Synthesis-Ready Evidence Repository

Funding for high-quality evidence synthesis to support decision-making in education

Expression of Interest – January 2026

Statement of Intent

A collective initiative to support evidence synthesis and use in education

Much of the 5.8 trillion USD spent on education every year is not guided by evidence on what we know about children and learning. While the education evidence base is growing fast, challenges persist around evidence synthesis, translation and use. For example, synthesising evidence into clear, trustworthy policy and practitioner-friendly guidelines is unnecessarily expensive and time consuming.

In response, we are delighted to announce this **collective initiative** to build and test a **synthesis-ready evidence repository for the education sector.** Together, we will:

- Pool existing evidence data with a co-created sector taxonomy into a shared repository.
- Conduct a global and open RFP for evidence intermediaries and EdLabs (particularly in the Global South) to test a '**minimum viable product'** of the repository during 2026, by producing syntheses in response to country-based policy and practice needs.

The repository will be a '**back-end tool'** designed to make the work of evidence intermediaries much more efficient. It will build upon and support broader evidence synthesis infrastructure coalescing around the Evidence Synthesis Infrastructure Collaborative (ESIC). It is an important step in **making user-centred and contextually relevant synthesis the norm to support decision-making, especially in resource constrained environments.**

Depending on what we learn during 2026, we aim to scale the initiative much further in 2027. We intend that this relatively small investment in evidence infrastructure will have an **exponential impact on children's learning**.

Alive, Campbell Collaboration, Centre for Evidence and Implementation (CEI), Durham University, Education.org, The Education Collaboratory at Yale, Education Endowment Foundation, Education Sub Saharan Africa (ESSA), Effective Basic Services (eBASE) Africa, EPPI Center, ESRC, Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), Future Evidence Foundation, Innovations for Poverty Action, Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies, International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), Jacobs Center, Jacobs Foundation, The LEGO Foundation, Porticus, SUMMA | Laboratorio de Investigación e Innovación en Educación para América Latina y el Caribe, viaEd, Wellcome Trust, and the What Works Hub for Global Education

About this Call

The **Synthesis-Ready Evidence Repository** is a [collective initiative supported by more than 25 organisations](#) that are committed to better education decision-making by supporting evidence synthesis and use. **This specific call,** led by the What Works Hub for Global Education, is supported by the Gates Foundation, Jacobs Foundation, LEGO Foundation, and Porticus.

This call invites **Evidence Intermediaries** – organisations, or partnerships that generate, synthesise, and translate education evidence for use by governments or other senior decision-makers – to express their interest in participating in the testing phase of the repository, as described further in the next section. The call **prioritises evidence intermediaries based in low- and middle-income (LMIC) countries.**

Selected applicants, whether individual intermediaries, consortia, or larger organisations applying on behalf of multiple consortia, will receive **up to CHF 100,000 per consortium** to produce synthesis and translation outputs. The funding will support intermediaries to:

- **Produce high-impact synthesis and translation outputs** (from evidence briefs to comparative syntheses) that help governments and/or practitioners in their respective context apply evidence to education policy and practice decision-making.
- **Explore and apply the repository's datasets, tools, and taxonomy** to help make this possible, sharing insights on the repository's functionality, usefulness, and potential to strengthen how evidence informs decision-making.

Each output should inform and support a high-impact influencing opportunity, with a clear line of sight for uptake and use by government or senior decision-makers.

Beyond funding, this call is also an invitation to collaborate. It's a chance to generate new synthesis for education policy and practice, while helping test and refine a repository that advances evidence use in education systems globally. Through this process, the goal is to codify and share lessons that make evidence more actionable and directly connected to real decision-making.

Implementation will run from **April 2026 to January 2027**, allowing selected grantees to complete at least one full synthesis cycle, from design and analysis to reflection and feedback.

This Expression of Interest (EoI) marks the first step in a two-stage process. Shortlisted applicants will later be invited to submit full proposals under a Request for Proposals (RfP).

