



Population, reproductive health and economic development

“PopDev”

*The impacts of reproductive health and population dynamics
on poverty and economic growth*

2nd CALL

FOR PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS

December, 2011

This call is a joint initiative of NWO-WOTRO Science for Global Development (the Netherlands, NL), the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC, UK), the research council of Norway (RCN) and the Population Reference Bureau (PRB, USA) in collaboration with the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (Hewlett, USA). The call is a follow-up to previous calls of the joint schemes that NWO-WOTRO, ESRC and RCN have developed separately and co-funded with the Hewlett Foundation. The collaborating agencies developed the current joint call with a view to increasing coherence in approaching the African and European researchers in the PopDev-field, to conduct a co-ordinated peer review and selection process (and to create the possibilities for co-funding multilateral proposals in which consortia of different participating countries and their developing countries partners join forces). Hewlett has recently funded a study to identify existing gaps in current research funded in the field of population, poverty and development. The current call is focused on research that contributes to filling these gaps in order to enhance the availability of research results relevant for policy and practice and to strengthen research capacity in this research field. Information can be obtained from all participating agencies; the call is managed by PRB.

Deadline for the submission of pre-proposals: March 15 2012

Contact:

USA (coordinator):

Marlene Lee, PRB

mlee@prb.org

Phone: 202-939-5445

The Netherlands:

Gerrie Tuitert, NWO-WOTRO

popdev@nwo.nl

www.nwo.nl/wotro/popdev

United Kingdom:

Lyndy Griffin, ESRC

lyndy.griffin@esrc.uk

Norway:

Jan M. Haakonsen, RCN

jha@rcn.no

1. Introduction

Background

ESRC, NWO-WOTRO and RCN started joint initiatives with Hewlett in the field of population and development and have awarded integrated research projects in 2008 and 2009 following separate first calls. PRB is a partner of Hewlett in filling in and managing the Population programme of Hewlett. The following issues are key to the on-going programmes and were leading in these first calls:

- Trends in fertility and mortality and the implications for economic growth and income distribution and the incidence of poverty, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa;
- The effect of (different types of) investments in reproductive health on economic conditions at the household level (productivity, labour force participation, savings behaviour). And the effect of the type and organisation of reproductive health services on their effectiveness in influencing economic conditions;
- The effects of reproductive health interventions on economic well-being of individuals;
- The way in which reproductive health interventions and their effects at the household level link to poverty/economic outcome at the macro level.

Hewlett commissioned a gaps finding study to identify what issues would deserve attention in a next phase of funding research in the field of population and economic development. ESRC, NWO-WOTRO, RCN and PRB composed a small expert writing team to outline a focus and priorities for the current call, based on the gaps paper.

The current call focuses on:

- 1) The impact of reproductive health on women's economic empowerment, particularly as measured by economic outcomes at the household and individual levels.
- 2) Relationships between reproductive health/family planning (including population policies and dynamics) and macroeconomic outcomes in countries.

Main conditions for the current call include:

- Research funded should concern a collaborative initiative of researchers from one or more of the participating countries (NL, UK, Norway, USA) with researchers from developing countries, with priority given to sub-Saharan Africa (SSA);
- SSA-led research initiatives are specifically invited (except in the case of SSA-Norwegian partnerships because the law only allows Norwegian first applicants);
- All partners should be involved in the formulation of the research questions, the development of the proposal, and in carrying out of the research, and this European/USA – developing country partnership files a joint application;
- Funding is available for integrated projects with at least two researchers who have completed their PhD and of which at least one is from the developing country to be studied; the maximum period of support for awards made under this call is 2 years (minimum 1 year);
- Focus is research that leverages existing data as current grants do not allow for extended field work or data collection. The above priorities favour the use of existing panel and other longitudinal datasets, such as those collected from INDEPTH demographic surveillance sites (see <http://www.indepth-network.org/>), but do not preclude gathering new data to complement existing randomized or observational studies where warranted and justified – for instance, to add economic information not previously collected. Any new data collection must produce results within the timeframe of the grant.
- Engagement with the relevant local/national/international societal stakeholders is requested in order to enlarge policy relevance and to promote use of the research and its results. Applicants invited to submit a full proposal will be granted funds to organise a proposal elaboration workshop with the relevant stakeholders. In addition, applicants should incorporate into their budget the cost of communication and engagement activities aimed at relevant scientific and societal stakeholders. Such activities should take place over the life of the project and have potential impact beyond the project life. Plans for such activities should

be outlined in the proposal. Some examples of ways to involve societal stakeholders as well as a document with tips for the workshop and for prior stakeholder analysis can be found on the programme website (<http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>)

A full description of key themes is presented in ANNEX 2 of this call.

2. Aim

This joint call by NWO-WOTRO, ESRC, RCN and PRB in collaboration with the Hewlett Foundation is a follow-up to previous calls that agencies have developed separately and co-funded with the Hewlett Foundation. It aims to fill in the gaps that have not been sufficiently addressed as yet. The joint schemes of Hewlett with its partnering agencies have an overall aim to contribute to knowledge about the effects of population dynamics and reproductive health on different aspects of economic and social development. Through funding excellent scientific research, information should become available that will strengthen the evidence base for policy and practice on how population and reproductive health (P/RH) affect poverty and how investments in P/RH might contribute to reducing poverty and fostering economic development and equity.

The current joint call takes into account what has been funded in the field of population, poverty and development in recent years. A study commissioned by Hewlett and performed by Cynthia Lloyd and Tom Merrick analysed what gaps exist or what issues still need more attention and identified relevant new topics to be addressed in later calls. In addition, the four agencies have consulted an expert panel (see Annex 2 for the composition of the panel and stakeholders consulted) to distill the Lloyd and Merrick report conclusions into a focus for the current joint call.

The aim of this joint call is:

- to fund high-quality scientific research that will yield results contributing to increased knowledge about the economic benefits of family planning and reproductive health for households, communities, and economies;
- to enhance production of development-relevant knowledge, engagement of researchers with societal stakeholders and availability of research results relevant for policy and practice at country level;
- to strengthen local research capacity in this research field;
- to enhance international collaboration and networking between research groups in this research field.

Notes:

- Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)-led research initiatives are specifically invited;
- Multilateral initiatives (explained below in Section 3) are eligible for a bonus topping-up in order to allow for engagement of an additional researcher;
- Applications focused on least developed countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, are particularly encouraged.

