

Coordinated by:



In partnership with:



# Private Enterprise Development in Low-Income Countries

**A CEPR / DFID Research Initiative**

**GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS**

**2017-2020**

# Contents

<b>1 About PEDL</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1 Purpose and Objectives . . . . .	2
1.2 Scope/Research Themes . . . . .	2
<b>2 Major Grants - Funding Programme</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Summary . . . . .	4
2.2 Eligibility . . . . .	4
2.3 The Application Process . . . . .	5
2.3.1 The Proposal . . . . .	5
2.3.2 Documentation . . . . .	5
2.4 Submitting your Proposal . . . . .	6
<b>3 The Evaluation Committee (EC)</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1 Redressed Procedures . . . . .	6
<b>4 Evaluation Process</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Evaluation of the Proposals . . . . .	7
4.2 Stages of Evaluation . . . . .	7
4.3 Evaluation Criteria . . . . .	8
<b>5 Timeline</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6 Successful Applicants</b>	<b>9</b>

# 1 About PEDL

## 1.1 Purpose and Objectives

Private Enterprise Development in Low Income Countries (PEDL) is a joint research initiative of CEPR and DFID. Launched in November 2011, PEDL is pursuing a research agenda focusing on private-sector development. The agenda starts from the need to develop a better understanding of what determines the strength of market forces driving efficiency in LICs. Existing research suggests that the private firms in these countries face a multitude of constraints, which interact with one another. For example, the strategic interaction of firms with market power will be affected by the regulatory regime governing both new entrants and incumbent firms. What is needed is research that allows us to understand how these constraints interact. PEDL's mission is to encourage and support high-quality research on firm growth which is applicable to policy in LICs.

In early 2012 PEDL launched a competitive research grants programme, a mixture of substantial 'Major' research grants (MRGs) and smaller 'Exploratory' grants (ERGs). Grants are awarded on a competitive basis, with applications solicited from researchers throughout the world. Since the number of grants and their amounts are significant, PEDL has devoted substantial resources to the evaluation, selection and oversight of these grants. Between May 2012 and July 2017 PEDL awarded 133 Exploratory Research Grants and 29 Major Research Grants.

The goal of the research programme is to influence policy in LICs. Researchers will be responsible for developing a Policy Impact Plan, which must be included as part of the research proposal. The quality and feasibility of the Plan will be one of the criteria used to evaluate the proposal. *Please see proposal guidelines below for more information.*

## 1.2 Scope/Research Themes

It is impossible for large numbers of people to be lifted out of poverty without sustained growth, and impossible for a country to experience sustained growth without a vibrant private sector. Each underdeveloped private sector is underdeveloped in its own way. Some dysfunctional domestic private sectors coexist with dynamic export sectors. Some are in countries which are conflict ridden or prone to natural disasters. Some lack small and medium-sized enterprises, while others have dynamic small firms which fail to grow into larger firms. A research programme which can inform policies for private sector development must therefore address a variety of issues and incorporate a variety of approaches.

The Initiative will therefore pursue a range of approaches that promise to produce credible research results that will be useful for policy-making, supporting research related to private enterprises of all sizes. PEDL will initially focus on four research themes:

- **Market frictions, management and organizations** - Well-functioning markets provide discipline for entrepreneurs, managers and investors. Competition increases incentives for efficiency and for innovation. But markets in LICs often do not function well. Weak institutions, missing information, and concentrated markets limit competitive pressure. Firms are often unwilling or unable to switch trading partners, undermining incentives. Projects in this area might explore market micro-structure, organisation of production within firms. Projects that create new data useful to other researchers are especially encouraged.
- **Trade and macro models - agglomeration and spatial location of firms** - Few countries have enjoyed long periods of sustained growth without an active foreign trade sector. Evidence suggests that exporters play a role in aggregate growth which is disproportionate to their share in output. First, exporters are a conduit for knowledge transfers that may (to varying degrees) spill over to the rest of the economy. Because export markets are highly competitive they provide very strong incentives for productivity improvements; because foreign consumers often have a higher willingness to pay for quality, exporters also

face stronger incentives to upgrade both capital and labour used in production. The focus on foreign trade overlaps in important ways with a focus on location of firms are workers more generally.

