

Enhancing Equity in Proposal Development

A Case Study Using the EquiPD Fillable Forms





Introduction

This hypothetical case study demonstrates how three structured, fillable forms from the EquiPD Toolkit can enhance equity in the development of an international collaborative research proposal. The case study is applied to a proposal for the Wellcome Trust Discovery Award scheme¹. It focuses on three critical types of equity challenge that commonly arise during proposal development: 1) governance inequities (e.g. intellectual property arrangements), 2) financial inequities (e.g. overhead and researcher time recovery models), and 3) power and recognition inequities (e.g. roles, leadership, and authorship).

The case study shows how using targeted interventions at key stages of proposal development helps surface and address inequity risks early. This can enhance partnerships and research sustainability, as well as supporting funder priorities in areas such as research culture, good governance, and shared decision-making. It also highlights how failure to address these issues at the outset can embed inequities into the project design, undermining both collaboration and research quality, even when scientific excellence is present.

Disclaimer: The research proposal, researchers, institutions, and locations described in this case study are entirely fictitious. Any resemblance to real individuals or organisations is coincidental.

¹ Wellcome Trust Discovery Award scheme (<https://wellcome.org/research-funding/schemes/wellcome-discovery-awards>) as at 31 May 2026



Case Study: Context

Prof Eleanor Finch, Professor of Planetary Health Systems at Northshore University (UK), is preparing an application to the Wellcome Trust Discovery Award scheme. She is a mid- to senior-career researcher with an established international reputation. Her work integrates environmental, social, and biological data to develop new theoretical approaches to understanding health and wellbeing, aligning with the scheme's emphasis on bold, curiosity-driven research. She has limited experience working with institutions based in the Global South.

Recognising the need for complementary expertise and the value of long-term collaboration, Prof Finch identifies three Co-Applicants. She approaches **A/Prof Thabo Mkhize** (Associate Professor of Urban Health Ecology, Ubuntu Metropolitan University, South Africa), who brings expertise in urban health in African contexts and access to established longitudinal research platforms. She also engages **Dr Amina Diallo** (Senior Research Fellow in Environmental Genomics, Institute of Biomedical Research, Senegal), whose specialised expertise in environmental genomics and leadership in laboratory and field infrastructure development provide critical technical and regional capacity. In addition, **A/Prof Joseph Njoroge** (Associate Professor in Social Futures and Innovation Studies, Great Rift Valley University, Kenya) is invited for his expertise in participatory, community-embedded research and his established field sites in Kenya, which offer a strong platform for understanding how communities respond to environmental and health challenges.

The following summaries show the potential outcomes of this collaboration via two scenarios, one in which the EquipD Fillable Forms are not used, and one in which they are.

The detailed, completed forms are shown as an additional reference in the **Appendix**.

Using EquiPD Fillable Form 1: Funding Call and Proposed Project Overview

After identifying the Wellcome Discovery Award call and developing an initial concept, the Lead Applicant (Prof Finch) approaches potential Co-Applicants.

Scenario 1 (EquiPD Form 1 not used)

Prof Finch shares a draft proposal with Co-Applicants for review after developing the concept independently, with limited opportunity for them to give early input into limitations the call may impose or into the project concept.

Consequences:

- Constraints affecting partners are not surfaced early
- The project reflects a single interpretation of the best response to the call
- Any misalignment remains implicit

Downstream risk if funded:

Unresolved issues emerge later, leading to delays, disengagement, or conflict.

Equity Risk:

Without structured early engagement, equity risks embedded in the call may manifest later when more challenging to address.

In this case, Prof Finch has limited knowledge of other jurisdiction's IP regulations, and the call requirement that the lead institution own the **Intellectual Property (IP) is accepted without scrutiny** and embedded into the proposal. Misalignment with a South African national IP regulation affects A/Prof Mkhize's institution, but only becomes apparent at the contracting stage, when substantive changes are difficult to implement. If the IP issue cannot be successfully negotiated or resolved, there is a risk the partnership may be dissolved despite a successful award. If not identified and addressed this equity risk may also create a path dependency where governance arrangements default to the lead institution's context, reinforcing power imbalances and limiting partner influence. Inequities remain hidden until late in the process, undermining trust and feasibility.

