2017 Institute Assessment Exercise Process and Guidelines for Institutes

March 2017
Version 1.0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF 2017 IAE SUBMISSIONS

The submissions for the 2017 Institute Assessment Exercise will consist of three major elements:

- Director's Statement (one per institute)
- Core Capability Grant application (one per institute)
- Institute Strategic Programme Grant application(s) (one or more per institute)

The information that should be provided for each of these submissions is summarised below. This is intended as an overview only and the Institute is advised that detailed information is contained within the full guidelines.

The calls will open on **18 April 2017** and close on **22 June 2017, 4.00 pm**. It is recommended that applications are submitted one week ahead of the deadline.

Director's Statement

- To be submitted via Je-S as an attachment to each ISPG application
- 17 sides of A4 maximum
- We recommend that you use Arial, Helvetica or Verdana typefaces
- A minimum font size of 11 pt and 2 cm margins must be used

Section	Page limits (sides of A4)
Executive Summary	1 side
Vision and strategic direction	up to 8 sides
Key research achievements in the last five years	up to 4 sides
Institute capability	up to 3 sides
Financial summary	up to1 side

Core Capability Grant (CCG) application

- To be submitted as a series of attachments to BBSRC via e-mail
- Page limits apply to specific sections and attachments
- We recommend that you use Arial, Helvetica or Verdana typefaces
- A minimum font size of 11 pt and 2 cm margins must be used

Attachment	Page limits (sides of A4)
CCG Proforma	As per word limits
Case for support	up to 15 sides
Justification of resources	up to 2 sides
Additional information on national capabilities and other wider capabilities (i.e. capabilities that are not for exclusive use by the institute)	Variable. Between 2 to 4 sides case for support (depending of level of financial support requested), plus one additional side for Workplan.

Attachment	Page limits (sides of A4)
Pathways to Impact	up to 4 sides
CVs for leadership roles and research staff supported through the CCG	up to 2 sides per CV
Letters of support from project partners (where necessary)	up to 2 sides per letter
Financing schedules (Excel)	No page limit

Institute Strategic Programme Grant (ISPG) applications

- To be submitted via Je-S
- Page limits apply to specific sections and attachments
- We recommend that you use Arial, Helvetica or Verdana typefaces
- A minimum font size of 11 pt and 2 cm margins must be used
- Each section / attachment should be specific to the individual ISPG application (with the exception of the Director's Statement which should identical for every ISPG application from the Institute)

Section / attachment	Page limits (sides of A4)
Je-S Form (e.g. abstract, summary, technical summary etc.)	As per Je-S character limits
Animal Use (where required)	As per Je-S character limits
Reviewers (six nominated reviewers)	As per Je-S instructions
Case for support	up to 24 sides[1]
Justification of resources	up to 6 sides (plus 2 sides for additional requirements)
A copy of the Director's Statement (see above)	up to 17 sides
Pathways to Impact	up to 4 sides
Workplan	up to 2 sides
Data Management Plan	up to 4 sides
Confirmation of eligibility	up to 2 sides
CVs for all PIs, Co-Is and other named research staff	up to 2 sides per CV
Letters of support from project partners (where necessary)	up to 2 sides per letter
List of related proposals and other support	No page limit

[1] BBSRC has not set variable page limits for the 'Case for Support' based on the financial value of ISPG applications. However, it is anticipated that smaller-scale ISPG applications will not require the maximum number of pages.

1. INTRODUCTION

BBSRC continues to be committed to the rigorous assessment of its strategically-funded institutes as a means of meeting its goals and, matching best practice, ensuring that institutes continue to provide value for money, as well as informing BBSRC's future funding decisions and complying with government policy.

To come to an informed position about the performance of an Institute as a whole, it is necessary to be clear about what an Institute should be delivering, namely:
- High quality, strategically important research aligned with BBSRC's Strategic Plan
- High quality national capability in strategically important areas of science and research
- Excellent knowledge exchange, including the delivery of public good science and research results to appropriate user communities and, where relevant, the commercialisation of science and research outputs
- Effective scientific leadership and management, including excellent research training and other training
- Effective engagement with the public around the science and research undertaken at the Institute
- Overall, an Institute with the vision and capability required to meet national strategic science and research needs.

This document sets out the procedures for the assessment; it also provides guidelines to the institutes on the written submissions they will be required to make.

1.1 Context for Institute Assessment in 2017

Awards to strategically-funded institutes in 2012 were made in a number of funding streams including Institute Strategic Programmes, National Capability, Knowledge Exchange and Commercialisation and the Institute Development Grant. Assessment also took place of Public Engagement and Science Communication (PESC) and Strategic Human Resources Capability (SHRC).

During 2015, a sub-group of Council considered a variety of future funding models for supporting the strategically-funded institutes, with the aim of ensuring funding is sustainable while at the same time meeting strategic priorities and the appropriate quality criteria. In September 2015, Council considered the recommendations from the sub-group and agreed a new funding model. The most significant change is the introduction of a new Core Capability Grant, incorporating national capabilities.

The overall envelope of non-capital funding for institutes from April 2017 will comprise:
- Core Capability Grant (CCG)
- Institute Strategic Programme Grant(s) (ISPG)
- Knowledge Exchange and Commercialisation Grant (KECG) (excluding IBERS and Roslin)
- Open Access Grant (OAG)

In addition there will be an earned:

- Institute Development Fund (IDF)

The Institute Assessment Exercise (IAE) process reflects these changes to the funding model. The process has also been amended to ensure greater alignment with other BBSRC funding mechanisms (e.g. strategic Longer and Larger Grants) and to reflect the drivers for efficiency that are in place across the public sector. BBSRC remains committed to conducting a robust and effective institute assessment.

In 2016, BBSRC conducted an Institute Assessment Exercise for seven of the eight strategically-funded institutes. The outcome of the IAE determined which awards were funded from April 2017. In light of the on-going development of the Quadram Institute (QI), the Institute of Food Research (IFR) did not participate in the 2016 IAE. Instead, it will participate in the IAE process during 2017.

The outcome of the IAE in 2017 will determine which awards are funded from April 2018 and will guide BBSRC Council's decisions on the overall level of BBSRC non-capital funding to the Quadram Institute (QI) from that date. The level of the KECG will be determined from the overall non-capital funding envelope for the Institute. Therefore, there will be no separate formal assessment element for determining the KECG, although the Institute will be expected to produce a revised strategy for KEC which will be reviewed as part of the 2017 annual monitoring process. In addition, there will be no separate formal assessment of PESC and SHRC as these elements will be included in the Director's overall statement. The Institute will continue to be eligible for BBSRC Responsive Mode and research initiative grants.

It is intended that awards will be for a duration of up to four years but the levels of award will be indicative and may be subject to review. Awards cannot extend beyond 31 March 2022.

1.2 Institute Assessment Process

ISPG proposals will be subject to external peer review before being assessed by the Institute Assessment Panel (IAP). CCG proposals will not be externally reviewed but will be assessed by the IAP. The Institute will be invited to present their proposals to the IAP. Further details on this will be provided at a later stage. To assist with the assessment of CCG proposals, the IAP will be provided with advice from an internal BBSRC office review group comprising finance, facilities management and estates development expertise.

Unlike the 2011 IAE, the IAP will not visit the Institute as part of the assessment.

The 2016 assessment process included greater competition between institutes than previous IAEs, and the IAP made recommendations to fund some ISPGs or some elements of CCGs in preference to others. The 2017 IAE retains this element of competition and QI's submission will be assessed using the same process as in 2016. The IAP will determine a priority category placement for each of QI's ISPG proposals, placing them alongside the ISPG proposals from other institutes that were assessed in 2016. The IAP will balance all

the assessment criteria in making their recommendations. For ISPGs, the relative scientific quality of proposals within the institutes' respective fields will be an important criterion.

Following the IAP meeting, BBSRC will provide the Institute with high-level feedback on the IAP's assessment of the ISPG and CCG proposals prior to the Council meeting:

- ISPG proposals: details will be provided of the priority categories in which the institute's individual proposals have been placed. Information from the 2016 IAE on the placement of ISPG proposals from other institutes will also be provided at this time, but specific institutes and proposals will not be identified.

- CCG proposals: details will be provided of the overall score of the institute's proposal. Information from the 2016 IAE on the scores of CCG proposals from other institutes will also be provided, but individual institutes will not be identified.

The Institute will not have the opportunity to submit a formal response to the high-level feedback. This is because the IAP will not be able to reconsider its assessment of individual proposals and adjust the placement of a proposal into a different priority category. This approach is consistent with that used for other competitive BBSRC funding mechanisms where there is no formal opportunity to respond to the Committee's / Panel's assessment before funding decisions are announced. As part of the assessment process, institutes will have had the opportunity to provide the IAP with their response to reviewers' comments and institute staff will have been interviewed by the IAP.

In the light of the IAP assessment and the discussion at the Council meeting, Council will determine the overall funding package for the Institute for the period 2018-2022. In view of the current constraints on public funding, it is anticipated that funding will be awarded for the years 2018-19 to 2019-20, in line with the period covered by the BBSRC's spending review allocation. Figures for 2020-21 and 2021-22 are expected to be indicative, subject to the outcome of future Spending Reviews.

Back to top

2. DIRECTOR'S STATEMENT

2.1 Background

In addition to the CCG and ISPG proposals, the Institute will be required to submit a Director's Statement, which sets the Institute in context and which has a clear high-level vision for the Institute as a whole. The Director's Statement will also include a brief overview of the Institute's approach to, and leadership of, Knowledge Exchange & Commercialisation (KEC), Public Engagement & Science Communication (PESC), and Strategic Human Resources & Capability (SHRC). These elements will not be formally assessed as part of the IAE, but the information provided should demonstrate that these activities are an integral part of the Institute's vision.

