishing one model or another, without prejudice to the fact that each one also develops their model over time, or is likely to change it. The aim of comparing countries is therefore to update the approach or approaches that organise each national policy on autonomy overall, and to increase our overall understanding of these approaches through this comparison.

**Submitted projects should justify the choice of countries and periods. They may investigate the segmentation between elderly people “loosing autonomy” and people with disabilities.** Depending on national configurations, this truncation may or may not be established, or partially so. They should also revisit the connections, in each national model, between autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term, employment policies and social policies, as well as a set of universal public (healthcare, education, etc.), spatial (transport, urban planning, land management) and sovereign (justice, police, armed forces) policies.

### **Project structure**

Without claiming to be exhaustive, in reference to the underlying “critical questions” of autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term – both in the field of disability and of dependence, which are often highlighted in the research and legal-administrative productions that cover them – we can draw up an indicative list that each project can use (whether or not in its entirety), add to or reformulate:

- The methods and tools for assessing loss of autonomy
- The forms the provisions take (in kind, cash, a combination of the two)
- The establishments and services
- The regulatory structures both for the “demand” and the offer of services
- Employment and professions (structuring of professions, statuses, distribution of activities, etc.)
- The combination of forms of “solidarity” (public, close and extended family, commercial)
- The representations of accessibility and the responsibilities of infrastructures and institutions
- Regional structures
- The role of target audiences in the construction of policies
- The way society adapts to ageing

Extending the call for proposals to policies “on autonomy” will also necessarily bring other critical questions to the fore. Projects will propose an analysis of several of these questions, in several national systems, with justification for their choices. The aim is to arrive at a cross-disciplinary comparative reading of national systems. Projects will offer an “increased generalisation” in order to both identify the overall approaches that structure each national system analysis and produce a comparative typology of the national systems addressed and their transformations, whether driven from within or from the outside.

In order to respond to the forward-looking phase of the projects, project leaders are invited to use comparison not only to demonstrate the national rationales behind autonomy policies, but also to identify overall approaches, be they similar or distinct. The forward-looking phase should also include consideration of other response rationales from public authorities: individual provisions, in kind or cash, universal or specific facilities, common law systems, for example in terms of retirement or the organisation of working hours and rhythms, etc.

## Theme 2: Regional arrangements and local mechanisms for policy on autonomy in France

### General framework

Regarding the second theme of challenge 2, in the case of France teams are invited to analyse policies in terms of action, or more precisely to analyse the very concrete means of implementation on an infra-national, regional level, autonomy policies in the strict sense of the terms, contributing policies and any additional private initiatives, both in terms of defining the offer of various facilities and services and those in need of assistance.

Autonomy policies bring into play a plurality of operators with diverging aims and interests, as well as target audiences that are also in a highly diverse, ever-changing and unstable situations, with very different interest and behaviours, leading to a series of tensions and dilemmas (between case-by-case and standardised approaches; between health-based and social rationales; between at-home and institution-based care, etc.). They are applied in contrasting and highly unequal ways according to the social groups in question and regionally.

Close observations on a group of departmental and infra-departmental areas will help identify the approaches at play, any limitations that arise, and the arrangements and adaptations made by operators and beneficiaries in order to make the most of the national and local context in which they take place – that is, to the best of what each feel to be in their interest. They will also help isolate the individual and collective authorities needed to design and implement these arrangements or opt out from them depending on the case, and the institutional, economic, social and demographic environments that encourage or hinder them.

A series of recent projects has drawn attention to the regional and social inequalities with which autonomy policies are implemented at different levels. An initial level relates to means of accessing rights and the interpretation given, among implementation officers, to the notion of “disability”, “dependence”, “incapacities” or “autonomy” so as to include or, conversely, exclude factual situations, to class them both in order of seriousness and urgency and by distinguishing prevention, “immediate” and “potential needs” in order to refer them to different types of stakeholders and consequently to specific provisions or funding mechanisms. The work of interpretation does not only cover medical/social evaluation matrices, but also legal categories for delegating decisions and assessing responsibilities (protection, maintenance obligation, etc.) and economic calculations (contributive capacity according to income, assets, employment status, etc.).

Next, the level of the genesis and regulation of the offer of autonomy support should help identify what makes up this offer in various “territories”. The level of costs involved in assisting people and their distribution enables us to consider the cost made up of public contributions and the contribution of each beneficiary, as well as the shortfalls experienced by certain categories of professionals, under the constraints of the authorities’ choice of rates and the mechanisms of the market.

