

Gamani Corea Foundation Research Awards 2024-2025

Research Grants for Economic Development

Guidelines for Proposal Submission

April 2024



**GAMANI COREA
FOUNDATION**

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.	GRANT TYPES & ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.....	3
3.	AREAS OF RESEARCH.....	4
4.	TERM.....	4
5.	ELIGIBLE ACTIONS.....	4
6.	STRUCTURE OF THE PROPOSAL AND SCORECARD	4
7.	PROPOSAL SUBMISSION	9
8.	SUBMISSION OF FINAL RESEARCH OUTCOMES	10
9.	DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS	10
10.	SCHEDULE FOR THE COMPETITION	10
11.	MONITORING & EVALUATION	11
12.	SELECTION CRITERIA & PROCESS (<i>For the Evaluators</i>)	11
	Annex 1: Research Themes for the Proposed Competitive Research Grant Scheme.....	13
	Annex 2: Reviewers' Guidelines for Four Scale Scoring.....	14
	Annex 3: Disbursement of Funds	17

1. INTRODUCTION

The Gamani Corea Foundation (GCF) was set up by the late Dr. Gamani Corea, former Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), to take forward his passion for global development, with particular emphasis on Sri Lanka. The GCF is an autonomous, non-profit, charitable institution that aims to promote economic and multi-disciplinary research into international and national economic development. The mission of the GCF is to contribute to the socio-economic development of Sri Lanka and other low-income and middle-income countries through informed, independent, high-quality research.

GCF Research Awards 2024-2025

In keeping with the vision of Dr. Gamani Corea, the GCF will launch a set of Research Awards 2024-2025 to support cutting-edge economic and multi-disciplinary research. This round of Research Awards will focus on socio-economic challenges relevant for Sri Lanka.

2. GRANT TYPES & ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

• **Individual Grants**

- The researcher should hold a **Ph.D. from a reputed university in the area of economics**. A qualification less than a Ph.D. can also be considered if the researcher has a track record of successful research and publications and/or successful policy development and implementation.
- The research can be based on the generation and analysis of primary data or the analysis of secondary data.

• **Team Grants**

- The team should consist of at least 3 researchers.
- **The team leader: Should have a Ph.D. in economics from a reputed university and a track record of successful research and publications.**
- **The team members:** A Ph.D. qualification in economics is preferred. Ph.D. qualified researchers from other disciplines (particularly humanities, management, and/or social sciences) can also be a part of the team based on the nature of the research. A qualification less than a Ph.D. can also be considered if the researcher has a track record of successful research and publications and/or successful policy development and implementation.
- The research can be based on the generation and analysis of primary data or the analysis of secondary data.

Note: (1) Funds will be provided, using a competitive mechanism and only the winners of the competition will benefit from this grant scheme. (2) Individuals should apply for only one grant.

Table 1: Grant types and the grant size

Grant Type.	Value per grant
Individual Grants	Up to LKR 1 million
Team Grants	Up to LKR 3 million

3. AREAS OF RESEARCH

- Any topics in economics, or multi-disciplinary research between economics, social sciences, management and/or humanities.

OR

- Specific development topics set by the GCF. *(Please refer to Annex 1)*

4. TERM

- The duration of all types of grants is **one year** from the date of signing of the contract.

5. ELIGIBLE ACTIONS

- The grants facilitate and encourage the eligible individuals/teams to undertake good quality research and to strengthen research & development (R&D) activities directed towards economic development of Sri Lanka.
- Innovation and creativity in designing and conducting the research and achieving high quality outcomes are encouraged and will be highly valued. It is essential that all the research actions are designed to achieve the desired performance indicators.
- The proposed research projects should necessarily be original investigations. The problem to be tackled or new knowledge to be generated should be identified in the proposal.
- The relevance and impact of the research output on the economic development of Sri Lanka should be explained in the proposal.
- The budget ceiling for different grant types is given in Table 1 and the total grant size should not be exceeded by the planned actions.

6. STRUCTURE OF THE PROPOSAL AND SCORECARD

The proposal should be limited to a maximum of 15 pages (excluding title page and appendices) printed in A-4 paper format, single-spaced using Times New Roman font (font-size – 12). Each subheading below from 1-11 must start on a new page.

Layout of the Proposal

1. Title page
2. Information of Researcher/Research team members
3. Research problem/s & Justification
4. Literature survey
5. Methodology
6. Time sequence of project actions
7. Economic benefits

- 8. Ethical clearance
- 9. Budget Justification
- 10. Expected research outcomes
- 11. Role and Responsibilities (for team grants)
- 12. Appendices:
 - Table D.1 - Research output
 - CVs of the Research team

The proposal and the scoring system for each individual criterion are given below to enhance the transparency of the evaluation process. The italicized font differentiates the instruction to the reviewer from the proposal writer.

