IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

for the

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding
International Opportunities Fund

between

Commonwealth Scientific and Industiral Research Organisation (CSIRO, Australia)

São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, Brazil)

Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC, Canada)

National Research Agency (ANR, France)

German Research Foundation (DFG, Germany)

Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India (MoES, India)

Japan Science and Technology Agency, (JST, Japan)

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS, Japan)

Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR, Russia)

National Research Foundation (NRF, South Africa)

Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC, United Kingdom)

Natural Environment Research Council (RCUK, United Kingdom)

National Science Foundation (NSF, USA)

Referred to here in after as the "Partner Organizations"

This document outlines an Implementation Plan for the *Belmont Forum and G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding International Opportunities Fund.*

Partner Organizations agree to this implementation plan in association with their relevant Memorandum of Understanding for the Belmont Forum Collaborative Research Actions and/or the G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding

This document should be read in association with the following documents that have been developed for this Call:

01	**Call for Proposals**
01A	**National Annexes**
02A	**Pre Proposal Form**
02B	**Pre Proposal Form Instructions**
03A	**Proposal Form**
03B	**Proposal Form Instructions**
04A	**Evaluation Form for Pre Proposals**
04B	**Evaluation Form for Full Proposals**
05	**Roles and Responsibilities**
06	**PoE Instructions for Reviewing**
07	**PoE Panel Guidance Notes**
08	**Peer Reviewers Instructions for Reviewing**
09	**Conflict of Interest Declaration**

A. Description and Goals

This Call will support collaborative projects of multinational research teams over 2 to 3 years, bringing together researchers from Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, India, Japan, Russia, South Africa, the UK and the USA.

The Call will select multinational research teams on the basis of a two-stage competition. Applicants will be invited to submit Pre-proposals, and those that are successful will be invited to submit Full Proposals.

For this International Opportunities Fund there will be two Themes: Freshwater Security and Coastal vulnerability, supported by a Theme Program Office from NSF and NERC respectively.

B. Definitions

- *"Call"* is the overarching term for the process undertaken to fund proposals from the research community to address a Collaborative Research Action.
- "Competition" means a two-stage peer-reviewed selection process, by which applicant teams initially submit Pre-proposals outlining their research plans. A subset of applicants will then be invited to prepare and submit Full Proposals. Upon completion of the review process, Research Grants will be awarded based on meritorious review and availability of funds from each Partner Organization.
- "Full Proposals" will be invited after submission of Pre-proposals and will be reviewed using external review and panel review.

- "External Reviewers" who review the Full Proposals, work independently in their personal capacity and do not represent any organization.
- "Group of Program Coordinators" (GPC) is the committee composed of one management level representative from each of the Partner Organizations with oversight responsibility for this Call. Additional representatives from Partner Organizations may attend as required.
- "Panel of Experts" (PoE) is the committee composed of scientific experts and one Chair and Vice-chair that will review Pre-proposals and Full Proposals.
- "Post-Review Meeting of GPC and Chair (PRM)" is a meeting between GPC and the PoE Chair following the Panel of Experts (PoE) meeting.
- "Pre-proposals" are responses to a Call for Proposals from multinational research teams pursuant to this Initiative.
- "Theme Program Office" is entrusted by the Partner Organizations to prepare, publish, and manage the Call for Proposals in cooperation and consultation with the Group of Program Coordinators (GPC) for the particular Theme of the Call.

C. Governance and Management

The governance structure outlined below is meant to be flexible and achieve the following:
- manage the selection and funding procedures effectively and efficiently
- support the Call through coordinated activities by the Partner Organizations over the period of the projects

The full functions of the various bodies are provided in Document 05. The governance for the Call consists of:

- **Theme Program Offices**
    - The two Theme Program Offices for this Call, NSF (Freshwater Security Theme) and NERC (Coastal Vulnerability Theme) will co-ordinate their activities so that the International Opportunities Fund will appear to the scientific community to be a single Call.
- **Group of Program Coordinators (GPC)**
    - There will be a separate GPC for each Theme
- **Panel of Experts (PoE)**
    - There will be a separate PoE for each Theme
- **Partner Organizations.** In addition to active participation in the GPC, the Partner Organizations are expected to
    - Fund and administer the research grants awarded by their respective Funding Organizations
    - Make available staff time to contribute to communications, monitoring, evaluation and other activities as required and cover staff travel and expenses
    - Cover travel costs of the PoE-members which have been nominated by them

D. Competition

Selection Criteria

A successful proposal will combine significant contributions by scientists from at least three of the participating countries and must bring together natural and social scientists in addressing the work package(s) within the scope of the described Call Theme. The proposal must demonstrate clear links to users and conform to program aims and the designated research

fields addressing **either** the Theme of Freshwater Security **or** Coastal Vulnerability. Proposals can address either one or both of the workpackages within the relevant Theme.

The PoE and individual External Reviewers will review the proposals under the following selection criteria:

i. **Quality/Intellectual Merit**
   - *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the goals and objectives of the joint research plan*
   - *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*
   How well does the activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field and across different fields?
   Does the proposal contribute to scientific excellence and significant progress toward the state of the art?
   To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts?
   If these partnerships currently exist what does this new funding allow them to do that they could not do otherwise?
   What is the added value of the international cooperation? Where appropriate this should also include the extent to which Partner Organizations' existing investments are leveraged in the proposed project.

ii. **User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts**
   - *Engagement of research users (relevant poicy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities or industry)and the effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*
   - *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related, economical*
   What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society, policy-development or economies?
   How have users been engaged and how effective are the proposed mechanism for knowledge transfer to decision makers?
   Does the project involve early career researchers?
   Does the research collaboration focus on global challenges for which solutions can only be achieved by global scientific approaches?

iii. **Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium**
   - *Collaboration between natural and social sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
   - *Competence and expertise of team and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*
   How strong is the collaboration between the natural and social sciences?
   How well qualified are the proposers (Leading Principal Investigator and team) in terms of science knowledge, expertise and experience to conduct the project?
   What is the quality of previous work in terms of past or potential contributions to, and impact on the proposed and other areas of research?
   Is the Leading Principal Investigator team (including any identified Co-Principal Investigators) able to lead the project, e.g. having strong management and leadership skills, or having complementarity of expertise and synergy of the members of the team?

iv. **Resources and Management**
   - *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
   - *Balanced cooperation*
   How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity?
   Is there an operational plan with well defined milestones in place?
   Is the coordination plan adequate?
   Is there sufficient access to resources?

Are the requested investments well justified and relevant?
Are the scientific and financial contributions requested of the Partner Organizations from each country well balanced?

Having taken into account these criteria in selection, the final decision on which proposals should be recommended for funding will be made at the PRM according to availability of funds. The Partner Organizations will have the overall responsibility for the final funding decision, administration and management of the projects chosen for funding.

Selection Process: Pre-proposals

Please also see Documents 05 Roles and Responsibilities and 07 PoE Guidance Notes

- Application forms must becompleted in English and submitted electronically to the Theme Program Office on a secure server operational for the entire Call.
- Applications that are not complete or do not meet the eligibility criteria outlined in the Call for Proposals will be removed from the competition. Applicants will be informed of the decision to do so.
- PoE will review the Pre-proposals based on published selection criteria and recommend a pool of high quality applications that will be invited to submit Full Proposals
- GPC members, in order to be able to convey feedback to the applicants, will attend the PoE meeting.
- The Partner Organizations will synchronize communication of the result of pre-proposal reviews to applicants. In particular no oral or written information will be given before the notification of LPIs by the Theme Program Office. This may include recommendations to make cuts to the application to better fit the call aims and/or merge with other applicants.

Selection Process: Full Proposals

Please also see Documents 05 Roles and Responsibilities and 07 PoE Guidance Notes

- Full Proposals will be submitted in English and submitted electronically to the Theme Program Office on a secure server operational for the entire Call
- The Theme Program Office will serve as the lead in securing the External Reviews of the multilateral proposal. Partner Organizations will be required to provide details to the Theme Program Office of at least three reviewers for each proposal that receives funding from them.
- Full Proposals will be reviewed by the PoE based on the selection criteria and the assessments of External Reviewers, resulting in a pool of high-quality recommended proposals.
- GPC members, in order to be able to convey feedback to the applicants, will attend the PoE meeting.
- Following the meeting to consider Full Proposals all LPIs will receive the result on their respective proposals and a short written summary of the panel discussion from the Theme Program Office, prepared by the PoE.

Approval Process & Communication of results

- The GPC will decide on a final common funding recommendation; the formal funding decision is subject to the specific regulations of the Partner Organizations.
- The Partner Organizations will synchronize communication of the result to applicants. In particular no oral or written information will be given before the notification by the Theme Program Office.

E. Grant Administration

- Once the applicants/ LPIs have been notified by the Theme Program Office of the funding recommendations and these recommendations are formally approved by each Partner Organization, the successful applicants will be contacted by their national Partner Organization regarding the award process.
- Every Partner Organization finances and administers the awards made by their respective organizations.
- The research carried out in each country under this Initiative will adhere to all the applicable laws and regulations including research ethics, participation of human subjects, etc. in the respective country.
- Each applicant on a project will be responsible for complying with its Partner Organization's intellectual property rights requirements and applicants on projects will work out any necessary intellectual property rights agreements among themselves prior to the start of the project.

F. Communications

The Theme Program Office will work in collaboration with the GPC in communications.