Finally, the level of life, support and cover pathways invites a dynamic approach, which brings out points of crisis and routine phases, sheds a stark light on the regional and local arrangements for the difficulties people face in finding their place among existing systems, the negotiations that take place in these instances with close family and friends and professionals, the rationales behind individual choices (beneficiaries, close family and friends, professionals), the effects of hystereses and reversibilities.

This research paves the way for more in-depth study involving at once statistical, econometric and ethnographic methods of analysis. In the context of this theme, comparing several French regions and going beyond autonomy policies alone to include all contributing public policies are the preferred lines of investigation.

## Project structure

If we consider both their specifically heuristic value and the pragmatic questions that arise in the design and implementation of policies on autonomy, we might suggest a set of precise points that could form the basis of investigations; each project may explore some of them, add to them or reformulate them:

- The concrete means of calculating allowances (in France, personalised autonomy allowance [APA], disability compensation provision [PCH], social accommodation assistance [ASH], personalised housing assistance [APL], etc.) according to the characteristics of beneficiaries and the local context
- Motivations behind the non-take-up of various provisions
- The normative baselines for professionals (requirement, subsidiarity, deviance, equity, etc.)
- The concrete implementation of accessibility standards and their consequences for economic stakeholders
- Control data on policies and their uses
- Alternative means of housing, their promoters, their users
- The role of “traditional” operators (CCAS or community centre for social aid, health and medical/social structures, health care and social work professions, social security offices, etc.) and less visible stakeholders (family and neighbours, elected representatives, various public services, retailers, etc.)
- The concrete combination of forms of “solidarity” and the sometimes-unseen overall approach that results from it
- Cover pathways and their complications
- The preventive measures adopted in terms of autonomy

Extending the call for proposals to policies “on autonomy” will necessarily bring other critical questions for investigation to the fore. Projects will propose an analysis of several of these questions, in several territories, with justification for their choices. As in theme 1, **project leaders should justify the type, number and nature of territories chosen** (the departmental level is not always the most pertinent). To **ensure the broadest possible territorial coverage, leaders are invited to form team consortia**. In an extension of comparative work conducted in a range of departments and in infra-departmental spaces on the various issues selected, each project is expected above all to strive to draw general lessons from the rationales behind choices and their varying degrees of limitation observed, the impasses encountered by stakeholders in the field, and the power relations that structure the local space. Linking these, where possible, would help to outline different local “models”.

## 3. EXPECTED PROJECTS

### 3.1 CHARACTERISTICS COMMON TO BOTH CHALLENGES

**Submitted projects should strive for interdisciplinary approaches.**

**All projects** must include a “research-based training” element (master’s and doctorate and post-doctorate).

### 3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECTS ON CHALLENGE 1

Challenge 1, “**Defining the notion of autonomy, methods for understanding and measuring it**”, includes two themes of investigation.

For one and/or the other of both themes of challenge 1, teams are invited to take one or more of the approaches listed below, or to propose others, explaining their methodological choices and justifying them:

- Research that seeks to examine and test one or several theoretical, normative, operational, etc., variations of autonomy in light of situations of vulnerability, including critical approaches and alternative proposals, etc.
- Research that seeks to historicist and contextualise the notion of autonomy, analyse its circulation, its conceptual and semantic shifts, as well as its practical uses and applications, etc.
- Research that seeks to bring out experiential approaches to autonomy, based on situations and experiences of vulnerability, etc.
- Research that seeks to propose innovative methods that could link disciplinary approaches, levels of analysis, etc.

Projects may also take the form of reasoned appraisals of research work conducted in different disciplinary fields in order to identify and map the concepts of autonomy (or related notions) they use, to summarise their empirical operationalisation and, particular in terms of evaluating and measuring autonomy, and to highlight the strengths and limitations in order to take account of the social realities studied. These inventories may also cover certain themes (for example, the socialisation of autonomy in education or the workplace, or assistance-based technologies, housing, mobility, etc.). Projects may also develop methodological proposals, particularly in terms of participatory research and interviewing those affected, and make use of the resources of international comparison. They should also take on an interdisciplinary perspective.

### 3.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECTS ON CHALLENGE 2

Challenge 2, “**Designing public policies on autonomy**”, includes two themes of investigation corresponding to the two preferred methods:

- Theme 1 calls for comparative analyses, temporal and spatial, of the different public action models established in terms of support for autonomy.
- Theme 2 calls for comparative analyses of regional arrangements and local systems implemented in the case of France, with an approach centred mainly on the concrete configurations formed at the interface of the “beneficiaries” and the structures and professions involved.