Each criterion will use a four-scale scoring where 1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, and 4 =Excellent. The score will be multiplied by its respective weight factor to derive the total weighted score. The proposals with a minimum score of **70** will be considered as satisfactory.

1. Title page

Title of the research project:
Area of specialization of the research study
Grant type: Individual Grant/ Team Grant

Name/s of reviewers who should NOT review the proposal can be incorporated in the cover letter

2. Researcher/Research team

Information of the individual researcher or research team (If applying under team grants a team leader should be identified). Give the following information in this section and **attach the curriculum vitae of the researcher/members of the research team.**

Name:
ID number:
Present affiliation & designation (if retired last affiliation & designation):
Highest academic qualification:
Field of specialization:
Official address:
Mobile Phone:
Email address:

.....
.....
.....

*Reviewer: Rate the competence of the research team
1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, 4 =Excellent*

3. Research problem/s & Justification

Explain the research question/s that you plan to address during the project and indicate the innovativeness of the proposed work. Identify the objective/s of the research project.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

*Reviewer: Rate the analysis of the research problem, rationale for the research question, and originality of the proposal
1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, 4 =Excellent*

4. Literature survey

Give a summary of the literature survey in the relevant research area based on the literature and cite the references.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

*Reviewer: Rate the comprehensiveness of the literature survey
1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, 4 =Excellent*

5. Methodology

Provide details of methodology. Describe the research activities in sufficient detail. The researchers are expected to draw on the recent economic literature relevant to the topic in hand. The analysis should be based on current theoretical models and the use of rigorous empirical techniques such as econometric analysis.

***If the research is based on already existing information or data (secondary data analysis), provide proper citations for the sources of information that will be used.*

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

*Reviewer: Rate the comprehensiveness of the proposed methodology
1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, 4 =Excellent*

6. Time sequence of project activities

Give a time sequence of all project activities with time estimation in months. Describe how the activities will be set up and how they will be implemented under a given time frame. Limit the number of activities to five. Provide the name and designation of the researcher(s) who will be mainly responsible for the implementation of the actions (project coordinator).

Activity	Sub-Activity	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
1.	1.1.				
	1.2.				
	1.3.				
2.....	2.1.				
	2.2.				
	2.3				
3.	3.1.				
	3.2.				
4.....	4.1.....				
	4.2.....				
	4.3.....				
5.....	5.1.....				
	5.2.....				

*Reviewer: Rate the chance of success of the project
1 =poor, 2 =fair, 3 =good, 4 =Excellent*

7. Economic benefits

State the potential benefits of the proposed research for the economic development of the country. This section should indicate the potential significance of the research studies for international development, national development, regional development or for the development of economic sectors.

.....

*Reviewer: Rate the value and relevance of the project
1 =Poor, 2 =Fair, 3 =Good, 4 =Excellent*

8. Ethical Clearance

Where relevant include the actions which will be taken to obtain ethical clearance for the study.

9. Budget Justification

Category (Indicative list of items)	Amount
Access to, or purchase of, literature and/or data	
Survey costs	
Field visits, Travel and lodging	
Stationery	
Equipment (e.g. computing, printing, telecommunications, software)	
Participation in conferences	
Submission fees to journals or publications	
Research assistance	
Staff costs	
Total	

A strong budget justification that explains the necessity and the basis for each category of the project costs must accompany the budget. Do not use titles such as “incidentals” or “general” or “miscellaneous” or “contingency” to describe any costs.

10. Expected research outcomes

Applicants can outline their expectations regarding research outputs and outcomes. This could include:

- Clearly stating the intended outcomes of the research project (e.g., policy recommendations, theoretical advancements, practical solutions).
- Describing the potential impact of the research on various stakeholders (e.g., policymakers, practitioners, academics and researchers, communities).
- Identifying specific deliverables (e.g., publications, reports, presentations) and their intended audiences.

11. Role and Responsibility (for team grants)

Clearly state the different roles within the research team and the responsibilities of each person in this section. A few examples are given below.

