

UK Research and Innovation

Equality Impact Assessment

Question	Response
<p>1. Name of policy/funding activity/event being assessed</p>	<p>The 2021 UKRI Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) Interdisciplinary Research Hubs Review process.</p> <p>The UKRI GCRF Hubs constitute a group of twelve significant multi-year investments launched by UKRI in 2019 with an investment of £200million.</p> <p>Following the completion of the first two years of the Hubs’ work and the reduction in ODA expenditure at the 2020 Spending Review, this formal review was carried out to inform decisions on future funding for the programme from April 2022 onwards. The review provided an independent assessment informed by a wide range of evidence and inputs.</p> <p>From the outset of the Hubs’ programme, a mid-grant review had been planned to ensure that each Hub was making appropriate progress and managing the award effectively. However, due to the impact of the pandemic and the reduction in UKRI’s ODA budget, the context of the review expanded to also assess the Hubs’ strategic alignment to local, national, and international strategies and policies (including FCDO priorities); value for money; and their forward plans.</p> <p>The revised independent review process included four stages, occurring from June – August 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stage 1: Evidence collection and collation - Stage 2: Analysis and Review - Stage 3: BEIS and FCDO strategic reviews - Stage 4: Final high-level recommendation panel
<p>2. Summary of aims and objectives of the policy/funding activity/event</p>	<p>UKRI commissioned a formal review in order to secure ongoing and future funding for the Hubs as outlined above.</p> <p>This Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) assesses the methodology UKRI used to review the Hubs in the revised process.</p> <p>The aims and objectives of the methodology are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to gather evidence for BEIS to prepare a bid into the Autumn 2021 Spending Review

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to review the Hubs’ alignment to the FCDO priorities - to review their individual progress, and individual value as investments - to inform BEIS Ministers’ decisions on future funding for the BEIS ODA Funds - as part of being a learning organisation, to gather lessons to inform potential future investments <p>The review should offer an independent assessment informed by evidence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevance, and structure to deliver, current HMG ODA priorities - Quality of research - Value for money - Progress against original commission - Future direction - Lessons learned for the Hubs model <p>The outcome of the formal review has been reported to BEIS and has informed their planning for the Autumn 2021 Spending Review process, it will play a key role in determining future funding for this programme.</p>
<p>3. What involvement and consultation has been done in relation to this policy? (e.g. with relevant groups and stakeholders)</p>	<p>UKRI has given consideration as to how the application of the process will impact on its ability to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED).</p> <p>The purpose of the Hubs’ review is to implement a robust, transparent and independent review to support an evidence-based decision on the future of individual Hubs and the programme as a whole and to evidence the value to date and the ongoing potential of the Hubs. The outcome of the review has fed into the UKRI/BEIS Spending Review bid submitted to Treasury in September 2021 and will play a key role in determining future funding for this programme.</p> <p>UKRI was notified at the end of April 2021 of the requirement to develop the review process and obtain sign-off from BEIS before implementation. A working group was established in mid-May to develop and implement the review. The plan was submitted to BEIS on 19 May 2021 and sign-off was obtained on 21 May by BEIS officials, but still required final ministerial sign-off for the final panel (obtained in late June). This led to very challenging timelines for the Hubs and everyone involved with the review.</p>

Given the short timelines needed to design and implement the process, consultation on EDI impacts to date was mostly limited to UKRI and BEIS colleagues, along with monitoring if any issues were reported by the Hubs.

Communications with the Hubs, including opportunities to share EDI impacts, have included:

- communicating directly with the Hubs, setting out the processes and timetable for each stage
- holding a webinar on 21 June with relevant Hub representatives to clarify the process, answer questions, and understand concerns
- responding to questions via email
- compiling and sending FAQs to Hubs via email and updating these as needed

Further details of the process are outlined below, and full guidance is included as an annex:

Stage 1: Evidence collection and collation

As part of the on-going monitoring and evaluation plans for the Hubs programme, significant information on the progress of the Hubs has been collected. This includes information on their aims and objectives; partnerships; intended pathways to impact and outcomes to date; governance and project management; and finances.

To supplement this information and allow an assessment to be made against all the objectives outlined above, some additional evidence will need to be collected (see Annex for details).

Given the volume of evidence for each Hub, UKRI completed a summary report for each Hub including information on gender and inclusion and equitable partnerships. This was done in a standardised way with a consistent approach and format and provided alongside the raw evidence to support the expert panels in effectively carrying out the review process.

Once the collection, collation, analysis and summary work was completed, the assessment packs circulated to the panels included:

- UKRI summary report
- evidence pack, containing previously collected information on the progress of the Hub and additional evidence submitted by the Hub

Stage 2: Analysis and Review

	<p>The initial analysis and review stage was carried out via parallel external expert panels which each included EDI Observers, and is covered in a separate EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Value for Money: An assessment of the value for money of each Hub was made using methodology developed and piloted by BEIS. This assessment was made by an external expert panel comprising of individuals who had experience applying the methodology and who had expertise aligned to the Hubs’ thematic areas. - Review of progress to date; outcomes for excellence and development impact; and forward plans: A second external expert panel, comprising academic and non-academic members from the UK and overseas, reviewed the evidence relating to each Hubs’ progress to date and whether it was meeting programme requirements and expectations, in line with those outlined in the original Stage Gate plans. The panel also reviewed the proposed forward plans for each Hub considering relevance, feasibility, potential for impact and value for money. <p>Stage 3: BEIS and FCDO strategic reviews The outcomes of the expert panels, along with the raw evidence were submitted to BEIS and FCDO to enable colleagues to produce a 1–2-page evidence based strategic review for each Hub. UKRI liaised with an agreed primary contact for each organisation, with BEIS and FCDO colleagues responsible for identifying the most appropriate individual(s) within their organisation to complete each review.</p> <p>Stage 4: Final high-level recommendation panel The full evidence, expert panel/group outcomes, and BEIS and FCDO strategic reviews were all considered by one overarching high-level expert panel responsible for making the final recommendation. The makeup of this panel, the criteria for assessment, and final report were decided and written by BEIS, not UKRI.</p> <p>UKRI then submitted a final report to BEIS and individual feedback to the Hubs.</p>
<p>4. Who is affected by the policy/funding activity/event?</p>	<p>Through this EIA, UKRI has given consideration as to how its application of the review will impact on its ability to comply with the PSED. UKRI is committed to both the principles of equality, diversity and inclusion and to equitable partnerships.</p>

