



JUNE 24, 2016

CALL FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

FUNDED BY THE UK DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUPPORTED BY THE EPPI-CENTRE



Department
for International
Development



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
CALL FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS	4
Systematic review questions	4
Role of the EPPI-Centre	4
Systematic review teams	5
review costs	6
CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR COMMISSIONING REVIEW TEAMS	7
SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL	9
MILESTONES AND PAYMENT TERMS	11
APPENDIX 1. FORMAT FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	12
Section A: Introduction	13
Section B: Proposed team	15
Section C: Description of approach and methodology to conduct the review	17
Section D: Project Management and Timeline	19
APPENDIX 2. FORMAT FOR FINANCIAL PROPOSAL	22

INTRODUCTION

The Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre (EPPI-Centre) has been enhancing the policy relevance of systematic reviews since the mid-1990s and with a particular focus on developing country concerns since 2007. Much of this has been done with the Department for International Development (DFID), which leads the UK's work to end extreme poverty and commissions world-class research that directly improves people's lives. The DFID Systematic Review Programme aims to strengthen evidence-informed policy making through the production of high quality and policy relevant evidence synthesis products.

Box 1: Definition of a systematic review

A systematic review is a comprehensive, rigorous and policy relevant synthesis of the evidence base, which includes the following aspects:

- *A structured literature search*
 - *The literature search should be exhaustive and should follow a clear protocol.*
- *Quality appraisal*
 - *The quality of the evidence included should be assessed according to clear criteria.*
- *A synthesis of the evidence base*

A key element of DFID's definition of a systematic review is being 'policy relevant' (Box 1). We consider systematic reviews relevant to policy (and policy makers) when they present, in a clear and timely manner, findings for policy audiences in order to: illuminate policy problems; challenge policy assumptions or develop policy interventions; or offer evidence about the impact or implementation of policy options; and take into account diversity of people and contexts (Oliver and Dickson 2015). Policy relevant systematic reviews present challenges because policy makers tend to ask broad questions which can only be answered by reaching both across and beyond academic disciplines.

This programme is developing methods to integrate knowledge that transcends academic disciplines by combining the interests of the policy and research communities throughout the systematic review process, from setting the question to sharing the findings. It will build on what we have learnt about how systematic reviews are seen from the different worlds of policy and research (Oliver and Dickson 2015). Policy and research teams working with the EPPI-Centre will, together, accrue experience of systematic reviews that reach across and beyond academic disciplines. The methods developed in the course of conducting substantive research will be shared in the academic literature, through policy networks and in guidance for producers of systematic reviews – both funders and systematic reviewers.

CALL FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

This call for systematic reviews should be read alongside the research brief for women's economic empowerment and the terms of reference.

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW QUESTIONS

The EPPI-Centre is now commissioning two systematic reviews for the UK Department of International Development. The aim of the first is to understand what influences women's employment in sectors with high or growing productivity that are male dominated. The aim of the second is to identify the effectiveness and design features of interventions that aim to overcome the barriers to women's participation in those labour markets.

Question 1: ***What are the main barriers to, and facilitators of, women's participation in labour market sectors where participation is low?***

Question 2: ***What are the effectiveness and design features of interventions that aim to overcome the barriers to women's participation in the labour market in higher growth/male-dominated sectors?***

ROLE OF THE EPPI-CENTRE

The EPPI-Centre has worked with DFID policy teams to identify appropriate systematic review questions that align with gaps in the existing evidence important for policy. For each systematic review question the EPPI-Centre will:

- Commission systematic reviews and provide a grant management function.
- Liaise with DFID policy team and the review team to facilitate policy input through discussion and comments on the draft protocol and draft review report.
- Liaise with the DFID Evidence into Action team to (a) invite their comments on the draft protocol and draft review report; and (b) agree approval of the final protocol and final report.
- Assess the training and support needs of selected review groups', and deliver training and bespoke technical assistance to address these.
- Provide a quality assurance function for the selected reviews.
- Provide a project management function, ensuring that reviews are completed to an agreed timeline and reporting back to DFID on progress at agreed milestones.
- Support the communication of review findings.