This document will be made available to the IAP and constitutes a major piece of evidence in the assessment of the Institute as a whole; it should enable panel members to understand the evolving role of the Institute. It will also be provided to the CCG internal review group so that they can see how the vision, programmes and the capability fit together. The Director's Statement will not be provided to the reviewers of ISPG proposals.

The Director's Statement should not exceed 17 sides of A4 in total (a minimum font size of 11 pt should be used. We recommend Arial, Helvetica or Verdana typefaces). The Director's Statement should comprise the following five sections:

- Executive Summary (1 side of A4)
- Vision and strategic direction, including an overview of approaches to KEC, PESC and SHRC (up to 8 sides)
- Key research achievements in the last five years (i.e. since 2012) (up to 4 sides)
- Institute capability (up to 3 sides)
- Financial summary (up to 1 side)

Page limits refer to each separate section and may not be combined.

Applicants must not include URLs to web resources in order to extend their Director's Statement. The inclusion of such URLs will result in your application being returned for correction. The IAP are advised to base their assessment solely on the information contained within the application, and are instructed not to access external links.

2.2 Submission of Director's Statement

The Director's Statement should be submitted as the 'Proposal Cover Letter' with each ISPG proposal as stated in section 4. The Director's Statement does not need to be submitted as part of the CCG application.

2.2.1 Executive Summary
(maximum 1 side of A4)

This should be a succinct statement of the vision for the Institute: where it will be in four years compared with where it is now. It should summarise how the Institute will help to deliver BBSRC's current Strategic Plan: The Age Of Bioscience. It should summarise how the Institute will contribute to the UK and global bioscience research base, and how it will contribute to addressing UK strategic priorities and wider global challenges.

2.2.2 Vision and strategic direction
(maximum 8 sides of A4)

This section should articulate the vision and strategic direction in more detail, and should focus on:

- The Director's high-level strategy and vision for the Institute.
- How the Institute Strategic Programmes (ISPs) and strategy contribute to BBSRC's mission and Strategic Plan objectives, and to UK priorities for bioscience, including current global challenges.
- How the CCG and ISPG funding streams will enable the Institute to deliver its vision and the interrelationships between them. This should include a brief outline of each grant (one paragraph; up to 200 words) to show its relationship to the overall vision and mission of the Institute. The approach to using the Institute Development Fund should also be outlined briefly. A diagram (1 side of A4) should be included to demonstrate how the proposed ISPs link together, how they are underpinned by the CCG, and how they combine to contribute to cross-institute themes.
- The contribution of the proposed research to the overall research portfolio of the Institute, including the identification of new areas for research activity as well as those for sunsetting.
- Why the proposed research needs to be delivered through an institute, and the added value gained from running the core/national capabilities and ISPGs alongside one another.
- Evidence that the Institute has the relevant leadership, expertise and capacity to deliver its vision through the different funding streams.
- Collaborations (both formally funded and informal) with other BBSRC strategically-funded institutes, and plans for strategic partnerships (both national and international) with other research organisations/institutions.
- A brief overview (up to 2 sides) of the Institute's approach to, and leadership around, Knowledge Exchange & Commercialisation (KEC), Public Engagement & Science Communication (PESC), and Strategic Human Resources & Capability (SHRC). These elements will not be formally assessed as part of the IAE, but the information provided should demonstrate that these activities are an integral part of the Institute's vision.

2.2.3 Key research achievements in the last five years
(maximum 4 sides of A4)

This should report on the key highlights and achievements of the institute in the previous funding period (i.e. since 2012), and should include:

- How the research has advanced knowledge in the field and its strategic importance to the Institute and to BBSRC
- The delivery of impact through knowledge exchange and commercialisation
- The delivery of training, skills and career development
- Development of capability, including infrastructure, scientific services, and any national capability
- A summary of major research outputs, including key academic papers and other outputs.

In describing your achievements, greater emphasis should be placed on achievements arising from previous ISPG and NCG support compared with achievements from other funding sources. In this context, please ensure that you clearly identify which achievements arose from previous ISPG and NCG support (distinguishing them from achievements from other funding).

All recipients of Research Council funding are required to report emerging outputs, outcomes and impacts through a common outcomes collection system (currently researchfish®). Please note that BBSRC will not be using outcomes information submitted to researchfish® as part of the 2017 IAE. However, there is an expectation that the key achievements highlighted in this section of the Director's Statement will have been submitted to researchfish® (if they have arisen from BBSRC or other Research Council support).

2.2.4 Institute capability
(maximum 3 sides of A4)

This section should articulate the Institute's capability:
- How the Institute's capability fits into, and enables, the overall strategy and vision
- The management arrangements for the capability and plans for future development (tying into the Institute's long-term estates strategy)
- For any elements of national capability, a brief description of the evidence for the need for the capability and how it supports UK national strategic interests.

2.2.5 Financial summary
(maximum 1 side of A4)

You should also provide a table, in the format below, setting out the proposed distribution of funding to the CCG and ISPGs for each financial year from 2018-19 to 2021-22, together with the total cash element of costs in individual proposals. For cross-institute programmes only the costs associated with your individual institute should be included in the table.

Any funding awarded as part of the 2016 IAE should be identified and included as a separate row in the table. For example, this may include ISPG proposals led by other institutes, where the Institute is listed as a partner on the proposal.

No decisions have been taken on the overall level of funding for each budget area over the spending review period. It is acceptable for activities to start and finish during the four year

period to reflect timing of new opportunities, restructuring and sunsetting of current programmes.

	£k			
	2018-19	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**
CCG				
ISPG 1				
ISPG 2				
ISPG 3, etc.				
TOTAL				

The Institute must develop its ISPG and CCG applications such that they remain within the maximum funding bid (as will be advised). BBSRC cannot permit institutes to increase their maximum funding bid over the course of the funding period to take into account inflationary costs or price increases. The Institute should develop its proposals to absorb any inflationary pressures that may arise. No additional financial support will be available to cover these costs.

Back to top

3. CORE CAPABILITY GRANT GUIDELINES

3.1 Background

In Autumn 2015, BBSRC Council agreed a new model for Institute financing aimed at ensuring the sustainability of Institutes while at the same time meeting strategic priorities. The main change from the previous round of institute funding is the introduction of a new Core Capability Grant (CCG), incorporating national capabilities.

The new model considers capability on a broader basis than the previous National Capability Grants (NCG) which were focused on national capability; it identifies the core capability that is essential to support BBSRC's investment in the ISPGs. The model enables BBSRC to consider institutes' unique capabilities and how they contribute to BBSRC's strategy. National capability will still form a key part of the grant for some institutes, but not all. This model was adopted by Council as a way of ensuring that core capability is fully identified and sustainably financed. Colleagues from BBSRC Finance have briefed each Institute on these changes.

To submit the CCG proposal the application form should be completed and emailed to iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk by **4.00 pm** on **22 June 2017**. CCG applications are not to be submitted via Je-S.

3.2 Definitions

Capability – fit for purpose land, buildings and equipment, together with the specialist skills to manage these effectively and efficiently over their whole life.

Core Capability – the capability that is essential to support the BBSRC-financed Institute Strategic Programme Grants.

Non-Core Capability – additional capability required to support non-ISPG work at the Institute. The Institute acquires and maintains non-core capability at its own risk and it cannot be supported using the CCG.

National Capability – capability that is essential for UK national strategic purposes and is intended to benefit the scientific community in general. Capability that allows the UK to deliver world-leading science, support national strategic needs, and respond to emergencies – including the research and development activities which keeps this capability at the cutting edge. Such capability also provides for UK insurance against market failure conditions, critical high risk infrastructure unlikely to be underwritten by the private sector and emergency response capability to outbreak/incidents/events.

The CCG provides full financing for an Institute's Core Capability. It also provides financing for national capabilities that are embedded within the Insitute, which may or may not directly support the Institute's ISPG work. However, where the national capability does not support ISPG work, or only supports it in part, then the Institute will need to clearly demonstrate the

national strategic requirement for that capability. The CCG will not provide support to finance the Institute's 'non-core capability'.

3.3 CCG Scope

CCG proposals should describe the Institute's overall capability, the 'core' components of capability relevant to BBSRC-financed ISPGs, and any specific elements of national capability using the definitions set out in section 3.2. Five key areas will be considered:

- Infrastructure
- Scientific services
- Support services (including HR and Finance)
- Equipment
- National capability

Capability should first be classified as national capability - if applicable - and then if not national capability one of the four remaining categories should be selected.

The proposals should include the costs associated with maintaining, operating and servicing the capability. Further detail on the eligibility of costs will be available in the Financing Schedules which form part of the CCG application form.

Whilst the CCG is a revenue funding stream, CCG proposals should also describe the associated capital requirements for the relevant capability. This capital element will not be funded via the CCG but is helpful to provide a complete picture of the capability financing and will inform BBSRC's forward capital planning. CCG proposals should reference any capital investments by HM Government, whether past, present or future, particularly where these investments are a driver for resource costs in the four-year period.

The duration of the CCG is four years. However, given the requirement to consider capability on a whole-life basis, CCG proposals are likely to include cost forecasts beyond the four-year period. The Institute may exercise discretion on the timeframe of costs provided in the CCG application, but should ensure that the information presented enables assessors to understand the forecast whole-life costs of the capability.

3.4 Assessment Criteria

The criteria for assessment of the CCG proposal are:

- The extent to which capability will enable internationally excellent research in the field, as proposed in associated ISPGs addressing strategic need
- The extent to which the capability is required to maintain key research capability within the UK bioscience community and enable associated high-quality research
- The evidence of the need for, and community interest in, the capability
- The adequacy of the plans for engagement with the research and user communities, including the extent to which the capability will be accessible to these wider communities

- The evidence of appropriate skills and competencies to deliver the capability, along with associated quality leadership
- Transparent identification, development and maximisation of usage rates of capability articulating relevant splits for non-ISPG use
- Demonstration and benchmark evidence of efficient management of capability compliant with recognised metrics
- Demonstration that the capability is operating effectively and efficiently
- The evidence of the sustainable whole-life cost of the capability
- The evidence of compliance with all relevant national and international regulatory standards applicable and to what extent.

