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EuFMD Fund for Applied Research (EuFMD-FAR)

Third call
The EuFMD, under the multi-annual agreement with the European Commission (DG-SANCO), has since 2008 provided support for small applied research projects that are relevant to the technical issues that are seen as priorities of the EuFMD member states. The thematic priorities have been mainly identified at the biennial General Sessions, held in 2009, 2011 and 2013, and a specific Research fund was adopted as a component of the 2 year, EC funded Workplan of the Commission. The list of previously supported research projects is given at the end of this section.

Funding
The EuFMD-FAR has earmarked funding of 250,000€ for the period to August 2015 under the Financial Agreement between EC and FAO relating to the EuFMD which is managed through the TF MTF/INT/003/EC. Studies which directly contribute to components of the 2013-15 workplan may also be funded directly by those components, which may allow more than the above fund to be used to commission work. Additional sources of funding, from other donors, which seems likely following the 40th Session, will be managed and reported through separate Trust Funds, and use a common application format and review procedure. The current (at 7/2013) funding is modest and limited to a ceiling of 50,000 € per study/project, enabling some 5 grants to the maximum amount in the period October 2013 to December 2014, with most studies to be completed before 31st March 2015, to enable reporting and evaluation of the performance of the Fund at the 41st Session. EuFMD-FAR is managed by the EuFMD Secretariat, advised by the Standing Technical Committee which acts as the Grant Review Board and a Referee Panel.

Schedule for calls for applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call</th>
<th>Funding available</th>
<th>Invitation to apply</th>
<th>Closing Date</th>
<th>Announcement of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Call</td>
<td>100,000 €</td>
<td>August-2013</td>
<td>30th-September 2013</td>
<td>30th October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Call</td>
<td>100,000€</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>3rd June 2014</td>
<td>4th July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Call</td>
<td>50,000€</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>15 December 2014</td>
<td>19 January 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Context
The Strategic Plan of the EuFMD for the period 2013-17 has three Strategic Objectives (Pillars), which are:

1. To Improve readiness for FMD crisis management by Members;
2. To Reduce risk to Members from the FMD situation in the European neighbourhood (progressive control in neighbouring regions);
3. To Promote the global strategy of progressive control of FMD;

The operational objective of maintaining a mechanism for emergency response to an FMD crisis in the European neighbourhood will underpin the first two objectives. The Plan will be made operational through funding agreement for 2 years from the EC; the Action has 13 components (see Annex 1), of which one is Applied Research.

EuFMD-FAR is placed under Pillar I for management purposes as the priorities for applied research identified during the 40th Session are primarily technical and economic issues affecting FMD emergency management in the member states, but applied research that supports Pillar 2 and 3 Objectives is also eligible for funding.

The Plan and the associated agreement with the EC indicate that the immediate beneficiaries of research findings and outputs are the Veterinary Services of the 37 countries which are members of the European

---

1 Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, The Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom.
Commission for the Control of Foot-and-Mouth Disease (EuFMD), and their associated agencies and institutions that underpin their FMD management capacity. Other countries in the European neighbourhood that border to the members, where the situation of foot-and-mouth disease (FMD) creates a direct or indirect threat of introduction of the disease into one or more of the member countries of EuFMD, may be immediate beneficiaries of activities conducted to promote better management of FMD in those countries. The member states are also the final beneficiaries for the international actions to reduce the risk of FMD that are conducted through the Global FAO/OIE FMD Control Strategy and supported under the third Strategic Goal of the Action.

**Thematic priorities 2013-15**

Studies must show a high relevance to the strategic objectives. Innovation is encouraged, but results must also be tangible and there should be a good chance of uptake of the results within 1-3 years of completion. Grants are usually small, but enable short pieces of work that demonstrate the proof of concept or generate biologicals, results or methods that can be applied by MS or their agencies in their contingency plans (Pillar 1) or progressive control plans (Pillar 2-3).

**Strategic Objectives (Pillars) and areas of priority (2013-15)**

The priorities in the bullet points are indicative but not exclusive. Interested parties can discuss ideas prior to proposal with the Secretariat or Members of the Standing Technical Committee. The applicant should declare this contact with the STC on the form.

