**EWDA Small Grants: Proposal Guidelines for the TRANSFORMATIVE RESEARCH ON WILDLIFE HEALTH GRANT**

**January 2025**

**Introduction**

In its 2019 report on the global assessment of biodiversity, IPBES concluded that “goals for conserving and sustainably using nature and achieving sustainability cannot be met by current trajectories, and goals for 2030 and beyond may only be achieved through transformative changes across economic, social, political and technological factors.” Here, transformative changes are defined as “a fundamental, system-wide reorganization [of human society] across technological, economic, and social factors, including paradigms, goals, and values”.

**The goal of this grant is to stimulate research projects on wildlife health that support or implement transformative changes of human society. This may be done by implementing as closely as possible the WDA’s Mission Statement and Charter of Values (**[**https://www.wildlifedisease.org/PersonifyEbusiness/About-Us**](https://www.wildlifedisease.org/PersonifyEbusiness/About-Us) **), given that they more or less correspond with the conclusions of the IPBES report.**

WDA’s Mission Statement is: “The mission of the Wildlife Disease Association is to promote healthy wildlife and ecosystems, biodiversity conservation, and environmentally sustainable solutions to One Health challenges.”

**Background**

The biosphere is being altered to an unparalleled degree across all spatial scales, and biodiversity is declining faster than at any time in human history. Important underlying causes are rapid growth of the human population, and its production and consumption patterns. In the last 50 years, the human population has doubled, the global economy has grown nearly fourfold, and global trade has grown tenfold. Under current trends, an ever faster downward spiral is predicted, with the additional risks of irreversible loss of many ecosystems, and multi-metre rise in sea level (IPBES, 2019; Kuiken, EcoHealth, 2021). Goals for conserving and sustainably using nature and achieving sustainability cannot be met by current trajectories, and goals for 2030 and beyond may only be achieved through transformative changes (IPBES, 2019).

How to achieve these necessary ‘transformative changes’ in our field of wildlife health research? This question isn’t easily answered and needs further exploration (Kuiken, Transformative changes in wildlife health, (E)WDA joint conference, Cuenca, 2021). Upon comparison between the 2019 IPBES report and the WDA’s *Charter of Values*, we found that these values match well with what seems necessary to make transformative changes as advised by the IPBES. One could therefore conclude that the stated values are in themselves transformative. This *Charter of Values* was adopted by the membership of the WDA in August 2021, and consists of eight statements that represent the basic, common goals and values that WDA members share:

1. That the conservation of biological diversity is of benefit and essential to human societies now and in the future;
2. That the health of wild animals, humans and domestic animals are interconnected and interdependent within a shared environment (‘One Health’);
3. That wildlife health is a global challenge transcending cultural and political boundaries and demanding international integration and cooperation of the scientific community, stakeholders and society;
4. That knowledge of wildlife health is best achieved through rigorous science, recognition of other accumulated forms of knowledge (e.g. traditional, experiential, professional), and open and respectful debate;
5. That our Association is most effective by being multidisciplinary, diverse, inclusive, fair and equitable;
6. That communicating the science of our members and values of our Association through advocacy and outreach is integral to achieving our mission;
7. That the future of our community and accomplishment of our mission depends on the fostering of student and early career learning and professional development;
8. That our Association should conduct its business according to principles of environmental sustainability.

Agreeing upon these values was already a big step forward. The next step is to implement these values in our research. By setting up this grant, the EWDA Small Grants Committee hopes to promote this implementation process. The specific aim of this grant is to invite researchers to explore how to implement the WDA Charter of Values—and thus, transformative changes—into research on wildlife health.

What transformative change might mean in practice is not easy to comprehend. To make things more concrete, it might be helpful to compare the current way of thinking to a potential new way of thinking about doing research (Table). First, in a new way, the formulation of research problems addressed in response to a wildlife health issue might be broader than is usually done in the current situation, giving as much attention to inorganic nature, ecosystems, wildlife, and, if applicable, to domestic animals and humans. Also, when formulating the research problem, one should consider ecological and social costs to society as well as financial costs. Second, the choice of methods employed to conduct scientific research should be determined not only by financial costs, but more importantly by their environmental impact. Third, solutions for addressing wildlife health issues should include not only short-term measures like the development of treatments, but also long-term measures that address underlying causes of wildlife health problems and help to make the transition to a sustainable society and to improve health according to a One Health approach (Table).

