Science & Technology Facilities Council

STFC 2020 NUCLEAR PHYSICS REVIEW OF CONSOLIDATED GRANTS
Please note this round includes Equipment requests

Guidelines for Applicants
OCTOBER 2019

CLOSING DATE: Grant Proposals and Form X – 11 February 2020

Please read these guidelines carefully as the proposal format has changed in order to improve the process for external reviewers.

Science & Technology Facilities Council

1   Overview

1.1   Introduction

1.1.1   This document sets out the guidelines for the 2020 Nuclear Physics Consolidated Grants round, and it should be read in conjunction with the [STFC Grants Handbook](#).

Please note: Funds are available in this grants round to apply for capital equipment items.

1.1.2   Applicants are asked to note the constrained financial environment within which the STFC is operating. It is important that proposals are ambitious and forward looking and that groups still request what they need to carry out their full programme of work; however expansion of the overall programme will not be affordable. Funds for capital and resource are separate and an award of capital will not reduce the availability of resource available and vice versa.

1.1.3   The grants round and these guidelines have been developed to ensure that the process:

- Is transparent and accountable, particularly with respect to the means of prioritisation;

- Is efficient, in terms of the requirement for applicants (length of proposals and detail provided), the reviewers, panel members, and the use of STFC office resources;

- Provides a timely outcome.

1.2   Nuclear Physics Grants Panel (NPGP) remit

1.2.1   Grant proposals are reviewed by the NPGP. The panel's role is to:

- Assess and make recommendations to the STFC Executive on research grant applications in nuclear physics;

- Take account (as appropriate) of the recommendations of external reviewers and the conclusions of specialist peer review panels. The latter may be convened by the executive to advise on consolidated grants, contiguous groups of research requests, or research requests which are judged (on the basis of cost or propriety) to warrant such separate, in-depth assessment;

- Advise the STFC's Science Board and the Executive as required on all issues relating to research grants, including monitoring the level of funding allocated to grants; and

- Carry out other such tasks associated with peer review as the Executive might require.

1.2.2   The membership of the NPGP taking part in the 2020 review of the consolidated grants can be found on the [STFC website](#).

1.3   Strategic guidance

1.3.1   In assessing proposals the NPGP will take account of the outcome of the 2017 Balance of Programmes Exercise and the strategic priorities identified by Science Board, along with the recommendations of the 2017 Programme Evaluation of Nuclear Physics. The community should note that the Programme Evaluation of Nuclear Physics which concluded in early 2019, which aims to ensure that the programme is optimal, balanced, coherent and sustainable will be published before the end of 2019. STFC will take note of international reports (e.g. the NuPECC long range plan) to help set the context for the proposed work.

The grants panel will ensure that:

- The programme supported is scientifically excellent;

- The programme is clearly in line with STFC's strategic science objectives and priorities; that it addresses the impact agenda (e.g. in terms of technology development and knowledge transfer) and is responsive to changes and future opportunities within the community;

- There is an appropriate balance between the programmatic themes within nuclear physics and the development of novel, generic technologies consistent with the overall STFC science strategy.

1.3.2   The Pathways to Impact statement should identify technology, skills development and UKRI's common funds such as Newton, ISCF (Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund)/GCRF (Global Challenges Research Fund) opportunities that are part of the group's activities and strategy for the future. There is a possibility to bid for additional funding through these funds.

1.4   Timetable

1.4.1   The timetable for the review will be as follows:

Cross Community Requests	19 November 2019
Closing date for consolidated grant proposals and Form X	11 February 2020
Reviewing process	April 2020
Clarification Meetings	Early May 2020
Applicants to receive and respond to reviewer comments	Mid May 2020
Peer Review meetings	May 2020 June 2020
Science Board	July 2020
Outcome announced	September 2020
Grants Commence	1 October 2021

1.5   Enquiries

1.5.1   Enquiries can be directed to the following staff at STFC:

- Mrs Jane Long: ☎   +44 (0) 1793 442141   ✉   jane.long@stfc.ukri.org

- Mr Ian Burns: ☎   +44 (0) 1793 442089   ✉   ian.burns@stfc.ukri.org

1.5.2   Problems encountered using the JeS system should be directed to the JeS helpdesk:

- JeS enquiries: JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk

2   Consolidated Grants

2.1   2020 Consolidated Grants (CG)

2.1.1   STFC provides support for the nuclear physics community through consolidated grants. Following a review of the implementation of the consolidated grant scheme in 2014, the mechanism has now been amended based on experience to address lessons learned. The 2020 grants will now move to the new three year simplified grants. During the Consolidated Grants period, there is the potential to request up to a one year no cost extension, providing flexibility to start posts later in the grant period.

