**Title of the project**

For the ANR, the registration of a PRCI project in step 1 **does not require the writing of a pre-proposal** but only the completion of the online form and CVs on [IRIS](https://iris.anr.fr/en/login) (for PRCI collaborations in “ANR Lead agency” mode or in “non-Lead agency” mode).

**NEW IN 2026:** the registration of a PRCE project **no longer requires the writing of a pre-proposal in step 1 of the AAPG**, but only the completion of the online form and CVs on [IRIS](https://iris.anr.fr/en/login), cf. 2026 AAPG guide or 2026 AAPG call text.

Please use **an easily readable document layout** (A4 pages, Calibri 11 or equivalent, single spaced, 2cm margins or more, numbered pages, for tables and figures Calibri font size 9 minimum or equivalent).

**The submission website** [**IRIS**](https://iris.anr.fr/en/login) **rejects the uploading of a scientific document of more than 4 pages or in a format other than pdf. No appendix allowed.** The CVs of the scientific coordinator and of the scientific managers of the partners must be completed online on [IRIS](https://iris.anr.fr/en/login) before the closing date and time. Concerning a JCJC or PRME project, only the CV of the scientific coordinator is required.

**Your pre-proposal must allow its evaluation regarding the two main evaluation criteria (see definition in the** [**2026 AAPG**](https://anr.fr/en/call-for-proposals-details/call/generic-call-for-proposals-aapg-2026/) **call text)** : « Quality and scientific ambition » and « Organisation and implementation of the project ». **Please, refer to the** [**2026 AAPG guide**](https://anr.fr/en/call-for-proposals-details/call/generic-call-for-proposals-aapg-2026/) **in order to know the sub-criteria, differentiated according to the chosen funding instrument.** No other information will be sought or requested to evaluate the project on these criteria and sub-criteria.

**No budget information is required in the scientific document,** given that no sub-criteria is linked to budget information in step 1.

# Context, positioning and objective(s) of the project

**This paragraph refers to the evaluation criterion « Quality and scientific aim ». The following information should be detailed here:**

* Objectives of the project and research hypotheses;
* Position of the project in relation to the state of the art;
* Methodology to reach the scientific objectives of the project, detailed description of the intended method(s) including its disciplinary coverage (mono-trans-inter-disciplinary) ;
* Added-value in terms of scientific contribution, concerning the object, the research issue, the methodology ; added-value in terms of knowledge production[[1]](#footnote-1) ;
* Ability of the project to address the research issues covered by the chosen research theme (cf. §F. Scientific themes covered by the Generic Call for Proposals 2026, in the [2026 AAPG call text](https://anr.fr/en/call-for-proposals-details/call/generic-call-for-proposals-aapg-2026/))

T**he criterion « Quality and scientific ambition» will be the determining one:** only the projects having received an « A » will proceed to the second step of the evaluation process.

# Partnership (consortium or team)

***This paragraph refers to the evaluation criterion « Organisation and implementation of the project » whose sub-criteria are differentiated according to the funding instruments.***

*The choice of the funding instrument requires reading the expectations in terms of objectives and partnership or team of each of the instruments before making this choice. This choice is final throughout the AAPG selection process.*

***The following information should be detailed here:***

* **For a collaborative research project (PRC),**
* Describe the scientific coordinator, her/his experience in the scientific field, her/his involvement in the project **including his/her involvement rate**;
* Describe the partnership and its complementarity, involvement of each partner in the goal achievement: indicate the different skills to achieve the project, detail the identity of the scientists involved, their institution and any other information providing a framework for assessing the quality and complementarity of the partners and assessing the effectiveness of the collaboration.
* **For a mono-team project (PRME),**
* Describe the scientific coordinator, her/his experience in the scientific field, her/his involvement in the project **including her/his involvement rate**;
* Describe the team, its expertise and complementarity to achieve the scientific goals, identity of the scientists involved **and their involvement rate**, demonstration of the sustainability of the team throughout the project.

Warning **: these information must be identical to the one given in the certificate** from the director of the laboratory uploaded on [**IRIS**](https://iris.anr.fr/en/login)at the closing date and time.

