



## SNAPP Proposal Frequently Asked Questions

*What does SNAPP mean by sustainable economic development, human well-being, and nature conservation?*

**Sustainable economic development** refers to the policy and investments that create the conditions for equitable and inclusive economic growth and improved quality of life by expanding livelihood opportunities for all segments of society including individuals, business interests, and communities while advancing mutual gain for the public and private sector.

**Human well-being**, in the broadest terms, is about the objective and subjective factors that make up a person's health and quality of life. It is context specific. Human well-being can be affected by material and non-material components, such as basic material needs (e.g., adequate income, housing), physical and mental health, social relations (e.g., cohesion, strong social support networks), freedom and choice, governance, and equity and equality.

**Nature conservation** can refer to either broad issues of conservation that are problem-oriented (e.g., climate change, land-use change, sustainable fisheries, biodiversity offsets, illegal trade in wildlife) or biodiversity conservation efforts directly (e.g., matters related to composition, structure, and function of ecosystems). Nature conservation can also include efforts focused on conserving ecological processes that form the foundation for ecosystem services (e.g., natural flow regimes, fire regimes, nutrient cycling).

*What is the model of a good SNAPP working group?*

SNAPP has supported synthesis science teams since 2013. Members should work together from the beginning of the project to design and co-produce its knowledge products. Gaining strong participation commitments from the outset will help maximize project success since the group's proposal and first meeting will set the project research questions and a clear plan for all remaining work. In an evaluation of our outcomes, we have found that effective working groups tend to include the following:

### **Working group composition**

- A transdisciplinary team of 12-15 individuals from a broad suite of sectors, institutions, and specialties who would not otherwise convene around a science and conservation challenge. Scientists, practitioners, other experts, and (in some cases) stakeholders will work together from the beginning to design the project and co-produce its products and outcomes.

- Effective working groups typically include members that play different roles, including subject matter experts from a range of natural and social sciences, as well as strategy or application experts who can facilitate the translation and integration of knowledge across disciplines (with the end user always in mind). To ensure decision-relevance, groups may include policymakers or stakeholder representatives, or engage an advisory committee.
- Working group members from the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and/or The Nature Conservancy (TNC) are highly recommended, as are representatives from other conservation and sustainable development non-governmental organizations (and similar organizations or government agencies).
- Contributions of individuals from diverse backgrounds, beliefs and cultures.

### **Working group leadership**

- A willingness of all members to abide by SNAPP's [ethics and inclusion statement](#) and collaborative principles outlined in the [working group guide](#).
- Principal Investigators (PIs, or team leads) with demonstrable experience and skills leading diverse teams to achieve both scientific and action-oriented objectives.
- A trained facilitator to plan and manage the first working group meeting is required and may be useful for consideration at future meetings. This helps the group launch in a productive way and allows PIs to participate fully as a team member. Facilitators can be especially helpful throughout the project for PIs who are new to collaborative, trans-disciplinary, multi-sector working groups.
- Groups are encouraged to consider whether a postdoctoral research fellow could be crucial to the group's success. Several past SNAPP projects have increased productivity with postdocs focused on supporting group analyses and maintaining project momentum between meetings. For more information, see the SNAPP Postdoctoral Researcher Requirements under the Resources section.

### **Working group meetings**

Three to four working group meetings spread over a two-year period. Each meeting should be 3-5 days in length, focused on data analysis (qualitative and quantitative), synthesis of existing data and information, and ongoing development of implementation products (policy recommendations, decision support tools, new strategic approaches, etc.). Collaboration and analysis continue between meetings. See the SNAPP Travel Policy in the Resources section for more details.

**Due to the ongoing uncertainty caused by the global pandemic, SNAPP welcomes innovative models including virtual and hybrid collaboration spaces.**

### ***Who is eligible to apply for a SNAPP working group?***

Researchers and practitioners of any nationality affiliated with an academic, governmental agency, multilateral, or nonprofit institution may submit a proposal. Individuals operating independently are also eligible to apply. Individuals from private sector institutions are fully

eligible to be participants of a working group but are not eligible to lead SNAPP working groups as PIs. Individuals and organizations from the humanitarian and development sectors are encouraged to submit SNAPP proposals.

