Updated July 2021

Guidelines for Projects Peer Review Proposal

Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP)

The Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP) is responsible for the assessment of projects that are considered to have significant scientific priority in particle physics, nuclear physics, astronomy, particle astrophysics, accelerator and solar system science, as well as associated computing infrastructure.

Introduction

The purpose of these notes is to provide guidance and instructions to Applicants when preparing a grant application for consideration by the PPRP. They are intended to supplement the STFC Grants Handbook and Je-S Handbook by providing specific guidance on the PPRP process.

STFC is committed to protect both personal and professional data and will use the latest encryption tools for communicating with the applicants. Therefore, applicants for STFC funding are expected to comply with the agreed encryption requirements during the process.

Where needed, currently STFC uses OME (Office 365 Message Encryption) for this purpose, more information on which can be found here. Other encryption software will be used where needed.

1. Aims of the scheme

The specific aims of the PPRP scheme are to assess each proposal in a systematic and time constrained process; calls for proposals and PPRP meetings are scheduled in advance according to need. Applicants who have submitted a successful Statement of Interest (SoI) will be invited to submit a full proposal to the PPRP.

2. The Projects Peer Review Panel Remit

The PPRP is responsible for the assessment of projects that are considered to have significant scientific priority in particle physics, nuclear physics, astronomy, particle astrophysics, accelerator and solar system science, as well as associated computing infrastructure. The panel will include a mix of disciplines and be supplemented with area specific experts for each proposal. The full PPRP membership is available here

The PPRP will provide proposal recommendations to be submitted to the Science Board (SB).

3. Eligibility

PPRP is an invite only Panel. Applicants must first discuss their proposal with the relevant Programme Manager and submit a SoI to Science Board before being invited to submit a proposal to PPRP.

4. Timetable

STFC provides research grant funding opportunities via frequent PPRP calls. The corresponding PPRP meetings are scheduled in advance and STFC makes every attempt to ensure that the review process is carried out in a timely way. Should STFC need to cancel any meetings, applicants will be informed as soon as possible with an explanation of any delays; accordingly, applicants are required to meet any specified deadlines so that an efficient and effective review process can take place.

5. PPRP Application Process

A flow chart of the PPRP process can be found here.

1. Applicant liaise with Programme Manager

The applicant must contact the relevant Programme Manager of STFC to discuss the proposed programme. Once the Programme Manager agrees, the applicant is requested to send a Statement of Interest.

2. SOI

A Statement of Interest (SOI) must be completed for initial evaluation and review by the Science Board. This document details the key scientific aims and a full economic cost of the proposed programme of work.

3. Science Board Meeting

During the Science Board meeting, the SOI is reviewed by the STFC Office and Science Board committee. If invited, the applicant will be asked to submit a comprehensive proposal to PPRP.

4. Proposal Submission to PPRP

The proposal along with the Joint Electronic Submission (Je-S) form must be submitted through the electronic submission system to the specified PPRP call. The submission deadlines are publicised on the STFC Funding Opportunities web page.

Each proposal is assessed by external reviewers via Je-S. Reviewers submit written comments on the proposal; applicants will be given the opportunity to see and respond to all reviewer comments. There is a half a page limit per review for responses, which can be employed holistically to respond to the reviews. Responses are not needed for all reviews and should only be used to provide further clarification and rectify misunderstandings to points raised by reviewers. Any questions of a more substantive nature can be addressed during the PPRP meeting. Responses should be returned within 5 working days of receipt.

Each proposal is also subject to a Project Management and Delivery Review undertaken by a relevant Project Management Expert who will be given access to the proposal via the Peer Review Extranet. The default position approach is for this review to be undertaken by an appropriate member of PPRP. Where this is not possible alternative reviewers will be sourced who will conduct the review under the same protocols as PPRP members (agreement to these will be sought prior to the review being conducted). The review will be sent to applicants via Office Message Encryption (OME) by the PPRP Secretariat around two weeks before the Panel for the applicants to provide a response. This response should be returned by OME within 5 working days of receipt.

In order to assist the PPRP with its deliberations the Project Management Reviewer (whether or not a PPRP member) will attend the meeting to raise questions on these aspects of the proposal. Applicants are asked to engage positively with these questions, which form a key part of PPRP's consideration of proposals.

Preliminary assessment of the proposal and resource work packages will be explored by STFC staff. Applicants will be contacted directly if there are any areas of the proposal that requires more detail or rework in advance of the PPRP meeting.