	<p>All the grants considered as part of the review are ODA funded and therefore it should be expected that <i>all</i> of the projects will have positive impacts on the following groups with protected characteristics: gender, race and ethnicity (given that they must have their primary impact in countries on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) List ODA Recipients¹. Therefore, the reduction or cessation of funding to <i>any</i> of these projects will have an EDI impact.</p> <p>UKRI anticipated that the roles in the process potentially most affected would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - those working on the process of gathering evidence for each Hub, and - potentially additional staff on the Hubs who would be submitting new evidence for the review, such as Advisory Board members, or other stakeholders, and could limit the diversity of views and inputs received the timelines could also have had negative effects on the diversity of the panels, who would have had to do work to tight timelines over the summer <p>Additional restrictions on grant extensions and funding limits based on past performance could affect scoring on certain criteria, such as future plans and outcomes to date. There was a possibility that the process could disproportionately affect Hubs who have had delays or reduced impacts related directly to having staff who have protected characteristics, e.g. pregnancy and maternity, or staff from groups that are disproportionately affected by COVID-19 because of race, age or disability – and compounded in cases of intersectional characteristics. Hubs also have staff and partners who were affected by their location in countries which have been more affected by COVID-19 or had stricter lockdowns, The intention was that Hubs were evaluated considering their individual contexts and circumstances, and this was included in panel guidance and briefings.</p>
<p>5. What are the arrangements for monitoring and reviewing the actual impact of the policy/funding activity/event?</p>	<p>Through communication with the Hubs, for example through the webinars, UKRI monitored comments for information on how the process and timeline could affect certain groups disproportionately. UKRI did not have Hubs raise any specific issues related to the disproportionate effects of this process on people with protected characteristics mentioned below. However, there were adjustments to the timeline and process in discussion with the Hubs, for example, adding a PI response stage, adjusting deadlines where possible – both for</p>

¹ [The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development \(OECD\), Development Assistance Committee \(DAC\) -List of ODA Recipient Countries](#)

the group as a whole, and in specific situations, for example where one individual had COVID-19.

This assessment should be updated at each stage (if needed) based on information received from grants related to those with protected characteristics affected by the process, and as the panels were confirmed. The two ‘Deep-dive’ panels on Value for Money and Review of progress to date; outcomes for excellence and development impact; and forward plans have a separate Equality Impact Assessment.

EDI observers attended both panel meetings to provide comments on how the decision-making process complied with EDI and PSED requirements.

UKRI has carried out continuous checks through the process and added to this live and evolving document.

In addition to UKRI’s duty under PSED, as a result of all Hubs being funded through ODA, they are ‘administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as the main objective’ⁱ. Necessarily therefore, as projects funded through ODA must benefit disadvantaged communities. In accordance with section 1(1A) International Development Act 2002 (ID Act) development assistance may be provided if it is likely to contribute to the reduction in poverty having regard to a desire that it is likely to contribute to reducing gender inequality.

All the GCRF Hubs considered as part of the review are ODA funded and therefore it should be expected that *all* of the projects will have positive impacts on the following groups with protected characteristics: gender, race and ethnicity (given that they must have their primary impact in countries on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) List ODA Recipients². Therefore, the reduction or cessation of funding to *any* of these projects will have an EDI impact. However, within the limitations due to timelines and finances, UKRI is trying to minimise the impact of these changes, reduce any possible harm and support future learning.

Protected Characteristic Group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
Disability	Potential Negative.	The Hubs Stage Gate review methodology distinguishes between projects according to the impacts to date, and future planned impacts. UKRI has evidence that certain	Given the limited timeline in which the decisions have had to be made and for the reasons set

² [The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development \(OECD\), Development Assistance Committee \(DAC\) -List of ODA Recipient Countries](#)

Protected Characteristic Group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
		groups have been disproportionately affected by COVID-19 – for example some people with disabilities. Therefore, if for reasons related to these disproportionate impacts a project has been slow in implementation, the methodology could discriminate against this group.	out above, consultation must be built into the process, requesting that grant holders identify any specific EDI issues related to reducing or terminating their grant.
Gender reassignment	No evidence of positive or negative impacts		Throughout this process to date, UKRI has been making adjustments to the timeline and process in discussion with the Hubs, for example, adding a PI response stage, adjusting deadlines where possible – both for the group as a whole, and in specific situations, for example where one individual had COVID-19.
Pregnancy and maternity	<p>Potential negative. UKRI has no relationship with the grantholder under which a claim for statutory maternity or paternity pay may be claimed, but the grant terms permit a project to be extended in order to accommodate maternity or paternity leave for the grantholder and people employed through the grant. The existing restriction on extensions could disproportionately impact on this group, whether they have had leave in the past or will need leave in the future.</p> <p>Tight timelines, over the summer, may disproportionately affect some people involved throughout this process – for example, those with school aged children who are on summer</p>	The methodology distinguishes between projects according to the impacts to date, and future planned impacts. Therefore, if for reasons of pregnancy or maternity a project has been slow in implementation, the methodology could discriminate against this group.	<p>This document is a live and evolving document and should be revised as grants report EDI issues.</p>

Protected Characteristic Group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
	break from school or those with caring responsibilities.		
Race	Potential Negative.	UKRI has evidence that certain groups have been disproportionately affected by COVID-19 – for example certain ethnic groups or countries. All the grants considered as part of the review are ODA funded and therefore it should be expected that <i>all</i> of the projects will have positive impacts on the following groups with protected characteristics: gender, race and ethnicity (given that they must have their primary impact in a developing country). Therefore, the reduction or cessation of funding to <i>any</i> of these projects will have an EDI impact.	
Religion or belief	No evidence of positive or negative impacts		
Sexual orientation	No evidence of positive or negative impacts		
Sex (gender)	Negative	The International Development Act 2002 (as amended) requires that all ODA spend has regard to gender equality. Hubs have been asked to provide gender specific data, impacts and monitoring and evaluation outcomes. Therefore, UKRI would expect all projects to be sensitive and inclusive to gender throughout the project lifecycle where gender equality is applicable. The implication is therefore that reducing or terminating funding <i>could</i> have an impact on this group.	
Age	Potential Negative.	Since the Hubs are large projects that collectively employ hundreds of researchers, reducing or terminating funding could have a disproportionate impact on researchers without permanent contracts, e.g. on early career researchers or Research Assistants. Although cuts would be	

Protected Characteristic Group	Is there a potential for positive or negative impact?	Please explain and give examples of any evidence/data used	Action to address negative impact (e.g. adjustment to the policy)
		likely to be based on contract status rather than age, based on career stage, it could affect younger age ranges disproportionately.	

Evaluation:

Question	Explanation / justification	
Is it possible the proposed policy or activity or change in policy or activity could discriminate or unfairly disadvantage people?	<p>As outlined above, it is possible that the proposed methodology will have a considerable impact on those with a number of protected characteristics: most notably sex, race, disability and age.</p> <p>The best way to mitigate against this would be to identify the projects affected, and to monitor the impact of the policy on those with a protected characteristic to minimise any disproportionate impact on a particular group and discuss options to mitigate or minimise the effects throughout, within the time and funding constraints.</p>	
Final Decision:	Tick the relevant box	Include any explanation / justification required
1. No barriers identified, therefore activity will proceed .		
2. You can decide to stop the policy or practice at some point because the data shows bias towards one or more groups		
3. You can adapt or change the policy in a way which you think will eliminate the bias		
4. Barriers and impact identified, however having considered all available options carefully, there appear to be no other proportionate ways to achieve the aim of the policy or practice (e.g. in extreme cases or where positive action is taken). Therefore, you are going to proceed with caution with this policy or practice knowing that it may favour some people less than others, providing justification for this decision.	X	<p>As outlined above, it is likely that the process to review the Hubs will have significant negative impacts on groups of people with protected characteristics.</p> <p>However, given the significant number of Hubs which are delivering benefits to groups with protected characteristics there is a potential for worse impacts if the Hubs do not receive future funding.</p>

		<p>UKRI worked within a short timeline in which to gather evidence and make recommendations, and although there are EDI impacts, there appeared to be no other proportionate ways to carry out this process.</p> <p>As such, UKRI proceeded to use the proposed methodology with caution.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Will this EIA be published* Yes (* Alongside the EIA for the 2021 UKRI Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) Interdisciplinary Research Hubs review 'Deep-dive' panels.)</p>	
<p>Date completed:</p>	
<p>Review date (if applicable):</p>	

Change log

Name	Date	Version	Change
	16/12/2021	1	

Annex 1:

Guidance for the UKRI GCRF Interdisciplinary Research Hubs Review

Change log

Version	Changes	Date
1	N/A	15/6/21
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Additional evidence request updated in line with post-webinar update (pages 4-5)- Hub response stage added (timeline – page 1; process – page 7-8)- FCDO priority areas added (Annex 2)- More detailed mapping of evidence to evaluation questions and VfM framework added in line with post-webinar update (Annex 3 & 4)	25/6/21

Overview

This document outlines the key principles and process for the redesigned GCRF Hubs review.