3. Guidelines for applicants

3.1 Who can apply?

- The call will be open to joint applications from eligible researchers from one or more of the subscribing countries¹ in partnership with one or more research groups from developing countries (DCs), identified as Low and Middle-Income countries², with a preference for those in SSA;
- The main applicant (PI) should be a researcher from an organisation acknowledged by and eligible to apply for funding from either ESRC³, NWO⁴, RCN⁵ or PRB⁶ or should be a senior researcher (with a PhD-degree) from a research institution with public interest in Sub-Saharan Africa;
- The call is thus open for integrated applications by (a) '*bilateral partnerships*' between consortia of eligible researchers from one of the subscribing countries (NL, NO, UK, USA) and their developing country partners and (b) '*multilateral partnerships*' between consortia of eligible researchers from two different subscribing countries and their developing country partners. Preferentially this includes linking up of institutions in different DCs, but this is not a prerequisite. A scientific justification for the multilateral combination should be given. The composition of possible eligible consortia is illustrated at the end of this paragraph;
- For all main applicants partnership with one co-applicant (bilateral initiative) or more co-applicants (multilateral initiative) is a prerequisite;
- Researchers (from SSA) not affiliated with recipient organisations recognised by one of the four agencies may be the main applicant to WOTRO, ESRC or PRB on the condition they have involved senior researchers from recognised NL, UK or USA universities/institutions. In case of an SSA-PI, Hewlett audit processes may apply before the grant will be awarded;
- Main applicants from NL, NO, UK or US, should have a DC co-applicant; main applicants from SSA should have an NL, UK or US co-applicant. Note that for partnerships with a Norwegian group, only the Norwegian researcher may be a main applicant;
- The research team must include at least two researchers (i.e., with completed PhDs) of which at least one originates from a DC. They will carry out the work under supervision and in collaboration with the applicants (senior researchers). PhD-student cannot be supported with these funds due to the limited grant duration of projects to be funded and the specific wish to offer opportunities for DC researchers who have already obtained their PhD;
- Applications for single, stand-alone projects with only one researcher are not eligible;
- In order to enhance knowledge use, the research team should engage with partners from relevant public or private sector organisations or NGO's; these partners, however, may not serve as co-applicant;
- Applicants and their institutions must fulfil national eligibility rules for research proposals as set by the relevant subscribing agency or agencies (in case of multilateral collaboration). All budget items must conform to the national rules applicable³⁴⁵⁶;
- For the DC-research project the maximum amount set for personnel costs is similar to the salary costs of a post-doctoral researcher in Europe; it is up to the research groups to determine whether part of this (maximum 20%) is spent on overhead costs for the DC research group;
- For the current call the funding limits for a 2-year initiative are:
 - o WOTRO: € 320.000
 - o ESRC: £ 300.000 or approximately € 340.000 (including Indirect and Estate costs according to FEC rules⁷)
 - o RCN: 4 Million Kroner or approx. € 500.000
 - o PRB: \$ 350.000 or approx. € 245.000
- The total number of proposals that is anticipated to be awarded by each agency is:

¹ The Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the USA.

² Countries that apply for receiving official development assistance (ODA), as defined by the OECD (see www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist).

³ Web link ESRC-rules: <http://www.admin.ox.ac.uk/researchsupport/sponsors/esrc/>

⁴ Web link NWO-rules http://www.nwo.nl/nwohome.nsf/pages/SPES_5VEDDR_Eng & http://www.nwo.nl/nwohome.nsf/pages/SPES_5VEDDR

⁵ Web link RCN-rules: http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Researcher_project/1195592882768

⁶ Web link PRB -rules: <http://popgov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>

⁷ ESRC FEC rules: <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/Pages/tcfec.aspx>

- o WOTRO: 2
 - o ESRC: 1
 - o RCN: 1-2
 - o PRB: 2
- For multilateral initiatives, where a coalition between one EU or US group with one DC group is linked up with another EU or US with DC coalition, bonus funding can be applied for. This is to allow for funding a researcher working in the second coalition, for a maximum of € 100.000 for 2 years. Bonus funding is available for 2 multilateral initiatives at most. Eligible consortia are illustrated below.

Illustration of the eligible consortia compositions

	Bilateral applications	Multilateral applications**											
Consortium with group in EU* country	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EU</td> <td>DC</td> </tr> </table>	EU	DC	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EU-1</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EU-2</td> <td>DC-2</td> </tr> </table>	EU-1	DC-1	EU-2	DC-2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EU-1</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EU-2</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> </table>	EU-1	DC-1	EU-2	DC-1
EU	DC												
EU-1	DC-1												
EU-2	DC-2												
EU-1	DC-1												
EU-2	DC-1												
Consortium with group in USA	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>USA</td> <td>DC</td> </tr> </table>	USA	DC	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>USA</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EU</td> <td>DC-2</td> </tr> </table>	USA	DC-1	EU	DC-2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>USA</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EU</td> <td>DC-1</td> </tr> </table>	USA	DC-1	EU	DC-1
USA	DC												
USA	DC-1												
EU	DC-2												
USA	DC-1												
EU	DC-1												

* EU concerns only the countries of the participating research councils.

** Different numbers mean different countries.

3.2 What can be applied for?

Grants will be provided for an integrated interdisciplinary programme of work, IP, including (at least) two integrated research projects for individual researchers. The maximum granting size of the IP is calculated so as to allow for two researchers to be engaged and it varies per funding organisation, as personal costs in the participating countries vary. Researchers should already have attained their PhD-degree.

Applicants may apply for a bonus (top-up) of up to € 100.000 for multilateral programmes (see 3.1) These funds should be used to engage an additional researcher (who has already obtained a PhD) working in a third country within the additional research consortium involved.

The preliminary proposal (pre-proposal) should include a description of the plans for elaborating the full proposal, indicating the (scientific and societal) partners/stakeholders that will be involved in this, and including description of the intended local workshop/meeting(s) to enhance personal engagement of partners in the developing country involved. Applicants invited to submit their full proposal will receive a grant as a contribution towards organising this joint proposal workshop. The workshop is a prerequisite for submission of the full proposal, which should include a brief account of the workshop. The maximum size of the workshop grant is € 8.000, - for bilateral initiatives and € 11.000 for multilateral initiatives.