- **High growth entrepreneurship** - A majority of the labour force in LICs works in firms with fewer than five workers. But we know from both cross-country and time-series evidence that the process of development is associated with a decrease in the share of the labour force that is self-employed and an increase in average firm size. Most small scale entrepreneurs in LICs are motivated by subsistence, with little interest in or prospect for sustained growth. Policies that help raise income of subsistence entrepreneurs will not be appropriate for more dynamic entrepreneurs. We need both tools for selecting entrepreneurs with more potential for growth and policies designed to help those entrepreneurs grow.
- **Social compliance and the environment** - Creation of wage jobs is an important outcome of a healthy private sector. But creation of desirable wage jobs should be the goal: jobs that are fairly remunerated with safe working conditions. There is evidence that export-oriented firms pay a wage premium in many countries. But by itself, the wage premium may not make factory jobs desirable. Turnover rates are often very high, especially among new factory workers. In export sectors, we need to understand how demands for social compliance are reflected through brands to local producers in LICs. A further question is how social compliance interacts with productivity. Moreover, certain types of workers - women and minorities, for example - often face a more hostile working environment.

PEDL will give particular encouragement to proposals which address cross-cutting issues such as:

- *Gender* - In Africa and south Asia, women are more likely to own businesses than to be wage workers, while the opposite is true for men. (See Figure 1 in Hallward-Driemeier, 2011.) At a global level, gender employment and wage gaps have closed somewhat over the past several decades. But reviewing evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa, Hallward-Driemeier (2011) notes that female entrepreneurs are “disproportionately found in smaller firms, in the informal sector, and in lower-value-added industries (page 67).” The explanations for this are both numerous and varied. Differences in human capital, disproportionate shares of household responsibilities, access to capital, land rights, and access to formal institutions such as courts all play a role in some settings, but some part of the gap appears to come from differences in policies related to access to formal institutions. While gender differences are sometimes the outcome of interest, they are almost always relevant even when they are not. Making gender a cross-cutting theme recognizes this fact. We seek to encourage researchers to take gender into account in every project. In this regard, the first phase of PEDL was successful in generating a large number of high-quality proposals in which gender was a serious consideration.
- *Fragile and Conflict-Affected States* - An increasing share of the world's poor are found in fragile or conflict-affected states. Many of the largest low-income but stable countries have experienced rapid growth in the past two decades, lifting them to lower-middle income status. But private sector development is particularly challenging where the state is fragile or conflict is common. Trust between potential trading partners is particularly difficult to maintain, as formal enforcement of agreements is undermined by the weak state, and the ability to honour agreements is compromised by unpredictable outbreaks of violence. Existing literature suggests that there is a complex relationship between growth and conflict in fragile states. (See, for example, Dube and Vargas (2010), which shows that increases in coffee (oil) prices led to decreases (increases) in the intensity of civil conflicts in Colombia.) Given the increasing relevance of conflict-affected areas as home to the world's poorest, we seek to encourage work in fragile states.
- *Unlocking Data* - A key to drawing new researchers into topics of private sector development in LICs is making relevant data more widely available. Of course, the data generated by any project must be made available to other researchers to the extent allowed by confidentiality or purchase agreements. But data generated by projects are not all equal in this regard. Where researchers can make a case that the data generated by their project is likely to be of particular interest to other researchers, we will consider

providing additional funding to allow the researchers to make the data more accessible to the research community. The past few decades have seen a much steeper fall in the cost of collecting data than the cost of analysing data. Those circumstances provide an opportunity for researchers. Governments and private firms may be willing to share data in return for providing analysis which is useful to the government agency or firm. A key is making these data more widely available. This may be accomplished by anonymising in a straightforward way or through creation of secure data centres where the capability exists and the circumstances merit. Examples include administrative data from government agencies, industry associations, or private firms. Making these data available leverages the effort or connections of the initial research team to generate additional research by scholars who would otherwise be unable to access the data. We view this as having potential to increase the size of the research community engaged in work on private sector development.