**Table.** Possible effects of a new narrative on choice of problems, methods and solutions of research on wildlife diseases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Research section** | **Current narrative** | **New narrative** |
| Problem | Effect of wildlife disease on domestic animal & human health | Equal attention to health of ecosystem, wildlife, domestic animals, humans |
|  | Financial cost to society | Also ecological & social costs |
|  | Restricted scope, e.g. pathogen-host | Broad scope, e.g interrelationship of all species in system |
| Methods | Financial cost | Also environmental cost |
| Solutions | Short-term | Also long-term |
|  | Solutions for proximate causes well accepted | Also solutions for ultimate causes required |
|  | Acceptable if status quo maintained | Acceptable if health of humans, wildlife, domestic animals, and ecosystems improved |

**Suggested further reading:**

- EWDA Winter Newsletter 2022/2023, Transformative changes in wildlife health research, p. 3-4

- Kuiken T. Implications of Transformative Changes for Research on Emerging Zoonoses. Ecohealth. 2021 Sep;18(3):275-279. doi: 10.1007/s10393-021-01534-y.

- IPBES (2019): Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. S. Díaz, J. Settele, E. S. Brondízio, H. T. Ngo, M. Guèze, J. Agard, A. Arneth, P. Balvanera, K. A. Brauman, S. H. M. Butchart, K. M. A. Chan, L. A. Garibaldi, K. Ichii, J. Liu, S. M. Subramanian, G. F. Midgley, P. Miloslavich, Z. Molnár, D. Obura, A. Pfaff, S. Polasky, A. Purvis, J. Razzaque, B. Reyers, R. Roy Chowdhury, Y. J. Shin, I. J. Visseren-Hamakers, K. J. Willis, and C. N. Zayas (eds.). IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany. 56 pages. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3553579>

**PURPOSE OF THE EWDA SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME:**

The intent of the EWDA Small Grant Programme is: to promote selected activities hampered by a lack of funding, to increase the benefits of EWDA membership, to increase the visibility of the EWDA, and to provide the EWDA with a new means to accomplish the general WDA mission

* The grants are available to EWDA members for projects located in Europe.
* Grant recipients will receive funding to accomplish a project that has defined and measurable goals that are in line with the EWDA/WDA mission.

**TRANSFORMATIVE RESEARCH ON WILDLIFE HEALTH GRANT**

* The focus of this grant is wildlife health research.
* Methods can include laboratory or field studies, questionnaire surveys, citizen science, etc. Analysis of pre-existing samples or data is also eligible.
* The proposal must be directly related to wildlife health and in line with the WDA Charter of Values.
* The requested budget may cover consumables, contribute to sample collection and/or to salaries (e.g. to encourage the analysis and publication of pre-collected raw data).

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**GENERAL CRITERIA FOR SMALL GRANT PROPOSALS:**

1. The grant proposal must support the mission of the WDA.
2. The main applicant and project leader must be a EWDA member. Early career members are encouraged to apply.
3. The proposed project must have measurable objectives which are achievable within 24 months (including reporting to the EWDA Board).
4. Grant funds must be administered through an organisation to which the EWDA can legally transfer funds and not a personal bank account; examples of allowable organisations are a university, a national laboratory, or a non-profit organisation.
5. The budget requested from EWDA cannot exceed 3,000 Euros per project. Project proposals with a higher total budget than that requested from EWDA can be considered as long the applicants provide evidence that the rest of the budget has been secured from other funding sources.
6. There is no current allowance for overheads (i.e. indirect costs for administrating the grant or project).
7. Requests for travel funds are not acceptable, unless it is critical for completion of the project and collaborators who are EWDA members receive highest priority.
8. EWDA Small Grants funds will not be approved for food/drink, lodging or transportation.
9. Any person that will be receiving funds to perform work as part of the EWDA Small Grants Programme must be listed as a collaborator, and the requested funding for that person should be included in the budget on the original grant proposal. This precludes secondary contracts with individuals not listed on the original proposal.
10. An intermediary and a final report, 12 and 24 months, respectively, after receipt of funding must be submitted to the EWDA. Non-respect of these deadlines must be justified by the grant holder and may result in the exclusion of future applications.
11. Proposals should not exceed 12 A4 pages (Times New Roman 12 or equivalent; maximum five pages for the section one of the application form, three pages for section two, and four pages for section three) and must be submitted electronically to the EWDA Secretary on the dedicated application form.
12. Acknowledgement of EWDA Small Grants funding must be included in all documents related to the funded project and in the final output for the project (e.g. scientific articles, conference participations).
13. Grant holders are encouraged to present their final results at the next EWDA conference (oral presentation or poster).
14. Recipients of grants with a research objective are encouraged to disseminate their results in the form of peer-reviewed scientific articles, preferably in the *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*
15. All applicants can only apply for one grant.

