GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION AND SELECTION
CRITERIA FOR PROPOSALS
FOR CCIAM COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH
1.0 BACKGROUND

The Royal Norwegian Government and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania have signed an agreement to support the participation of Tanzania in the development and implementation of the programme to address challenges of climate change with the purpose of increasing Tanzania’s participation in the mitigation of and adaptation of the effects of climate change.

Developing, optimizing and sustaining readiness and adequacy in capacity to address the challenges brought by climate change will require a number of interventions through raising awareness, training to build capacity at various levels, and conducting research and outreach activities.

The research component has the following specific objectives which are translated into thematic areas:
1) Development of appropriate climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in forestry, other land uses, ecosystems and biodiversity management.

2) Assessment of climate change impacts and vulnerability on ecosystem services and livelihoods under REDD initiatives.

3) Policy and legal framework analysis of climate change adaptation and mitigation with emphasis on economic efficiency, ecological effectiveness and wider political legitimacy.

Under each thematic area, several research focus areas to be addressed have been broadly identified. It is suggested from the CCIAM programme that 50% of the research projects to be funded shall address issues related to forests and the remaining 50% shall be crosscutting issues in relation to REDD initiatives and agriculture or other ecosystem services and land use.

Following the inception of the programme, a call will be made to researchers from the four collaborating institutions in Tanzania together with those from Norwegian Institutions to submit research concept notes dealing with topics in the above three thematic areas. Topics on cross-cutting issues are also encouraged. An inception workshop is planned to bring together researchers from the various institutions to interact and identify potential collaborators.
2.0 GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING CONCEPT NOTES

2.1 Overview
A concept note is a brief outline of a proposed research. The concept note should:

- Outline background, spell out research problem, objectives, methodology, location where the work is expected to be carried out and indicative budget;
- Identify the principal researcher and other researchers involved in the project, their qualifications, specific roles and their track records; and
- Not exceed 3 pages, excluding the attachments - with single spaced paragraphs and font size 12 Times New Roman in Microsoft Word.

If the concept note is accepted, one will be invited to prepare a full proposal. However, one may be asked to clarify certain issues before proceeding to the full proposal stage. In some cases, related concept notes may be advised to merge. The acceptance of the concept note will not guarantee that one’s proposal will ultimately be accepted for funding.

2.2 Organization and Format
The CCIAM Programme has three separate action research themes. Concept notes are invited from researchers from collaborating institutions intending to undertake action research on one of the thematic areas focusing on:

i) Development of appropriate climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies in forestry, other land uses, ecosystems and biodiversity management

ii) Assessment of climate change impacts and vulnerability on ecosystem services and livelihoods under REDD initiatives

iii) Analysis of policies and legal frameworks on climate change adaptation and mitigation with emphasis on economic efficiency, ecological effectiveness and wider political legitimacy.

Concept notes addressing more than one of the above themes are encouraged. The organization of the concept note should be as outlined in Table 1.
Table 1. Organization and narrative summary of the concept note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Title</td>
<td>The title should capture reader’s attention on the essential theme(s) of the proposed research. - Show clearly what is being investigated. - Have a concise and focused title. - Be short, preferably not more than one line. - Avoid unnecessary punctuation (commas, colons, semicolons). -Should not repeat keywords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Selected Thematic Area</td>
<td>Select one of the three thematic areas and state the major research focus one intends to accomplish in the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Research Problem</td>
<td>A short summary of the research problem. What does the investigator want to find out? What will be known after doing this research? What are the research questions? Use a clear and logical style in writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Background</td>
<td>A concise review of the main research work and current issues in the specific subject area. What is already known about this specific subject? This is not a literature review; you do not need to do one for a concept note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Objectives/Hypothesis</td>
<td>Should clearly state the overall and specific objectives as well as hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Methodology</td>
<td>Outline clearly the methods and approaches of data collection and analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expected outputs and outcomes of the proposed project</td>
<td>Clearly outline the outputs and outcomes that the project is expected to generate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location</td>
<td>Indicate clearly where the research will take place and justification for the choice of the site(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Researchers</td>
<td>The principal researcher should be identified. The name(s) and full contact details collaborating researchers should be provided. State briefly the qualifications, research experience of all researchers and their roles in the project implementation. Multidisciplinary, multi-institutional collaboration is highly encouraged. Attach short CVs (maximum three pages each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Budget lines</td>
<td>Provide indicative budget with key cost centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project Timeframe</td>
<td>Show the duration of the project and the timeline for major activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 Assessment