2.1.2   Each university department (or equivalent sub-unit within the university) may submit one consolidated grant proposal per subject area every three years. Nuclear physics experiment and nuclear physics theory are considered to be one subject area and should be applied for together on the same consolidated grant proposal.

2.2   Consortium Grants

2.2.1   Groups from different institutions working collaboratively in the same well-defined research area may apply for a consolidated research grant as a consortium. This is intended to allow members of such consortia the opportunity to bid for shared resources, that they might not otherwise be able to secure on their own, perhaps due to the size and/or scope of their activity. In practice, this would require the submission of a single case for support, with either one JeS form per institution or one JeS form on behalf of the consortium.

2.2.2   An individual will only be supported on a maximum of one consolidated grant. Therefore individuals in groups that apply as a consortium will be excluded from also applying as part of their individual institution's application.

2.2.3   In the case of a consortium application by groups from different institutions, the consortium should provide a single Case for Support. In such a case the word 'group' in the guidelines that follow should be interpreted to apply to the consortium as a whole.

2.2.4   If you are considering submitting a new consortium grant, please let STFC know prior to submission using the contact details in 1.5.1. In some instances, a brief written summary of the proposed consortium may be requested as part of this process.

3   Classification of Posts

3.1   Categories of Staff

3.1.1   Consolidated grants have four categories of staff: academics, core staff, non-core staff, and support staff.

3.1.2   New posts may be requested in either the core or non-core categories, or a change in categorisation may be requested, so a post assigned as non-core in the 2016 round may now be requested as part of the core group and vice versa. It is not expected that core posts would represent a high proportion of the non-academic total grant costs.

3.1.3   Cross-community effort is available to provide support to the whole of the UK nuclear physics community. The posts are mostly located in Daresbury Laboratory and at the Universities of Liverpool and Manchester, with cross-community staff in key technology areas for the programme, including target making, technical support, and mechanical, electronics and software engineering. Cross community staff support Consolidated Grant themes and PPRP projects. Details of the STFC Nuclear Physics Cross Community Team can be found on STFC's Nuclear Physics Group webpage: The Resource allocation following the meeting of 21 November 2018 can also be found on the Nuclear Physics page.

3.2   Definition of core posts

3.2.1   'Core posts' are defined as underpinning support that is, to a great extent, not contingent on the specific details of the group's future programme of work. For instance, a nuclear physics group may require an electronics engineer, which they will need regardless of which experiments they are going to run over the grant period. Senior research posts may be defined as a core post where their role is essential to the strategic scientific success of the group and they possess critical expertise with skills that would be difficult to replace.

3.2.2   Ultimately, the grants panels will make judgements on whether a post is core on a case-by-case basis, but the following may be used as a guide. Please note that this list is not intended to be exhaustive, nor will all of these categories be applicable to every grants panel.

   • Expertise in the areas of experimental development and construction;
   • Software/computing support;
   • Expertise in the maintenance and operation of experiments;
   • Engineering and technical expertise, e.g. electronic engineers, mechanical designers.

3.2.3   Pool staff and general secretarial or generic computing support staff are not considered to be core staff.

3.2.4   Core group infrastructure may also include posts which are needed as cross-community support. Such posts are likely to provide engineering and technical expertise, such as electronic engineers, mechanical designers, software support, and target makers.

3.3   Making a case for core posts

3.3.1   Each group must make a case as part of their proposal for the overall size of their proposed core group. This should stress the areas of expertise of the group, building on work of the individual post holders over the last three years. It should also give a plan of work for the next three years, and explain how this maps on to the proposed core group.

3.3.2   Posts requested as core may be awarded as non-core posts by the panel, if it is felt that the scientific case does not require the long term continuity intended for core posts, but that the case is strong enough to justify funding.

3.4   Non-core posts

3.4.1   Non-core posts will be allocated in response to strong physics cases. A competitive allocation procedure will be used for them, comparing cases for the continuation of both existing, and new posts.

3.4.2   Requests may also be made for support staff. These include administrative effort as well as general computing support. These posts are also considered as non-core posts.