From the outset of the programme, a stage gate review has been planned to ensure that each Hub is making appropriate progress and managing the award effectively. As you are aware, due to the impact of the pandemic and the ODA review, the panel review component of the stage gate was delayed to allow you and your partners to review and revise your plans. The broader context of this review has now changed significantly and, in light on this, we have had to redesign the review process and reinstate it over a shorter timeframe. The review will now take place in summer 2021, delivering outcomes at the end of August. The outcome of this review will then feed into the Spending Review process and play a key role in determining future funding for this programme.

Due to the current circumstances, the review will now follow a four-step process:

- Collection of additional evidence to support the review’s shift in focus and provide an up-to-date, clearer picture on the progress and forward plans for each Hub
- ‘Deep dive’ expert panel reviews
- Strategy review by BEIS/FCDO
- Final recommendation panel

Given the format and timelines for the revised approach, all stages will be paper-based reviews drawing on a combination of the original proposal and reporting documentation submitted to date and the additional evidence provided as part of step one. In addition to the aspects covered by the original stage gate

process, this review will also consider each Hub’s strategic alignment to local, national and international priorities, forward plans (21/22 - 23/24) and value for money. Further details are included in the relevant sections below.

Timeline

Approximate timeline	Stage
21 st June 2021	Webinars with Hubs to address questions/provide clarification
9 th July 2021	Additional evidence submitted by Hubs
Late July/early August 2021	Expert Panels held
By mid August 2021	Panel feedback shared with Hubs and Hub response submitted
By mid August 2021	Reviews submitted by BEIS and FCDO and shared with Final Recommendation Panel
By mid to end August 2021	Final Recommendation Panel
By 31 st August 2021	Final report to BEIS
From Mid-September 2021	Individual feedback to Hubs

Overarching Assessment Criteria for the Review

Using the original programme objectives as a framework (Annex 1), the following assessment criteria will be used:

Progress against programme and Hub level objectives

- Development impact
 - o Progress towards development impact, including how the project is ensuring the Hubs overarching goals are achieved, and the reach and significance of development outputs, outcomes delivered to date
 - o Steps taken to strengthen capacity both in the UK and overseas at the individual, organisational and institutional level
- Interdisciplinary research excellence
 - o How the project has facilitated and promoted collaborative and interdisciplinary ways of working
 - o Progress of the project to date, in delivering high-quality research outputs, outcomes and impacts
- Global partnerships and leadership
 - o Measures and approaches in place to facilitate equitable partnerships, including the management of any challenges and changes
 - o The balance of advice sought, mechanisms for identifying and engaging stakeholders and how these have been implemented
 - o How the project has demonstrated global leadership, including evidence of international recognition
 - o Steps taken to facilitate and promote global networks to address the development challenge(s) relevant to the Hub
- Effective governance and project management
 - o Implementation of data, finance and risk management arrangements and overall approach to managing challenges and changes.
 - o Implementation of the projects monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy
- Flexible Funding
 - o The strategic rationale behind any flexible fund allocations and their contribution to the overall aims of the Hub
- Research practices

- The approach to considering, identifying and mitigating relevant dimensions of gender equality
- The approach to addressing ethical issues and compliance with the relevant frameworks

Strategic alignment

- The strength of the alignment to relevant local, national and international strategies and priorities (including SDGs and FCDO priorities)

Value for Money to date

- Relevance
- Equitable partnerships and collaborations
- Progress on activities and outputs
- Capacity-strengthening
- Positioning for achieving project/programme outcomes
- Likelihood of contributing to fund-level impact

Strength of forward plans

- The strategic rationale behind the response to the ODA review
- The alignment of proposed plans to relevant local, national and international strategies and policies
- Appropriate consideration of gender equality and inclusivity within each activity
- The feasibility of proposed plans given the time and funds currently available and any changes to partnerships
- The breadth, scale and likelihood of the proposed outputs, outcomes and impacts being achieved

Additional Evidence to be submitted by the Hubs

In order to meet the agreed objectives of this review, we are asking for the following additional evidence to be submitted by each Hub. Each Hub should seek input from across the partnership and their advisory groups as appropriate. This will supplement the information on the progress of the Hubs that have been previously collected via the Inception/September review, Annual and Advisory Board reports and ResearchFish returns. As outlined previously, the Interim Expenditure Statements (IES) exercise has been decoupled from the stage gate process and will not form part of the review.

The following information must be submitted to UKRI **by 9th July 2021**, via the GCRFHubs@ukri.org inbox. To ensure the review panels have time and capacity to review the information fully, we will be keeping to these word counts and will remove any information provided above the limits given. This also ensures fairness across the cohort.

Where relevant you may include images as an annex to your additional evidence submission that are directly linked to and illustrate the evidence included within the main body of your response. They must not be used as a means of adding substantive new information and we will only include those that fit within this guidance in the panel papers.

For all aspects of the forward plan section, please assume the original grant end date and the level of funding outlined in the most recent round of template returns.

All information provided as part of the additional evidence will be treated as confidential by the panel. However, if you wish to include any information/evidence that is particularly sensitive please highlight this within your response.

Following the Hub review webinar on 21st June, we have reviewed the additional evidence we have requested to take on board the comments made. We have done this to respond to the request to have the option to amend documents submitted in March, rather than providing separate updates. We have been able to accommodate this in most parts. However, there are some assessment criteria which were added when the review scope was expanded where we still need to request additional information. It is for each hub to decide whether they wish to update their documents submitted in March or to add some updates separately or to provide nil returns.

It is also for each Hub to decide how they wish to approach this stage of the review process, and to decide what new information they wish to include, if any, to make the strongest case for their Hub. This should be guided by what information/evidence the Hub currently has available and is feasible to gather, and a practical level of detail for the panel to consider.

Updates to the Annual Report and and/or Advisory Board reports submitted in March 2021

The Hubs are invited to make the following updates to Annual Report and Advisory Board reports submitted in March '21. In total these updates must not add more than 1000 words to the original submission.