*In italics* are those areas where one or more proposals were received in the first call and which were funded or are in advanced stage of discussion for a funding agreement.

In **bold** are priorities for the third call.

**Pillar 1: To Improve readiness for FMD crisis management by Members**

1. Development of a prototype FMD impact calculator
   Intended application: for use in rapid assessment of the potential scale and impact of different of FMD outbreaks, principally in FMD-free European countries
   Context: relates from contingency planners for a form of impact calculator to assist them in communicating the risks of inadequate preparedness. The impacts of interest where a semi-quantitative calculation could assist include economic costs of control operations, the human and other resources needed over time in control, but also, if possible, wider impacts, that have political or economic importance to decision makers. The latter depend on the situation but may include animal welfare impacts (e.g. welfare culls because of impacts on the production systems) and negative media impacts.

   It is desirable that prototype should be available for demonstration/review by mid-April 2015.

**Pillar 2: To Reduce risk to Members from the FMD situation in the European neighbourhood (progressive control in neighbouring regions)**

2. Pilot study using non-invasive sampling for surveillance for FMDV infection in wildlife

   Background: Proof of freedom from circulation of FMDV in wildlife is being increasingly sought following FMD incursions into areas with an abundant, susceptible wildlife population. Pilot studies in the field have demonstrated that saliva from wild boar and wild ungulates can be collected by non-invasive sampling, and a PCR test has been optimised for detection of FMDV RNA on ropes or swabs collected from pens where infected pigs were present. There is a need to move to a pilot study in an country with FMD endemic in domestic population and where frequent wildlife exposure is anticipated and where conventional sampling of both domestic and wildlife could be used in a pilot
study to demonstrate if FMDV circulation or its absence could be proven with use of non—invasive sampling.
Desirable outcomes include guidance on optimised management of the application and collection of the baits/swabs in the field, and optimised level of pooling of samples for efficient use of lab capacity.
Further references:

Pillar 3: To Promote the global strategy of progressive control of FMD

3. Methods to evaluate FMD vaccine stability along the production and supply chain

Intended application and outcomes: The importance of virus capsid stability for antigenicity was reviewed by Doel and Doel (EuFMD Open Session, October 2014). There is a high need for simple and standardized methods for evaluating if sufficient intact capsid is present in a vaccine to elicit protection, and other purposes. The intention in the call is to speed the development of such methods, with desired outcome of a test that has sufficient performance data that it can be used in a subsequent studies in the field where the stability of the vaccines used in the field is tested as part of studies on vaccine effectiveness (not in the scope of 3rd Call).

Studies under the 3rd Call should provide data on optimization of protocols, including recovery of antigens from different types of vaccines, and development or optimization of methods for evaluating virus integrity for each serotype, ideally to be able to be applied to both monovalent and multivalent vaccines.


Nature of the funded research

Examples of research funded by the EuFMD under the “Concept Notes” scheme between 2008 and 2013 are given at the end of this section, and include Reviews, epidemiological studies, development of diagnostic tests and biological materials needed in reference centres, developing methods for full-genome sequencing, proof of concept on use of smart phones in outbreak active surveillance operations, etc.

Awards have an individual maximum of 50,000 €.

Research to be completed within 6-18 months with the longer of these periods possible only at the beginning of the two year funding cycle.

Criteria

1. Relevance to strategic objectives or specific components of the EuFMD Strategy;
2. Address generic problems identified as common to many member states veterinary services;
3. Likelihood of tangible results or outputs;
4. Urgency of need for results/outputs and lack of alternative funding;
5. Synergy or complementarity with field based activities relating to FMD;
6. Value for money.

Applicants

Applications are welcome from any source and are not limited by geographical origin. Awards are normally made to not-for-profit research centres with a capacity for signing the contract, with principal investigators capable of delivering quality research, and for managing funds and reporting. Interested parties can discuss
ideas prior to proposal with the Secretariat or Members of the Standing Technical Committee. The applicant should declare this contact with the STC on the form. The application form is given in Annex 3 and online.