You can visit the [initiative page](#) for further details about this opportunity. For any questions, please contact proposals@wwhge.org.

A. Introduction and Context

This call is intentionally designed to learn from real use and practical experience. Selected evidence intermediaries will work directly with the synthesis-ready evidence repository's data and tools to produce policy-relevant syntheses, while also offering feedback on usability, relevance, and areas for improvement. Their contributions will play an essential role in shaping how the repository evolves into a global resource that ultimately supports evidence-informed decision-making, especially in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs).

To reinforce these aims, and to ensure that the resulting syntheses are closely grounded in local realities, this call prioritises evidence intermediaries based in LMIC contexts. Doing so strengthens the link between evidence producers and in-country decision-makers and helps ensure that synthesis outputs are relevant to local context, language, and policy and practice needs.

What Are Evidence Intermediaries?

Evidence Intermediaries are organisations and partnerships that bridge research and policy/practice. They identify evidence needs, synthesise and translate findings, and connect research with decision-makers so that evidence meaningfully informs policy and practice.

They might be:

- **Established or emerging evidence labs (eg EdLabs[1])** whether embedded in a government agency or working in partnership with ministries to link data, evidence, and policy
- **Research organisations (public and private), think tanks, multi-laterals or universities,** combining strong analytical capacity with policy engagement and close working relationships with governments
- **Independent researchers as part of a collaborative** partnering with government teams to synthesise or apply evidence
- **Government units, such as technical teams in the Ministry of Education or related Ministries**, that lead data and evidence initiatives for education and often commission or co-commission research
- **Collaborations across these groups,** such as an EdLab partnering with a local researcher or university to conduct synthesis and share findings
- **Umbrella organisations or large technical partners coordinating multiple in-country teams**, and supporting synthesis work and engagement with government partners across different settings.

If you help connect **research, data, and decision-making,** whether at national, regional, or the local level, you are part of this community, and we would love to hear from you.

---

[1] https://www.wwhge.org/resources/education-evidence-labs/

B. The Repository and Intermediary Engagement

The **Synthesis-Ready Evidence Repository** is being developed as a globally available resource to make it easier and faster to find, combine, and use education evidence for decision-making. It will host a synthesis-ready data from a range of studies and interventions in education, organised under a common taxonomy.

The early-stage repository represents the repository's first working version: **a 'minimum viable product' that includes data, a taxonomy, and prototype tools to be tested in real settings.** This stage of development will explore how users engage with the repository, what they find valuable, and what should be refined.

Intermediary Engagement

Evidence Intermediaries selected through this RfP will:

- **Select at least one policy or practice-relevant question** aligned with education priorities in their context spanning early childhood education (ECE), primary or secondary education.
- **Use the repository's data and taxonomy** to identify relevant evidence
- **Conduct an evidence synthesis and translation drawing on repository data.** We do not anticipate that the repository will contain sufficient information on any given topic to undertake an analysis without drawing on other sources too.
- **Share findings with policy makers and or practitioners (eg government partners)** for uptake and use
- **Share reflections and lessons** on usability, data relevance, and how the repository supports synthesis production.

Through this work, intermediaries will produce tangible synthesis outputs while also helping to refine the repository, testing how well it supports efficient and relevant synthesis.

What Do We Mean by Evidence Synthesis and Translation?

In this call, synthesis and translation go beyond traditional reviews. **It is about bringing together studies, data, and experiences from multiple contexts, complemented by local evidence and insights that may be produced in different languages, to answer real policy/practice questions.** It is also about translating that evidence into practical use by decision-makers through creative approaches, such as identifying 'inspiration evidence' from one context to inform another.

For evidence intermediaries, this is a way to connect evidence to action, helping decision-makers make sense of insights that are often scattered or inaccessible. Syntheses may take the form of systematic or rapid reviews, evidence summaries, or comparative or thematic analyses, as long as they help bridge research, policy, and

practice. We're also interested to explore the idea of 'living synthesis' (ie where synthesis is routinely updated, not just as a one-off analysis).