Name	Role	Responsibilities
<i>Eg: Researcher 1</i>	<i>Research team leader</i>	<i>Will be responsible for the overall conceptualization and management of the project. This will include the delegation of tasks and overall communication within the team. She/he will write the following sections of the report: (describe the sections).</i>
<i>Eg: Researcher 2</i>	<i>Econometrician</i>	<i>She/he will be responsible for the econometric analysis. This will include the selection of the appropriate econometric model, running of the model, and drawing inferences from the results. She/he will write the following sections of the report: (describe the sections).</i>
<i>Eg. Researcher 3</i>	<i>Research Assistant</i>	<i>She/he will be responsible for the literature survey and the compilation of data. This will include surveying the latest relevant literature, such as journal articles, books, monographs, working papers or reports, and obtaining data for the study, cleaning the data and arranging it for analysis. She/he will write the following sections of the report: (describe the sections).</i>

Also, please disclose any academic relationships between the team members. For instance, if there is a Ph.D. student as a team member, are some of the other team members her/his thesis supervisors or examiners?

12. Appendices

The proposal should contain Table D.1 and the Curriculum vitae of the Individual researcher/research team members as appendices. *Any other tables/graphs that the proponent may consider relevant could also be included as appendices.*

Table D.1 Research output of the Individual researcher/research team (During the years 2018-2023)

Output	Team leader	Researcher 1	Researcher 2	Total
Number of research papers published in peer reviewed indexed international journals				
Number of research papers published in peer reviewed local journals				
Number of other research publications (monographs, books, book chapters etc.) by reputed publishers				
Number of research papers presented and abstract published in academic symposia, professional bodies at international level				
Number of research papers presented and abstract published in academic symposia, professional bodies at national level				
Number of journals where the researcher served as an editor				

7. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

GCF uses an e-Research Proposal Management System (e-RPMS) which allows the submission of proposals and evaluation online. Please visit (<https://gcfresearch.lk/login>) to create an account and upload the proposal. For team grants, one researcher identified by the research team can register in the system to upload the proposal.

Proposals should be uploaded in their final form, and no additional written or other information will be considered in the evaluation process.

A softcopy of the proposal should also be emailed to gcf.researchgrants@gmail.com.

The proposal should be uploaded to the e-RPMS on or before noon, June 30, 2024. Proposals uploaded beyond the deadline will not be considered. Proponents are strongly encouraged to upload their proposals in advance of the deadline.

8. SUBMISSION OF FINAL RESEARCH OUTCOMES

The output(s) of the research would, in the first instance, be one or more e-publications by the Gamani Corea Foundation, after the research has been completed and written up. These e-publications will be placed on the GCF website.

- A copy of the data sets used to generate results should be submitted. These data sets will be used to replicate the results reported in the research papers.
- Papers should take care to attribute, fully and transparently, all sources from which material is taken for the paper, and distinguish between material cited from others and the original results and writing by the researcher(s).
- When using material obtained from AI engines, it's essential to clearly indicate the source and attribute the work of the AI engine appropriately and distinguish it from the researcher's original work.

The Foundation uses a plagiarism detection software to check the integrity of the papers submitted.

The GCF will also arrange for the dissemination of these outputs to appropriate audiences of policymakers, academics, researchers and interested members of the general public.

Subsequently, the researchers are welcome to further develop their research and publish their findings as journal articles, books or monographs among reputed publishers. These publications will be the outcomes of the research. **The researchers are expected to acknowledge the financial support from the GCF in such publications.** If published the bibliographic information of the publication (in APS style) should be submitted to the Foundation.

NOTE: Submission of outputs will be linked to the disbursement of funds. (Please refer to Annex 3)

9. DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS

- **Individuals/teams applying for a grant independently from their affiliated institution:** Upon signing the grant agreement, the funds will be disbursed to the grantee in installments according to Annex 3. Researchers are responsible for complying with the policies and requirements of the institutions they are affiliated with when receiving the funds and conducting the research.
- **Individuals/teams applying for a grant through the institution:** A grant agreement will be signed with the respective institution. The funds will be transferred to the institution's designated account in installments according to Annex 3.

10. SCHEDULE FOR THE COMPETITION

ACTIVITY	TO BE COMPLETED
Invitation for EOIs	April 2024
Submission of Proposals	May 2024- June 2024
Desk Evaluation	June 2024- July 2024

Discussion stage if needed	July 2024
Announcements	July 2024
Award of Grants	July-August 2024
Completion of Research	July-August 2025

11. MONITORING & EVALUATION

Each research team/researcher receiving a grant is expected to submit a progress report after 3 months of implementation to the foundation. This report shall include brief descriptions on major achievements, obstacles encountered and actions taken to overcome them.

