

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Funding Pilot Call for Full Proposals

Foreword

This initiative is endorsed by the Global Research Council (GRC), given the collective agreement on the importance of sustainability for our collective future. With this call the GRC is committed to taking concrete steps towards achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through innovative research and actions.

The GRC is a virtual organisation comprised of science, research, and engineering funding agencies from around the world. It is dedicated to the promotion and sharing of data and best practices for high-quality collaboration among funding agencies worldwide. Further, the GRC is committed to providing an opportunity for countries large and small to work in concert across national borders. The GRC believes that cooperation and collaboration can enhance the quality of science, avoid unnecessary duplication, provide economies of scale, and address issues that can only be solved by working collectively and collaboratively.

This is a pilot call aiming to accelerate the achievement of the SDGs, through the implementation of results from ongoing or recently finalised research and innovation projects to advance knowledge-based achievement of the SDGs, from local to regional scale. Projects will be funded through international consortia where researchers together with implementation partners and stakeholders collectively and collaboratively aim to improve research outcomes for impact. The research and outcomes of the projects funded should lead to impact on society and improve the livelihoods of people on the ground. The call is supported by 11 funding agencies spanning four continents.

Call title: Sustainable Development Goals Pilot Call 2022

Short call title: SDGs Call 2022

Aim and topics: Advancing implementation of 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development, particularly in the topics of (1) human well-being and capabilities; (2) sustainable and just economies; (3) Food systems and nutrition patterns; (4) Energy decarbonisation with universal access; (5) Urban and peri-urban development; (6) Global environmental commons

Budget: Approximately 8.2 million €. Date for the exchange rate will be fixed by each country in their national annex. See each funder's national annex for local currency and budgetary limitations per funding organization.

Participating funders: Chile (ANID), China (NSFC), Côte d'Ivoire (FONSTI), Kenya (NRF Kenya), Norway (RCN), South Africa (NRF), Switzerland (SNSF), Sweden (FORMAS), Tanzania (COSTECH), The Netherlands (NWO) and Turkey (TUBITAK)

International consortia: Applicants must form project consortia with eligible partner organizations from at least three different countries funding the call. Consortia must be based on previously or recently finalised research and innovation projects funded by participating Funding Organisations from the following countries: Chile, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Norway, South Africa, Switzerland, Sweden, Tanzania, The Netherlands and Turkey.

Standard consortium size: Three to six partners

Funding: Each funding agency will provide funds directly to their eligible applicants per consortia in accordance with the agencies' rules and regulations as stated in the national annexes

Duration per project: 2 to 4 years

Background

If the timeframe set by the UN to achieve the SDGs by 2030 is to be realized, there will need to be unrivalled international collaboration within the political, scientific, and societal realms. A concerted effort internationally is needed to develop practical strategies and implementation plans, these then must be actioned at national, regional, and global scales. Implementation of initiatives to realise the SDGs requires governments and all other relevant stakeholders to understand and engage with the scientific realities that underpin the relationship between human activity and the natural world. Scientific expertise and innovation can and should be brought to bear to deliver practical and appropriate results required for the necessary transformations related to the achievement of the SDGs.

As a basis for this initiative to be successful, it is imperative that global perspectives are developed, and this can only be done through a collaborative partnership between stakeholders from both the Global north and Global south, within the context of the 11 countries funding this initiative.

Aims and objectives

This call aims to enhance impact of existing knowledge through innovative approaches towards the achievement of the SDGs, within the context of governance, societal structures, and economy. The call seeks innovative approaches to development, adaptation, design, or improvement of existing or new tools that promote and/or facilitate the achievement of the SDGs.

Projects applying for funding through this call must be based on on-going or recently completed (completed in 2017 or later) research and/or innovation projects. The research and outcomes of the projects funded should lead to impact on society and improve the livelihoods of people on the ground.

Projects applying for funding should use a consortia approach with a diversity of partners co-designing the project. The project consortia should be based on equitable partnership(s). It is crucial that the project fosters societal ownership and empowerment of outcomes through the meaningful involvement of researchers, local authorities, communities, NGOs, i.e., relevant actors and stakeholders. Consortia should structure themselves in alignment with the thematic focus and objectives of the call, based on the eligibility criteria mentioned below.

Call Topics

The SDGs are a framework for improving social, environmental, and economic development on multiple scales. All 17 SDGs are dependent on each other, it is therefore important to consider both the intended and unintended consequences of any proposed implementation actions, while balancing social, economic, and environmental sustainability.