5. PPRP Meeting

The PPRP meeting is held to assess the proposal and question the applicant. The meeting consists of open sessions, where the applicants give a presentation and members of the public can attend, and closed sessions. In its assessment of proposals the panel will look at each category referred to in the STFC Research Grants Handbook Assessment Criteria to ensure all requirements are met.

If undergoing the non-light touch process (see light touch process below), feedback questions from the meeting are sent to the applicants to respond to ahead of the Visiting Panel, including requests for descopes (see below). These responses are assessed at the Visiting Panel Meeting.

6. Visiting Panel Meeting (where appropriate, see light touch process below)

The Visiting Panel meeting carries out a detailed assessment of the proposal. The meeting consists of Panel experts and members of PPRP. The final recommendation usually takes place at the end of this meeting during a closed session.

7. PPRP Report

A report from the Visiting Panel is written by the PPRP Secretary in conjunction with STFC Programmes Directorate and agreed and finalised by the Visiting Panel Chair. The report presents the Visiting Panel's findings and is submitted to the next Science Board meeting.

8. Science Board Meeting

At the Science Board meeting, the Meeting Chair presents PPRP's recommendations to Science Board. Science Board provides strategic advice and recommendations on the proposal which are shared with Executive Board and Council.

9. Outcome of Proposal

Following Science Board's recommendations, the STFC Executive will make a funding decision on the proposal and will inform the applicant and Research Organisation of STFC's decision. This will include any relevant information from Science Board's consideration of the proposal. On average a successful proposal will take 6-9 months.

10. Informing PPRP

PPRP will be informed of the recommendations made by Science Board and the actual funding decisions made by the STFC Executive at the next PPRP meeting.

Light Touch Process

PPRP has a light touch process which skips step 6, with all recommendations reached within the step 5 meeting. Where this process is utilised applicants will be asked by the PPRP Secretariat to respond to clarification questions generated by the PPRP Assessor and Panel Experts ahead of the meeting, as well as potentially additional descope scenarios. Questions will be sent by and should be responded to via OME. This is in addition to the postal peer review comments and Project Management and Delivery Review in the full process.

Applications which are subject to this process will be informed as such by the relevant Programme Manager.

Descopes

As an essential test of value for money, it is a key part of the PPRP process to request "descope" (reduction) scenarios for **all** proposals. Such scenarios are requested whether or not there is sufficient budget to fund the proposal in full and are in addition to any reductions in scope made prior to PPRP (such as in the consideration of the SoI). Applicants are requested to fully engage with this process in preparing credible scenarios for the cuts requested. Artificially inflating the grant or not engaging with these requests seriously runs the risk of the Panel recommending cuts not in the applicants' control.

6. PPRP Proposal

All proposals should be submitted online using the Je-S System; there are links to tutorials and help areas on the system. Applicants should select the following options in the Je-S system when generating their proposal:

- Council: STFC
- Document Type: Standard Proposal
- Scheme: PPRP
- Call: PPRP Round X 20YY

Failure to select the options displayed above may result in the proposal not reaching the correct Research Council or department and cause the Je-S proposal to need to be rejected and re-created as part of the correct scheme.

It is the responsibility of the submitting grant's Principle Investigator (PI) to ensure that the institution's administration department submits the proposal before **4:00pm** on the deadline day. This deadline will be strictly enforced. Applicants can view the status of the proposal online by logging into the Je-S system. STFC are unable to view the proposal until it has been submitted by the institution's administration department. Please refer to the Internal Research Funding for STFC Sites Policy for guidance on whether a separate Je-S should be submitted for STFC Laboratories.

Councils operate a 'page' restriction policy on attachment length; the proposal's Case for Support should not exceed 40 pages not including technical appendices. Proposals that exceed the page limits on any part of the submission will be returned for amendment if time permits but run the risk of being REJECTED.

The completed Je-S proposal form will require an accompanying Case for Support and a Data Management Plan, each as a separate attached PDF file and all must be submitted by 4.00pm on the closing date. For information on other supporting documents please see the STFC Research Grants Handbook.

Case for Support

The Case for Support document should not exceed the 40-page restriction not including technical appendices. STFC specific page format and style guidance is available on the Je-S Handbook. The Case for Support can be seen as the equivalent of a Business Case document. The Business Case is the key baseline document for the project and defines why the project should be undertaken, what benefits would be derived, and what level of resources is likely to be required. It evaluates the strategic fit, value for money, affordability and deliverability of the project.

The Finance Tables, Risk Register and List of Acronyms should be appended to the Case for Support or included as separate documents but are not included in the 40-page limit. The Case for Support should be clear and concise with minimal technical jargon, and include sections explicitly addressing the following. Proposals which do not include explicit sections under all of these headings will be returned for amendment to do so.