Scenario 2 (EquiPD Form 1 used)

Prof Finch identifies potential Co-Applicants and completes Section A of **Fillable Form 1 (Funding Call and Proposed Project Overview)** to outline key details of the call (including those that may impact equity) and her proposed research concept. She shares this with Co-Applicants, inviting them to complete Section B ahead of a scheduled discussion.

Consequences:

- Co-Applicants identify aspects of the call affecting participation
- The project concept is refined collaboratively
- Partners engage early with shared understanding and expectations

Downstream impact if funded:

The proposal is built off a base of shared understanding of the call and its limitations, strengthening alignment, trust, and long-term collaboration.

Equity Dialogue:

Form 1 enables early identification and discussion of equity risks embedded in the funding call.

In this case, A/Prof Thabo Mkhize raises concerns that the Wellcome Trust requirement for the lead institution to own project IP conflicts with South African regulatory requirements. This prompts early engagement between Research Contracts teams at Northshore University and Ubuntu Metropolitan University to explore **compliant IP solutions**.

By surfacing this issue early, the team shifts IP from an implicit assumption to an explicit design consideration, reducing the risk of delays, disputes, or partner withdrawal later in the process.



Using EquiPD Fillable Form 2: Expertise, Resources and Requirements

After Co-Applicants have been approached and agreed to be involved, the Lead Applicant (Prof Finch) starts developing the initial concept into a more detailed proposal.

Scenario 1 (EquiPD Form 2 not used)

Prof Finch develops the proposal using informal discussions and assumptions about partner contributions and needs, without systematically capturing Co-Applicants' requirements or institutional cost structures.

Consequences:

- Researcher and institutional constraints are not fully considered
- Institutional overhead requirements remain unclear
- Co-Applicants' budgets reflect assumptions rather than actual costs

Downstream risk if funded:

Some partners may face financial strain or reduced ability to participate due to under-resourced budgets.

Equity Risk:

Without structured articulation of partner requirements, resources needed for equitable participation remain hidden.

In this case, because Northshore, as a UK university, is unable to recover overheads under Wellcome conditions, the Lead assumes overheads should be omitted for all partners. She also assumes Co-Applicants are in institutionally funded posts and do not require salary recovery. This results in **exclusion of overheads and Co-Applicant salary contributions** from the budgets of partners outside the UK who are permitted to recover these costs and rely on them for financial sustainability. This may leave Co-Applicants to cover shortfalls from their own research budgets or lead their institutions to decline participation altogether.

Because assumptions are not checked early, inequitable financial burdens become embedded in the proposal, reducing participation, limiting institutional support, and undermining long-term sustainability.

Scenario 2 (EquiPD Form 2 used)

Prof Finch completes Section A of **Fillable Form 2 (Expertise, Resources and Requirements)** and shares it with Co-Applicants. Each partner articulates their relevant expertise, resources, institutional cost structures, and requirements for participation, so necessary aspects can be incorporated into the proposal.

Consequences:

- Clear visibility of partner capabilities and constraints
- Institutional overhead and cost recovery models are surfaced
- Budget decisions are based on real requirements

Downstream impact if funded:

The proposal reflects realistic contributions, costs and institutional requirements, supporting equitable budget allocation and sustainable participation.

Equity Dialogue:

Form 2 enables the team to identify and address equity risks related to what partners can offer and what they require to participate, including project and institutional costs.

In this case, discussions reveal that Ubuntu Metropolitan University, represented by A/Prof Mkhize, requires that the maximum **overheads allowed by the funder are requested** within the budget. The other African partner institutions have similar requirements. A/Prof Njoroge also highlighted his **soft-funded employment and need to recover a salary contribution** to make participation viable. These costs can be built in early.

This makes visible a key equity risk: without inclusion of accurate and appropriate costs, some institutions would effectively subsidise the project more than others. By identifying this early, the team can adjust budget allocations and expectations to ensure that financial contributions are transparent and equitable across partners.



Using EquiPD Fillable Form 3: Project Roles & Responsibilities

As the proposal progresses, the Lead Applicant (Prof Finch) addresses the roles and responsibilities of the partners.

