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The priority-driven Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT) Funding Program is designed to enhance the impact of research. We do this by providing funding for two distinct kinds of KTT projects:

1. KTT Research (KTT-R) Funding supports research projects that **advance the science of knowledge translation and transfer (KTT)** in agri-food and rural sectors. Research projects advance the science of KTT by identifying and evaluating methods designed to enhance and accelerate the impact of research.

2. KTT Mobilization (KTT-M) Funding supports outreach and/or engagement activities that **support the dissemination, uptake and/or use of existing research** to support Ontario’s agri-food sector and/or rural communities.

**Timeline for 2020-2021 Programming**

- **KTT Funding Program Launch:** October 14, 2020
- **KTT Funding Program Town Hall Information Sessions:**
  - November 3, 2020 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
  - November 4, 2020 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.
- **Full Proposal Submission Deadline:** December 15, 2020 at noon
- **Anticipated Award Notification:** March/April 2021

**Contact Information**

The following Alliance contacts can assist you with inquiries related to your KTT Research or Mobilization Project:

- **KTT Research Program Director:** Dr. Alison Duncan ([amduncan@uoguelph.ca](mailto:amduncan@uoguelph.ca)).
- **Knowledge Mobilization Manager:** Victoria Holla ([holla@uoguelph.ca](mailto:holla@uoguelph.ca)).
- **If you experience technical difficulties or need support with the RMS application template please contact our Research Program Coordinators at** [rescoord@uoguelph.ca](mailto:rescoord@uoguelph.ca).

**What is Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT)?**

The Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance (previously the OMAFRA-U of G Partnership) has supported knowledge translation and transfer (KTT) in agri-food and rural sectors since 2010 with the goal of enhancing the impact of publicly funded research.

The Alliance defines KTT as the transformation of knowledge into use through synthesis, exchange, dissemination, dialogue, collaboration and brokering among researchers and research users. Put another way, KTT refers to the many activities and strategies aimed at building awareness of research findings, moving research knowledge into active use, or enhancing research impact. The goal of KTT work is to create a two-way connection between researchers and research users to increase and enable dissemination, uptake and application of research.
KTT Funding Program Objectives

The objectives of the KTT Funding Program are to:

- Explore the science of KTT to identify and evaluate best practices to drive and enhance the positive impact of research and innovation.
- Drive knowledge into action by advancing the synthesis, exchange, application and dissemination of knowledge resulting from Alliance-funded research and other agri-food and rural research beneficial to Ontario and Ontarians.
- Evaluate and utilize KTT methods and best practices to support awareness and impact of research among users.

Program Scope: What We Fund

All KTT projects must relate to an established OMAFRA research priority and support Ontario’s agri-food and/or rural sectors.

The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) undertook a new approach to research priority setting in 2019. Research priorities for the Alliance Research Program are aligned within the Ministry’s core businesses and objectives: Protection and Assurance, Stewardship, and Economic Development as illustrated below.

OMAFRA Research Priorities by Core Business

KTT projects supported by the Funding Program DO NOT need to address a specific research question, but must relate to one of the eleven identified priorities and must demonstrate a high likelihood of contributing to the health, sustainability, and/or competitiveness of Ontario’s agri-food sectors and/or rural communities.

Further information about OMAFRA’s research priorities are available in the OMAFRA Research Priorities document and on the Alliance website.

Available Funding

To meet established objectives, the KTT Funding Program invites project applications to one of two funding streams:

1. KTT Research Funding

   **Maximum project duration:** 2 years (24 months) | **Budget Limit:** $35,000 annually ($70,000 total)
KTT Research Funding supports research projects that **advance the science of knowledge translation and transfer (KTT)** in agri-food and rural sectors. Research projects advance the science of KTT by identifying and evaluating methods designed to enhance and accelerate the impact of research.

Successful KTT Research projects will contribute to evidence-informed KTT practice.

2. **KTT Mobilization Funding**

   **Maximum project duration:** 2 years (24 months)  |  **Budget Limit:** $20,000 annually ($40,000 total)

   KTT Mobilization Funding supports outreach and/or engagement activities **that support the dissemination, uptake and/or use of existing research** to support Ontario’s agri-food sector and/or rural communities.

   KTT Mobilization projects may last up to 24 months with appropriate justification; however, we welcome projects between 6 and 24 months in duration.

   *Please note: a project may only be submitted to ONE funding stream; applicants may not seek funding from both funding streams for the same project.*

### Proposal Review Process

All proposals will be reviewed by a panel consisting of subject matter experts from academia, government and industry. Proposals will be reviewed against established criteria including:

- Fit with OMAFRA priorities. Projects must demonstrate how they are likely to benefit Ontario’s agri-food and/or rural sectors;
- Strength of the project lead(s) and research team;
- Benefits to client groups and contribution to Ontario’s agri-food sector. End users should be engaged early in the project and often;
- Quality and clarity of the project design;
- Deliverables that are clear, tangible, measurable and achievable;
- Strength of the Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT) plan (for KTT-R stream only);
- Value for money; and
- Evidence of involvement of relevant partners through [leverage and partnerships](#).

Applications to the KTT research stream will be reviewed by a KTT expert external to the review committee.

*The scorecard used by the review committees is provided in this program guide.*

Review committees will make funding recommendations to the Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance Research Program Management Committee. Final funding decisions are at the discretion of OMAFRA.

### Equity, Diversity and Inclusion

The University of Guelph is committed to the principles of equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI). All applicants to Alliance funding programs are encouraged to review the [EDI Resource Document for Researchers](#) developed by the U of G Office of Research Services.
**HOW TO APPLY**

The Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance awards KTT funding via a competitive, single-stage application process.

KTT-M and KTT-R project applications are different; lead applicants will be required to select the appropriate application in the RMS.

An expert panel of researchers, government analysts and industry partners reviews submitted project proposals based on project merit, quality, value for money, and contribution to Ontario’s agri-food and/or rural sector. A single panel may review both KTT-M and KTT-R applications, but each stream is evaluated using a distinct scorecard.

A KTT research expert will complete a technical review of KTT Research applications for consideration by the review panel in advance of scoring.