For more information, please read the Overview of the [PEDL Project Research Agenda 2017-20](#).

## 2 Major Grants - Funding Programme

This Guide for Applicants applies to the Call for Proposals for the 5<sup>th</sup> round of Major Grant submissions.

### 2.1 Summary

In this round we plan to award at least 5 Major Grant awards, with an average grant size of £300,000. Note however that whilst there is a lower limit of £100,000 for each Major Grant, there is no upper limit. Cost effectiveness and value for money will also be important evaluation criteria. Major Grant awards will fund teaching buyouts, or relevant remuneration practices, for the Principal Investigator (PI), Lead Scientists from partner institutions, research assistants, travel costs, data collection and new surveys in low-income countries. Major Grants will be awarded to projects for twenty-four or thirty-six months of duration. A researcher may be named as the Principal Investigator in only one proposal in each round. They will require the submission of a substantial proposal, which should follow the template provided. Upon submission, the proposal will be evaluated through a three-stage procedure, discussed in more details in Section 3.

### 2.2 Eligibility

Proposals may be submitted by “eligible” institutions and organisations. An eligible institution is one that:

- Is a legally registered entity in its home country;
- Is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not entered into an arrangement with creditors, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, and is not in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- Has not been convicted by a judgement for fraud, corruption, involvement in criminal organizations or any other criminal activity or breach of relevant law;
- Has fulfilled its tax obligations, obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or obligations relating to the treatment of employees.

Joint proposals from consortia of institutions will be considered provided that they have an appropriate legal arrangement via an MOU or sub-contractual agreements between parties, with only one lead institution and

one Principal Investigator<sup>1</sup>.

Individual researchers might wish to apply for a Major Grant without being obliged to choose their home university as the host institution. In some (exceptional) circumstances it may also be appropriate for CEPR to administer the project on behalf of the researcher, i.e., for CEPR to act as the host institution - for example, where a host institution is unable to satisfy the necessary eligibility and/or evaluation criteria, whilst the researchers' credentials and expertise are considered of sufficiently high quality to undertake the research.

## 2.3 The Application Process

### 2.3.1 The Proposal

To apply for a Major Grant, your proposal should include the following information:

- A short summary of the proposal (max. 3 pages, excluding references and appendix), outlining the aims of the proposed research, the methodology that will be employed and the policy impact - see [Summary Proposal Template - Annex I](#);
- A full scientific proposal (max. 15 pages, excluding references and appendix) - see [Proposal Template, Annex II](#);
- CV of the Principal Investigator, referencing in particular similar projects led by the applicant (max 1-2 pages with relevant publications);
- CVs of Lead Scientist of Partner Institutions (max 1-2 pages with relevant publications);
- A detailed budget - see [Budget Template, Annex III](#).

Proposals (including all supporting documents) must be submitted in English. Where any required supporting document cannot be obtained in English, a translation verified and approved by an official authority must be submitted.

Proposals (including all supporting documents) must be submitted in English. Where any required supporting document cannot be obtained in English, a translation verified and approved by an official authority must be submitted.

All financial information contained in the proposed budget must be expressed in pounds sterling. Awards will be specified and grant payments will be made in pounds sterling.

### 2.3.2 Documentation

The hard copies of following documents must be provided for every application:

Coordinating Institution eligibility:

- Legal status (excerpt from commercial register for private companies only)
- Declaration of Eligibility Coordinating Institution administrative information:
- Financial Identification Form (including a copy of the most recent bank statement and a copy of the most recent certified accounts)
- Legal Representative Form

---

<sup>1</sup> Partners will be expected to sign a Consortium Agreement before the start of the project. CEPR is not a party to Consortium Agreements and does not establish the terms and conditions of such Agreements.