Scenario 1 (EquiPD Form 3 not used)

Prof Finch assigns roles and responsibilities based on her understanding of how Co-Applicant expertise and environments will enable the project, with limited structured discussion. Co-Applicants may raise concerns once they are aware of the role allocations, but these are often difficult to address before submission.

Consequences:

- Roles may not align with partner expertise
- Some partners are positioned in support roles despite leadership capacity
- Leadership of activities and decision-making remain concentrated

Downstream risk if funded:

Misaligned roles persist, leading to tensions around leadership of project components, contributions and authorship, with an erosion of trust.

Equity Risk:

Without a structured process, **roles are defined by the Lead Applicant** and become embedded in the proposal.

In this case, Co-Applicants, such as A/Prof Njoroge, recognise misalignment, but there is limited opportunity to influence change once roles are established. This results in A/Prof Njoroge being assigned a supporting role despite having the capacity to lead components of the project, limiting his intellectual contribution and visibility. Leadership and narrative control remains concentrated with the lead institution.

Because decisions are effectively fixed at submission, inequities in leadership, influence, and authorship persist into implementation and are difficult to resolve, undermining both collaboration and research quality.

Scenario 2 (EquiPD Form 3 used)

Prof Finch completes Section A of **Fillable Form 3 (Project Roles and Responsibilities)**, outlining roles, responsibilities, governance structures, and authorship expectations. Co-Applicants review and respond, raising concerns and proposing adjustments well before proposal submission.

Consequences:

- Roles are explicitly examined and negotiated
- Misalignments with expertise are identified early
- Leadership is aligned with capacity and contribution, and expectations around decision-making and authorship are clarified

Downstream impact if funded:

The project proceeds with clearly defined and agreed roles, supporting balanced contribution, accountability, and reduced conflict.

Equity Dialogue:

Form 3 enables **explicit negotiation of roles, leadership, and intellectual contribution** before proposal submission.

In this case, when reviewing assigned roles, A/Prof Joseph Njoroge raises concerns that his expertise in participatory and community-based research is underutilised, as he has been assigned largely technical and support-oriented responsibilities. In contrast, A/Prof Mkhize and Dr Amina Diallo have clearly defined leadership roles aligned with their expertise. This prompts a broader discussion about how different forms of knowledge are valued and how leadership is distributed across the partnership. In response, the team revises the proposal so that Dr Njoroge leads the participatory and community engagement components, aligning his role with his expertise and ensuring his contribution is both substantive and visible.

This negotiation takes place before submission, allowing meaningful redistribution of responsibility and recognition, and strengthening both equity and scientific quality.



Conclusion

This hypothetical case study demonstrates that key equity challenges in collaborative research, relating to governance (e.g. IP), financial sustainability (e.g. overheads and researcher time), and roles and recognition (e.g. leadership of study components), can emerge early in proposal development and can become embedded if not addressed. By introducing structured interventions at defined points in the process, equity risks can be surfaced, discussed, and mitigated before they become fixed.

Collectively, the three EquiPD Fillable Forms shift equity from a reactive concern to a deliberate design feature of the collaboration. This not only strengthens fairness and trust in the partnership, but also improves the feasibility, sustainability, and overall quality of the proposed research.

Appendix

EquiPD FILLABLE FORM 1

FUNDING CALL AND PROPOSED PROJECT OVERVIEW

SECTION A – LEAD APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

Funding call overview

1	Funding call details	
	Funder name:	
	Funding scheme name:	
	Scheme URL:	
	Funder deadline:	
	Total budget available per award (with currency):	
	Grant duration:	
	Earliest project start date:	

2	Summary of funding call (+/- 200 words)	
	<i>Base on summary provided in the funding call.</i>	

Funding call areas impacting research equity

1	Are there any limitations on who the Lead Applicant can be? <i>E.g., location, level of experience, nationality, gender, qualifications.</i>
2	Are there any limitations on the geographical location of the research? <i>E.g., sanctioned countries.</i>
3	Are there any requirements related to the nature of the person/organisations that can participate? <i>E.g., organisational type, LMIC Co-Applicant, lived experience, community engagement, Athena Swan accreditation.</i>
4	Are there any administrative considerations that would limit participation in the project? <i>E.g., individual/organisational registrations with funder portals.</i>