Projects should consider the pledge of ‘Leave No One Behind’, and where appropriate the outcomes of the funded projects should benefit those most vulnerable¹. In striving to achieve the SDGs within the context of this call, consortia should be both pragmatic and realistic when designing their

¹ Most vulnerable: those groups at a higher risk of physical, social and socioeconomic vulnerability such as poverty, poor nutrition, poor infrastructure, limited resources that may include knowledge, technology, or financial resources or owing to conflict, security or fragility.

approaches and methodologies. Not only should the intended outcomes be considered but also broader unintended consequences and mitigation. Consortia need to look beyond academic impact and acknowledge multiple pathways to impact and implementation within the context of societal benefit.

The Global Sustainable Development report "[The Future is Now: Science for Achieving Sustainable Development](#)", published in 2019, states that current trends across the entire 2030 Agenda are not aligned. The report identifies six key 'entry points' (challenges) where focused and collaborative action by various stakeholders can accelerate progress towards achieving the SDGs and bringing about the necessary transformations. Proposals for this call should consider the following challenges:

- Human well-being and capabilities
- Sustainable and just economies
- Food systems and nutrition patterns
- Energy decarbonisation with universal access
- Urban and peri-urban development
- Global environmental commons

Each participating funder can specify some of the six challenges as its priority for the call, please see the national annexes for each funder. Each proposal should cover no more than two challenges.

Project requirements

The call seeks to fund collaborative, transdisciplinary and cross-cultural consortia.

The consortia are to consider the following in terms of approaches and objectives/outputs:

- have a challenge approach with clear-cut implementation goals to effect and measure impact;
- use targeted and innovative action aimed at contributing towards the achievement of SDGs that are likely to have societal impact;
- that addresses a minimum of one and maximum two of the challenges described above;
- based on results from one or more ongoing or recently finalized research or innovation projects (ongoing for at least two years or finalized in 2017 or later);
- facilitate international collaborative action that prioritises the practical relevance of research outputs and the ability to share data and deliver innovative implementation approaches geared towards impact;
- advance knowledge-based achievement of the SDGs at local or regional scale in at least one participating country within a consortium.

Eligibility requirements differ for each funder and can be found in the National Annexes which are listed on the call web page. Only consortia with eligible Concept Notes can submit a full proposal.

Consortia composition

To be eligible for funding applicants must form a consortium:

- that is transdisciplinary, where collaboration between research institutions and stakeholders such as local authorities, communities, NGO's, civil society, business etc. is mandatory;
- consisting of at least three and maximum six applicants from at least three different countries that are funding this call;

- that consists of institutions from both the global north and global south;
- with an identified consortium lead for management and communication purposes. The consortia lead is responsible for submitting the Concept Note and full proposal. The consortia lead is responsible for all communication with the call secretariat;
- where each country in the consortium has a co- Lead (co-PI) in the consortium, excluding the country of consortium lead;
- where all partners in the consortium requesting funding are eligible to be funded as described in their respective national annexes;
- that is preferably both gender diverse and diverse in terms of composition of the project's participants (established and emerging researchers).

Transdisciplinarity which promotes impact and ownership of outcomes amongst all stakeholders and strong equitable partnership between academic and non-academic partners in co-designing and implementing the project is a prerequisite.

Research only oriented applications are not eligible.

The duration of projects can be between two and four years, but this can vary from funder to funder. Please refer to the national annexes for budgetary and time constraints. See the table on page 8 for the links to the national annexes by the funding organisations.

The consortia can include partners that are not eligible for funding from any of the participating funding agencies if they can secure their own funding. This type of participation will not be considered to fulfil the criteria above. These research partners should submit signed Letters of Intent to indicate their commitment to the project. **See Annex 1 for a Template.** It should be noted that, for the full proposal stage, this type of participation is also required to fulfil the criteria of this pilot call as outlined above. Any in-kind contributions will be in addition to the funding commitment made by the consortia partner. See National Annexes for specific requirements of your funding organisation(s).

Call Procedures

A two-step process will apply, with a mandatory Concept Note as the first step, and submission of full proposals as the second step. Thereafter the Funding Organisations will make funding decision based on step 1 and 2. Concept Notes were submitted by Consortia Lead, via email, to the Call Secretariat at CJ.Diederiks@risa.nrf.ac.za.

Full proposals must be written in English and submitted electronically to the Call Secretariat via the NRF Online System. Applicants must have submitted a Concept Note to be allowed to submit a full proposal. Some funders may require submission of additional documents via their national agency portals. Please check your national annex through the links provided in the table on page 8.