1. Any updates or additional information should be entered into the relevant section of the report. This can include but is not restricted to further progress on Hub activities; additional challenges and/or mitigations; and key outputs/outcomes/impacts achieved post submission.
2. Where relevant, please provide information on gender and inclusiveness for major Hub activities/events, including the diversity of participants in terms gender and age. Where possible please also provide an indication of geography, discipline and role. You may include supporting information regarding your approach to gender and inclusiveness. This information should be included within the Annual and/or Advisory Board Report sections on how your Hubs is considering gender equality.
3. Please provide an update on your experience to date of implementing the original monitoring, evaluation and learning strategy for the Hub. This should include but is not restricted to a summary of progress with implementing relative to your original plans; challenges or barriers you have experienced and were relevant any mitigations; and an outline of any significant amendments made to your strategy. This information should be included within the governance and project management section of your Annual and/or Advisory Board Report.

Please note that you will not be able to submit an updated ResearchFish report on system. Any additional information relating to your ResearchFish submissions that you wish to include within the Annual and/or Advisory Board Reports should be included within the research progress sections.

Evidence to be provided as update documents for those hubs which choose not to update their March 2021 submissions

- *Gender and inclusiveness (see bullet point 2 above), max. 250 words*
- *Implementation of MEL strategy (see bullet point 3 above), max. 300 words*

Evidence requested which adds to that provided through the request above

Alignment to strategic priorities

- Please articulate how each major work package/stream of the Hub aligns to relevant local, national and international strategies and policies including alignment to the SDGs and the UK cross-Government ODA priorities (see Annex 2) for:
 - o the work carried out to date; and (max. 300 words)
 - o the proposed forward plan (max. 300 words)

Building and maintaining effective and equitable partnerships and global leadership

- Please summarise the approach that the Hub has taken to establish and maintain effective and equitable partnerships, including reference to:
 - o co-design;
 - o fair opportunity;
 - o fair process; and
 - o fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes. (max. 300 words)
- Please describe how the Hub has demonstrated global leadership, including any evidence of international recognition. (max. 300 words)

Interdisciplinary research excellence

- Please provide an overview of how the Hub has ensured a highly integrated approach delivering interdisciplinary research excellence. (max. 300 words)
- Please provide up to 5 case studies which demonstrate your interdisciplinary research excellence achievements to date (max. 1500 words per case study). Each case study should clearly summarise:
 - o The staff and partners involved in delivering this work (name, primary discipline, institution and country) and which overarching Hub work package/stream this relates to;
 - o What the achievement was, when it was achieved and what was its significance;
 - o How this work demonstrates well integrated and rigorous interdisciplinary approaches which offer innovative perspectives and challenge traditional disciplinary boundaries;
 - o How this work has made an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge in the field and the influence on, or potential for influencing the development and understanding of policy and/or practice;
 - o Any gender equality or inclusivity dimension (where relevant); and
 - o Any verifiable sources to evidence this including any cited outputs, reports, review, web links or other public or confidential sources.

Development impact

- Please provide an overview of the approach that the Hub has taken to ensure delivery of tangible development impacts both within the lifetime of the grant and beyond, in particular referencing how the collaborations, partnerships and placements you have established are enabling you to progress towards and/or deliver your intended impacts. (max. 500 words)
- Please provide up to 5 case studies which demonstrate key achievements/steps towards delivering your intended development impacts (max. 1500 words per case study). It is not anticipated that these impacts will have been fully achieved at this stage in the programme; progress here is expected to be in line with each Hub's theory of change. Each case study should clearly summarise:

- o The staff and partners involved in delivering this work (name, institution and country) and which overarching Hub work package/stream this relates to;
- o What the achievement is, how it is progressing, what is its significance and reach and how this is directly linked to the work of the Hub;
- o Who is benefitting from, being influenced by or acting upon this and to what extent;
- o Any gender equality or inclusivity dimension (where relevant); and
- o Any verifiable sources to evidence this including any cited outputs, reports, review, web links or other public or confidential sources.

Forward plan

Please provide an overview of the Hub’s plans for 21/22, 22/23 and 23/24 (max. 500 words) including:

- o A description of the Hub’s approach to managing the budget reductions;
 - o A high-level summary of which elements of the original Hub plans have been reduced or removed and any new elements not included in previous plans;
 - o Any changes to the countries or partners involved in the Hub;
 - o Any considerations relating to gender equality and/or inclusivity including steps taken to ensure a neutral or positive impact.
- Please provide a revised work plan for each work stream which includes major activities for 21/22, 22/23 and 23/24.
 - If your Theory of Change and/or Log Frame have been further amended since March 2021 please submit your updated version. Alternatively, if relevant you may provide a brief narrative outlining any key changes you would intend to make to either/both documents in line with the plans outlined in this section.
 - Please summarise below the key anticipated outputs/outcomes/impacts you expect to realise in 21/22, 22/23 and in 23/24. Below we have suggested a table format to present this.

Key activity /work stream	April 21 – March 22	April 22 – March 23	April 23 – March 24
e.g. Workstream 1	<i>Anticipated outputs:</i> <i>Anticipated outcomes:</i> <i>Anticipated impacts:</i>	<i>Anticipated outputs:</i> <i>Anticipated outcomes:</i> <i>Anticipated impacts:</i>	<i>Anticipated outputs:</i> <i>Anticipated outcomes:</i> <i>Anticipated impacts:</i>

You are not expected to provide an in-depth, highly detailed plan. The intention of this section is to provide the relevant panels with a sense of how the Hub has evolved as a result of the pandemic and the ODA review exercise, and to convey how you intend the Hub to move forwards over the remaining grant period. This should be based on your current ‘best guess’ as to how you anticipate the Hub progressing.

If you wish to you may include within the word count a very high-level plan as to what the Hub would look to deliver should an extension become an option. However, please note that the panel assessment will focus on the plan and deliverables for the current grant period (up to March 2024) and this information will only be considered as additional context/supporting information.

Annexes 3 and 4 outline the overarching review framework and the Value for Money (VfM) framework. These highlight the review questions and the evidence and data that will be considered to address each one. The evidence sources highlighted in grey are those which UKRI do not currently have and have requested the Hubs to provide.

Deep dive panels

Two parallel external expert panel meetings will take place. Membership will be drawn from a range of expertise from academic and non-academic positions both in the UK and internationally. Members of each Panel will be assigned to act as the Introducing Members of each Hub, where they will review the relevant documentation in detail and take the lead in terms of providing feedback and making an overall recommendation. Please note, however, that all panel members will be encouraged to actively engage as appropriate in discussions for all Hubs to support consistency in terms of feedback and recommendations.

A table outlining the documents that the Panel members will be asked to consider in each assessment can be found in Annex 5.

Value for Money Panel

An assessment of the value for money of each Hub will be made using the 'Value for Money' methodology developed and piloted by BEIS. This assessment will be made by an external expert panel with membership built largely on those with experience of applying this methodology and expertise aligned to the Hubs' thematic areas.

This part of the review will use the assessment rubric outlined in Annex 6. This methodology will result in an individual score and rating for each Hub for each of the key criteria, plus an overall score. As a starting point, an average score of all the individual criteria will be used to determine the overall scoring. The panel will then agree any key points of feedback (including highlighting any key strengths, weaknesses and best practice).

Additional information on the definitions underpinning the assessment can be found in Annex 7.

Progress to Date and Forward Plans Panel

The other expert panel will assess the Hubs based on the 'Progress against programme and Hub level objectives,' 'Strategic alignment' and 'Strength of forward plans' sections of the assessment criteria. Panel membership will include a range of academic and non-academic experts from the UK and overseas with expertise in areas directly related to the focus/themes of the Hubs.