Please send these documents by post to:

The PEDL Programme Team  
Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR)  
2nd Floor, 33 Great Sutton Street  
London EC1V 0DX  
United Kingdom

Administrative, financial and legal documents submitted as part of a proposal may be passed to external advisors by the PEDL Programme Team for verification. Candidates will be deemed to give their consent for such transmission and external verification.

All costs incurred by the applicant in the course of the submission process/application procedure must be borne by the applicant. PEDL will not provide financial assistance to applicants.

All necessary documents for your proposal can be found on the PEDL website once you are logged in [here](#).

## 2.4 Submitting your Proposal

All Proposals must be submitted online through [the PEDL website](#). To do so, you must create a PEDL account. You must be logged in before you are able to access the online submission form. A proposal becomes final once you have clicked on the “Please submit my application” button. Only final proposals should be submitted. For help with the online application process, please see this [page](#). In [Annex IV](#), we have included a Checklist to help ensure that your submission is complete.

Deadlines will be specified in the calls for proposal. All administrative documentation as described in 2.3.2 above must be submitted by post. The deadline will be met provided all proposal documents are uploaded and the “Submit” button clicked on the relevant web page before the expiry of the deadline and all accompanying administrative documents are post-marked on or before the submission deadline. If either of these two requirements is not met, your proposal will not be considered. An electronic email receipt will be generated for every submitted proposal and will serve as proof of submission. All information submitted must be complete. Incomplete proposals, with missing or false information or documents containing misrepresentations of facts will be rejected.

Resubmissions will take place via invitation only. If you are invited to resubmit your proposal, revised proposals can be resubmitted in any future round. During resubmissions you must specify that the proposal is a resubmission by checking a tick box under “Resubmission” in Step 1 of the online application form, and include details of the changes made to your proposal in the “Resubmission Details” text box.

## 3 The Evaluation Committee (EC)

The Evaluation Committee (EC) will be jointly appointed by CEPR and DFID and consist of ten international specialists. The composition of the EC will be a mix of northern and southern individuals with a background in academia and policy/practice, with the aim of having at least two members who are policymakers with a background in research. We suggest ten members because of the Conflict of Interest provisions, which require that EC members step down in a round if they are involved in an application during that round.

### 3.1 Redressed Procedures

Researchers whose proposals are rejected in either stage one or stage two may appeal the decision to the PEDL Management Committee.

## 4 Evaluation Process

### 4.1 Evaluation of the Proposals

Procedures for evaluating and selecting research proposals are modelled on current best practice, as exemplified by the European Research Council (ERC). However, the criteria for the selection of projects in PEDL are more complex, since policy relevance and the potential for policy uptake are also highly relevant considerations.

The selection of proposals for funding by PEDL will be based on peer review evaluation. PEDL will use a system in which a panel of scientists and policymakers make recommendations for funding either autonomously or based on the recommendations of specialists external to the Evaluation Committee (EC) (referees).

### 4.2 Stages of Evaluation

PEDL will use the same evaluation process adopted by the ERC: a single submission of the proposed research, followed by a three-stage evaluation process. Each submission will contain both a short (three-page) and a full (fifteen-page) version of the research proposal:

1. All proposals are checked by CEPR for completeness and the supporting documentation is verified. Proposals that are not complete or cannot be verified are rejected as ineligible at this state.
2. All eligible proposals are sent to DFID for comment and to EC members and an external referee for review. The initial review is based on the Summary Proposal and the CV of the Principal Investigator. DFID will evaluate the proposal based on its fit with the PEDL themes and countries. The proposals are ranked by the Committee and “shortlisted” proposals move forward. The initial review will be made based largely on the summary proposal. The summary should, therefore, give a complete and concise description of the project.
3. Reviews of the full version of short-listed proposals are carried out by an EC member, as well as by external Referees (in order to take advantage of a wider range of specialist expertise). All the reviews will then form the basis for the EC discussions.