In order to promote joining of expertise internationally it is possible to include an extra research project that should be integrated into the programme and ensures the active involvement of an additional

research consortium with matching expertise. The composition of a multilateral initiative has been outlined under paragraph 3.1. Applicants should provide a justification for the proposed multilateral combination, outlining how the collaboration adds value to the research effort.

A maximum bonus of € 100.000 is available for this under the following conditions:

- The integrated research collaboration should fit within the four types of multilateral combinations of coalitions presented in paragraph 3.1;
- The bonus project is executed by a researcher from the additional coalition and in one of the additional countries;
- Projects should be well-integrated, have well-identified joint working, thus demonstrating clearly the added value of transnational collaboration;
- The top-up for the extra project will be integrated into the total research grant and will be awarded to the main applicant of the multilateral initiative by the EU council concerned.

Concerning remuneration, the salary rules of the participating funding agencies should be consulted and applied (please see references to national guidelines in the Box at the end of this paragraph). Comparable national remuneration guidelines should be applied in the DCs. If the budget allows for it limited funds can be used both in bilateral and multilateral applications for short-term involvement of additional senior experts.

In addition to Dutch, English, Norwegian, US and developing country researchers, it may be used to (partly) fund involvement of other international research partners. It is possible to reserve part of the budget for research assistance e.g. short-term involvement of PhD/M.Sc./MA students or supplementary experts who are not affiliated with one of the institutions involved in the initiative or for involvement of relevant organisations (e.g. NGOs). Details of budget guidelines for application are described in the Box below.

Grant applications for stand-alone (Ph.D. or post-doc or senior) researchers are not eligible.

Applications should not duplicate recent work submitted to or awarded in related granting schemes of Hewlett, ESRC, AERC, PRB, NWO, RCN and AFD (France). However, applications might create added value through cooperation with or linkage to initiatives awarded in these schemes.

Applications have to be made on the correct and fully-completed application form complying with the indicated format criteria for the council for which the applicant is eligible.

Budget

The budget and financial controls must meet the administrative guidelines of the funding agency concerned. The proposed research should be feasible within the budget indicated; the grant should be viewed as a contribution to the total costs. The majority of research programmes requires additional funding from other sources, which is most often the host institution(s).

Note that pre-proposals require a summary budget only, while full proposals require a detailed budget. See the last page of this document for an example of what should be included in a detailed budget.

Reimbursable costs (for the details consult the rules of the funding agency concerned):

Reimbursable costs can be delineated as:

- Personnel costs: salaries; living allowances; bench fees; replacement or support grant for senior researchers involved or costs for an external international expert;
- Research costs (travelling expenses, durables, consumables, research assistance);
- 'Communication' costs (costs of joint activities and knowledge exchange);
- Costs of the 'proposal workshop'.

Reference for guidelines of the agencies and specifics in the rules of the separate agencies

ESRC

Terms and conditions : <http://www.esrc.ac.uk/funding-and-guidance/guidance/applicants/research-funding-guide.aspx>

Full Economic Costing:

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/research/Pages/tcfec.aspx>

For non-UK institutions, in response to concerns about the effect of the FeC "80% rule" on developing country partners, the scheme will support in full (100%) of the costs of the research.

Indirect and Estate Costs:

UK applicants for funding by ESRC should include indirect and estate costs in their application. Details of the Transparent Approach of Costing (TRAC) indirect costing system can be found in the Research Funding Guide above.

Applications for funding by ESRC from Non-UK institutions may charge overhead costs on staff salary and other staff related costs (i.e. statutory contributions analogous to UK National Insurance or Superannuation contributions). Overhead costs may not be charged on non-staff related direct costs, e.g. equipment, travel and subsistence, consultancies, conferences etc.

The following rates for overhead costs should be applied:

- for applicants from developing countries*, the overhead rate is 50%.
- for applicants from developed countries, the overhead rate is 20%.

*As defined by the DAC list of ODA Recipients www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist

NWO-WOTRO

General terms and conditions of NWO applicable : http://www.nwo.nl/nwohome.nsf/pages/SPES_5VEDDR
http://www.nwo.nl/nwohome.nsf/pages/SPES_5VEDDR_Eng

Eligibility:

Researchers should be involved at least for 0.5 fte and for at least 1 year with the research programme.

Reimbursable costs for applications for funding by NWO:

- Personnel costs depend on the type of funding (temporary employee or net grant);
- Project researchers can be employed by a Dutch host institution, which then assumes the full employer's responsibility. WOTRO provides a fixed amount for the personnel costs of additional temporary personnel to the main applicant's institute. The personnel costs of staff already employed (incl. supervision costs) are not reimbursed. The contribution to personnel costs is paid directly to the host institution. The amount of funding for a post-doc researcher (i.e. having obtained a PhD) depends on the duration of the appointment and the time to be spent on the project (minimum of 1 year and at least 0.5 fte appointment). On a fulltime basis the amount* for a post-doc researcher: € 63.756 for 1 year and € 129.240 for 2 years;
- Alternatively, project researchers from developing countries (DC) can be provided with a grant; a net monthly living allowance. The living allowance is expected to cover all personal costs, including housing, medical costs, insurances and travel to and from work. The regulations of the main applicant's institute should be guiding for determining the amount of the living allowances. The maximum amount that can be requested is equal to the amount of funding that can be requested for a researcher with an employment at a Dutch institution, as indicated above. Overhead costs for the DC-institution can be included in this for a maximum of 20% of the requested grant;
- In case of multilateral initiatives funding for an additional post-doc researcher can be applied for under the same conditions as mentioned above. This implies that the bonus of maximum € 100.000 should be spent on personnel costs and research costs, and only in the case of a DC-researcher working in the developing country, 20% overhead costs for the institution can be requested;
- For each (DC and NL) engaged post-doc researcher, a bench fee of € 5,000 is made available that is paid directly

Reference for guidelines of the agencies and specifics in the rules of the separate agencies

to the main applicant's institute. This is a contribution to the personal costs in support of the research conducted by the post-doc researcher, for example, tuition, courses, a PC/laptop, congress visits, books, costs for publications). In multilateral initiatives a bench fee is also available for the extra post-doc researcher from the additional consortium (either EU, USA or DC origin);

- In case the budget allows for it replacement costs or a support grant can be motivated and requested for two senior researchers at most to a maximum of € 25,000 each. This replacement or support grant is specifically meant for short-term, programme-wide activities, such as writing an overarching publication:
 - Replacement costs for one senior Dutch researcher to a maximum 0,5 fte for one year;
 - Costs of (additional) allowances for one senior researcher from a developing country for a maximum of one year.
- The research budget is maximum € 14.000 per year on average for a fulltime post-doc;
- Support for supplementary experts or training for junior researchers / staff in the DC to a maximum of € 10.000;

** The amounts may be subject to change.*

Non-reimbursable costs for applications for funding by NWO:

Non-reimbursable costs include:

- Office space, basic facilities, overheads and depreciation costs
- Consumables or administrative and technical assistance which the Dutch host institution may be expected routinely to provide;
- Costs of accommodation, with the exception of the expenses incurred in the short trips of supervisors or researchers directly related to the research (< 3 months).