**Review Process**

Applications will be assessed in two stages, first by external referees (Referee Panel) then by the Standing Technical Committee (acting as the Grant Review Board), a multidisciplinary panel of experts who are familiar with the priorities and scope of the fund and the context of the institutions which are expected to utilise the knowledge, tools and outputs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-Tiered Peer Review Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Review by Referee Panel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FOUR external referees are chosen for their expertise in specific research areas; at least one of these is from the EuFMD Special Committee on Research but not an applicant in the current call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial review of scientific merit and research ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rate and give comments on each grant application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd Review by Grant Review Board</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess quality of Referee Panel’s comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Final review of scientific merit and research ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate relevance to scope of fund and thematic priorities, applicability to local context, applicant’s track record, administering institution’s research capability, “value for money” of proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make recommendations on funding to the Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Criteria**

These are provided in Annex 2 and online.

**Composition of the Referee Panel**

The Referee Panel includes the 15 members of the Special Committee for Research and Programme Development (SCRPD) of the EuFMD, plus 3 experts from the FAO FMD Reference Centres in Europe. The four Referees for each proposal will be selected by the Chair of the STC, or in the case of a conflict of interest, his/her Deputy. One referee must always be from the SCRPD but according to need, the Chairperson may also invite an external referee to undertake the review if the expertise is not present within the SCRPD. Reviewers should complete a conflict of interest statement before review.

**Composition of the Grant Review Board**

The GRB is composed of the Members of the STC plus the Secretary, EuFMD Commission. DG-SANCO have the right to be represented in the GRB. Representatives of the GRB should complete a conflict of interest statement before review, and if doubt exists, not take part in the review of the applications in which a conflict of interest may exist. The Chairperson should ensure that a minimum of there are at least three persons for any decisions, co-opting a member of the Executive Committee if this is required. *Minutes of these meetings will be reported to the EuFMD Executive Committee.*

**Award of Grants and dispersion of funds**

The EuFMD Secretariat will provide the Executive Committee with the recommendations for funding; decisions will be normally taken by the Executive or the Chairperson of the Executive together with the EC at the regular Executive Committee Sessions at six monthly intervals. In case of urgency, decisions will be taken by the Chairman and the representative of the EC as soon as the Review Board have made their recommendations. Funding will be dispersed by the EuFMD through Letters of Agreement (LoA) which are contracts between the FAO of the UN and not-for-profit institutions. In exceptional circumstances, the funds may also be dispersed
through direct implementation mechanisms by the Secretariat where LoAs cannot be used. The application form should provide most of the details needed to enable the LoA to be finalised quickly after decision is taken, and initial funding dispersed. Limited changes to the proposal may be agreed when the LoA is negotiated and any major changes would require a review by the Chairman of the STC.

The Reporting schedule will be set at the time of the LoAs being agreed and normally the contractees must provide reports that co-incide with the timing of the 6 monthly STC meetings and provide an oral report to the biennial Open Session of the Standing Technical Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Titles of Research Studies funded by the EuFMD, 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Development of full genome sequencing methods and tools for application to FMD tracing in outbreak situations (Contractor: Pirbright);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Global Review of research on FMD (Awarded to GFRA, Contractor OVI);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comparative performance of NSP tests for use in regions affected by SAT viruses (Contractor OVI);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Production of antisera for vaccine matching against SAT viruses (Contractor BVI, Botswana);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Production of antisera for studies on type A FMDV from African and elsewhere (Contractor: Lelystad);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FMD epidemiology in wild boar populations in endemic areas of Anatolia, Turkey (Contractor FAO/SAP Institute Turkey);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Methods for real-time tracking wildboar dispersion in Europe (direct management with Bulgaria);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. FMD serology using commercial kits for use in wild boar –parameters for negative populations (AFFSA);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Development of methods for non-invasive sampling of wildlife for FMD (direct management with Bulgaria);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Application of vaccine effectiveness study methods to assess type Asia-1 and type A vaccine effectiveness in Turkey (Pirbright);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Contract to develop an “FMD surveillance design and analysis model “ (FMDSurv software using multiple data sources to calculate confidence in FMD freedom) (AUSVet);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Application of smart-phone applications for real-time data collection in FMD outbreak investigation and local risk factor determination (Royal Vet College, London);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Improving molecular diagnostic tests for use with African FMDV; validation of PCR-serotyping of African FMDV serotypes and methods of transporting RNA/cDNA samples cheaply (DTU, Denmark and Pirbright).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EU FUNDED ACTIVITIES (2013-2015) CARRIED OUT BY THE FAO
EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR THE CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES OF THE EC FUNDED ACTION