5	Are there any due diligence considerations that would limit participation in the project? <i>E.g., export control, lack of safe-guarding policies, willingness to undertake GFGP assessment, funder due diligence requirements.</i> <i>Contact your Research Office or equivalent for assistance, if unsure.</i>
6	Are there any limitations on how the budget can be allocated? <i>E.g., budget line restrictions, budget spend timelines, percentage allocation across Co-Applicants, co-funding needed.</i>
7	Are there any IP or commercialisation considerations? <i>E.g., IP must be retained in a certain country, commercialisation isn't allowed.</i>
8	Are there any pre-submission funder requirements? If yes, provide details, including any deadlines. <i>E.g., expression of interest submissions, funder online portal registration for submitting/participating organisations, accreditations (e.g., GFGP)</i>

Project Overview

1	Proposed working title.		
	<i>A short phrase to refer to the proposed project idea.</i>		
2	Proposed project idea/concept (high level, e.g., 300 words)		
	<i>Where known, include aims or methodologies to help Co-Applicants get a sense of the proposed project.</i>		
3	Who are the proposed applicants?		
	<i>Provide individual's names and organisations (add rows if needed).</i>		
	Applicant	Name	Organisation
	Lead Applicant		
	Co-Lead Applicant (if applicable)		
	Co-Applicant 1		
	Co-Applicant 2		
	Co-Applicant 3		
	Co-Applicant 4		
Additional Co-Applicants (break down, numbering Co-Applicant 5 onwards)			
4	Lead Applicant details		
	Name:		
	Email:		
	Position in submitting (Lead) organisation:		
	Official name of submitting (Lead) organisation:		
	City & Country:		

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details
	Name:
	Email:
	Position in Co-Applicant organisation:
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:
	City & Country:
2	Will any of the areas impacting research equity, as provided in Section A, affect your ability to participate in the project? If yes, please describe how.
3	Are there any other aspects of the funding call that may affect your ability to participate equitably?
4	Do you have any suggested amendments to the proposed project idea/concept? If yes, please describe.

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Email:	
	Position in Co-Applicant organisation:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
	City & Country:	
2	Will any of the areas impacting research equity, as provided in Section A, affect your ability to participate in the project? If yes, please describe how.	
3	Are there any other aspects of the funding call that may affect your ability to participate equitably?	
4	Do you have any suggested amendments to the proposed project idea/concept? If yes, please describe.	

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Email:	
	Position in Co-Applicant organisation:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
	City & Country:	
2	Will any of the areas impacting research equity, as provided in Section A, affect your ability to participate in the project? If yes, please describe how.	
3	Are there any other aspects of the funding call that may affect your ability to participate equitably?	
4	Do you have any suggested amendments to the proposed project idea/concept? If yes, please describe.	



EquiPD FILLABLE FORM 2

EXPERTISE, RESOURCES AND REQUIREMENTS

SECTION A - LEAD APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Lead Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Email:	
	Position in submitting (Lead) organisation:	
	Official name of submitting (Lead) organisation:	
	City & Country:	

What the Lead Applicant can offer	
1	Based on the project idea/concept, how do you feel you could contribute? <i>Describe in brief, considering:</i> • <i>Your expertise</i> • <i>Your resources</i> • <i>The time you have available (during proposal development and the actual project) – be realistic.</i>



2 What expertise do you have that might enable or enhance the proposed project? (+/- 300 words)

- *E.g., expertise in data science, virology, anthropology, statistics, clinical trial management, ethics of AI, electron microscopy, focus group facilitation.*
- *Try to be specific, e.g., if offering expertise in statistics and the project involves adaptive trial design, do you specifically have expertise in statistics that support adaptive design?*

3 What resources do you have access to that might make the proposed project possible or enhance it? (max 300 words)

- *Infrastructure e.g.: access to an accredited ethics review board, a PET-CT scanner, a proprietary piece of software, a clinical trial site, a theatre for musical performances, a recording suite, a super-resolution microscope.*
- *Human resources e.g.: access to clinical trial staff, a bioinformatician, a community advisory board, a participant group the study requires, an interpreter, a tracker.*
- *Environmental circumstance e.g.: access to a coral reef, an endangered species, a celestial event, a social/ political event, an archaeological find.*

What the Lead Applicant needs

1 What are your critical resource requirements (without which you are unable to participate in the project)?

E.g., specific human resources, infrastructure, research costs.