**GRANT SPECIFIC INFORMATION REQUIRED IN THE APPLICATION FORM:**

**Proposals must include the following information:** (please use the dedicated application form, maximum five pages for section one, three pages for section two, three pages for section three)

**SECTION ONE:**

1. Project title:
2. Project leader (current and past EWDA member-confirm status):
3. Collaborators incl. affiliations:
4. Summary of the project – maximum 100 words
5. Location of proposed work:
6. Mechanism for administration of funding:
7. Background of the project:
8. Aims:
9. Objectives:
10. Methods: To include, where appropriate, sample size and justification whether this is sufficient to meet the project aims, and details of the practical aspects of the work.
11. How will the aims advance the mission of the WDA and fulfill the specific grant criteria:
12. Expected outcomes:
13. Project timeline:
14. Detailed Budget: If the total budget is greater than the grant provides then evidence that the rest of the budget has been secured from other funding sources must be supplied.
15. Resources and previous accomplishments that demonstrate capacity to complete the project:
16. Ethical and legal considerations: If the project involves sampling or manipulation of live animals then details of ethical approval must be provided:

**SECTION TWO:**

**CV:** Please add a CV, maximum two pages (no photographs please)

**References:** Inclusion of references is optional, maximum one page, 10 references

**SECTION THREE:**

**The following guidelines directly relate to the WDA mission statement and Charter of values.**

* Research proposals will be ranked according to the cumulative score of the average scores for Problem statement, Methodology and Impact.
* For each criterion, a score from 1 to 5 is given (1: insufficient; 2: poor; 3: good; 4: very good; 5: excellent).
* In principle, the average scores for Problem statement, Methodology, and Impact should be at least 3 (good) for the proposal to be funded.

**Problem statement**

1. Relevance for wildlife health: How relevant is the problem that the proposal addresses for the health of free-living wildlife, health of ecosystems, and/or biodiversity conservation?

*Background: a rare abnormality of individual free-ranging animals might be interesting to study but if not clearly related to a bigger problem of wildlife and ecosystem health this is not likely to be selected for this grant.*

2. Application of the One Health approach: To what extent does the problem statement take into account the interconnection and interdependence of health of wild animals, humans and domestic animals within a shared environment?

*Background: try to explain the connections that your problem has with both animal (including human) health and environmental health, instead of highlighting just one part (e.g. only wildlife health). For the current definition of One Health, which will be used by the selection committee, see: One Health High-Level Expert Panel. One Health: A new definition for a sustainable and healthy future. PLoS Pathog. 2022 Jun 23;18(6):e1010537. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1010537.*

3. Environmental sustainability: To what extent does the problem statement take environmental sustainability into account?

*Background: In many cases, wildlife health problems are symptoms of unsustainable human activities. An example is* Batrachochytrium salamandrivorans *die-offs in salamanders in Europe, caused by a chytrid fungus that is hypothesized to originate in Asia and to have spread to Europe via unsustainable wildlife trade. Another example is canine distemper outbreaks in urban foxes. The risk for such outbreaks may be increased because of the unusually high density of foxes in this urban environment as a result of the abundant availability of food due to unsustainable food waste and irresponsible food disposal.*