CCG proposals will be assessed by the IAP but will not be subject to prior external peer review. To assist with the assessment of CCG proposals, the IAP will be provided with advice from an internal BBSRC office review group comprising finance, facilities management and estates development expertise.

3.5 Submission of CCG proposals

CALL OPENING DATE: 18 APRIL 2017
CALL CLOSING DATE: 22 JUNE 2017, 4.00 pm

There is no requirement for submission of outline CCG proposals. However, BBSRC expects to meet with the Institute to discuss its proposal prior to submission of the full CCG proposal. The Institute may submit only one CCG proposal, which should provide a cohesive summary of the Institute's entire core capability requirements.

The Institute will submit its CCG proposal in line with the timetable for ISPGs. Submissions should be emailed as a series of PDF documents and an Excel file (Financing Schedules) to iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk; confirmation of receipt will be returned. The CCG proposal must not be submitted via Je-S. It is recommended that applications are submitted one week ahead of the deadline.

The CCG application should comprise the following attachments:

- CCG Proforma
- Case for support
- Justification of resources
- Additional information on national capabilities and other wider capabilities
- Pathways to Impact
- CVs for leadership roles and research staff supported through the CCG
- Letters of support from project partners
- Financing Schedules (Excel)

BBSRC recognises that not all aspects of an Institute's core capability will be relevant to each component of the application form. The main purpose of the written sections of the application form (i.e. excluding the Financing Schedules) is to enable the IAP to understand

how the CCG will underpin the Institute's ISPG research and the UK's national capability in bioscience.

The Institute should ensure that its IAE submissions enable easy and transparent cross-referencing between individual components of the submission. For example, it may be helpful to label and number aspects of the CCG and individual ISPGs.

The Institute should ensure that those staff who act as approvers and submitters for the CCG application should undertake appropriate quality control over the application. This should include responsibility for checking the completeness, validity and accuracy of the costs sought.

3.5.1 CCG Proforma

The CCG Proforma should be submitted as a PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG Proforma'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

The CCG Proforma is intended to provide a broad overview of the CCG proposal and the core capability of the institute, encompassing institute-specific capabilities, national capabilities and other wider capabilities. It will be used to populate BBSRC's internal information management systems. Information contained in the following sections of the CCG proforma may be published by BBSRC (e.g. via Gateway to Research):

- Purpose and objectives
- Summary
- Technical Summary
- Academic beneficiaries
- Impact Summary

Please ensure that confidential information is not included in these sections.

The Institute may wish to draw on the text included within the Director's Statement to complete the CCG Proforma. However, the information provided should focus on the Institute's core capability rather than the proposed ISPGs.

CCG Details

Complete this section as follows:
- Title should read 'BBSRC Core Capability Grant for <INSTITUTE >: 2018-2022'
- Start Date should be entered as 1 April 2018
- Duration should be 48 months

Applicants

The Institute should provide details of the key staff that will lead, manage and run the institute's core capability. The leadership position for any individual components of capability included within the 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and other Wider Capabilities' attachments should also be listed (see section 3.5.4).

Applicants must be categorised as Principal Investigator (CCG leader) or Co-Investigator (other leadership staff included in the proposal). These terms are the labels used by BBSRC systems and in no way reflect the Principal Investigator status of those who form part of the CCG team. The Principal Investigator for the CCG must be the Institute Director and will be the person to whom all relevant correspondence is directed.

Information provided against the 'How many hours a week will the investigator work on the project?' question should be based on a standard 37.5 working week. The Institute should enter a number of hours that is based on the proportion of the working week that the individual will spend working on the CCG. For example, if an individual would spend 50% of their working week on the CCG, this should be recorded as 18.75 hours (37.5 x 0.5).

Purpose and objectives (maximum 500 words)
Describe the overall purpose of the core capability supported by the CCG. Where relevant, list the main objectives that will be delivered throughout the duration of the grant.

Summary (maximum 500 words)
Describe the Institute's core capability in simple terms in a way that could be publicised to a general audience.

Technical Summary (maximum 500 words)
Describe the Institute's core capability in a manner suitable for a specialist reader.

Academic beneficiaries (maximum 500 words)
Describe who will benefit from the Institute's core capability. Please consider academic beneficiaries within the UK and, where appropriate, internationally.

Information on non-academic beneficiaries should not be included here; this information should form part of the Impact Summary section.

Impact Summary (maximum 500 words)
The Impact Summary should focus on the non-academic beneficiaries of the capability. It should answer the following questions:
- Who might benefit from the institute's core capability?
- How might they benefit from the institute's core capability?

Ethical implications (maximum 500 words)
Indicate whether there are any ethical implications arising from the proposed capability. If yes, provide details of what they are and how they will be addressed.

The Ethical Implications section does not need to duplicate the detailed information provided in the Animal Use section below.

Ethical information
Each section of the ethical information must be completed:
- Human participation
- Animal research

- Genetic and biological risk
- Approvals
- Other issues

Animal Use

The Animal Use section must be completed if animals form part of the Institute's core capability supported through the CCG. Please note that this requirement relates to support for the animals themselves (e.g. a reference population or colony), and not any associated infrastructure (e.g. animal housing, containment facilities). In general, it is expected that the information on animal use would normally be provided as part of a related research proposal (e.g. ISPG application, responsive mode application), rather than a CCG proposal.

Experiments using animals funded by the BBSRC must comply with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 (ASPA), amended 2012 and any further embodiments. Institutions and grant holders are responsible for ensuring that all appropriate personal and project licences required under the Act have been granted by the Home Office, and that appropriate Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body approval has been given. All BBSRC awards are made on the absolute condition that no work that is controlled by the Act will begin until the necessary licences have been obtained.

Applicants are expected to have developed their proposals in accordance with the cross-funder guidance: Responsibility in the Use of Animals in Bioscience Research and NC3Rs Guidelines. Compliance will be assessed as part of the review process and implementation of the principles in the guidance will be a condition of funding.

You must fully justify the choice of species and numbers of all animals required, including experimental design and power calculations where appropriate.

Estimates of the number of animals needed should, where possible, take into account the likely magnitude of the effect, the required statistical significance and power, and the factors that might affect this. Other points that must be addressed include:

- Why is animal use necessary - are there any other possible approaches?
- Why is this species most appropriate?
- What humane endpoints have been identified?

A separate 'Species' section should be completed for each animal species used. If there are distinctive elements of animal use for a single species which it would not be appropriate to combine, these should be described separately within the relevant 'Species' section.

Further guidance on how to complete the Animal Use section is provided in section 4.3.1.

Classification of proposal

Indicate the strategic priority areas to which the CCG proposal would contribute by marking the appropriate boxes.

Staff

The table should be completed for the individuals listed in the Applicants section at the beginning of the Proforma. Any individuals listed as a Co-I on an 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and other Wider Capabilities' attachment should also be included (see section 3.5.4). There is no requirement to complete the table for other staff supported through the CCG.

For 'Contracted Working Week expressed as % of full time work', show the number of hours the investigator is contracted to work as a percentage of the standard working week, using a standard of 37.5 hours for a working week. This question is about whether the investigator is employed full-time or part-time (and if part-time, what percentage). Therefore do not enter in this box a percentage that relates to the number of hours a week the investigator expects to spend on this project. The percentage entered must be greater than zero and no more than 100%. For example, someone who was contracted to work 20 hours would enter a figure of 53%. An investigator contracted to work more than 37.5 hours a week should still enter 100%. Please note that this question differs from the 'How many hours a week will the investigator work on the project?' question in the Applicants section at the beginning of the Proforma.

3.5.2 Case for support
(maximum 15 sides of A4)

The Case for Support should be submitted as a PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG CfS'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

Applicants must not include URLs to web resources in order to extend the Case for Support. The inclusion of such URLs will result in your application being withdrawn for correction. The IAP are advised to based their assessment solely on the information contained within the application, and are instructed not to access external links.

The case for support should focus on the core capability of the institute **as a whole**. There is scope to provide more detailed information on individual elements of the capability in the 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and Other Wider Capabilities' attachments (see section 3.5.4).

The Case for Support should comprise the following eight sections:
- Overview of the capability
- Strategic case
- Business case
- Social and economic impact case
- Leadership, expertise and skills case
- Statement on expertise of other research staff within the CCG
- Management case
- Approach to generating the Institute Development Fund

The page limits associated with each section may not be combined.

Overview of the capability (up to 2 sides)

Provide a brief description of the institute's core capability that will be supported through the CCG. The following areas should be covered:

- Infrastructure
- Scientific services
- Support services
- Equipment
- National capability

For the areas of infrastructure, scientific services, support services and equipment, a brief outline of the capability should be included (one paragraph; up to 200 words). For national capability, a brief outline of each individual component of the capability should be included (one paragraph per component; up to 200 words each).

Strategic case (up to 1 side)

The strategic case should clearly articulate the relevance of the proposal to local, national and international science priorities, BBSRC's Strategic Plan and priorities.

The case should outline the role of the capability in enabling internationally-excellent research in the field. It should also demonstrate the role of the capability in maintaining key research capability within the UK bioscience community and enabling associated high-quality research.

The case should include a clear demonstration of the need for the capability within the UK and, if appropriate, internationally. This section should also outline why the capability should be sited within an institute.

Business case (up to 3 sides)

The business case should describe the capability proposed and identify a small number of high-level objectives which drive its provision.