3.5   Project Studentships

3.5.1   It is possible to apply for project PhD studentships as part of grant proposals. For guidance, please see the STFC Grants Handbook. A strong case needs to be made explaining how essential the student is to the theme on which they will be working.

3.5.2   The NPGP will assess the scientific quality of the project, consider whether the project offers suitable training in research methods and techniques, comment on the broader training, and consider if the studentship adds value overall to the research proposal. All potential costs should be included in the proposal.

3.6 Co-investigators named on grants

3.6.1 Co-applicants who, following peer-review, are not in receipt of any funding for academic time are usually not listed on the grant. However, genuine participants in the research who do not require any funding for academic time such as emeritus researchers or fellows fully or partially funded from other sources, are eligible to be named as co-investigators. It is recognised that such individuals may sometimes be difficult to identify, so the PI should alert STFC to ensure that any such instances can be dealt with. Cases should be made for such posts as the grants panel will assess these along with all others. If overheads are sought for such posts, this should be made clear in the case for support.

4 Applying for a Consolidated Grant

This section should be read in addition to the guidance provided in the [STFC Grants Handbook](#).

4.1 Submitting applications through the JeS system

4.1.1 All proposals should be submitted online using the [JeS login screen](#). This screen also has links to tutorials and system help. In the event of any queries relating to the JeS system please contact the JeS helpdesk directly by email at: JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk or by phone on: +44 (0) 1793 444164. Applicants should use the JeS form for standard grants, and should apply for a grant of three years duration. The following options should be selected in the JeS system when putting your proposal together:

Council	STFC
Doc Type	Standard Proposal
Scheme	Standard
Call	NPGP 2020
Peer Review Preference	Nuclear Physics Panel

4.1.2 Failure to select the correct options may mean the proposal does not reach the correct Research Council or department and will ultimately result in your JeS proposal being returned.

4.1.3 The consolidated grants for this round will have a start date of 1 October 2021 and an end date of 30 September 2024. You are reminded that all consolidated grants must start on the announced start date. For this reason there is no flexibility to adjust the grant's start date, and when awarded, the latest start date will be the same as the earliest date.

4.1.4 The deadline for the submission of consolidated grant proposals and Form X is 4pm on 11 February 2020.

4.1.5 **Please note:** it is the responsibility of the PI to ensure that their institution's Administration Department submits the proposal before the submission deadline, and that they therefore submit the proposal to the Admin Department sufficiently far in advance of the deadline. Applicants can view the status of their proposal online by logging into the JeS system. STFC office staff are unable to view the proposal until it is finally submitted by the institution's administration department and has undergone initial checks by the UKRI Grants Team. Proposals submitted after the closing date **WILL NOT** be considered.

4.1.6 Further information on how to apply for a grant can be found on the [STFC website](#).

4.2   Additional documents required

4.2.1   In addition to the online application form which must be submitted through JeS, the following documents are required:

- A Case for Support which is a single document containing the following:
  - **Section 1**: Group Overview Report and Proposal
  - **Section 2**: Cases for the Themes
  - **Section 3**: Publications table and list
  - **Section 4**: Cross Community cases[*]

- Separate attachments are required for each of the following:
  - Pathways to Impact document
  - Data Management plan
  - Form X (Staff details form)

4.2.2   **Please note:** applicants should be careful to classify documents correctly using the options available and submit as PDFs. Failure to do so will result in incomplete proposals being sent out to reviewers (e.g. documents classified as 'Other' are not sent out for review). The Case for Support, Pathways to Impact and Data Management plan should be uploaded as attachments to the JeS proposal. The Form X spreadsheet should be emailed to pp@stfc.ac.uk.

4.2.3   All documentation should be provided in 11 point Arial font with 2cm page margins.

4.3   Costings

4.3.1   All details relating to the grant costs can be found in the STFC Grants Handbook

4.4   Justification of resources

4.4.1   All costs associated with the research proposal must be justified, with the exception of estates, indirects, infrastructure technician costs and the unit cost of TRAC-determined elements such as investigator salary costs or research facility charge-out costs.

4.4.2   An explanation for all costs requested on the JeS form must be given in the Case for Support. Each directly incurred post must be given a name or, for unnamed posts, a unique number (e.g. RA1, RA2 etc.). The same name or number must be used in the JeS proposal, Case for Support and the Form X. **Where these details do not match the documents will be returned for correction.**

---

[*] Manchester, Liverpool, and Daresbury only

4.5 Section 1 – Group Overview Report and Proposal

4.5.1 Section 1 should provide a concise report on the scientific progress of the group since the last review, and set out proposals for the future programme.