Stage 1: Concept Note

A call for Concept Notes was launched on May 24th 2022 and closed on August 31st 2022.

The Concept Note was used by the Call Secretariat (NRF), with assistance from participating funders, to verify the eligibility of the proposals according to eligibility criteria and criteria specified in the national annexes and to aid in the planning of the peer review process. **Only Concept Notes that fulfilled the eligibility criteria were move forward to Stage 2: Full Proposals.** Successful applicants were notified by the call secretariat.

Stage 2: Full Proposals

This call is for full proposals that must be submitted by the Project Consortium Leads electronically through the NRF-Connect system [<https://nrfconnect.nrf.ac.za>]. The deadline for submissions is Wednesday 10 May 2023 | 23:59 SAST. Once uploaded on the NRF-Connect System, the Project Consortium Leads must select the “*SDGs Pilot Call*” from the listed options of calls.

Submission is upon invitation for selected Concept Notes only. Full proposals must be written in English. Proposals received after the deadline, or failing to comply with the published call requirements, will be rejected. Incomplete proposals and proposals submitted outside the NRF Connect will also be rejected.

Please note that some Funding Organisations may require their researchers to also submit nationally. Researchers are therefore advised to consult the National Annex of their respective Funding Organisation (see table on page 8).

Compulsory attachments

- CVs of all partners (Consortium Lead, Co-Leads and Research Partners), max 3 pages each.
- Detailed budget breakdown of all partners (Consortium Lead, Co-Leads & Research Partners).
- Signed Letters of Intent by other Research Partners not requesting funding from the Funding Organisations. The letter should specify the nature and level of support expected from the institution in terms of technical, financial and administrative contribution towards the project resources.
- Latest report of the ongoing/ completed project to be implemented through this proposal.

Proposals will be evaluated by a mechanism decided by Funding Organisations as follows:

Eligibility check and consideration of the full proposals

The Call Secretariat will determine the eligibility of full proposals based on several administrative-technical criteria and will only consider those proposals that meet all the eligibility criteria. In case of errors in technical-administrative details, the Call Secretariat, in consultation with the Funding Organisations, will analyse the possibility of provide opportunity for applicants to correct these. No second opportunity will be granted in this regard.

External expert reviewers

The Call Secretariat will request input from at least three external reviewers. These are independent experts in the subject of the Call. They will assess the full proposal and provide a written assessment of the application in accordance with the review criteria stated below. The Call Secretariat will therefore receive two assessment reports per proposal.

Transdisciplinary merit review Panel

A multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral review Panel will be appointed for the final assessment of the full proposals. The submitted full proposal and external reviewers’ reports will be submitted for assessment by this Panel. The Panel members will review the full proposals based on the assessment criteria and will give the full proposal a numerical score per assessment criterion. Following the discussion, the Panel will draw up a written recommendation addressed to the Funding Organisations about the quality and ranking of the full proposals.

The assessment criteria

The proposals are assessed based on their content with respect to both scientific and societal relevance. This includes the following three criteria *i) Relevance and potential, ii) Implementation, and iii) Competence and collaboration*. At the end of the review process, the Panel will make recommendations of which applications should be funded and prepares a ranked list of applications based on their relative merit. Each evaluation criterion will be scored on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest score. All criteria are weighted equally. The 1-5 scoring system for each criterion indicates the following assessment:

- 1 - Poor. Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information. The criterion is inadequately addressed.
- 2 - Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but several shortcomings are present.
- 4 - Very Good. Proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5 - Excellent. Proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

See **Annex 2** for the assessment criteria with scores and descriptors.

Relevance and potential

- To what extent does the project build on relevant knowledge addressing challenges in an innovative way?
- To what extent does the project contribute to implementing Agenda 2030/ the UN Sustainable Development Goals?
- To what extent can the project lead to societal impact?
- To what extent does the project employ transdisciplinary approaches and appropriate methods?

Implementation

- To what extent are the methods realistic and innovative for achieving beneficial results?
- To what extent does the project have a realistic, clearly defined and relevant time frame, distribution of budget, work packages, milestones, roles and responsibilities in order to reach the objectives of the project?
- To what extent does the project include appropriate considerations of ethical issues, and/or gender and other diversity perspectives where relevant?
- To what extent has the project included communication and engagement activities with relevant stakeholders/users throughout the project period?

Competence and collaboration

- To what extent do the consortium lead and consortium have the necessary skills, competence and capacity for carrying out the project and achieving its objectives?
- To what extent is the project based on strong and equitable partnership(s) between the different participating partners and stakeholders in co-designing and implementing the project?