- Public information will be in English. Each Partner Organization will be responsible for the translation in other languages, if needed.
- The Partner Organizations will publicize this funding opportunity domestically through their usual networks and channels.
- The Call description and application forms will be posted on a website organized by the Theme Program Office(s), which Partner Organizations will provide a link to on their websites.
- Announcement of the competition results will be posted on website organized by the Theme Program Office after the competition.

G. Reporting

LPIs are requested to submit a report to the Theme Program Office upon completion of the research projects. Each PI must also fulfill national reporting requirement(s) of their national Partner Organization.

H. Financial Contributions

The Partner Organizations will administer their funds directly and each Partner shall be responsible for costs related to their grant payment as well as costs relating to the monitoring of recipient use of their grant funds.

Partner Organizations contributing to this International Opportunities Fund				
			Funds committed M€	
Legal Name	*Acronym*	*Country*	*Freshwater Security*	*Coastal Vulnerability*
The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization	CSIRO	Australia	In kind*	In kind*
São Paulo Research Foundation	FAPESP	Brazil	1.5	0.5
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada	NSERC	Canada	1.5	x
Agence Nationale de la Recherche	ANR	France	1.5	1.5
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft	DFG	Germany	1.5	1.0
Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India	MoES	India	0.5	0.5
Japan Science and Technology Agency Japan Society for the Promotion of Science	JST JSPS	Japan	0.5	1.5
Russian Foundation for Basic Research	RFBR	Russia		
National Research Foundation	NRF	South Africa	0.25	0.25
Natural Environment Research Council and Economic and Social Resarch Council	NERC and ESRC	United Kingdom	1.3	1.5
National Science Foundation	NSF	USA	1.0	1.0

*Up to the allocation provided by other Partner Organizations

Notwithstanding any other clause in this agreement, Partner Organizations contributions are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and Partner Organizations are not obligated to commit current or future resources in advance of appropriated funds; nor does this agreement obligate Partner Organizations to spend funds on any particular project or purpose, even if funds are available. Partner Organizations maintain the authority to reduce or increase the amount noted above following budget appropriations.

The Partner Organizations funding supports individual researchers or teams from their respective countries conducting research and research support activities that fall within their mandates.

I.   Timeline

1.0 Pre-Competition Phase	
1.1 Implementation docs sent to WG	3 February 2012
1.2 WG return comments including country Annexes	17 February 2012
1.3 Major texts are agreed upon	12 March 2012
2.0 Pre-proposal Phase	
2.1 Launch of online research matching system	27 March 2012
2.2 Publication of "Call for Proposals"	15 April 2012
2.3 Chair and Vice Chair of PoEs appointed	April 2012

2.4 Appoint PoEs	May - mid August 2012
2.5 Deadline for submission of Pre-proposals	20 July 2012
2.6 Assignment of Pre-proposals to Panel members	August 2012
2.7 Pre-selection Panel, GPC-Meeting and PRM	September (early) 2012
3.0 Full Proposal Phase	
3.1 Invitation to submit Full Proposals	20 September 2012
3.2 Deadline for Full Proposals	20 December 2012
3.3 Deadline for peer reviews	February 2013
3.4 Selection Panel, GPC-Meeting and PRM	March 2013
3.6 Official funding decisions taken	April-May 2013
3.7 Start of projects	From June 2013

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding
International Opportunities Fund

Theme 1: Freshwater Security
Theme 2: Coastal Vulnerability

OPENING DATE OF THE CALL: 15th April 2012

CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSION of "Pre-proposals": 20th July 2012[1]

NOTIFICATION FOR SUBMISSION of "Full Proposal": 20th September 2012[1]

CLOSING DATE FOR SUBMISSION for "Full Proposal": 20th December 2012[1]

Introduction

Belmont Forum
The Belmont Forum is a high level group of the world's major and emerging funders of global environmental change research and international science councils[2]. It aims to accelerate delivery of the international environmental research most urgently needed to remove critical barriers to sustainability by aligning and mobilising international resources. The aims of the Belmont Forum are detailed in a White Paper[3], and encapsulated as 'the Belmont Challenge':– "To deliver knowledge needed for action to mitigate and adapt to detrimental environmental change and extreme hazardous events".

In order to make progress against the Belmont Challenge and help deliver international collaboration the Belmont Forum agreed to develop collaborative research actions (CRAs). The principles of the CRAs are that they will:
- Address the Belmont Challenge priorities (i.e. societally relevant global environmental change challenges)
- Lever Belmont Forum member's existing investments through international added value
- Bring together new partnerships of natural scientists, social scientists, and users

---

[1] All closing dates will be midnight Central European Time (CET)

[2] Australia, Department of Climate Change; Austria, Ministry for Education, Science and Research; Brazil, FAPESP; Canada, NSERC and CFCAS; France, ANR; European Commission, DG Research; Germany, BMBF and DFG; Japan, MEXT; India, MoES; Norway, The Research Council of Norway; South Africa, NRF; UK, NERC; USA, NSF; International Council for Science (ICSU); and International Social Sciences Council (ISSC)

[3] http://igfagcr.org/images/documents/belmont_challenge_white_paper.pdf

G8 Heads of Research Councils
At the G8 Heads of Research Councils (HORCs)[4] meeting held in Kyoto, Japan in May 2008, an initial proposal for a multilateral funding activity was introduced with the understanding that multilateral research projects can address global challenges in ways that are beyond the capacity of national or bilateral activities. The G8 HORCs framework provided the unique opportunity to pilot a new modality for conducting international research.

G8HORCs agreed that research topics would be defined separately for three calls. Following two successful calls the G8 Research Council Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding is now embarking on its third and final call.

Working Together
Belmont Forum and G8HORCs have come together in this International Opportunities Fund, taking forwards the process developed by G8HORCs to deliver against two priority areas of the Belmont Challenge. Partner Organizations are participating under the G8HORCs Multilateral Resarch Initiative Memorandum of Understanding or the Belmont Forum Collaborative Research Actions Memorandum of Understanding.

Partner Organizations contributing to this International Opportunities Fund				
			Participating in the Theme on:	
Legal Name	*Acronym*	*Country*	*Freshwater Security* M€	*Coastal Vulnerability* M€
The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization	CSIRO	Australia	In kind*	In kind*
São Paulo Research Foundation	FAPESP	Brazil	1.5	0.5
Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada	NSERC	Canada	1.5	X
Agence Nationale de la Recherche	ANR	France	1.5	1.5
Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft	DFG	Germany	1.5	1.0
Ministry of Earth Sciences, Government of India	MoES	India	0.5	0.5
Japan Science and Technology Agency Japan Society for the Promotion of Science	JST JSPS	Japan	0.5	1.5
Russian Foundation for Basic Research	RFBR	Russia		
National Research Foundation	NRF	South Africa	0.25	0.25
Natural Environment Research Council and Economic and Social Research Council	NERC and ESRC	United Kingdom	1.3	1.5
National Science Fondation	NSF	USA	1.0	1.0

* Up to the value provided by other Partner Organizations

This International Opporunties Fund is aimed at supporting excellent research on topics of global relevance best tackled through a multinational approach, recognising that global challenges need global solutions. Funding should support researchers to cooperate in consortia

---

[4] the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), the French National Research Agency (ANR), the German Research Foundation (DFG), the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS), the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (RFBR), the Research Councils of the United Kingdom (RCUK), and the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF)

consisting of partners from at least three of the participating countries and must bring together natural scientists, social scientists and research users (policy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities and industry). Where appropriate, some Partner Organizations could also support capacity building in some developing countries.

Scientific Themes

Proposals may address only one of the scientific Themes and can address either one or both of the work packages within that Theme. Proposals of 2-3 years duration are invited in the region of 1 to 2 million Euros (€1M- €2M).

Theme 1: Freshwater Security

We live on a resource-limited planet where pressures on water usage are increasing rapidly and pose mounting challenges for sustainable water management. In addition, climate change is anticipated to cause many water-stressed regions to become even drier and the frequency of extreme events, both droughts and floods, to increase and exacerbate the disaster risk of the society. The capacity of society to mitigate against such problems and, where possible to adapt to them, is currently constrained by the limits of our understanding and knowledge of the complex coupling of natural and anthropogenic systems that operate on the multiples scales of water stress and the unavailability of this science to management decision-making. The global scientific community needs to rapidly evolve the knowledge base that will enhance our capacity to enable communities to become more resilient, and manage the water system more sustainably in the face of the many interacting drivers of water supply and demand.

Water stress is a key component of water security and is influenced both by natural hydro-meteorological processes as well as the many complex facets of our wider societal footprint, such as land-use or water abstraction (for agriculture or industry) which in-turn are governed by patterns of consumption or population change. We currently have an inadequate understanding of the critical interactions between natural processes and human activities over a wide range of temporal and spatial scales, as well as across different regions. Managing regional water security remains challenging as the science enabling confident forecasts of rain-fed water supply over (seasonal) timescales that are most useful in decision-making is also highly immature. Furthermore, we have a limited set of management approaches, both physical and behavioural, that will enable society to become more resilient to water stress in future decades.

To tackle such problems requires a significant directional change in the science we need to undertake. We need to develop novel, transferable, approaches to the delivery of freshwater security in order to facilitate decision making for "wicked" problems that inevitably involve trade-offs (e.g. between ecosystems services and livelihoods or lifestyles). Research is therefore needed to address the coupling of natural and anthropogenic sytems operating on the multiples scales of water stress as well as the complexity of the associated decision-making processes.