Section 1 should include the following:

4.5.2 **Summary of the group's activities and strategy:** The report should begin with a summary of the group's activities/achievements and the strategy for the future programme. Reference should be made to the support your institution provides to your group, with emphasis on recent investments that are relevant to the group's research programme and its component themes. If relevant, you should also refer to any future PPRP proposals expected to be submitted over the next grant period. This part of the report is expected to be no more than **two pages** in length.

4.5.3 References to individuals in the group's reports should be highlighted in bold face.

4.5.4 Only the publications and equivalent material since 1 October 2016[†], should be used which provide a track record and appropriate context for the case for support, and references should be made to these in Section 3, rather than including the bibliographic information several times.

4.5.5 If a theme was funded in the previous Consolidated Grant round but will not continue into the new round then a report on the programme of work carried out by group members in that theme since 1 October 2016 should be included. The maximum length for each theme here is half a page per FTE in the theme, or one page per theme, whichever is the greater. This is in addition to the two page limit above.

4.6 Other information

4.6.1 The following information should also be provided (and does not count towards the pages limits set above):

a) For the programme of work carried out since 1 October 2016, an explanation of any expenditure which has resulted in a variation of 20% or more against the funds awarded against each heading in the original announcement.

b) Other STFC support and non-STFC support: The Grants Panel seeks information on STFC support outside the consolidated grant over the review period, for example grants funded through PPRP, IPS, and Fellowships etc. Examples of non-STFC support include organisations like the European Research Council. The Panel is only interested in support which has been obtained for equipment, consumables, travel and staff posts directly involved in the programme; it is not necessary to detail any other items.

c) Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers: The applicant

---

† Publications published in September 2016 but not included in the previous grants submission should also be included.

is required to report on how the concordat is being implemented within the context of the group.

4.6.2 **Group-wide Support posts:** A case, no longer than one page, should be made for the administrative and computer support requested. Where administrative or computing support is requested under the 'Other Directly Allocated' heading, the following information should be provided for each post: type (e.g. administrative support or computing support), name, FTE, duration and total cost per person. The cases for support posts should be in alphabetical order by surname, or post title for unnamed posts. Support posts should be included on Form X below the scientific and technical posts. The order and format of names should be consistent in both the case for support and Form X.

4.6.3 **Group-wide Non-Staff costs:** A case, no longer than one page, should be made for group-wide non-staff costs such as public engagement resources and consumables (which include equipment items under £10k). Where items of equipment over £10k are sought, a case for support should be provided (maximum half a page per item, which is in addition to the one page limit). This should: provide a technical justification related to the programme of research it is intended to support, noting whether the equipment is critical for the programme of work; set out the full cost of the equipment with the Institute's proposed contribution; and give an indication of when the equipment is needed.

4.7 Section 2 – Cases for the Themes

4.7.1 This part of the proposal should provide the information requested by Theme. A theme consists of a clearly defined, cohesive, scientific programme of work. Where there are strong synergies between themes within a proposal, applicants should consider if it would be more appropriate to combine themes in order to create a cohesive programme.

4.7.2 **Part (a)** A report on the programme of work carried out by group members since 1 October 2016. This should explain if there have been any major changes to the programme compared with the original plans, and provide an assessment of the extent to which the major aims have been met.

4.7.3 **Part (b)** A science case for the group's future programme for the time period – 1 October 2021 to 31 September 2024. This should set out the science case for the proposed programme of work over the requested period. For each scientific area it should address the following:

1. What are the major goals and scope of the programme/theme?
2. How does the programme/theme fit within the international context?
3. How will the programme/theme advance the field?
4. Explain how the main highlights of related previous research since 1 October 2017 relate to the proposed programme of work.
5. What methodologies and techniques will be applied to the research and what facilities will be required to achieve the programme aims?
6. Where work on the scientific area is proposed as part of a consortium of university groups, the relationship between the groups and added value of funding the area as a consortium should be explained. Alternatively, if not applying as a consortium please explain the synergies with other groups carrying out similar activities.

4.7.4 The maximum page limit for **Parts (a)** and **(b)** for all the themes is half a page per FTE for Part (a) and one page per FTE for Part (b). FTE is defined as per-head for an academic or fellow, and the actual proportion of time for a researcher (includes PDRAs). To reflect that themes may vary in their size of programme, it is up to groups to determine how they wish to split the overall page limit by theme. Where page limits are not adhered to, proposals will be returned. Where an individual is working on more than one theme, a justification needs to be made within each theme whilst remaining within the page allowance. The page allocation should be divided between the themes.