Whatever the chosen theme, it is expected that proposed projects include:

- An initial phase based on thematic approaches focused on the “critical questions” that emerge both in light of previous work and in analyses conducted by stakeholders or even observers, as well as problems that appear obscure and poorly managed, or that cause dysfunction. Examples of such issues will be included in this call as an indication. This initial phase of work should, in a field known to be fragmented, make use of **contributions from different disciplines and laboratories brought together as a consortium**, giving them the ability to build their approaches and use the results in an integrated way on these relatively constrained “critical questions”. Teams should specify the **way in which they will conduct these international comparisons and the partners that they may involve**.



- A second phase consisting of a **“increased generalisation”, both on the theme of international comparisons (theme 1) and the study of local systems (theme 2), with teams encouraged to cover both themes as a consortium**. The aim is therefore to produce an overall effect of understanding 1) national systems in themselves and by comparing them, 2) local policies and practices in themselves and by comparing them with other local configurations. This second, more ambitious, phase will also necessitate this grouped approach for teams in order to facilitate the increased generalisation that it requires.
- A third, prospective phase will strive to identify, from the perspective of the “critical questions” selected, the issues and challenges that public action in terms of support for autonomy will have to face in the medium and long term. Particularly in mind are changes to working conditions, the efficacy of primary care, increased requirements for nursing or adjustments to day-to-day life, demographic transformations of family structures, generational renewal, etc. This forward-looking exercise is an invitation to consider other avenues to those followed so far in terms of autonomy policies in the strict sense of the term (preventive work, job transformations, the credibility of alternatives to the EHPAD or nursing home, etc.), and to consider more generally any other fields of public policy that could contribute to autonomy.

Responses to this challenge of the PPR on autonomy should cover all these specifications (genealogy, comparisons, forecasting) based on at least one of the proposed themes (international comparison of national public action models, infranational comparison of local systems).

### 3.4 PARTNERSHIPS

The “Autonomy” Priority Research Programme encourages an **interdisciplinary approach**. It is expected that **projects mobilise research consortia, human and social sciences as well as health sciences and engineering sciences**.

The participation of associations in projects is encouraged, and will form an element of their assessment. However, only higher education and research institutions will be able to receive funding from the ANR.

A single partner, designated as “coordinating institution” in the project, will sign the contract with ANR. They will be responsible for the management of funding received from the ANR and, as needed, will sign repayment agreements with the project’s partner institutions.

### 3.5 PROJECT DURATION AND AMOUNT OF FUNDING

The maximum duration of the projects is 3 years for projects that fall under challenge 1 and 5 years for projects that fall under challenge 2. The aid requested for projects that fall under challenge 1 must be between €350 and €500K and between €1 and 1.5M for projects on challenge 2. The aid requested for projects that address both challenges 1 and 2 must be between €1.35 and 2 M.

### 3.6 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT OF THE PPR

The scientific management of the PPR is entrusted to the CNRS. It will draw on strong guidance from the scientific communities involved in the projects, which will be selected as part of this call for proposals. In particular, this management will include:

- **a provision for the scientific management and monitoring of projects in the form of a dedicated seminar for both challenges;**
- international scientific conferences and gatherings and/or seminars between researchers, representatives affected by autonomy issues and public policy leaders;
- the production of documents for disseminating various types of knowledge, including abstracts with an operational purpose for different audiences: scientists, socio-economic stakeholders, managers and public decision-makers, throughout the duration of the programme.

The research project teams selected at the end of this call for proposals should take part in this range of work.

## 4. REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECTS

### 4.1 SELECTION PROCEDURE

Eligible projects (see § 4.2) will be evaluated by an **independent jury with an international dimension**. The jury may, if necessary, call upon external expertise and may conduct a **hearing of the leaders of the projects** that it has previously **preselected**.

Upon completion of its work, the jury will submit to the steering committee of the "Autonomy: ageing and disability" PRP a report including: 1°) the scores awarded to projects evaluated according to the criteria indicated below, 2°) the list of projects that the jury recommends for funding because of their quality, evaluated on the basis of these criteria, 3°) the list of projects that the jury recommends not funding because of a quality that it considers insufficient on at least one of the criteria indicated. Each evaluated project will be the subject of an argument justifying its position on one of the two lists. The jury may offer an opinion regarding the amount of funding requested.

The steering committee designates to the General Secretariat for Investment those projects that could be financed and the amount that could be definitively allocated to them. The Prime Minister, after consulting the SGPI, decides on the beneficiaries and the amounts granted. Each project is the subject of an agreement between ANR and the project coordinating institution, detailing the reciprocal obligations of the parties.