Scientific Needs

- **Objectives:** A description of the intended end result of the project should be given. Please bear in mind that this description should not just encompass the scientific work of the project but also articulate the value and benefits of investing in the project. This should be clearly stated so that the success or failure of the project can easily be determined at the end of the

funded period. Any intermediate results upon which the final result depends should be identified.

- **Project Description:** A description of the applicants proposed contribution to the project should be given. The stage of the project (e.g. R&D, construction etc.) should be specified. The document should highlight any unique contributions, likely global impact and aspects of UK leadership.

- **Work Package Breakdown:** Provide a breakdown of the Work Packages of the proposal, including a short summary description of the work and overall cost of each. Optionally, a Work Breakdown Structure can also be included as part of this section, where appropriate.

- **STFC Science and strategy:** Identify the specific STFC science opportunities that this project addresses. How does this relate to STFC priorities? What aspects are particularly relevant? What is its potential impact? Are there any long-term implications or liabilities that may be generated as a result of investing in this project?

- **Awareness & Context:** Describe the present status of related research and development worldwide. Where is this research field likely to be in 10 years' time? What is the current state of play? How important is it that we act now? Does the project have a strong supportive user base among the relevant community both in the UK and internationally?

- **Competing research:** Provide a summary of any competing experiments or research and level of investment. There should be some analysis of the benefits of this particular research against similar past and current research worldwide.

- **Track record:** Explain your track record in this field. Why do you consider your group the best or most appropriate to carry out this programme? How should the introducers be confident that you would be able to deliver the project? What is the competency of your group to perform this work?

- **Impact:** PPRP applications should demonstrate the potential for impact. Applicants must consider how they will or might achieve impact throughout their projects, and this detail should be included as part of the Case for Support.The most important thing to remember is that Impact Planning is meant to be a forward-looking exercise in which the applicant says what they are going to do to maximise the likelihood of a range of anticipated impacts arising from the project they are proposing. It is your chance to be specific, and to ask for the resources you need to put your plan into action. Activities to realise impact do not have to be cost-incurring, but costs which are included must be fully justified. See the STFC Research Grants Handbook for further information.

Business Needs

- **Project Management Plan:** The STFC Project Management Framework sets out the programme management framework within which projects are appraised, funded, and managed by STFC, and must be followed for all funded projects and programmes. In order to set out how the proposal meets these requirements sections which address the following need to be included:

    - **Roles and Responsibilities:** The ultimate success of the project, delivery to time, cost and specification relies on the quality of the planning and management, and the people involved. To ensure the best possible chance of success, it is important that everyone knows what they are responsible for and what they should be doing. The roles that are found in all projects are: Customer, Project Sponsor, Project Manager, Team Member. In the STFC research environment it is also necessary to define the role of Principal Investigator (PI).

    - **Scheduling and resourcing:** A Milestone Plan is the minimum requirement for any project. It lists key events in the project with dates. Milestones are, in the main, concerned with the project schedule and mark the completion of significant events such as decision points (e.g. moving from one phase of the project to the next) or deliverables (such as completion of preliminary design, placing of contracts, equipment installation etc.). Milestones should be defined in sufficient detail so that it is clear when they have been met, and be sufficiently frequent to enable effective monitoring of the project.

    - **Gantt Chart:** Most projects should use a Gantt Chart or Network Diagram for more detailed planning. They can be used to illustrate simple time dependency or full resourcing and costing. A useful technique is rolling wave planning where projects are planned in detail in the early stages, and at a higher level for the remaining stages.

    - **Change Control:** An effective, formal change control procedure is essential to successful Project Management. The procedure must ensure that the Project Manager, and the Customer or Project Sponsor, take into account the impact of the change on all aspects the project and then agree and sign off the change.

    - **Justification of resources:** Costs must be clearly defined and spend planned, including in-kind contributions. The STFC Finance policy for costing projects requires all projects to be approved on the basis of the full cost to STFC over their entire life - from conception to completion. Time and cost estimates should be based upon experience, be initially top down, include an agreed amount of contingency resulting from risk analysis and not include “hidden contingency”. Projects should be pragmatic in their use of staff resource planning – for much of the work that we undertake it is not realistic to turn staff on and off projects on a day by day basis or to split their effort over a number of tasks. Where projects look to make use of effort funded through Consolidated Grants (CGs) as part of the project, it is important that this section also includes a case for the basis to utilise this resource so it can be assessed by PPRP. Other resources such as equipment, consumables, accommodation and travel should also be considered. The STFC Staff Costing Guide provides further guidance.

