

Rules for Preparation, Submission and Selection of Global Components Proposals

Preparation

- Consortia of international participants are encouraged to prepare proposals, which should be submitted by the coordinating participant.
- Participant is used to define both institutions and individuals.
- Proposers should bear in mind the budget and time frame target guidelines reported in the Request for Proposals when preparing their proposal.
- Proposals should be word-processed using a computer, character size 11 pt minimum.

Submission format and procedures

- A. Proposal: The description of the proposed research shall consist of the following parts, with text and figures of **15 pages maximum**, exclusive of budget tables and participant CVs:
- 1) Abstract. The abstract shall be no longer than one single-spaced page.
 - 2) State-of-the-art. Discuss the state-of-the-art and how this project will result in data or analyses that will significantly improve upon its predecessors.
 - 3) Project plan. Discuss the specific hypotheses or research questions, the conceptual framework or model to be used, as well as the data collection and analysis plans, and continuing efforts that will be implemented to address the Request for Proposals.
 - 4) Final report and dissemination. GEM considers dissemination of research data and results to potential users to be an integral aspect of projects it funds. Beyond the requirements for a final technical report, describe your plan for dissemination of project data and results and the planned users of those results that will result in the greatest possible benefit to earthquake risk mitigation.
 - 5) Project personnel and bibliography of directly related work. Provide one-page curriculum vitae as an annex to the proposal for the professional staff, summarizing education, experience, and the last five years' bibliographic information related to the proposed work. Curriculum vitae for post-doctoral researchers, who contribute significantly to the project, should also be included.
 - 6) Institutional qualifications. If relevant, you may state the resources available at the institutions where work will be carried out.
- B. Detailed Budget. The detailed budget must include the amount proposed for each of the following items in this order:
- 1) Salaries. Identify estimated months of time, and the rate of compensation proposed for each person with a role in the project. In general, salaries of permanent staff cannot be supported except in special cases, but stipends of students, post-Docs, emeritus scientists, and technicians can be included. Tuition remission and other forms of compensation paid as, or in lieu of, wages to students performing necessary work are allowable.
 - 2) Equipment, consumables and supplies. Provide the cost of equipment necessary for achieving the objectives of the project in excess of €2,000 or more per item.
 - 3) Travel. State the purpose of the trip and summarize estimated travel costs and the number of trips required, the destinations, the number of people traveling. This could include workshop travel for consortium members or travel to countries to perform work.
 - 4) Other direct costs. Itemize the different types of costs not included elsewhere.
 - 5) Total direct costs.
 - 6) Indirect costs. Indirect costs are fixed as maximum 20% of the direct costs
 - 7) External consultancy costs. Note that overheads cannot be claimed for external consultancy costs.
 - 8) Total project cost.
- C. Budget, resources and deliverables tables: Please prepare the following tables:
- 1) Resources Breakdown by Participant
 - 2) Resources Breakdown by Task
 - 3) List of Deliverables
 - 4) Budget Summary by Participant
 - 5) Total Budget Summary

Table 1: Resources Breakdown by Participant

Please indicate in the table the number of person months over the whole duration of the planned work, for each identified Task, for each participant. Identify the Task leader by showing the relevant person-month figure in bold.

Participant Name	Task 1	Task 2	...	Total Person Months
Participant 1				
...				

Table 2: Resources Breakdown by Task

Task No.	Task Title	Lead Participant	Start Month	End Month	Total Person Months
1					
2					
...					

Table 3: List of Deliverables

Deliverable No.	Deliverable Title	Task No.	Total Person Months	Delivery Date (Month)
1				
2				
...				

Table 4: Budget Summary by Participant

Please fill in the table below for each participant in the consortium.

Cost Category	First Year	Second Year ¹	Total
1. Salaries and Wages (by role/individual)	€	€	€
Total Salaries and Wages	€	€	€
2. Equipment, Consumables and Supplies	€	€	€
3. Travel	€	€	€
4. Other Direct Costs	€	€	€
5. Total Direct Costs (items 1-4)	€	€	€
6. Indirect Costs	€	€	€
7. External Consultancy Costs	€	€	€
8. Total Participant Costs (5-7)	€	€	€

¹Add year columns as appropriate

Table 5: Total Budget Summary

Cost Category	First Year	Second Year¹	Total
1. Salaries and Wages	€	€	€
2. Equipment, Consumables and Supplies	€	€	€
3. Travel	€	€	€
4. Other Direct Costs	€	€	€
5. Total Direct Costs (items 1-4)	€	€	€
6. Indirect Costs	€	€	€
7. External Consultancy Costs	€	€	€
8. Total Project Costs (5-7)	€	€	€

¹ Add year columns as appropriate

Submission

Proposals should be sent as a .pdf by midnight CET on the day of the deadline to 'secretariat@globalquakemodel.org'. All proposers will receive an acknowledgement of receipt.

Selection

The Secretariat receives and compiles all proposals submitted to each global component RfP and the Secretary General sends them to the members of the Scientific Board who review the documents and suggest a number of peer reviewers for each global component. The members of the Governing Board (in particular the associate participants) may also be asked to suggest peer reviewers. The Secretariat checks that there is no conflict of interest with the proposed peer reviewers and at least 2 peer reviewers are selected to review the proposals for each global component.

The Secretary General contacts each peer reviewer separately, sends them the RfP, and invites them to review the proposals for this global component. Following a positive answer, the proposals in that category are sent to the reviewer. The reviewer is requested to submit within 2 months a short report (e.g. 1-2 pages per proposal) scoring, in relative fashion, the proposals on the following aspects:

- Scientific and/or technological excellence (i.e. relevance to the topics of the call, progress beyond the state-of-the-art, quality and effectiveness of the work plan, potential for successful delivery of envisaged results)
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management (i.e. appropriateness of the proposed consortium structure and procedures, quality and relevant experience of the individual participants, quality/complementarity of the consortium as a whole).

The scores should be in the range 0-5 (half marks may be given), with the following meanings:

0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information

1 - Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4 - Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Short qualitative comments accompanying the quantitative scores on each of the two categories highlighted are also requested. Review reports should then be submitted to 'secretariat@globalquakemodel.org'.

Once the Secretariat has received all reviews for the global components they are sent to the members of the Scientific Board who are requested to review both the proposals and the reviews, and produce a summary report. The level of detail of this report will depend on the area of expertise of the Scientific Board member, but all reports are expected to provide general comments on the organisation of the consortium, their management strategy and whether they can be expected to provide the requested results on time etc.

The Secretariat combines the summary reports from each Scientific Board member into a single report with recommendations on the proposals that should be selected. Following approval by the Scientific Board, this report is then submitted to the Governing Board who takes a final decision on the proposals. All of the consortia are then notified in writing of the decision and receive a summary document with the reviews.

The GEM Scientific Board may request modifications to the proposal plans, deliverables, budget, or timeline of the selected proposals following the selection process.