This panel will consider all evidence relating to each Hubs progress to date and whether it is meeting programme requirements and expectations will be in line with those outlined in the original stage gate plans. The proposed forward plans for each Hub will consider relevance, feasibility, potential for impact and value

for money. Additional information on the definitions underpinning the assessment, including those relating to ‘Development impact’ and ‘Interdisciplinary research excellence’ can be found in Annex 7.

The assessment rubric for this panel can be found in Annex 8. Like the Value for Money rubric, this approach will result in an individual score and rating for each Hub for each of the key criteria. In addition, the panel will agree any key points of feedback (including highlighting any key strengths, weaknesses and best practice).

Hub response

In response to feedback from Hub colleagues, a ‘Hub response’ stage has been added to the review process. Following the two ‘Deep dive’ panels, each Hub will receive a summary of the panel outputs relating to their Hub including:

- the agreed panel scores for each of the Value for Money assessment criteria and the overall Value for Money score for their Hub
- the agreed panel scores for each of the Progress to date and forward plans assessment criteria
- feedback comments including key strengths, weaknesses, and best practice from each Panel

Each Hub will have the option to submit a written response to the panel outputs, highlighting any significant misunderstandings or factual inaccuracies in the panel comments. This response must be a maximum of 2 pages, and should be submitted via the GCRFHubs@ukri.org inbox. Your response should be in A4 format, written in a minimum of 11pt font (Arial or equivalent) and with a minimum of 2cm margins.

The timeline for completion of this step in the process is very tight, and exact dates are subject to final confirmation of panel dates. The exact dates will be confirmed as soon as possible.

Where Hubs choose to submit a response, this will feed into the final recommendation panel stage detailed below.

BEIS/FCDO strategic reviews

Distinct from the outlined expert panels above, BEIS and FCDO will be asked to provide strategic input into the review process. Their review will take into account the evidence provided by the Hub and UKRI alongside the outputs of the external expert panels (Annex 5). BEIS and FCDO will produce a one-to-two-page review for each Hub. Each review will provide comments on:

- Strategic alignment with government priorities
- Progress to date
 - o Interdisciplinary research excellence outputs/outcomes/impacts
 - o Development outputs/outcomes/impacts (including capacity building)
- Strength of forward plans potential for impact
- Overall assessment

Final High-Level Independent Recommendation Panel

The full evidence, expert panel outputs and BEIS and FCDO strategic reviews (Annex 5) will all be considered by a small overarching high-level panel. This panel will be responsible for making the final recommendation to BEIS. Further details are under on-going discussion with BEIS, and we will update Hubs colleagues with further information at a later stage.

Next Steps

The aim is that individual feedback will be given to each Hub from mid-September. The feedback will outline the Hub's scores for each panel and highlight any relevant panel comments. The feedback will also outline how the Hub scored against the average across the cohort.

The final recommendation from this review process will then feed into ongoing discussions with BEIS with regard to the Spending Review. UKRI does not have control over the timelines for the Spending Review, but understand that it will be in the autumn, after which we will be able to confirm the outcomes of this review, including the programme budget for the hubs.

Annex 1a: Original Hub Programme Objectives

Challenge and impact focus

- Challenge-led and impact-focussed, generating excellent and novel research and translating this into measurable real-world outcomes.
- A clear vision and integrated plan for the translation of the proposed research into measurable international development impact.
- The potential to deliver a broad range of impacts and scalable solutions at the local, national and/or international level.
- Developing a sustainable programme that has a legacy beyond the initial investment, with potential to leverage further support from development agencies, as well as financial or in-kind contributions including from universities and the private sector.

Interdisciplinary research excellence

- Excellent research capacity to conduct meaningful, well integrated and robust interdisciplinary research, including an appropriate range of research skills required to address the challenge(s).
- A demonstrable capacity to think across and between as well as within the thematic areas covered by the various SDGs, and a clear understanding of the way different disciplines working together contribute to the overall objectives of the Hub.
- Taking an interdisciplinary approach that assembles new knowledge and insight from across different research communities - transcending traditional disciplinary boundaries by integrating ground-breaking research with a better understanding of the social, political, economic, historical and cultural contexts.
- Commitment to build strategically on previous ODA and non-ODA investments (RCUK, DfID and other delivery partners) to add value to international efforts and improve co-ordination and ensure the whole is more than the sum of the parts.

Global partnerships

- An indispensable feature will be co-development with international partners and substantial, genuine and meaningful collaboration between UK and developing-country researchers, as well as relevant development agencies, Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs), Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), industry and other private sector organisations, policy makers, and other relevant local and international partners.
- An appropriate strategy for deep engagement with users, intermediaries and beneficiaries of research throughout the duration of the Hub.
- Full consideration of the relevant developing country context (e.g., languages, cultures, faiths, public engagement, legal frameworks, political and regulatory systems), ethical issues in the planning and conduct of research, and implementation of an ethical innovation and 'do no harm' approach.

Organisation and leadership

- Shared values and goals within the Hub and its partnerships.
- Ensuring strong research and operational leadership, including robust financial and risk management, assurance and governance.
- Implementing appropriate and effective monitoring and evaluation frameworks.
- The ability to learn and adapt, including demonstrating the agility to respond to opportunities arising over the lifetime of the award.

Annex 2: UK cross-Government ODA priorities

In November 2020, Dominic Raab, Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs, announced a new strategic framework for ODA, which will replace the 2015 UK aid strategy. In order to ensure that all there is a consistent and joined up approach across Whitehall, all aid will be focused on seven global challenges where the UK can make the most difference. These are:

Climate Change and biodiversity: A greener and cleaner path to growth in developing countries. This will include maintaining our five-year commitment to spend £11.6 billion on climate change, investing in research and science, and supporting countries to develop their own climate action plans.

COVID and global health security: Combat Covid-19 and support healthier and more resilient populations in developing countries. We will do this through major investments in global initiatives such as the GAVI vaccine alliance, core funding to the World Health Organisation, and by supporting fragile health systems in developing countries.

Girls' education: A global commitment to get 40 million girls into education and 20 million more girls reading by the age of 10.

Science, research, technology: Deliver cutting edge technology and research-led solutions in health, education, resilience, low carbon technologies, agriculture and economic development, conflict and poverty. This includes leveraging global science partnerships, drawing on the UK's own science expertise.

Open societies and conflict resolution: Strengthen democratic institutions, human rights, free media and effective governance. This includes international campaigns on democracy, human rights and media freedom, and maintaining an independent UK sanctions regime to tackle global corruption.

Humanitarian preparedness and response: Lead stronger collective international response to crises and famine. This includes reforming the international humanitarian system, maintaining a minimum FCDO crisis aid reserve, and promoting science and digital technology to offer faster and cheaper delivery to those affected by crises.

Trade and economic development: Build trading and investment partners of the future. This includes helping countries to trade, create better investment environments, infrastructure and access to finance, backed by investment from CDC and UK Export Finance.

Annex 3: Overall Review Framework

The following table outlines the high-level review questions and the evidence and data that will be considered to address each one. The evidence sources highlighted in grey are those which UKRI do not currently have and have requested the Hubs to provide.