- **Project Monitoring and Reporting**: The proposal should define the methods to be used for progress reporting and control. The plan includes frequency and attendance for progress meetings, the acceptance process for key deliverables and milestones, and the frequency and content of progress reports. Projects which are considered to be business critical to STFC will be required to provide monthly Project Reports to the STFC Project Review Committee, as well as reports to an oversight body. These are either Project Boards, responsible for overseeing the delivery of the project or Oversight Committees which provide independent scientific, technical and management advice to the STFC

- **Project organisation and participants:** Proposals should identify the implementation strategy, duration, project deliverable ownership, and work packages; representation of this information in Gantt chart format is recommended. All funded UK participants, their staff category, FtE (full time equivalent) project/work package allocation per year, activity and justification for each post, should be listed. Key individuals, such as the UK Spokesperson and Project Manager(s), responsible for ensuring that the project and its constituent parts are kept on schedule and budget should be identified. This section should include a diagrammatic organisational chart.

- **Scope:** Where proposals have undergone processes of iteration (including after consideration of the SoI) these can be detailed as part of this section for PPRP's Information. Whatever the process of iteration prior to invitation to PPRP, it is **mandatory** for proposals to be submitted at the level invited by Science Board, though additional ambition over and above this can be discussed as part of this section.

  In addition, within this section proposals are required to include consideration of a scenario to lower the ambition of the project by 10% of the requested budget. As part of this section please outline what cuts would be made to the amount requested (including the cost of each) and the effect to the project and UK leadership and scientific return of such reductions. This scenario does not need to be detailed in finance tables but should be clear on what the proposed cuts are, as well as include an accompanying narrative of their impact on the project. Any reduction scenario does not negate the need for all costs proposed to be fully justified as outlined in the justification of resources section above.

  PPRP and the STFC Office reserve the right to request descopes in addition to this specific to the context of the proposal.

For more guidance on these elements please refer to STFC's Project Management Framework

Finance Tables

Finance tables must be appended to the Case for Support; exemplars can be found in Annex 1. Cost tables should be completed for each work package.

Advice on costing should be sought from the relevant Programme Manager. All project costs should be presented in a clear and understandable way, and all resource requests must be fully justified; failure to provide full and explicit resource justification is likely to result in resource request being rejected.

All costs in the finance tables must be in agreement with the funding requested within the Je-S form; there should not be any discrepancies as the proposal will be returned where there is inconsistency.

Working Allowance This is used to cope with the uncertainties that occur in all projects, such as increased cost of materials, complexity of design and manufacture of components. It can be calculated in a number of ways and should take account of the project risks and their mitigation. There should be a reasonable chance (i.e. greater than 75%) that the project can be completed within the budget of the base cost plus the working allowance; it is awarded as part of the grant at announcement (at 100%).

Contingency This should not be requested on the Je-S form; it is for the unknown and unexpected things that can occur within a project and which could not reasonably be predicted. It should be calculated on the basis of an understanding of the risks of the project and there should be a high expectation that the project can be completed without the use of contingency. Contingency will only be released on the approval of STFC Executive after it has considered advice from the STFC Oversight Committee or Project Board and explored the possibilities of de-scoping the project.

STFC Laboratory costs – Costs for STFC Laboratories must be shown as 100% in the Finance Tables and include staff costs and overheads. These always count as 'new' costs. Please consult with the Programme Manager for the latest advice on STFC costs and costing.

Risk Management

The systematic identification and analysis of the strategic, financial and operational uncertainties associated with the proposal helps devolve the responsibility for risk management to the appropriate level. It is recommended that a Risk Register identifying the proposal's risks, mitigation activities and associated schedule/financial impact with an explanation of how these have been calculated. Further information about risk management and a risk template can be found in Annex 2.

Collaborative Projects: Describe linkages and/or collaborations with key collaborators and/or external players in this area. Include a description of how responsibilities are to be shared among the collaborators, both within the UK and internationally. For international collaborations, the membership of the international collaboration, a brief breakdown of responsibilities within it, and how the significance of the UK contribution to the project fits relative to those from other countries, should be given. The status of approval and funding of the international experiment should be provided.

Key Stakeholders/Cross-Council involvement: The key stakeholders in the project should be identified. Describe any links to other (non-STFC) research council or research establishment (E.g. Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; Ministry of Defence; Department of Health and Social Care, etc.).

Data Management Plan

The Research Grants Handbook provides Data Management guidance. PPRP Grants will not be allowed to start without an acceptable Data Management and Sharing plan.