Consider the total project budget available and number of Co-Applicants involved.

Note: Complete at a high level this is not an extensive list or budget.

2 What are your other 'nice-to-have' resource requirements?

E.g., human resources, infrastructure, research costs, travel and other project requirements.

Note: Complete at a high level this is not an extensive list or budget.

3 Organisations typically require the inclusion of indirect costs on a budget. Liaise with your research office (or equivalent) and provide specifics and/or indirect rate to be used for this proposal.

E.g., 20% of Total Direct Costs; 40% of Total Salaries Cost; rules for min FEC Recovery & Contribution to Overheads.

Policies, processes and timelines that may affect the application

1 Are there any national restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the nation of the Lead organisation)

E.g., Export control, Intellectual Property ownership, sanctions.

2 Are there any organisational restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the Lead organisation)

E.g., overhead policies, diversity/inclusivity, ability to meet funder prescribed due diligence, capacity constraints (e.g., professional support staff).

3 Provide any pre-submission requirements and their deadlines at your Lead Applicant organisation.

E.g., administrative, budgetary, letters of support, due diligence, internal peer-review, final submission sign-off.

Type of approval/sign-off	Working days required

4 Are there any other deadline considerations that need to be factored?

E.g., public holidays, organisational shutdown periods, key personnel availability.

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
What the Co-Applicant can offer		
1	Based on the project idea/concept, how do you feel you could contribute? <i>Describe in brief, considering:</i> • <i>Your expertise</i> • <i>Your resources</i> • <i>The time you have available (during proposal development and the actual project) – be realistic.</i>	



2	What expertise do you have that might enable or enhance the proposed project? (+/- 300 words)
	• <i>E.g., expertise in data science, virology, anthropology, statistics, clinical trial management, ethics of AI, electron microscopy, focus group facilitation.</i> • <i>Try to be specific, e.g., if offering expertise in statistics and the project involves adaptive trial design, do you specifically have expertise in statistics that support adaptive design?</i>
3	What resources do you have access to that might make the proposed project possible or enhance it? (max 300 words)
	• <i>Infrastructure e.g.: access to an accredited ethics review board, a PET-CT scanner, a proprietary piece of software, a clinical trial site, a theatre for musical performances, a recording suite, a super-resolution microscope.</i> • <i>Human resources e.g.: access to clinical trial staff, a bioinformatician, a community advisory board, a participant group the study requires, an interpreter, a tracker.</i> • <i>Environmental circumstance e.g.: access to a coral reef, an endangered species, a celestial event, a social/ political event, an archaeological find.</i>



What the Co-Applicant needs

1 What are your critical resource requirements (without which you are unable to participate in the project)?

E.g., specific human resources, infrastructure, research costs.

Consider the total project budget available and number of Co-Applicants involved.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

2 What are your other 'nice-to-have' resource requirements?

E.g., human resources, infrastructure, research costs, travel and other project requirements.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

3 Organisations typically require the inclusion of indirect costs on a budget. Liaise with your research office (or equivalent) and provide specifics and/or indirect rate to be used for this proposal.

E.g., 20% of total direct costs; 40% of total salaries cost; rules for min FEC Recovery & Contribution to Overheads.



Policies, processes and timelines that may affect the application

- 1 Are there any national restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the nation of the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., Export control, Intellectual Property ownership, sanctions.

- 2 Are there any organisational restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., overhead policies, diversity/inclusivity, ability to meet funder prescribed due diligence, capacity constraints (e.g., professional support staff).

- 3 Provide any pre-submission requirements and their deadlines at your Co-Applicant organisation.

E.g., administrative, budgetary, due diligence, internal peer-review, final submission sign-off.