The case should describe how the capability will underpin the research in the associated ISPGs. It should also describe how any spare capacity within the core capability will underpin other research at the institute (BBSRC-funded and non-BBSRC funded). Clear reference should be made to how the capability will benefit research within and, if applicable, outside BBSRC's remit.

The case should provide a description of the interactions of the capability with academic researchers (internal and external), non-academic users, beneficiaries and other capabilities. Where relevant, it should include details of how the capability will be made accessible to these wider communities.

The case should include a brief statement on plans for data management and sharing. This should demonstrate how you will comply with BBSRC's published Data Sharing Policy. The policy can be viewed at http://www.bbsrc.ac.uk/web/FILES/Policies/data-sharing-policy.pdf.

Where the capability supported through the CCG is a component of a larger investment, information should be provided on other relevant investments – funded or planned – to provide greater context.

Social and economic impact case (up to 1 side)

The impact case should identify possible social and economic impacts associated with the CCG proposal, along with expected timescales and suggest objectives that will support these impacts. Examples may include public engagement and training activities that are directly associated with the capability. Impacts identified in this case must be specific to the CCG. It is not appropriate to simply reproduce information from the social and economic impact case of associated ISPG applications.

Where appropriate, possible impacts beyond the UK should be identified (e.g. international development).

Details should be included of any anticipated contribution from industry and / or other users to the CCG proposal.

Leadership, expertise and skills case (up to 2 sides)

The case should demonstrate that the Institute has the appropriate leadership in place to deliver the capability. Statements on the relevant expertise and track record of the key personnel involved in leading, managing and running the capability should be included.

The case should demonstrate that the Institute has the appropriate skills and competencies to deliver the capability. Consideration should made of how this expertise will be maintained (e.g. succession planning).

Statement of expertise of research staff involved in the CCG (up to 2 sides)

The purpose of this section is to provide additional information on research staff supported through the CCG who are involved in maintaining research capability that is strategically-important for UK bioscience. This section applies to research staff only and does not need to be completed for non-research staff.

The section should describe the previous track record of researchers involved in the capability. For each named Co-I on the CCG Proforma, a statement should be included on the contribution of the individual to the CCG and the particular skills they bring to the capability (3-4 lines per co-I). This statement should include an indication of the FTE commitment of each Co-I to the CCG. CVs must also be attached (see section 3.5.6).

A similar statement should also be included for each named PI and Co-I on the 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and Other Wider Capabilities' attachments (3-4 lines per PI or Co-I; see section 3.5.4). CVs must also be attached (see section 3.5.6).

Management case (up to 2 sides, plus one side for a list of regulatory standards)

The management case should include a statement on how the capability will be managed including, where appropriate, the justification of the time of project manager(s). It should include a description on how the capability will operate and the resources required to maintain the provision.

The case should demonstrate that the capability is operating effectively and efficiently, and provide evidence of the approach towards achieving longer-term sustainability. Objectives and activities that will support these goals should be identified.

The Institute should include examples of indicators or metrics that will be used to demonstrate and benchmark the efficient management of the capability. The Institute should identify relevant targets for these indicators to be achieved over the duration of the award. Where available, indicator data for previous years may also be provided. Examples of general indicators could include:

- Engagement with external stakeholders e.g. UK academics, research students and fellows, international community, industry, government, general public:
  - Number of users
  - Extent of interaction
- Percentage of in time use:
  - Balance between internal and external use
  - Up-time and down-time
- Development of new relationships with stakeholders:
  - Number of new users
  - Number of potential new users

The case should include a statement demonstrating that the Institute is compliant with relevant national and international regulatory standards. This should cover standards associated with the physical infrastructure, processes and people. A list of the key regulatory standards achieved by the institute should be included (1 side maximum).

Approach to generating the Institute Development Fund (up to 1 side)

Institutes should provide a statement of how the core capability supported through the CCG will be used to generate the Institute Development Fund (IDF). For example:
- Which components of the core capability are expected to generate income for the IDF?
- What actions will the Institute take to maximise usage and generate income for the IDF?

A table should be provided, in the format below, setting out a forecast for the IDF for each financial year from 2018-2019 to 2021-22.

Institute Development Fund forecast (£k)			
2018-19	**2019-20**	**2020-21**	**2021-22**

Information on how the Institute will use the IDF is included in the Director's Statement and does not need to be reproduced here.

Additional guidance on the IDF will be issued to institutes before the call opens on 18 April.

3.5.3 Justification of resources
(maximum of 2 sides of A4)

The Justification of Resources should be submitted as a PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG JoR'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

The Justification of Resources attachment should be used to explain why the resources identified in the Financing Schedules are needed, taking into account the nature and complexity of the capability proposed. Note that it is not sufficient merely to list what is required.

A short statement should be provided against each of the cost types used in the 'Design Input – Resource Costs' worksheet of the Financing Schedules. Greater emphasis should be placed on resources that directly underpin research programmes (e.g. consumables, equipment) compared with more general costs (e.g. catering, cleaning, fuel and power etc.).

BBSRC will provide an Open Access Grant to help implement the Research Councils UK Policy on Open Access for publications arisng from the Institute's funded ISP research and CCG-funded national capability. As such, the CCG application should not include requests for funds to support open access-related costs.

The CCG and ISPGs should not duplicate requests for funds.

3.5.4 Additional information on national capabilities and other wider capabilities
(maximum page limit varies depending on the level of financial support requested)

The 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and other Wider Capabilities' attachment(s) should be submitted as a PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG Additional Information'. Multiple attachments are allowed for each CCG application. Each separate attachment should be individually numbered.

This section should be completed separately for each specific capability that is not for exclusive use by the Institute. The section must be completed for all elements of national capability, but it may also be relevant for other capabilities (e.g. campus capabilities, very large local capabilities). It is anticipated that this attachment would be completed for the majority of capabilities currently supported through NCG or Campus Capability Grant funding (taking into account any restructuring of these capabilities).

Following the CCG application closing date, BBSRC will review the information provided and may require the Institute to provide further details or complete further Additional Information attachments for specific capabilities. Please contact BBSRC Office if you have queries about whether this section should be completed for a specific capability.

The Additional Information attachment is intended to supplement the information included in the CCG Case for Support and provide more details on specific capabilities. The IAP will use this information to help inform their recommendation on which elements of a CCG proposal should be funded. In reviewing the Additional Information documentation, the IAP will primarily consider the following CCG assessment criteria:

- The extent to which capability will enable internationally excellent research in the field, as proposed in associated ISPGs addressing strategic need
- The extent to which the capability is required to maintain key research capability within the UK bioscience community and enable associated high-quality research
- The evidence of the need for, and community interest in, the capability
- The adequacy of the plans for engagement with the research and user communities, including the extent to which the capability will be accessible to these wider communities
- The evidence of appropriate skills and competencies to deliver the capability, along with associated quality leadership

Each Additional Information attachment should consist of:
- Additional Information Proforma
- Detailed case for support (this section should start on a new page)

Additional Information Proforma

The Additional Information Proforma should be completed for each individual capability. It includes the following information:

Title and reference
Provide a title for the individual capability. Include a reference (e.g. NC1, NC2) to enable cross-referencing with the other parts of the submission, including the Financing Schedules.

Financial support requested
Indicate the total amount of financial support requested. This should be consistent with the information included within the Financing Schedules.

Applicants
The member of staff who is responsible for leading the capability should be identified. They should also be listed within the Applicant section of the CCG Proforma and their CV included in the 'CCG CVs' attachment (section 3.5.6).

Other key members of staff supported through the capability should also be identified. These do not need to be listed within the Applicant section at the beginning of the CCG Proforma.

However, they should be included in the table in the 'Staff' section of the CCG Profroma and their CVs should be included in the 'CCG CVs' attachment (section 3.5.6).

Applicants must be categorised as Principal Investigator (capability leader) or Co-Investigator (other staff). These terms are the labels used by BBSRC systems and in no way reflect the Principal Investigator status of those who form part of the CCG team.

<u>Purpose and objectives</u> (maximum 500 words)
Describe the overall purpose of the capability and list the main objectives that will be delivered throughout the duration of the grant. This information may be made publicly available.

Please note that other sections from the CCG Proforma are not required for the Additional Information Proforma (i.e. Summary, Technical Summary, Academic Beneficiaries, Impact Summary, Ethical Implications, Ethical Information, Animal Use, Classification of Proposal, Staff).

Detailed Case for Support (variable page limit)

The Detailed Case for Support should start on a new page. It should follow a similar format to that of the whole CCG proposal and include the following five sections:
- Strategic case
- Business case
- Social and economic case
- Leadership, expertise and skills case
- Management case

The guidance provided in section 3.5.2 is relevant here. However, the information included should focus on the individual capability rather than the CCG as a whole.

The maximum page limits for the Detailed Case for Support vary depending of the level of financial support requested:

Financial support requested over the four year funding period	**Page limit** (sides of A4)
< £2M	Up to 2 sides + 1 side for Workplan
£2M to £5M	Up to 3 sides + 1 side for Workplan
>£5M	Up to 4 sides + 1 side for Workplan

As a minimum, institutes should:
- identify a small number of high-level objectives for the capability
- describe how the capability will underpin the associated ISPG proposals
- describe how the capability will underpin other research (internal / external; BBSRC-funded / non-BBSRC-funded)
- provide evidence of the need for, and community interest in, the capability
- describe plans for engagement with academic researchers, non-academic users, beneficiaries and other capabilities

- provide examples of indicators / metrics that will be used to demonstrate success
- provide a diagrammatic Workplan, such as a GANNT chart, with clear links to the Workplan(s) of associated ISPGs (maximum 1 side)

Justification of Resources

There is no requirement to include a Justification of Resources as part of the Additional Information attachment. Resources requested for individual capabilities should be included within the overall CCG justification.