List of Acronyms

As the PPRP has members from a range of disciplines, please outline the acronyms used throughout the proposal.

7. Assessment Framework

The framework contains five areas for consideration: Scientific/Technical Excellence: Specific objectives of the project, International Competitiveness, Strategic Value within the STFC Programme, Leadership, Planning and Project Management and Social and Economic Impact from the proposed research which are described below. Although each area is considered during the assessment process, scientific/technical excellence is considered to be the most important. These criteria align with the Research Grants Handbook Assessment Criteria but include specific bullet points for PPRP.

Scientific/Technical Excellence: Specific objectives of the project

- The scientific merit of the project and its potential to make a significant difference to the discipline and contribute to addressing STFC's Science Challenges
- The technical importance of the project.
- The benefits of the project compared to past, current and future planned experiments worldwide.
- The timeliness of the project

International competitiveness

- The international relevance of the project/UK leadership within the field, in both European and global arenas

Strategic Value within the STFC Programme

- The extent to which the project/facility benefits from or contributes to coherence and synergies/linkages with other programmes and facilities, including international subscriptions.

Leadership, planning and project management

- The competency, track record and appropriateness of the collaboration to undertake the proposed work
- The level of scientific standing, UK leadership and return to the UK generated by the proposed
- The quality of Project Management including the project schedule and justification of the financial request, including assessment of the descope options
- Evaluation of the risks (including technical) associated with implementation of the project and the risks associated with the economic and societal impact and leadership objectives and appropriateness of the requests for Working Allowance and contingency.

Social and Economic Impact from the proposed research

- The potential application of the proposal's technologies in other fields
- Third party professional sector engagement and outreach opportunities (e.g. business, government, NGO engagement)
- The development of transferable skills supported by STFC
- Inspiring young people to value STEM skills and consider STEM careers
- Engaging wider society and specific interested/affected demographics with the themes, progress and outcomes of the research
- Creating opportunities for two-way interactions between the research community and society

8. STFC Resources and Guidelines

STFC policies and procedures are aligned with UK Research and Innovation policies; applicants can refer to the following supporting documentation:

UKRI - How We Make Decisions
STFC Project Management Framework
STFC Research Grants Handbook
Je-S Handbook
Data management plan
STFC Peer Review and Assessment
ResearchFish
Internal Research Funding for STFC Sites Policy
PPRP Membership
Statements of Interest for new projects
STFC Science Board
STFC Funding Opportunities

Annex 1 – Finance Tables

Applicants should note that failure to comply with the format requested will result in the proposal being returned for amendment. It is essential that all costs are consistent between Finance Tables and the Je-S forms.

The Guidance for Finance Tables is available on the STFC website.

Work-package tables

These notes should be read in conjunction with the example provided. Applicants are required to adhere to the following guidance and to consult the office prior to submission if queries cannot be answered by reference to this guidance.

A separate table is required for each individual work-package. Where a work-package contains sub work-packages, costs need to be presented for each individual sub work-package and itemised individually as shown in the example. Each item requested must identify which Institution / Organisation is making the request.

All costs must be shown in financial years (NOT GRANT YEARS) STFC financial years begin on 1 April. Costs should be shown as two separate totals:

- 100% fEC costs
- Total cost to Research Council (RC)

In calculating the total cost to RC, the following percentages should be used for fund categories and Applicants are advised to add a footnote to the table explaining the calculation.

- Staff, Travel, ODI, ODA, Estate and Indirect costs, at 80%
- All STFC Laboratory costs, Exceptions Staff, Exceptions Other costs, Working Allowance, Equipment (Instrument Development) at – 100%
- Most other Equipment - 50%, please refer to the Research Grants Handbook for further information on Equipment contributions

All costs must be presented in the correct year according to the following standard profiles, in order to present the ACTUAL cost to STFC each year:

- Applicant costs should show the FTE requested each year as information for the panel. However the costs need to be presented as a flat profile across the duration of the grant.
- Staff costs (Researchers, Technicians, Other etc.) should be presented as actual in year costs in accordance with start and end dates (i.e. not generally flat profiled) and in line with the Je-S entries. It is worth noting that where a post is entered as an average % FTE over the duration of the grant on Je-S, the associated salary costs will also be averaged. It is therefore worth having several entries where FTE differs between years. For example, a Researcher working for 3 years at 50% in year 1, and 80% in years 2 and 3, could be entered onto Je-S as a single post for 3 years at 70% FTE (an average across the duration which would be reflected in the payments). To be more accurate two entries could be made, 1 year at 50% and another for 2 years at 80%, therefore better reflecting the actual costs.