The goal is not just to test the repository, but to use it to generate meaningful, policy-relevant learning for both evidence intermediaries and governments.

Applying the Repository in Practice to Synthesis & Translation

Using the repository means putting its tools and data to work throughout your synthesis & translation process. This will involve:

- **Exploring the repository:** navigating its synthesis-ready data to find studies and evidence relevant to your policy question.
- **Applying the taxonomy:** using the repository's built-in filters (for example, country, educational level, population or implementation description) to select potentially relevant evidence.[2]
- **Producing synthesis:** downloading data from the repository into a local tool (eg Excel, EPPI reviewer) and then combining and analysing studies or dataset to answer your question, summarising insights, comparing results, or identifying evidence gaps.
- **Translating and sharing insights:** turning synthesis findings into accessible, policy-facing outputs that help governments or other audiences apply the evidence to real decisions.

Intermediaries will additionally reflect on **how effectively the repository supports your ability to find, connect, and apply existing evidence**, and to share feedback on what works well and what could be improved in future iterations.

We expect that **applicants will complement repository data with local sources, including non-Anglophone materials**. Local and complementary evidence should be used to enrich or contextualise findings, ensuring they remain grounded in national realities. Whenever possible, we will ask you to upload the additional evidence you discover and use back into the repository (using the same taxonomy) so that the repository grows as a public good for all. Support on using the repository will be part of the on-boarding process for successful bids.

The Kinds of Questions We Are Interested In

We are especially keen on locally relevant syntheses that align with national priorities (policy or practice), **within early childhood education, primary grades and secondary grades. This includes but is not limited to foundational learning (literacy, numeracy, and SEL).** Syntheses should aim to inform real policy decisions, strengthen programme design, and generate insights for system-level learning.

Strong syntheses can also help **refine research and learning agendas**, **improve existing programmes and practices**, and **bring lessons from 'near-neighbour' contexts** into national discussions, helping governments learn from comparable experiences elsewhere.

---

[2] There will be at least 17 built-in filters (categories in the taxonomy) in the early-stage repository. Further information will be provided prior to the RfP submissions.

Below are illustrations of the kinds of questions, synthesis approaches, and outputs that could be produced using the repository alongside complementary sources.

Example 1: Structured Pedagogy for Foundational Learning

How can lessons from the implementation of structured pedagogy in low-resource contexts across sub-Saharan Africa inform curriculum and teacher-support reforms in Rwanda?

Possible synthesis approach: Rapid evidence synthesis using a subset of repository sources and complementary empirical sources such as programme evaluations to examine the effectiveness of structured pedagogy interventions in improving foundational learning outcomes in sub-Saharan African contexts.

Potential outputs:

- **Descriptive policy brief:** A concise policy-facing brief using descriptive summaries and graphs to summarise the evidence based on structured pedagogy programs including patterns and lessons.
- **A concise visual or narrative summary mapping** illustrating common enabling and constraining factors and providing actionable insights to inform Rwanda's curriculum and teacher development reforms.
- **Integration note:** Practical recommendations for integrating evidence-informed structured pedagogy approaches into national foundational literacy strategies, curriculum revisions, and teacher professional development frameworks.

Potential decisions to inform:

- Sequencing small scale pilots before wider adoption
- Adapting elements of structured pedagogy to the Rwandan context, eg teacher support strategies and guidance

Example 2: Teacher Professional Development

What teacher training and support models have led to measurable improvements in primary level learning outcomes in West Africa, and how can these lessons inform national teacher-training reforms in Ghana?

Possible synthesis approach: A thematic synthesis using repository data on teacher professional development, coaching, and school support, comparing intervention models (peer coaching, cluster training, on-site mentoring etc.), complemented by national policy documents and qualitative evidence from teacher training colleges or reform pilots.