12. SELECTION CRITERIA & PROCESS (For the Evaluators)

The scorecard given below will be used by the reviewers during the evaluation.

The scoring system for each individual criterion will use a four-scale scoring (1-4) where 1 =poor, 2 =fair, 3 =good, 4 =Excellent. Reviewers' guidelines for four-scale scoring are given in **Annex 2**.

Section	Weight (A)	Score (B)	Actual mark (A x B)
Researcher/Research team	5	4	20
Research problem/s & Justification	4	4	16
Literature survey	3	3	9
Methodology	5	4	20
Time sequence of project actions	3	2	6
Economic benefits	5	2	10
Total score			81

The score will be multiplied by its respective weight factor as given above to obtain the actual mark and a simple addition of the actual mark for each section will give the total mark.

The evaluation of proposals will be based on the following principles:

13. Objectivity
14. Fairness
15. Competence
16. Professionalism
17. Relevance to economic policy.

The evaluation process should not only be fair and objective but also should be transparent. Any potential conflict of interest should be prevented in the evaluation process. Hence, the reviewers will not be allowed to evaluate the proposals submitted by researchers at his/her university or the institution with which he/she has affiliation, financial connection, or personal interest.

The proposal will be evaluated by experts of the same discipline. The proposal will be assigned to two reviewers and two reviewers will carry out an independent evaluation.

The final average score must be a minimum of 70 out of 100 to receive a grant

NOTE: Individual and institutional grants will be evaluated separately.

The evaluation process involves the following steps:

- Submission of the Proposal
- Eligibility Check
- Evaluation of the Proposal
- Ratification of results by the board of directors of the Foundation

Proposal Submission should be done according to the Guidelines for submission of proposals, and the structure of the proposal is described in Section 6 of the Guidelines. The proposal should not exceed 10 pages excluding appendices.

Eligibility Check of the proposing research team will be conducted by the research unit of GCF and those satisfying the eligibility criteria will be assigned for review.

Evaluation of the proposal will be undertaken by an Expert Review Panel (ERP) selected and appointed by the Foundation. The ERP will consist of a minimum 2 reviewers including *subject specialists*. One of the panel members will be designated as the *Anchor Reviewer*. During the evaluation, the reviewers evaluate the proposals according to a set of evaluation criteria stated in this document and recommend whether to award the grant or not.

If a reviewer finds it difficult to come to a conclusion based on the proposal, he/she can request a discussion with the researcher/research team. In such cases, a virtual meeting will be arranged on a date and a time convenient to both parties.

Recommendation to award a grant will be made by the ERP based on the evaluation, and this will be forwarded to the Board of Ratification.

Ratification of results will be done by the Board of Ratification at an aggregate level. The Board of Ratification will consist of board members of GCF.

Annex 1: Research Themes for the Proposed Competitive Research Grant Scheme

International Economics

1. Reform of the International Financial Architecture taking into account the needs of emerging markets and developing countries.
2. Resuscitating the rules-based multilateral trading system.
3. Strengthening multilateralism in a multipolar world.
4. A multilateral initiative for debt relief for market access countries
5. Promoting export-led growth
6. Export Competitiveness
7. The Global economy and inclusive development
8. Migration and workforce development

Environmental Economics

9. Climate, agriculture, and sustainable transformation
10. Climate friendly industrial development
11. Green services

Political Economy, Institutional Economics, Planning

12. Economic planning in a market economy
13. Governance, institutions, and political economy

Human Capital, Human Development, Welfare Economics

14. Education
15. Health
16. Labour markets, labor force participation, employment
17. Social Protection
18. Poverty
19. Equitable and inclusive growth

Technology, Innovation and Growth

20. Technology and information
21. Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies and opportunities for economic development.
22. The Innovation Ecosystem: Challenges to Innovation Led Growth
23. Science, Technology and Innovation for Economic Growth

Macroeconomics

24. Policy Options for Sri Lanka's Economic Recovery
25. Rules vs. Discretion in Macroeconomic Policymaking
26. Fiscal and Monetary Policy Coordination
27. Debt Sustainability in the Context of Fiscal Operations and Balance of Payments
28. Inflation
29. Macroprudential Policy and Banking System Risks