- Note and discuss with policy and research teams challenges encountered and solutions developed in the course of the review process.

SYSTEMATIC REVIEW TEAMS

Producing policy-relevant systematic reviews raises challenges for working across academic disciplines and with partners beyond academia. Systematic reviews combine: understanding of the topic from direct experience of working in, or potentially affected by, policy or services; understanding of the topic from an academic perspective, how it has been or could be studied; systematic review methods drawing on information science, statistics or qualitative analysis; and project management skills. Therefore, review teams should include:

- Members with sector experience and good familiarity with specific issues covered by the research question;
- Members with experience in conducting systematic reviews (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, data extraction and data analysis);
- An information specialist or experienced librarian to undertake and supervise the searching;
- Members with statistical expertise for quantitative analysis / statistical meta-analysis;
- Members with expertise in qualitative synthesis methods and theory of change analysis.

Depending on the requirement of the review, only quantitative or qualitative expertise may be required. Thus, review teams should propose methods experts depending on the scope of review questions, nature of evidence and proposed methodology.

Applicants are encouraged to collaborate with other competent organisations including academic institutes, research organisations, NGOs and research groups as well with individual researchers, systematic reviewers and sector experts to achieve a high quality team.

In the case of a consortium, contracting will be done with the lead organisation of the consortium, while the lead organisation may have sub-contracting arrangement with collaborating institutes or researchers.

It is important that members of the systematic review team have substantial dedicated time to complete the work. This requirement includes sufficient staff time to ensure systematic searching of the existing literature, the independent double reading of full text articles, data extraction and quality appraisal of included studies, with third party referral in case of disagreement.

Teams should describe in their proposal their relevant links with policy-makers, practitioners and the development community as potential users of their systematic review.

REVIEW COSTS

Applicants are required to quote a price for each intended review separately in the format provided in [Appendix 2](#), the Financial proposal. The price must include any professional fees and other project expenses (including accommodation, travel, subsistence, subscription, cost of dissemination workshop or any other cost in relation to the review) that will be incurred by the review team to carry out the specific systematic review.

The price should be quoted in pound sterling (GBP). The proposed budget for each systematic review **should not normally exceed GBP 70,000 including taxes**. We encourage bidders to suggest a reasonable budget depending on the scope of the review, methods of synthesis to be used and realistic time and costs for the tasks to be done. Value for money should be taken into account while proposing various cost components. In exceptional circumstances, a higher budget may be considered if it is backed by very strong justification of costs in terms of the methodology being proposed.

Review teams should earmark sufficient funds from their proposed budget to cover expenses of conducting a **dissemination workshop**.

The price quoted by the applicant in the Financial proposal should not include costs for **peer review** as this will be arranged by the EPPI-Centre.

Further, as the programme provides free of charge access to information management software for systematic reviews, "EPPI-reviewer", to the selected review teams, applicants are required to provide details regarding any other software that may be required for conducting the research along with the cost, if any, in the financial proposal under "Other Project Expenses".

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR COMMISSIONING REVIEW TEAMS

An evaluation panel for assessing proposals submitted by interested teams will comprise representatives from the EPPI-Centre and DFID. The members of the panel will independently evaluate and score all the proposals. The scores given by each panel member will be averaged to estimate the final score for each bidder. The scores will be used to facilitate a discussion between panel members. All the panel members will use the following evaluation framework to score the proposals:

Criteria	Definition	Sub-components	Score
Quality of review team	Experience, skills and knowledge of the proposed team in the relevant research, policy area and/or in conducting systematic reviews	Experience and track record of Principal Investigator in systematic reviewing and research project management	10
		Team members with skills, experience and knowledge allocated to appropriate roles for conducting the proposed systematic reviews (e.g. topic knowledge, information scientist, statistical analysis)	15
Criteria Sub-Total			25
Capacity to undertake the work	The ability of the proposed team in the relevant systematic review question area and in conducting systematic reviews	Access to relevant systematic review and information management software	5
		Access to knowledge sources (databases and journals) relevant to the systematic review question for identifying relevant primary studies and retrieving information	5
		Clear articulation of timeframe, staff days, linking to deliverables according the proposed proposal	5
Criteria Sub-Total			15
Quality of technical proposal	Use of appropriate review approaches to address the proposed review questions, including search strategy, critical appraisal, data collection and synthesis	Clear understanding of the key principles and objectives of systematic review, aligned with international standards	5
		Use of appropriate methods and evidence to answer the research question; a clear rationale linking the review approach to the desired product	15
		Effective strategy for uptake/ dissemination of research findings and evidence	15
		Clarity and appropriate mechanisms of quality assurance, monitoring and risk assessment	10

<i>Criteria Sub-Total</i>			45
Commercial		Competitiveness and value for money	5
		Clear and effective financial plan and approach linking to outputs and deliverables.	10
<i>Criteria Sub-Total</i>			15
<i>TOTAL</i>			100

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL

As mentioned above, applications are invited for two packages of work:

- Systematic review 1: Understanding what influences women's employment

Question 1: ***What are the main barriers to, and facilitators of, women's participation in labour market sectors where participation is low?***

- Systematic review 2: Intervening to enhance women's employment

Question 2: ***What are the effectiveness and design features of interventions that aim to overcome the barriers to women's participation in the labour market in higher growth/male-dominated sectors?***

Organisations may submit proposals for one OR both packages. Proposals must make clear how they will work to ensure that the two reviews relate well to each other, whether they are conducted by the same or different teams, and whether they are conducted by the same or different organisations. Each proposal must include all the details required in Appendices 1 and 2.

All applicants are expected to submit the proposal in two parts, as following:

- Part A: Technical Proposal in the format provided in Appendix 1
- Part B: Financial Proposal in the format provided in Appendix 2

The acceptable page limit for each section is mentioned with the format.

Both the proposals should be submitted through email to the email address ioe.eppi.systematicreviews@ucl.ac.uk, as two separate documents.

In the subject line of the email, the applicant must mention "Systematic review Q1" or "Systematic review Q2" when submitting the application.

Before submitting the proposal the applicant shall ensure that both the proposals (Technical & Financial) are in "pdf" format and **financial proposal is password protected**. The applicants who score a minimum of 50 marks in the technical evaluation will be shortlisted for financial bid opening and will be requested to submit the password to open the financial bid.

The financial bid submitted by the shortlisted applicant shall be opened using their respective passwords sent to the e-mail address ioe.eppi.systematicreviews@ucl.ac.uk for financial evaluation.

The applicants can send their queries on the call to the EPPI-Centre by 7 July 2016 through mail to the email address ioe.eppi.systematicreviews@ucl.ac.uk. Please mention, “EPPI-Centre Systematic Review call query” in the subject line when asking questions. The responses to the queries will be posted on EPPI-Centre’s website by 14 July 2016.

The EPPI-Centre may choose to ask further clarifying queries to the applicant review teams, if necessary, either by email or telephone.

Please note that the final decision making power regarding the selection and procurement rests with the evaluation panel comprised of members of DFID and the EPPI-Centre.

The timetable for this tender is:

#	Details	Date
1.	Issue of call	Friday 24 June 2016
2.	Last date for receiving pre-bid queries	Thursday 7 July 2016
3.	Date for posting replies to pre-bid queries	Thursday 14 July 2016
4.	Last date for submission of bid	Monday 8 August 2016 17:00 UK time
5.	Opening of technical bid	Tuesday 9 August 2016
6.	Communication to shortlisted bidders for sharing password for financial proposal	Wednesday 24 August 2016
7.	Opening of financial proposal	Thursday 25 August 2016
8.	Communication to preferred bidder(s)	Monday 5 September 2016
9.	Negotiation and Signing of Contract	Approximately 3 weeks from communication to successful bidders
10.	Commencement of Work	Within one week from signing of contract or as may be agreed in contract

Note: If above mentioned schedule undergoes any change due to unforeseen reasons, we will inform applicants about the corresponding changes either through mail or notice on EPPI-Centre’s website.