The review questions and subcategories were developed by UKRI, in consultation with BEIS at several key stages. An evidence and data mapping exercise was carried out by UKRI at three stages during the development of the review questions to ensure that the panellists carrying out the assessment have sufficient information to respond to the criteria and that the Hubs are not being requested to provide additional evidence that UKRI already holds or may not require as part of the review.

It may appear that some of the additional evidence required is similar to evidence provided previously by the Hubs; in these cases, the additional evidence has been requested because the information already held by UKRI is not appropriately focused or does not contain sufficient detail for the panellists to make an assessment against the revised review criteria. We are keen that Hubs are given the opportunity to present the best quality and most fitting evidence possible to underpin a meaningful and rounded assessment process. Equally, Hubs are able to send in nil returns for any sections in their returns.

Review Question and subcategories	Evidence/Data Source
Project progress and addressing the challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 19/20 & 20/21 - Original and 2021 theories of change and log frames (and any further updates where relevant) - Annual reports - Advisory board report - Up to 5 development related case studies,
Progress against the project theory of change and log frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Original, updated and updates to theories of change and log frames - Annual reports - Advisory board reports - Overview of approach to ensure progress along pathways to impact
Alignment to local, national and international priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full proposal - Case for Support - Researchfish submission 20/21 - UKRI internal portfolio analysis - Overview of current and future local, national and international alignment
Interdisciplinary research excellence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports - Overview of approach to ensure integrated interdisciplinary research - Up to 5 research case studies
Capacity strengthening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports

Governance and Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - September Review (2019), excluding work plans and financial management plan - Annual reports - Advisory board reports - Progress with implementation of MEL strategy
Equitable partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports - Advisory board reports - Summary of overarching approach to partnerships
Leadership, stakeholder engagement and global networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports - Advisory board reports - Evidence of global leadership and international recognition
Research practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports - Advisory board reports - Gender and inclusiveness data/narrative
Financial management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - September Review (2019), financial management plan - Annual reports - Advisory board reports
What is the overall cost-effectiveness of the Hub, and how does it score in the following areas? (Explained further in value for money section below)	
Relevance	- Financial management plan
Equitable partnerships and collaborations	- Selected September Review documents (2019) (detailed further in below table)
Progress and quality of activities and outputs	- Pathways to Impact
Capacity strengthening	- Original and 2021 theories of change and log frames (and any further updates where relevant)
Positioning for and likelihood of achieving project/programme outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Researchfish submission 20/21 - Annual reports 19/20 and 20/21
Positioning for and likelihood of achieving fund level impact	- All additional evidence excluding forward plans (detailed further in below table)
What are the hub's future plans, are they in line with programme objectives and how do they align with the current landscape?	
Relevance and quality of future plan	- Description of the Hub's approach to managing the budget reductions
Feasibility	- Revised work plan for each work stream which includes major activities for 21/22, 22/23 and 23/24
Potential for impact	- Original, updated and any updates to theories of change and log frames
Response to 2021 reductions	- Key anticipated outputs/outcomes/impacts the Hub expects to realise in 21/22, 22/23 and 23/24

Annex: 4 Value for Money Framework

The VfM assessment will use the same approach as is used in BEIS; the BEIS team developed this approach in 2019/20 and consulted closely with UKRI throughout the process. The approach underwent three pilot phases before it was approved.

During the development of the revised Hubs review, UKRI carried out a dummy run of the VfM approach using the evidence and information we already have to identify evidence gaps where panellists would require further information in order to make a full assessment. The VfM component in the Annual Progress Reports and September Review (2019) documents were key here; however, this exercise also highlighted several evidence gaps. The mapping for this exercise is set out in the below table:

Criteria	Information against which to be assessed	Reference Documents with Information
Relevance	Align with partner country (national, regional or local) or wider ODA priorities or challenges	- Alignment to strategic priorities
Equitable partnerships and collaborations	Project resources being use in an equitable fashion, evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-design, • Fair opportunity, • Fair process, and • Fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes 	- Building and maintaining effective partnerships and global leadership - Original and 2021 theories of change and log frames (and any further updates where relevant) - Pathways to impact
Progress and quality of activities and outputs		- Annual report 19/20 and 20/21 - Interdisciplinary Research Excellence - Development impact - Gender and inclusiveness data/narrative - Researchfish submission 20/21
Capacity strengthening	Enhancement of the ability and resources of individuals, institutions, and/or systems to undertake, communicate, and/or use high quality research efficiently, effectively, and sustainably	- Researchfish submission 20/21 - Financial Management Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partner country leadership & capacity strengthening - Gender and inclusiveness data/narrative
Positioning for and likelihood of achieving project/programme outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is on track to meet its objectives, • Evidence of engaging key stakeholders or user groups, Uptake of research outputs, • Positioning for influence on policy or practice, or evidence of catalytic effects for other research and innovation. 	- Annual report 19/20 and 20/21 - Researchfish submission 20/21 - September Review (2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk register

Positioning for and likelihood of achieving fund level impact	According to the ToC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- September Review (2019)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Inception report• MEL Strategy• Risk register- Pathways to Impact- Original, updated and updates to theories of change and log frames- Annual report 19/20 and 20/21- Researchfish submission 20/21- Progress with implementation of MEL strategy
--	----------------------	---

Annex 5: Evidence to Support each Assessment

Evidence Already Held	Deep dive panel – Value for Money	Deep dive panel – Progress to date and forward plans	BEIS/FCDO strategic review	Final recommendation panel
Original application documents ³	X	X	X	X
September review documents ⁴	X	X	X	X
Original and March 2021 Theories of Change and Log Frames	X	X	X	X
Inception/September review documents ⁵	X	X	X	X
ResearchFish submissions 2020/2021 ⁶	X	X	X	X
Annual Reports 2019/2020 & 2020/2021	X	X	X	X
Advisory Board reports 2019/2020 & 2020/2021		X	X	X
Deep dive panel – Value for Money outputs			X	X
Deep dive panel – Progress to date and forward plans outputs			X	X
BEIS/FCDO strategic review				X

Other evidence to support the various assessments:

- UKRI Summary
 - The panel will have access to all the original evidence; however, to enable them to navigate the large volume of documents more readily, UKRI will create a summary document for each Hub. We will ensure that a consistent approach will be taken across all Hubs. These summaries will be shared with members of the deep-dive panels, BEIS/FCDO for the strategic review and members of the final recommendation panel.
- Additional evidence to be submitted by the Hubs
 - Details of the evidence to be submitted has been outlined in the main document. This evidence will be shared with members of the deep-dive panels, BEIS/FCDO for the strategic review and members of the final recommendation panel.