The members of the evaluation jury, along with the invited external experts, undertake to respect the rules of ethics and scientific integrity established by ANR. The ANR code of ethics is available on its website. ANR ensures strict compliance with the rules of confidentiality, the absence of links between the members of the jury or external experts and the project leaders, as well as the absence of conflicts of interest for the members of the jury and external experts. In the event of a duly noted breach, ANR reserves the right to take any measures it deems necessary to remedy it. The composition of the jury is posted on the publication site of the call for proposals at the end of the selection procedure.

### 4.2 ADMISSIBILITY CRITERIA

**IMPORTANT- DOSSIERS THAT DO NOT MEET THE ADMISSIBILITY CRITERIA WILL NOT BE PRESENTED TO THE JURY AND WILL NOT BE GRANTED ANY FUNDING.**

1°) The submission dossier, comprising the scientific document and the administrative and financial document, must be submitted in digital form, in the format requested (see 2° below) on the ANR submission site before the closing date and time of the call for proposals shown on page 4. Signed and

scanned letters of commitment must be submitted to the ANR submission site before the date and time indicated on page 4.

2°) The project scientific document must imperatively follow the template available on the call for proposals website and be filed in unprotected PDF format.

3°) For projects that fall under **challenge 1, the total amount of funding requested must be between €350 and €500K and the maximum duration of the project 3 years.** For projects that fall under **challenge 2, the total amount of funding requested must be between €1 and €1.5M and the maximum duration of the project 5 years.** For projects that fall under both challenges, the total amount of funding requested must be between €1.35 and €2M and the maximum duration of the project 5 years.

4°) The coordinating establishment must be a higher education and research institution.

### 4.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The proposed project should fall fully within the scope of the call for proposals.

**IMPORTANT - DOSSIERS THAT MEET THE ADMISSIBILITY CRITERIA WILL BE EVALUATED BASED ON THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA.**

#### 4.3.1 CRITERIA COMMON TO ALL PROJECTS

While no prerequisite is imposed on the field of the call for proposals, particularly to allow for the contribution of specialists from other research sectors than those of ageing and disability, the following criteria will be used in the evaluation.

1°) Excellence and scientific ambition:

- relevance of the project to the objectives of the “Autonomy: ageing and disability” PPR and coherence with the expected projects
- clarity and relevance of the objectives, research hypotheses and methodological choices of the project
- quality of the results already obtained by the members of the consortium, including in other fields than that of the call for proposals
- ability to involve stakeholders in the system of research
- ability to include international collaborations

2°) Quality, relevance, degree of interdisciplinarity of the consortium:

- quality of the profile of the scientific manager and coordination team of the consortium, ability to steer the project
- quality of the team mobilised for the project
- quality and degree of interdisciplinarity mobilised in the consortium

3°) Organisation and resources mobilised:

- correlation between human and financial resources mobilised in relation to the targeted objectives
- relevance of the organisation of the project, division of labour and work packages, coherence of deliverables, credibility of proposed milestones

- relevance of project monitoring indicators
- relevance and efficacy of the governance system of the project

4°) Expected impact:

- ambition and feasibility of the promotional programme for the envisaged work (publications, scientific conferences and congresses, promotion aimed at stakeholders, public decision-makers and/or the general public, etc.)

#### **4.3.2 SPECIFIC CRITERIA**

For proposals that respond to challenge 1 of the call for proposals:

- originality of the materials that the project proposes to bring together
- level of internationalisation of the project and the means of guaranteeing this in the proposed research system

For proposals that respond to challenge 2 of the call for proposals:

- relevance and innovative character of the proposed research system in light of the themes recommended by the call for proposals
- quality of the empirical research system, be it for comparison between national sites or between public policy models
- openness of the system(s) to different players (stakeholders, professionals, public decision-makers)

For projects that fall under both challenges:

- projects will be evaluated according to the specific criteria of both challenges

### **5. GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FUNDING**

#### **5.1 FUNDING**

The state has decided to invest 30 million euros (7 million of which are allocated to this call for proposals) as part of the “Priority Research Programmes” action of the Investments for the Future Programme 421 (“Support for progress in higher education and research”) in support of research projects that aim to meet the challenges people face in terms of autonomy, be it due to a disability or the process of ageing. This Priority Research Programme, entitled “Autonomy: ageing and disability”, should culminate in scientific and technical progress that enables France to tackle the human, social, demographic, health-based and economic challenges by both adapting its policies in this field and adapting the environment in which people are likely to find themselves.