*Example problem statement formulation related to a study on the emergence of highly pathogenic avian influenza (hpai) and coronavirus disease (covid-19), Kuiken, EcoHealth, 2021:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current narrative** | **Potential new narrative** |
| Pathogen emergence in chickens (HPAI) or traded wildlife (COVID-19) causes mortality in humans and high financial costs to poultry industry or global economy | Increased demand for wild and domestic animal protein in human diet drives wildlife trade and livestock production, and is associated with increased land use change and freshwater withdrawals, loss of biodiversity, environmental pollution, emergence of infectious diseases like HPAI and COVID-19, reduction of animal welfare, and both positive and negative effects on human health |

**Methodology**

4. Environmental cost-benefit analysis: To what extent does the benefit of the envisaged research outcome for wildlife health outweigh the estimated environmental impact of the methodology to perform the research?

*Background: As an exaggerated example, if the proposed study entails helicopter flights in a protected wildlife area it remains to be seen whether the envisaged research outcome will outweigh the estimated negative environmental impact (CO2 emission, fossil fuel usage, noise disturbance). So be sure to take environmental costs along in designing your methodology.*

5. Cross-sector involvement: To what extent does the methodology involve cooperation of the scientific community, stakeholders and society?

*Background: prepare a list of stakeholders and/or other societal actors, and explain for each how they will be involved.*

6. Different forms of knowledge: To what extent does the methodology involve and recognize other accumulated forms of knowledge (e.g. traditional, experiential, professional)?

*Background: this relates to WDA’s value that knowledge of wildlife health is best achieved through rigorous science, recognition of other accumulated forms of knowledge (e.g. traditional, experiential, professional), and open and respectful debate.*

7. Multidisciplinarity: To what extent do the partners in the proposal represent different scientific disciplines?

*Background: this relates to WDA’s value that we are most effective by being multidisciplinary, diverse, inclusive, fair and equitable.*

8. Learning and development: To what extent does the proposal foster student and/or early career learning and/or professional development of wildlife health researchers involved?

*Background: this relates to WDA’s value that the future of our community and accomplishment of our mission depends on the fostering of student and early career learning and professional development.*

*Example cost-benefit considerations for your study design, for a study on the emergence of highly pathogenic avian influenza (hpai) and coronavirus disease (covid-19), Kuiken, EcoHealth, 2021:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current narrative** | **Potential new narrative** |
| Evaluation of financial costs of the study, including personnel, laboratory experiments, travel to conferences, and publication of scientific articles | Evaluation of methods with potentially significant environmental impacts (e.g. air travel, use of biosafety level 3 facilities, breeding laboratory animals, plastic and chemical waste from virological and pathological analyses, long-term storage of swabs and tissue samples in ultracold freezers, and long-term storage of viral genome sequences in computers) by Environmental Impact Assessment |

**Impact**

1. One Health outcome: To what extent does the envisaged research outcome sustainably balance and optimize the health of humans, domestic animals, wildlife, and their shared environment?

*Background: refers to WDA’s mission statement and follows the recent OHHLEP definition: “One Health is an integrated, unifying approach that aims to sustainably balance and optimize the health of people, animals, and ecosystems.”*

1. Biodiversity conservation: To what extent does the envisaged research outcome benefit the conservation of biodiversity, now and in the future?

*Background: this relates to the value that biodiversity conservation is of benefit and essential to current and future human societies.*

11. Environmental sustainability: To what extent is the envisaged research outcome in accordance with the principles of environmental sustainability?

*Background: this relates to the value that the WDA should conduct its business to principles of environmental sustainability. Management principles for environmental sustainability as developed by Hermany Daly at the World Bank (Göpel 2016) are:*

* *The use rate of renewable resources cannot be higher than their rate of regeneration or they are lost for future generations.*
* *The use of non-renewable natural resources should not exceed the discovery of alternative sources to deliver on the same function (e.g., replacing fossil fuels with solar technology).*
* *Emissions cannot be higher than the capacity of the natural environment to cope with them.*
* *Human-made threats to or excessive risks for human health and the environment should be avoided.*

*The relevance of these principles to the proposal depends on its particular subject.*

12. Dissemination and translation: To what extent are the results and recommendations of the research planned to be communicated to the relevant users, translated into policies, or both?