- Where staff are not working for an entire year, the start date and duration of the post must be presented in addition to the relevant percentage FTE.
- Travel, Other Directly Incurred, Other Directly Allocated, Exception, Estate and Indirect cost should be presented evenly across the duration of the proposal.
- Equipment costs should be presented in the FIRST year of the proposal only.
- STFC Laboratory costs should be presented as actually required.

(1) WORKPACKAGE COST TABLE

Work package reference number and title (WP 1 – Title)

Financial year	**01/04/2016**		**01/04/2017**		**01/04/2018**		**Totals**
Staff - FTE / £	**% FTE**	**Cost £**	**% FTE**	**Cost £**	**% FTE**	**Cost £**	**Cost £**
1.1: Title of sub work package							
Institution PDRA start 1.4.16 x 18 months	*100*	*10,000*	*50*	*5,000*	*0*	*0*	***15,000***
PDRA replacement - start 1.10.17 x 18 months	*0*	*0*	*50*	*5,000*	*100*	*10,000*	***15,000***
Institution – PhD	*100*	*1,000*	*100*	*1,000*	*100*	*1,000*	***3,000***
Institution - DI Technical support name	*50*	*15,000*	*50*	*15,000*	*50*	*15,000*	***45,000***
Institution - Details of support staff	*30*	*300*	*30*	*300*	*30*	*300*	***900***
Institution - Applicant name 1	*10*	*500*	*10*	*500*	*10*	*500*	***1,500***
Total PDRA FTE	***100***	***10,000***	***100***	***10,000***	***100***	***10,000***	***30,000***
Total PhD FTE	***100***	***1,000***	***100***	***1,000***	***100***	***1,000***	***3,000***
Total DI Technical FTE	***50***	***15,000***	***50***	***15000***	***50***	***15000***	***45,000***
Total Support Staff FTE	***30***	***300***	***30***	***300***	***30***	***300***	***900***
Total Applicant FTE	***10***	***500***	***10***	***500***	***10***	***500***	***1,500***
Total Staff costs		***26,800***		***26,800***		***26,800***	***80,400***

Non Staff Costs *single line per item*	**Cost £**	**Cost £**	**Cost £**	**Totals**
Travel				
Institution - Item description	*500*	*500*	*500*	
Total	***500***	***500***	***500***	***1,500***
Other Directly Incurred (ODI)				
Institution - Item description	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,000*	
Total	***1,000***	***1,000***	***1,000***	***3,000***
Exceptions				
Institution - Item description	*500*	*500*	*500*	

Total	***500***		***500***		***500***	***1,500***
Equipment Total						
Institution - Item description	*11,000*		*0*		*0*	
Total	***11,000***		***0***		***0***	***11,000***
Other Directly Allocated (ODA)						
Institution - Item description	*2,500*		*2,500*		*2,500*	
Total	***2,500***		***2,500***		***2,500***	***7,500***
Indirect Cost						
Institution	*10,000*		*10,000*		*10,000*	
Total	***10,000***		***10,000***		***10,000***	***30,000***
Estate Cost						
Institution	*10,000*		*10,000*		*10,000*	
Total	***10,000***		***10,000***		***10,000***	***30,000***
ODA – Infrastructure Technicians						
Institution	*5,000*		*5,000*		*5,000*	
Total	***5,000***		***5,000***		***5,000***	***15,000***
Total cost sub workpackage at 100% fEC	***67,300***		***56,300***		***56,300***	***179,900***
Total cost to Research Council	***56,340***		***45,340***		***45,340***	***147,020***

Financial year	**01/04/2016**		**01/04/2017**		**01/04/2018**		**Totals**
Staff FTE / £	**% FTE**	**Cost - £**	**% FTE**	**Cost - £**	**% FTE**	**Cost - £**	**Cost £**
1.2: Title of sub work package							
Institution - PDRA name	*100*	*10,000*	*50*	*5,000*	*0*	*0*	***15,000***
PDRA replacement (start 1.10.17 - 18 months)	*0*	*0*	*50*	*5,000*	*100*	*10,000*	***15,000***
STFC Lab (RAL,ATC etc) - Tech support name	*50*	*15,000*	*50*	*15,000*	*50*	*15,000*	***45,000***
Other Details of support staff per Institution (secretarial support etc)	*30*	*300*	*30*	*300*	*30*	*300*	***900***
Institution - Applicant name 1	*10*	*1,000*	*10*	*1,000*	*10*	*1,000*	***3,000***
STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc) - Applicant name 1	*30*	*4,000*	*30*	*4,000*	*30*	*4,000*	***12,000***
Total PDRA FTE	***100***	***10,000***	***100***	***10,000***	***100***	***10,000***	***30,000***
Total DI Technical FTE	***50***	***15,000***	***50***	***15,000***	***50***	***15,000***	***45,000***
Total Support Staff FTE	***30***	***300***	***30***	***300***	***30***	***300***	***900***
Total Applicant FTE	***40***	***5,000***	***40***	***5,000***	***40***	***5,000***	***15,000***