Blue skies research

30. Any other topics to be proposed by the researcher or research team.

Annex 2. Reviewers' Guidelines for Four Scale Scoring

		Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Average/fair (2)	Poor (1)
1.	Research team – competence of the research team (for team grants)	There are at least 10 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researchers.	There are at least 8 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researchers.	There are at least 6 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researchers.	There are less than 4 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researchers.
	Competence of the researcher (for individual grants)	There are at least 5 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researcher.	There are at least 4 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researcher.	There are at least 3 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researcher.	There are at less than 2 publications (peer reviewed indexed journals, books or monographs published by recognized publishers) in total by the researcher.
2.	Research problem/s & Justification - analysis of the research problem, rationale for the research question and originality of the proposal	Problem is very clearly identified and communicated with relevant and accurate justifications and evidence	While not very clear, the problem is adequately identified and communicated with relevant and accurate justifications and evidence	Problem is marginally identified and briefly communicated with relevant and accurate justifications and evidence only being briefly presented.	Problem is very vaguely identified and elusively communicated and relevant and accurate justifications and evidence are not sufficient
		The identified problem is extremely important and amenable to research	The identified problem is important and amenable to research	The identified problem is somewhat important and amenable to research	The identified problem is somewhat important but not amenable to research
		Objectives very clearly stated and logically flow	Objectives are adequately identified and sufficiently	Identification of objectives is not very	Identification of objectives is poor and unclear.

		towards the identified problems and the literature search.	stems from research problem.	clear. How they stem from the research problem is not very clear.	
3.	Literature survey – Comprehensiveness of the literature survey	A thorough reference including most relevant and balanced coverage of most recent and important literature. Studies are compared and contrasted with controversies highlighted.	Less thorough and balanced coverage of most recent and relevant literature. Some controversies are highlighted.	Only some reference to most recent and relevant literature. Very briefly compare and contrast studies without controversies being highlighted.	Very brief reference to most recent and relevant literature. No comparing and contrasting. Controversies are not highlighted.
		Has included material to very clearly show the development and limitation in the area.	Has included material to sufficiently show the development and limitations in the area.	Briefly show the development and limitations in the area without adequate reference/evidence.	Very briefly and inadequately show either development or limitations in the area without reference/evidence.
4.	Methodology - technical/scientific merit (relevant to the discipline) of the proposed methodology.	Describe the research activities and methodological aspects very clearly and rationally in full detail. Demonstrate the applicability of methodology to the problem.	Adequately describe the research activities and methodological aspects clearly and rationally. Somewhat demonstrate the applicability of methodology to the problem.	Describe the research activities and methodological aspects, rationality briefly.	Vaguely describe the research activities and methodological aspects, rationality is not clear.
5.	Time sequence of project actions - the chance of success of the project	Extremely coherent and effective work plan with feasible time frame along with appropriate allocation of actions, sub actions and resources.	Adequately coherent and effective work plan with appropriate allocation of actions, sub actions and resources.	Work plan with appropriate allocation of actions, sub actions and resources has been briefly explained.	Work plan with appropriate allocation of actions, sub actions and resources has not been sufficiently explained. The work plan does not appear to be effective.

6.	Economic benefits	The outcomes of the project have a high relevance and impact on the economy and society.	The outcomes of the project have considerable relevance and impact on the economy and society.	The outcomes of the project have some relevance and impact on the economy and society.	The outcomes of the project has little relevance and impact on the economy and society.
		Has very clearly identified and stated all the target beneficiaries as well as the indirect benefits to the stakeholders.	Has adequately identified and stated most of the target beneficiaries as well as indirect benefits to the stakeholders.	Has briefly identified and stated some of the target beneficiaries as well as indirect benefits to the stakeholders.	Has either briefly identified and stated some of the target beneficiaries or the indirect benefits to the stakeholders.

Annex 3: Disbursement of Funds

Research papers based on Analysis of Existing Information or Data

Payment	Milestone	% of payment	Cumulative Payment %
1st Tranche	Upon signing of the contract between the researcher or institution and the Foundation	10	10
2nd Tranche	Upon submission of a draft research paper/article of an acceptable standard	45	55
3 rd Tranche	Upon completion of the research paper to an acceptable standard	45	100

Research papers based on Analysis of New Data or Information (e.g. a Survey)

Payment	Milestone	% of payment	Cumulative Payment %
1st Tranche	Upon signing of the contract between the researcher or institution and the Foundation	10	10
2nd Tranche	Budget needed for generating new information (e.g. conducting a survey)	Based on a discussion with the Foundation staff on a case by case basis	
3 rd Tranche	Upon submission of a draft research paper/article of an acceptable standard	<i>To be decided on a case by case basis, depending on the amount set aside for the second tranche</i>	
4 th Tranche	Upon completion of the research paper to an acceptable standard	<i>To be decided on a case by case basis, depending on the amounts paid in the preceding steps</i>	100