PRB

Terms and conditions are specific to each individual call and based on guidelines of sponsors:

-indirect costs (overhead) may not exceed 15 percent of total direct costs (e.g., personnel, necessary equipment, and services) and should be included in the total grant request.

-the budget narrative should include a justification for any proposed equipment purchases and an explanation of what indirect (overhead) costs cover.

RCN

Terms and conditions : <http://www.forskningradet.no/en/Contract/113882213515>

Projects funded through RCN will become part of the ECONPOP activity under the NORGLOBAL programme. Please refer to the NORGLOBAL web-page

<http://www.forskningradet.no/servlet/Satellite?c=Page&cid=1224698160055&pagename=norglobal%2FHovedsidema>

Reimbursable costs guidelines for applications solely for funding by RCN:

http://www.forskningradet.no/en/Payroll_expenses_and_rates/113882216669

A specific requirement for ECONPOP is a strong participation of female researchers from the DC partner institution(s) and that a substantial part of any grant should be disbursed to the DC partner(s).

Personnel costs

The budget should clearly specify the input of research personnel in terms of institutional affiliation, citizenship, types of personnel, FTE appointments and salary scales/levels. Allowable personnel costs also depend on the eligibility requirements of funders (EU councils and PRB/USA) participating in this call.

Other reimbursable costs

The research budget should include all costs necessary for carrying out the proposed programme, with the exception of costs specifically excluded in terms and conditions of specific funders. For example, applicants eligible for NWO-WOTRO funds may exclude costs already covered by the bench fee. For some budget headings, certain conditions or maximum amounts of funding are attached.

Communication costs (collaboration with stakeholders, dissemination and knowledge exchange activities, networking) should be planned for at least 5, and maximum 10% of the budget.

3.3. When can applications be submitted

Applications (pre-proposals) can be submitted until 21.00 pm March 15, 2012 (U.S. Eastern Time). The entire evaluation and selection procedure will take about 9 months and is split into two stages. Applicants must submit a pre-proposal or outline application. For an overview of the procedure, please see paragraph 4.1

3.4 Drawing up an application

Applicants are advised to write their applications such that they are clear and comprehensible for colleagues from different disciplinary backgrounds. In addition, applicants are advised to clearly explain the way in which they intend to fairly deal with ethical issues associated with the research proposed in their application.

All applications will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Scientific Quality,
- Relevance for the topic of the call,
- Quality of collaboration.
- The potential for impact on policy and practice

For a detailed overview of the criteria used to evaluate the preliminary proposals, please see paragraph 4.2. For details regarding the application form, please see paragraph section 6.

3.5 Specific conditions

All applications must fulfil the General Terms and Conditions of the appropriate participating agency (see references in the Box in paragraph 3.2) and all of the following formal criteria in order to be admitted to the competition:

Applicants and researchers

Applicants should fulfil the criteria mentioned above. The researchers that will execute the research should be of post-doctoral level (i.e. having already attained their PhD) and at least one of them must be from the developing country to be studied. The identity of the researchers will preferably be known at the time of submission of the full proposal. The full programme should start within three months after the granting date; otherwise the grant will be retracted.

International interdisciplinary research partnerships

A research proposal must be a collaborative initiative of researchers from the countries of the participating agencies (NL, NO, UK, USA) and from one or more DCs, with a preference for SSA. All

partnering researchers and institutions should be involved in the formulation of the research questions and the development of the proposal as well as in carrying out the research programme. The research should preferably concern an interdisciplinary approach.

Partnering scientists and non-scientific stakeholders

The research proposal should be developed as a collaborative effort of all research partners and other relevant stakeholders. An analysis of stakeholders should be performed and it is an obligatory part of development of the full proposal to organise a multi-stakeholder proposal workshop to enhance collaboration with and input of research partners and stakeholders from policy and practice in the developing country/ies. The relevant stakeholders from outside the scientific community should be engaged in all phases of the programme: from its inception phase to sharing emerging results.

- An outline and plan for the joint programme proposal workshop must therefore be part of the preliminary application and will be evaluated as part of the assessment procedure;
- The full proposal should include a brief account of the workshop (set-up, participants, outcome, and integration in the proposal).

On the web (<http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>) information will be made available concerning (a) tips for the proposal workshop and prior stakeholder analysis and (b) examples of engagement with societal stakeholders.

Eligible study countries

Eligible sites of research are those countries that are ranked as low and middle income countries in the most recent OECD/DAC list of ODA recipients (www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist). Preference will be given to research in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Knowledge sharing

Research results and publications should be made accessible to the public (open access). Applicants should share their output according to rules of the respective funding agencies and the information might be used by the agencies and the Hewlett Foundation in additional outreach activities.

Grant recipients will be expected to cooperate in outreach activities if deemed appropriate by the funding agencies and will also be expected to represent their project in (third-party) events, e.g. the annual meeting of Hewlett grantees in international population research organised by the Population Reference Bureau (www.prb.org) or other collaborating partners.

Data sharing

Data should be made as widely and freely available as possible while safeguarding the privacy of participants, and protecting confidential and proprietary data. Data sharing allows scientists to expedite the translation of research results into knowledge, products, and procedures. It also reinforces open scientific inquiry, encourages diversity of analysis and opinion, promotes new research, makes possible the testing of new or alternative hypotheses and methods of analysis, supports studies on data collection methods and measurement, facilitates the education of new researchers, and permits the creation of new datasets when data from multiple sources are combined. Preliminary proposals should include a description of how final research data will be shared, or explain why data sharing is not possible. It is expected that the data sharing discussion will be provided primarily in the form of a brief paragraph.