Scientific posts

4.7.5 A case relating to the proposed programme and Form X must be made for the continuation of each current staff post, or fraction of a post, and for initiation of new posts. In line with the principles of FEC, cases must be included also for academic staff posts for which no salary funding is sought.

4.7.6   A scientific case for each post (including project studentships) should be made, with a maximum of half a page allowed for each post indicating if the post is cross-community or should be considered core, and a proposed plan of work identified for the next relevant period of the post identifying the FTE fraction spent on the theme. The case for investigator time should be justified in terms of the future programme, not past productivity, including posts where no funding is sought.

4.7.7   Posts should be justified in the following order: a) academic posts, b) core posts, c) non-core posts, d) support posts e) cross-community effort requested. Within each category, posts should be listed alphabetically by surname, post title for unnamed posts, or post title for generic cross-community effort requested, specifying the type (target making, technical support, mechanical, electronics and software engineering). The posts on Form X must be listed in the same order. The naming format used must be consistent on the case for support, JeS form and Form X. All posts should have the same name/number as given on the JeS form so that it is clear how each case for support relates to a post listed on the JeS form.

4.7.8   For each academic post listed, the level of effort and experience/skills required should be justified in terms of their specific activities in the programme of work. Biographies and CVs are not appropriate for this purpose.

4.7.9   For non-academic staff, applicants should describe their role in the programme of work in terms of their specific skills and activities, and describe any non-publication related scientific output.

4.7.10 Academics should apply for the actual amount of their time they expect to spend on research, taking into account other commitments (e.g. teaching, other funded research activity). The typical amount of time requested is 60% FTE per year. Academics are entitled to request 60% FTE and will not be disadvantaged relative to those requesting less time. If a proposal is only requesting a particular investigator's time for part of the grant duration (e.g. if an academic has fellowship funding for the first two years of the grant and so only seeks funding for the last year), this needs to be made clear in the text, as the JeS form does not have the facility to enter this information. Similarly, if an academic is requesting variable levels of FTE support during the grant this also needs to be made clear, with the different amounts of FTE and exact start and end dates of the changes specified. **If no salary costs are requested for a particular investigator but estates and indirect costs are requested for that investigator, this needs to be made clear in the text as it will not be apparent from the JeS form.**

Please note: it is imperative that the correct level of time is sought, because it is likely that scaling of some kind may be applied to the academic positions.

4.7.11 Bids for continuation of existing posts, and for additional staff support, will be assessed on their merits by the NPGP. The overall group size and the number of academics in the group are among the factors that the NPGP may take into account in their deliberations.

4.7.12 If cross-community expertise is required, applicants should make a case for and justify the level of support required for each theme in their proposal. All cross community support requests should be discussed with Ian Lazarus (ian.lazarus@stfc.ac.uk) and Alan Grant (alan.grant@stfc.ac.uk) in advance. Following these discussions, the formal request for cross-community expertise should be made to Ian Lazarus and Alan Grant, copied to the Cross-Community Committee Chair (Prof Tom Davinson, t.davinson@ed.ac.uk) and STFC (pp@stfc.ac.uk) by **19 November 2019.** In your request, you should specify the type of expertise required, (target making, technical support, mechanical, electronic and software engineering), level of FTE required and when the expertise is required. This will allow the groups applying for the cross-community experts, sufficient time to feed the requests into their proposal and also allow the Cross-Community Committee to provide input to the NPGP. Please note that if cross-community expertise is required and is not requested by this date, then your request will be considered a lower priority. Please ensure that all requests that are likely to occur within the duration of the consolidated grant are included.

4.7.13 If a Visiting Researcher is requested, please enclose a CV of the proposed visitor as an appendix to the case for support, and a justification of the request in terms of their scientific role in the proposed research, in half a side of A4.

4.7.14 Requests for activities that support the UK Nuclear Physics Programme (e.g. projects and detectors used by the UK community, requiring ongoing support) should be requested in Section 2 as a separate theme, following the guidelines above. This should be included as part of the overall page limit for Section 2. Within this theme, constituent projects/activities should be clearly numbered as sub-themes, with the sub-theme numbering used for Parts (a) and (b), and the staff resources request, so that they can be easily reviewed.

