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Criteria and Application

**Annex 1**

# EuFMD-FAR proposals: Assessment Criteria

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Referee's AssessmentTWO 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 BoardAfter 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 strengths.Rating a Grant ApplicationA 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:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4 - Recommended for support  | Nil or very minor issues to address only |
| 3 - Recommended for support subject to clarifications/ amendments | Minor revision and clarification required for a successful delivery |
| 2 - Not recommended for support at present | Major revision required for significant improvement  |
| 1 - Not worthy of support  | Minimal impact on research / flaw in methodology/ incomplete application/ out of scope of the fund |

 |

 |

**Annex 2**

# Application for Funding from EuFMD-FAR

**PART A: TECHNICAL and PART B: ADMINSTRATIVE**

**PART A: TECHNICAL**

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

1. 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

* 1. *Add*
	2. *Add #2 etc.*
1. 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.*

1. 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*

1. Key policy or technical issues addressed
2. Relation to the EuFMD Strategic Objectives 2013-17:

*The 3 Objectives are found in the Guidance Document. 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]*

1. 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.*

1. 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.*
1. 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.*
1. 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 Interm report* | *+ 6 weeks after 1st payment* |
| *2.* | *Data analysis and final reporting* | *+10 weeks*  |

1. 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.*

1. 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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Budget lines*** | ***Quantity*** | ***Amount, Euro*** |
| *Research and laboratory staff costs (1508 hours)* | *See Annex II for further details* | *4177.7829* |
| *Consumables and direct experiment costs (30 days)* | *12467.422* |
| *Overhead Expenses* | *12703.306* |
| *Total* |  | ***29348.51*** |

1. 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).*

1. Further information on the matter

*Copies of research cited that is vital to the understanding or evaluation of the proposal can assist.*

**PART B: ADMINSTRATIVE**

*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)
	1. 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:**