- To what extent are there plans to include and strengthen individual and institutional capacities in the consortia for knowledge generation and production across emerging and established researchers, stakeholders and partners and countries?
- To what extent is the project group as well as the distribution of influence balanced with respect to gender?

Decision on funding

A total of 11 participating funders from diverse countries have committed in total *circa* 8 M€ of funding for this call. Based on the panel evaluation and ranking, and considering the available budgets, a funding decision will be made by the participating Funding Organisations. Successful projects will be announced on the call website.

Award letters will be issued by the participating Funding Organisations.

Projects activities are expected to start within three months of the award letter being issued and in accordance with each Funding Organisation's national norms and regulations.

Reporting

All granted projects must adhere to the reporting requirements specified in the national award letters. Projects will be requested to participate in conferences or similar events in order to create synergies and platforms for learning and knowledge sharing. Please make sure to budget for participation in these two conferences.

Call timeline (provisional)

24 May 2022	Call for Concept Notes launched
25 August 2022	Deadline for Concept Note submission
2 February 2023	Announcement of the outcomes of the Concept Note eligibility check.
1 March 2023	NRF online submission system opens for submission of full proposals.
22 March 2023	Call Webinar
10 May 2023	Deadline for submission of full proposals.
October 2023	Announcement of successful projects by Call Secretariat.
1 December 2023	Start of funded projects.

Call Secretariat contact details

For specific content-related questions please contact:

Nombuso Madonda on tel. +27 12 481 4285 and email: SDGPilotCall@nrf.ac.za.

For technical questions about the NRF online submission system contact:

NRF Support Desk on email: supportdesk@nrf.ac.za and tel. +27 12 481 4202 OR Mr Jan Phalane on tel. +27 12 481 4157 or email. JR.Phalane@risa.nrf.ac.za.

Office hours:

Mon-Fri 9AM-4PM (SAST)

Please also contact your National Contact Person as listed in the National Annexes and table below.

Funding Organisation	Contact Person
Chile , Chilean National Agency for Research and Development (ANID) Link to National Annex: https://www.anid.cl/concursos/concurso/?id=1370	https://ayuda.anid.cl/hc/es reference GRC SDGs
China , National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) Link to National Annex: https://www.nsf.gov.cn/publish/portal0/tab621/module2809/more.htm	Keshuang TANG tangks@nsfc.gov.cn / +86 10 6232 8404
Côte d'Ivoire , Fonds pour la Science, la Technologie et l'Innovation (FONSTI) Link to National Annex: https://fonsti.ci/appel-pilote-a-propositions-completes-pour-le-financement-des-objectifs-de-developpement-durable-odd/	Annette OUATTARA annette.ouattara@fonsti.org / +225 0103635199, 0778266858
Kenya , National Research Fund (NRF) Link to National Annex: https://researchfund.go.ke/sustainable-development-goals-sdgs-call-2022/	Jacob K. Njagih kamwariajacob@gmail.com / +254 721281207 Jackline Muyalo jackline.muyalo@gmail.com / +254 712444853
Norway , The Research Council of Norway (RCN) Link to National Annex: https://www.forskingsradet.no/contentassets/173c095711ce4c14a3ffb95d5f0cbfeb/national-annex-norway.pdf	May-Guri Sæthre masae@rcn.no / +47 92253213
South Africa , National Research Foundation (NRF) Link to National Annex: https://www.nrf.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2023/02/National-Annex-South-Africa.pdf	Call Secretariat – see above
Switzerland , Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) Link to National Annex: https://www.nrf.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/GRC-SDG-Call_National-Annex-Switzerland_FINAL-1.pdf	Dr Anne Jores grc-sdg@snf.ch / +41 31 308 2311
Sweden , A Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development (FORMAS) Link to National Annex: National Annex Template Formas.pdf	Karin Önneby karin.onneby@formas.se / +46 8-775 40 22 / +46 73-432 16 78
Tanzania , Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH) Link to National Annex: http://41.93.33.54/index.php/s/9EYevmWlpQo4Bj	Dr Bugwesa Katala bugwesa.katala@costech.or.tz , +255 624 718014/ 784 687178 Ms Neema Tindamanyire neema.tindamanyire@costech.or.tz / +255 767 147947
The Netherlands , The Dutch Research Council (NWO) Link to National Annex: https://www.nwo.nl/en/calls/grc-sdg-call-2022	Jacomijn Zoutewelle and Rachel Kelders GRC-SDGcall@NWO.NL / +31703440979 +31703494085
Turkey , Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK)	Dr Muslum Guzel muslum.guzel@tubitak.gov.tr Zeynep Arzıman zeynep.arziman@tubitak.gov.tr / +90-312-2981756

Annex 1: Format Letter of Intent

[Template Letter of Intent for consortium partners not requesting funds]

[The letter should be printed on the stationery of the consortium organisation concerned]

[Address main applicant]

Concerns: Letter of Intent

[Location], [date]

Dear [name main applicant],

Through this letter, I confirm that [name consortium organisation] is available and committed to participate fully self-financed in the proposed project, entitled '[proposal title]', which was submitted to the '[Title of Call]'.

