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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 explicit 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

- The project
- Alignment with Priorities
- Roles & Resources
- Budget

- Who will participate?
- What will their contribution be?
- What resources are available to achieve the project?
Components of the application

- The project
- Alignment with Priorities
- Roles & Resources
- Budget

- 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 must show >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 reviews

- Twice declined proposals need to be significantly recrafted to be accepted
Review Process

Assessment criteria –

Qualifications
• Record of accomplishment – track record
• 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
Applications for logistic support

Considerations

• Justification needs to be commensurate with cost
• Planning lead times
• Cost effective
• Scope creep

Requirements

• **Science proposal**
• **Support request** - where, when, how long, who, what needs to be achieved and how the work needs to be undertaken – all tied to the proposal aims, objectives and hypotheses
• Explanation of **Alignment** to government strategy – how will this proposal deliver concrete outcomes for the strategy
• **Environmental** Impact Assessment including sample collection
• Effective **outreach** plan
• All components need to be well justified and linked to the Science Proposal objectives and goals
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 what the specialist and non-specialist need to know)
• Proposals do not stretch to new collaborations and new goals
• Objectives and goals are not SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant & Time-specific)
• Type A NZARI proposals are not the place for projects that look like business as usual
• Lack of preparation and proofreading
• Not reading the review criteria
• Preconception about who will get funded
• Lack of familiarity with the process, requirements, and components of the proposals