2022 Bioinformatics and Biological Resources Fund – Call Guidance

Background

The Bioinformatics and Biological Resources (BBR) Fund aims to facilitate the establishment, maintenance and enhancement of high-quality bioinformatics and biological resources to support the UK bioscience research community.

Applicants can apply for up to £2m (100% fEC) over 5 years. The indicative budget for the call is up to £6M, subject to the quality of proposals received. Please note that all proposals must have a start date no earlier than 1 July 2023.

In addition to following the guidance below on the required documentation for the 2022 BBR (22BBR) call, we would encourage all applicants to refer to the full assessment criteria when preparing their proposal. In addition to this call guidance, applicants should also refer to the Je-S Handbook and BBSRC Grants Guidance when preparing a proposal.

It is expected that all submitted proposals are fully self-contained, including all relevant information that would allow reviewers and panellists to make a thorough assessment. Applicants are strongly encouraged to ensure their proposal is written in an accessible manner. While reviewers are selected to be as close to the subject matter as possible, the panel is tasked with assessing proposals through a broader strategic lens and is by design less familiar with community nuances.

Required documents

In addition to the completed Je-S proposal form your submission should include the following attachments. All documents need to be submitted as a pdf.

Attachment	Max. page length (A4)	Guidance
Case for support	8 pages	See below
Letters of Support - Demand and Collaborative	2 pages per letter, maximum of 10 letters total.	Letters of support demonstrating community need are **mandatory**, at the time of submission, and proposals submitted without these letters will be rejected prior to assessment. Letters demonstrating community need should give an indication of community demand for the resource in question, demonstrating the breadth of research and the high-quality science relevant to BBSRCs remit that the resource would underpin. **A maximum of 10 letters of support demonstrating community demand** should be provided. BBSRC expects letters of support aimed at demonstrating demand to clearly explain the impact and benefit of the proposed resource on the writer's research and the associated community and if possible where this research has demonstrated particular scientific, economic or societal impact.

		Letters of support that fail to do so, in particular template letters indicating generic support without identifying a particular usage, are of negligible value for the assessment and should not be submitted. Carefully chosen letters containing relevant evidence of the requirement/ benefit to be gained, are of greater value than large numbers of letters.
		'Collaborative' letters of support should be provided by collaborators who will provide expertise or resources necessary for the proposed work. These also include letters of support provided by industry partners. Any number of these may be provided as necessary.
		The separate letters of support and a tabulated summary of those letters should be collated and provided as one **single** pdf document. Please ensure that all letters of support are on headed paper, and that they are signed and dated within 6 months of the date of submission of the proposal.
Justification of Resources	2 pages	All resources requested (directly incurred, directly allocated, staff costs for Research Technical Professionals and Research Software Engineers, PI and Co-I time) must be fully justified.
		Items that would ordinarily be found in a department, for example non-specialist computers, should include justification both for why they are required for the project and why they cannot be provided from the research organisation's own resources (including funding from indirect costs from grants).
		For proposals where access to Research Council Facilities is required, please ensure you follow the [relevant guidance for BBSRC found on Je-S](#).
Data Management Plan	3 pages	In response to the recent [BBSRC Review of Data-Intensive Bioscience](#), to help contribute towards making data FAIR, and following a successful trial in 2021 BBR, BBSRC is continuing to use a 'data management plan (DMP) template' as part of the 2022 BBR funding opportunity.
		The DMP offers a mechanism to: ● enhance data sharing practices ● emphasise the need to develop and support relevant digital skills ● encourage planning for data storage infrastructure.
		A dedicated DMP is required to ensure proposals describe their data management processes in adequate detail, allowing assessors to fully understand: ● how data is managed, documented or curated ● the project's approach to data sharing and access ● who the responsible persons for data management activities are.
		Please refer to the DMP template, available for download on the 22BBR funding finder page, for further information.