[Outline the availability and commitment of the consortium organisation]

[If applicable, indicate the consortium organisation's total contribution in cash, or quantify the in kind contribution. This amount should be the same as indicated in the application form.]

Yours sincerely,

[Signed by the head of the organisation/department]

Location: [...]

Date: [...]

..... [Signature]
[NAME + POSITION]

Annex 2: Assessment Criteria Scores and Descriptors

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
1. RELEVANCE AND POTENTIAL					
<p>- To what extent does the project build on relevant knowledge addressing challenges in an innovative way?</p> <p>- To what extent does the project contribute to implementing Agenda 2030/ the UN Sustainable Development Goals?</p> <p>- To what extent does the project employ transdisciplinary approaches and appropriate methods?</p> <p><i>The proposal should demonstrate that design, methods and analysis are properly developed, well-integrated and appropriate to the objectives and scope of the Call; clearly contributes to the implementation of Agenda 2030/ the UN SDGs; and should overall fit within the scope of the Call.</i></p>	<p>The proposal is exceptionally strong and well-constructed. The project idea contributes to the generation of both new methodologies; new knowledge in the field; and contributes to the implementation of Agenda 2030/ the UN SDGs.</p> <p>The research question/problem statement is clear and the rationale of the study is well advocated.</p> <p>The study is well conceptualised; the literature is thoroughly reviewed, relevant, cited, referenced, and addresses the existing gaps in extant literature.</p> <p>The research objectives are clearly stated and are appropriate to meet the aims of the study.</p> <p>The methodology is aligned with the objectives of the study. The proposal is excellently conceptualised and directly aligned to the strategic objectives of the Call.</p>	<p>The proposal is well constructed; the project idea will generate new knowledge with the application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field; and has the potential to contribute to the implementation of Agenda 2030/ the UN SDGs.</p> <p>The research question/ problem statement is clear and the rationale of the study is good.</p> <p>The study is reasonably conceptualised; the literature is relevant, cited, referenced, and addresses the existing gap in the extant literature, but some important references are not included.</p> <p>The research objectives are sound but have inconsistencies and can be refined to appropriately meet the aims of the study. The research methodology is sound but has inconsistencies and can be refined.</p> <p>The proposal is directly aligned to the strategic research objectives of the Call.</p>	<p>The proposal is fairly constructed, the study involves the unique application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field.</p> <p>The research question/ problem statement and the rationale could be refined.</p> <p>The study conceptualisation could be strengthened; the literature is relevant, cited, referenced but it is unclear which gaps in the extant literature are being addressed.</p> <p>The research objectives are appropriate but only partially address the aims of the study. The methodology fairly addresses the study objectives but has inconsistencies and can be refined.</p> <p>The proposal is generally aligned to the strategic objectives of the Call but there are immediate gaps that could be identified and addressed.</p>	<p>The proposal structure lacks logic, the study will utilise the application of existing knowledge and methodologies in the field.</p> <p>The research question/ problem statement and the rationale are not clear.</p> <p>The conceptualisation is weak; the literature is not relevant and/or is outdated, cited, referenced but it is unclear which gaps in the extant literature are being addressed.</p> <p>The research objectives are not aligned with the aims of the study.</p> <p>The methodology is vaguely articulated to assess the feasibility of the study.</p> <p>The proposal does not fully align with the strategic objectives of the Call.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The proposal structure is poorly formulated.</p> <p>The problem statement and the rationale are not included in the proposal.</p> <p>The conceptualisation is weak; the literature is not relevant and/or is outdated, cited, referenced but it is unclear which gaps in the extant literature are being addressed.</p> <p>The research objectives are not aligned with the aims of the study.</p> <p>The methodology lacks detail to assess the feasibility of the study.</p> <p>The proposal does not align with the strategic objectives of the Call.</p>