Concept notes that demonstrate relevance to the themes and adhere to the guidelines will be reviewed by three experts based on criteria described in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Parameters Being Evaluated</th>
<th>Descriptive Scale</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Actual Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Title</strong>: Focused and relevant to the research theme(s)</td>
<td>- Very Relevant (4-5 points)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Slightly relevant (2-3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Irrelevant (0-1 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Background</strong>: Contain sufficient description of the state of knowledge and identification of gaps of the subject.</td>
<td>- Very good (10-15 points)</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Good (2-9 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Poor (0 – 1 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Research Problem</strong>: clearly stated and logically presented.</td>
<td>- Adequately stated (10-15 points)</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Inadequately stated (4-9 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Poorly stated (0-3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research objectives: clear and achievable.</td>
<td>- Clear and achievable (6-10 points)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear but not achievable (1-5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Unclear (0-points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong>: Clearly indicate the methods and approaches of data collection and analysis</td>
<td>- Clear and adequate (14-20 points)</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clear but inadequate (5-13 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Unclear (0-4 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Relevance to REDD initiatives</strong>: address adaptation to and/or mitigation of climate change and policy implications</td>
<td>- Very Relevant (10-15 points)</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Slightly relevant (4-9 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Irrelevant (0-3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Team composition</strong>: Multidisciplinary, multi-institutional with a gender mix</td>
<td>- Very good (3-5 points)</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Good (1-2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Poor (0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Output/Outcomes</strong>: whether the research will lead to development of innovative technologies/models, catalytic to REDD initiatives, livelihood security and poverty reduction</td>
<td>- Satisfactory (10-15 points)</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Slightly satisfactory (4-9 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not satisfactory (0-3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reviewers will submit written reports to Programme Management Team (PMT) showing strengths and weaknesses of each submitted concept note with specific recommendations on whether the concept be rejected, accepted or revised.

The PMT will, after receiving reports, review and make recommendations accordingly to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for endorsement on whether a concept note be rejected or accepted. Should it be necessary some concept notes will be advised to revise or merge with other related concept note(s).
2.4 Submission

All concept notes should be submitted within the time frame as indicated in the advertisement of the call for proposals. The call will be advertised in newspapers, websites and notice boards of collaborating institution. Completed concept notes should be sent to:

Programme Director (attention of the Programme Coordinator)
Directorate of Research and Postgraduate Studies
Sokoine University of Agriculture
P.O. Box 3151
Chuo Kikuu
Morogoro
E-mail it to: drpgs@suanet.ac.tz.
3.0 GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING RESEARCH PROPOSALS

These guidelines are designed to help researchers to prepare full research proposals from approved concept notes. As stated in the preparation of concept notes, how well one plans the research project is critical to the success of the project. Adherence to these guidelines will increase the chances of the proposal to be accepted for funding.

Before considering the guidelines it is important to understand the “what, how and why” elements of a research proposal. That is what is to be addressed by the proposed research; how the object will be realised and contribution of the proposed research.

A research proposal is expected to provide a logical presentation of a research idea, illustrate the significance of the idea, show the idea's relationship to past research, and articulate the activities for the proposed research project. Furthermore, researchers are supposed to remember the fact that proposal is a stand-alone document. It is important to remember that reviewers and interested parties will be assessing one’s proposed research in their absence.

3.1. Organization and Format

The research proposal to be submitted must contain the following elements

1. **Cover page:**
   The cover page should include the name of the lead institution hosting the applicant for the award and the name, title, mailing address, e-mail address, telephone, and fax numbers of researchers. Indicate who will be the principal investigator.

2. **Project Abstract: (one page)**
   Must include the following:
   (a) Project title and names, titles, and affiliations of Researchers
   (b) 150 – 200 word abstract
   (c) 3 – 5 keywords describing the proposed research
   (d) Project Period/Duration

3. **Proposal’s Technical Narrative: (20 page maximum)**
   Must include the following:
   (a) Narrative summary of the project (not more than 120 words)
   (b) Introduction, Problem Statement and Justification
   (c) Research Objectives and hypothesis
   (d) Literature Review
   (e) Methodology describing the study location, methods and approaches for data collection
   (f) Expected outputs and outcomes, including how the project will contribute to the long-term mitigation of and adaptation to climate change.
   (g) Clear description of data processing, analysis and interpretation.
   (h) Potential relevance and application of the results; including policy implications
   (i) An outreach plan including, where appropriate, science-based tools disseminated, participants involved in delivery, and how impacts will be measured.
   (j) Expected risks and limitations of the proposed study.
   (k) Training plan.
   (l) Schedule of proposed activities
(m) Capability Statement: Describing roles and responsibilities of key personnel and partner organizations.
(n) Logical framework
(o) Detailed Budget

4. Research collaborators
Provide information about researchers that will collaborate in the proposed research project. Give full names address, field of specialization and specific roles and responsibilities of each team member in the proposed project. Provide curriculum vitae for Principal Researcher (PR) and co-researchers (maximum three pages for each).

5.0 Budget and Cost Narrative and Additional Sources of Support (if any)
The research grant should cover cost items including labour charges, subsistence allowance, transport, materials and supplies, literature acquisition, organizing seminars or workshops, training of students, data collection and analysis.

Standard rates for all budget items that are considered to be sufficient for carrying out research in Tanzania will be considered. Researchers are required to provide details on the number of days, number of researchers and rates used to calculate the costs.