4.7.15 **New themes:** for any new activities or initiatives, part (a) above should be replaced by a description of the applicants' previous work in the field and its relevance to the work proposed. The same page limit applies.

4.7.16 **List of references:** the reference list, given in Section 3, is supplementary and is not counted in the page limit.

4.8   Non-staff costs

4.8.1   A case, maximum one and a half pages in total within each theme, should be made for travel and subsistence, public engagement resources and consumables (which includes equipment items under £10k). Where items of equipment over £10k are sought, a case for support should be provided (maximum half a page per item, which is in addition to the one page limit). This should provide a technical justification related to the programme of research it is intended to support and note whether the equipment is critical for the programme of work, set out the full cost of the equipment with the Institute's proposed contribution and an indication of when the equipment is needed.

4.8.2   It should also be made clear where items are being purchased for shared use with other institutions and where items are being purchased to build one larger item. It should be noted that it is possible for one university to make a bid for equipment on behalf of several groups. Detector systems or other equipment which will be jointly constructed by more than one group should have a single case in one consolidated grant proposal which should be referred to by the other groups that intend to request a share of the costs instead of each group presenting a separate case for the same equipment. In general, STFC expects to contribute around 50% of the cost of equipment items, with matched funding from the university, although applicants can request a STFC contribution of more than 50% and this will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. For further information please see the STFC Grants Handbook.

4.8.3   Applicants should request the full estimated cost of group travel, in line with the rules of their institution, including a justification of the request. The NPGP also expects that groups should seek travel funds from sources other than their institutions.

4.8.4   Other Directly Incurred (ODI) costs

a)   When applying for ODI costs, please ensure that the funds requested are clearly listed under the separate headings given below in your Case for Support. The cost of the items listed should agree with those provided in the JeS form. Please refer to the STFC Grants Handbook when putting together these lists and ensure that these items are individually less than £10k. Requests for consumables which support the whole proposal should not be split proportionally across themes; instead they should be presented as an overall cost on the proposal. Please ensure that items are not included that should be part of the Estates or Indirects, or met by the University.

b)   Computing: Please note standard desktops and laptops should normally be provided by the institute. Where higher specification desktops or laptops are required, for the completion of specific grant related activities, justification should be given.

c)   Public engagement: Applicants may request funds for public outreach activities on consolidated grants, subject to a well justified case. A description of the proposed activities and a justification of the resources requested should be included as a separate section within Section 2 of the proposal document (this is required in addition to the Pathways to Impact document so that the request can be peer-reviewed). This section should be a maximum of one page. For more guidance please see the 'Public Engagement' section of the STFC Website.

4.9 Section 3 – Publications

4.9.1 Please read the [STFC Grants Handbook](#) with regard to the Publications Table, in particular the new section relating to the Declaration of Research Assessment (DORA). The sections that follow are specific to Nuclear Physics.

4.9.2 A table of the group's publications accepted for publication or published from 1 October 2016[‡] should be provided in the following format:

	Number of refereed Publications	Number of refereed publications where a Significant contribution was made.	Number of technical reports[2]	Number of technical reports[2] where a Significant contribution was made	Number of conference proceedings
Investigator					
A N Other 1					
A N Other 2[1]					

[1] A N Other 2 was on maternity leave from June-Dec 2018
[2] Technical papers are defined as those specifically arising from instrument development or construction and not un-refereed science papers.

4.9.3 For the purposes of this exercise 'Investigator' includes Research Assistants and academics. The second column, 'Number of refereed publications where a significant contribution was made' should be a subset of publications from the first column in which the investigator has led the research. In the case where there is a justifiable career break such as a period of maternity leave, or extenuating circumstances, a footnote should be added as shown above.

4.9.4 Full list of publications: To supplement these data, a full list of publications for each investigator and named RA from 1 October 2016 with titles, full author lists[§] as they appear in the journal, and a reference should be provided. Those in which the investigator/named RA has played a significant role, as defined above should be clearly indicated. If possible, all references should be accompanied by a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to help locate the article.

[‡] Publications published in September 2016 but not included in the previous grants submission should also be included.
[§] For papers with more than 15 authors, only the institute authors and the total number of authors should be given.

4.10 Section 4 - Guidance for Manchester, Liverpool and Daresbury Cross-Community Requests

4.10.1 In addition to the information already provided above, the requests for cross-community posts at Daresbury, Liverpool, and Manchester should be provided as a separate Section and follow the format below.