### 4.3 Evaluation Criteria

Below are the criteria on which the proposals will be assessed. Please review and give suitable attention to those parts of your proposal that relate to these scorings.

AWARD CRITERIA		Possible	Score
Criterion A	<b>Qualifications and expertise of the Principal Investigator and project team</b>	<b>(25)</b>	
	• scientific credentials of Principal Investigator	15	
	• credentials and experience of the research team, including meaningful participation by target-country researchers	10	
Criterion B	<b>Quality of the proposed research</b>	<b>(20)</b>	
	• clear description of the conceptual framework, analytical framework and research questions, demonstrating in-depth knowledge of the issue/s under question	10	
	• methodology and its appropriateness to the research questions	10	
	<b>RESEARCH SCORE</b>	<b>(45)</b>	
Criterion C	<b>Identification of the policy relevant dimensions of the subject</b>	<b>(30)</b>	
	• potential policy uptake	10	
	• quality of the Policy Impact Plan	10	
	• relevance to cross cutting issues, including a discussion of how the research relates to gender issues.	10	
	<b>POLICY SCORE</b>	<b>(30)</b>	
Criterion D	<b>Quality and Value for Money of the project management plan</b>	<b>(20)</b>	
	• value for money including resource allocation (personnel and budget)	15	
	• work organization and feasibility of the schedule	2.5	
	• quality assurance mechanisms and ethical considerations	2.5	
Criterion E	<b>Quality of the host institution</b>	<b>(5)</b>	
	• relevant experience, track record, governance and management structure	5	
	<b>IMPLEMENTATION SCORE</b>	<b>(25)</b>	
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>(100)</b>	

We encourage applicants to show an awareness and consideration of gender issues in the design and implementation of the research project. This could be demonstrated, for example, by describing the extent to which the relevance of gender factors to the research question(s) and to stakeholder groups has been considered, as well as how gender may have been taken into account in the composition of research teams.

## 5 Timeline

Successful proposals will be announced on the PEDL website, together with a description of the work supported, no later than one month after contract signature.

Month	Activity
Month 0	Call for Major Research Grants issued
Month 2	Submission deadline for Call
Month 2	Stage One of Evaluation
Month 3	Stage Two of Evaluation and Selection Process
Month 4	Stage Three of Evaluation and Selection Process - Meeting of the Evaluation Committee
Month 5	Contracts signed for selected first round projects
Month 5/Month 6	Announcement of Successful Proposals on PEDL Webpage

## 6 Successful Applicants

Successful applicants will be expected to report their progress on a regular basis in the following ways:

- Communicating the research findings through publications, seminars, conferences, electronic outlets and the media, to both academic and non-academic audiences, potential users and beneficiaries (especially business, government and voluntary organisations);
- Submitting an annual report after the first year of the project, and every year thereafter;
- Submitting a final report at the end of the project, summarising the research carried out for the duration of the whole project;
- Submitting a full Impact Report one year following the closing of the project. The Impact Report should provide a measurement of and report on the impact of the relevant policy research carried out in the project.

A CEPR / DFID Research Initiative  
**Major Grants Proposal Summary Template**  
**2017-2020**

<b>Principal Investigator</b>
<b>Project Title</b>
<b>Address/ telephone number/email of the Principal Investigator</b>
<b>Co-Funder(s)</b>

## 1. Introduction

*Please include the research questions your research will address and the approach you will use, including references to existing research that has been carried out in the past*

## 2. Methodology

*Please include a description of data sets to be generated, and how those data sets will be made available to other researchers*

## 3. Policy Impact

*Please include a summary of your Policy Impact Plan*

## 4. Timelines and outputs

*Please include a timeline for the project and expected outputs*

A CEPR / DFID Research Initiative  
**Major Grants Proposal Template  
2017-2020**