³ Proposal Form, Case for Support, Justification of Resources, Pathways to Impact, ODA compliance statement

⁴ Advisory Board and Executive Group membership, Risk register, Financial management plan, Flexible fund management, Governance and project management plan, MEL plan, Log frame, Theory of Change

⁶ Key findings, Impact narrative and Collective Fund AQR sections

Annex 6: BEIS Value for Money Assessment rubric

Criterion	Poor/1	Adequate/2	Good/3	Excellent/4	Certainty
Relevance	Evidence suggests that the project does not align with partner country (national, regional or local) or wider ODA priorities or challenges	Evidence suggests that the project aligns with partner country (national, regional or local) or wider ODA priorities or challenges	Evidence suggests the project aligns well with partner country or wider ODA priorities or challenges	Evidence suggests that the project is very well-targeted to partner country (national, regional or local) or wider ODA priorities or challenges	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Equitable partnerships and collaborations	Evidence suggests no or limited equitable partnerships or collaborations. This could include project resources being use in an inequitable fashion, limited evidence of co-design, fair opportunity, fair process, and fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes.	Evidence suggests an acceptable degree of equitable partnerships or collaborations. This could include project resources not being used to encourage equitable partnerships but not being used in an inequitable way, evidence of some co-design and some fair opportunity, fair process, and fair sharing of benefits costs and outcomes.	Evidence suggests positive equitable partnerships or collaborations. This could include project resources being used in a way that encourages equitable partnerships or collaborations, evidence of some co-design, fair opportunity, fair process, and fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes.	Evidence suggests highly equitable partnerships or collaborations. For example, project resources are being used in a way that encourages strong equitable partnerships or collaborations, evidence of significant co-design, fair opportunity, fair process, and fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes for all partners. The partnership/collaboration has done/or is likely to lead to further collaborations.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Progress on activities and outputs	The project is not showing acceptable progress with regards to expected activities and outputs.	Although not meeting progress with activities and outputs, the project is showing acceptable progress bearing in mind external circumstances.	Progress thus far generally met with regards to activities and outputs.	Progress thus far met or exceeded with regards to activities and outputs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Capacity-strengthening (where applicable)	Evidence suggests little or no enhancement of the ability and resources of individuals, institutions, and/or systems to undertake, communicate, and/or use high quality research efficiently, effectively, and sustainably.	Evidence suggests some enhancement of the ability and resources of individuals, institutions, and/or systems to undertake, communicate, and/or use high quality research efficiently, effectively, and sustainably.	Evidence suggests positive enhancement of the ability and resources of individuals, institutions, and/or systems to undertake, communicate, and/or use high quality research efficiently, effectively, and sustainably.	Evidence suggests significant and sustainable enhancement of the ability and resources of individuals, institutions, and/or systems to undertake, communicate, and/or use high quality research efficiently, effectively, and sustainably.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High

Positioning for achieving project/programme outcomes	Evidence suggests the project is not positioned to achieve its outcomes. E.g. the project is not on track to meet its objectives, no evidence of engaging key stakeholders or user groups, no uptake of research outputs, or no positioning for influence on policy or practice, or evidence of catalytic effects for other research and innovation.	Evidence suggests the project is doing some positioning to achieve its objectives. E.g. the project is not on track to meet its objectives or is on track to partially complete objectives, but outcomes are still likely to be reasonable considering circumstances. There is some evidence of engaging key stakeholders or user groups, some uptake of research outputs, or some positioning for influence on policy or practice, or evidence of catalytic effects for other research and innovation.	Evidence suggests the project is positioning well to achieve its objectives. E.g. It is likely to meet most of its objectives. There is evidence of positively engaging key stakeholders or user groups, positive uptake of research outputs, or positive positioning for influence on policy or practice, or evidence of catalytic effects for other research and innovation.	Evidence suggests the project is positioning very well to achieve its objectives. E.g. There is evidence of some outcomes already achieved, significant engagement of key stakeholders or user groups, significant uptake of research outputs, or strong positioning for influence on policy/practice, or evidence of significant catalytic effects for other research and innovation, or evidence of securing further funding.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
likelihood of contributing to fund-level impact	Evidence suggest outcomes are unlikely to lead to a contribution to fund-level impact, as detailed on the Theory of Change	Evidence suggests that outcomes might lead to a contribution to fund-level impacts, as detailed on the Theory of Change. E.g. significant contextual barriers limit potential for impact.	Evidence suggests outcomes are moderately likely to lead to a contribution to fund-level impacts, as detailed on the Theory of Change.	Evidence suggests outcomes are very likely to lead to a significant and/or sustainable contribution to fund-level impacts, as detailed on the Theory of Change.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Scores					

How worthwhile was/is the investment?	Poor Multiplier of 0.875	Reasonable Multiplier of 1	Good Multiplier of 1.125	Excellent Multiplier of 1.25
	Given the project's quality (as indicated by the above scores), the relative cost of the project seems excessive and it may not be a worthwhile investment.	Given the project's quality (as indicated by the above scores), the relative cost of the project seems reasonable and it seems a worthwhile investment There is not enough evidence to justify changing the multiplier	Given the project's quality (as indicated by the above scores), the relative cost of the project seems economical and it seems a worthwhile investment	Given the project's quality (as indicated by the above scores), the relative cost of the project seems highly economical and it seems a very worthwhile investment

Final score for project: (average score from the rubric x worthwhileness of investment multiplier):

Annex 7: Definitions

Interdisciplinary research excellence outputs/outcomes are considered as outputs/outcomes (including new approaches) that could not be achieved within the framework of a single discipline. Interdisciplinary research features significant interaction between two or more disciplines and / or moves beyond established disciplinary foundations in applying or integrating research approaches from other disciplines.

Originality will be understood as the extent to which the output makes an important and innovative contribution to understanding and knowledge in the field. Interdisciplinary research outputs that demonstrate originality may do one or more of the following: produce new empirical findings or material; engage with new and/or complex problems; develop innovative research methods, methodologies and analytical techniques; show imaginative scope; provide new arguments, formal innovations, interpretations and/or insights; collect and engage with novel types of data; and/or advance theory or the analysis of doctrine, policy or practice, and new forms of expression. This can be identified in one, some, or all of the constituent parts brought together in the work, or in their integration; they do not need to be demonstrated across all contributing areas/fields.

Significance will be understood as the extent to which the work has influenced, or has the capacity to influence, knowledge and scholarly thought, or the development and understanding of policy and/or practice. This can be identified in one, some, or all of the constituent parts brought together in the work, or in their integration; they do not need to be demonstrated across all contributing areas/fields.

Rigour will be understood as the extent to which the work demonstrates intellectual coherence and integrity, and adopts robust and appropriate concepts, analyses, theories and methodologies. This includes the design and application of relevant and robust approaches, methods and concepts to achieve productive interactions between the disciplines.

Development impacts should be on track to or have provided benefits to one or more areas of the economy, society, culture, public policy and services, health, production, environment, international development or quality of life. Impact may be local, regional, national or international and can be manifested in a wide variety of ways including, but **not** limited to:

- impacts on products, processes, behaviours, policies, practices and understanding;
- capacity building;
- public and community engagement (for example, through citizen science, patient and public involvement in health, or through public and community engagement); and
- avoidance of harm or the waste of resources in the widest sense. This can include impacts that describe changes or benefits resulting from research that leads to a decision **not** to undertake a particular course of action.

Reach will be understood as the extent and/or diversity of the beneficiaries of the impact, as relevant to the nature of the impact. Reach will be assessed in terms of the extent to which the potential constituencies, number or groups of beneficiaries have been reached; it will not be assessed in purely geographic

terms, nor in terms of absolute numbers of beneficiaries. The criteria will be applied wherever the impact occurred, regardless of geography or location, and whether in the UK or overseas.

Significance will be understood as the degree to which the impact has enabled, enriched, influenced, informed or changed the performance, policies, practices, products, services, understanding, awareness or wellbeing of the beneficiaries.