- Summary – a two page overview of the cross community effort, highlighting the role of the cross community effort, previous achievements and the future strategy.
- Part (a) and Part (b) (as described above) for each of the cross community teams. Part B should demonstrate that there is a community wide need for the skills and expertise of this post and funding is contingent on this case being accepted. A plan detailing the projects in which the post is likely to be involved should also be supplied, accepting that this is likely to be less certain in the medium to longer term. The science case for each activity does not need to be re-made as this can be found in the themes requesting the cross-community effort. The page limit for this section is 3 pages for each team requested (e.g. Electronic, Mechanical, Software etc.).
- Description of the laboratories (maximum two pages).
- Staff Request:
  - o summary table of the cross community staff requested (name, FTE requested and area of expertise)
  - o summary table of all themes (across the community) requesting cross community effort and the FTE requested in each team area.
  - o case for each post requested (maximum half page per post).
- Non-staff cost request – maximum four pages. Note that a breakdown of costs by financial year is not required at this stage.

4.10.2 The number of cross-community posts requested should reflect the overall level of requests by the community. Individual posts cannot have more than 100% of their time allocated. Where an individual does have requests totaling more than 100%, an additional post should be requested and can be unnamed.

4.11 Pathways to Impact

4.11.1 A 'Pathways to Impact' document is required for all new grant applications and should be uploaded to the JeS proposal as a separate attachment. The Pathways to Impact document is an opportunity to describe how the potential impacts of the research, including knowledge exchange and public engagement, will be realised (please note – this is a forward looking document). For more information on completing the document, please see the guidance in the STFC Grants Handbook and refer back to section 1.3.2.

Please note: If there is no 'Pathways to Impact' statement, or parts are missing, or the panel decides that the statement does not adequately address the criteria, the principal investigator will be asked to address these deficiencies before a grant is awarded.

4.12 Data Management Plan

4.12.1 Applicants are required to provide a Data Management Plan. Further information can be found in STFC Grants Handbook:

Proposals must include an acceptable data management plan before a grant will be awarded.

4.13 Form X (staff details form)

4.13.1 Groups should provide the details of staff posts by completing the Form X using the Excel workbook provided, and send it to pp@stfc.ac.uk by 11 February 2020.

Please note: The years on the form relate to Academic Year.

4.13.2 Form X is intended to give the NPGP an indication of how the focus of effort for each staff post has changed since the previous review and how it will change through the period of the grant.

Separate guidance is now provided for completing Form X, as well as an example spreadsheet.

5 Peer Review Process

5.1 Introducers

5.1.1 At least two members of the NPGP will be allocated as "Introducers" for each consolidated grant proposal. As in previous rounds, the Introducers role is to clarify any issues which are unclear in the grant proposal documentation and lead the discussion at the Peer Review Meeting.

5.2 Meetings with groups

5.2.1 Teleconference meetings will be arranged with each applicant group to clarify any issues arising from the proposals. The purpose of the meetings is clarification to help the Introducers fully understand the grant proposal and is not an opportunity to re-make the science case. The meeting will involve STFC, the Introducers, the PI and key applicants.

Please note: No more than **three** University members of staff are expected to be present at any given time.

5.3 Reviewers

5.3.1 The proposal will be sent to reviewers of international standing for assessment. Separate reviewers will be asked to consider each of the themes. Rather than nominate a single reviewer on the proposal form, applicants are invited to send reviewer nominations for each theme to pp@stfc.ac.uk. The NPGP will take the nominations into consideration when assigning reviewers, but it is not guaranteed that the nominated reviewers will be used.

5.4 Applicant's response to reviewers' comments

5.4.1 Following the reviewers process, applicants are then given the opportunity to see and comment on the reports via the JeS system.

5.5 Peer review meeting

5.5.1 Peer review meetings will take place to consider the consolidated grant proposals and make recommendations on the programme to Science Board and the STFC Executive.

5.6 Assessment criteria

5.6.1 The NPGP will assess all proposals in accordance with the assessment procedures set out in the STFC Grants Handbook.

5.7   Cost revision following review

5.7.1   If, as a result of the NPGP review of the grants, a reduction is recommended in resources on a proposal, STFC will amend the award on a pro-rata basis in line with the reduction or increase in research staff effort awarded. In exceptional circumstances STFC will contact the research organization to recalculate the estates and indirect costs. If this is the case there will be a ten day period for this work to be completed.