The grants provided under CCIAM will include minimal capital expenditure excluding purchase of vehicles. Provide budget notes on each cost item.

6. How and Where to Submit
Full proposals must be submitted both electronically through e-mail and in paper format (7 copies) to:

Programme Director (attention of the Programme Coordinator)
Directorate of Research and Postgraduate Studies
Sokoine University of Agriculture
P.O. Box 3151
Chuo Kikuu
Morogoro
Or email it to drpgs@suanet.ac.tz.

The receipt of all applications will be acknowledged by e-mail.
Deadline for submission of full proposal

7. Screening and evaluation
Before a research proposal is sent for expert evaluation, it will be screened on whether the proposal has followed guidelines. Researchers may be asked to revise the proposal if the guidelines are not adhered to.
The three expert reviewers of the research proposals will use the rating instrument that will score an item up to the maximum marks indicated under each item. An average score from the reviewers will be obtained for each proposal. In addition, the reviewers will provide written critical comments on the main components of the proposal.

The proposal can be accepted outright, accepted subject to minor or major revisions or rejected outright. Comments from the reviewers will be forwarded to applicants.

Each application meeting the minimum requirements will be evaluated using the following relevant criteria,

(i) **Overview (15)**
- The title of the research is adequate (2),
- The introduction/ background is rich enough to provide justification for the study (2),
- The research problem is clearly articulated (1),
- The research problem is relevant to CCIAM (1),
- The objectives of the research are clear (2),
- The hypotheses are testable (1)
- The literature review is appropriate/adequate to address the gaps (2)
- The quality of text and general presentation conform to the stated format (2)
- There are clear proposed feedback mechanisms to the target groups (2)

(ii) **Understanding of Research Problem and Issues (20 points)**
- Knowledge on CCIAM (4)
- Knowledge of CCIAM in the proposed Research Site(s) (4)
- Knowledge of local social, economic, and cultural constraints and opportunities in the research sites (4)
- Knowledge of strategies for promoting technological change in light of CCIAM (4)
- Creative and original concept (4)

(iii) **Quality of Research Design (30 points)**
- Appropriate sampling procedures and site selection including justification with respect to the programme (10)
- Appropriate data collection tools/procedures (5)
- Applicable data analysis techniques (5)
- Project feasibility (Potential for attaining project objectives and deliverables) (5)
- Strong and multidisciplinary team to address the research problem (5)

(iv) **Participation and Equity Issues (10 points)**
- Role for community level partners (5)
- Balanced gender and minority participation at all levels (5)

(v) **Potential Research and Development Impacts (20 points)**
- Fitting with CCIAM and vision and Goal (5)
- Potential of proposed research and capacity building activities to enhance climate change adaptation and mitigation (5)
• Potential for scaling up and out beyond the study site(s) (5)
• Potential of proposed research and capacity building to impact on sustainable development (5)
• Mechanisms for disseminating results (5)

The External Evaluation Panel (EEP) reviewing these applications may recommend some modification to the selected or high-ranking proposals.

6.2 Other criteria to be considered during the evaluation

Proposals submitted to the CCIAM Steering Committee shall be evaluated according to the criteria listed above. However, complementary or specific eligibility or evaluation criteria for each category of support will be considered during the evaluation process as narrated below:

1. Scientific quality: originality, innovativeness, feasibility. In the case of proposals involving the development of software platforms and the recruitment of software developers, the capability of the teams to supervise this activity will be a key point in the evaluation.

2. Fostering strong linkages that demonstrate:
   i. Interactions between disciplines, and in particular between social and biotechnical sciences
   ii. That the research is focused on the thematic area exploiting the excellence of expertise from partner institutions
   iii. How research team will work with at least one of the partner institutions

3. Contribution to international climate debate
4. Relevance to socio-economic and sustainable development issues.

Recommendation for funding
The Programme Management Team will recommend the winning proposals to CCIAM Joint Steering Committee for funding approval. The principal investigators will be notified of the fate of their proposals. Furthermore, the principal investigators will receive a summary of the reviewers’ comments.

Dissemination of Research Results

Dissemination is a vital part of the overall research exercise. Among others, the PMT will organize annual research workshops and seminars where researchers will present their preliminary and final research findings and receive critical feedback from other researchers. In addition, papers and poster presentations from other researchers outside the CCIAM programme will be invited. Researchers are also encouraged to disseminate the results of their research through other means including popular media.

Research Clearance
Researchers will arrange their own research clearance according to the established procedures of their institution.
Research Ethics
Beneficiaries of CCIAM grants will be expected to adhere to professional ethics. No information should be obtained by force or fraud. Whilst researchers are expected to co-operate with local political and administrative authorities in the course of their research, it would be counterproductive to make use of these authorities to force respondents to cooperate with the researchers.

Evidence of systematic plagiarism (unacknowledged quotations from other research) or double funding of the same research project will lead to the immediate cancellation of funding.