Three strategic objectives, also described as the Three Pillars of the EuFMD Strategy Plan 2013-17 are as follows:

1. To Improve readiness for FMD crisis management by Members;
2. To Reduce risk to Members from the FMD situation in the European neighbourhood (progressive control in neighbouring regions);
3. To Promote the global strategy of progressive control of FMD;

The operational objective of maintaining a mechanism for emergency response to an FMD crisis in the European neighbourhood will underpin the first two objectives.

The 13 components (outputs) are described below under the 3 objectives

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: IMPROVE READINESS FOR FMD CRISIS MANAGEMENT BY MEMBERS

Progress towards the Strategic Goal may also be assisted by joint activities with non-member states of EuFMD where there is a mutual advantage recognised by the EuFMD Executive Committee.

Outputs of the Action and the Activities to be undertaken

1.1. Develop a cadre of European experts in FMD crisis management - recognition and response training
This includes conducting training on clinical disease recognition, sampling for diagnosis, local area epidemiological investigations, risk factor analysis, practical application of biosecurity principles, and other aspects of FMD crisis management.

1.2. Support contingency planning of Members and at European level – Developing decision support tools for managers
This includes conducting training and providing support for Members to use disease simulation models and decision support tools to assist contingency planning, and engaging with researchers on FMD modelling to facilitate technology transfer of appropriately developed tools to assist Members.

1.3. Thrace region: programme for early warning surveillance in Greece/Bulgaria/Turkey
This includes collation and analysis of existing surveillance data, development of risk-based surveillance methods, and tripartite coordination of activities, integration of decision support tools and risk analysis into policy evaluation and development, and management of support to surveillance activities.

1.4. Improved emergency management capacity for FMD in the Balkan region
A programme of support to MS in the Balkan region to improve the quality of contingency planning, to improve awareness of FMD risks and the economic consequences of emergencies, and give attention to the issues affecting national reference laboratory capacity for FMD confirmation and surveillance.

1.5. Research activities relevant to resolve policy issues
This includes support for research projects which have been endorsed by the standing technical committee of the EuFMD as being of benefit to EuFMD objectives; activities to translate research into tools, actions or activities which are of benefit to EuFMD activities; and actions to integrate research outcomes with policy.

1.6. Support provided to member states through emergency technical response to FMD outbreaks in the member state or the European neighbourhood

---

As adopted by the 40th General Session of the EuFMD, 22-24 April 2013
This includes the maintenance of a capacity to provide advice, technical support and assistance to EuFMD member states and countries in the European neighbourhood in the event of an FMD outbreak, including laboratory and epidemiological support. This baseline activity is also serviced by several of the activities listed above, as these will also act to maintain a degree of organisational readiness to respond to an FMD crisis. This also includes assisting and supporting Members with vaccine procurement and supply, through the provision of technical input, advice on selection of vaccine strains, risk based evaluation of vaccination strategies and other related activities.

1.7. **Support for alignment of the performance of the National FMD Reference Laboratories (NRLs) of EuFMD members and neighbourhood countries**

This includes the provision services of the Proficiency Test Services to the non-EU members of the EuFMD to enable them to participate to the same extent as the NRLs of the EU 28 under the Scheme implemented through the EU-RL at Pirbright; in addition the participation of neighbourhood countries according to priorities indicated in Strategic Goal 2.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2: REDUCE RISK TO MEMBERS FROM THE EUROPEAN NEIGHBOURHOOD  (PROGRESSIVE CONTROL IN NEIGHBOURING REGIONS)**

**Outputs of the Action and the Activities to be undertaken**

2.1. **South-East Europe: promote better management in Turkey and neighbours**

This includes supporting the collation, analysis and application of epidemiological data, including spatial data, from the area; providing training in the practical application of epidemiology to control FMD and advance along the FAO/OIE progressive control pathway (PCP); engaging with national veterinary services to support them in the detection, management, and control of FMD; and identification of circulating viruses.