3.6 Submitting an application

The application should be made on the correct and fully-completed programme application form and must fulfill all criteria with respect to format, length of text etc. Proposals must be submitted in English. Hand-written applications will be disregarded. Supplementary information or revisions after the deadline are not possible.

The completed application should be submitted electronically from <http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>

Grants will be awarded separately by each research council. For administrative purposes, in order to receive workshop grants, applicants whose pre-proposals are successful will be asked to resubmit their preliminary applications to their respective awarding council. Similarly, those that have been selected to receive a research grant on the basis of their full proposal will be requested to re-submit their full application via the electronic application system of the council that will award their grant.

4 Assessment procedures

4.1 Procedure

The entire evaluation and selection procedure will take about 9 months and is split into two stages. It is compulsory to submit a preliminary application. Applications concerning the different funding agencies will be handled jointly by one joint International Advisory Panel.

Decisions on funding will take into account the ranking order of the applications as well as the budget availability of the agency concerned. Multilateral applications will be handled jointly with the bilateral ones. In case the number of multilateral applications that would qualify for funding is larger than the number of available bonuses for multilateral applications, the Advisory Panel will be asked to assess scientific quality and feasibility of these applications both with and without the inclusion of the bonus project. The Panel should advise on whether the proposal in that case would qualify for the regular 'bilateral grant'.

First stage

The preliminary applications or pre-proposals will be evaluated and ranked by the International Advisory Panel. All applicants will be informed of the outcome of the preliminary selection procedure in writing. Applicants of the preliminary applications ranking highest will be invited to elaborate their application into a full proposal. The number of invitees will be such that applicants at the next stage of competition will have a 30-50% chance of having their full proposal awarded through their own council. Invited applicants may receive a financial contribution (a workshop grant) for organising the obligatory workshop with all research partners and relevant non-scientific stakeholders involved.

Second stage

For the full proposals panel review will be as follows:

First, two anonymous members of the International Advisory Panel will review the proposal. Second, applicants will be given the opportunity to respond to the issues raised in these review reports. Finally, the Panel as a whole will then evaluate and rank the full proposals based on the proposal, the two panel review reports and the applicants' response to these.

The recommendations of the Panel will be used to make decisions on funding, taking into account the budgets available to each agency. PRB will inform all applicants in writing of the outcome of the final selection procedure by the PRB. The level of funding might depend on the outcome of budget negotiations between the applicant and his/her funding agency. Each council/funding agency will issue formal award letters to its grantees. Research supported with a grant should start within three months of the granting date.

Overview of the procedure:

First stage: preliminary application	Date / Period
Application forms for preliminary application available via the PRB-website (http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx)	December 2012
Deadline for submission of the pre-proposals	March 15, 2012

Evaluation and selection of the pre-proposals by the Advisory Panel	April 2012
Invitations sent to selected applicants to submit full proposal. Application forms for full proposals available on http://popgov.org/Research/RFP.aspx	April 30, 2012
Joint elaboration of full proposal with all partners	April-June 2012
Second stage: full application	
Deadline for the submission of full proposals	June 30, 2012
Panel review – 2 pre-reviews	July 2012
Pre-reviews sent to applicants	August 1, 2012
<i>Opportunity to reply to these review reports</i>	<i>Within 10 working days</i>
Evaluation and selection of full proposals; applicants notified	September 30, 2012
Check and formal determination of budgets for awarded initiatives, formal letter of approval	October 2012
Start of awarded programmes	Between October and December 2012

4.2 Criteria

All applications are evaluated according to a fixed set of criteria: Scientific Quality, Relevance for Development (i.e. Relevance for the topic of the current call; likelihood of providing a meaningful contribution) and Quality of the Collaboration. Only high quality proposals (i.e. scoring excellent or very good for all three criteria) are eligible for awarding. The scores for Scientific Quality, Relevance for the Call and Quality of Collaboration are equally important in the set of criteria. In case of approximately similar mean scores, the level of excellence for scientific quality will be used as the distinguishing criterion.

Evaluation criteria for preliminary applications

I Scientific quality

- Originality or innovative character of the research questions and/or methods (including the novelty of the integrative approach)
- Adequacy of the approach

II Relevance for the current call

- Expected contribution to the main themes/questions on which the call focuses
- Extent to which the research questions and intended research results are aimed at the identified societal issues

III Quality of collaboration

- Quality and added value of the partnership (international composition; disciplinary complementarity; relevant scientific and societal stakeholders; potential strengthening of the scientific capacity of researchers and research groups involved)
- Quality of the proposal development process, including the workshop plan (appropriateness of the analysis of who the stakeholders/potential end users of research outputs are; extent of engagement of the relevant societal stakeholders; extent of linking/embedding the research in larger (international) initiatives/platforms/networks)

IV Potential impact on policy and practice

- Does the project have real potential for impact on reproductive health, population dynamics, poverty and economic growth?

Evaluation criteria for full proposals

I. Scientific quality

- Originality of research questions and/or of approach/methodology (including novelty of the integrative approach); scientific relevance/impact
- Adequacy and effectiveness of the approach, including coherence of the research questions and approach, the integration of sub-projects

- Feasibility in terms of infrastructure and time frame (including the appropriateness and suitability of the methodology, quality of the research group(s) and the facilities/infrastructure, managing capacity of the co-ordinators).

II. Relevance for development - potential impact on policy and practice

- Extent to which the research questions fit the aims of the call and the research results can be expected to contribute to the population issues prioritised in the call
- Extent to which the proposed research is capable of providing answers to the identified societal issue;
- Potential of getting research results into policy and practice: appropriateness of the processes and means for engaging with stakeholders, at all stages of the research process; clarity and quality of the communication plan to make findings available to target audiences.

III. Quality of collaboration

- Added value of the partnership (international composition, disciplinary complementarities, quality of existing partnership, longer term perspectives of new partnerships, quality of the collaborative arrangement, extent and quality of stakeholder involvement)
- Potential strengthening of the scientific capacity and possibly policy capacity in the countries involved
- Extent of linking/embedding the research in larger (international) initiatives/platforms/networks both in terms of scientific cooperation and development cooperation.

Note: A multilateral initiative might undergo a partial reassessment as a bilateral one in case there would be more multilateral qualifiers than bonuses available, as explained under paragraph 4.1.

4.3 Composition of the international expert panel

The international expert advisory panel will consist of senior researchers and experts from policy and practice and will be interdisciplinary in nature. For assessment of full proposals, the Panel may be modified based on the disciplinary specialties and expertise required to evaluate anticipated submissions.