Potential outputs:

- **Synthesis brief** summarising the professional development with highest learning gains (across all the dimensions of foundational learning), contextualised to the country's teacher policy framework. Consider 'who' it worked for, and 'why'.

- **Policy options brief** outlining 2-3 feasible pathways to improve the existing approach to teacher training and support
- **Cost-outcome matrix** showing comparative professional development model costs and outcomes to support resource allocation and prioritisation

Potential decisions to inform:

- Teacher training models to prioritise, refine or scale in teacher training colleges
- Adjustments to the national/regional teacher development framework
- Sequencing pilots of the most promising approaches

Example 3: Accelerated and Remedial Education

How effective have accelerated or remedial learning interventions been in addressing post-crisis learning loss in foundational skills, and how might these insights inform Nepal's recovery strategy?

Possible synthesis approach: A synthesis integrating multiple repository sources on remedial learning, tutoring, structured pedagogy, SEL, and learning recovery with programme evaluations, cost data and contextual policy documents to examine comparative evidence on effectiveness, cost and scalability. The synthesis could include cross-county comparisons and consultation with national experts to identify transferable practices.

Potential outputs:

- **Evidence Summary:** Comparative analysis of remedial learning models, including key delivery conditions (teacher support, dosage, pedagogical approach, assessment integration)
- **Policy brief for education planners:** Prioritised recommendations for embedding proven learning recovery interventions within national curriculum and teacher support systems
- **Implementation guidance:** Short toolkit aligning evidence with curriculum pacing guides and formative assessment practices, designed for ministry programme units

Potential decisions to inform:

- The type of remedial or accelerated learning model(s) to adopt or adapt for Nepal's recovery strategy
- Appropriate delivery modalities and dosage before piloting and scaling
- Integrating learning recovery approaches into curriculum pacing and teacher support systems

Implementation Period

Selected evidence intermediaries will carry out their synthesis work over a maximum of eleven months, from **April 2026 to January 2027**. This timeframe includes inception, synthesis design, repository use, partner consultation, and submission of final outputs and reflections.

Within this overall period, applicants may determine the **scope and pacing** of their work, including the number of synthesis questions or outputs they aim to complete, as long as all activities are concluded by **January 2027**.

C. The Offer

Selected evidence intermediaries will receive **financial support** to produce education evidence synthesis while contributing to the testing and refinement of the early-stage repository. This is a partnership designed to support both your work and our collective learning about how repositories can make synthesis faster, easier, and more policy and practice relevant.

🪙 Funding

Grants of up to CHF 100,000 will be awarded, depending on the scope and ambition of the proposed synthesis. Smaller, focused syntheses (around CHF 20,000–40,000) and larger, multi-question projects or projects with multiple synthesis outputs (up to CHF 100,000) are both welcome.

Funding must be used to:

- **Produce one or more synthesis outputs** drawing on the repository's datasets and complementary sources.
- **Engage in repository learning activities**, including user feedback and reflection sessions

and may also be used (as appropriate) to:

- **Strengthen team capacity** for evidence synthesis, translation, and use by resourcing the right partnerships, training and technical assistance
- **Cover relevant costs,** including personnel, research inputs, and embedded technical support. We anticipate that many teams will want to 'outsource' some technical aspects of synthesis to a technical partner.

The grant is intentionally flexible, allowing you to structure your approach, partnerships, and resourcing to fit your context, technical strengths, and available time. *(See FAQ for further guidance)*

While a range of project sizes is welcome, **we encourage applicants who have the interest and capacity to consider more ambitious outputs or comprehensive syntheses**, as these may generate particularly valuable learning for the repository's early phase. This is an encouragement, not a requirement, and smaller, focused syntheses remain fully eligible.

Collaboration and Support

If selected, you will join a small, collaborative cohort of evidence intermediaries and we will ask you to participate in:

Periodic reflection sessions to explore what is working and how repository use is evolving across the cohort.
Hands-On Technical Support (Repository Use Only)
Light-touch technical support focused specifically on helping you use the repository.