		Please also refer to the BBSRC website for our [Data Sharing Policy](#). We recommend consulting the Software Sustainability Institute website for guidance on [software management](#) and the ELIXIR [Research Data Management Kit (RDMkit)](#) online guide for advice on good data management practices.
Diagrammatic Work Plan	1 page	A diagrammatic Gantt chart outlining the key steps to be taken and milestones to be reached to realise the project outcomes as described in the Case for Support. Where the resource is part of a larger project, a meta-resource or network it may be helpful to include the interactions within the Diagrammatic Work Plan or within the Management Structure where appropriate (see below).
Management structure	1 page	A diagrammatic overview of how the project management and scientific advisory functions will operate. This may include the interactions with a wider project, other resources, or networks as appropriate. The proposed membership of the Scientific Advisory Board should be listed. Please use attachment type 'other attachment'.
Team Résumé for Research and Innovation		Maximum 3 pages, excluding additions. Please use the provided template, available for download on the 22BBR funding finder page. Please use attachment type 'C.V.'. 22BBR specific guidance for the Team R4RI can be found [below](#).
Proposal cover letter + Eligibility Confirmation	Variable	This cover letter should contain an Eligibility Confirmation statement from a suitably senior stakeholder (e.g. Director level or above), confirming that the applicants: • are at least lecturer level or equivalent • will abide by the [standard UKRI terms and conditions of grant](#) • have contracts that exceed the end of the grant period, where any exceptions are explained in full. Applicants should also indicate whether they are applying for funding to support an existing or new resource. Applicants' conflicts of interest will also need to be added to the Proposal Cover Letter. Please refer to the [UKRI Declaration of Interests: Applicants](#) for further guidance.

Case for Support (maximum of 8 sides of A4)

The Case for Support should be a self-contained description of the proposed resource, with detailed descriptions of necessary changes and upgrades that are needed to be supported by this proposal. It should include the following information, but these do not indicate mandatory sections within the case. You should choose the most appropriate structure, whilst incorporating all relevant information.

Areas to cover	Details
Background to the Resource	Introduction of the proposed resource, including its academic and wider economic and societal context. Overview of past and current resource(s) in the subject area in both the UK and abroad, including any alternative community resources currently available. You should indicate the community size of the intended resource and how this relates to the field in which it operates.
Details of Resource	The case for support should outline the full details of the resource and associated work packages presented in the proposal. - Indication whether the project proposed is to develop a new resource or is in support of an existing one. - Objectives for the proposal should be detailed including individual measurable targets against which the outcome of the work will be assessed. This should refer to the objectives set out in the Je-S proposal form. - Significant technical details for the development, maintenance or enhancement of the resource must be clearly outlined and indicated how this is of internationally exceptional quality. - If applicable, outline any proposed research efforts and how they directly facilitate development of the resource. - For proposals looking to focus on maintaining status quo for an existing resource instead of suggesting further development, you should detail evidence of why significant upgrades are not required at this time and detail why the resource needs continued support to maintain world-leading functionality. Additional questions that may be considered: - Does the facility begin or continue to support a growing field of bioscience, what is the anticipated growth and does the proposal adequately accommodate this? - How will the resource accelerate science within its field and beyond? - What would be the impact on the scientific community if the resource did not exist? How would this impact other, possibly dependent resources?
Community Demand	Evidence of community demand should be primarily driven from **UK academic** researchers working largely within BBSRC remit – see our [BBSRC Strategic Delivery Plan](#) for more detail on research areas covered by BBSRC. Demand from other users (such as academic communities outside of BBSRC remit or industrial users) may be appropriate to provide additional support,

	especially in highlighting the potential for economic, commercial or societal impact, but should not be the focus of the demand demonstration.
	Evidence provided should highlight examples of the high-quality science that the resource will underpin or has underpinned. Where possible and relevant, examples should be drawn from a wide research community to illustrate the broad impact of the resource to support high-quality internationally excellent science.
	The level of community demand should be benchmarked against other relevant resources and/or the size of the community. This will allow the fair assessment of resources with different user bases. The types of evidence that may be appropriate to provide will be different for new and existing resources.
	Evidence of wider consultation of the prospective community (e.g. community surveys) is encouraged.