3.5.5 Pathways to Impact
(maximum 4 sides of A4)

A Pathways to Impact statement should be submitted as a PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG PtI'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

The Pathways to Impact statement, together with the Impact Summary, should outline the wider benefits of the capability to the public sector, commercial private sector, third sector and/or the wider public.

Plans for engaging with academic users and beneficiaries may be included, but the pathway towards economic and societal impact must be clearly articulated.

The Pathways to Impact statement should:
- be specific to the CCG and have very clear deliverables
- describe societal and economic deliverables and milestones instead of focusing on just scientific deliverables
- plan to deliver activities pertinent to the CCG instead of a focus on track record or routine activities for research organisation posts
- consider broader beneficiaries, the likely impact on them and appropriate mechanisms for realising these potential impacts
- be focused on knowledge exchange and impact generation rather than narrowly focused, end focused, or purely for dissemination purposes
- be clearly laid out in terms of timelines when each impact activity will be carried out

The Institute is advised to ensure that the PtI statement sets out clear impact objectives with specific timelines for planned activities.

The information in this section should be focused on the capability supported through the CCG. It is not appropriate to simply reproduce the information contained in the PtI statements of associated ISPG applications. Where appropriate, the Institute is advised to identify specific activities and deliverables associated with any elements of national capability included within the CCG application.

The Institute is invited to consider how the capability will deliver impact beyond the UK as part of the Pathways to Impact statement (e.g. international development).

It is recognised that it may not be appropriate to reference all aspects of the capability supported through the CCG within the Pathways to Impact statement.

Further information is available from the RCUK website: www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/

3.5.6 CVs for leadership roles and research staff supported through the CCG

CVs should be submitted as a single PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG CVs'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

A CV is required for each individual named on the CCG Proforma. CVs must be no more than two sides of A4 per person and should include details of:
- Employment history (give dates and details of position held including the nature of current employment)
- Qualifications (state subject, class of degree with University dates)
- Most recent publications, within the last 5 years, in refereed journals relevant to the project (where relevant)
- Other achievements

For leadership roles, the information within the CV should provide evidence of the ability to lead and manage the proposed capability. Where appropriate, individuals should clearly identify within their CVs the achievements that arose from previous NCG or ISPG support. The Institute Director is not required to submit their CV as part of the CCG application.

For other research staff roles, the information within the CV should provide evidence of the ability to deliver the proposed capability. Where appropriate, individuals should clearly identify achievements that arose from previous NCG or ISPG support. Information is required for all research staff employed at lecturer level or equivalent who will be directly supported through the CCG. Information on other research staff may also be included where they make a significant contribution to the CCG.

If information on publications is provided, this should be included within the CV and not submitted as a separate document. Separate lists of publications and other unsolicited documents will not be taken into account in the assessment process.

Investigators are invited to include information about career breaks or other considerations that may affect the amount or quality of evidence provided. The IAP will take into account time spent outside the active research environment, whether through career breaks or flexible working. The panel will note the applicant's career trajectory and potential at the beginning of a break, relative to the stage of the applicant's career and will recognise that the effects on productivity of a career break, or a period of flexible working, may continue beyond the return to work.

In preparing the CV attachment, please ensure that the individuals listed in the Applicant section the CCG Proforma are included at the beginning of the document. These should be followed by the individuals listed on 'Additional Information on National Capabilities and

Other Wider Capabilities' attachments, grouped by individual capability. Where individuals contribute to more than one capability, their CV does not need to be duplicated.

3.5.7 Letters of support from project partners
(where necessary)

Letters of support should be submitted as a single PDF file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG Letters of Support'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

Letters of support are required for applications with project partners. A letter of support from each project partner should be included, confirming its support for the capability, detailing any financial or other contributions to be made, and outlining the expected benefits to the organisation and the capability. Letters of support must also be included to confirm an active collaboration or contribution to a capability in terms of resources or expertise.

General letters of support or endorsements from colleagues, users etc. should not be submitted, nor should letters include copies of papers of other attachments.

Letters of support should be compiled into one PDF file with a table on the first page listing the letters, as below. Each letter must be a maximum of two sides of A4.

Author of letter (organisation/individual)	Brief description of nature of contribution/collaboration	Page number

3.5.8 Financing Schedules

The Financing Schedules should be submitted as an Excel file with the filename '<INSTITUTE> CCG Financing Schedules'. Only one attachment is allowed per CCG application.

Queries regarding the financing schedules should be directed to Zahir Sachak (zahir.sachak@bbsrc.ac.uk).

The CCG and ISPGs should not duplicate requests for funds.

3.6 Format for Written Submissions

The required file names and formats for the CCG application attachments are shown below:

Attachment	Filename[1]	Format
CCG Proforma	<INSTITUTE> CCG Proforma	PDF
Case for support	<INSTITUTE> CCG CfS	PDF
Justification of resources	<INSTITUTE> CCG JoR	PDF
Additional information on national capabilities and other wider capabilities	<INSTITUTE> CCG Additional Information *Each separate attachment should be individually numbered*	PDF
Pathways to Impact	<INSTITUTE> CCG PtI	PDF
CVs for leadership roles and research staff	<INSTITUTE> CCG CVs	PDF
Letters of support from project partners	<INSTITUTE> CCG Letters of support	PDF
Financing Schedules	<INSTITUTE> CCG Financing Schedules	Excel

[1] The Institute should include an abbreviated institute name at the beginning of each filename (i.e. QI)

BBSRC recommend that you use typefaces Arial, Helvetica or Verdana. A minimum font size of 11 pt must be used for the entire application (excluding text on diagrams and the use of mathematical symbols). A minimum of single line spacing and standard character spacing must be used. Margins must not be less than 2 cm.

Applications will be checked for faults by BBSRC Administrative staff soon after the closing date to ensure that relevant aspects of the application are legible and comply with the formatting rules. Any component(s) of an application which do not meet these rules will be returned for amendment before being validated for peer review.

The Institute should number the individual pages of each attachment. Please note that this differs from the ISPG guidance where page numbers will be added when the documents are submitted through Je-S (see section 4.4).

Where A4 page is stated, this refers to a "side of A4".

Further information on BBSRC requirements can be found in the BBSRC Research Grants Guide.

If you have any queries please e-mail iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk.

Back to top

4. INSTITUTE STRATEGIC PROGRAMME GRANT GUIDELINES

4.1 Background

In 2012, a portfolio of ISPGs was awarded to each Institute, following assessment of proposals in 2011. A new round of ISPGs will be awarded in 2017 following the 2016 IAE. For QI, a new round of ISPGs will be awarded in 2018, subject to a favourable assessment in the 2017 IAE. The assessment of the new round of proposals will, as in 2011, follow the principles of peer review used in BBSRC grant assessment.

ISPG proposals should be submitted via Je-S.

4.2 Assessment Criteria

The IAP will advise on which ISPGs should be funded based on the following criteria:
- The scientific quality of the proposal in relation to internationally excellent standards for strategic research in the field
- The extent to which the proposal addresses global challenges in the biosciences, as set out in BBSRC's current Strategic Plan and relevant BBSRC Strategic Research Frameworks
- Whether the resources (people, equipment, etc.) are appropriate and deployed as effectively as possible
- The appropriateness of the proposed scientific leadership and track record of key investigators
- The appropriateness of the proposed actions and objectives to achieve impact
- For programmes which build on previous ISPG research, the quality and impact/potential impact of the outputs from the previous programme(s)
- The approach to data management
- The overall value for money.

Please note that while the assessment criteria for the 2011 IAE included reference to uplift objectives, this has been removed for the 2017 IAE. BBSRC does not require detailed descriptions of uplift objectives as part of the 2017 IAE.

BBSRC expects ISPG proposals to describe a self-contained programme of work. The delivery of the ISPG objectives should not be dependent on the Institute obtaining uplift funding.

4.3 Submission of Full ISPG Proposals

CALL OPENING DATE: 18 APRIL 2017
CALL CLOSING DATE: 22 JUNE 2017, 4.00pm

Institutes will submit full proposals for the agreed ISPGs, together with a Director's Statement (see section 2).

The closing date for submissions is 4.00 pm on **22 June 2017**. All applications must be submitted via Je-S before 4.00 pm on this date. It is recommended that applications are submitted one week ahead of the deadline.

All mandatory sections of the Je-S form should be completed, please refer to Je-S help for general guidance (https://je-s.rcuk.ac.uk/Handbook/Index.htm).

4.3.1 Je-S Form

Submission details
- ISPG titles should explicitly recognise BBSRC support (e.g. "*BBSRC Strategic Programme in ...*", or " *... :a BBSRC Strategic Programme*"). Titles should be meaningful to a non-expert audience (BBSRC can advise on naming if necessary).
- In the 'Project Details' section:
  - department must be that of the ISPG Leader
  - '2017 Institute Assessment (ISPG)' should be selected as 'Proposal Call'
  - start date should be entered as 1 April 2018
  - duration should be set as any duration up to 48 months.
- Applicants must be categorised as Principal Investigator (PI, ISPG Leader) or Co-Investigator (Co-I, other PIs in the programme). These terms are the labels used by Je-S and in no way reflect the Principal Investigator status of those who form part of the ISPG team.
- Please ensure your Je-S information is up-to-date so the correct details appear in the form.
- Information provided against the 'How many hours a week will the investigator work on the project?' question should be based on a standard 37.5 working week. Institutes should enter a number of hours that is based on the proportion of the working week that the researcher will spend working on the ISPG. For example, if a researcher would spend 50% of their working week on the ISPG, this should be recorded as 18.75 hours (37.5 x 0.5).

Resources
Institutes must give the total funds requested at 100% FEC. Contributions from any project partners must also be noted. Institutes should be aware that Je-S will automatically reduce the Research Council Contribution to 80% FEC for most resource headings. As the 'core' funding streams for institutes do not follow the standard approach to FEC for project grants at 80% FEC, the Je-S system generated figures will be adjusted following submission to provide parity with current arrangements and the cash levels as required in the Director's Statement (section 2). An estimate of the funding requested should be given in the 'Justification of Resources' attachment.