**Online Application System – Research Management System (RMS)**

- All Alliance programming is administered in the RMS. A new RMS platform was launched in October 2019.
- If you have never registered in the RMS select “Register” on the login page: [https://omafra2.smartsimple.ca](https://omafra2.smartsimple.ca) (new URL as of October 2019)
- If you have already registered in the new RMS (you have applied to a program in RMS since October 2019 or submitted a report in RMS since January 2020), simply log in.
- If you have previously applied to a program in the RMS but have not applied or completed any reporting since October 2019, you will need to create a new password. Faculty contact records were migrated from the previous RMS system, but for security reasons passwords were not. Please follow these steps:
  1. Select the “Forgot Password” option on the home screen of the RMS login page. Enter your uoguelph.ca email address when prompted.
  2. You will receive an e-mail to your uoguelph.ca email address containing a link to reset your password. Enter a new password at the prompts. Note: Faculty existing within the previous RMS system must follow the “Forgot Password” option to be properly affiliated with their previous projects that have been migrated to the new RMS. It should not take longer than an hour to receive the e-mail for your password reset. Occasionally these e-mails can go to the spam folder.

Please contact rescoord@uoguelph.ca if you experience any difficulties logging in.

To open an application, select the relevant KTT Program (KTT-Research or KTT-Mobilization) and click on “Determine Eligibility”. Confirm your eligibility to apply for funding to access an application.

*For the best experience we suggest using the latest version of Chrome, Firefox or Safari. Internet Explorer will not be supported by the RMS platform provider beyond November 2020.*
Lead Applicants and Co-Applicants

The Lead Applicant is the primary award holder and is accountable for project management and compliance with any reporting requirements.

A Co-Applicant (optional) is a researcher that plays an important and ongoing role in the development and implementation of the project. Co-applicants are identified and invited from the Invitations tab in RMS. There can only be one Co-applicant. Co-applicants share a role in the responsibility for project management and reporting requirements and as such have editing capabilities on applications and reports as the Lead Applicant, with the exception of the team member invitation table.

University of Guelph faculty members are eligible to be the Lead Applicant and/or a Co-applicant on any Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance Research Program project. Adjunct faculty members may also apply if they are eligible to hold research funding at the University of Guelph. Non-faculty team members are not eligible to be either a Lead or Co-applicant.

Prior to being awarded any new project(s) under the Alliance, Lead Applicants and Co-applicants must be fully compliant with all reporting requirements for existing projects under the OMAFRA-U of G / Alliance Research Program

FULL PROPOSAL APPLICATION

Support for Applicants

The following supports are available to assist researchers in the application process:

- This program guide;
- Instructions and tool tips (denoted by 🛥️) in the RMS Application Template;
- Tip sheets available on the RMS Researcher Workbench Home page (‘Help’ icon);
- If you experience technical difficulties or need support with the RMS application template please contact our Research Program Coordinators at rescoord@uoguelph.ca.

Full Proposal Template

KTT-R and KTT-M applications consists of several sections that are navigated via tabs across the top of the on-line application in the RMS. All tabs must be completed. The majority of the application instructions are provided in the RMS, but some additional guidance is provided below.

A validation process will take place upon submission to ensure all mandatory fields are complete.

Research Team and Invitation process

Team members and Highly Qualified Personnel are identified in their respective tables in the Team tab in the RMS. The research team member invitation process is described in the application template and in the tip sheets (accessible under the ‘Help’ icon on the RMS home page). Co-applicants, Delegates (described below), and all Collaborators should confirm their participation in the project and be registered in the RMS by the Full Proposal submission date. Confirmed Collaborators will have read-only access to the proposal; Co-Applicants and Delegates (both optional) with have ability to edit the proposal.
A Delegate (optional – limit of one) is an individual whose only role is to assist the Lead Applicant in the creation and editing of the application and progress reports (for awarded projects). A Delegate must be part of your organization. A Delegate, while not formally a team member, is identified and invited from the team member tab in the RMS. Delegates that play an active role in the research project must also be identified and invited as a Collaborator or identified in the HQP table in the RMS (this is important for Alliance programs performance indicator reporting).

There is no limitation placed on the balance of the team composition, but all team members should play an active role as collaborators in the implementation of the project (advisory, researcher or knowledge broker). The team may include individuals from:

• U of G (researchers and other support staff e.g. technicians);
• Other University or research institutions in Canada or globally;
• Private businesses;
• Industry / commodity organizations;
• Non-governmental organizations; and
• Provincial, federal or municipal government departments (e.g., OMAFRA staff).

The project team composition should ensure that the appropriate research expertise is brought to bear on the research objective(s) to be addressed. Where applicable, team members responsible for KTT should be identified in the team table.

A new Funding Source field captures the funding source for team members to help support the evaluation of the budget. This field applies primarily for team members working at the U of G who are funded as part of the project, other Alliance/OMAFRA funding, or from partner funds (e.g. Research Technicians, Research Associates, etc.). Select one of the following for each team member as appropriate:

• This project (in whole/in part) – for team members who will be supported directly with project funds. These expenses need to be identified in the budget.
• Another OMAFRA program – for Research Technicians etc. who are supported through other funding from the Alliance (e.g. base funded Technician). They do not need to appear in the budget.
• Another funding source – for team members supported under this project through partner funds. These expenses, and the relevant co-funder(s), need to be identified in the budget.
• N/A - for all other team members (faculty, collaborating researchers etc.)

The FTE (full-time equivalent) you report in the team member table should reflect the total average annual time that each individual will contribute to the project. An FTE of 1.0 is a full-time commitment to the project (e.g. 35 hours per week) and an FTE of 0.1 is equivalent to 3.5 hours per week (for a 35-hour week). Documenting FTE contributions are important to support Alliance programs performance indicator reporting.

The involvement of all team members (including their estimated actual FTE contributions to the project) will be reported on in annual and final reports.

Highly Qualified Personnel

The training and development of Highly Qualified Personnel (HQP) is an important objective of the Alliance and an Agreement performance indicator. Effort should be made wherever possible to engage HQP in Alliance-funded research projects.
HQP are undergraduate and graduate students or post-doctoral fellows receiving training through the proposed research, regardless of funding source. These HQP are captured separately from team members in the RMS. Please provide details on all HQP that will be involved in the project, regardless of their stipend funding source. Highly Qualified Personnel do not need to be invited. Proposals can move forward without specific persons identified as HQP if the positions are not yet filled. If specific people are not identified, use “TBD” as a placeholder for the first and last name within the HQP table and complete all other fields except for e-mail address. Similarly to the Team Member table, identify the HQP Funding Source as either 'This project (in whole/in part)', 'HQP Scholarship Program', or 'Another funding source'.

Ensure that all personnel that will be supported through the project, either through program or partner funds, are clearly identified in the budget.

Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT) – for Research Stream ONLY

The KTT tab in the KTT Research Stream application consists of two tables: KTT User Audiences and the KTT Plan. Instructions for completing these two tables are in RMS. The KTT Plan asks you to project costs for your KTT Activities. Please ensure the cost for KTT Activities is reflected in your Application Budget using either funds from Request from Program or Other Sources of Project Funding.

There are several resources available to assist you in creating your KTT plan. Visit the KTT Services and Resources page to access these resources.

- **Growing Knowledge Translation and Transfer in Ontario: A Manual of Best Practices**: This manual outlines a collection of best practices in agri-food and rural KTT that can help guide you through the development of your KTT plan.
- **KTT Plan Checklist**: A practical tool based on the Alliance KTT plan template. These guidelines, prepared by Alliance funding program reviewers, ensure your proposal covers key aspects of KTT planning.
- **KTT Example Plans**: Examples of complete KTT plans to help provide ideas of innovative KTT activities as well as questions to consider as you answer each section.
- **KTT Plan Appraisal Tool**: This tool is a decision aid/ rubric to help reviewers appraise and assess KTT Plans in The Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance's research project proposals.

Contact kttadmin@uoguelph.ca if you have any questions about these resources or the KTT section of your proposal.

**Supporting Documentation**

Supporting documentation should be in PDF format and may include:

- **Team Member Supporting Documentation**
  - CV’s of the Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant (mandatory)
- **Proposal Details Supporting Documentation**
  - References for your Literature Review
  - Relevant articles demonstrating industry needs
  - One-page diagram which illustrates the methods described in the proposal
• Other Supporting Documentation
  o Letters of support. **Note:** Letters of support from OMAFRA are not admissible
  o Confirmation of leveraged funding (if additional funding is listed as confirmed, a letter of confirmation is required before the project can be Awarded)
  o Award letters to be leveraged with this proposal
  o Sub-Award/Collaborative Research Agreement (CRA) Budget Templates (mandatory if funds moving to other researchers or organizations via these mechanisms)

**OR-5**

An OR-5 Form is **no longer required to be uploaded to the application.** OR-5 fields are completed on-line by the applicant on the OR-5 tab of the application within the RMS. Department and College approval will be obtained electronically following proposal submission. No further action, beyond completing the OR-5 fields, is required from the applicants.

**THE RMS BUDGET AND LEVERAGE GUIDELINES**

**Budget Limits**

Proposals for projects up to 24 months (2 years) duration are eligible for funding.

Applicants to the KTT Research funding stream may request up to $35,000 annually ($70,000 total) for direct project operating costs.

Applicants to the KTT Mobilization funding stream may request up to $20,000 annually ($40,000 total) for direct project operating costs.

Project duration and budget must be commensurate with the nature of the proposed research/mobilization initiative and show high value for money requested. For all project applications, we welcome projects shorter than the maximum time allowed (24 months).

**Eligible and Ineligible Expenses**

The following provides a guideline of direct project expenses that are eligible under the Alliance Funding Programs. It is not an exhaustive list. Please contact rescoord@uoguelph.ca with any questions regarding eligibility of budget items (either as direct project expenses or as matching contributions).

Eligible project expenses (can also be provided by funding partners):

- Salaries of scientific or technical staff employed on a contract basis or hired specifically for the purposes of this project (including those at U of G if not funded by the Alliance). Value should be based on their FTE contribution to the project;
- Graduate student stipends;
- Goods and services necessary for the project (e.g. supplies, disposables, sampling, lab testing, etc.);
- Equipment purchases (generally not exceeding $10,000 per item). Alliance funding is limited and not intended for significant equipment purchases with a useful lifespan beyond the duration of the project. However, a larger equipment purchase (exceeding $10,000) that is fundamental to the research project may be eligible with a strong rationale. The review committees will consider these purchases on a case
by case basis. Please contact rescoord@uoguelph.ca if you have any questions about equipment purchases.

- KTT and technology transfer related costs such as the organization of workshops (venue, meals etc.) and communication materials;
- Publication costs (e.g. page charges for academic journals);
- Travel necessary to carry out the project (e.g. to research stations and field plots); and
- Travel to conferences where project information is being presented.

Ineligible project expenses:

- OMAFRA staff time or resources;
- Salaries of permanent staff whose compensation is not specifically dependent on on-going research project funding; and
- Support for meetings/events that would occur regardless of project funding

Research Station Use and Access Fees

U of G faculty have access to 15 research stations at highly subsidized rates. While the majority of KTT projects don’t require the use of research stations, some producer organizations have used the research stations for KTT projects in the past. If you intend to use a research station, please ensure this is identified in the ‘General’ Tab and the ‘OR-5’ tab under the Resource Use section in the RMS. This will create a section on the Budget tab where you identify the specific research station services you require. Full instructions are available in the RMS application.

Visit the Program website for a complete list of Research Stations and Research Station Access Fees.

Third party (non-OMAFRA) funding is required to cover the non-subsidized portion (8%) of the fee.

Leverage / Partner Funding

Funding partners are individuals or organizations that contribute cash and/or in-kind support to the project. These partners are captured under the ‘Other Sources of Project Funding’ section within the RMS.

In-kind contributions are non-cash contributions providing a direct, tangible benefit to the project. The donated asset or contribution must be essential to the project’s success and if not donated, would need to be purchased and paid for from approved project funds. In-kind contributions must be in lieu of eligible project expenses only.

All in-kind contributions must be fully explained in the budget notes. The value of the assets or services donated must reflect fair market value for the time period it is donated. The eligibility and value of in-kind contributions will be assessed by the review committee.

Alliance Funding Programs do not have prescribed matching or partner funding requirements. This approach recognizes that this program funds a broad diversity of research that spans the continuum from discovery research through to applied and pre-commercialization research, as well as policy and ‘public good’ research that is less likely to attract third party investment. Furthermore, there are significant differences in the ability of different end users to financially support research projects (e.g. smaller vs. larger industry groups).

OMAFRA wants to understand how their investment is used to leverage research capacity and other supports, as leverage is a key performance indicator for Alliance Programs. So, while Alliance projects do not require matching funding, funding partners show industry and end user pull/support for a project, which helps build a strong rationale for the research. Effort should be made to secure partner support wherever possible.
Review committees will take into account the level and nature of partner support that could reasonably be expected for particular types of projects. All partner support, whether cash or in-kind, needs to be fully documented/justified and considered essential to directly carry out the work of the project.

When documenting your leveraged funding in the RMS, funding partners may have both an Organization and Funding Program (for example NSERC Discovery has the Organization ‘NSERC’ and Funding Program ‘Discovery’). Please ensure you correctly identify these as independent entries (for example do not input the Organization as ‘NSERC Discovery’).