Recognising this, and the value of interdisciplinary and comparative approaches, the Belmont Forum and G8HORCs are calling for research groups from at least three different countries involving both natural and social sciences to co-design and develop, in conjunction with users, medium sized regionally-based projects that tackle either one or both of the following work packages:

1. Identification and characterization of the interactions between natural processes (physical and biological, including ecological processes) and human (including cultural, social, economic, technological, abstraction, transfer and water re-use) practices that

<u>govern water budgeting in selected regions.</u> This will include establishing how these drivers vary over wide-ranging temporal and spatial scales (including extreme events and global scales), their impacts, and determining which are most important in governing the vulnerability of socio-economic and environmental systems to water extremes.

2. <u>Development of approaches that support the evolution of resilient communities/regions through improved seasonal (months to multi-year) forecasting of droughts, taking into account natural (hydro-meteorological) and socio-economic drivers identified in the above work package.</u> Research should clearly couple the complex system science of water stress at multiple-scales to the structure and protocols for decision making. Development of these approaches is expected to involve both model-based and place-based research that makes use of existing observations and existing modelling approaches, and where possible identifies key missing local observations. It will explore utilisation of forecast advice, and will consider determining how individuals, communities, businesses and governments alter or not their habits and practices on the basis of improved forecasts.

Theme 2: Coastal Vulnerability

As the proportion of the world population living near coasts increases during the XXI century, coastal environments may be degraded by multiple stresses arising from local to global scale drivers (e.g. water use, influx of sediments and pollutants, ecosystem degradation, river flooding, shoreline erosion, storms, tsunamis, relative sea level rise, aggregate extraction etc.). Decision making, social adaptation and building governance to enable resilience against coastal risks is difficult because of the complex interactions between these drivers and competing concerns (e.g. human migration, lifestyles, land use, and ecosystems services).

Assessments of what makes a system vulnerable vary greatly from one case to another due to the conjunction of multiple drivers (e.g. type of hazard, environmental context, socio-economic development, social situation, risk management) and local circumstances. This situation often results in the development and use of specific local approaches that are not generic enough to be used elsewhere, and therefore inhibit the wider sharing of knowledge (e.g. between nations).

To tackle such problems requires a significant directional change in the science we need to undertake. We need to develop novel, transferable, coastal vulnerability assessment approaches to facilitate decision making for "wicked" problems that inevitably involve trade-offs (e.g. between ecosystems services and livelihoods or lifestyles).

To globally capitalize on local and national expertise, this CRA is promoting the development and comparison and transfer of coastal scientific approaches which link researchers to decision makers and communities. The focus of this call is on the vulnerability, resilience and adaptation options of coastal societal, managed and natural systems to multiple drivers. This may be within different environments (e.g. estuaries, deltas and bays) and in areas of different societal development (e.g. post-industrialisation, emerging, developing countries or regions).

Recognising this, and the value of interdisciplinary and comparative approaches, the Belmont Forum and G8HORCs are calling for research groups, from at least three diffferent countires, involving natural and social scientists to co-design and develop, in conjunction with users, medium sized projects that address either one or both of the following work packages:

1. <u>Characterisation of natural process and human (including cultural, technological and socio-economic) interactions that govern coastal vulnerability and resilience</u>. This should establish how multiple stresses vary over wide-ranging temporal and spatial scales

(including past extreme events), analyse their impacts, and determine the most important factors which govern the vulnerability of socio-economic and environmental coastal systems. Determining what science based knowledge enables people (e.g., individuals, communities, businesses, etc.) to change their habits and practices towards more sustainable management in the coastal zone should be investigated. Particular attention should be dedicated to the comparative reanalysis of highly documented areas, the evaluation of predictive frameworks and the identification of information needs to improve them. This will support international convergence towards a 'coastal vulnerability and resilience typology' to enhance decision making.

2. <u>Development of predictive frameworks and adaptive coastal management strategies that support the evolution of resilient coastal communities.</u> In particular, this should be based on jointly-developed natural and social science based scenarios of gradual or abrupt large scale changes and their interactions. It should consider the role of legislative and governance issues, evolving regulatory frameworks, as well as economic, social and political barriers and opportunities. Probabilistic approaches to assess the uncertainty in coupled models will be welcome.

Research Matching

One of the criteria on which the proposals to the Belmont Forum International Opportunities Fund will be judged is the collaborative nature of the projects, specifically among a diversity of countries and the involvement of a variety of natural and social science disciplines. We recognize that all researchers may not have already established networks of collaborators that cover these types of collaborations. To help facilitate this process we have established a Research Matching web interface on the Belmont Forum page for those researchers interested in the International Opportunities Fund Call for Proposals.

The research matching site is available to all researchers interested in the IOF Call. To register, basic information will be required including discipline, area of expertise, the IOF Theme area of interest, and a 1-2 sentence summary of topical interest within the IOF theme. This database will be available through the Belmont Forum website and searchable for those interested in finding a collaborator with a certain background or within a specific topic area. All researchers should please consider registering for this service.

Further details can be found at www.belmontforum.org/iof

Principles for Applications - for details, please consult www.belmontforum.org/iof

Consortium partners should identify a Leading Principal Investigator (LPI) for each proposal for application, management and communication purposes. The LPI is officially responsible for all communications with the Program Office, including the submission of the Pre-proposal and, if invited to do so, the Full Proposal. (Note that US LPIs in accordance with NSF policy must have their office of sponsored research submit the proposal). Research projects will be selected in a two-step procedure. Short "Pre-proposals" must be submitted by interested consortia by **20th July 2012**. These will be considered by a scientific review panel that will invite submission of Full Proposals by **20th September 2012**. Full Proposals must be submitted by the **20th December 2012.**

Principles of Funding

Within each selected consortium, funding of the participating researchers is provided by their respective national Funding Agencies according to their normal terms and conditions for project funding. Funding is meant for collaborative research, not merely for networking, mobility or communication. Projects are encouraged to consider attributing a specific budget to clustering activities with other projects within their theme and other relevant activities, such as the planned EC FP7 call Coasts at threat in Europe. A consortium agreement (including International Property Rights) will need to be developed between the participating researchers should their application be successful, and shared with the relevant Partner Organizations.

The total budget for this call is approximately 17 million Euros (€). Funding will be provided for projects lasting between **2 and 3** years. It is expected that approximately 10-15research consortia will be funded in this call. It is anticipated that awards will be made by July 2013.

Eligibility

Each consortium must consist of at least one academic participant from a minimum of 3 different countries represented by the participating Partner Organizations. Each consortium must show clear links through to users and include collaboration between natural and social sciences, and other sciences where relevant.

All applicants must fulfil national eligibility rules for research grant applications as set by their national Funding Agencies. Additional eligibility rules may be applied by the Partner Organizations involved, such as opportunities to support research capacity building in some developing countries. Please see the relevant National Annex and/or contact the relevant national contact point for more information.

More than one applicant from each country is possible in each consortium. However, consortia should aim for a balanced geographical contribution to the research project.

Researchers from countries not represented by any of the Partner Organizations can participate in the research project at their own expense (unless otherwise allowed by Partner Organizations – please see National Annexes).

If an applicant is found to not be eligible, the proposal will only be evaluated if the remaining elements of the proposal remain viable and meet the eligibilitiy criteria.

Selection criteria

Each proposal must combine significant contributions by scientists from at least three of the participating countries and must bring together natural and social scientists in addressing the workpackage(s) within the scope of the described call Theme. The proposal must demonstrate clear links to users and conform to program aims and the designated research fields addressing **either** the Theme of Freshwater Security **or** Coastal Vulnerability.

The PoE and individual External Reviewers will review the proposals under the following selection criteria:

v. **Quality/Intellectual Merit**
   - *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the goals and objectives of the joint research plan*
   - *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*
   How well does the activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field and across different fields?
   Does the proposal contribute to scientific excellence and significant progress toward the state of the art?
   To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts?
   If these partnerships currently exist what does this new funding allow them to do that they could not do otherwise?
   What is the added value of the international cooperation? Where appropriate this should also include the extent to which Partner Organizations' existing investments are leveraged in the proposed project.

vi. **User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts**
   - *Engagement of research users (relevant policy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities or industry)and the effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*
   - *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related, economical*
   What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society, policy-development or economies?
   How have users been engaged and how effective are the proposed mechanism for knowledge transfer to decision makers?
   Does the project involve early career researchers?
   Does the research collaboration focus on global challenges for which solutions can only be achieved by global scientific approaches?

vii. **Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium**
   - *Collaboration between natural and social sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
   - *Competence and expertise of team and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*
   How strong is the collaboration between the natural and social sciences?
   How well qualified are the proposers (Leading Principal Investigator and team) in terms of science knowledge, expertise and experience to conduct the project?
   What is the quality of previous work in terms of past or potential contributions to, and impact on the proposed and other areas of research?
   Is the Leading Principal Investigator team (including any identified Co-Principal Investigators) able to lead the project, e.g. having strong management and leadership skills, or having complementarity of expertise and synergy of the members of the team?

viii. Resources and Management
- *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
- *Balanced cooperation*

How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity?
Is there an operational plan with well defined milestones in place?
Is the coordination plan adequate?
Is there sufficient access to resources?
Are the requested investments well justified and relevant?
Are the scientific and financial contributions requested of the Partner Organizations from each country well balanced?

Pre-proposals

The selection of projects to be funded follows a two-stage peer-reviewed selection process. In the first step, interested consortia are required to submit a Pre-Proposal electronically to the Program Office through the online system. Applications must be completed in English. For details, please consult www.belmontforum.org/iof.