ISPGs and the CCG should not duplicate any request for funds. For example, if technical support staff are included within the CCG bid, provision for that technical support should not be included within the ISPG application. If the ISPG requires technical support, specific to the project and above and beyond the 'core' service provision, it can be included in the ISPG proposal but a clear justification must be provided. BBSRC would not expect estate costs to be requested as part of an ISPG application.

Please note that the salaries of Group Leaders can be funded through Institute Strategic Programme Grants (ISPG) or the Core Capability Grant (CCG), depending on their role within the institute:

- Where a Group Leader staff member is primarily involved in the delivery of an ISP, their salary should be supported through an ISPG
- Where a Group Leader staff member is primarily involved in the delivery of a capability, their salary should be supported through the CCG

Group Leaders would normally be expected to raise additional grant funding to support their salary costs. BBSRC expects that the Institute's request for salary costs within an ISPG application should reflect this.

Animal Use

Experiments using animals funded by the BBSRC must comply with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 (ASPA), amended 2012 and any further embodiments. Institutions and grant holders are responsible for ensuring that all appropriate personal and project licences required under the Act have been granted by the Home Office, and that appropriate Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body approval has been given. All BBSRC awards are made on the absolute condition that no work that is controlled by the Act will begin until the necessary licences have been obtained.

Applicants are expected to have developed their proposals in accordance with the cross-funder guidance: Responsibility in the Use of Animals in Bioscience Research and NC3Rs Guidelines. Compliance will be assessed during peer review and implementation of the principles in the guidance will be a condition of funding.

The Je-S list does not currently include an 'Other' option; if your animal species does not appear in the list, please select 'Other Rodent' and detail your actual species in the justification text box.

You must fully justify the choice of species and numbers of all animals required, including experimental design and power calculations where appropriate.

Estimates of the number of animals needed should, where possible, take into account the likely magnitude of the effect, the required statistical significance and power, and the factors that might affect this. Other points that must be addressed include:

- Why is animal use necessary - are there any other possible approaches?
- Why is this species most appropriate?
- What humane endpoints have been identified?

Please note that this requirement applies whether or not the animals are to be purchased with funds requested within the proposal itself.

Although there is no expectation that applicants provide details of every proposed experiment, it is essential that applicants provide sufficient assurance over the use of animals within the research programme.

In addition to the guidance above, BBSRC advises the Institute to ensure that ISPG applications:

- Provide information that is specific to the ISPG, rather than describing a generic Institute-level approach to animal use.

- Provide details of any aspects of the programme that require the use of animals in the Home Office 'moderate' and 'severe' categories, including approximate numbers of animals that might be subject to these categories of procedures over the course of the ISPG.

- Provide worked examples with descriptions of experimental design, justification of proposed sample size, planned statistical analyses and power calculations. The examples within the proposal should provide coverage of:
  - all species that will be used in the work
  - the range of severity of procedures that will be used, with particular attention to procedures that require the use of animals in the moderate and severe categories

- Provide details on ISPG-specific actions that will be taking to implement the 3Rs during the course of the programme.

- Provide details of animal use, even if the care of the animals is being managed by another institution.

Applicants are advised that the statistical analysis section of the Je-S form associated with each species does not have a word limit.

Investigator eligibility

Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators must meet standard BBSRC eligibility rules, i.e. employed at lecturer level or equivalent. Researchers who are in receipt of a fellowship which makes them eligible to apply for grants (e.g. David Phillips, Royal Society, etc.) may also be included as co-investigators.

BBSRC expects PIs and Co-Is included on an ISPG proposal to have a post that extends beyond the duration of the ISPG or will have a contract of employment that extends to the duration of the ISPG, should it be awarded. Under exceptional circumstances, investigators who do not meet this employment criterion may be included as a Co-I (e.g. early-career researchers, tenure-track staff). Please note that this represents a relaxation of the standard eligibility rules and applies to ISPG funding only. Institute staff are still subject to the standard BBSRC eligibility rules when applying for other BBSRC research grant funding.

A letter from the Director must be included to confirm that PIs and Co-Is meet standard BBSRC eligibility rules (maximum 2 sides; see section 4.3.8). This should be attached as 'Other Attachment'. The letter should also confirm that investigators meet the employment criterion described above. Any individual investigators who do not meet this criterion must be identified within the letter and the following additional information included:
- the date at which the individual's current contact of employment ends (Month, Year)

- the date at which a decision on the individual's future employment at the Institute is expected to be made (Month, Year)

An equivalent letter should also be provided for each other research organisation (e.g. Institute, HEI) that is participating in the ISPG and requesting ISPG funding. This should be attached as 'Other Attachment'. Each letter should be a maximum of 2 sides.

Institutes should ensure that the inclusion of staff who do not have a contract of employment for the full duration of the ISPG is fully justified within the application. The status of these individuals and their contributions to the ISPG should be clear. The IAP will take account of this information in their assessment of the proposal.

Please note that Researcher Co-Investigator is not a valid category for the ISPG scheme. Investigators who do not meet the eligibility requirements above should not be listed. However, if they make a significant contribution to the ISPG they may be referred to in the case for support and their CV included.

Full details on BBSRC's eligibility rules can be found in the Grants Guide (www.bbsrc.ac.uk/funding/apply/grants-guide.aspx). Please contact BBSRC Office if you are unsure whether an investigator should be included.

Joint applications with other institutes and/or HEIs
Institutes may submit joint applications with other institutes and/or HEIs. **All joint applications should be submitted on a single Je-S form**. The Principal Investigator must be from the lead BBSRC Institute and will be the person to whom all scientific correspondence is directed. Other partners should be listed on the application form as co-investigators. A table detailing the breakdown of funds between the partners should be included as an additional page in the 'Justification of Resources' attachment.

The Institute must list the funds requested to support the partner components of the proposal at 100% FEC. Partner components will normally be paid at 80% FEC. An exception will be made for BBSRC strategically-funded institute partners, which will be paid at 100% FEC if the institute is not part of an HEI.

Classifications
It is mandatory to complete the classifications section in Je-S, assigning the most appropriate strategic priorities and keywords.

Reviewers
The names of six suitable nominated reviewers must be given, avoiding those with a direct conflict of interest with the programme or Institute e.g. a current collaborator. The Institute should inform BBSRC in writing of any potential reviewers who should not be approached (as a 'Proposal Cover Letter' attachment). However, BBSRC reserves the right to make the final selection.

4.3.2 Case For Support
(maximum 24 sides of A4)

Applicants must not include URLs to web resources in order to extend their Case for Support. The inclusion of such URLs will result in your application being returned for correction. Peer reviewers are advised to base their assessment solely on the information contained within the application, and are instructed not to access external links.

References should appear in a list at the end of the case for support and be linked to relevant text by, for example, sequential numbering and superscript reference numbers embedded in the body of the document. Only one publication should be listed for each number. Within the list of references, URL links to relevant publications or online resources are permissible.

BBSRC has not set variable page limits for the 'Case for Support' based on the financial value of ISPG applications. However, it is anticipated that smaller-scale ISPG applications will not require the maximum number of pages.

The Case for Support must describe the proposed research and should include the following:

a. Strategic case
The strategic case should make explicit the relevance of the proposal to international and national science priorities, BBSRC's Strategic Plan, BBSRC's Delivery Plan and priorities, and the skills and resources which the Institute has available to achieve the programme goals. This section should also explain why the research should be conducted in an Institute.

b. Science case
The science case should identify the problem to be addressed, including a small number of clear, measurable high-level top-down objectives. The objectives should be specific and appropriately ambitious, taking into account the resources that will be available over the award period. Where ISPGs are a component of a larger programme information should be provided on other relevant projects – funded or planned – to provide greater context. This section should also include a brief outline of experimental approaches that will be taken to address the research question/topic and scientific detail should be elaborated.

c. Social and economic impact case
The impact case should identify possible social and economic impacts associated with the programme along with expected timescales and objectives that will support the realisation of these impacts. Examples include public engagement and training activities that are directly associated with the programme. If there is an anticipated contribution from industry and/or other users to the programme, details should be included on the stage of the programme at which this will take place and how the partner(s) will be engaged. Impacts identified in this case must be specific to the proposed ISPG and its associated investigators. Where appropriate, possible impacts beyond the UK should be identified (e.g. international development).

d. Leadership and management commitment case

This should include:

- a statement on how the programme will be managed including, where appropriate, the justification of the time of a project manager
- a statement on the scientific and leadership role of the ISPG leader, plus a clear indication of the time commitment per week to the ISPG
- a statement on the approach to the succession planning of the ISPG leadership.

e. Statement on expertise of other investigators within the ISPG

This should describe the previous track record of investigators involved in the programme. For each named Co-I on the proposal, a statement should be included on the contribution of that individual to the ISPG and the particular skills they bring to the programme (3-4 lines per Co-I). This statement should include an indication of the FTE commitment of each Co-I to the ISPG. CVs must also be attached (see section 4.3.9).

4.3.3 Justification of resources
(maximum 6 sides of A4, plus 2 sides for additional requirements)

Each ISPG proposal should include an attachment entitled 'Justification of Resources'. This should be used to justify the resources required to undertake the research project and is mandatory.

Applicants should:

- Explain why the indicated resources are needed, taking account of the nature and complexity of the research proposed. Note that it is not sufficient merely to list what is required
- Have regard for the breakdown of resources into the summary fund headings Directly Incurred, Directly Allocated and (where appropriate) Exceptions
- In some cases, such as investigator time, use of internal facilities and shared staff costs (all likely to be Directly Allocated costs), the basis of the costing need not be justified, but the need for the resources does need justification
- Try to be explicit about the need for the level of investigator time sought, bearing in mind the complexity of the research, the need to manage the project and supervise staff and any wider considerations such as collaboration or facilities usage
- Justify any requests for staff posts above the normal salary entry level
- Estates and indirect costs should not be included where these are included in the CCG.