This includes:

- **Onboarding and orientation** to the interface, tools, and taxonomy.
- **On-demand troubleshooting** for navigating the platform or accessing materials.

This support is **limited to repository use** and does not extend to broader synthesis production.

Technical Assistance Expectations: Any additional technical assistance you may need, such as support with conducting syntheses, deeper methodological guidance, or evidence translation, **should already be built into your team.** This may include bringing on a technical partner or collaborator as part of your application, where necessary.

Shaping What Comes Next

As early collaborators in this learning phase, your outputs, lessons, and feedback will directly shape if and how the repository evolves into a more robust, user-driven resource for education decision-making.

D. Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria

Eligibility Criteria

All Applicants must meet all the following:

Table 1. *Eligibility Criteria for the Call*

CRITERION	DEFINITION
EVIDENCE INTERMEDIARY	The organisation or partnership **fits the definition of an evidence intermediary** as presented in Section A.
LEGAL STATUS	The lead organisation is **legally registered** and able to receive and manage grant funds.
CLEAR PATHWAY TO SENIOR DECISION-MAKERS	The applicant is either a **government entity** or works in **formal partnership with government** (government as co-applicant or collaborator). **Alternative routes to senior policy and practice decision-makers** can also be considered depending on your context and how education policy and practice decisions are made.
LOCAL PARTNERSHIP & COLLABORATION	This call will **prioritise evidence intermediaries from LMICs**. Evidence intermediaries operating from outside LMICs must demonstrate meaningful partnerships with locally based organisations, including government actors or other senior decision-makers. This should include shared decision-making, clearly defined roles, and complementary expertise to ensure that synthesis work is grounded in local realities and builds on local needs/strengths.
THEMATIC FOCUS	Synthesis topics **may span early childhood, primary, or secondary education outcomes.**
LANGUAGE CAPACITY	Teams must have the ability to work in **languages** relevant to decision-makers in the context. In addition, as the repository interface and reflection sessions will be delivered in **English**, participating teams must have members with some working knowledge of English for this purpose.

Applications that do not meet all eligibility criteria will not proceed to evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria (for Eligible Applicants)

CRITERION	WHAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR	WEIGHT
1. RELEVANT EXPERIENCE	Demonstrated experience producing, translating, or using evidence to inform education policy and practice, particularly within or for governments in your country of focus. Prior engagement with synthesis-ready datasets or digital repositories is an advantage. Examples of prior synthesis which are related will strengthen applications.	**30%**
2. MOTIVATION AND PROPOSED SYNTHESIS FOCUS	A clear rationale for joining this phase, and a realistic, policy- or practice-aligned synthesis question (or a clear pathway for how such a question will be identified)[3] showing how your participation connects to national education priorities in your country of focus. Proposals that focus on LMIC policy or practice needs will be especially relevant.	**30%**
3. LINKAGES TO SENIOR DECISION-MAKERS	Evidence of active collaboration or partnership with the respective government or other senior decision-makers to ensure relevance, use, and potential uptake of evidence for decision-making. Ideally, a letter of support from the relevant decision maker will be included in the EoI stage.	**20%**
4. CAPACITY (SKILLS AND PEOPLE)	Availability of the right mix of technical, analytical, and translation skills, with a clear team or consortium structure to deliver the proposed synthesis effectively.	**20 %**

We intend to select around 15 applicants at this EoI stage to submit full proposals.

---

[3] We understand that many policy questions from senior stakeholders (eg ministers of education) require fast responses and cannot be predicted in detail many months in advance. In these cases, we will evaluate whether you have a clear pathway and commitment from senior decision-makers to engage with relevant questions at the appropriate time. You should provide examples of potential questions.

E. Submission Process and Timeline

How to Apply

Interested evidence intermediaries should complete a **short EoI form and upload a 2-page concept note** outlining their eligibility, motivation, and capacity to participate in this effort. The process is simple and designed for quick, transparent screening.