For each Theme the Pre-proposals will be evaluated by a Panel of Experts (PoE). The PoE will encompass the necessary expertise to cover the call theme in the natural and social sciences as members with expertise in the field of policy and decision makers (public and private). The PoE will establish a pool of high-quality applications based on above-mentioned criteria that will be invited to submit Full Proposals.

All LPIs will receive the result and a short written summary from the Theme Program Office on their Pre-proposals.

Full Proposals

The Full Proposal must be closely based on the successful Pre-proposal and substantial changes to the proposed program of research or consortium membership is not anticipated.

The LPI should submit their proposal electronically to the Program Office through the online system. There may be additional national application requirements - please see the National Annex of your respective Partner Organization. Further details on submission will be provided at www.belmontforum.org/iof.

Peer review will be coordinated across the participating Partner Organizations using external and panel review, sharing a common review form. Each proposal will be peer-reviewed ideally by three experts.

Full Proposals will be discussed and recommended for funding by the PoE based on the selection criteria and the assessments of external reviews.

The final award decision will be responsibility of the Partner Organization. Upon the final decision a list of funded projects will be published on the Belmont Forum website.

All LPIs will receive the result and a short written summary from the Theme Program Office on their Full Proposals.

Reporting

LPIs of successful proposals will be requested to submit a report to the Theme Program Office upon completion of the research project. Each PI must also fulfill the national reporting requirement(s) of the respective Partner Organization.

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding

International Opportunities Fund on:
Theme 1: Freshwater Security
Theme 2: Coastal Vulnerability

PRE-PROPOSAL APPLICATION FORM 2012

1.Project title

2. Theme and Work Packages applied to: (Each application may only apply to one Theme)
Theme: Freshwater Security / Coastal Vulnerability Work package(s):

3. Duration
From   / /2013 *(DD/MM/YYYY)* to   / /201X   *(DD/MM/YYYY)*

4.Project reference (to be completed by the Theme Program Office)

5. Project summary (Maximum 2100 characters)

6. Key words (for allocation of reviewers (up to 10))

7. Summary of applicants

PI	First name	Last name	Institution	City	Country	Role in the consortium
Leading PI						
Partner PI 1						
Partner PI 2						
Partner PI 3						
Partner PI 4						

Comment [MU1]: If

8.Principal investigators - Leading Principal Investigator -	
Family name	
First name(s)	
Address at the university/research institute	
University/research institute	
Position	
Street name and number	

PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**	
City		**Country**			
Phone		**Fax**			

E-mail	
Web site	
Highest academic qualification	
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)	

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 1 -

Family name	
First name(s)	

Address at the university/research institute

University/research institute	
Position	
Street name and number	

PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**	
City		**Country**			
Phone		**Fax**			

E-mail	
Web site	
Highest academic qualification	

Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 2 -

Family name	
First name(s)	

Address at the university/research institute

University/research institute	
Position	
Street name and number	

PO Box		Postal/Zip code		Cedex/State/Province	
City		Country			
Phone		Fax			

E-mail	
Web site	
Highest academic qualification	

Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 3 -

Family name	
First name(s)	

Address at the university/research institute

University/research institute	
Position	
Street name and number	

PO Box		*Postal/Zip code*		*Cedex/State/Province*	
City			*Country*		
Phone			*Fax*		

E-mail	
Web site	
Highest academic qualification	

Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 4 -

Family name	
First name(s)	

Address at the university/research institute

University/research institute	
Position	
Street name and number	

PO Box		*Postal/Zip code*		*Cedex/State/Province*	
City			*Country*		
Phone			*Fax*		

E-mail	
Web site	
Highest academic qualification	

Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)

ADD more boxes for Senior Personnel if necessary

9. Objective (Maximum 7000 characters, not including reference list)

Please state the general nature, context and specific purpose of the research collaboration, with a summary at the beginning and with references, where necessary, to existing academic literature. The proposal must conform to program aims and address one theme only. Details should be articulated clearly, particularly with regard to the following points:

1. Quality/Intellectual Merit
   · *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the joint research plan*
   · *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*
2. User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts
   · *Engagement of users and effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*
   · *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related, economic*
3. Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium
   ·*Collaboration between natural and social/economic sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
   · *Competence and expertise of teams and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*
4. Resources and Management
   · *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
   · *Balanced cooperation*

10. Provisional Financial Summary					
Principal Investigator	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total requested budget
Leading PI					
Partner PI 1					
Partner PI 2					
Partner PI 3					
Partner PI 4					
Senior Personnel 1					
Senior Personnel 2					
Total					

*The currency unit must be represented in thousand Euro (K€) for entire project duration

**Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund**

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PRE-PROPOSALS 2012

A copy of the Pre-proposal must be submitted by the Leading PI to the Theme Program Office by 20 July, 2012.

Note: U.S. Lead PI's, in accordance with NSF policy, must have their office of sponsored research submit the proposal by the deadline.

Pre-proposals are to be submitted through the electronic proposal system and Leading PIs are requested to write the proposals directly into the system. However, MS Word File Form could be used in the process of completing the proposal and used to share the proposal among your consortium members.

Note: Both Leading and Partner PIs should make sure to check the information provided by their national Funding Agencies and to contact them if needed. There may be additional national application requirements in Pre-proposal phase.

General guidance for all applicants:
- the proposal must be written in English.
- the different sections of the application should not exceed the prescribed maximum number of characters. **Extra characters will be removed.**
- any documents other than those requested as part of the proposal **will not be forwarded** to Panel members.

1. Project title

Give a project title which clearly describes the research content of your consortium.

2. Theme and Work package(s)

Indicate the theme that you are applying to. Each application may only address one Theme. Detail the work package(s) within that Theme that you are applying to. An application may address one or both of the work packages within the Theme

3. Duration

Indicate the duration of the project and anticipated start date. The starting date of the project should be no later than November 1, 2013 and no earlier than September 1, 2013. The project should last between two and four years.

4. Project reference

This is completed by the Theme Project OfficeTheme Program Office for administration purposes only.

5. Project summary (2100 characters or less, suitable for public release)

Provide a summary describing the proposed research program and expected impact in plain language suitable for general audience.

This summary will be published if the proposal is selected.

6. Key words

Give at least three and up to ten keywords that represent the scientific content of your proposal. These will be used to assist in identifying reviewers.

7. **Summary of applicants**
   Provide brief summary information on consortium members and their roles in the consortium.
8. **Principal investigators**
   Provide detailed information on each Leading and Partner PI, including institution and contact details. Please check with your national contact point for eligibility.
   For each PI, 1400 characters summary of key achievements that are relevant to the research proposed and up to 5 most recent relevant publications should be included. Fully self-financed partners who bring their own secured budget are allowed from any country.
9. **Objective (Maximum 7000 characters, not including reference list)**
   Describe the objective of your consortium's research in accordance with the instructions in the application form.
10. **Provisional Financial Summary**
    Describe your Provisional Financial Summary for each Leading or Partner PI in the table. The currency unit must be represented as thousand Euros (K€).

When preparing the Pre-proposal it is useful to remember the Selection Criteria on which it will be evaluated – please see the Call for Proposals for details.
National Call Contacts:
Australia, CSIRO

Brazil, FAPESP

Canada, NSERC

France, ANR

Germany, DFG

India, MoES

Japan, JSPS /JST/MEXT

Russia, RFBR

South Africa, NRF

United Kingdom, RCUK

USA, NSF
   Dr. Maria Uhle
   Program Director for International Activities
   Directorate for Geosciences – Office of the Assistant Directors
   (703) 292-2250
   muhle@nsf.gov

**Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding**

**International Opportunities Fund on:
Theme 1: Freshwater Security
Theme 2: Coastal Vulnerability**

FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION FORM 2012

1. Project title
（Project Acronym）

2. Theme and Work package(s) applied to
Theme: Freshwater Security / Coastal Vulnerability Work package(s):

3. Duration
From   / /2013 *(DD/MM/YYYY)* to   / /201X *(DD/MM/YYYY)*, __Months

4. Project reference (to be completed by the Theme Program Office)

5. Project summary (Maximum 2100 characters (including spaces))

6. Key words (for identification of reviewers (at least 3 and up to 10))

7. Summary of applicants						
Principal Investigator	First name	Last name	Institution	City	Country	Role in the consortium

Leading PI						
Partner PI 1						
Partner PI 2						
Partner PI 3						
Partner PI 4						
Senior Personnel 1-						
Senior Personnel 2						

8.Principal investigators - Leading Principal Investigator -			
Family name			
First name(s)			
Address at the university / research institute			
University / Research institute			
Department			
Position			
Street name and number			
PO Box		*Postal/Zip code*	*Cedex/State/Province*
City		*Country*	
Phone		*Fax*	
E-mail			
(Laboratory's)Website			
Highest academic qualification			
Role in the consortium			
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)			
1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements:			
5 most recent relevant publications:			

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 1 -				
Family name				
First name(s)				
Address at the university / research institute				
University / Research institute				
Department				
Position				
Street name and number				
PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**
City			**Country**	
Phone			**Fax**	
E-mail				
(Laboratory's)Website				
Highest academic qualification				
Role in the consortium				
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)				
1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements:				
5 most recent relevant publications:				

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 2 -					
Family name					
First name(s)					
Address at the university / research institute					
University / Research institute					
Department					
Position					
Street name and number					
PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**	
City			**Country**		
Phone			**Fax**		
E-mail					
(Laboratory's)Website					
Highest academic qualification					
Role in the consortium					
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)					
1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements:					
5 most recent relevant publications:					