This also includes secretarial and coordination support for the West Eurasia roadmap for progressive control of FMD, in coordination with other stakeholder bodies, as regards the European neighbourhood.

This component also includes:
(a) developing specific country projects in line with the PCP designed to improve national capacity to manage and control FMD and assist progress in cooperation with regionally coordinated GF-TADs programs and roadmaps;
(b) as much as necessary to provide information to support analysis of the risk of FMD incursions into the European neighbourhood by identifying circulating virus strains, and actions to characterise the risk of FMD incursions due to factors which may be changing or subject to temporal or spatial dynamics, support for existing FAO or joint FAO/OIE surveillance networks, notably the WELNET in West Eurasia in coordination with other stakeholder bodies.

2.2. **South-East Mediterranean: support better management in the neighbourhood of Cyprus and Israel**

This includes holding workshops and training sessions for neighbour countries of Cyprus and Israel to support laboratory diagnosis, contingency planning, and vaccination strategy development; support to develop laboratory capacity in those countries; regional coordination of FMD control strategies.

This component also includes:
(a) developing specific country projects in line with the PCP designed to improve national capacity to manage and control FMD and assist progress in cooperation with regionally coordinated GF-TADs programs and roadmaps.
(b) as much as necessary to provide information to support analysis of the risk of FMD incursions into the European neighbourhood by identifying circulating virus strains, and actions to characterise the risk of FMD incursions due to factors which may be changing or subject to temporal or spatial dynamics.

---

4 The neighbourhood of the current 37 EuFMD Members is here defined as follows:

i. European Member Countries of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and member of the OIE Regional Commission for Europe which are eligible for membership in EuFMD

ii. Countries and territories adjacent to Members

iii. Countries in North Africa cooperating with Members in the framework of REMESA
support for existing FAO or joint FAO/OIE surveillance networks, notably the EARLN in East Africa and those under REMESA in coordination with other stakeholder bodies.

2.3. North Africa: technical support to REMESA\(^5\) actions

This component includes, at the request of those Members participating in REMESA:

(a) actions to support activities carried out by France, Spain, Italy and Portugal aiming at strengthening and regionally coordinating laboratory diagnosis, contingency planning, vaccination strategy development, risk based surveillance and other associated actions in Mediterranean countries of North Africa which pose a risk of FMD virus incursion into the REMESA area;

(b) as much as necessary to provide information to support analysis of the risk of FMD incursions into the European neighbourhood by identifying circulating virus strains, and actions to characterise the risk of FMD incursions due to factors which may be changing or subject to temporal or spatial dynamics, support for existing FAO or joint FAO/OIE surveillance networks, notably the EARLN in East Africa, RESOLAB in West Africa and those under REMESA in coordination with other stakeholder bodies.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3: PROMOTE THE GLOBAL STRATEGY OF PROGRESSIVE CONTROL OF FMD

Outputs of the Action and the Activities to be undertaken

3.1. Support FAO FMD Unit in collating information for review of progress of regional programmes on FMD control

This includes collation, analysis and dissemination of relevant information on regional FMD control programmes worldwide; support for workshops to coordinate this process; and other associated actions.

3.2. Technical support to develop the OIE/FAO FMD progressive control pathway (PCP) methods and guidelines

This includes engaging with the on-going development of the PCP, providing training in the application of the PCP at national level, regional level, and to international agencies; supporting the development of associated tools and activities to integrate relevant fields with PCP applications; and support for the development of regional PCP roadmaps.