* **For young researcher’s project (JCJC),**
	+ Describe the scientific coordinator, her/his position within the organisation or the host laboratory / within the future organisation or future host laboratory, her/his experience in the scientific field, her/his involvement in the project **including her/his involvement rate**; indicate clearly the year in which the doctoral thesis was defended and year of assumption of duties in the different organisations;
	+ Describe the team formed around the project, its quality and complementarity to reach the objectives, specify the involvement of each participant in achieving the objectives;
	+ Describe the capacity of the project to promote the level of responsibility of the young researcher and to promote the development of her/his own team for the assessment of the adequacy of the project to the JCJC funding instrument.

In the case of a non-permanent position of the coordinator in the host organization or laboratory, it is required to provide in this section the necessary information to reassure the panel members about the feasibility of the project.

# References

**This section refers to the evaluation criterion « Quality and scientific aim », sub-criterion “Scientific ambition of the project and position with respect to the state-of-the-art”.**

List of the bibliographical references used in the pre-proposal.

Please, provide “usable” references, i.e. including the first co-authors (put and al. for publications containing several co-authors), full title, title of the journal, year. You can complete these references by indicating the « open access » link to improve accessibility for the reviewers, but not replace these references with the open access link. Please note, these links do not replace the description of the expectations **in the scientific document**.

Preprints are allowed, especially those referencing preliminary data.

Impact factors should not be mentioned, as they cannot be used by reviewers.

As with other sections of the pre-proposal, **the layout of the bibliography should allow for comfortable reading for reviewers.**

**Bibliography is included in the limit of 4 pages.**

***The success of a project submission depends not only on its ambition or originality, but also on its presentation, both in terms of clarity of purpose and readability for reviewers.***

***You should pay particular attention to the following points:***

*□ I structure my document so that the evaluators can identify the sections that meet the sub-criteria applicable to my project: I use headings, I organize my text into paragraphs, and I may use graphic representations to support my argument (diagrams, images, graphs).*

*□ I follow the document formatting guidelines (line spacing, font size, margins) to make it easier for reviewers to read my document. Please note that panel members may have up to twenty scientific documents to review before the plenary meeting in step 1, and comparing a document that does not follow the formatting guidelines with those that do will not benefit the document that does not follow them.*

*□ I check the consistency of the references in my text: to images, diagrams or tables, to references in the bibliography.*

*□ I do not add information that is not required in step 1, for example “requested budget” or “impact factors” of journals that will not be used by reviewers.*

*□ I correctly complete the required header to facilitate the identification of my project by the evaluators. I check the consistency of this information with that completed online.*

*□ I take the time to have my document read by colleagues to ensure its consistency, readability, and completeness, in the sense that it must meet the applicable evaluation sub-criteria. No information other than that completed and uploaded on IRIS by the closing date and time will be sought or requested from the coordinators during the evaluation.*

*Not all panel members will be experts in your field. Remain accessible in your writing.*

*□ I take care to upload the latest version of my scientific document on IRIS, without comments or corrections; I check that the conversion to PDF has not changed the layout.*

***Projects are evaluated based on the information as completed and submitted on IRIS at the closing date and time, within the 4-page limit for the scientific document. No changes may be made to the information completed online or to the scientific document as submitted on IRIS at the closing date and time.***

***No information other than that completed and submitted at the closing date and time will be requested from coordinators, inferred, or sought from other sources of information as part of the project evaluation.***

***The information submitted online will take precedence over that provided in the scientific document if both sources of information are inconsistent, including if they are incorrectly fulfilled or missing.***

1. *Whatever the type of project: project aiming at original, disruptive or exploratory objectives or concepts; projects aiming to remove scientific obstacles well known in the community; projects exploiting data generated by research infrastructures; projects resulting from previous projects and intended to consider new objectives. Specify, if necessary, the preliminary results obtained. Concerning a follow-up project, specify the results obtained through the previous project and position the new project in relation to the previous one regarding the “new objectives” pursued.* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)