**Proposal Full Title:**

--

**Name of Principal Investigator:**

--

**List of Participating Institutions:**

Institution Name	Acronym	Country

**The page lengths for sections 1, 2 & 3 are indicative only. The total length of sections 1, 2 & 3 should not exceed 15 pages.**

**1. Scientific quality (Expected length 10 to 12 pages, 1" margins, 11 point font)**

**1.1 Abstract**

*The abstract should provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to PEDL*

**1.2 Concept**

*Explain the concept of your project. What are the main ideas that led you to propose this work? Is the project feasible, and how can you (and we) be sure of that? Where initial work has been performed, please report the results of that work. Why and how would the project contribute to knowledge about private sector development in Low Income Countries?*

**1.3 Objectives/Methodology**

*What are the objectives of your project? These objectives should be clearly achievable and measurable through a set of milestones. Give details of the methodology to be used, including the proposed research framework, use of data sets and expected outputs. Where the proposal includes surveys or randomised trials, provide power calculations to justify the sample size.*

**1.4 Timeline/Milestones**

*Include a Gantt chart (or similar) showing the timeline of the project and a list/table of milestones*

**1.5 Deliverables and outputs.**

**2. Policy Impact Plan (expected length 1 to 3 pages)**

**2.1 Potential users – *In the country you propose to study*** which individuals / organizations in the policy community / the private sector will take an interest in and use the results of your research?

*Be specific: identify the government departments or firms, the positions within these organizations, and if possible particular individuals who you expect to use your research. If you have already established a relationship with these organizations / individuals through previous research, please give details.*

## 2.2 Potential uses - How will these organizations and individuals use your research in their work?

*Identify the specific policies / decisions that you expect to influence through your research, and the channels through which this influence will take place. Explain why the potential users identified above are the right people to influence these policies / decisions? If in your previous research you have influenced these similar policies / decisions in this (or another) country please give details.*

## 2.3 Outreach strategy - How will the research team promote the use of the research?

*Outline your methods for communication and engagement with the groups identified above. This should include, at a minimum, regular briefings by the research team. Who will be responsible for implementing the strategy?*

## 2.4 Policy Outputs - What types of policy outputs are you planning to produce? At what points during the planned research project will they be produced?

*Describe the policy outputs (e.g. workshops, briefing papers, reports, etc) you plan to produce from the research generated in your project. Explain your rationale for your choice of output, including when and how the outputs will be disseminated. Who will be responsible for preparing these outputs – members of the research team or a communications specialist? If in your previous research you have found particular outputs to have been effective, please give details.*

## 2.5 Where the country under study is **not** an LIC, please answer questions 1 to 3 again in the space provided below – i.e. identifying the potential users and uses of your research in one or more specific LICs, and explain how your outreach strategy will engage users in LICs.

*If the country you propose to study is not an LIC, you must demonstrate that the results of your research will be of direct interest to policymakers and decision-makers in an LIC, and explain how you will help these groups make use of your results.*  
*If the country you propose to study is neither a LIC nor an MIC where DFID has an active programme, the specific LIC(s) you name here should be your primary audience. For more information see the FAQs on the PEDL website.*

## 2.6 How will you assess the influence of your research on policy?

*Explain how you will monitor and evaluate the policy impact of your research. If you believe that your previous research had an influence on policies / decisions please give details and explain how you measured this impact.*

## **3. Implementation (expected length 1 to 3 pages)**

### **3.1 Management structure**

*Give details of the management structure*

### 3.2 Dissemination

*Give details of the dissemination plans for the research; and please indicate where this may overlap with details already provided in the Policy Impact Plan. It is important, however, to provide a full overview here of the dissemination plan for the project as a whole.*

### 3.3 Budget Narrative

*Explain how the budget will be utilised, and give a detailed description and justification against each of the direct expenditure line items listed in the budget template.*

## 4. Participants (maximum length 1 page per institution)

*Provide a brief description of each institution's capacities and a short profile of team members from each institution*

## 5. List of References Cited

### 6a. Other funding

*Please list other funding related to the proposed project that you have either received or for which you have applied.*

