

**California Breast Cancer Research Program
Community-Driven Pilot Studies to Explore Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Consumer Product Availability and Use
Budget Arrangement Scenarios**

Several possibilities exist for configuring the budget for the funding opportunity. The decision as to how to handle the budget may have implications on the power balance between the partners and should be carefully considered. The following table lists advantages and disadvantages to the various options.

Budget Arrangement	Advantages	Disadvantages
<p><i>Separate Awards:</i> Community organization(s) and scientific institution(s) each receive an award directly from CBCRP.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Each organization is in control of a key resource for carrying out the research. 2. This arrangement allows each eligible organization to receive autonomous funding and be eligible for indirect costs. 3. Structure helps to define & reinforce equal project responsibilities of each partner. 4. Structure may support growth of the community organization by requiring good fiscal monitoring and accounting procedures acceptable to the CBCRP. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structure can be a source of tension & disagreement if roles & responsibilities have not been clearly spelled out in advance. 2. Structure requires good fiscal monitoring & accounting procedures acceptable to the CBCRP to be in place which the community organization(s) may not have. 3. Each agency is responsible for submitting fiscal reports to CBCRP. 4. If funding from CBCRP is delayed due to problems with administrative issues, small agencies may be put in a cash bind. 5. All partners must jointly submit and approve an annual progress report which may require coordination between partners in a timely manner.
<p><i>Sole Contract with Subcontract (Scientific Organization)</i> The scientific institution(s) receive(s) the award from CBCRP and subcontracts part of the budget to the community organization(s).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community organization(s) still has good control of a key resource for carrying out the research but final control is in the hands of the scientific organization. 2. There may be a delay in receiving funds from the scientific institution. 3. The community organization is still eligible to receive funding for indirect costs. 4. Structure may support growth of the community organization by requiring good fiscal monitoring and accounting procedures acceptable to the scientific institution. 5. Scientific institution MAY be willing to "float" subcontract funds to the community organization(s) if CBCRP funds are delayed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final fiscal control is in hands of the scientific partner/organization. 2. Scientific partner may hire staff to work with community organization(s), where the community organization does not have any supervisory or oversight responsibilities for project staff. 3. Structure requires fiscal monitoring and accounting procedures required by the scientific institution to be in place or put in place, which may be a strain on a small organization. 4. The application runs the risk of being seen as not community-driven.

Budget Arrangement	Advantages	Disadvantages
	6. Scientific partner is the only partner fiscally responsible to CBCRP.	
<p><i>Sole Contract with Subcontract (Community Organization)</i> The community organization receives the award from CBCRP and subcontracts part of the budget to the scientific institution.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community organization has final control over a key resource for carrying out the research. 2. Each partner (if eligible) can receive funding for indirect costs. 3. Structure may support growth of the community organization by requiring good fiscal monitoring (including monitoring the subcontracts) and accounting procedures acceptable to the CBCRP. 4. Community organization is the only partner fiscally responsible to CBCRP. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community organization solely responsible to CBCRP for fiscal and programmatic reporting. 2. Community organization must enforce compliance in fiscal management and project deliverables with subcontracted scientific organization. 3. Community organization may not have sufficient funds to “float” for the project if CBCRP funds are delayed.
<p><i>Sole Contract with Community Partner as a Consultant</i> The entire budget is the responsibility of one partners (no subcontracts), and budget items necessary for the other partner appear as line items in that budget.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structure requires only one partner to have fiscal accounting/monitoring systems acceptable to CBCRP. 2. Only a single fiscal and programmatic report is necessary 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It may cause a power imbalance as not all partners are in control of all/part of the resources, and by extension can more easily have control of the research lie with only one partner. 2. If the research partner has the sole contract, the community organization does not gain experience in handling grant funds & building a fiscal infrastructure. They may also experience a delay in compensation for the work performed. 3. Only the partner with the sole contract can receive funds for indirect costs. 4. The application runs the risk of being seen as not community-driven.

Please note: the focus and intention of this initiative is to fund community-driven research on racial/ethnic disparities in consumer product use and availability. The research partners, as they develop their application, will be illustrating how their proposed research is community-driven. Some scenarios listed may require additional justification to illustrate how it will result in a community-driven project.

If you have identified another option not listed here, please contact Carmela Lomonaco (sri@cabreastcancer.org or 510-987-9886) to discuss further.