

## Scoping our planet – General feedback on applications

Following the review of all applications received for Scoping our planet opportunity seeds, the reviewers noted common themes and areas for potential improvement against the [evaluation criteria](#).

### **Comments for applications that were determined as *out of scope or non-compliant*:**

- + A number of applications were identified as out of scope, and therefore did not progress to full review. Proposals may have been determined as out of scope for any of the following reasons:
  - They did not show how the idea *either* aligns with *or* challenges the assumptions of the Summary, Beliefs, or Observations in the [opportunity space document](#), or,
  - The idea was undifferentiated or is likely to happen without ARIA support, or,
  - The application requested funding for a commercial or close-to-commercial stage product.
  - The application was in scope for the [Forecasting Tipping Points](#) programme (funding call to be released in the coming months) .
- + Some applications were deemed as non-compliant as they had not followed the submissions guidelines. This included applications that were longer than 3 pages (excluding references).

### **Comments against criterion one: *Importance and vision of the proposal***

- + Applications that clearly stated what they are proposing to do within their answer to the first question built a stronger case against this criterion.
- + While some of the ideas described in the proposals showed strength, they often did not make the case strongly enough for how the idea could change scientific consensus or open up new research paths. Higher scoring proposals included evidence to support how the idea being proposed could have a transformational impact beyond the research focus.
- + Applications that clearly articulated why the idea has been underexplored by the field and why the team themselves have not been able to work on it before were more likely to score highly against this criterion.

### **Comments against criterion two: *Our confidence that the individual or team can deliver on the proposal***

- + Proposals that included a well-considered plan that was clearly explained were given higher scores, as they helped reviewers build confidence that the individual/team could deliver on

the proposal even though the key ideas to be explored were bold and high risk. Proposals that scored highly in this area included details of the first experiment or step they were planning to do/take.

- + While it was helpful to see the skills and knowledge the applicant has built in their career and how these would directly support the project, reviewers also wanted to see detail of the applicant's intrinsic motivations for wanting to work on the proposed idea. For example, is this project a new departure from their existing research, in a direction unlikely to be supported outside of ARIA? Evidence that the individual/team had experience in bringing high risk ideas to reality was also valued.

### **Comments against criterion three: *Relevance to ARIA***

- + Particularly for proposals in areas of research where there are existing, alternative funding streams, reviewers needed to see more evidence of why the proposals were not well suited to those schemes and what specifically made them relevant to ARIA.
- + Applicants would have benefited from illustrating a transformational impact or a significant shift in conventional thinking that would be catalysed by the success of the proposed project, and explaining why the conventional thinking in their field makes it difficult for them to attain funding from other sources.

For more information on ARIA's review and selection process for opportunity seed applications, please see [here](#).