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 3 -					
Family name					
First name(s)					
Address at the university / research institute					
University / Research institute					
Department					
Position					
Street name and number					
PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**	
City			**Country**		
Phone			**Fax**		
E-mail					
(Laboratory's)Website					
Highest academic qualification					
Role in the consortium					
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)					
1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements:					
5 most recent relevant publications:					

8.Principal investigators - Partner Principal Investigator 4 -				
Family name				
First name(s)				
Address at the university / research institute				
University / Research institute				
Department				
Position				
Street name and number				
PO Box		**Postal/Zip code**		**Cedex/State/Province**
City		**Country**		
Phone		**Fax**		
E-mail				
(Laboratory's)Website				
Highest academic qualification				
Role in the consortium				
Principal Investigator Details (1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements and 5 most recent relevant publications)				
1400 characters (including spaces) summary of key achievements:				
5 most recent relevant publications:				

Add more Partner-Boxes if required

9. Executive summary (Maximum 7000 characters (including spaces))

10. Project description (Maximum 35000 characters (including spaces))

10.1 Background

10.2 Research plan

10.3 Inter-disciplinarity and complementarity of the team (added value of the consortium)

10. Management Plan (Maximum 17500 characters (including spaces))

11. Outcome and dissemination plan

12. Budget plan (Currency unit must be represented in thousand Euros (K€))

Total Cost: K€

Leading Principal Investigator

	Expenses for facilities and equipments	Expenses for supplies /consumables	Travel Expenses	Salaries	Other	Total requested budget
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						

Total LPI Cost: K€

Partner Principal Investigator 1

	Expenses for facilities and equipments	Expenses for supplies /consumables	Travel Expenses	Salaries	Other	Total requested budget
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						

Total PI1 Cost: K€

Partner Principal Investigator 2					
	Expenses for facilities and equipments	Expenses for supplies /consumables	Travel Expenses	Salaries	Other	Total requested budget
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						

Total PI2 Cost: K€

Partner Principal Investigator 3					
	Expenses for facilities and equipments	Expenses for supplies /consumables	Travel Expenses	Salaries	Other	Total requested budget **
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						

Total PI3 Cost: K€

Partner Principal Investigator 4					
	Expenses for facilities and equipments	Expenses for supplies /consumables	Travel Expenses	Salaries	Other	Total requested budget
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						

Total PI4 Cost: K€

Add more Senior Personell boxes if required

14. Funding from other sources (current and pending support)

15. Budget justification

16. Suggested reviewers
Suggest the names (and provide address, affiliation and e-mail) of at least 3 reviewers who might be asked to evaluate your proposal. Reviewers should be experts in the field, and not have known conflicts of interest with any of the Principal Investigators or Funding Agencies.

17. Potential reviewers to avoid for direct competition reasons or conflict of interest
List the names (and provide his/her country and affiliation) of potential reviewers who, you think, should not be asked to evaluate the project for reasons of direct competition and partiality. Also provide the names of significant collaborators that should not be used as reviewers due to conflicts of interest.

**Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund**

Instructions for Full Proposals 2012

A copy of the Full Proposal must be submitted by the Leading PI to the Theme Program Office by 20 December 2012. Note that U.S. LPI's, in accordance with NSF policy, must have their office of sponsored research submit the proposal. **Leading and Partner PIs of each consortium will also be contacted separately by their national Funding Agencies, as appropriate, for detailed guidance on how to submit one copy of the Full Proposal through their national systems.**
Full Proposals are to be submitted through the electronic proposal system and Leading PIs are requested to write the proposals directly into the system. However, MS Word File Form could be used in the process of completing the proposal and used to share the proposal among your consortium members.

General guidance for all applicants:
- the proposal must be written in English.
- the different sections of the application should not exceed the prescribed maximum number of characters. Any exceeded characters (including spaces and line breaks) **cannot be entered** into text fields of the system.
- **spaces and line breaks also count as characters.**
- non text descriptions such as **graphic chart, diagrams, figures, etc., can be presented only in the two sections, 10. Project description and 11. Management Plan** by uploading an arbitrary format to the system in PDF format.
- any documents other than those requested as part of the proposal **will not be forwarded** to External Reviewers or Panel members.

1. **Project title**

    This should be the same as the title of the Pre-proposal.

2. **Theme and Work package(s)**

    Indicate the theme that you are applying to. Each application may only address one Theme. Detail the work package(s) within that Theme that you are applying to. An application may address one or both of the work packages within the Theme

3. **Duration**

    Indicate the duration of the project and anticipated start date. The starting date of the project should be no later than November 1, 2013 and no earlier than September 1, 2013. The project should last between two and four years.

4. **Project reference**

    This is completed by the Theme Program Office for administration purposes only.

5. **Project summary (Maximum 2100 characters, suitable for public release)**

    Provide a summary describing the proposed research program and expected impact in plain language suitable for general audience.

    The project summary should be the same as the summary provided in your Pre-proposal (although minor amendments are acceptable).

This summary will be published if the proposal is selected.

6. Key words

Give at least three and up to ten keywords that represent the scientific content of your proposal. These will be used to assist in identifying reviewers.

7. Summary of applicants

Provide brief summary information on consortium members and their role in the consortium.

8. Principal investigators

Provide detailed information on each Leading and Partner PI, including institution and contact details.

For each PI, 1400 characters summary of key achievements that are relevant to the research proposed and up to 5 most recent relevant publications should be included.

9. Executive summary (Maximum 7000 characters)

Give an overarching summary of the goals of the research project, with particular reference to the scientific quality of the consortium and of the proposed research, and the innovativeness of the approach. Describe the added value to be expected from the international collaboration with reference to the specific Inter-disciplinarity, competence and expertise of the team and the complementarities of the consortium. Explain how users have been engaged in the proposal and the potential impact of the research on society, policy economically etc..

10. Project description (Maximum 35000 characters)

Describe the research plan of your consortium in no more than 35000 characters.

10.1 *Background*

Give the scientific basis for your proposal and describe the present state-of-the-art. Identify important gaps to be filled in the current knowledge. Include reference to the significance of preliminary studies, describing how the proposed project is embedded within the research currently funded in the consortium laboratories and how it adds value to this broader program.

10.2 *Research plan*

Give an overall description and the general approach and methodology chosen to achieve the objectives. Highlight the particular advantages of the methodology chosen; quantify the expected project result(s).

Break down the research program into individual tasks, showing the interrelationship between the tasks. Explain why there is synergy between different tasks of the project and how this is going to be exploited. Remember that proposals will ultimately be assessed by an interdisciplinary panel of reviewers so applications should be prepared in that context. External reviewers and panel members will have been chosen so that there is sufficient expertise to cover the breadth of the call topic, but not all panel members will have specific expertise relevant to all proposals. Applications should be prepared with these two audiences in mind. Added-value – In instances where the proposed work builds on previous activities, describe how this collaborative proposal will complement or build on previous activities as well as the incremental value of the proposed work.

10.3 *Inter-disciplinarity and complementarity of the team (added value of the*

consortium)

Describe clearly the contribution and role of each partner to your project. It is expected that unless the participation is at the level of sub-contracting for specific tasks, individual applicants will be true research partners in the consortia and will contribute significantly to the development of the research program. Evaluators will be asked to comment on and rate the value added by the involvement of all partners in order to assist the assessment of these projects. All projects must involve both a natural and social/economic science element.

Demonstrate how the project will increase synergy between teams across partner countries and how international collaboration adds a particular value.

11. **Management Plan (Maximum 17500 characters)**

Describe how the overall coordination, monitoring and control of the project will be implemented. Outline the management processes foreseen in the project (decision boards, coordination meetings, etc). It is recommended that milestones be presented in a detailed diagram (e.g. PERT or Gantt charts) providing the time schedule of the tasks and mark their interrelationships; add when decisions on further approaches will have to be made; indicate a critical path marking those events which directly influence the overall time schedule in case of delays. Explain how information flow and communication will be enhanced within the project (e.g. collaboration and task meetings, exchange of scientists).

Risk management: Indicate where there are risks of not achieving the objectives and describe potential solutions, if appropriate.

Note that a Consortium Agreement (including Intellectual Property Rights) should be signed among the partners of a research consortium prior to the start of the project.

12. **Impact and dissemination plan**

Describe *who* may benefit from or make use of the research, *how* they might benefit and/or make use of the research, and *methods* for disseminating data/knowledge/skills in the most effective and appropriate manner. Detail how users will be engaged in the project.

Describe how information generated in the course of the project will be captured, stored and managed. Also explain any plans for longer-term archiving and for the release of data to the wider scientific and user community. The application will be expected to demonstrate the necessary resourcing to achieve these aims.

Describe how the consortium will deal with the dissemination, publication, and, protection of results generated in the project. Notably: the access rights for academic and/or private research purposes to the research results, the delay before research results to be publicly available.

It is expected that arrangements will be made for timely release of information and resources from publicly funded research projects.

13. **Budget plan**

Describe your budget plan for each Leading or Partner PI under the headings in the table. The currency unit must be represented in thousand Euros (K€).

14. **Funding from other sources (current and pending support)**

Please indicate if a) support from other funding sources will be used to augment resources provided through the award and b) if support is currently being sought from other sources that is relevant to the proposal. If so, then the relationship between these various funds and the proposed project should be explained. This is particularly important in judging the need for funding via this Initiative.

15. Budget justification

In this section the summary of requested costs and own contribution related to the project should be inserted. The applicants should provide evidence that the requested means are balanced and justified when compared to the work proposed.