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
<p>- To what extent can the project lead to scientific and societal impact?</p> <p><i>The proposed project has demonstrated, ex ante, the following types of impact will be derived:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>Scientific impact - on advancing knowledge</i> (ii) <i>Societal impact - on the development of societies (vulnerable groups);</i> (iii) <i>Economic impact - on fostering innovation;</i> (iv) <i>Policy impact - knowledge transfer to support evidence-based policy making.</i></p> <p><i>Impact can be derived at different times, with varying predictability and measurability.</i></p>	<p>The proposal has exceptionally defined the significance and merits of the research concerning its contribution to the science, commercial application, societal and/ or policy benefits nationally and globally; the envisaged impact, cutting across at least three types of impact is feasible and relevant both in the national and international context.</p> <p>Therefore, the potential impact of the study is high based on the information provided.</p> <p>There is a solid plan to measure the impact, with a focus on implementing, testing and refining solutions to maximise potential impact.</p> <p>The significance of the stepwise and overall change is clearly described</p>	<p>The proposal has clearly defined the significance and merits of the research concerning its contribution to the science, commercial application, societal and/ or policy benefits nationally; the envisaged impact cutting across at least two types of impact is feasible and relevant in the national context. Therefore, the potential impact of the study is high based on the information provided.</p> <p>There is a sound approach to measure the impact. An implementation, testing and refinement of solutions to maximize impact is planned, though limited in scope.</p> <p>The significance of the overall change is described, but there is lack of detail regarding the stepwise approach.</p>	<p>The proposal has defined the significance and merits of the research in relation to its contribution to the science, commercial application, societal and/ or policy benefits nationally; the envisaged impact covering knowledge impact is relevant in the national context. Therefore, the potential impact of the study is moderate based on the information provided.</p> <p>There is a notable approach to measure the impact. However, an implementation, testing and refinement of solutions to maximize impact is vaguely planned, though very limited in scope.</p> <p>The significance of the overall change is described, but there is no detail regarding the stepwise approach.</p>	<p>The significance and merits of the research have a vague contribution to the science; the envisaged impact cannot be delineated. Therefore, the potential impact of the study is weak based on the information provided.</p> <p>There is a vague approach to measure the impact. An implementation, testing and refinement process to maximize impact is mentioned but not well-described.</p> <p>The significance of the change is broadly described.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The proposal has vaguely/ not defined the significance and the merits of the research to assess the potential impact of the research.</p> <p>The proposal lacks a plan or approach to measure the impact. There is no implementation, testing and refinement processes planned to maximize impact.</p> <p>The significance of the change is not sufficiently articulated.</p>
2. IMPLEMENTATION					
<p>- To what extent are the methods realistic and innovative for achieving beneficial results?</p> <p>- To what extent does the project have a realistic, clearly defined and relevant time frame, distribution of budget, work packages, milestones,</p>	<p>The proposal timeline is realistic, with a detailed work breakdown structure and is achievable in the outlined funding period.</p> <p>The budget allocation provided is excellent. There are other sources of research funding available exceeding the funding</p>	<p>The proposed timeline is realistic and achievable in the two-year funding period.</p> <p>The budget allocation provided is reasonable.</p> <p>There are other sources of research funding available. Overall, there is the potential</p>	<p>The proposed timeline is stated. However, there are concerns that it might not be feasible.</p> <p>The budget allocation provided is well thought through.</p> <p>Overall, there is the</p>	<p>The proposed timeline is unrealistic and not achievable.</p> <p>The budget section has a limited number of omissions or flaws that require significant revision.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The proposed timeline is incomplete or inconsistent with the timeframe.</p> <p>The budget section has</p>