MILESTONES AND PAYMENT TERMS

The systematic review is expected to be completed **within 15 months** from contract signing to submission of final reports.

Payment for the reviews will be tied to the deliverables that meet agreed timelines and will be given in four tranches, as following:

Milestone/deliverables	Payment Terms
Protocol completed following peer review to be published on EPPI-Centre website	Satisfactory completion of protocol following peer review according to the agreed timeline (30%), as judged by EPPI-Centre and DFID
Draft report submitted for peer review using the DFID template, 12 months after contract signed	Satisfactory completion of draft review according to the agreed timeline (40%), as judged by EPPI-Centre and DFID
Final report: content agreed following responses to peer review	Satisfactory content of final report (15%), as judged by EPPI-Centre and DFID
Final report published and dissemination activities initiated	Satisfactory presentation of final report and dissemination plan according to the agreed timeline (15%) 5% of the contract budget is dependent on timely completion of outputs and invoicing throughout. This payment will only be withheld when failure to achieve the agreed milestones is the sole responsibility of the Research Team.

Appendix 1. Format for Technical Proposal

Proposals will include four sections:

SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

Section B: Proposed team

Section C: Description of Approach and Methodology to Conduct the Review

Section D: Project Management and Timeline

SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

(Maximum of four pages for this section)

- I. **Title of Proposed Review:** *(as mentioned in the call)*
- II. **Propose Start and End date:** Teams should aim to start work shortly after signing the contract; please mention proposed timelines for the review:
Proposed start date: (MM/YYYY) Proposed end date: (MM/YYYY)
Contract duration will be ___ months.
- III. **About Your Organisation/ consortium:** *(Please provide following information about your organisation / consortium)*
 - A. Name of the organisation / lead member (in case of consortium):
 - B. Type of organisation *(Academic institute, NGO, research organisation etc.):*
 - C. Constitution / Legal Status: (Company/Society/Firm /any other form of entity to be mentioned in details):
 - D. Registered office address of the organisation:
 - E. Name & contact details of the key contact person/ authorised representative:
(Please note that all key correspondence related to this application will only be sent to this person)
 - F. Type of applicant (Single organisation / Consortium / Lead organisation with individual sub-contractors):
 - G. Name & location of other consortium members (if any):
- IV. **Experience of your organisation / consortium:** (Please provide a brief summary of experience of your organisation / consortium in conducting systematic review in general and for sectors to be studied.
- V. **Policy engagement:** (Briefly describe your contacts and network with policy makers, practitioners and development community and past experience of disseminating research findings & results to them)
- VI. **Access to databases:** Please confirm whether your organisation / consortium has access to following databases, and list additional databases that your organisation / consortium has access to.

#	Databases (not providing open access)	Whether your organisation / consortium has access (Y/ N)
1.	JSTOR- www.jstor.org/	
2.	ASSIA: Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts http://www.proquest.com/products-services/ASSIA-Applied-Social-Sciences-Index-and-Abstracts.html	
3.	Emerald Insight- http://www.emeraldinsight.com/	
4.	Sociological Abstracts: http://www.proquest.com/products-services/socioabs-set-c.html	
5.	EconLit- https://www.ebscohost.com/academic/econlit	
6.	American Economic Association: https://www.aeaweb.org/econlit/	
7.	Scopus http://www.scopus.com/	
8.	Web of Science- webofknowledge.com/	
9.	PsycINFO- www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycinfo/	
10.	Wiley Online library - http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/	
11.	International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) http://www.proquest.com/libraries/academic/databases/ibss-set-c.html	
12.	Other databases that your organisation / consortium has access to which are relevant to the review question: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • • • 	

