RfP 2018-1

Type A proposals – investigator-initiated proposals for short-term research projects (one year in duration and requests of up to $100k excl. GST) plus Antarctic logistic support if required

Timeline:

• RfP usually goes live in August
• Proposal in September
• Notifications in February
• Fieldwork requests into EMPEROR by March
• Research usually starts after 1 July
What are Type A proposals?

One year in duration
High-risk/high impact
Address critical time-sensitive question

Your proposal may be part of a bigger question but it needs to be clear what critical advance will be made by this piece of work and that it can stand alone

- Ensure your proposed idea fits the one year timeframe
- Up to two year timeframe (no extra money) will be considered if the type of data collection requires it
- Make sure your proposal explains why it is high-impact, timely and relevant – don’t assume the reader will work it out – make a compelling and convincing case
Your proposal must

- Be well formed
- Present clear questions
- Outline clearly testable hypotheses
- Have clear objectives
- Ensure the approach taken will address the questions, hypotheses and Objectives
- Be clear in the value of the outcomes

- Only submit the proposal when it is ready and the most convincing case can be made
- Ensure your Objectives are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-limited)
- Make sure it is clear who cares about the outcomes and why they care
Components of the application

The project
Alignment with Priorities
Roles & Resources
Budget

- Clear Statement of the problem
- Outline of approach, methods & procedures
- Work Plan
- Projected Outcomes
- Significance of the work
Components of the application

The project
Alignment with Priorities
Roles & Resources
Budget

- SCAR priorities
- national priorities
- International priorities
- Whatever is appropriate to show that someone cares that this research is undertaken and that you will deliver an outcome that will make an advance
Components of the application

- Funds may be directed to any area required to achieve the research goals
- All requested amounts must be clearly outlined and justified
- Matching support is required – NZARI is required to show a >1:1 match to our foundation sponsor
- Proposals need not ask for funds from NZARI – in this case NZARI can provide the peer review criteria required for a logistic support request when science funding is available from another source
Review Process

Excellence and potential for high impact are the overriding considerations.

3 part assessment

- Proposals that are incomplete or not aligned with the Type A criteria will not be sent out for review.
- ISP moderates a robust peer review process.
- A recommendation for funding is considered by the NZARI Board.
- Resubmissions must explain how they have addressed previous review.
- Twice declined proposals need to be significantly recrafted to be accepted.
Review Process

Assessment criteria –

Qualifications
Record of accomplishment – track record (as appropriate)
Cross-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary approach
Excellence of research plan and study design
Synergism – going beyond individual pursuit/business as usual

Scholarly Value
• Extra-ordinarily rewarding and discovery based
• Transformational
• Innovative – goes beyond traditional Antarctic discipline
• Highly valued and well timed
• Future oriented – project contributes to next generation
• Globally connected
What are the most common pitfalls?

- Assuming the reader understands the significance rather than explaining it
- Not being clear and convincing about the value of what is proposed
- Not justifying why particular data or field effort is required and not tying it back to the individual objectives
- Not pitching at the right level (capture both what the specialist and non-specialist need to know)
- Proposals do not stretch to new collaborations and new goals
- Type A NZARI proposals are not really the place for proposals that look like business as usual
- Lack of preparation and proofreading
- Not reading the review criteria
- Believing there is a preconception about who will get funded
- Lack of familiarity with the process, requirements and components of the proposals
- Objectives and goals are not SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant & Time-specific)