Total Staff costs	***30,300***	***30,300***	***30,300***	***90,900***

Non Staff Costs *single item per line*	**Cost - £**	**Cost - £**	**Cost - £**	**Totals**
Travel				
Institution - Item description	*500*	*500*	*500*	*1,500*
STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc)	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,000*	*3,000*
Total	***1,500***	***1,500***	***1,500***	***4,500***
Other Directly Incurred (ODI)				
Institution - Item description	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,000*	*3,000*
STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc)	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,500*	*3,500*
Total	***2,000***	***2,000***	***2,500***	***6,500***
Exceptions				
Institution - Item description	*500*	*500*	*500*	
Total	***500***	***500***	***500***	***1,500***
Equipment Total				
Institution - Item description	*13,500*	*0*	*0*	
Total	***13,500***	***0***	***0***	***13,500***
Other Directly Allocated				
Institution - Item description	*2,500*	*2,500*	*2,500*	
Total	***2,500***	***2,500***	***2,500***	***7,500***
Indirect Cost				
Institution	*10,000*	*10,000*	*10,000*	
Total	***10,000***	***10,000***	***10,000***	***30,000***
Estate Cost				
Institution	*10,000*	*10,000*	*10,000*	
Total	***10,000***	***10,000***	***10,000***	***30,000***
ODA – Infrastructure Technicians				
Institution	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*	
Total	***5,000***	***5,000***	***5,000***	***15,000***
Total cost sub workpackage at 100% fEC	***75,300***	***61,800***	***62,300***	***199,400***
Total cost to Research Council	***67,240***	***53,740***	***54,240***	***175,220***
Total cost WORKPACKAGE at 100% fEC	***142,600***	***118,100***	***118,600***	***379,300***
**** Total cost of WORKPACKAGE to RC***	***123,580***	***99,080***	***99,580***	***322,240***

** RC contribution costed at 80% with the exception of:*
STFC Lab Staff, STFC Non staff requests, PhDs, Equipment which have been costed at 100%

Summary Table

Applicants should ensure that all costs on the Summary table are consistent with those presented in the individual Work Package Tables. Contingency costs and Working Allowance should be included in the Summary Table only. Should Working Allowance be awarded then STFC will amend the request from ODI at 80% Research Council Contribution to Exceptions at 100% contribution

There is a requirement for Particle Physics, Astronomy and Nuclear Physics Projects to provide details of Consolidated Grant support in the Summary table. The numbers presented should be an estimate of the total Consolidated Grant costs, including salary, estates in-directs and any other resource, and presented as the actual cost to the Research Council.

(2) SUMMARY COST TABLE FOR WHOLE PROJECT

Financial Year	**01/04/2016**	**01/04/2017**	**01/04/2018**	**Totals**
	£	**£**	**£**	**Cost £**
Applicants	*5,500*	*5,500*	*5,500*	*16,500*
PDRAs	*20,000*	*20,000*	*20,000*	*60,000*
STFC (RAL, ATC etc)	*15,000*	*15,000*	*15,000*	*45,000*
PhD	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,000*	*3,000*
Technicians	*15,000*	*15,000*	*15,000*	*45,000*
Other Staff	*600*	*600*	*600*	*1,800*
Travel	*2,000*	*2,000*	*2,000*	*6,000*
Other Directly Incurred	*3,000*	*3,000*	*3,500*	*9,500*
Exceptions	*1,000*	*1,000*	*1,000*	*3,000*
Equipment	*24,500*	*0*	*0*	*24,500*
Other Directly Allocated	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*15,000*
Indirect Costs	*20,000*	*20,000*	*20,000*	*60,000*
Estate Costs	*20,000*	*20,000*	*20,000*	*60,000*
Infrastructure Technicians	*10,000*	*10,000*	*10,000*	*30,000*
*Exceptions - Working Allowance **	*5,000*	*5,000*	*5,000*	*15,000*
TOTAL 100% Costs	***147,600***	***123,100***	***123,600***	***394,30***
Total Cost to Research Council	***128,580***	***104,080***	***104,580***	***337,24***
Contingency	***5,000***	***5,000***	***5,000***	***15,000***
Total Consolidated Grant - please refer to the guidance	*100,000*	*150,000*	*150,000*	*400,000*

**Use a single line to identify each Institution requesting a Working Allowance*

Please note that a download template of these finance tables is available on the STFC website.