Type of approval/sign-off	Working days required

- 4 Are there any other deadline considerations that need to be factored?

E.g., public holidays, organisational shutdown periods, key personnel availability.

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
What the Co-Applicant can offer		
1	Based on the project idea/concept, how do you feel you could contribute?	
	<i>Describe in brief, considering:</i> • <i>Your expertise</i> • <i>Your resources</i> • <i>The time you have available (during proposal development and the actual project) – be realistic.</i>	



2	What expertise do you have that might enable or enhance the proposed project? (+/- 300 words) • <i>E.g., expertise in data science, virology, anthropology, statistics, clinical trial management, ethics of AI, electron microscopy, focus group facilitation.</i> • <i>Try to be specific, e.g., if offering expertise in statistics and the project involves adaptive trial design, do you specifically have expertise in statistics that support adaptive design?</i>
3	What resources do you have access to that might make the proposed project possible or enhance it? (max 300 words) • <i>Infrastructure e.g.: access to an accredited ethics review board, a PET-CT scanner, a proprietary piece of software, a clinical trial site, a theatre for musical performances, a recording suite, a super-resolution microscope.</i> • <i>Human resources e.g.: access to clinical trial staff, a bioinformatician, a community advisory board, a participant group the study requires, an interpreter, a tracker.</i> • <i>Environmental circumstance e.g.: access to a coral reef, an endangered species, a celestial event, a social/ political event, an archaeological find.</i>



What the Co-Applicant needs

1 What are your critical resource requirements (without which you are unable to participate in the project)?

E.g., specific human resources, infrastructure, research costs.

Consider the total project budget available and number of Co-Applicants involved.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

2 What are your other 'nice-to-have' resource requirements?

E.g., human resources, infrastructure, research costs, travel and other project requirements.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

3 Organisations typically require the inclusion of indirect costs on a budget. Liaise with your research office (or equivalent) and provide specifics and/or indirect rate to be used for this proposal.

E.g., 20% of total direct costs; 40% of total salaries cost; rules for min FEC Recovery & Contribution to Overheads.



Policies, processes and timelines that may affect the application

- 1 Are there any national restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the nation of the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., Export control, Intellectual Property ownership, sanctions.

- 2 Are there any organisational restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., overhead policies, diversity/inclusivity, ability to meet funder prescribed due diligence, capacity constraints (e.g., professional support staff).

- 3 Provide any pre-submission requirements and their deadlines at your Co-Applicant organisation.

E.g., administrative, budgetary, due diligence, internal peer-review, final submission sign-off.

Type of approval/sign-off	Working days required

- 4 Are there any other deadline considerations that need to be factored?

E.g., public holidays, organisational shutdown periods, key personnel availability.

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
What the Co-Applicant can offer		
1	Based on the project idea/concept, how do you feel you could contribute?	
	<i>Describe in brief, considering:</i> • <i>Your expertise</i> • <i>Your resources</i> • <i>The time you have available (during proposal development and the actual project) – be realistic.</i>	



2 What expertise do you have that might enable or enhance the proposed project? (+/- 300 words)

- *E.g., expertise in data science, virology, anthropology, statistics, clinical trial management, ethics of AI, electron microscopy, focus group facilitation.*
- *Try to be specific, e.g., if offering expertise in statistics and the project involves adaptive trial design, do you specifically have expertise in statistics that support adaptive design?*

3 What resources do you have access to that might make the proposed project possible or enhance it? (max 300 words)

- *Infrastructure e.g.: access to an accredited ethics review board, a PET-CT scanner, a proprietary piece of software, a clinical trial site, a theatre for musical performances, a recording suite, a super-resolution microscope.*
- *Human resources e.g.: access to clinical trial staff, a bioinformatician, a community advisory board, a participant group the study requires, an interpreter, a tracker.*
- *Environmental circumstance e.g.: access to a coral reef, an endangered species, a celestial event, a social/political event, an archaeological find.*



What the Co-Applicant needs

- 1 What are your critical resource requirements (without which you are unable to participate in the project)?

E.g., specific human resources, infrastructure, research costs.