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
<p>roles and responsibilities in order to reach the objectives of the project?</p> <p><i>The proposed implementation timeline for proposed activities should be feasible, achievable within the time frame and available resources. The proposal should clearly demonstrate that budget items are in line with the proposed methodology and timelines.</i></p>	<p>allocated for this Call.</p> <p>Overall, there is the potential for a high return on investment. There is potential for the project to be sustainable post the funding allocated for this Call.</p>	<p>for a significant return on investment.</p>	<p>potential for a moderate return on investment.</p>		<p>major omissions or flaws and requires major revision.</p>
<p>- To what extent does the project include appropriate considerations of ethical issues, and/or gender and other diversity perspectives where relevant?</p> <p><i>Research proposals must demonstrate considerations of diversity, including sex as a biological variable and gender as a socio-cultural factor in research projects.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal should clearly indicate team composition by gender, clearly indicate whether and how sex/gender are included as units of analysis, as feasible throughout the project and beyond.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal should also be clear on how sex/gender and diversity will be considered in the execution of the project.</i></p> <p><i>The proposal should have appropriate plan for the management of ethical issues.</i></p>	<p>The research team comprises more than 40% women.</p> <p>The team composition clearly demonstrates that meaningful opportunities have been provided to different genders to contribute throughout the project. The proposal has included sex/gender as units of analysis, as appropriate throughout the project and beyond.</p> <p>The proposal has sufficiently demonstrated how any risks and unintended negative consequences on gender equality and diversity will be avoided or mitigated against, and monitored.</p> <p>The proposal has considered and clearly indicated where relevant, that methodology, findings, outputs and outcomes will include data disaggregated by gender and age.</p>	<p>The research team comprises 30-40% women.</p> <p>The team composition demonstrates that meaningful opportunities have been provided to different genders to contribute throughout the project.</p> <p>The proposal has included sex/gender as units of analysis, as appropriate in some aspects of project.</p> <p>Some risks and unintended negative consequences have been indicated including how they will be avoided, mitigated or monitored.</p> <p>The proposal has considered and clearly indicated where relevant, that methodology, findings, outputs or outcomes will include data disaggregated by gender and age.</p> <p>The proposal has a plan for</p>	<p>The research team comprises less than 30% women.</p> <p>The team composition lacks clarity that meaningful opportunities have been provided to different genders to contribute throughout the project. The proposal has included sex/gender as units of analysis, as appropriate in some aspects of project.</p> <p>Risks and unintended negative consequences have not been indicated.</p> <p>The research proposal lacks clarity, where relevant, that methodology, findings, outputs or outcomes will include data disaggregated by gender and age.</p> <p>Although the proposal mentions ethical consideration, a plan on</p>	<p>The research team does not include women.</p> <p>The proposal has only indicated that sex/gender will be considered as units of analysis but not indicated how this will be applied.</p> <p>The proposal does not indicate, where relevant, that methodology, findings, outputs or outcomes will include data disaggregated by gender and age.</p> <p>The proposal is silent on ethics.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The research team does not include women.</p> <p>The proposal has not considered gender, diversity and ethics at all.</p>

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
	The proposal has a well-articulated plan for managing ethical issues.	managing ethical issues.	how this will be managed is not very clear.		
<p>- To what extent are there plans to include and strengthen individual and institutional capacities in the consortia for knowledge generation and production across emerging and established researchers, stakeholders and partners and countries?</p> <p><i>The proposal should clearly indicate expected human capital contributions, including gender considerations.</i></p>	<p>The proposed human capacity contributions indicate that Master's and Doctoral students and postdoctoral Fellows will benefit from the research in a realistic manner within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>The contributions will benefit more than 40% of women in this cohort.</p> <p>Contributions by this cohort are clearly indicated including aspects such as publishing with students.</p>	<p>The proposed human capacity contributions indicate that Master's and Doctoral students will benefit from the research in a realistic manner within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>The contributions will benefit 30-40% of women in this cohort.</p> <p>Contributions by this cohort are clearly indicated including aspects such as publishing with students.</p>	<p>The proposed human capacity contributions indicate that students will benefit from the research in a realistic manner within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>The contributions will benefit less than 30% of women in this cohort.</p> <p>There is limited clarity on the specific contributions of this cohort to the research.</p>	<p>The proposed human capacity contributions indicate that students will benefit from the research but there is no clarity on whether this is realistic within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>It is not clear whether women will be included in this cohort.</p> <p>The contributions of this cohort to the research are not specified.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The proposal does not indicate any human capital contributions.</p>
<p><i>The proposal should clearly indicate how expected findings and outputs will be disseminated including the use of science communication strategies, and open access².</i></p>	<p>The proposal indicates a dissemination plan that is original and highly innovative, including extensive use of science communication strategies.</p> <p>All project outputs are clearly indicated, with a clear plan to deliver such outputs.</p> <p>All project outputs will be available to the public on Open Access as indicated on the Call.</p>	<p>The proposal indicates a dissemination plan that is innovative, including some use of science communication strategies.</p> <p>The proposal indicates project outputs and a plan to deliver such outputs.</p> <p>All project outputs are indicated to be available to the public on an Open Access basis as indicated on the Call.</p>	<p>The proposal indicates a dissemination plan that is acceptable, including some of the potential outputs.</p> <p>All project outputs are indicated to be available to the public on an Open Access basis as indicated on the Call.</p>	<p>The proposal indicates a dissemination plan that is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Project outputs are not indicated including availability to the public on an Open Access basis.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>The proposal indicates a dissemination plan that is unsatisfactory and requires comprehensive revision. Project outputs are not indicated.</p>

² All project outputs must be made available to the public on an Open Access basis: (a) Books, data and journal articles generated by the grantees and sub-grantees of funded projects will be made accessible free of charge to the end user; (b) Authors are encouraged to publish their books Open Access and their articles in Open Access journals. If this is not possible, the published books or articles must be uploaded to an Open Access repository within 12 months of publication; (c) All project outputs identified above will be made freely and openly available under the most recent version of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence; and (d) Research proposals submitted must include an Open Access dissemination plan.