Actual composition of the Panel will be published on the PRB-website (and the websites of the agencies) after awards have been disbursed.

5 Other information

5.1 Contact and information

Overall coordinator and central contact point for ALL potential applicants:

Marlene Lee, Population Reference Bureau (PRB, USA)

Email: mlee@prb.org

Phone: 202-939-5445

For information concerning specifically the European agencies:

The Netherlands: Ms Gerrie Tuitert, PopDev-coordinator WOTRO & Ms. Raquel Jansen, financial controller; NWO-WOTRO, popdev@nwo.nl, www.nwo.nl/wotro/popdev

United Kingdom: Lyndy Griffin, ESRC, lyndy.griffin@esrc.uk

Norway: Jan M. Haakonsen, RCN, jha@rcn.no

6. Annex 1: Instructions for application

Please follow the links at <http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx> to download the application form and to submit the required application materials online. All sections of the application form must be uploaded online in one electronic document.

The sections 6.1 – 6.10 describe the requirements for each item in the application form. All applicants must follow the word and page limits described below.

6.1 Registration

Programme information provides the basic identifying data for your proposed programme of research. Include the title of the research proposal and number of sub-projects (usually a minimum of two), the start and end dates (the period should not exceed two years), and the countries where the research will be carried out. This information along with the composition of the research team will be used to determine basic eligibility before any substantive review of the proposal takes place. Choose a title that is descriptively appropriate. This registration information for the main applicant and co-applicants (see description in next section) should be entered in the online form at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> and should be included in the complete application uploaded via this site as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.2. Composition of the research team

a. Applicants are the team members that direct the research programme. These individuals and their institutional affiliations are the ones that will be used to determine eligibility. The main applicant should be the person submitting the application. Co-applicants are from the partnering institutions. Eligible configurations of partnerships are described in 3.1 above. Provide the full legal name of the applicants, their academic or professional title. If an individual has more than one title, please include the most appropriate. The email provided will be the one used for all written electronic communication. The address will be used for all written communication sent via mail. To ensure that eligibility is appropriately assessed, include the full name and address of the institutions through which the applicants will conduct the proposed research and the country in which each institution is located. Provide a day time telephone number for all applicants and, if available, a fax number. Provide the approximate full time equivalent (FTE) that each applicant will spend on the project. Please take note of any FTE limitations specified in section 3.2 above. The amount of FTE that will be covered by the grant award may be limited, and the grant award may represent only a portion of the resources used to carry out the proposed activities. However, the budget and proposal description should make it clear that adequate resources will be available to carry out the proposed research activities.

b. The responsible project administrator should be the person within the institution of the main applicant who is authorized to act for the main applicant organization and to assume the obligations imposed by the laws, requirements, and conditions for a grant or grant application, including the applicable regulations within the country where the main applicant's institution is located. Provide a complete address for postal delivery and the telephone, fax, and e-mail address for the signing official.

c. Collaborating researchers or research groups are usually those researchers providing expertise for one or more of the proposed subprojects but who are not co-applicants. Such collaborators usually have a discrete role on the subprojects and provide active support for a very limited period. External international experts are usually advisors and not necessarily active researchers. They may advise on substantive topical issues, policy relevance, community context, or other issues as needed.

d. Project researchers are members of the research teams that will carry out the proposed programme of activities under the supervision of the main applicant and/or co-applicants.

6.3. Summary of the research proposal

The summary should not exceed 300 words. It is meant to serve as a succinct and accurate description of the proposed work when separated from the application. State the application's broad, long-term objectives and specific aims for the work to be accomplished during the grant period, making reference to the population or reproductive health relatedness of the project. Describe concisely the research design and methods for achieving the stated goals. This section should be informative to other persons working in the same or related fields and insofar as possible understandable to a scientifically or technically literate reader. Avoid describing past accomplishments and the use of the first person. The summary should be entered in the online form at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> and should be included in the complete application uploaded via this site as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.4. Description of the programme of research

The description should not exceed 1500 words. It should be self-contained and include sufficient information to evaluate the project, independent of any other document (e.g., previous application). See section 4.2 for the evaluation criteria applied to preliminary applications. Be specific and informative, and avoid redundancies. The description should clearly state the aims (goals and objectives) and the proposed research strategy. It should elaborate on the significance of the proposed research and identify any innovations incorporated in the research approach, and the expected contributions to the themes that are the focus of the call (see Annex 2). Describe the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the project. The organizational structure of the leadership team (main applicant and co-applicants) and the research project should be described, including expected contributions of each subproject and the value added through the collaboration. The expected technical and scientific responsibilities within the programme should be delineated. Explain the programmatic, fiscal, and administrative arrangements to be made between the main applicant organization and collaborators identified in the pre-proposal. The preliminary proposal will need to include a brief statement of how final research data will be shared, or explain why data-sharing is not possible. This description should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.5. Summary plan for compulsory workshop

The summary plan should not exceed 400 words and should be accompanied by lists of proposed participants. These lists do not count against the word limit. A link to a document containing tips on carrying out a successful workshop may be found at <http://popgov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>. This document provides information that could be helpful in formulating the workshop plan. As described in section 4.2, the workshop plan will be one of the criteria on which preliminary proposals are evaluated. The workshop plan should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.6. Literature references

References should not exceed 1 single-spaced page in 10 point font. Provide a bibliography of any references cited in the description of the programme of research. Each reference must include names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. Include only bibliographic citations. Follow scholarly practices in providing citations for source materials relied upon in preparing any section of the application. The references should be limited to relevant and current literature. These references should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.7. Relevant recent publications of research team

This list should not exceed 1 single-spaced page in 10 point font. The page limit applies to the research team as a whole not to each individual member of the team. Curriculum Vitae may be attached as

annexes and allow for a more complete list of publications. Provide only references to the most recent appropriate publications, manuscripts accepted for publication, patents, and other printed materials by members of the research team that are known at this time. The publication list should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.8 Summary budget

See section 3.2 and Annex 3 for information on details to consider in developing the budget. The preliminary application (pre-proposal) requires only a summary budget. Please use the basic summary budget format included in the application form. The summary budget should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.9 Annexes