5.8   Feedback

5.8.1   Feedback to applicants will only be provided by STFC once the grants application cycle has been completed. The feedback will be sent to the PI separately on a similar timescale to the awards.

6   New Applicant Scheme

6.1   New Applicants Scheme

6.1.1   Newly appointed academic members of staff (lecturers or lecturer equivalent fellows) who have joined a department between grant reviews may exceptionally apply separately for support. This will potentially allow them to begin to establish a research programme on appointment. If grant funding is agreed, funding will be awarded as a separate grant to the department's existing consortium or consolidated grant.

6.1.2   It should be noted that the number of awards is likely to be limited and funding will be extremely competitive. Where awards are made it is likely to be at the low level of Travel, Consumables, Computing and Secretarial Support.

6.2   Eligibility

6.2.1   Applicants may not be funded on more than one grant. For example, if an individual transfers from another university, they cannot hold resource on both a new applicant grant, and a consolidated grant at their previous institution.

6.2.2   Applicants must be employed on a full or part-time basis as academic members of staff at the grant-holding University by the start date of the new applicants grant. Note that the usual eligibility rules apply – please see the STFC Grants Handbook.

6.2.3   Applicants will need to demonstrate that there are insufficient funds within the flexibility of the existing grant to support their research.

6.3   Terms of the scheme

6.3.1   Applicants must be the sole investigator.

6.3.2   Applicants can only apply once at any institution for a new applicant award.

6.3.3   Applicants can apply for funding for a minimum of a year and a maximum of three years up to the start of the department's consortium/consolidated grant. Applicants can apply for limited resources to allow the applicant to begin to establish a research programme.

6.3.4   The relevant grant panel will assess applications against the same criteria as the consolidated grant proposals (and funding will come from the appropriate grants line); however, research potential in addition to track record will be taken into account.

6.3.5   Grants are not renewable and cannot be extended.

6.4   Proposals

6.4.1   Applicants should submit a one page pre-proposal for consideration by the executive in consultation with the relevant grant panel.

6.4.2   Requests will be considered under urgency procedures.

6.4.3   The pre-proposal should briefly set out the circumstances, explaining why a new applicant proposal is appropriate, and how the application matches the eligibility criteria set out above.

6.4.4   The pre-proposal should also briefly sketch the nature and strength of the scientific case that would be described in full if permission for a full proposal is given.

6.4.5   The pre-proposal should provide an indication of the requested resources.

6.4.6   The pre-proposal should be accompanied by a brief letter from the Principal Investigator of the consolidated grant held by the department concerned, confirming the employment status and timing, and explaining carefully why the new member of staff's research cannot be supported using the spending flexibility allowed within the existing grant.

6.4.7   If the case for funding is considered to be potentially a high priority, applicants will be advised of next steps.

7   Other Useful Information

7.1   Cross-disciplinary or cross-council proposals

7.1.1   For advice on cross-disciplinary or cross-council proposals please see the STFC Grants Handbook.

7.1.2   Applicants are welcome to request support for cross-disciplinary programmes of work (themes) within their consolidated grant application and STFC will liaise with the appropriate Research Council/internally within STFC to ensure appropriate peer review. The consolidated grant gives PIs the flexibility to manage the awarded resources in the most appropriate way. It is permissible for PIs to use resources awarded on their consolidated grant for nuclear physics activities which provide support for (or link to) cross-disciplinary proposals to other funding schemes (both internal and external to STFC).

7.1.3   Specific guidance on the STFC and EPSRC remits relating to nuclear physics can be found on the EPSRC website.

7.2   Peer review framework

7.2.1   Peer Review framework information is at:

http://www.stfc.ac.uk/funding/research-grants/peer-review-and-assessment

7.3   Unconscious Bias and Equality and Diversity

7.3.1   Details relating to unconscious bias can be found at:

http://www.stfc.ac.uk/funding/research-grants/peer-review-and-assessment

7.3.2   Information about STFC's commitment to promoting equality and diversity is at:

https://stfc.ukri.org/funding/promoting-equality-and-diversity

7.4   Researchfish

7.4.1   Researchfish is an online system which is pivotal in demonstrating the case for investment in science. STFC has a responsibility to demonstrate the value and impact of research supported through public funding. By using Researchfish we have a central means for researchers to log the outputs, outcomes and impacts that have been realised through STFC's research funding. Outputs are then made available through the Research Councils' 'Gateway to Research' portal. Further information can be found at: https://gtr.ukri.org/resources/about.html