Certainty

Each row of the deep-dive panel rubrics has a 'certainty' tick box. The Panel will need to indicate whether they feel the evidence provides a low, medium or high degree of certainty for the score they have chosen

- **High** - There is clear evidence which explicitly supports assessment of this criterion. The panel are confident that this assessment is accurate.
- **Medium** - The evidence for this criterion is reasonably clear, however some minor interpretations/assumptions were required to make this assessment. The panel are moderately confident that this assessment is accurate.
- **Low** - There is limited evidence which explicitly relates to this criterion, with a number of interpretations/assumptions required to make the assessment. The panel are unsure as to whether this assessment is accurate

Annex 8: Progress to date and forward plans Panel Assessment Rubric

Criterion	Poor/1	Adequate/2	Good/3	Excellent/4	Certainty
Development impact	The Hub has demonstrated recognised but modest outputs/ outcomes/ impacts in terms of their reach and significance. There is no or very limited evidence of meaningful capacity strengthening in the UK or overseas.	The Hub has demonstrated considerable outputs/ outcomes/ impacts in terms of their reach and significance. There is evidence of some capacity strengthening activities, however these are not particularly innovative and/or are overly focused on a specific geography or aspect of the Hub.	The Hub has demonstrated very considerable outputs/outcomes/impacts in terms of their reach and significance. There is evidence of good capacity strengthening activities, but the approach could be improved somewhat by being more innovative and/or diverse.	The Hub has demonstrated outstanding impacts in terms of their reach and significance. There is evidence of significant and innovative capacity strengthening efforts across a range of geographies and aspects of the Hub.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Interdisciplinary research excellence	The evidence indicates poor integration of disciplines and a lack of transformative perspectives/approaches. The outputs/ outcomes/ impacts reported are of a quality that is recognised nationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.	There is some evidence of disciplinary integration and some transformative aspects, but these are limited in scale and breadth. The outputs/ outcomes/ impacts reported are of a quality that is recognised internationally in terms of originality, significance and rigour.	There is evidence of a good level of disciplinary integration and a number of examples of transformative perspectives/approaches, but room for minor improvements in terms of breadth or scale. The outputs/ outcomes/ impacts are of a quality that is internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour but which falls short of the highest standards of excellence.	There is evidence of a high level of integration across all disciplines, with a clear demonstration of transformative perspectives/approaches. The outputs/ outcomes/ impacts are of a quality that is world-leading in terms of originality, significance and rigour.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High

<p>Global partnerships</p>	<p>There is limited evidence of co-design, and an apparent lack of equity in opportunities, process and outputs/benefits. The range of stakeholders is lacking, with several notable gaps and/or poor engagement from a number of stakeholders. The networks developed outside the core Hub partnership are minimal and there is poor evidence of global recognition and leadership.</p>	<p>There is some evidence of co-design, and demonstrates a reasonable degree of equity in some but not all areas. A reasonable range of stakeholders have been identified but there are some clear gaps and some stakeholders are less well engaged. Some networks have been developed, but these are somewhat limited in scope/diversity, and there is some evidence of recognition and leadership at the global level.</p>	<p>There is clear evidence of co-design, and a good level of equity across all most aspects of the Hub. The Hub had engaged a good range of stakeholders, with only minor gaps, and the level of engagement of all stakeholders is good. The networks developed are good with reasonable scope/diversity and there is clear evidence of global recognition and leadership.</p>	<p>There is strong evidence of co-design and highly equitable partnerships across the Hub. The range of stakeholders is very good with no obvious gaps or issues with engagement. Strong networks have been developed beyond the core Hub partnership and there is strong evidence of global recognition and leadership.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High</p>
<p>Effective governance and project management</p>	<p>The evidence suggests that the management arrangements have been poorly implemented and that the Hub has struggled to effectively respond to challenges and changes. The MEL strategy has been poorly implemented with no or limited evidence of learning.</p>	<p>The evidence suggests that the management arrangements have been adequately implemented, though some elements are lacking and/or this is not consistent across the Hub. Challenges and changes have all been managed well and implemented effectively. The MEL strategy has been implemented reasonably well but there are some weaknesses, and learning is not consistent across all aspects of the Hub.</p>	<p>The evidence suggests that management arrangements have been implemented well with only some minor weaknesses/gaps. Challenges and changes have been well managed with only minor areas for improvement. The MEL strategy has been effectively implemented across the majority of the Hub and there is clear</p>	<p>The evidence suggests that the management arrangements have been implemented very effectively and all challenges and changes have been well managed. The MEL strategy has been effectively implemented across all aspects of the Hub and demonstrates Hub-wide learning based on the outputs.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High</p>

			learning based on the outcomes.		
Flexible funding	The allocation of Flexible Funding demonstrates poor alignment to Hub aims/ objectives, and offers no or limited added value.	The allocation of Flexible Funding is somewhat aligned to Hub aims/objectives, but the added value is relatively limited or unclear.	The allocation of Flexible Funding is well aligned to Hub aims/ objectives, adding clear value to Hub activities.	The allocation of Flexible Funding is strongly aligned to Hub aims/objectives, adding significant value to Hub activities.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Research practices	The approach to research practices is lacking in several areas with no clear consideration of key issues.	The approach to research practices demonstrates consideration of some elements, but there are clear gaps and/or this is inconsistent across the Hub.	The approach to research practices is good, and consistently applied across the majority of the Hub.	The approach to research practices is very good with clear consideration of key issues.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Strategic alignment	Evidence suggests weak or mis-alignment to local, national and international strategies and priorities with several key areas overlooked.	Evidence suggests that there is reasonable alignment, but that this could be stronger with some key areas or opportunities missed.	The evidence demonstrates good strategic alignment, but with some minor areas or opportunities overlooked.	There is evidence of strong alignment at the local, national and international level with no obvious gaps.	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High
Strength of forward plans	The strategic rationale for the approach to the ODA cuts is weak or poorly articulated. The forward plans demonstrate weak or mis-alignment to local, national and international priorities and policies with several key areas overlooked. There are significant concerns over the feasibility of the	There is evidence of some rationale for the approach to the ODA cuts, but the underpinning strategy is unclear. There is reasonable strategic alignment of the forward plans, but that this could be stronger with some key areas or opportunities missed. The proposed plans are reasonable and considered to be mostly feasible but with concerns about some aspects. The identified outputs/ outcomes/	There is evidence of a good strategic rationale for the approach to the ODA cuts, with good alignment to the original programme level aims/ambitions. There is good strategic alignment of the forward plans, but with some minor areas or opportunities overlooked. The proposed plans are considered to be largely	The evidence demonstrates a strong strategic rationale for the approach to the ODA cuts with clear alignment to the original programme level aims/ ambitions. The forward plans demonstrate strong alignment at the local, national and international level with no obvious gaps. The proposed plans are considered achievable and the identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Low <input type="checkbox"/> Med <input type="checkbox"/> High

	proposed plans and the identified outputs/ outcomes/ impacts appear unlikely to be achievable and/or would represent limited value in addressing the challenge.	impacts would represent a reasonable contribution to addressing the challenge.	feasible with only minor concerns about some aspects. The identified outputs/ outcomes/ impacts would represent a good contribution to addressing the challenge.	outputs/ outcomes/ impacts would represent a significant contribution to addressing the challenge.	
Scores					

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/officialdevelopmentassistedefinitionandcoverage.htm>