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
3. COMPETENCE AND COLLABORATION					
<p>- To what extent do the consortium lead and consortium have the necessary skills, competence and capacity for carrying out the project and achieving its objectives?</p> <p>- To what extent is the project based on strong and equitable partnership(s) between the different participating partners and stakeholders in co-designing and implementing the project?</p> <p><i>The proposal should clearly indicate that team members possess complementary skill sets that can be leveraged for the success of the project.</i></p> <p><i>It should clearly and sufficiently state research collaborations to meet the study objectives and clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of each team member and collaborators. Should consist of multi-stakeholders research partners.</i></p> <p><i>The PI's curriculum vitae should clearly indicate past contributions to knowledge production, e.g. journal articles, book chapters, designs, performances, etc. and postgraduate supervision (Honours, Masters and Doctoral students).</i></p>	<p>The proposed national and international collaborations, partnerships and networks to be formed are outstanding and represents world-leading standards.</p> <p>Collaborators and partners have been identified to develop and maintain excellence in this research area; possess complementary skills sets; and the research team's roles are very clear.</p> <p>The team involves a good balance of academic and non-academic partners with roles clearly defined and elaboration of value-add.</p> <p>Team members are already publishing with each other. There is a strong history of established collaborators/partnerships.</p>	<p>The proposed national and international collaborations, partnerships and networks to be formed are comprehensive.</p> <p>Team roles are clear.</p> <p>Some collaborators and partners have already been identified to develop and maintain excellence in their respective research area. The team involves a good balance of academic and non-academic partners, but their roles and value-add could have been better explained.</p>	<p>The proposed national and international collaborations, partnerships and networks to be formed are good.</p> <p>The roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined for team members and the collaborators.</p> <p>There is involvement of non-academic partners in the project although their roles and value add have not been clearly defined.</p>	<p>The proposed collaborations, partnerships and networks to be formed are satisfactory although detailed information should have been provided.</p> <p>Some mention of the roles of the team members and collaborators.</p> <p>No clear roles to identify. There is no involvement of non-academic partners in the project.</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.</p> <p>Partnerships and networks to be formed are unsatisfactory and require major revision.</p> <p>No mention of the roles of the team members and collaborators.</p>
	<p>The PI is outstanding and has a track record that is internationally competitive in terms of the quality and impact of research outputs.</p> <p>The PI's track record is outstanding nationally, regionally and globally.</p> <p>The PI has significant</p>	<p>The PI is good and has a track record that is at the forefront nationally and regionally in terms of the quality and impact of research outputs.</p> <p>The PI's track record is good nationally, regionally, and globally.</p> <p>The PI has adequate</p>	<p>The PI has a track record that is becoming competitive nationally in terms of the quality and impact of research outputs.</p> <p>The PI has satisfactory supervisory experience having trained and mentored less than five</p>	<p>The PI has an unsatisfactory track record in terms of the quality and impact of research outputs.</p> <p>The PI has not clearly indicated supervisory and publishing experience, including</p>	<p>Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information. There is no evidence of contribution to research by the PI.</p> <p>Supervisory and publishing experience are not</p>

Review Category	Score and Descriptor (100% weighting)				
	(5) Excellent	(4) Very Good	(3) Good	(2) Fair	(1) Poor
	<p>supervisory experience having trained and mentored more than five Master's and Doctoral students (more than three for female PIs).</p> <p>The PI has outstanding experience in the development and application of high quality research in specific focus areas, with a view to inform policies and practices or contribute to technology development and implementation.</p>	<p>supervisory experience having trained and mentored more than five Master's and Doctoral students (more than three for female PIs).</p> <p>The PI has reasonable experience in the development and application of high quality research in specific focus areas, with a view to inform policies and practices or contribute to technology development and implementation.</p>	<p>Master's and Doctoral students (less than three for female PIs).</p> <p>The PI has satisfactory experience in the development and application of high quality research in specific focus areas, with a view to inform national policies and practices or contribute to technology development and implementation.</p>	<p>contributions to research.</p>	<p>indicated.</p>