In addition to the summary, some funding agencies require a detailed budget specification according to national funding rules. For the appropriate forms and any other questions you should contact or refer to the website of your National Call Contact (contact details at the end).

16. Suggested reviewers

Suggest the names (and provide address, affiliation and e-mail) of at least three reviewers who might be asked to evaluate your proposal.

Reviewers should be experts in the field, and should not have known conflicts of interest with any of the Principal Investigators (PIs) or Funding Agencies.

17. Potential reviewers to avoid for direct competition reasons or conflict of interest

List the names (and provide his/her country and affiliation) of potential reviewers who, you think, should not be asked to evaluate the project for reasons of direct competition and partiality. Also provide the names of significant collaborators that should not be used as reviewers due to conflicts of interest.

When preparing the Full Proposal it is useful to remember the Selection Criteria on which it will be evaluated – please see the Call for Proposals for details.

National Call Contacts:
Australia, CSIRO

Brazil, FAPESP

Canada, NSERC

France, ANR

Germany, DFG

India, MoES

Japan, JSPS /JST/MEXT

Russia, RFBR

South Africa, NRF

United Kingdom, RCUK

USA, NSF
Dr. Maria Uhle
Program Director for International Activities
Directorate for Geosciences – Office of the Assistant Directors
(703) 292-2250
muhle@nsf.gov

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding
International Opportunities Fund

Evaluation Form for Full Proposals

_____

CONFLICT OF INTEREST
If after reading the proposal, you feel that you have a conflict of interest, as identified in the ***Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration***, please notify **the Theme Program Office**.
_____

Reference No. of proposal: ……   Name of Reviewer: ……………………
Name of Leading Principal Investigator: ....……..................

ix.   **Quality/Intellectual Merit**
- *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the goals and objectives of the joint research plan*
- *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*

How well does the activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?
Does the proposal contribute to scientific excellence and significant progress toward the state of the art?
To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts?
If these partnerships currently exists what does this new funding allow them to do that they could not do otherwise?
What is the added value of the international cooperation? Where appropriate this should also include the extent to which Partner Organizations' existing investments are leveraged in the proposed project.

The excellence of this proposal has been demonstrated: ☐ **A**   ☐ **A-**   ☐ **B**
☐ **B-**   ☐ **C**

                                                          Fully   Very well   Well

Adequately   Not at all

x.   **User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts**
- *Engagement of research users (relevant policy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities or industry) and effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*

- *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related , economical*

What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society, policy-development or economies? How have users being engaged and how effective are the proposed mechanisms for knowledge transfer to decision makers?

Does the research collaboration focus on global challenges for which solutions can only be achieved by global scientific approaches?

User engagement and potential impact has been demonstrated: ☐ **A**   ☐ **B**

☐ **C**

Fully

Adequately   Not at all

xi. Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium

- *Collaboration between natural and social sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
- *Competence and expertise of teams and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*

How strong is the collaboration between the natural and social sciences?

How well qualified are the proposers (Leading Principal Investigator and team) in terms of science knowledge, expertise and experience to conduct the project?

What is the quality of previous work in terms of past or potential contributions to, and impact on the proposed and other areas of research?

Is the Leading Principal Investigator team (including any identified Co-Principal Investigators) able to lead the project, e.g. having strong management and leadership skills, or having complementarity of expertise and synergy of the members of the team?

Level of Inter-disciplinarity, and of applicants' track record and ability to deliver this is :	☐ **A**	☐ **B**
☐ **C**	Fully	
Adequately Not at all		

xii. Resources and Management

- *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
- *Balanced cooperation*

How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity? Is the coordination plan adequate?

Is there an operational plan with well defined milestones in place? Is there sufficient access to resources?

Are the requested investments well justified and relevant?

Are the scientific and financial contributions of the partners from each country well balanced?

The level of planning and justification of resources is   :   ☐ **A**   ☐ **B**
☐ **C**

Fully

Adequately   Not at all

xiii.   Overall Assessment
Please summarize your view of the proposal.

☐   **A** This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria.

☐   **A-** This is a strong proposal that meets all assessment criteria well.

☐   **B** This is a very good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses.

☐   **B-** This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with a number of minor weaknesses.

☐   **C** This proposal does not meet a significant number of ass. criteria and/or is scientifically or technically flawed

**Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund**

Roles and Responsibilities

1.   Theme Program Office (TPO)

The Theme Program Office for Freshwater Security is NSF (US) and for Coastal Vulnerability is NERC (UK). The **TPO** will provide central management, documentation of procedures and facilitation of a streamlined flow of information during the evaluation and selection of Pre-proposals and Full Proposals as well as consecutive activities for each Theme.

The **TPO** will manage the activities of the members of the Panel of Experts (**PoE**) and the Post-Review Meeting (**PRM**) of GPC and Chair. It will collect and store all relevant information and provide it to the respective boards, panels and individuals as needed for the evaluation and selection.

Duties are as follows:

- Co-ordination of the preparation of documents for the call implementation

- Posting of the Call for proposals

- Co-ordination of National Contact Points

- Receipt of Pre-proposals/Full Proposals

- Support the GPC in establishing the PoE

    o   Chair and Vice/Chair of the PoE? should be appointed just after the call is launched, and selected by the GPC from nominations from Partners (2 each). The Chair and Vice-Chair of the PoE? should be from a country that is not participating in this Call.

    o   According to the needs for expertise foreseen (following pre-proposal submission), each Partner has to provide 2-5 names of experts they recommend to be part of each PoE. The Chair and vice-Chair of the PoE? then suggest a list of names to the GPC, using two nominations from each country, to consitute a PoE that covers all (sub) disciplines necessary to review the proposal. The final composition of the PoE is approved by the GPC.

    o   A proportion of Committee members should be from countries that do not participate in the call to allow further flexibility in case of conflicting interests.

- Support the GPC and PoE during the evaluation by providing overall management of peer review process including co-ordinating eligibility checks, finalising the list of ERs based on eligibility, and assigning individual ERs to specific proposals.

- Organise and provide the reporting from the GPC and PoE meetings

- o Providing an overview list based on PoE members' feedback in advance of the Pre-proposal/Full Proposals PoE meeting to guide discussion
- o Providing feedback to applicants on recommendations following the Pre-proposal PoE meeting ('invite'/'do not invite')
- o Providing feedback to applicants on recommendations following the Full Proposal PoE meeting and PRM ("recommended" or "not recommended")
- o Keeping accurate minutes of the meeting proceedings for the PoE meeting and PRM
- Cover travel costs for the Chairs of the PoE

Objectivity in the decision-making process and transparency of assessment procedures are key components the entire review process. The **TPO** will obtain from all PoE members/External Reviewers participating in the peer review process and GPC members a Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration before giving them access to individual proposal information.

2.   Group of Programme Coordinators (GPC)

Each Partner Organization will appoint a management-level representative to represent their organization on the Group of Program Coordinators (GPC). At the GPC Meetings, each representative may be accompanied by specialist colleagues from the respective organization. The GPC will be chaired by the Theme Program Office for that Theme.

The members of the GPC and/or an alternate (e.g. senior program staff) of their respective Organization will have the following functions:

- Provide policy-level guidance on the overall execution of the call
- Develop and approve the relevant documentation to support the call
- Assist in developing a list of External Reviewers for Full Proposals
- Attend the proposal review meetings (PoE and PRM)
- Recommend the award portfolio for each Call based on PoE recommendations and availability of funds
- Meet or participate in teleconferences as needed to address questions

Together with the Theme Program Office, the **GPC** is jointly responsible for the development, management and documentation of procedures as well as for contributing to the achievement of a streamlined process during the evaluation and selection of Pre-proposals and Full Proposals. They will also be responsible for ensuring that subsequent steps are taken at a national level, which will lead to funding of individual components of grants. In the frame of this Initiative a detailed evaluation and analysis of the preparation, implementation and organization of the call may be made after the evaluation and selection procedure of the call is finished.

3.   National Contact Points

The contributing Funding Agencies nominate National Contact Points who represent the Partner and can be contacted by applicants and the Theme Program Office for information on or to explain the call procedures as well as national rules and procedures. The National Contact Point may be the same person as the Group of Programme Coordinator member.

4.   Panel of Experts (PoE)

The **PoE** consists of experts from the scientific community and is comprised such that it can cover the full range of topics within the scope of the particular Theme within the Call for Proposals. The **PoE** meeting will be organized and managed by the relevant Theme Program Office.

Members take part in the committees as independent experts and do not represent any organisation (a titre personal) nor can they send any replacements. This means that, although they have been nominated by Funding Agencies their work on this Panel does not represent any organization or nation.

In summary, the tasks of the **PoE** include:

- Performing the assessment of the Pre-proposals based on the respective evaluation criteria, providing a written evaluation to the Theme Program Office in advance of the PoE meeting for discussion at the PoE

- Presenting their assessments at the PoE meeting and recommending a list of consortia to be invited to submit a Full Proposal

- Proposing External Reviewers for the Full Proposals

- Performing the assessment of Full Proposals based on the evaluation reports of the External Reviewers and with the benefit of their individual expertise

- Providing written evaluations of all proposals one week in advance of the PoE meeting for discussion at the PoE meeting.

- Presenting their assessment at the PoE meetings and recommending a short list of consortia recommended for funding

- Preparing Panel Summaries for each proposal based on PoE discussions of the proposal's strength and weaknesses for later distribution to the applicants by the LPIs' national Funding Agencies.