Additional Justification of Resources requirements and page allowances – please note that the page limits for these are separate. Each additional section should begin on a new page and have an appropriate heading.

- A table must be included for each proposal showing the total cash element of costs included in FEC for each financial year from 2018-19 to 2021-22. The table must match the summary figures in the Director's Statement. The costs should be inclusive of VAT and other taxes where applicable (maximum one side)

- For joint applications, a table should be included showing the breakdown of costs for each partner in the four main categories (Directly Incurred, Directly Allocated, Indirect, and Exceptions) over the duration of the grant (maximum one side).

BBSRC will provide an Open Access Grant to help implement the Research Councils UK Policy on Open Access for publications arisng from the Institute's funded ISP research and CCG-funded national capability. As such, the ISPG application should not include requests for funds to support open access-related costs.

ISPGs and the CCG should not duplicate requests for funds.

4.3.4 Director's Statement
(maximum 17 sides of A4)

The Director's Statement should be attached as a 'Proposal Cover Letter'; for full details of the format and contents see section 2.

4.3.5 Pathways to Impact
(maximum 4 sides of A4)

The Pathways to Impact assessment statement, together with the Impact Summary, should outline the wider benefits of the research to the public sector, commercial private sector, third sector and/or the wider public.

Plans for engaging with academic audiences may be included but only where these form part of the critical pathway towards economic and societal impact. This pathway must be clearly articulated.

The Pathways to Impact statement should:
- be project specific and have very clear deliverables
- describe societal and economic deliverables and milestones instead of focusing on just scientific deliverables
- plan to deliver activities pertinent to the project instead of a focus on track record or routine activities for research organisation posts
- consider broader beneficiaries, the likely impact on them and appropriate mechanisms for realising these potential impacts
- be focused on knowledge exchange and impact generation rather than narrowly focused, end focused, or purely for dissemination purposes
- be clearly laid out in terms of timelines when each impact activity will be carried out.

Institutes are advised to ensure that the Pathways to Impact statement sets out clear impact objectives with specific timelines for planned activities. The activities outlined in the Pathways to Impact statement should be project specific and appropriate, done by the people working on the project, during the grant period.

Applicants should request and justify the **project-specific** resources needed to achieve their Pathways to Impact.

Institutes are invited to consider how the ISPG will deliver impact beyond the UK as part of the Pathways to Impact statement (e.g. international development).

Further information is available from the RCUK website: www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/

This attachment is in addition to the Impact Summary required in the Je-S form. Please note that the 'Impact Summary' section of the Je-S form may be published to demonstrate potential impacts of BBSRC-funded research so please ensure that confidential information is not included in this section.

Further information about what is meant by impact and how it can be achieved can be found at http://www.bbsrc.ac.uk/funding/apply/application-guidance/pathways-impact/.

The RCUK Pathways to Impact toolkit is available at http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/.

4.3.6 Workplan
(maximum 2 sides of A4)

A diagrammatic workplan, such as a GANTT chart, must be attached. This should be attached as the 'Workplan'.

4.3.7 Data Management Plan
(maximum 4 sides of A4)

A statement on data management must be included as attachment type 'Data Management Plan'. This statement must clearly detail how you will comply with BBSRC's published Data Sharing Policy, including concise plans for data management and sharing as part of the ISPG proposal, or provide explicit reasons why data sharing is not possible or appropriate. In this case it may be appropriate to note whether this applies to both sharing of data within the institute and externally.

The policy, and detailed guidance notes, can be viewed at http://www.bbsrc.ac.uk/web/FILES/Policies/data-sharing-policy.pdf

The Institute may have already initiated an institutional data sharing policy, in which case it may be appropriate to summarise the main points from the policy and how it will implemented across the ISPGs.

Data management plans may include details of:
- Data areas and data types - the volume, type and content of data that will be generated e.g. experimental measurements, records and images
- Standards and metadata - the standards and methodologies that will be adopted for data collection and management, and why these have been selected
- Relationship to other data available in public repositories
- Secondary use - further intended and/or foreseeable research uses for the completed dataset(s)

- Methods for data sharing - planned mechanisms for making these data available, e.g. through deposition in existing public databases or on request, including access mechanisms where appropriate
- Proprietary data - any restrictions on data sharing due to the need to protect proprietary or patentable data
- Timeframes - timescales for public release of data
- Format of the final dataset
- Applicants may claim justifiable costs associated with data sharing activities, which should be captured in the application proforma and in Justification of Resources statement.

BBSRC recognises that a key part of supporting data sharing is supporting credit for researchers who make data available. We would encourage you to make note of any efforts you have to make data citable and assign appropriate credit to researchers involved with sharing or data curation, particularly those that might not be otherwise captured.

Important - These pages should be used only for the statement on data sharing. Any information included other than that relating to data sharing statement requirements, as prescribed above, will result in your application being rejected. Only one statement is required per ISPG proposal.

Please note that preliminary data and descriptions of the proposed work belong in the Case for Support and should not be included in the data sharing statement.

4.3.8 Confirmation of eligibility
(maximum 2 sides of A4)

Letter from Director to confirm eligibility of all PIs and Co-Is, attached as 'Other Attachment'.

4.3.9 CVs for all PIs, Co-Is and other named research staff
(maximum 2 sides of A4 per CV)

A CV is required for each PI, Co-I and other named research staff on the Je-S form. CVs must be no more than two sides of A4 per person and should be submitted as attachment type 'CV'. The CV should include details of:
- Employment history (give dates and details of position held including the nature of current employment)
- Qualifications (state subject, class of degree with University dates)
- Most recent publications, within the last 5 years, in refereed journals relevant to the project
- Other outcomes and achievements arising from your research.

Publications should be included within the CV and not submitted as a separate document. Separate lists of publications and other unsolicited documents will not be taken into account in the peer review process.

Where appropriate, researchers should clearly identify within their CVs the achievements that arose from previous ISPG or NCG support.

Investigators are invited to include information about career breaks or other considerations that may affect the amount or quality of evidence provided. The IAP will take into account time spent outside the active research environment, whether through career breaks or flexible working. The panel will note the applicant's career trajectory and potential at the beginning of a break, relative to the stage of the applicant's career and will recognise that the effects on productivity of a career break, or a period of flexible working, may continue beyond the return to work.

4.3.10 Letters of support from project partners
(where necessary)

Letters of support are required for applications with project partners. A letter of support from each project partner should be included, confirming its support for the research, detailing any financial or other contributions to be made, and outlining the expected benefits to the organisation and the proposal. Letters of support must also be included to confirm an active collaboration or contribution to a project in terms of resources or expertise.

Applicants are asked to note that other members of an Institution from which someone has provided a letter of support will not in general be used as reviewers for that proposal. Therefore, **including letters other than those necessary to confirm important collaborations can be detrimental to the peer review process**. General letters of support or endorsement from colleagues, etc., should not be submitted, nor should letters include copies of papers or other attachments.

Letters of support should be compiled into one PDF file with a table on the first page listing the letters, as below. Each letter must be a maximum of 2 sides of A4.

Author of letter (organisation/individual)	Brief description of nature of contribution/collaboration	Page number

This document should be submitted as attachment type 'Letter of Support'.

4.3.11 List of related proposals and other support

Details of related grants and other support must be provided as a separate attachment of type 'Proposal Cover Letter' (it is not necessary to enter all related grants/proposals individually in Je-S). The document should be a PDF document and should include details of all relevant grants for the specific ISPG. The following information should be provided for each grant:
- Principal Investigator
- Awarding organisation
- Awarding organisation's reference
- Title of project

- Start and end dates
- Amount awarded (please indicate FEC level for these amounts) or amount requested if still under consideration
- % PI time.

4.3.12 Equipment

Applicants should read the information on the RCUK website at http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/publications/equipment-guidance-pdf to which the BBSRC-specific information below is supplementary. Please note that the information on the RCUK webpage was updated in March 2016 to reflect changes being introduced on 1 April 2016.

Equipment that is specific to the ISPG can be requested for individual programmes, as follows:
- Single piece of equipment <£10K – funded at 80%
- Single piece of equipment >£10K – funded at 50%
- Instrument development can be funded at 100%

Further information on equipment can be found in the BBSRC Grants Guide.

4.3.13 National Facilities

Information on access to national facilities can be found in the BBSRC Grants Guide.

Choose the 'Add New Research Council Facilities Item' link within the Research Council Facilities section in Je-S. Select the facility you wish to use from the drop down list and complete the proposed usage section. For joint grants, choose the facility on the Proforma of the Institute who will be using the facility only. Contact with the facility should be made prior to submission to ensure that the work can be done, both from a scientific aspect and to confirm that the facility has the capacity to fulfil your request during the required time period. The facility staff will be able to provide details of the costs and where applicable this confirmation should be added as the attachment type 'Technical Assessment'. For joint grants, only the components using the facility should list the facility and costs on their individual proforma.

4.3.14 Research Facilities / Existing Equipment

Information on access to other research facilities / existing equipment can be found in section 5.42 of the BBSRC Grants Guide ('Other Directly Allocated Costs').

4.4 Format for Written Submissions

BBSRC recommend that you use typefaces Arial, Helvetica or Verdana, A minimum font size of 11 pt must be used for the entire application (excluding text on diagrams and the use of mathematical symbols). A minimum of single line spacing and standard character spacing must be used. Margins must not be less than 2 cm.