Please note that members of SNAPP's Board of Directors and Science Advisory Council cannot be named a member or leader of the working group, nor provide a letter of recommendation. They will be required to recuse themselves from all discussions on the evaluation of any proposal they may have spoken to or offered feedback during the course of its development, as well as for any other conflict of interest. However, these individuals may eventually serve as members on funded projects when appropriate.

***How can SNAPP funds be allocated? Are there limits on the types of activities for proposals? Is there an upper limit on the funding amount for proposals?***

Unlike a grant, SNAPP does not transfer funding to the PI's home institution. SNAPP funds are provided to convene working groups and, in some cases, to support salaries of postdoctoral fellows or research/technical assistants committed to specific projects (see below). Funding restrictions are as follows:

- Under no circumstances may SNAPP funds be used to pay salaries of Principal Investigators, nor can these funds be used to pay for routine working group meeting attendance by PIs.
- No overheads may be charged to SNAPP funds.
- Funds may be used to pay for analysis conducted by an outside contractor, or even a specific analysis conducted by a working group member (who is not a PI) where it is above and beyond the engagement of most working group members and not otherwise part of this person's job. Funds may also cover postdoctoral researchers, research assistants, facilitators, graphic designers and other independent contractors on a case-by-case basis.
- TNC is the fiscal agent for SNAPP and will execute all contracts unless otherwise approved in advance and in writing; therefore, standard TNC constraints on conflicts of interest apply.
- There is no upper limit on contracts. Under a certain amount, we can easily employ a letter of agreement and larger amounts will take more time in advance for programmatic and legal review.

***Are matching sources of funding required for a successful application?***

Matching sources are not required but are strongly encouraged.

***How should our proposal demonstrate a plan to connect our science results to entities that can use these results to guide policy and practice?***

SNAPP aims to deliver innovative science in a practical form that can be rapidly adopted by its intended audiences. Please note that while scientific papers are expected outputs of SNAPP working groups, these papers alone are insufficient products for a competitive SNAPP working group. Successful proposals will clearly articulate a likely series of actions and intended

outcomes that will ensue as a result of the new knowledge, methods, strategies or tools produced by the working group. Proposals should avoid language or intent to develop research products that will then simply be made available to stakeholders without a significant element of co-design and -creation from the SNAPP working group. The proposal must outline a clear and specific plan about how stakeholders will be engaged throughout the product development phase, and how the team's final products will be poised for implementation and use by specific entities.

Successful working group proposals will include a letter of endorsement from one or more program or entity (whose staff will participate in the working group), stating why the working group's efforts are important and outlining how they intend to use the results.

***What support, in addition to funding, does SNAPP provide to funded working groups?***

SNAPP staff and program representatives will provide various support throughout the project, including:

- Working group and project management advice, as appropriate, informed by SNAPP staff's experience with successful working groups
- Limited meeting travel, logistics and reimbursement support (see the SNAPP Travel Policy in the Resources section)
- Contract development support, as appropriate
- Assistance identifying pathways to procure data analysis and other support, as needed
- Communications and outreach conduits, including in the development of a project webpage and promoting of resulting products through SNAPP and partner institution social media.

***What is SNAPP's proposal review process and timeline? Will I receive feedback on a rejected proposal?***

The SNAPP review process is two-tiered. Successful submission of a complete and accurate proposal is Round 1. Proposals that most strongly align with SNAPP's mission and priorities (as described online and in the RFP) will advance to Round 2 for rigorous scientific review and vetting of their plan to implement long-term, tangible changes for nature conservation and human well-being.

Due to the volume of proposals received, SNAPP is unable to provide feedback on proposals that do not advance to Round 2. SNAPP will share limited feedback (usually 3-4 summarized bullet points) about proposals that advance to Round 2 but are not ultimately recommended for funding. Limitations in staff time prevent SNAPP from providing additional written comments or the opportunity to discuss declined proposals.