Funder	Amount	Dates

### 6b. Other grants on which you are the Principal or a Co-Principal Investigator

*Please list other current or pending grants on which you are the Principal Investigator or one of the Co-Principal Investigators.*

Funder	Amount	Dates

## 7. Ethics

*Before submitting your proposal, please ensure that you have read the "Code of Conduct for Researchers" on the PEDL website.<sup>1</sup>*

	Yes	No
Please confirm that the Principal Investigator and the research team will comply with the Code of Conduct for Researchers		
Please confirm that the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee etc.) of the Principal Investigator's Institution has approved the project		

<sup>1</sup> <http://pedl.cepr.org/sites/default/files/Code%20of%20Conduct%20for%20Researchers.pdf>

## 8. Privacy

*If your proposed research involves the processing of personal data, please ensure that you are familiar with the provisions of the UK Data Protection Act.<sup>2</sup> You may also wish to consult the University of Edinburgh's guide to the Act's implications for researchers.<sup>3</sup>*

	Yes	No
Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinions, religious or philosophical convictions)?		
Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
Does the proposed research involve processing any other "personal data" as defined in the Data Protection Act, i.e. data that could be used to identify individuals?		
<b>Where the answer to any of the above questions is yes, please indicate below how you will ensure compliance with the Data Protection Act.</b> This may include anonymisation of published datasets, securing consent from the individuals concerned etc. You may also set out any exemptions you believe apply.		

## 9. Intellectual Property Rights

	Yes	No
<b>Please confirm that you agree with the IPR policy stated below</b>		
All intellectual property rights in all material (including but not limited to reports, data, designs whether or not electronically stored) produced by researchers as part of the research funded by PEDL shall be the property of the researcher. In order to ensure the proper dissemination and policy uptake of the research, the researchers shall, as part of their contract with CEPR, grant to CEPR and DFID a worldwide, non-exclusive, irrevocable, royalty free licence to use all the Material. "Use" shall mean, without limitation, the reproduction, publication and sub-licence of all the Material and the intellectual property rights therein, including the reproduction and sale of the Material and products incorporating the same for use by any person or for sale or other dealing anywhere in the world.		

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.ico.gov.uk/for\\_organisations/data\\_protection/the\\_guide.aspx](http://www.ico.gov.uk/for_organisations/data_protection/the_guide.aspx)

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.recordsmanagement.ed.ac.uk/InfoStaff/DPstaff/DP\\_Research/ResearchAndDPA.htm](http://www.recordsmanagement.ed.ac.uk/InfoStaff/DPstaff/DP_Research/ResearchAndDPA.htm)

## 10. Open and Enhanced Access to Research Outputs

DFID's "Open and Enhanced Access Policy" covers the whole range of outputs produced by the research it funds. Judgement does need to be exercised over the materials that fall within the policy, but the guiding principle is that the outputs made available will be of value and use to others, erring on the side of inclusion over exclusion. Further information on the policy can be found in the Implementation Guide prepared by DFID,<sup>4</sup> and the editorial policy of "Research for Development" (R4D) DFID's own Research Repository.<sup>5</sup> For peer reviewed journal articles, PEDL researchers must pursue either "gold" or "green" open access.<sup>6</sup> Researchers are also requested to deposit datasets in a suitable subject or institutional repository such as those listed in the Directory of Open Access Repositories. Where no suitable repository is available, simple datasets may be deposited with R4D; in all cases metadata for datasets should be deposited in R4D (via CEPR). **Applicants should detail any difficulties they will have in complying with the open access policy.**

	Yes	No
Please confirm that the Principal Investigator and the research team will comply with the provisions of DFID's "Open and Enhanced Access Policy"		
Please describe your plans for making the data you collect available to other researchers.		