	New Resources	**Existing Resources**
	New resources should estimate the number of researchers who may engage and benefit from the resource. Evidence, where possible, would be of benefit and may include: • Datasets (or samples) in public or private repositories • Citations or acknowledgments • Gap analysis with existing resources • Pilot project uptake or feedback from potential users. In particular, proposals for new resources should have consulted their prospective community **prior** to proposal.	For existing resources this should include usage data of the current resource. Data types may include: • Access requests from independent users/ sites • Citations or acknowledgements • Other public resources providing links to the resource • New major acquisitions captured by the resource Additionally, existing resources need to evidence why this resource needs to be maintained/updated by the current grant. This could include: • Survey data from users on what upgrades are needed Evidence of an expanding user base, which requires additional resource • Recent developments in the field, which require upgrades to be integrated into the resource.

User engagement	Discussion of user engagement provision should aim to answer the following questions: • Is there awareness of the resource within the user community? • How do you plan to develop the engagement strategy within the proposal timeframe to establish or expand user engagement? • How have access mechanisms to ensure usability of the resource been considered? • How have user needs been incorporated into this proposal to ensure it is fit for purpose and will deliver on expectations?

	New Resources Evidence should be provided as to how the resource **plans** to engage stakeholders and ensure that the resource meets their needs and is used by the community targeted by the resource.	**Existing Resources** Evidence should be provided as to whether the resource has **achieved** the level of engagement it originally anticipated, and consideration is given how the additional investment would change this.
Resource Management	To complement the management structure document, proposals may outline how the resource management and advisory structures will operate including outlining any review procedures. Additionally, plans for staff training and support to ensure their continuous development should be identified to safeguard the successful delivery of the resource.	
Long term sustainability planning	The case for support should outline considerations for the long-term sustainability of the resource beyond BBSRC funding, as well as the true cost of running and maintaining the resource in question. The proposal should include: • The level of support the resource is projected to require for expected maintenance and/or subsequent maturation/enhancement activities. • Cost recovery plans, where appropriate, or an explanation why cost recovery is not viable. Evidence of clear business planning with a focus on at least partial cost recovery is required, especially when applying as an existing resource. • Details for alternative support plans, aside from BBSRC funding. Clear arguments as to why BBSRC should support the resource now should be provided if other cost recovery and support plans are deemed unsuitable.	
Potential for economic and societal impact	Outline how the outputs of the proposed resource will contribute to knowledge and how this may have the potential for economic return or societal benefits. Impact activities should be integrated into appropriate sections of the case for support. • All proposals are expected to demonstrate clear plans with recorded milestones and timelines for associated activities to develop economic, commercial and societal impacts. • Methods of engagement and measures of success should be outlined including how these will be regularly reviewed throughout the project in order to deliver the most impact. • Any planned activities should be fully justified within the Justification of Resources attachment.	

Why R4RI for BBR?

Successful delivery of BBR proposals rely on effective team science to deliver state-of-the-art resources, with the Résumé for Researchers & Innovation (R4RI) approach designed to bring out the benefits of team science more clearly than traditional CVs. Based on the Royal Society's Résumé for Researchers (R4R), the R4R-like format will allow people working across the research and innovation sector to evidence a wider range of activities and contributions critical for effective team science and resource creation.

We request a single, combined "Team R4RI" for 22BBR. For inspiration as to what team science can look like in practice, please see recent case studies such as the narrative behind a new BBSRC strategic longer and larger (sLoLa) project and [why its ambitions can only be realised through team science](#).

R4RI will ultimately replace current varied formats and guidance with a single approach when you apply for funding whilst reducing bureaucracy. Piloting a Team R4RI approach in 22BBR allows both UKRI and the bioinformatics and biological resource community to explore an approach that allows the assessment of proposals in a more inclusive and supportive research and innovation culture. We will seek applicant feedback on the use of R4RI through a survey in due course.