The action funded under the “Priority Research Programmes” is exceptional and differs from the recurrent funding of research. For higher education and research institutions, the funding allocated represents additional resources, intended for new actions.

Eligible expenditure is specified in the financial regulation relating to the methods of granting aid. Financial support will be provided in the form of an endowment, the disbursement of which is made by ANR for the project-coordinating institution, according to the schedule stipulated in the agreement, over the duration of the project. This support can only benefit higher education and research institutions with legal entity status.

## 5.2 CONSORTIUM AGREEMENTS

Funded projects carried out in partnership must establish a consortium agreement specifying the rights and obligations of each partner establishment in the project. For projects that fall under challenge 1, the consortium agreement will only be necessary if a company is a partner in the project. The agreement will specify:

- the distribution of the financial allocation, tasks and deliverables between the various partners, along with the human and financial resources mobilised by them,
- the scientific, technical and financial modalities of access to resources shared between the partners,
- the conditions for promoting the results obtained after the research and for sharing their intellectual and industrial property.

For projects including one or more industrial partners, the consortium agreement must demonstrate that this(these) partner(s) does(do) not receive indirect aid.

## 5.3 OPEN SCIENCE

As part of ANR's contribution to the promotion and implementation of open science, and in connection with the national plan for open science, the coordinating institution and its partners must commit, in the event of funding, to:

1°) deposit all scientific publications (full text) resulting from the project in an open archive, either directly in HAL, or through a local institutional archive, under the terms of article 30 of the "For a Digital Republic" Act,

2°) provide, within 6 months of the start of the project, a data management plan (DMP) according to the terms communicated in the granting agreement and the Financial Regulation. Moreover, ANR recommends giving priority to publication in journals and books that are natively open access.

## 6 SUBMISSION CONDITIONS

### 6.1 CONTENTS OF THE DOSSIER SUBMITTED

The dossier submitted must include a set of items making it possible to conduct a scientific and technical evaluation of the project. It must be submitted before the close of the call for proposals, the date and time of which are indicated on page 4.

#### IMPORTANT

No additional items, other than letters of commitment from partners, can be accepted after closure of the call for proposals, the date and time of which are indicated on page 4.

The documents must be uploaded to the submission site whose address is given on page 4. In order to access this service, it is essential to first open an account (ID and password). To obtain these items, registration should be performed as soon as possible.

The complete tender dossier consists of three fully informed documents:

- the "specific document", including a description of the envisaged project, according to the format supplied. It must not exceed 15 pages (minimum font size: 11, Times New Roman or equivalent), with the list of scientific publications from the last 3 years of the researchers/teams proposing the project as an appendix;

**IMPORTANT:**

**As projects are evaluated by an international jury, it is recommended that a project description be produced in English. If the “scientific document” is written in French, the jury may request an English translation within a time frame compatible with the deadlines of the evaluation process**

- the "administrative and financial document", which includes the administrative and budgetary description of the project;
- the letters of commitment signed by partner institutions.

The elements of the submission dossier (administrative and financial document in Excel format / scientific document templates and letter of commitment in Word format) will be accessible on the publication web page of this call for proposals (see address page 4).

## **6.2 SUBMISSION PROCEDURE**

**The tender dossier documents must be submitted by the project's scientific and technical manager:**

**IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT only:**

- before the closing date of this call for proposals indicated on page 4,
- on the submission website ensuring recommendations are followed.

Pre-registration on the submission site is required to submit a project.

Only the electronic version of the submission documents present on the submission site at the close of the call for proposals will be considered for the evaluation.

AN ELECTRONIC ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT will be sent to the project's scientific and technical manager once the documents have been uploaded.

Note: The signing of the letters of commitment certifies that the project partners agree to submit the project in accordance with the terms described in the administrative and financial document as well as in the scientific document and its possible annexes.

## **6.3 ADVICE FOR SUBMISSION**

It is strongly advisable:

- to open an account on the submission site as soon as possible;
- not to wait until the project submission deadline to enter the online data and upload the files (caution: compliance with the submission deadline is imperative);
- to ensure that the documents uploaded to the dedicated "submission documents" and "signed documents" sections are complete and correspond to the expected items. The tender dossier and uploading of the signed documents can only be validated by the scientific and technical officer if all the documents have been uploaded;
- to regularly check the programme website, at the address listed on page 1, which contains up-to-date information about its progress;
- to contact correspondents by e-mail, if necessary, at the address mentioned on page 1 of this document.