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/What-we-do/Research-and-evidence/DFID-Open-Access-Policy/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/R4D/PDF/Outputs/Communication/R4DEditorialPolicy.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Gold open access refers to the immediate availability of a publication free of charge on the publisher's or journal's website. Green open access means the authors must self-archive a 'post-print' copy of their article within six months of first publication, where "post-print" means a final draft, revised after peer review.

## Major Grants: Budget Justification

Please provide a detailed breakdown of your budget per item under each category. Sub-totals should match those on the online budget.

**Partner Name:**

### Part A: Direct Costs

Category	Description of Item	Rate*	Cost (£)*
<b>A1: Personnel Costs</b>			
Principal Investigator			
Co-investigator			
Research Assistant			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A2: External Consultants</b>			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A3: Travel and Subsistence</b>			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A4: Data Acquisition</b>			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A5: Dissemination</b>			
Events			
Publications, reports, etc			
Other			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>A6: Other</b>			
A			
B			
C			
D			
E			
		<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>B: Indirect Costs</b>			
Overheads	Rents, rates, offices, etc.	20%	0
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>0</b>

**\*The daily rate for Personnel Costs should be calculated as actual salary costs divided by the number of working days**

**Please note that budgets may be subject to negotiation**

**Private Enterprise Development in Low-Income Countries** is a joint research initiative of the Centre for Economic Policy Research (CEPR) and the Department for International Development (DFID).

## CHECKLIST - MAKE SURE YOUR APPLICATION IS COMPLETE

### PREPARING YOUR APPLICATION

- ☐ **Does your planned research fit with the call for proposals?** Check that your proposed work does indeed address the topics open in this call by reading the PEDL Project Overview which can be downloaded from the PEDL home page.
- ☐ **Is your proposal eligible?** The eligibility criteria are outlined in section 2.2 of this *Guide for Applicants*. Any proposal not meeting the eligibility requirements will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- ☐ **Is your application complete?** Before submitting your documents via the online application form, ensure you have prepared the necessary documents to upload, namely: Part A - Administration Form, Part B - Research Proposal, Part C - Project Budget, Part D - Policy Impact Plan. Please ensure that you use the provided form or template for all of these documents. A proposal that does not contain all three parts will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- ☐ **Does your proposed work raise ethics issues?** Human Subjects approval should be obtained through your university and proof of approval from your Institutional Review Board will be required. Proposals may be rejected on ethical grounds if such issues are not dealt with satisfactorily. In the online application form, you will be required to indicate any potential ethical, safety or regulatory aspects of the proposed research and the way these will be dealt with prior and during the implementation of the proposed project.
- ☐ **Does your proposal follow the suggested structure?** Proposals should be precise and concise, and should be guided by the proposal template provided - see example in Annex 1.
- ☐ **Have you maximised your chances?** There will be strong competition. Therefore, edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator; refer to the evaluation criteria given in section 3.2.1 of this *Guide for Applications*. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.
- ☐ **Do you need further advice and support?** If relevant, you are strongly advised to inform your university of your intention to submit a proposal. It is important that if they are to administer your grant, that they are aware of this.

### FINAL CHECKS BEFORE SUBMISSION

- ☐ **Do you have the agreement** of all the members of the consortium to submit this proposal on their behalf?
- ☐ **Check once more the eligibility criteria mentioned in the call documents (including this *Guide for Applicants*). This includes any budget limits.**
- ☐ **Is your proposal in Portable Document Format (PDF),** including no material in other formats?
- ☐ **Is the filename made up of the letters A to Z, and numbers 0 to 9?** You should avoid special characters and spaces.
- ☐ Double check that you respect the font size (11 point) and the page limitations for your Project Proposal

**Have you posted (or will you post) the following documents to CEPR by the submission deadline:**

☐ Financial Identification Form

☐ Eligibility Form

☐ Legal Representative Form

☐ Proof of Legal Status

**FOLLOWING SUBMISSION**

☐ Information input and uploaded to the online application form will not be made available to the Evaluation Committee until you submit your application form. Once you have submitted your proposal through the online application form, you will be unable to change it.