5.   External Reviewers (ERs)

The purpose of the External Review is to generate multiple qualified and in-depth evaluations of the Full Proposals from the perspectives of international research community. This broadens the

basis of the subsequent discussions in the **PoE** meeting. The PoE members are not bound to follow the ERs recommendations however.

The involvement of **ERs** in the context of the Full Proposal evaluation ensures - with respect to the individual application – the necessary specific scientific expertise. The in-depth evaluation of the Full Proposals allocated to them will provide vital information for the subsequent assessment by the **PoE**.

The work of the **ERs** will be guided by

- the evaluation criteria as stated in the Call for Proposals and as contained in the Call evaluation forms,
- the individual expertise and independence of each **ER** (Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration to be signed).

In general, participating **ERs** have to be independent scientific experts. An independent expert is an expert who is working in a personal capacity and who, in performing the work, does not represent any organization. They are expected to have skills and knowledge as well as proven experience appropriate to the respective areas of research in which they are asked to assist. The required competence of the **ERs** is established by scientific activity in the respective or a closely related field, as well as by publications in reviewed journals, text books, invited lectures, awards, academic positions, etc. Their ability to evaluate the broader impacts of the proposed work including economic and societal dimension will also be considered. **ERs** must also have the appropriate language skills required to evaluate the proposals in English.

The Theme Program Office coordinates the External Review of the multilateral proposals. International **ERs** are selected from nominations from the GPG and PoE. Along with independent scientific experts, **ERs** may also include the Theme Program Office's own authorized staff, staff from other Funding Agencies and from the members of the PoE assigned to each Full Proposal. In addition, the applicants may suggest reviewers and may also indicate whether there are specific individuals who should not be used.

The evaluation comments by the **ERs** will be produced in a pre-defined evaluation form that covers all evaluation criteria as stated in the Call for Proposals and **ERs** will attribute an overall score. It is envisaged that each proposal will be assessed by 3 **ERs**. In principle a reasonable number of External Reviewers will be contacted about their availability to review a proposal. In the unique case when there is only one External Reviewer, the full proposal will be reviewed by two additional PoE members assigned to the proposal by the Panel Chair in conjunction with the TPO.

6.   Post-Review Meeting of GPC & Chair (PRM)

The Post-Review meeting of GPC and Chair (PRM) will be held to have a discussion between GPC and the PoE Chair following the Panel of Experts (**PoE)** meeting, focusing primarily on budget constraints. The **PRM** will be responsible for producing a final list of Pre-proposals

invited to submit Full Proposals and the Full Proposals recommended for funding. As such the selection will be based on:

- A short list of consortia recommended for funding provided by the **PoE**

- Financial considerations, including the availability of funds from the contributing Funding Agencies for selected Full Proposals and any required adjustment of requested budget

As the GPC members are individuals representing the Funding Agencies contributing to the Call, these individuals are aware of the budgetary constraints and able to make decisions on budgetary aspects. Their organisation will have the overall responsibility for administration and management of the projects chosen for funding.

The following guidance is recommended for this process in the PRM:

- Top priority group should be considered first and only proceed to the next category if there are no more projects that could be financed as requested

- Maintain minimal requirement of three partners from three different partner countries per application

The final recommendation will be forwarded to the national Funding Agencies for further action.

7.   Funding Agencies

The outcome of the PRM will be communicated to the Funding Agencies by the GPC and the Theme Program Office.

The final funding decision on recommended proposals rests with the national Funding Agencies that contribute funds to the Call. The outcomes of External Review, **PoE** meeting and **PRM** steps, have to remain confidential until ALL concerned Funding Agencies have taken their national funding decision apart from informal notification to LPIs from the Theme Program Office.

The applicants will then enter into the administrative process with their corresponding national Funding Agencies.

**Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund**

Panel of Experts Guidance Notes 2012

1.   Preface

These Guidance Notes outline the responsibilities of Panel members and has been agreed to by all Funding Agencies.

This document should be read in conjunction with the Call for Proposals, Instructions for Reviewing and Roles and Responsibilities.

2.   Panel of Experts (PoE)

The **PoE** consists of experts from the scientific community and is comprised such that it can cover the full range of topics within the scope of the particular Theme within the Call for Proposals. The **PoE** meeting will be organized and managed by the relevant Theme Program Office.

Members take part in the committees as independent experts and do not represent any organisation (a titre personal) nor can they send any replacements. This means that, although they have been nominated by Funding Agencies their work on this Panel does not represent any organization or nation.

The **PoE** meeting may be attended by the Partners Group of Program Coordinators (GPC).

In summary, the tasks of the **PoE** include:

- Performing the assessment of the Pre-proposals based on the respective evaluation criteria, providing a written evaluation to the Theme Program Office in advance of the PoE meeting for discussion at the PoE

- Presenting their assessments at the PoE meeting and recommending a list of consortia to be invited to submit a Full Proposal

- Proposing External Reviewers for the Full Proposals

- Performing the assessment of Full Proposals based on the evaluation reports of the External Reviewers and with the benefit of their individual expertise

- Providing written evaluations of all proposals one week in advance of the PoE meeting for discussion at the PoE meeting.

- Presenting their assessment at the PoE meetings and recommending a short list of consortia recommended for funding

- Preparing Panel Summaries for each proposal based on PoE discussions of the proposal's strength and weaknesses for later distribution to the applicants by the LPIs' national Funding Agencies.

3.   Pre-proposal evaluation process

In the *Pre-proposal phase*, the **PoE** members will have two roles – acting individually as peer reviewers for the Pre-proposals and also working jointly as a Panel member to recommend a group of high quality proposals for invitation to Full Proposal stage.

3.1   Role of the Panel - *Prior to the meeting*

Each PoE member will be provided with a list of proposals and review assignment by the Theme Program Office . All Panel members will be able to view all proposals unless they are in conflict of interest. For specific reviews, however, each proposal will have three panel members assigned to it. One of them will be nominated as the Lead Reviewer.

Assigned PoE members should complete an Evaluation Form for each of the proposals they have been assigned and the Evaluation Forms should be provided to the Theme Program Office in advance of the meeting. The report form is provided for two reasons – it is an *aide memoire* for use with discussion at the meeting, and also acts as a basis for feedback (where appropriate) to the LPIs.

3.2   Role of the Panel - *At the Panel meeting:*

The Lead Reviewer will be invited to start the discussion by briefly summarizing the proposal making reference to the objectives of the work and the quality of approach, the proposed consortium, the track record of the applicants and the management of the proposed programme of activity.

Having introduced a particular Pre-proposal, the Lead Reviewer will be asked to allocate Pre-proposals to one of three categories - 'invite', 'may be invited' and 'do not invite' - highlighting any specific areas of the proposal used in their appraisal and the rationale behind the allocation. The allocation will then be discussed and an overall allocation agreed on by the Panel by consensus. The aim of the meeting is to obtain a list of 20 to 30 recommendations to 'invite' for Full Proposals which will be considered by the Post-Review-Meeting of GPC and the Chair (PRM).

The PoE will prepare Panel Summaries for each proposal to be used by the LPIs' national Funding Agencies as feedback to the applicants/LPIs. Panel Summaries should be completed and provided to the Theme Program Office under the responsibility of Lead Reviewer during the Panel meeting.

4.   Full Proposal evaluation process

In the *Full Proposal phase*, the **PoE** is responsible for evaluating applications, based on their own expertise and with the help of the External Review evaluation reports. The result of the

evaluation, and recommendations for funding, will be forwarded to the Theme Program Office in the form of a grouped listing.

The Full Proposal phase aims to select in a fair, valid and effective way the best and most suitable project applications according to the requirements as stated in the Call for Proposals.

4.1   Role of the Panel - *Prior to the meeting*

Each member of the PoE will be provided with a list of proposals and review assignment by the Theme Program Office. As with the Pre-proposals, each proposal will be reviewed by three assigned PoE members, one of these will be nominated as the Lead Reviewer. Assigned members of PoE should complete an Evaluation Form for each of the proposals they have been assigned also considering the evaluation reports of the External Reviewers. The Evaluation Form should be provided to the Theme Program Office in advance of the meeting and again will be used as an *aide memoire* at the meeting, and also as a basis for feedback to the LPIs.

4.2   Role of the Panel - *At the Panel meeting:*

The Lead Reviewers will be invited to start the discussion by briefly summarizing the proposal following the review criteria published in the Call for proposals. The members will have the benefit of having not only the Full Proposals, but also the evaluation reports from External Reviewers when assessing their assigned Proposals and giving their overall ratings. The PoE members are not bound to follow the External Reviewers recommendations.

Having introduced a particular proposal, the Lead Reviewer will be asked to assign Full Proposals to one of three categories - "highly recommended", "recommended if funding is available" and "not recommended."- highlighting any specific areas of the proposal used in their evaluation and the rationale for the recommendation.   A final recommendation for each consortium will be arrived at by consensus of the Panel.

The PoE will prepare Panel Summaries for each proposal to be used by the LPIs' national Funding Agencies as feedback to the applicants/LPIs. Panel Summaries should be completed and provided to the Theme Program Office under the responsibility of Lead Reviewer during the Panel meeting.

Because of the budgetary constraints of the Funding Agencies, in case there are more applications in the pool of recommendations than can be funded, the GPC together with the Chair will – without compromising quality – consider geographic balance and available funding during the PRM.

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund

Instructions to Peer Reviewers on Reviewing Full Proposals

Important:

If after reading the proposal, and anytime during the review process, you feel that you have a conflict of interest, as identified in the *Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration*, please notify the Theme Program Office by which you get contacted.