3.3. Support the global system for improved FMD reference lab services (World Reference Laboratory Contract, supporting FAO/OIE Strategy and Gf-TADs)

This includes supporting the FAO FMD World Reference Laboratory to provide services to the European neighbourhood and globally, including diagnostic service, vaccine matching, molecular epidemiological analysis of worldwide and regional FMD patterns, and provision of laboratory proficiency test (PTS) ring trials for harmonisation of performance of the principal international reference laboratories (of FAO and OIE) including in non-EU states\(^6\).

---

\(^5\) REseau MEditerranéen de Santé Animale – REMESA: http://www.remesanetwork.org/

\(^6\) EU Member States are included in the PTS funded under the EU-CRL activities, and non-EU EuFMD member states and NRLs in the European neighbourhood are supported to participate in this as a joint PTS programme under Component 1.7 in Pillar I.
**EuFMD-FAR proposals: Assessment Criteria**

**Referee’s Assessment**

FOUR External reviewers are invited to review each application, and to both objective and specific in their critical appraisal of each grant application, and to focus on the scientific merit and significance.

*Scientific merit*
- Originality;
- Relevance to the fund and thematic priorities;
- Significance of the research questions;
- Quality of scientific approach;
- Credibility of design and methods;
- Applicability of the outputs.

*Research ethics/animal welfare*
- Are there any ethical/animal welfare concerns?
- Are measures in place to address these?

**Grant Review Board**

After review by the Referee Panel, each proposal will be discussed further, bearing in mind the track record of the principal applicant, the research capacity of the administering institution and the value for money of the proposal. Funding recommendations will be finalised in the Grant Review Board meeting. Summary statements containing questions, comments and/or recommendations will be forwarded to the applicant.

*Scientific merit (see above)*
*Research ethics (see above) plus*

*Relevance to the scope of funding*

- Is the topic within the scope of the fund and the thematic priorities?

*Track records of the applicants*

1. What is the likelihood that the proposed study can be accomplished by the investigators given their documented experience and expertise? Track record includes the applicant’s compliance with the terms and conditions of previous awards and records of research output.

*Research capacity of the administering institution*

- Research capacity refers to the ability of the administering institution to provide an environment conducive to productive research, in terms of
  ~ physical space;
  ~ facilities and equipment;
  ~ qualified research staff;
  ~ qualified support/administrative staff.

The emphasis placed on each aspect varies between applications, depending on their relative
Rating a Grant Application

A score ranging from 4 (Recommended for support / High) to 1 (Not worthy of support / Low) will be assigned by the referees to indicate the scientific merit under each heading in the Referee’s Assessment Form. The overall rating for each application will be discussed and finalised in the Grant Review Board meeting. The overall rating is defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil or very minor issues to address only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minor revision and clarification required for a successful delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major revision required for significant improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimal impact on research / flaw in methodology / incomplete application / out of scope of the fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3

Application for Funding from EuFMD-FAR

PART A: TECHNICAL and PART B: ADMINISTRATIVE

PART A: TECHNICAL

1. **TITLE OF THE STUDY (AND ACRONYM, IF LONG):**

2. **Applicant Name and institution:** .................................................................

   *Provide also e-mail and phone contact details*

   Lead Investigator (if different)

   Is this application made on behalf of several parties (collaborators whose inputs will be vital to success)? If YES, give details

   a. **Add**

   b. **Add #2 etc.**

3. **Has this proposal been discussed with members of the EuFMD Standing Technical Committee or Secretariat before application?**

   *YES/NO. If yes, indicate who and in what time period. Prior discussion can often be helpful to applications, but for transparency the extent of involvement of STC in steering proposals should be known by the Review Board.*

4. **Short description of the background to application**

   *Indicate how the problem area or research topic was identified - e.g. from a Session of the Research Group, following a country project or meeting, from own research findings etc*

5. **Key policy or technical issues addressed**

6. **Relation to the EuFMD Strategic Objectives 2013-17:**

   *The 3 Objectives are found in the Guidance Document, and online at the EuFMD site (40th General Session pages). Explain how the research will contribute to Strategic Objectives 1, 2 or 3; and indicating what types of institution or stakeholder will be the direct beneficiaries (immediate users) of the findings or outputs. Indicate if there is a specific link to a work component of the EuFMD/EC Action [one or more of the 13 Components; note it is NOT essential but if strongly linked has a possibility of funding under the budget for those components]*
7. **Technical Background**
   Up to 500 words plus references to indicate why the study approach was been selected, and any relevant references to methods that are essential to success of the approach but not yet widely accepted or applied.