The information provided at this stage will be used to confirm eligibility and to identify the most suitable applicants to be shortlisted for the full proposal stage (RfP).

Submission Package

1. EoI Form

The form captures essential eligibility information, including:

- ❑ Typology of evidence intermediary, including whether applying as a single entity or consortium
- ❑ Legal registration and country of operation
- ❑ Pathway to Senior Decision-makers: Applicant is either a government entity or applying in partnership with one, verified through a letter of support or MoU. Alternative routes to senior policy and practice decision-makers may be considered depending on your context and how education policy and practice decisions are made.
- ❑ Confirmation of country focus and reach
- ❑ Local language capacity and English language capacity of key team members to use the database and interact with the team
- ❑ Thematic focus of proposed study
- ❑ Anticipated funding range (for indicative planning only and does not affect eligibility)

2. Short Concept Note (approximately 2 pages)

The concept note should provide a concise overview of your motivation, experience, and proposed synthesis focus for engagement.

It should include:

- **Motivation:** Why you wish to participate in this phase and what your organisation brings to the initiative.
- **Experience:** One to two recent examples of synthesis output you produced that was used in engaging with the government, as part of a policy process or consultation, or more directly informed government decisions in the respective country, highlighting the types of synthesis, data, and sources used.

- **Policy/Practice Focus:** One or two illustrative, policy/practice-aligned questions or synthesis areas you may explore if selected, and how they relate to decision-making in your context.
- **Team and Organisational Structure:** Names, titles, and short bios (2–3 lines) of key team members, including any government representatives. For consortia, specifying the lead organisation and partners with their respective roles.

The concept note **must be uploaded as a PDF using the template provided**. Other formats or templates will not be accepted. Applicants who are not a government entity would be expected to include evidence of their partnership with government or senior decision-makers (eg MoU, letter of support, formal partnership record) merged into the PDF submitted.

Indicative Timeline

Stage	Activity	Indicative Date
Launch of EoI	Call opens	17 Dec 2025
Helpdesk sessions	15-minute slots for individual clarifications.	7 Jan – 26 Jan 2026
EoI Submission Deadline	EoIs due (EoI eligibility form & 2-page concept note)	29 Jan 2026 **3PM UTC**
Notification of Results RfP Stage Opens	Shortlisted applicants invited to RfP stage	13 Feb 2026
Proposal Development Support	Optional session to co-design & refine your proposals and ideas	18 Feb – 4 Mar 2026
RfP Stage Closes	Final proposals submitted	6 Mar 2026
Final Selection	Selected intermediaries announced	End of Mar 2026

Helpdesk session registration will open early January.

Next Steps and Contact

For questions or clarifications, please contact:

✉ **proposals@wwhge.org**
💬 *Include 'Evidence Repository EoI' in the subject line.*

Thank you for your interest and ongoing commitment to strengthening evidence use in education!

Glossary

ECE	Early Childhood Education
EoI	Expression of Interest
LMIC/ LMICs	Low- and Middle-Income Country (or Countries) as defined by the World Bank
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MVP	Minimum Viable Product
RfP	Request for Proposals
SEL	Socio Emotional Learning
TA	Technical Assistance
WWHGE	What Works Hub for Global Education

FAQ

1. What qualifies as a consortium?

A **consortium refers to two or more organisations** applying jointly, bringing together complementary skills and perspectives. For example, a Ministry of Education partnering with a research institute, firm or university. In such cases, one organisation should serve as the lead applicant (responsible for managing the grant), while others contribute as technical or implementation partners.

2. Can government entities apply directly?

Yes. Government teams, including units within Ministries of Education, can apply directly or in collaboration with external partners such as research organisations or EdLabs.

3. Can non-government entities also apply?

Yes, but you must provide evidence of a clear pathway to senior decision-makers in your country. For example, this could be through an established relationship with a government counterpart, demonstrated through a memorandum of understanding, letter of support, or formal collaboration record. We are open to considering other forms of decision-makers relevant to your country (eg regional government, national practitioner networks or teacher federations).