*Background: this relates to WDA’s value that communicating the science of our members and values of our Association through advocacy and outreach is integral to achieving our mission.*

*Example of envisaged impact of a study on the emergence of highly pathogenic avian influenza (hpai) and coronavirus disease (covid-19), Kuiken, EcoHealth, 2021:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Current narrative** | **Potential new narrative** |
| Development of low-cost vaccines against current strain of HPAI or SARS-CoV; these solutions reduce risk of human infection while maintaining status quo in poultry production and wildlife trade, but do not remove the risk for the emergence of other pathogens from these sources | Reduction of wildlife trade and livestock production, stimulation of circular agriculture with feed production and nutrient recycling at the local level, in parallel with a shift from animal-based protein to plant-based protein in human diet; these solutions are aimed at improving biodiversity and ecosystem health and benefiting animal health and welfare and human health, but also can reduce the risk of emergence of viral diseases such as COVID-19 in wildlife and HPAI in livestock |

**Reporting requirements for successful applicants:**

**Intermediary report (12 months) requirements:**

* Project title
* Grant ID / Institution
* Date of report
* Name of investigators
* Start date
* Planned end date
* Detailed budget with itemised expenses during the first period
* Summary of the original aims and objectives
* List of works achieved, and results obtained during the first period
* Information on encountered difficulties or expected changes of schedule, and on how these problems will be solved during the second project period to achieve the final objectives

**Final Report Requirements:**

* Project title
* Grant ID / Institution
* Date of report
* Name of investigators
* Start date
* End date
* Detailed budget with itemized expenses
* Summary of the original aims and objectives, list of outcomes in relation to the aims and objectives, and description of how they fit into the WDA mission.
* A summary report (approximately 1 page), with photos if appropriate, suitable for publication in the EWDA Newsletter
* For research grants, information on how the results have been or will be disseminated among the research community (e.g., planned, submitted or published peer-reviewed article, conference participation) is additionally expected, i.e., appropriate documents have to be submitted to the EWDA Small Grant Committee together with the project proposal, the intermediary and final reports, and later on as appropriate (in agreement with the Committee).

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Grant cycle:**

* **January/February of non-conference years**: reminder sent out to all EWDA members by the EWDA Secretary about the grants (including the Small Grants Guidelines) and the possibility to ask for mentorship to write the application and carry out the project.
* **July 1st of non-conference years**: request for proposals (and Small Grants Guidelines) is circulated again to EWDA Membership by the Secretary.
* **September 15th**: Proposal submission closed.
* **October 15th**: Small Grants Committee completes proposal evaluation, submitting their comments to the Committee Chair.
* **October 31st**: Committee Chair summarizes outcomes and reports back to the Small Grant Committee members with recommended action for discussion/ratification.
* **November 1st**: EWDA Secretary notifies Committee Chair of deadline for submission of final ranking for inclusion in winter Board meeting agenda.
* **November 30th**: Small Grants Committee recommendations and comments or briefing notes if any, are forwarded by the Committee Chair to the Eastern Country Communication Facilitators, EWDA Vice Chair and Secretary for inclusion in the winter EWDA Board meeting agenda.
* **December 24th**: Small Grants Committee recommendations are ratified by the EWDA Board and successful and unsuccessful applicants are notified by the Committee Chair. (i.e., after Board ratification of applicant selection). At this stage, the Committee Chair asks the successful applicants to provide their bank account details to the EWDA Treasurer.
* **January 31st**: Funds disbursed to the successful applicants by the Treasurer.
* Intermediary reports 12 months after receipt of funding (i.e., **January 31 of the next year**) to be sent to the Committee Chair, who forwards them to the Committee members, Eastern Country Communication Facilitators and Vice Chair for a brief evaluation and report to the Board members at the next teleconference.
* Final report at completion (**within 24 months of receipt of funding**) to be sent to the Committee Chair, who forwards them to the Committee members, Eastern Country Communication Facilitators and Vice Chair for final evaluation (general level of satisfaction; no form to be filled) and report to the Board members at the next teleconference.
* Abstract submission and presentation at **upcoming EWDA conference** (if appropriate).

**Criteria for awarding proposal:**

Besides scoring for general criteria of the Small Grants Committee, Appendix I, the research proposals submitted for the call “Transformative research on wildlife health” also are scored for the specific criteria indicated in Appendix II.