SECTION B: PROPOSED TEAM

I. Review Team members

Please indicate names of all team members, their role and proposed tasks in the review, current job title and name of the employer organisation or specify independent researcher as appropriate and their input days. Please use the table given below to provide this information:

Title	Name	Role in the review	Tasks assigned for the review	Current job title & employer organisation	No. of Days
Dr. / Prof./ Ms. / Mr.	Xxx	<i>E.g. Principal Investigator; Information scientist; research assistant etc.</i>	<i>E.g. leading the review; guiding team on research methodology; coordinating with team members & with client; etc.</i>	<i>E.g. Lecturer of development studies with abc university</i>	<i>e.g. 90 days</i>

II. Declaration of competing interests:

Are you aware of any interests arising from research, financial or personal reasons which might reasonably lead to biases in your work? **Yes/No**

If **yes**, list these here alongside any primary studies of relevance for the review to which you have contributed.

III. Please provide here, **CVs of all the proposed team members and advisory group members in the following format.** (a CV should not exceed 4 pages)

1. Personal details:

Name:

Date of Birth:

Nationality:

Country of residence:

2. Education and relevant trainings:

3. Employment record/ Posts held:

#	Name of the employing organisation	Position held	From (MM/YY)	To (MM/YY)

4. Do you have any systematic review experience or have attended any systematic review trainings? (Yes / No). *If yes, please provide brief summary about each review including its start and end date / training content and training providers.*

5. Experience in primary and secondary research, particularly in sectors to be studied: *(Please provide a brief summary about each study / project or future commitments including its start date and end date):*

6. Experience in qualitative and/or quantitative analysis *(Please provide a brief summary of each project / study or future commitments including its start date and end date):*

7. Projects and Publications related to the research theme:

8. Experience in managing research projects *(applicable only for the CV of team leader/ principal investigator)*

9. Experience of conducting systematic searches of existing studies and literature for primary and / or secondary researches: *(applicable only for the information scientist / librarian) (Please provide a brief summary of each project / study including its start date and end date):*

SECTION C: DESCRIPTION OF APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY TO CONDUCT THE REVIEW

(Write-up for this section should not exceed 4 pages)

I. Background to the Project – *(Please provide write-up on below mentioned sub-sections)*

- A. **Policy Issue(s)** – Provide a brief outline of the policy or implementation issue(s) that this systematic review will address
- B. **Existing Evidence** – Indicate the state of existing evidence on this topic including any existing systematic reviews and some relevant primary studies. (Bidders are encouraged to mention 3-5 empirical studies that they could include in the review)

II. Understanding of the research theme - *(Please provide write-up on following sub-sections)*

- A. **Research question & review scope:** Based on your understanding and experience of the research theme, provide your comments on the research question and scope included in the call (see appendix ADD).
- B. **Possible challenges** - Please describe any challenges this systematic review may encounter including issues of the likely evidence available.

III. Review Methods- *(Indicate how the review will be undertaken, using the following headings)*

- A. **Search methodology** - Describe your proposed search strategy for identifying published and unpublished studies, which are likely to include, but are not limited to, the following sources:
 - Electronic sources (e.g., database, e-library, internet)
 - Print sources (e.g., journals, library shelves, hand search)
 - Grey literature (e.g., databases, conference proceedings, research funders)
 - Reference snowballing from published and unpublished literature
- B. **Determining the quality of studies:** Describe how the quality of the quantitative and qualitative studies to be included in the review will be assessed.
- C. **Data extraction and critical appraisal** - Describe how the data from primary studies will be coded, extracted and reconciled.

D. Analysis- Describe how quantitative and qualitative data (if applicable) will be analysed and synthesised

E. Report Writing - Describe a report-writing plan, including contributions of participating team members, the section(s) of the report in which they will be involved, and the approach for communicating findings in a user-friendly manner (e.g. summary of findings, shorter version of the report).