8. **Definition of Outputs**

   6.1 Simple and short definition of what the Service Provider will do:
   Conduct a field based study, in vivo experiment, review, etc...

   6.2 Simple and short definition of what the provider will PRODUCE: (Outputs)
   These will be used by FAO to verify progress, for payment purposes, as for example a narrative report is used to justify interim payments.
   e.g
   - Provide an interim report on project activities upon completion of the animal experiment.
   - A final report detailing the activities conducted under the collaboration, which will be presented to the EuFMD standing technical committee and may be published on the EuFMD website.

9. **Description of study plan, activities and/or services to be provided by the applicant(s)**

   The detail to be provided must be sufficient to allow
   - assessment of the appropriateness of the method used,
   - the data that will be generated for analysis;
   - the efficiency of the design and use of inputs.

10. **Workplan and Timeframe (Duration)**

    The timing of major activities and milestones must be given, either in relation to the date of signature of the agreement/first payment, or in relation to monthly calendar if the study is affected by season, for example.

    **Proposed Date of final report:**

    (Note: not to exceed March 2015)

    | Milestone | Details (example)                              | Due date               |
    |-----------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|
    | 1.        | Animal experiment and interim report          | + 6 weeks after 1st    |
    |           |                                               | payment                |
    | 2.        | Data analysis and final reporting             | +10 weeks              |

11. **Inputs required to implement the project**

    **Inputs to be provided free of charge by Recipient Organization**

    Indicate what is provided as part of the capacity of the applicants, and what additional support will be used for.
    Example: The Service Provider will make available a scientific team and FAO will make a contribution towards the overall cost of staff resources. Remaining time is provided free of charge by the Service Provider, during the overall timeframe of the LoA.
Inputs to be provided in kind by EuFMD or FAO

List of Inputs

Indicate if EuFMD or FAO are expected to provide any inputs, for example from the field components of the EuFMD work programme or other projects or activities.

Indicate if the application is dependent on decisions by any other agency (co-funding or affecting the progress)

Added value: indicate if/how the application will add value to ongoing FMD activities/research of the applicant or partner.

Timing of Inputs

The usual schedule of payments for LoAs is an initial payment, an interim payment (upon an interim report) and a final payment after completion. The initial payment is usually not more than 30% of total. Indicate if there are specific need for a different schedule of payments, for example the majority of costs are up front for animal experiments, etc.

12. Budget (a detailed description of costs as estimated by Service Provider can be given in an Annex)

As far as possible, use a summary table with budget lines that your institution is prepared to report on later (in the Final Financial Report), and a separate table indicate how these were calculated.

**Example** of a summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget lines</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Amount, Euro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and laboratory staff costs (1508 hours)</td>
<td>See Annex II for further details</td>
<td>4177.7829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables and direct experiment costs (30 days)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12467.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>12703.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>29348.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Bottlenecks/risks:

Indicate any assumptions that must hold if the activity is to reach expected output.

Indicate risks that could have a significant impact upon progress (and which might justify later requests for extension or change in plan, for example).

14. Further information on the matter

Copies of research cited that is vital to the understanding or evaluation of the proposal can assist.
PART B: ADMINISTRATIVE

Curriculum vitae of the lead applicant and any significant research partners should be provided. Details on the Entity /Institution that is proving the administrative capacity may assist if the entity has no track record with FAO of LoAs or is non-Governmental.

1. Details on the applicant(s). The applicant is normally expected to be the contact point and provide the Reports.

2. Details on the Entity that will sign any financial agreement

3. Name and title of the person who will sign a financial agreement (the Signatory for a LoA with FAO)
   a. If Letters of Agreement (Standard Contract) with FAO are not feasible then suggested route for payment of the inputs required to undertake the activity:

4. Version Number: (the applicants Version number –useful in case changes are made)

5. Date of this Submission: