

# Funding Agencies – Development of a Compelling Protocol

### Patrick Webb





## **U.S. GOVERNMENT PARTNERS**

























### Major sources of research funding:

- Federal (science) agencies (NIH, NSF
- Foundations (BMGF, Welcome, Rockefeller, Haya)
  - Limits on overheads covered
- Bilateral donors (USAID, USDA, DFID, GIZ)
- Trusts (Grand Challenges)
- Sub-grants within others' proposals
  - Innovation Lab pass-throughs
- Multilaterals (UNICEF, FAO, WFP)









| Programme | World Food | Alimentaire | Programme | Mondial |

Programa Mundial de Alimentos



#### Request for Expression of Interest (EOI) for Provision of Consultancy Service for Targeting Study EOI Number: EOI/05/18

### **Closing Date: Monday, 02 April 2018**

The United Nations World Food Programme (UNWFP) in Ethiopia is seeking formal Expressions of Interest (EOI) from well established, fully qualified consultancy companies, with solid experience and proven financial capacity for provision of consultancy services for a thematic study as indicated below.

#### **Description of Requirements**

The consultancy company will be required to systematically assess and analyse the targeting mechanisms for both food and cash assistance in Somali Region. Objectives of the targeting study include assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of WFP's targeting mechanisms in the region, formation of recommendations to improve said mechanisms, evaluation of the efficacy of WFP's role in targeting and distribution and the existing checks and balances, and provision of concrete recommendations for future sustainability.

In order to comprehensively fulfill the requirements of this study, the ideal provider must have a basic familiarity with the Somali Region, as well as a good working relationship with Somali Regional Government. Specific requirements include:



#### https://wellcome.ac.uk/funding/research-enrichment-open-research

Funding What we do About us News		Search	Q,		
Scheme finder Managing a grant Develop your research career					
Level of funding: Up to £50,000		16 April 2018, 17:00 BST			
Duration of funding: Funding will end at the same time as your main	<b>Duration of funding:</b> Funding will end at the same time as your main Wellcome grant		O Decision		
Wellcome grant					
		June 2018			
Eligibility and Suitability -	+	July 2018 round			
		The application form will be available on			
What we offer	$\mathbf{N}$	Wellcome Trust Grant Tracker in April 2018.			
You can ask for Research Enrichment – Open Research funding of up to	You can ask for Research Enrichment – Open Research funding of up to £50,000. You should ask for a level of funding that's justifiable for the scale and scope of your grant, and proposed open research activities. Enrichment funding will end at the same time as your main Wellcome grant.		2010.		
£50,000.			<ul> <li>Application deadline</li> <li>9 July 2018, 17:00 BST</li> <li>Decision</li> <li>September 2018</li> </ul>		
You should ask for a level of funding that's justifiable for the scale and scop					
of your grant, and proposed open research activities.					
Enrichment funding will end at the same time as your main Wellcome grant.					
Funds can be used for a range of costs such as:					
<ul> <li>staff costs, where justified</li> </ul>	+	Apply for this grant			
■ development costs	+	Log in to our online grants system	~		
<ul> <li>licensing and computational costs</li> </ul>	+	(Grant Tracker). You can save your application and return to it any time.			







#### http://www.esmo.org/Research/EU-Calls-for-Proposal

۷

V

۷

V

How to Apply For EU

Other Research Funding

Grants

Opportunities

Training and Events

**Regulatory Information** 

Research Groups,

Databases and Tools

About the Grant Schemes



An ESMO pre-selected listing of the most recent EU research funding opportunities

SEARCH

**OncologyPRO** 

Policy

Visit our ' About the Grant Schemes' page for more general information on each individual scheme.

#### » The following Horizon 2020 calls for proposals directly targeting cancer research are currently open

- 1. Translational collaborative cancer research between Europe and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC). The deadline to submit proposals is 18 April 2018. For further information, please visit the portal here.
- 2. Big data and Artificial Intelligence for monitoring health status and quality of life after the cancer treatment. The deadline to submit proposals is 24 April 2018. For further information, please visit the portal here.

Please note that the Horizon 2020 Work Programme 2018-2020 for Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing includes several broad calls that offer opportunities for cancer research. For more information, please read the Work Programme 2018-2020 for Health, Demographic Change and Wellbeing available here.



### **Responding to Requests For Proposals**

- Propose explicitly to answer what is called for.
- Demonstrate clear understanding of science, but also  $\succ$ technical feasibility, financial management, administrative complexity.
- Propose a team of heavy-hitters who will deliver on time.
- Articulate value-for-money.  $\succ$
- Respond to values of donor (partnership, capacity-building,  $\succ$ innovation, research-to-practice, gender, EMP).







# WHAT IS A COMPELLING PROPOSAL?

- 1. A clear strong narrative problem, relevance, process, solution.
- 2. Well thought-through team of complementary skills, institutions.
- 3. Articulate record of past performance.
- 4. Strong administrative/financial systems, audits, safeguards.
- 5. Track record of publishing (influencing the field).
- 6. Not over-promising, but reaching high.
- 7. Innovative, not replicating.







# 1. Do your homework! What does the donor want (or think they want)?

- Find the right funders to partner with/support your work.
- But if responding to a call ensure a 'match'! A successful proposal meets the needs of the funder. Interests, goals, ethics, needs must align well.







### 2. Present a solution to a defined problem

- > Tell a compelling story. The narrative is critical.
- Stories have a beginning, middle, and end (problem, solution and outcome). The reader should want to read from abstract to the end; should not have questions about interpretation; not get lost in the flow of text.
- The solution to presented problem must make sense.
- Why should anyone care about the issue or findings?









Tufts



### 3. Convince the funder you know what you're doing!

- Demonstrate a clear understanding of the problem
- > Demonstrate understanding of how to undertake the work.
- Donor must feel confident that you/your organization can be a responsible steward of their funds. Present a clear plan, and highlight skills and experience of investigators relevant to the research.







# 4. Consistency matters. Tell the same story in budget and proposal narratives.

- A compelling narrative falls down if budget is not clearly aligned to achieve proposed activities.
- Budget narratives and capability statements are more opportunities to tell *your* story, but they must match.
- All main budget line activities should be obvious in the main narrative. Avoid raising questions in the budget.
- Ensure that individuals proposed as investigators 'make sense' based on the proposed work (consistent with the narrative).





### **5.** Proposal reviewers are human (not institutions)

- Treat them as intelligent people.
- If appropriate call them (not just email) with questions.
- Many successful grants are based on relationships!!! Networking at conferences may help. Building engagement with potential partners can facilitate future proposal preparation.







Dear Colleagues,

We received an update from the donor today. Unfortunately, our proposal was eliminated and we will not go forward for the next round of competition.

We received the following feedback:

- The applicants fail to create a network that is capable of addressing donor needs. It's unclear exactly how they will bring in additional partners
- The proposal neglects to show how they will fund research to solve the questions they identify. Likewise they neglect to show how those solutions can be translated to policy-relevant findings.
- The skills for the roles are not sufficient; It is unclear what their qualifications are.
- The institutional competencies and resources are directed primarily towards rural transformation, which is not in fitting with the goals of this RFA to establish a network with a broad array of sectors.
- Brief mentions within the text (p. 1-4) give hints, but no clear plan is outlined specifically. Therefore, it is unclear whether they can fulfill requirements.







Total Score: 79.546 Trait Score Sum: 79.5 Overall Score: 0.046

#### JUDGING CRITERION # 1: MEANINGFUL (0-5)

Is the proposal bold? Does it seek to solve an important and urgent problem? Will the proposed solution significantly improve the condition of the target beneficiaries and result in broad public benefit?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5	
Failed to present an adequate, well-timed solution to a substantive problem; delivered a marginal level of improvement without considering local conditions; no public benefit.	Described a cautious solution to a problem that lacks scope or timeliness; attempted to meet basic needs and addressed some local conditions; some public benefit.	Presented an appropriate solution to a serious and pressing problem; met needs of beneficiaries with an understanding of local conditions; noteworthy public benefit	Conveyed an effective solution to a difficult and dire problem; strived to overcome local conditions and to ensure conditions improve; significant public benefit.	Illustrated a powerful solution to a compelling and crucial problem; reached an ambitious but realistic level of impact that maximized improvements; profound public benefit.	
			4.5 /	5	
Score:	4.5				
Comment:		e. I was moved by the ambitious	goal and the clear capabilities of t	he team.	
				4.8 / 5	
Score:	4.8				
Comment:			Inutrition and attacking the problem		
	absorption) with one of the most consequential technological innovations in the modern era, the lowa State team and it well- conceived network of partners should be able to contribute to reducing the incidence of malnutrition in the regions targeted.				
	3.4 / 5				
Score:	3.4				
Comment:	The problem that this proposal seeks to solve is immense and of vital importance for future well being of significant proportions of the global population. The initial focus on Uganda and Honduras provides a valid test bed for the launch, expansion and scaling up of the program across different continents and societies. If it were to achieve the success it targets, then it would not only benefit the immediate populations participating, but would have wider public benefits, as well as a strong demonstration impact. An important factor in this assessment would need to take into account the involvement of a large multinational commercial entity as delivery partner, and a start-up company (both of which which would have private sector investors) the project would need to				

have clear benchmarks around private Vs public benefit.



#### JUDGING CRITERION #2: VERIFIABLE (0-5)

Does the proposal present evidence that the solution has previously yielded practical and concrete results? Does the proposed solution rely on existing methodology, technology, and/or provable science?

0 - 1	1-2	2 - 3	3-4	4 - 5
Failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or depended upon an untested methodology, technology, and/or unproven science.	Showed some signs of effectiveness but evidence is unconvincing; methodology, technology, and/or science was unreliable.	Established reasonable record of effectiveness; methodology, technology, and/or science was reliable and dependable.	Demonstrated a credible and effective solution; employed methodology, technology, and/or science with predictable results.	Grounded in authentic, certifiable results that can be easily replicated; universally recognized methodology, technology, and/or science.
				5/5

Score: Comment: 5.0

Very clear methodology, with knowledge drawn from adjacent successes. There are risks in this project, but they are worth taking on for the potential benefit.







#### JUDGING CRITERION # 3: FEASIBLE (0-5)

FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Does the team have the skills, capacity, and experience to deliver the proposed solution? Do the budget and project plan align with a realistic understanding of the costs and tasks to implement the proposed solution?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
Failed to offer a cohesive team with capabilities to deliver the proposed solution; presented an impractical budget and/or project plan.	Described a team with basic abilities but lacking in knowledge or training; offered an insufficient budget and/or project plan.	Proposed a competent, qualified team with clear strengths; presented a realistic budget and project plan with sufficient attention to detail.	Delivered a team of accomplished professionals with a record of success; budget and project plan were detailed, measurable, and cost effective.	Led by a team of seasoned experts who have achieved remarkable results; budget and project plan were grounded in successful past performance. 4.5 / 5
Score: Comment:	4.5 Truly a dream team. (Don't unde	erestimate the productization of th	ese new super foods though.)	4.4/5
				-•
Score:	4.4			
Comment:	The scope of this effort is beyon apparently free from bureaucrad	nd what any of the partners have a cy.	attempted before, but this is an e	exceptionally well-qualified team,
		алгон на лана на		
			Johns <b>H</b> opkins	Friedman School

my of Health

Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy

BLOOMBERG SCHOOL of PUBLIC HEALTH



#### JUDGING CRITERION #4: DURABLE (0-5)

Does the team propose a solution that has staying power? Is there a plan in place to support the resolution of the problem, including any need for ongoing support, if necessary?

0 - 1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4 - 5	
Offered a short-lived solution to meet basic needs that will expire over time and/or will require continuous support.	Offered a solution that may persist but failed to present convincing sustainability and/or a plan for support.	Focused on a reliable solution with a clear pathway toward sustainability; presented a sufficient plan for support.	Proposed an enduring solution with proven results; articulated a detailed method of maintaining support. 3.8/5	Demonstrated a perpetual solution with recognized and lasting results; described a compeiling support model.	
Second	2.0		•		
Score:	3.8	for the East second it are a little			
Comment:	Building on a strong foundation for the first years, it appears that the strategic partnerships and the publication of a robust set of insights in the Blueprint for Change will make this highly durable.				

4.1/5

Score: Comment:

#### 4.1

If the proposal has any weaknesses at all, it is making the leap to sustainability. That appears to require access to cultural and political tools that may not be familiar to team members. I believe that the creation of nutrient enhance foods can be easily replicated, but there should be some investment in the global scaling problem.







# AND THE WINNER IS...

"Dear Team Members,

MacArthur Foundation announced the 8 semi-finalists for its 100&Change competition. Although reviews of our proposal were highly complementary, our proposal, "First 1,000 Days for 100&Change: Nourishing Mothers and Children",

was not selected to move forward in the competition."







## DON'T GIVE UP!

- > Learn from feedback. It was probably not a match.
- Recycle proposals to the extent possible. Good ideas are still good ideas.
- Do better next time. Plan and prepare for calls for proposals, don't just react to them and scramble.
- > The future of research is bright! (i.e. remain optimistic...)













# FEEDIFUTURE

The U.S. Government's Global Hunger & Food Security Initiative

#### www.feedthefuture.gov



Friedman School of Nutrition Science