IV. Dissemination plan and user engagement – Provide a brief dissemination plan, explaining (1) potential end users of the review findings; (2) how to involve and inform potential end users of the review questions, progress and findings (through publications, participating in seminars, conference etc.); (3) identifying online and print media platforms for publishing research summary and abstracts; and (4) plan for organising dissemination workshop.

SECTION D: PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND TIMELINE

I. Accountability arrangement - Indicate the following:

- The accountability arrangements for the team (who is coordinating the work and who will report to whom)
- The arrangements for team meetings

II. Timetable – Below is the indicative timetable & schedule of deliverables for the review. If required, bidding teams can change the schedule of activities leading to deliverables. However the schedule of deliverables should not be changed.

TABLE 1: FORMAT FOR TIMETABLE OF THE REVIEW

Tasks	Description	Start date	End date	Duration (weeks)
Title Registration	Selected teams will register their reviews with the EPPI-Centre. The team is allowed around 2 weeks to complete the process after contract signing.	3 Oct 2016	17 Oct 2016	2 weeks
Preparation of Protocol	<p>Protocol preparation will start simultaneously with title registration.</p> <p>The protocol will include- (1) Background, (2) Aims and rationale for review, (3) Definitional and conceptual issues, (4) Objectives of the systematic review; (5) Conceptual framework; (6) Methods for identifying and briefly describing studies to assess the literature available.</p> <p>Teams will consult advisory group members while preparing the protocol and / or will take their feedback on the draft protocol before submitting it for review.</p>	3 Oct 2016	9 Dec 2016	10 weeks
Scoping of literature	A scoping of the literature will include: (1) details of the systematic search strategy; (2) a record of the search strategy implemented so far; (3) an initial analysis of the topic focus and study designs identified so far. The analysis can be presented as a series of tables or PowerPoint file, sufficiently detailed to	3 Oct 2016	9 Dec 2016	10 weeks

Tasks	Description	Start date	End date	Duration (weeks)
	inform a discussion and decision about the most productive focus for subsequent review activity to complete the contract.			
Full Protocol Review & revision	The full protocol will be reviewed by the EPPI-Centre (2 weeks) and DFID (1 week); Teams will revise the protocol for EPPI-Centre comments in 2 weeks and for DFID's comments in 1 week.	12 Dec 2016	27 Jan 2017	6 weeks
Data extraction	Relevant data and information will be extracted from selected studies using data extraction sheets;			
Appraisal	Appraisal determines how much weight is placed on the evidence of each study included in the final synthesis. The three key components to critical appraisal are (1) the study's relevance to the review question, (2) the appropriateness of its methods in the context of the review, and (3) the quality of the execution of these methods.			
Synthesis	It is the process of integrating the findings from the included studies to answer the review question. It involves examining the available data, looking for patterns and interpreting them. Synthesis may involve qualitative or quantitative analysis or both. At this stage, team will draw key findings and conclusions.			
Preparation of draft report and summary	The report will include (1) Structured abstract (background, methods, results, conclusions); (2) Executive summary; (3) Background; (4) Objectives; (5) Methods; (6) Search results; (7) Details of included studies; (8) Synthesis results; (9) Limitations; (10) Conclusions and recommendations; (11) References (included studies and studies excluded when inspecting full reports). The systematic review report will also include a section on contextualisation and policy		2 Oct 2017	12 months after contract signed

Tasks	Description	Start date	End date	Duration (weeks)
	relevant implications of findings. Teams will consult advisory group members while preparing the systematic review report and / or will take feedback from advisory group on draft report and summary before submitting it for review.			
Review and revision of draft systematic review report and summary	Draft report will be reviewed by first by EPPI-Centre and DfID (4 weeks); Teams will revise report for Peer reviewer's comments in 3 weeks	2 Oct 2017	17 Nov 2017	7 weeks
Dissemination	Organising dissemination workshop, stakeholder engagement			By 2 Oct 2017
Finalising systematic review report	Copy editing and formatting in the final report for publication		8 Dec 2017	3 weeks

Note: Tasks in the timelines may overlap.