Proposals will be ranked in order of score, highest first. If none of the proposals meet the standard required, the Small Grants Committee will not recommend an award and the funds for that year shall be directed to the next funding cycle.

The scoring criteria are in Appendix I and II.

**APPENDIX I** - **Evaluation of Proposals: Score sheet for sections one and two.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application reference number** |  |
| **Proposal title** |  |
| **Project leader (current EWDA Member)** |  |
| **Institutional affiliation of project leader** |  |
| **Name of EWDA reviewer** |  |

**Evaluation: Section one and two.**

There are 5 categories upon which the proposal is evaluated. Each section receives a numerical score of 1-5 or 1-10 with **5 or 10** = excellent, and **1** = unacceptable.

The highest total score for all sections will determine the ranking of the proposal.

The maximum score possible is 40.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Scale | Score |
| Aims are clear and in alignment with WDA/EWDA Mission | 1-10 |  |
| Objectives are measurable and realistically achievable within 24 months | 1-5 |  |
| Budget is realistic and within the guidelines of the call | 1-5 |  |
| Project will result in significant contribution to the additional grant specific criteria (eg wildlife health research) | 1-10 |  |
| Proposal is clearly written | 1-10 |  |
|  | Total/40 |  |

**APPENDIX II - Evaluation of Proposals: Score sheet for section three.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application reference number** |  |
| **Proposal title** |  |
| **Project leader (current EWDA Member)** |  |
| **Institutional affiliation of project leader** |  |
| **Name of EWDA reviewer** |  |

**Evaluation: Section three**

For each criterion, a score from 1 to 5 is given (1: insufficient, 2: poor, 3: good, 4: very good, 5: excellent). The average scores for Problem statement, Methodology, and Impact need to be at least 3 (good) for the proposal to be funded.

The average scores for Problem statement, Methodology, and Impact need to be at least 3 (good) for the proposal to be funded. Research proposals are ranked according to their cumulative score.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Criteria | Score |
| **Problem statement**  1. Relevance for wildlife health: How relevant is the problem that the proposal addresses for the health of free-living wildlife, health of ecosystems, and/or biodiversity conservation? |  |
| 2. Application of the One Health approach: To what extent does the problem statement take into account the interconnection and interdependence of health of wild animals, humans and domestic animals within a shared environment? |  |
| 3. Environmental sustainability: To what extent does the problem statement take environmental sustainability into account? |  |
| **Average score** |  |
| **Methodology**  4. Environmental cost-benefit analysis: To what extent does the benefit of the envisaged research outcome for wildlife health outweigh the estimated environmental impact of the methodology to perform the research? |  |
| 5. Cross-sector involvement: To what extent does the methodology involve cooperation of the scientific community, stakeholders and society? |  |
| 6. Different forms of knowledge: To what extent does the methodology involve and recognize other accumulated forms of knowledge (e.g. traditional, experiential, professional)? |  |
| 7. Multidisciplinarity: To what extent do the partners in the proposal represent different scientific disciplines? |  |
| 8. Learning and development: To what extent does the proposal foster student and/or early career learning and/or professional development of wildlife health researchers involved? |  |
| **Average score** |  |
| **Impact**  9. One Health outcome: To what extent does the envisaged research outcome sustainably balance and optimize the health of humans, domestic animals, wildlife, and their shared environment? |  |
| 10. Biodiversity conservation: To what extent does the envisaged research outcome benefit the conservation of biodiversity, now and in the future? |  |
| 11. Environmental sustainability: To what extent is the envisaged research outcome in accordance with the principles of environmental sustainability? |  |
| 12. Dissemination and translation: To what extent are the results and recommendations of the research planned to be communicated to the relevant users, translated into policies, or both? |  |
| **Average score** |  |
| **Cumulative average score** |  |

**󠆶 Application is disqualified because:**

**󠆶** Submission received after deadline

󠆶 Application does not fulfill the grant guidelines (regarding length and format etc)

󠆶 Main applicant and project leader is not a current EWDA member

󠆶 An appropriate organisation has not been listed through which funds can be administered

󠆶 Project proposed in not planned to be done in a European country