Funding partners can include:
- U of G (Lead Applicant organization) – cash support only from institutional source (e.g. scholarships, start-up funds etc.)
- Federal (including tri-council), provincial (including non-Alliance OMAFRA funding), or municipal governments;
- Other universities/ research Institutions;
- Business and Industry;
- Non-governmental organizations; and
- Individual donors, private foundations

Ineligible partner cash and in-kind:
- In-kind support from OMAFRA (time, resources, supplies, materials, etc.);
- In-kind support from U of G including use or provision of existing supplies, materials, and equipment belonging to the Lead Applicant, Co-Applicant, or U of G collaborators;
- Salaries for individuals that are ‘regular, base-funded’ positions within the applying or donating organization. These individuals, if involved in the project, should be identified on the ‘Project Team Members’ table and invited to participate in the project;
- Other Alliance funding, including graduate student stipends awarded under the HQP Scholarship Program (however these HQP must still be identified the HQP table); and
- Alliance-funded Technician time (however Alliance-funded Technicians must be identified on the team member table to support performance indicator reporting – and their funding source should be identified as Other OMAFRA Programs).

If your project is dependent on leveraged cash from external sources (any non-Alliance cash support), please ensure you identify this on the OR-5 tab in the RMS.
Overhead/Indirect Costs

U of G indirect costs are incorporated into the master Alliance Agreement. No additional indirect costs are required and/or eligible on a project-by-project basis on the amount requested from OMAFRA. The overhead percentage identified in the budget tab should remain at 0.

**Partner Cash Contributions:** Indirect costs must be included at the applicable rate (on partner cash contributions from government and industry sponsors when those contributions leverage OMAFRA funding. Identify these costs in the ‘Operating-Other’ category in the ‘Cash from Partners’ expenditure table and describe them in the budget notes. More information is available here: [https://www.uoguelph.ca/research/for-researchers/funding/apply/indirect-costs](https://www.uoguelph.ca/research/for-researchers/funding/apply/indirect-costs)

**Indirect costs levied by a collaborating institution** receiving transfers of Alliance project funds are eligible and must be included in the budget under ‘Operating-Other’ in the ‘Funds Requested from Program’ expenditure table and described in the budget notes (see Collaborative Research Agreement section below).

Building a Project Budget

An Excel version of the budget template is available on the Alliance Tier 1 program website as an OPTIONAL tool to draft and plan your budget. This is for planning purposes only. Please **DO NOT** upload this Excel budget to your application. You are required to complete and submit the budget outline provided in the application in the RMS.

1. **Sources of Project Funds** includes the funding requested from the program as well as the cash and in-kind support from partners. If you have indicated there are other sources of funding for the project, click ‘ADD Funding Source’ under the ‘Other Sources of Project Funding’ section within the Budget tab and provide the details requested for each Funding Partner supporting the project.

2. **Expenditures of Project Funds** - There are three tables to be completed in the Budget tab (will appear in a pop-up window):
   - Request from Program;
   - Cash from Partners (if applicable); and
   - In-kind Support from Partners (if applicable).

The use of research stations requires cash support from partners to cover the portion of station access fees that is not subsidized by OMAFRA.

Use of program and partner funds should be allocated across budget categories and fiscal years. Each row in the budget corresponds to a U of G fiscal year (May 1 – April 30) that the project will take place. E.g., A 3-year project beginning October 1st would require 4 budget periods (fiscal years) – the first and last periods covering 6 months only.

*Use of projects funds must be fully explained/justified in the text boxes provided. Your notes help reviewers determine whether your expenses are eligible, commensurate with the nature of your proposed research, and are valued appropriately.*
Budget for Collaborating Researchers

Sub-Awards (for U of G Collaborating Researchers)
If a significant part of the project budget will be managed by a collaborating U of G faculty team member(s) a sub-award with a separate FRS tracking account number can be set up upon request. U of G Researchers in the same Department are expected to manage their project spending collaboratively.

- A separate budget worksheet which provides the details of the sub-award must be uploaded with the proposal. The budget worksheet is available on the Alliance Tier 1 program website.
- In addition, a Letter of Agreement for Internal Transfer of Funds will be required at the time of award.
- It is the Lead Applicant’s responsibility to report on all project activities, including the work of collaborating team members.

Collaborative Research Agreements (for non-U of G Collaborating Researchers)
Alliance project operating funding awarded for an approved project can be transferred to another institution for use by a team member via a Collaborative Research Agreement (CRA). CRAs are created post-award.

- Any overhead/indirect costs levied by the receiving institution on such fund transfers of OMAFRA-U of G project support must be included in the amount identified and budgeted for transfer, as there is no other mechanism by which such indirect expenses can be paid. The maximum overhead rate allowed will be 25%.
- If a CRA is required, a separate budget worksheet which provides the details of the budget for the CRA must be uploaded with the proposal. The budget worksheet is available on the Alliance Tier 1 program website.

It is the Lead Applicant’s responsibility to report on all project activities, including the work of collaborating team members.
APPLICATION CHECKLIST AND POST AWARD PROCESSES

Full Proposal Checklist

- Read the current OMAFRA Research Priorities document. Please be sure to read the entire Appendix as some topic areas are not intuitively located within the document.
- Attend the U of G KTT Program Virtual Town Hall (program information session) on:
  - November 3, 2020 12:00p.m. – 1:00p.m.
  - November 4, 2020 12:00p.m. – 1:00p.m.
- Develop project concept.
- Assemble project team that includes your research capacity, advisors, stakeholders (including OMAFRA staff), and technicians. Team members must be confirmed through an invitation process. HQP are identified in a separate table.
- Connect with your Research Program Director, College Research Manager, Alliance Research Program Coordinators and program support staff such as U of G Knowledge Mobilization staff for support in preparing a strong proposal (kttadmin@uoguelph.ca).
  - The Research Program Director for the Alliance KTT Program is Dr. Alison Duncan (amduncan@uoguelph.ca).
- Develop proposal by completing all tabs in the RMS. Ensure the proposal is complete, well-written and clearly demonstrates how it addresses a specific research question in the priority document.
- Append all required documents (e.g. Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant CVs, Value Assessment Plan if applicable) and other supporting documentation as described above.
- Submit your Full Proposal in the RMS by the submission deadline (December 15 at noon).