Annex 2 – Risk Management Guidance and Template

Guidance on Risk Management

Risk is any action or event that affects a project's ability to achieve its objectives. Risks can be seen as a threat to the success of a project because they have a negative impact on cost, schedule and technical performance. However, with appropriate procedures, risks can be managed and in so doing, present new opportunities with a positive impact. It is as much concerned with good things not happening as bad things happening.

The objective of risk management is to identify, assess, reduce, accept and control risk in a systematic and proactive way, whilst at the same time taking into account the project's technical and programmatic constraints (e.g. costs, timescales, specifications, etc.). To achieve this, risk needs to be captured effectively so that appropriate management attention can be directed to the essential issues. The various stakeholders can then agree on the best course of action for mitigating the risk. This approach underpins the key objective of risk management.

Basic Principles and Process

STFC's risk management policy requires well-structured information about the nature of risk so that the information can facilitate communication and the management decision making process. Certain activities must be implemented as part of a risk management plan and risk management must be seen as part of the normal project management structure and internal reporting within the STFC's Science Programme Office (SPO) through its project assurance process.

An outline of the steps used in the risk management process is shown below. Generally, trade-offs are made among the different, and often competing, project goals. Undesired events are assessed for severity/impact and likelihood. In the assessment of mitigating risk and devising an action plan, risk is considered tradable against known project resources within the management (e.g. cost and schedule) and technical domains (e.g. specification). Key steps comprise:

- Identifying the full spectrum of potential risks through appropriate techniques (e.g. engineering analysis, project team meetings etc)
- Analysing and assessing the risks to determine the most serious and rank them through a risk index scheme (see below)
- Capturing and tracking risks on a standard risk register. This should distinguish between inherent and residual risk. The former is the risk present before taking any mitigation action, while the latter is what remains after mitigation
- Devising action plans to mitigate risks either by avoiding the risk, transferring the risk, reducing the probability/impact or accepting the risk; this requires an understanding of the cost and schedule impact of the risk as part of determining an appropriate level of working margin and contingency. Some types of risk lend themselves to a numerical diagnosis – particularly financial or technical risk. For other risks such as reputational risk, a more subjective view is all that is possible.
- Implementing action and control plans and taking appropriate actions when unforeseen risks occur. This will include monitoring, communicating and accepting risks as well as alerting the management team of new risks.

Suggested Risk Index Scheme

A risk index scheme should be used to score or measure the magnitude of each risk scenario. It is a combination of the likelihood of occurrence and the impact or severity of the consequence of the risk materialising. Scores are used to measure the likelihood and impact.

It is important that periodic assessment and review of all identified risks and up-dating of results takes place as part of the project management reporting. For this reason, risks should be captured and tracked using a Risk Register (suggested template attached below).

Likelihood **Risk Index: Combination of Impact and Likelihood**

0.8-1.0	Medium	Medium	High	High	High
0.6-0.8	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
0.4-06	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
0.2-0.4	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
0.0-0.2	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100

Impact

Risk index	**Risk severity or magnitude**	**Proposed actions**
50 - 100	High risk	Unacceptable risk: implement new mitigation process or change baseline (e.g. de-scope, re-schedule) – seek high level project management intervention as defined in the risk management plan.
25 – 50	Medium risk	Unacceptable risk: actively manage, consider alternative mitigation process or baseline (e.g. de-scope) – seek attention at appropriate management level as defined in the risk management plan.
0 – 25	Low risk	Acceptable risk: control, monitor – seek responsible work package management attention.

NB. For further information please contact the relevant Programme Manager.

RISK REGISTER

Total risk is product of
Likelihood and Impact

0 - 25	Low
25 - 50	Med
50 - 100	High

Project Title:

Project Manager:

Last Update:

Ref.	Risk Description	Potential impact on project	Owner	Inherent Risk			Existing Controls	Current/ Proposed mitigation	Residual Risk			Risk Exposure		Action Required
				Likelihood	Impact	Total			Likelihood	Impact	Total	Description	Cost (£k)	
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			

Notes

Likelihood scale of 0.1 to where 0.1 is low.

Impact scale of 1 -100 where 1 is low.