Please read this document in conjunction with the Call for Proposals.

A successful proposal will combine significant contributions by scientists from at least three of the participating countries and must bring together partnerships of natural scientists, social/economic scientists and users in addressing the work package(s) within the scope of the described call Theme. The proposal must conform to program aims and the designated research fields addressing **either** the Theme of Freshwater Security **or** Coastal Vulnerability. Proposals can address either one or both of the workpackages within the relevant Theme.

In developing the Evaluation Form, it was decided that an effective approach was to group evaluation criteria around four broad categories. The categories are described below and in the evaluation form. In considering whether the proposals address the criteria for the Call you may wish to address the questions proposed under each category. You may also highlight additional issues or concerns related to these criteria.

xiv.   **Quality/Intellectual Merit**
- *Scientific quality and innovativeness of the joint research plan*
- *Added value to be expected from the international research collaboration*
- How well does the activity advance knowledge and understanding within its own field and across different fields?
- Does the proposal contribute to scientific excellence and significant progress toward the state of the art?
- To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts?
- If these partnerships currently exist, what does this new funding allow them to do that they could not do otherwise?
- What is the added value of the international cooperation? This should also include the extent to which partners existing investments are leveraged in the proposed project.

xv.   **User Engagement and Societal/Broader Impacts**
- *Engagement of users and effectiveness of proposed knowledge exchange activities*
- *Expected impacts: e.g. societal, policy related, economical*

   How have users been engaged and how effective are the proposed mechanism for transfer of knowledge to decision makers?
   What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society, policy or economically?
   Does the research collaboration focus on global challenges for which solutions can only be achieved by global scientific approaches?

xvi.   **Inter-disciplinarity and Personnel/Quality of the Consortium**
- *Collaboration between natural and social/economic sciences, and other sciences where relevant*
- *Competence and expertise of team and complementarities of consortium (inter-disciplinary / inclusion of all necessary expertise)*

How strong is the collaboration between the natural and social/economic sciences?
How well qualified are the proposers (Leading Principal Investigator and team) in terms of knowledge, expertise and experience to conduct the project?
What is the quality of previous work in terms of past or potential contributions to, and impact on the proposed and other areas of research?
Is the Leading Principal Investigator team (including any identified Co-Principal Investigators) able to lead the project, e.g. having strong management and leadership skills, or having complementarity of expertise and synergy of the members of the team?

xvii.   **Resources and Management**
- *Appropriateness of resources and funding requested*
- *Balanced cooperation*

How well conceived and organized is the proposed activity?
Is there an operational plan with well defined milestones in place?
Is the coordination plan adequate?
Is there sufficient access to resources?
Are the requested investments well justified and relevant?
Are the scientific and financial contributions of the partners from each country well balanced?

For each criterion, you will check one of the boxes indicating to what degree you feel the criteria have been addressed. You are then asked to provide an overall comment on the proposal and to assign it to one of the following three groupings;

A This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria.

A- This is a strong proposal that meets all assessment criteria well.

B This is a very good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses.

B- This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with a number of minor weaknesses.
C This proposal does not meet a significant number of ass. criteria and/or is scientifically or technically flawed

Belmont Forum and
G8 Research Councils Initiative on Multilateral Funding
International Opportunities Fund

Conflict of Interest, Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure Declaration for
Panel of Experts (PoE), External Reviewers, Group of Program Coordinators (GPC)

1. Your Potential Conflicts of Interests.

Your participation in this Initiative requires that you be aware of potential conflict situations that may arise. Read the examples of potentially biasing affiliations or relationships listed on the next page of this form. As a member of the Panel of Experts, an External Reviewer or member of the Group of Program Coordinators (GPC), you will be asked to evaluate applicant grant proposals. You might have a conflict or be perceived to have a conflict with one or more. Should any conflict arise during your term, or when asked to do a review, you must bring the matter to the attention of the Theme Program Office who will determine how the matter should be handled and will tell you what further steps, if any, to take.

2. No Use of "Insider" Information.

If your designation gives you access to information not generally available to the public, you must not use that information for your personal benefit or make it available for the personal benefit of any other individual or organization.

3. Your Obligation to Maintain the Confidentiality of Proposals and Applicants.

Proposals are received with the expectation of protection of the confidentiality of their contents. For this reason, you must not copy, quote, or otherwise use or disclose to anyone, including your graduate students or post-doctoral or research associates, any material from any proposal you are asked to review. If you believe a colleague can make a substantial contribution to the review, please obtain permission from the G8 Initiative representative who asked that you review the proposal *before* disclosing either the content of the proposal or the name of any applicant or principal investigator.

4. Confidentiality of the Review Process and Reviewer Names.

The G8 Initiative will keep reviews and your identity as a reviewer of specific proposals confidential to the maximum extent possible. Copies of external reviews will be sent to the Leading Principal Investigators (LPIs) of their own proposals without the reviewer's name, affiliation, or other identifying information. You must respect the confidentiality of all principal investigators and of other reviewers, as appropriate. You can not disclose their identities, the relative assessments or rankings of proposals by a peer review panel, or other details about the peer review of proposals.

YOUR CERTIFICATION

Your Potential Conflicts.
I have read the list of affiliations and relationships (on the next page of this form) that could prevent my participation in matters involving such individuals or institutions. To the best of my knowledge, I have no affiliation or relationship that would prevent me from performing my duties. I understand that I must contact the Theme Program Office if a conflict exists or arises during my service. I further understand that **I must sign and return this Conflict Statement to the Theme Program Office before I can review proposals.**
Maintaining the Confidentiality of Others.
I will not divulge or use any confidential information, described above, that I may become aware of during my service. I have read and understand the information on Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure (on the next page of this form) and promise to take all necessary measures to fulfil my obligations in my role as Panel of Experts (PoE) member, as External Reviewer or member of the Group of Program Coordinators (GPC).

Your Identity as an External Reviewer will be Kept Confidential (Does not apply to PoE Members and GPC Members).

I understand my identity as a reviewer of specific proposals will be kept confidential to the maximum extent possible, except that copies of written reviews that I submit will be sent to the leading principal investigator(s) without my name, affiliation or any information that may identify me.

Release of the names of the PoE (Apply only to PoE Members).

Following the announcement of awards from each Call of the G8 Initiative on Multilateral Research Funding, the names of the Panel of Experts will be released.

Name (Please Print) _____ _____

Signature _____ DATE _____

Function (PoE, External Reviewer, GPC)_____ _____

Conflict of Interest

Here is a summary of potential conflicts of interest and other circumstances that may raise questions about the impartiality of your expert evaluation. Before submitting any written reviews or before participating in any meeting in which proposals are discussed, please inform the Theme Program Office whether circumstances exist that could be interpreted as a conflict of interest.

You have an **institutional conflict** with a proposal when you…

- Hold a position, such as professor, adjunct, visiting scientist, consultant or similar
- Are seeking employment
- Have a re-employment agreement
- Are serving on an Advisory Committee or similar body (the conflict is with part of the institution that is advised by the committee)

You have an **institutional conflict** with a proposal when you…

- Own stock worth over the *de minimus*
    - 11,000€ ($15,000) or less in each proposal
- Serve as an Officer, Governing Board, Councilor, Trustee
    - Fiduciary positions
- Received monetary compensation within the last year
    - Honoraria or travel expenses

You have an **individual conflict** with a proposal which involves a…

- Spouse or family member
- Business or professional partner
- Former employer (within one year)
- Present or past PhD advisor/student
- Collaborator within the past six years
- Co-editor within the past 24 months

You may also have a conflict with a proposal involving …

- The employer/school of spouse or child
- A person living in your household or their employer
- Your parent's employer (except solely receipt of honoraria)
- "catch all"

"Catch All"

- Any other circumstances where your impartiality could be questioned

    Use "**Reasonable Person Test**" – Would a reasonable person with all the relevant facts question your impartiality?

A conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict means that you will not be able to participate in deliberations on the proposal in question. You may not serve as a reviewer if you are included in a proposal submitted to this competition.   You will be asked to leave the room during discussions of any proposals for which you have conflicts as identified in the above listing, or as appropriate, the designated Ethics Official may recommend remedies to resolve conflicts on a case by case basis.

Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure

Documentation provided to External Reviewers and members of the Panel of Experts may contain personal information and confidential technical information. You must treat all documentation as strictly confidential.

1. Peer review documentation provided to External Reviewers and Panel of Experts members must be used only for the purpose for which it was originally collected, i.e., assessing applications and making funding recommendations. It must not be used for any other purpose or discussed with or disclosed to individuals who are not External Reviewers, members of the PoE or the Group of Program Coordinators.
2. External Reviewers and PoE members must ensure that proposals in their possession are stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access. They must be transmitted using secure techniques and when they are no longer required, they must be destroyed in a secure manner, e.g., by deleting electronic data files, or by shredding or burning paper, or arranging for their return to the Theme Program Office.
3. Peer review deliberations are confidential. Comments made by individual PoE members during the meetings and during the rating of applications must never be discussed or disclosed. Panel summaries that reflect the consensus comments on applications will be provided by the Theme Program Office to the Leading Principal Investigators. Until competition results are announced officially, they must remain confidential. The names of applicants whose applications were not recommended for support or who were declared ineligible will not be made public and must not be divulged by Panel of Experts members.
4. Enquiries received by PoE members from applicants about the review of their applications must be referred to the Theme Program Office. There must be no direct communication between applicants and Panel of Experts members on matters arising out of peer review.