Full Proposal Decision Notification and Award Phase

- Researchers will be notified of the outcome of the review and approval process via the RMS.
- Conditionally approved applications must address any conditions in the offer described in the notification email through the RMS. All leveraged funding must be confirmed with a letter of support prior to final approval.
- A Data Management Plan will be a condition of funding for approved KTT-Research projects. A DMP is not required for projects funded through the KTT Mobilization funding stream.
- Award Agreements are issued for projects once the response to conditions of funding have been addressed and approved by the Research Program Director and Alliance staff. Execution of Award Agreements will occur by an online ‘DocuSign’ process. The Lead Applicant and the Department Chair will receive notification via email that there is an Agreement to sign.

Data Management Plans

The Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance is committed to fostering sound data management practices to facilitate new agri-food and rural research. As of 2018, researchers awarded funding through the Alliance research program must complete a data management plan (DMP) for their awarded project(s). A DMP summarizes how data generated over the course of a research project will be stored, shared and maintained. It can help improve the effectiveness and efficiency of a research project as well as help prepare data for preservation and sharing.
Upload the DMP to the “Data Management Plan” filed under the Documentation tab.

Data Management Plans will be a condition of funding for projects funded in 2021. All DMPs must be reviewed and endorsed by the U of G Library prior to submission to the Alliance.

Post Award-Reporting

- Annual Progress reports are due 30 days after the anniversary of the project start date (with budget reporting for each fiscal period) and should include reporting on sub-award and/or CRA activities and KTT related to the project.
- Annual reports will be reviewed and approved if acceptable or revisions may be requested. Funding for the following year of the project will only be released once the report has been approved.
- Final reports are due 60 days following the conclusion of the project. They are critical to the success of the Alliance. Some of the summary fields will be published publicly.
- Reports are reviewed and approved on completeness and merit by Alliance staff and OMAFRA Research Analysts.
- Any changes to the start and end dates, objectives, deliverables or budget in an awarded project, must be requested and approved by OMAFRA through the amendment request process.
- If you have questions about the amendment or reporting process, please contact rescoord@uoguelph.ca

ACKNOWLEDGING ALLIANCE RESEARCH FUNDING

Recipients of funding must acknowledge Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) support in all public communications products, including news releases, web copy, magazine stories, public-facing reports, interviews, journal articles, conference posters and oral presentations. More details on how to acknowledge OMAFRA funding are available on the Alliance website.

APPEAL PROCESS

To ensure the transparency and rigour of the processes involved in the review and selection of Full Proposals, the Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance Research Program has established a policy to guide the appeals process.

The primary purpose of the appeal is to correct errors, omissions or mistakes made by the Review Committees during the review of the Full Proposal. These errors are rare, however, in order to maintain fairness and equity to all applicants, the Program does permit appeals under the specific circumstances outlined below.

Appeals are heard only where the researcher demonstrates that an error of fact or process, or inadvertent omission of information has been made by the Review Committees. A researcher who has had a Full Proposal rejected, or an active project terminated prior to its normal end date, may request a review or appeal of the specific process used in the evaluation or assessment of the proposal or project. All researchers are entitled to receive a written communication indicating the decision regarding the approval or decline of the funding for their Full Proposal or active project, which will include the rationale behind that decision.
A written request for a review/appeal must be submitted within 30 calendar days from the date of the documented notification of decision and must include written evidence of error in the evaluation or assessment process. The request for appeal should be addressed to the Associate Vice-President, Research (Agri-Food Partnership) (AVPR).

The AVPR will determine if sufficient evidence exists for a formal appeal. Once a determination has been made to proceed with an appeal hearing, the AVPR will, in collaboration with the other co-chair of the Research Program Management Committee, convene a meeting of an appropriate Appeal Committee as per the following:

1. The AVPR will Chair the Appeal Committee.
2. The Appeal Committee may consist of one or more of the Research Program Directors (RPDs) and up to two (2) OMAFRA representatives as appropriate. This committee will not include the Research Program Director(s) of the priority area(s) where the project fits.
3. All relevant written materials generated concerning the project in question, prior to the date of the request for review, will be supplied to the Appeal Committee at least 5 business days in advance of the meeting.
4. The RPD of the relevant priority area will present an oral report to the Appeal Committee summarizing the process followed and actions taken pertaining to the decision in question. The RPD will then be excused from the balance of the appeal proceedings.
5. The Appeal Committee will then receive evidence from the researcher concerning the project in question, specifically addressing the errors or omissions which have been alleged to have occurred.

The Appeal Committee will then determine, by consensus, a recommendation on the Appeal which will be presented to the Executive Committee for a final, binding decision on the matter. A written decision communicating the Executive Committee’s decision will be presented to both the researcher and the Research Program Director. No further appeals will be permitted within either the University or OMAFRA systems.
PANEL REVIEW SCORECARD: KTT RESEARCH PROJECTS

1. RESEARCH TEAM (see Team section of the proposal)
Evaluate the qualifications and suitability of the lead applicant, co-applicant (if applicable) and team members to conduct the research proposed and to achieve the project outcomes. Are there gaps in the expertise required to complete the project?
   - **Outstanding**: Lead Applicant is a leader in the field. Exceptional expertise from all necessary disciplines represented and contribution of each is fully defined and appropriate.
   - **Very Good**: Lead Applicant is highly regarded in the field or has the potential to be a field leader. The research team has a proven track record in the proposed research area. Roles and responsibilities are clearly articulated.
   - **Good**: Lead Applicant is appropriate to lead the study. The research team has experience in the proposed research area. Some revision needed: either additional expertise or better description of team member roles and responsibilities.
   - **Sufficient**: The Lead Applicant and research team have some experience in the proposed research area. Key areas of scientific or technical expertise or industry collaboration are deficient. Roles and responsibilities are not well defined.
   - **Marginal**: The research team lacks the breadth of experience in the field(s) outlined in the proposal. Project outcomes may be compromised by the lack of experience.
   - **Unsatisfactory**: Significant weakness in the research team composition. Project outcomes will be compromised by this weakness.

Comments:

2. HIGHLY QUALIFIED PERSONAL (HQP) (see Team and Budget section of the proposal)
The training of HQP is an important objective of the Ontario Agri-Food Innovation Alliance. Evaluate the training and development of HQP.
The HQP training as described is:
   - **Outstanding**: HQP training includes graduate student and/or Post-Doctoral Fellows and meets or exceeds expectations for a project of this nature.
   - **Good**: Makes an appropriate contribution to HQP development for a project of this nature. Graduate students and/or Post-Doctoral Fellows will be trained.
   - **Marginal**: Some HQP development (e.g. undergraduates). No graduate students or Post-Doctoral Fellows will be trained.
   - **Unsatisfactory**: No HQP trained.