Consider the total project budget available and number of Co-Applicants involved.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

- 2 What are your other 'nice-to-have' resource requirements?

E.g., human resources, infrastructure, research costs, travel and other project requirements.

Note: Complete at a high level; this is not an extensive list or budget.

- 3 Organisations typically require the inclusion of indirect costs on a budget. Liaise with your research office (or equivalent) and provide specifics and/or indirect rate to be used for this proposal.

E.g., 20% of total direct costs; 40% of total salaries cost; rules for min FEC Recovery & Contribution to Overheads.



Policies, processes and timelines that may affect the application

- 1 Are there any national restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the nation of the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., Export control, Intellectual Property ownership, sanctions.

- 2 Are there any organisational restrictions, policies or other considerations that may impact equity in the project? (refers to the Co-Applicant organisation)

E.g., overhead policies, diversity/inclusivity, ability to meet funder prescribed due diligence, capacity constraints (e.g., professional support staff).

- 3 Provide any pre-submission requirements and their deadlines at your Co-Applicant organisation.

E.g., administrative, budgetary, due diligence, internal peer-review, final submission sign-off.

Type of approval/sign-off	Working days required

- 4 Are there any other deadline considerations that need to be factored?

E.g., public holidays, organisational shutdown periods, key personnel availability.

EquiPD FILLABLE FORM 3

PROJECT ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

SECTION A – LEAD APPLICANT TO COMPLETE

1	Proposed Lead Applicant and Co-Applicant roles & responsibilities				
	For the Lead Applicant and all Co-Applicants, indicate their proposed roles on the project and their responsibilities.				
	Role	Applicant name	Organisation	Project Role	Responsibilities
	Co-Applicant X	Jane Bloggs	University of X	Lead for Clinical Site A; Lead for Work-package D	* For the proposal: draft Work-package D; prepare University of X budget; review full proposal. * For the project: oversee work at Clinical Site A; lead data collection, analysis & write-up for Work-package D; contribute to primary publication; lead drafting of secondary publication on sub-analysis from Work-package D.
	Lead Applicant				
	Co-Lead Applicant (if applicable)				
	Co-Applicant 1				



Co-Applicant 2				
Co-Applicant 3				
Co-Applicant 4				
Additional Co-Applicants (break down, numbering Co-Applicant 5 onwards)				

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE (INCLUDING CO-LEAD APPLICANT, IF APPLICABLE)

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
2	Do you feel the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for you as Co-Applicant are appropriate? If not provide details. • Consider the expertise and resources you can offer. • Consider the time you have available (during proposal development and the subsequent project). • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.	
3	If you have any concerns about the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for the other Co-Applicants from an equity perspective, comment here. • Consider the expertise and resources they can offer. • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.	

SECTION B – CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE (INCLUDING CO-LEAD APPLICANT, IF APPLICABLE)

1	Co-Applicant details	
	Name:	
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:	
2	Do you feel the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for you as Co-Applicant are appropriate? If not provide details. • Consider the expertise and resources you can offer. • Consider the time you have available (during proposal development and the subsequent project). • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.	
3	If you have any concerns about the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for the other Co-Applicants from an equity perspective, comment here. • Consider the expertise and resources they can offer. • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.	

**CO-APPLICANT TO COMPLETE
(INCLUDING CO-LEAD APPLICANT, IF APPLICABLE)**



1	Co-Applicant details
	Name:
	Official name of Co-Applicant organisation:
2	Do you feel the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for you as Co-Applicant are appropriate? If not provide details. • Consider the expertise and resources you can offer. • Consider the time you have available (during proposal development and the subsequent project). • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.
3	If you have any concerns about the role(s) & responsibilities proposed for the other Co-Applicants from an equity perspective, comment here. • Consider the expertise and resources they can offer. • Consider this in the context of all Co-Applicants involved.

Contact



<https://health.uct.ac.za/equipd>



equipd.admin@uct.ac.za



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN
IYUNIVESITHI YASEKAPA • UNIVERSITEIT VAN KAAPSTAD



UNIVERSITY OF THE
WITWATERSRAND
JOHANNESBURG



UCL
University College London



**The
British
Academy**