4. Can teams apply if they work in languages other than English?

Yes. We encourage applications from teams working in a variety of local language contexts. The synthesis-ready evidence repository, its user interface, and learning sessions will be delivered in English. For this reason, participating teams will need at least some members who can engage in English for the purposes of using the tools and joining the sessions. We do not expect all team members to be English speakers, and teams working primarily in other languages are very welcome.

We recognise that teams that are non-English-speaking can bring valuable perspectives on how evidence is interpreted and used in diverse contexts, and we see this as a strength in the synthesis process.

5. Will proposals that focus on non LMIC contexts be eligible?

This call will prioritise proposals focused on LMIC contexts. However, proposals that focus on non-LMIC contexts may be considered where the applicant organisation demonstrates very strong and formalised partnerships with its own government or senior decision-makers and alignment to policy and practice needs.
We recognise that such intermediaries can provide valuable insights into how the repository supports government decision-making, and their participation can help strengthen the repository's development and use as a global public good.

6. What data should we expect to access in the repository?

The synthesis-ready evidence repository brings together data from major global datasets spanning ECE to secondary level outcomes. At this stage, for LMIC contexts, the strongest coverage is for primary level learning outcomes although the repository also includes studies from early childhood and secondary education. If selected for the RfP stage, applicants will receive more detailed information on the repository's structure and data coverage. This will help guide topic selection and refinement to ensure that proposed syntheses are well aligned with the available evidence.

7. How should I estimate a funding range for my proposed synthesis? What types of scope are acceptable for this call?

As indicated in the EoI, the requested **funding should reflect the ambition, scope, and feasibility of the proposed work** within April 2026 – January 2027.

We expect the funding amount to vary based on both the scope (how broad or multi-dimensional the policy question is) and the depth (the type and intensity of synthesis method proposed) of your study. We encourage you to propose a level of effort that is realistic for your capacity, context, and intended outputs. **You may also produce multiple outputs and aggregate the budget, for instance, two short, focused syntheses for up to 40,000**.

The following guidance may help:

Indicative Range (CHF)	Typical Focus and Effort	Examples of Possible Synthesis Types
20,000	Short, focused synthesis or evidence scan addressing a single, well-defined question	Rapid evidence scan, short narrative synthesis.
20,001 – 40,000	Targeted synthesis exploring one policy issue or reform area in depth, drawing on repository data and complementary local sources	Rapid evidence review, thematic synthesis, or focused realist synthesis.
40,001 – 70,000	Broader or multi-source synthesis integrating several data sources, potentially incorporating consultations or comparative perspectives	Realist synthesis, mixed-methods synthesis, scoping or mapping review.
70,001 – 100,000	Comprehensive, higher-intensity multi-output synthesis, involving extensive use of repository data, advanced analysis, or strong policy translation components	Systematic review, meta-analysis, or large-scale mixed-methods synthesis.

Kindly note that these ranges are only offered as guidance. All **syntheses are expected to use the repository as a data source**, supplemented by additional data/datasets.

8. How well defined should the proposed synthesis focus be at this stage?

At the Expression of Interest (EoI) stage, your proposed synthesis topic can be **indicative rather than final**. We are not expecting a full research protocol or fixed question(s) yet. However, you should use it to demonstrate that your proposed area of focus:

- **Aligns clearly** with current education priorities in your country or region;
- **Shows potential policy relevance**, particularly for government or similar decision-making; and
- **Illustrates your experience and analytical strengths** in evidence synthesis.

The goal is to understand *how you think about evidence and policy-practice connection*, not to lock you into a specific synthesis topic. Shortlisted applicants will have the opportunity to **refine and finalise their potential synthesis question(s)** during the RfP stage, informed by further understanding of the repository's datasets and feedback from the evaluation team. At that stage, applicants will be asked to submit a focused expansion of their proposed synthesis focus and approach.