Curriculum vitae for members of the research team identified at the time of the preliminary application are optional attachments. Inclusion of vitae for the main applicant and all co-applicants is recommended. Vitae should include positions and honors listed in chronological order, concluding with the present position. Applicants should include a list of peer-reviewed publications and manuscripts in press. List ongoing and completed research projects. For research support lists, briefly indicate the overall goals of the projects and responsibilities of the applicant. Individuals may choose to include selected publications and selected research projects based on recency, importance to the field, and/or relevance to the proposed research. All curriculum vitae (max. 2 pages per person) submitted as annexes should be included in the complete application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

6.10 Signatures

The signature of the project administrator signifies that the appropriate programmatic and administrative personnel of each organization involved in this grant application are aware of the preliminary application and of the main applicant institution agreement policy and that each organization is prepared to establish the necessary inter-organizational agreement(s) consistent with the policies of the main applicant institution in order to carry out the proposed research. Signatures of the main applicant and co-applicant(s) signify that they have participated in the preparation of the preliminary application and that the proposed research is a joint applicant. Electronic signatures are acceptable. Please do not submit pdfs with encrypted signatures or password protected signatures. Signatures should be included as part of the completed application uploaded at <https://www.openconf.org/JointCall2012> as a Microsoft Word document (.doc or .docx) or an Adobe pdf document.

7. Annex 2: Description of the focus of the call and programme background and themes

Research to be supported through the current call is intended to encourage robust inquiry into the economic benefits of family planning and reproductive health for households, communities, and economies. The purpose of the current call is to build upon knowledge produced in the earlier PopPov (Population, Reproductive Health, and Economic Development) funding rounds and to enhance understanding in the two research areas described below.

Eligibility requirements for this call may be found in section 3. Information about projects funded in earlier rounds and selected research publications are available at the PopPov website (<http://www.poppovresearchnetwork.org/>).

Themes of the Call for Proposals

A detailed review of the on-going and completed PopPov research revealed themes that have not yet been sufficiently addressed in the PopPov portfolio and that warrant additional funding because of their centrality to the overall objectives of the programme. Through this call for proposals, the sponsors seek to address two of these themes which would expand the knowledge base and address areas of critical importance to the MDGs.

Researchers are invited to submit research proposals that focus on one of the following themes:

- 1) The impact of reproductive health on women's economic empowerment, particularly as measured by economic outcomes at the household and individual levels.
- 2) Relationships between reproductive health/family planning (including population policies and dynamics) and macroeconomic outcomes in countries.

Theme 1: Economic Outcomes at the Household and Individual Levels

Issues of women's economic empowerment, including participation in the labor force, have a long history in economic and demographic science. The consequences of reproductive health and family planning (RH/FP) programs for women's labor force participation and women's control over income are of particular importance as they address both the issue of women's empowerment and the transformation of gender relations at the micro level. Study of the relationship between RH/FP and women's economic empowerment poses some methodological challenges because access to RH/FP programs may be confounded with women's economic and gender position. Women with a stronger position in their household and women with more economic advantages may well be the one's more likely to have access to these programs, confounding cause and effect. Research conducted through prior PopPov grants has made headway in describing and explaining the role of reproductive health in women's labor and economic decision-making. But key questions remain about the definition and nature of women's wage-earnings and the variables used to describe them. This call for proposals solicits research to answer the following and related questions:

-How does RH/FP affect women's ability to gain and exert influence outside the household? How do any effects of RH/FP on labor force participation affect women's roles outside the household?

-How much does investment in reproductive health increase (decrease) formal vs. informal labor force participation?

-What effects do family planning interventions have on the savings behaviors of women and households, including the amount saved and how savings are spent?

-How does RH/FP affect women's ability to manage/combine earning and child-rearing activities?

A potentially fruitful avenue for further exploration of the micro-level of benefits of family planning for women's work, control over assets, and empowerment may be found in employing a broader set of outcome variables and data sources. Researchers should consider examining outcomes other than female labor force participation and earnings. Women's access to and uses of savings and assets would be one set of alternative outcomes. Past research has made extensive use of the Demographic Health Survey (DHS) for a wide array of countries, but the questions posed above would be more adequately addressed with richer sources of data. Such data might be longitudinal and/or household survey data which combine strong demographic and strong economic information.

Another potentially useful line of inquiry would be to assess how household RH/FP behaviors, especially number and timing of children, affect household poverty. Poverty may be measured directly but can also be measured indirectly via expenditures or other health and well-being concepts. Examination of nutritional status may be one useful approach to linking RH/FP behaviors and well-being. For instance, biomedical literature has confirmed the long-term consequences of mother's and fetal nutritional status (Schack-Nielsen et al 2010; Gluckman, Hanson, and Cooper 2008; Godfrey et al 2011). However, whether and how these mechanisms interact with RH/FP has not been explored. Research to answer these and related questions in a rigorous manner will need to be deeply embedded in the African or Southern perspective and will require a nuanced approach in defining key variables and the selection of appropriate data.

Theme 2: Relationships between RH/FP and the macroeconomic environment

A substantial body of early research has focused on the impact of population growth and its components (fertility, mortality, and migration) on macroeconomic growth and poverty reduction. A recent meta-analysis of research findings on the impact of population change on economic growth (Headey and Hodge, 2009) reports a wide range of differences in the strength and direction of those findings. Findings depend on the types of countries considered, the control variables used, the ways in which population growth was measured, and the statistical methods employed. In addition, the negative effects of population growth on economic growth were found to be greater under conditions of land scarcity, and population growth had significantly more adverse effects on economic growth in the post-1980 period. The study authors recommended that researchers pay closer attention to the extent to which their results are sensitive to alternative assumptions and techniques and to the conditioning effects of geography as well as the conditioning effects of the speed and timing of demographic transitions.

Other studies (e.g., Schultz 2009) have pointed out the inconsistencies between macro- and micro-level findings on how age structure affects savings. The often-heard assertion that population size helps countries become global competitors (India and China are often cited) needs to be reconciled with analyses of other dimensions of population change that may either have helped large countries get where they are now or may be inhibiting smaller countries in ways that make it less likely that becoming larger will actually be beneficial for them in the long run. For instance, new research could utilize sub-regional data, natural experiments, or other innovative approaches to refine the evidence about how population influences macroeconomic measures.

Future research could work to better understand and reconcile parameter values derived from micro- and macro-level studies—for instance, why RH/FP and economic relationships appear strong at one level and weak at the other. In one instance, the problem turned out to be a matter of timing (Lam 2005) because the impact of fertility decline on schooling came sooner for households than at the societal level. Population momentum kept cohorts growing for longer even though fertility rates declined. Individual households were able to reallocate resources as they were smaller immediately, but population size and the aggregate number of school-age children did not decline as rapidly for society as a whole. As a result of this and other studies, a new, more nuanced view of the macro-level linkages between demographic change, economic growth, and poverty reduction emerged. Work on population and economic growth continues in the World Bank and other research institutions, stimulated in part by earlier PopPov

initiatives. Under this call, the PopPov programme will support work to resolve similar inconsistencies which may be related to differences in methodological approaches.

The PopPov programme remains interested in linkages between demographic change and macroeconomic outcomes. Proposals that build on earlier findings in ways that refine knowledge are welcome, as are proposals that can elucidate the potential for alternative interventions in family planning and reproductive health to influence macroeconomic outcomes in specific contexts. The goal is to guide policymakers in making health and population policy choices that achieve maximum macroeconomic benefits. Proposals designed with this aim are likely to be more successful when the project includes a substantive role for policymakers and others closely familiar with the mechanisms of policymaking in a specific country.

Data Resources to Address Themes

Researchers are encouraged to find ways to exploit and develop methodologies that would improve understanding of causal relationships between reproductive health and economic outcomes, and to identify longitudinal and other data sets to address the above themes. Some previous research has made use of the DHS, but data on labor force participation as well as other aspects of household economics are not as rich in the DHS as in data sources designed to collect detailed economic information, precluding DHS as a possible data source for the nuanced study of household economics described in Theme 1. The above priorities favor the use of existing panel and other longitudinal datasets, such as those collected from INDEPTH demographic surveillance sites (see <http://www.indepth-network.org/>), but do not preclude gathering new data to complement existing randomized or observational studies where warranted and justified – for instance, to add economic information not previously collected. Any new data collection must produce results within the timeframe of the grant. Existing longitudinal studies that have RH/FP variables and economic outcomes are likely to prove more useful for exploration of these issues within the two year period envisioned for projects in this call for proposals. An illustrative list of surveys may be found at (<http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>).

References

Gluckman, P.D. et al., Effect of In Utero and Early-Life Conditions on Adult Health and Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2008. 359:61-73.

Godfrey, K.M. et al. Epigenetic Gene Promoter Methylation at Birth Is Associated With Child's Later Adiposity. *Diabetes*, 2011. 60(5):1528- 1534.

Headey, D.D. and A. Hodge, The Effect of Population Growth on Economic Growth: A Meta-Regression Analysis of the Macroeconomic Literature. *Population and Development Review*, 2009. 35(2):221-248.

Lam, D. and L. Marteleto, Small Families and Large Cohorts: the Impact of the Demographic Transition on Schooling in Brazil, in *Growing Up Global: The Changing Transitions to Adulthood in Developing Countries: Selected Studies*, C.B. Lloyd, et al., Editors. 2005, National Academies Press: Washington, DC. p. 56-83.

Schack-Nielsen L et al, Gestational weight gain in relation to offspring body mass index and obesity from infancy through adulthood. *International Journal of Obesity*, 2010. 34:67-74.

Schultz, T.P., The Gender and Intergenerational Consequences of the Demographic Dividend: An Assessment of the Micro- and Macro linkages between the Demographic Transition and Economic Development. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 2009a. 23(3):427-442.

Experts and Stakeholders Consulted

Paulina Adebusoye

William Gould

Rachel Nugent

Cheikh Mbacke

Nyovani Madise

Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Development Cooperation, DSO-Department of Health and Aids

8. ANNEX 3 - APPLICATION FORM

Applicants must register and upload their completed application using the required form found at <http://poppov.org/Research/RFP.aspx>.

The first stage requires a pre-proposal/preliminary proposal application form with following information to be provided:

- Programme Information, including the anticipated period and countries in which the research will be carried out
- Applicant Information, including contact information for the main applicant/principle investigator and collaborators
- A summary (300 words) and description (1500 words) of the research proposed
- A summary of the proposed stakeholder workshop (400 words)
- Bibliographic references for literature cited (1 page, single-spaced, no smaller than 10 pt font)
- A summary budget
- Curriculum Vitae
- Signatures of Applicants

The second stage requires a full proposal with the following required:

- Programme Information (the pre-application submission is sufficient)
- Applicant Information (pre-application submission is sufficient)
- A summary (300 words) of the proposed research
- A full narrative of the proposed research (4000 words) that includes a description of: research goals, specific aims, anticipated scientific contribution and or innovation, research plan that elaborates the data and methodology to be applied, and a data sharing plan.
- A detailed budget
- Curriculum Vitae (pre-application submission is sufficient unless more researchers are added to the application)

ILLUSTRATION OF ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED IN DETAILED BUDGETS (see section 3.2 for more information).

Budget item	Explanation	Costs in EURO				Costs # In £, \$ or Kroner
		ESRC	WOTRO	PRB	RCN	
Personnel costs						
- employed at European/USA (as appropriate) institution <i>Specify number of researchers, length of employment</i>						
- costs for a DC researcher <i>Specify number of researchers, length of project involvement, percentage overhead for the DC institution</i>						
- bench fees - for WOTRO- <i>Max. 5000 k€ per researcher *</i>		Not applicable		Not applicable	Not applicable	
Research costs						
- travelling expenses						
- durables						
- consumables						
- research assistance						
- communication, dissemination (<i>5-10% of total budget</i>)						
- proposal workshop						
Topping up for multilateral programme, to be specified as below:	Max. 100 kEuro for 1-2 pp, 0.5- 1 fte, 1-2 yr					
- researcher employed at European institution						
- costs for a DC researcher <i>(can include overhead for the DC institution; specify % overhead)</i>						
- research costs						
- bench fee (NL)		Not applicable		Not applicable	Not applicable	
Overhead costs (for councils with FEC system)			Not applicable			
- Indirect costs						
- estate costs						
Exchange rate used						
Total requested research grant						

* A bench fee is paid to the main applicant's institute but is meant as contribution to personal costs in support of the research conducted by the post-doc researcher, e.g. tuition, courses, a laptop/PC, conference visits, books, publication costs.

For applications to ESRC, PRB and RCN the costs should be filled in in Euro's as well as in this additional column in the currency of the country. Please indicate the exchange rate used.