TABLE 2: FORMAT FOR SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Due date (dd/mm/yyyy)
Title registered	17 October 2016
Draft protocol including a scoping report	9 December 2016
Training need assessment form	On registration, and as requested throughout
Final protocol and Feedback document (recording feedback received and changes made to draft protocol)	27 January 2017
Draft systematic review and summary	2 October 2017
Final report with systematic review summary, and Feedback document; completion of dissemination activities including dissemination workshop	8 December 2017

Appendix 2. Format for Financial Proposal

(On letterhead of the applicant / Lead Organisation (in case of Consortium))

Date:

Dr. Mukdarut Bangpan,
Programme Manager
EPPI-Centre, UCL Institute of Education

Subject: Financial bid for Systematic review titled “.....”

Dear Dr Bangpan,

In response to your Request for Proposal, we offer to conduct the systematic review on the above-mentioned topic. Our financial proposal for the project is given as below;

Components	Amount (GBP)
<i>Total Professional Fees (Refer Table-F1)</i>	
<i>Total Project Expenses (Refer Table-F2)</i>	
Total Fees (including 20% VAT, where applicable)	

This quoted price covers personnel cost (professional fees, honorarium, etc.) and project expenses including accommodation, airfare, subsistence, equipment, subscription, cost of dissemination workshop or any other cost in relation to the project. The above quote is including 20% tax, if applicable.

This financial proposal shall be binding upon us subject to any modifications resulting from negotiations.

Signature of authorised signatory of lead organisation

Name and designation of authorised signatory

Table-F1: Personnel Input and Fees:

Applicants are required to present breakdown of personnel fees using the following format.

Sl. No.	Name	Proposed position	Input Days	Daily Fee Rate (GBP)	Amount (GBP)
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
Total Professional Fees (Personnel Cost): (A)					

Table-F2: Project Expenses (Consolidated)

Applicants are required to present breakdown of project expenses using the following format

(Note: Travel and accommodation expenses relating to dissemination workshop should be presented in **Table F2.a**)

Particulars	No	Unit Rate	Cost (GBP)
TRAVEL			
Air Fare			
<i>Person A (travelling from x to y location, economy airfare)</i>			
-			
-			
Other travel costs (specify)			
Vehicle Rental for Local Travel			
Sub Total			
SUBSISTENCE person/days			
<i>Person A (stay in y location)</i>			
-			
Sub Total			

Particulars	No	Unit Rate	Cost (GBP)
ACCOMMODATION person/days			
<i>Person A (stay in y location)</i>			
-			
Sub Total			
OTHER Expenses			
Workshop expenses (details in table F2.a)			
Any other project expenses (specify below)			
-			
-			
Sub Total			
Total Project Expenses (B):			

Table-F2.a: Workshop Expenses

Applicants are required to present breakdown of workshop expenses using the following format.

Particulars	No	Unit Rate	Cost (GBP)
TRAVEL			
Air Fare			
<i>Person A (travelling from x to y location, economy airfare)</i>			
-			
-			
Other travel costs, if any (specify)			
Vehicle Rental for Local Travel			
Sub Total			
ACCOMMODATION person/days			
<i>Person A (stay in y location)</i>			
-			

			Sub Total
Venue			
Food and beverage during workshop			
Stationary			
Other expenses (please specify)			
-			
Total Expenses:			

Notes

1. Travel, subsistence and accommodation cost relating to project activities (other than dissemination workshop) should be included in table-F2. Travel and accommodation cost relating to dissemination workshop should be included in table-F2.a.
2. Unit prices should be quoted for such items as airfares (stating the class of fare envisaged), subsistence, accommodation and local transport.