3. OBJECTIVES (see Objectives section of the proposal)
Evaluate the project objectives: Are the objectives clear and well developed? To what extent will the project address to the research question(s) identified and realize the intended benefits of the project?

The project objectives are:
   - **Outstanding**: Objectives are detailed, realistic and very well developed. All project elements fall within the identified research question(s). Anticipated project outcomes and benefits are very likely to be achieved.
   - **Very Good**: Clear and detailed description of objectives. All project elements fall within the identified research question(s). Anticipated project outcomes are likely to be achieved.
   - **Good**: Objectives are appropriate and fall within the identified research question(s) but minor deficiencies are observed (e.g., lack of clarity, or 1 or 2 project elements out of scope and/or are not in full alignment with the research question(s) identified).
• **Sufficient**: Objectives are reasonable but lack detail, requiring moderate revisions. Project is limited in scope and/or has some elements that do not fall within the identified research question(s). Anticipated benefits of the project may not be fully realized.

• **Marginal**: Objectives are vague or not well developed. Many project elements are out of scope and/or marginally fall within the identified research question(s).

• **Unsatisfactory**: Objectives are vague and poorly developed. Objectives do not fall within the identified research question(s)) and the intended benefits of the project are unclear.

5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

4. **RESEARCH IMPACT/BENEFIT** (see Project Description, Alignment with OMAFRA Priorities, Objectives, Benefits & Rationale and Deliverables sections of the proposal)

Evaluate the likelihood of this proposal generating a positive impact on the Ontario agri-food sector or rural communities. Is the rationale for the study clearly articulated and does it provide sufficient justification for the project (e.g. knowledge gap to be addressed, problem to be solved)?

The potential impact/benefit of the project is:

• **Outstanding**: Project is very likely to advance the field. Project will contribute significant, lasting benefits to Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities. Very clear and compelling description of expected benefits that are realistic and exceptional in their potential for impact on the sector.

• **Very Good**: Project will provide significant new knowledge that contributes to Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities. Benefits for the project are realistic and clearly described.

• **Good**: Project will provide incremental or temporary benefits for Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities. The benefits are reasonable.

• **Sufficient**: Project will provide limited benefits for Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities. The benefits are not fully described or are under or over-stated.

• **Marginal**: Extent of the potential impact of the project is not clear. A description of the benefits is lacking.

• **Unsatisfactory**: Little benefit evident for Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities.

Comments:
5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

WEIGHTING OF 200%

5. **METHODS** (see Methodology and Milestone sections of the proposal)

Evaluate the quality and clarity of experimental design: Are the methods clear and do they provide sufficient detail to determine the course of the project? Do the methods support the project plan (objectives, milestones and deliverables)? Can the methods realistically achieve the deliverables within the stated timeframes?

The methods as described are:

• **Outstanding**: Approach is well developed, highly original and/or innovative and designed to deliver on project objectives and deliverables. Objectives are detailed, realistic and very well developed. Probability of success is very high.

• **Very Good**: Approach is clear, logical, robust and well proven and can be completed within the stated timelines. Clear and detailed description of objectives Probability of success is high.

• **Good**: Approach is feasible and based on proven methodologies. Objectives are appropriate. Some revision or additional detail or clarity may be required.

• **Sufficient**: Project may be completed successfully, but there are moderate deficiencies in the description of the proposed objective or methods or likelihood of success is unclear.
• **Marginal**: Approach and/or objectives are not well developed or vague and is unlikely to produce the planned results.
• **Unsatisfactory**: Insufficient detail to assess approach. Approach not well aligned with outcomes and deliverables. Objectives are vague and poorly developed. Unlikely that the project can be completed successfully.

Comments:
5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

6. DELIVERABLES
Evaluate the project deliverables: Are the deliverables clear, tangible, measurable and achievable within the project timeframe? If fully achieved, will the deliverables result in the outcomes and impact described in the proposal?

The deliverables are:
• **Outstanding**: Deliverables are comprehensive, fully detailed, measurable and clearly achievable. Anticipated outcomes and impact very likely to be achieved.
• **Very Good**: Clear and concise description of project deliverables resulting in tangible outcomes. Anticipated outcomes and impact likely to be achieved.
• **Good**: Deliverables are clear and appropriate but weaknesses observed. Minor revision required to improve clarity and detail or ensure deliverables are tangible.
• **Sufficient**: Deliverables are reasonable but not clearly defined. Moderate revision required to ensure project deliverables are tangible and linked to desired outcomes.
• **Marginal**: Deliverables are not well described or vague and are unlikely to produce the planned results. Major revision required.
• **Unsatisfactory**: Deliverables poorly developed or unrealistic. Project will not result in tangible outcomes.

Comments:
5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

7. KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION AND TRANSFER (KTT) (see KTT Plan section of the proposal)
Taking into account the KTT reviewer’s comments and using the KTT Plan Appraisal Tool, evaluate the quality of the KTT plan.

The KTT plan is:
• **Outstanding**: The KTT Plan components are fully, clearly, and comprehensively described with excellence/innovation of approach.
• **Very Good**: The KTT Plan components are fully, clearly, and comprehensively described.
• **Good**: The KTT Plan components are well described with most details and the plan is mostly clear.
• **Sufficient**: The KTT Plan components are described without elaboration and some points are unclear.
• **Marginal**: The KTT Plan components are vaguely mentioned or mainly unclear.
• **Unsatisfactory**: The KTT Plan components are missing or not present.

5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory
Comments:
8. BUDGET (see Budget section of the proposal)
Evaluate the budget: Is the budget appropriate for the work proposed? Does the amount of funding requested seem appropriate and expenditures linked to the outcomes described? Are all budget items sufficiently described/justified and valued appropriately?

The budget as presented is:
- **Outstanding**: Budget is clear, very well developed and represents great value for money. All items are fully described and justified in the budget notes and valued correctly.
- **Very Good**: Budget is clear, appropriate for the scale of the proposed research and represents good value for money. All items are sufficiently described and justified and valued correctly but may require minor revisions.
- **Good**: Budget is reasonable for the scale of the proposed research but requires moderate revisions (such as additional clarity and justification for items or more appropriate valuation of some budget items).
- **Sufficient**: Budget is acceptable for the scale of the proposed research but requires moderate revisions (such as additional clarity and justification for items or more appropriate valuation of some budget items). Alignment of expenditures with project outcomes not fully clear.
- **Marginal**: Budget is somewhat appropriate but requires major revisions. Budget items are not sufficiently described or justified or are valued improperly. Alignment of expenditures with project outcomes not fully clear.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Budget is disproportionate to the work proposed or insufficiently described to assess. Budget items not valued appropriately (clearly unrealistic or over- or underestimated) and/or inadequately justified (poorly explained). Budget does not represent good value for money.