Applications will be checked for faults by BBSRC Administrative staff soon after the closing date to ensure that relevant aspects of the application are legible and comply with the formatting rules. Any component(s) of an application which do not meet these rules will be returned for amendment before being validated for peer review and assessment. Attachments are supported in the following formats:

- PDF versions 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 1.6 (*.pdf)
- Postscript level 2 (*.ps)
- Microsoft Word ('97 and later including Word 2007)

All attachments will be stored as PDF, and are restricted to 10MB for 'Case for Support' and 5MB for other types of attachment.

Also please note that, on submission to BBSRC, all non-PDF documents are converted to PDF, so the use of non-standard fonts may result in errors or font conversion, which could affect the overall length of the document. Please note that BBSRC cannot guarantee that documents will be reproduced in colour.

It is not necessary to number the pages of attachments as this will be done when the documents are submitted to BBSRC via Je-S.

Where A4 page is stated, this refers to a "side of A4".

Further information on BBSRC requirements can be found in the BBSRC Grants Guide.

If you have any queries please e-mail iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk.

4.5 Assessment of Full Proposals

Each full ISPG proposal will be sent to several reviewers, up to half drawn from those nominated by the Institute, with the remainder identified by BBSRC Office and introducing members. Reviewers will receive the ISPG documents excluding the Director's Statement. They will be asked to comment on similar criteria as those used for responsive mode grants:

- The scientific quality of the proposal in relation to internationally excellent standards for strategic research in the field
- The extent to which the proposal addresses global challenges in the biosciences, as set out in BBSRC's current Strategic Plan and relevant BBSRC Strategic Research Frameworks
- Whether the resources (people, equipment, etc.) are appropriate and deployed as effectively as possible
- The appropriateness of the proposed scientific leadership and track record of key investigators
- The appropriateness of the proposed actions and objectives to achieve impact
- For programmes which build on previous ISPG research, the quality and impact/potential impact of the outputs from the previous programme(s)
- The approach to data management
- The overall value for money.

They will also be asked to provide specific comments on the approach to data management and, where appropriate, approach to animal research, and ethical and social issues.

The Principal Investigator will be given the opportunity to reply to comments from the reviewers. Responses will be considered by the IAP in making its decision. BBSRC will not enter into correspondence or discussion concerning reviewers' comments prior to the meeting.

[Back to top](#)

5. ANNUAL MONITORING

Information from previous annual monitoring and mid-term review exercises will be provided to the IAP and will form part of the Institute's track record. BBSRC will provide the information to the IAP directly; institutes should not attach documents from the annual monitoring or mid-term reviews as part of their submission.

6. TIMETABLE

An overview of the 2017 IAE timetable is provided below. Please note that the timings are subject to change and specific dates will be provided in due course.

Activity	Date
Outline applications commissioned	1 December 2016
Outline applications submission deadline	30 January 2017
Call for full ISPG and CCG applications opens	18 April 2017
Call for full ISPG and CCG applications closes	22 June 2017
External peer review of ISPG applications	June – August 2017
Reviewers' comments provided to Institutes	14 August 2017
Institute submits responses to reviewers' comments	28 August 2017
Institute Assessment Panel meeting	26 September 2017 (to be confirmed)
High-level feedback provided to institutes	Late October 2017

7. KEY CONTACTS

For general queries, please email iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk

BBSRC Office

Contact	Role	Email
Paul Reeves	Coordination and management	paul.reeves@bbsrc.ac.uk
Rachel Obrike	Peer Review Delivery (ISPG)	rachel.obrike@bbsrc.ac.uk
Zahir Sachak	Finance (CCG, IDF)	zahir.sachak@bbsrc.ac.uk
Rachel Spencer	Coordination and management	rachel.spencer@bbsrc.ac.uk

BBSRC Science Group Institute Contacts

Institute	HoS contact point	Email
Institute of Food Research / Quadram Institute	Jef Grainger (food and health)	jef.grainger@bbsrc.ac.uk
	Colin Miles (industrial biotechnology)	colin.miles@bbsrc.ac.uk

Back to top

8. GLOSSARY

CCG   Core Capability Grant
Co-I   Co-Investigator
CV   Curriculum Vitae
FEC   Full Economic Cost
FTE   Full Time Equivalent
IAE   Institute Assessment Exercise
IAP   Institute Assessment Panel
IDF   Institute Development Fund
ISP   Institute Strategic Programme
ISPG   Institute Strategic Programme Grant
Je-S   Joint electronic Submission
KEC   Knowledge Exchange and Commercialisation
KECG   Knowledge Exchange and Commercialisation Grant
NCG   National Capability Grant
PESC   Public Engagement and Science Communication
PDF   Portable Document Format
PI   Principal Investigator
RCUK   Research Councils UK
SHRC   Strategic Human Resources Capabilities

Back to top

9. AMENDMENT HISTORY

Version	Revision Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
IAE 2016 v1.0	February 2016	CSPG	Original
IAE 2016 v2.0	March 2016	CPSG	**1. Introduction** 1.2 Institute Asssessment Process • Amended text on the IAE as a competitive process to indicate that this applies to ISPGs and CCGs, and that all assessment criteria will be considered by the IAP. **3. Core Capability Grant Guidelines** 3.4 Assessment criteria • Added text to indicate that the CCG will be assessed by the IAP. 3.5 Submission of CCG propoals • Detailed information and guidance on the CCG application form is now provided. **4. Institute Strategic Programme Grant Guidelines** 4.3 Submission of Full ISPG proposals • Submission details: Added requirement for ISPG titles to explicitly recognise BBSRC support. • Submission details: Included additional guidance on the 'How many hours a week the investigator will work on the project?' question. • Animal Use: Removed reference to supplementary information for non-human primates, dogs, cats and equidae. • Investigator Eligibility: Amended eligibility rules and employment criterion text. • Case for Support: Added text on impact beyond the UK to 'strategic and economic impact case' guidance. • Pathways to Impact: Added text on the importance of identifying clear objectives and specific timelines. • Pathways to Impact: Added text on impact beyond the UK. • Equipment: Included text to highlight that

Version	Revision Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
			RCUK will be introducing changes on how equipment is requested from 1 April 2016. • National Facilities: Amended text on access to national facilities. • Research Facilities / Existing Equipment: Added new section on access to other research facilities / existing equipment.
IAE 2017 v1.0	March 2017	CPSG	**General** • Amended text to reflect that only a single institute is participating in the 2017 IAE • Amended text to reflect that the funding package will be for four years rather than five years. • Amended text to indicate 2017 submission dates • Amended text on recommended typefaces to be used in application **1. Introduction** 1.2 Institute Asssessment Process • Added text regarding the alignment of the IAE process to other BBSRC funding mechanisms • Amended text on the competitive nature of the process to indicate that the proposals from QI will be considered alongside those from Institutes that participated in the 2016 IAE. • Amended text on the provision of feedback to Institutes following the IAP meeting to reflect the process followed in 2016 **2. Director's Statement** 2.1 Background • Removed text indicating that the Director's Statement would be provided to reviwers. The Director's Statement will be provided to the IAP, but not to ISPG proposal reviewers. • Added text to clarify that URLs should not be included within the Director's Statement

Version	Revision Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
			2.2 Submission of Director's Statement • Financial summary: Added text highlighting the requirement to include any funding awarded as part of the 2016 IAE within the financial summary table. • Financial summary: Added text indicating that the institute should develop its proposals to absorb any inflationary pressures that might arise over the funding period. **3. Core Capability Grant Guidelines** 3.1 Background • Amended text to indicate that the core capability is to support BBSRC's investment in the ISPGs 3.2 Definitions • Amended definition of core capability. • Added definition of non-core capability • Added text describing the role of the CCG in supporting core capability and national capability. 3.5 Submission of CCG proposals • Animal Use: added reference to section 4.3.1 which provides additional guidance for completing this section for large programmes of work • Business case: Amended text to clarify that the case should identify how any spare capacity in the core capability will underpin other research at the institute. • Justification of Resources: Added information on requesting support for Open Access costs. • Additional information on national capabilities and other wider capabilities: clarified that the maximum page limits relate to the financial support requested over the four year funding period. • Pathways to Impact: Added text to indicate that the Institute should identify specific deliverables and activities associated with any elements of national capability. • Financing schedules: BBSRC contact

Version	Revision Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
			for queries has been changed.
			3.6 Format for Written Submissions
			• Amended text on the recommended typeface to be used in the application.
			4. Institute Strategic Programme Grant Guidelines
			4.2 Assessment Criteria
			• Added text to clarify that ISPG proposals should represent a self-contained programme of work and that ISPG objectives should not be dependent on uplift funding.
			4.3 Submission of Full ISPG Proposals
			• Resources: included additional guidance about support for Group Leader salary costs.
			• Animal Use: added text to provide additional guidance for completing this section for large programmes of work.
			• Joint applications with other institutes and / or HEIs: added text to clarify that costs for partner components should be listed at 100% FEC, but will normally be paid at 80% FEC.
			• Case for Support: added text on the use of URLs / hyperlinks for publication references.
			• Justification of Resources: Added information on requesting support for Open Access costs.
			• Pathways to Impact: added text to indicate that applicants should request and justify project-specific resources needed to achieve the PtI.
			• Pathways to Impact: added text to emphasise that PtI activities should be project specific and conducted by the people working on the ISPG during the grant period.
			• CVs: Expanded text about how the IAP will take into account career breaks and flexible working.
			• Equipment: amended hyperlink to RCUK website.

Version	Revision Date	Author(s)	Summary of Changes
			4.4 Format for Written Submissions • Amended text on the recommended typeface to be used in the application. 4.5 Assessment of Full Proposals • Amended text to indicate that reviewers will not receive the Director's Statement. **6. IAE 2017 Timetable** • Added a new section to provide an overview of the IAE 2017 timetable. **7. Key contacts** • Changed the contact e-mail for general queries to iae2017@bbsrc.ac.uk • Amended list of BBSRC Office contacts

Back to top