Comments:
5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

9. LEVERAGE AND PARTNERSHIPS (see Budget and Team sections of the proposal)
Evaluate the leverage and partnerships: Is the level of partnerships and external support (letters of support, expertise, facilities, equipment, cash, in-kind) adequate? Where appropriate, is there evidence that relevant partners are contributing to the project or will be contacted?

**Note**: While projects do not require matching funding, funding partners show end-user pull/support for a project, which helps build a strong rationale for the research. The appropriate level of leverage funds and partnerships will vary by project depending on the nature of the study. Please focus on the appropriateness of both cash and in-kind leverage and other evidence of end user support for the type of project.

The leverage and partnerships are:
- **Outstanding**: Project significantly exceeds the leveraged funds and/or partnerships expected given the type of research. The funds and partnerships are confirmed by documentation (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support are provided.
- **Very Good**: Project has a high level of leveraged funds and/or partnerships given the type of research. Most stakeholder support is confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support are provided.
- **Good**: Project has the adequate level of leveraged funds and/or partnerships given the type of research. It has some stakeholder support confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support are provided.
- **Sufficient**: Project has nearly adequate level of leveraged funds and/or partnerships. It has limited stakeholder support confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support.
• **Marginal:** Project has limited leveraged funds and/or appropriate partnerships given the type of research. There are no letters of support and/or in-kind contributions. Essential facilities and/or access to equipment may be lacking.

• **Unsatisfactory:** Project does not have adequate levels of leveraged funds and/or appropriate partnerships. It has no industry or stakeholder support or plans for gaining support. Essential facilities and/or access to equipment are lacking.

Comments:
5=Outstanding; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Sufficient; 1=Marginal; 0=Unsatisfactory

10. **OVERALL COMMENTS (not scored)**
Please summarize your overall assessment of the project and any comments you feel will support decision-making. Please provide any feedback you would recommend for the researchers (e.g. conditions of funding if the proposal is funded)

Comments:

TOTAL SCORE:
## PANEL REVIEW SCORECARD: KTT MOBILIZATION PROJECTS

### 1. TEAM
Is the Principal Investigator suited to lead the project? Does the team have the appropriate expertise and experience to meet project objectives? Are roles and responsibilities articulated clearly? Are HQP engaged in the project?

The team is:
- **Outstanding**: PI is a leader in the field. Exceptional expertise from all necessary disciplines represented on the team and the contribution of each member is fully defined and appropriate. Excellent HQP participation.
- **Very Good**: PI is highly regarded in the field or has the potential to be a leader in the field. The team has a proven track record in the proposed subject area and the expertise to successfully complete the mobilization project. Roles and responsibilities are clearly articulated. Very good HQP participation.
- **Good**: PI is appropriate to lead the project. The team has experience in the proposed subject area and mobilization activities. Some revision required, such as additional expertise or better description of team member roles and responsibilities. Good HQP participation.
- **Sufficient**: The PI and team have some experience in the proposed subject area and mobilization activities. Key areas of technical expertise or industry collaboration are deficient. Roles and responsibilities are not well defined. Sufficient HQP participation.
- **Marginal**: The team lacks the breadth of experience in the field(s) outlined in the proposal. Project outcomes may be compromised. Marginal HQP participation.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Significant weakness in team composition. Project outcomes will be compromised as a result. Unsatisfactory HQP participation.

### 2. AUDIENCE
Is the identified audience the appropriate target for the research knowledge? Will the identified audience benefit from the research knowledge? To what extent will this benefit extend to the wider agri-food sector and/or rural communities?

The identified project audience is:
- **Outstanding**: Audience is the clear primary beneficiary of the research knowledge. The audience will benefit from the knowledge and this benefit will likely extend to the wider agri-food sector/rural community.
- **Very Good**: Audience is an appropriate target for the activity. The audience will benefit from the knowledge.
- **Good**: Audience is an adequate fit for the identified research knowledge and should benefit from the information, but may not be the ideal target audience. Some revision to include additional or slightly modified/targeted audience may be required.
- **Sufficient**: Audience may benefit from the research knowledge, but key audiences are missing. Moderate revisions required for project benefits to be fully realized.
- **Marginal**: Audience is vague or not a good target for the research knowledge. As a result, it is unlikely that the full benefits of the knowledge will be realized in this project.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Audience is not a fit for the research knowledge or proposed activity. Significant revisions are required for the project to be effective.

### 3. OBJECTIVES
Are the objectives clear and well developed? Does the project fit within the identified priority area? Are the intended benefits likely to be achieved?
The project objectives are:

- **Outstanding**: Objectives are detailed, realistic and very well developed. All project elements fall within the identified research priority. Anticipated project outcomes and benefits are very likely to be achieved.
- **Very Good**: Clear and detailed description of objectives. All project elements fall within the identified research priority or priorities. Anticipated project outcomes are likely to be achieved.
- **Good**: Objectives are appropriate and fall within the identified research priority but minor deficiencies are observed (e.g. lack of clarity or 1 or 2 project elements out of scope and/or are not in full alignment with the theme identified)
- **Sufficient**: Objectives are reasonable but lack detail, requiring moderate revisions. Project is limited in scope and/or has some elements that do not fall within the identified research priority. Anticipated benefits of the project may not be fully realized.
- **Marginal**: Objectives are vague or not well developed. Many project elements are out of scope and/or marginally fall within the established research priority.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Objectives are vague and poorly developed. Objectives do not fall within the established research theme and the intended benefits of the project are unclear.

4. Research Impact/Benefit (see project description, alignment with OMAFRA priorities, benefits & rationale) (2x weight)

Evaluate the likelihood of this proposal generating a positive impact on the Ontario agri-food sector or rural communities. Is the rationale for the project clearly articulated and is sufficient justification for the project provided (i.e., is the research knowledge being translated and transferred in this project required by the target audience(s))? 

The benefits as presented are:

- **Outstanding**: Project will provide critical new knowledge to the identified audiences. Mobilization of this knowledge is likely to yield significant benefits for the identified user audience(s) and, by extension, Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural community; there is a clear need for the identified research knowledge. Clear, compelling, and realistic descriptions of expected benefits. Applicant provides very strong justification for the project.
- **Very Good**: Project will provide significant, beneficial new knowledge to the identified audience(s), which will contribute to Ontario’s agri-food sector/rural communities. Benefits for the project are realistic and clearly described. Applicant provides strong justification for the project.
- **Good**: Project will provide beneficial new knowledge to the identified audience(s), but other information is more urgently required. The likely benefits are reasonable and the applicant provides good justification for the project.
- **Sufficient**: Project will provide new research knowledge to the identified audience(s), but the need and/or benefit of the identified knowledge is vague or poorly described. The benefits are unclear and require more detail. Applicant provides limited justification for the project.
- **Marginal**: Project will provide little new research knowledge to the identified audience(s) and the need and/or benefit of the identified knowledge is unclear. The benefits are not fully described and project justification is understated or overstated.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Project will not provide any new or useful knowledge to the identified audience(s). Proposed project duplicates existing outreach and/or engagement activities or the identified audiences do not require/already have the identified information.
5. METHODS (milestones, methods and evaluation)

Quality and clarity of activity design and planning: Are the methods clear and described with sufficient detail to determine the course of the project? Do the methods support the project plan (objectives) and are well suited to the identified audience(s)? Are the methods identified likely to lead to the successful completion of project objectives? Can the methods be evaluated within the stated timeframes?

The methods as described are:

- **Outstanding:** Approach is well developed, highly original and/or innovative, and informed by existing KTT scholarship. The methods are suited to the target audience. The evaluation plan is appropriate, realistic and likely to be completed within the project timeframe. Probability of success is very high.

- **Very Good:** Approach is clear, logical, and can be completed within the stated timelines. High probability of success. The intended audience is likely to be reached and evaluation is likely to be achieved within the established timeframes.

- **Good:** Approach is feasible and based on proven methodologies. Some revision and/or additional detail or clarity may be required to reach the intended audience and complete an appropriate evaluation within the established timeframes.

- **Sufficient:** Project may be completed successfully, but there are moderate deficiencies in the description of the proposed methods or likelihood of success is not certain. Moderate revisions are required to reach the intended audience and conduct appropriate evaluation.

- **Marginal:** Approach is not well developed or vague and is unlikely to lead to the planned results or reach the intended audience(s). Evaluation plan is vague or not well developed.

- **Unsatisfactory:** There is insufficient detail to assess the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Approach not well aligned with outcomes and deliverables. Unlikely to reach the intended audience(s). Evaluation plan is not appropriate for the stated activity or cannot be completed within the stated timelines. Unlikely that the project can be completed successfully.

6. DELIVERABLES

Are the deliverables clear, tangible, measurable and achievable within the project timeframe? If fully achieved, will the deliverables result in the outcomes and impact described in the proposal?

The deliverables are:

- **Outstanding:** Deliverables are comprehensive, fully detailed, measurable and clearly achievable. Anticipated outcomes and impact very likely to be achieved.

- **Very Good:** Clear and concise description of project deliverables resulting in tangible outcomes. Anticipated outcomes and impact likely to be achieved.

- **Good:** Deliverables are clear and appropriate but weaknesses observed. Minor revision required to improve clarity and detail or ensure deliverables are tangible.

- **Sufficient:** Deliverables are reasonable but not clearly defined. Moderate revision required to ensure project deliverables are tangible and linked to desired outcomes.

- **Marginal:** Deliverables are not well described or vague and are unlikely to produce the planned results. Major revision required.

- **Unsatisfactory:** Deliverables poorly developed or unrealistic. Project will not result in tangible outcomes.

Comments
7. BUDGET

Is the budget appropriate for the work proposed? Does the amount of funding requested seem appropriate and expenditures linked to the outcomes described? Are all budget items sufficiently described/justified and valued appropriately?

The budget as presented is:

- **Outstanding**: Budget is clear, very well developed and represents great value for money. All items are fully described and justified in the budget notes and valued correctly.
- **Very Good**: Budget is clear, appropriate for the scale of the proposed project and represents good value for money. All items are sufficiently described and justified and valued correctly but may require minor revisions.
- **Good**: Budget is reasonable for the scale of the proposed project but requires moderate revisions (such as additional clarity and justification for items or more appropriate valuation of some budget items).
- **Sufficient**: Budget is acceptable for the scale of the proposed project but requires moderate revisions (such as additional clarity and justification for items or more appropriate valuation of some budget items). Alignment of expenditures with project outcomes not fully clear.
- **Marginal**: Budget is somewhat appropriate but requires major revisions. Budget items are not sufficiently described or justified or are valued improperly. Alignment of expenditures with project outcomes not fully clear.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Budget is disproportionate to the work proposed or insufficiently described to assess. Budget items not valued appropriately (clearly unrealistic or over- or underestimated) and/or inadequately justified (poorly explained). Budget does not represent good value for money.

8. LEVERAGE AND PARTNERSHIPS

Is the level of partnerships and external support (letters of support, expertise, facilities, equipment, cash, in-kind) adequate? Where appropriate, is there evidence that relevant partners are contributing to the project or will be contacted?

Note: The appropriate level of leverage funds and partnerships will vary by project depending on the nature of the mobilization project. Please focus on the appropriateness of both cash and in-kind leverage, as well as letters of support when answering this question. Are the noted contributions and/or partnerships reasonable for a project of this type?

The leverage and partnerships are:

- **Outstanding**: Project significantly exceeds the leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements expected given the type of mobilization project. The funds/partnerships/endorsements are confirmed by documentation.
- **Very Good**: Project has a high level of leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements given the type of mobilization project. Most support is confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support are provided.
- **Good**: Project has the adequate level of leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements given the type of mobilization project. Some support is confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions).
- **Sufficient**: Project has nearly adequate level of leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements. It has limited stakeholder support confirmed (letters of support, in-kind and cash contributions) or plans for gaining such support.
- **Marginal**: Project has limited leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements and there are obvious gaps indicating poor industry/sector interest. There are no letters of support and/or in kind contributions.
- **Unsatisfactory**: Project demonstrates no leveraged funds/partnerships/endorsements indicating poor industry/sector interest. There are no letters of support and/or in kind contributions.

*Feedback and Comments*
Please provide overall comments on the proposal and any feedback you have for the researcher.

*Conditions*
If you recommend this project for funding, do you recommend any conditions of award? (Please note: if you do not recommend this project for funding, please write 'do not recommend').

**OVERALL COMMENTS (not scored)**
Please summarize your overall assessment of the project and any comments you feel will support decision-making. Please provide any feedback you would recommend for the researchers (e.g. conditions of funding if the proposal is funded).