Instead of submitting a traditional academic CV, we invite applicants to 22BBR to submit a single combined document using the R4RI template. This should act as a cohesive narrative which showcases how the relevant experience and expertise within the team, as well as the institutional environment(s) in which the research will take place demonstrates the team's collective capability to deliver the proposed BBR project. Use of the template is mandatory.

R4RI is designed to be flexible. Like a case for support, your Team R4RI should be unique to you and to the funding opportunity. **A Team R4RI which simply lists past positions, publications, and funding will not adequately support a proposal**.

Background to R4RI

UKRI committed to adopting a narrative CV based on the Royal Society's Résumé for Researchers (R4R) for all funding opportunities requiring track record information in April 2021. We officially launched R4RI in December 2021 and will be rolling out the format across UKRI throughout 2022 and 2023. R4RI is one part of a wider ambition to create a more inclusive and supportive research and innovation culture.

Traditional academic CVs are often narrowly focused and tend to include limited information beyond education history, publications and successful funding. R4RI should be thought of as halfway between a CV and a cover letter, providing space to explain the proposal-specific context of your achievements.

R4RI gives applicants the opportunity to:

- showcase the many other contributions they make to the research and innovation community
- highlight essential skills, such as managing teams or collaborations, as well as outputs.

The format also allows better description of varied career paths, reduces focus on continuous productivity and enables a greater diversity of people to be recognised.

Applicants are able to put their skills and experience in context to aid reviewers or panel members who may be unfamiliar with the discipline or sector to understand the significance and impact.

Team Composition and Team Science:

Teams should draw on the breadth of expertise available within the UK. Typically, this may span several departments and research organisations.

Teams can include researchers at a variety of career stages. Fellows, technical staff, and postdoctoral scientists who are not eligible to apply as a co-investigator can be included as researcher co-investigators where they play a distinctive role.

Teams should identify any recent professional development, plans for mentoring or shared responsibilities (for example, co-principal investigators) that will enhance the effectiveness of their leadership. Dedicated project management support can also be incorporated into proposals.

You should consider the expectations laid out in the [Concordat to Support the Career Development of Researchers](#), to which BBSRC is a signatory.

Teams should describe only a selection of their past contributions that are relevant to this funding opportunity and best evidence their ability to deliver the proposed project. Individual's specific achievements can be highlighted where appropriate, but together the contributions described across the modules should demonstrate the appropriateness of the team as a collective whole.

What to include:

Applicants should draw on a breadth of examples which illustrate how they have contributed to new ideas, hypotheses and tools, as well as how they have contributed to teams and collaborations, the research community, and to wider society. **Applicants should describe only a selection of their outputs and, in each case, clearly explain the relevance to their ability to deliver the proposed project.**

For 22BBR, we expect that a single, combined "Team R4RI" is submitted per BBR proposal, with a **maximum of 3 pages per proposal excluding Additions and the Team Composition Table.**

Applicants should prioritise the selection of the most relevant exemplars according to each section described in the template and make it clear how these relate to the capability to deliver the proposed BBR programme of work. In the Team composition table, it should be made clear how each individual is contributing to deliver the proposed BBR project. Within other sections, there is no need to provide information for every team member. Where applicable, the narrative should highlight how applicants have worked together and delivered key outcomes in current or prior collaborative projects.

Information that **must not** be included:

- Detailed biographical information such as prior positions held, length of employment
- Extensive lists of publications (you may link to ORCID and/or Gateway to Research profiles in the team composition table if you wish)
- Journal-based metrics such as impact factors, H-index, or other surrogate measures of an applicant's outputs
- Pictures of applicants

<u>Team Composition Table</u>

Previously for BBR, track record information was included in the Case for Support, delineating the specific role of each applicant and collaborator in the project. This information should now instead be woven into the project specific Team R4RI, using the Team Composition table to provide a short description of an individual's specific role within the project, freeing up space in the case for support document.

You are encouraged to include the following information within the team composition table for each applicant:

- Their scientific contributions to the BBR project, e.g. research field and specialist knowledge, experience, technical and data analysis expertise
- Their role and responsibilities, e.g. managerial, leadership, technical, administrative, mentoring oriented
- References to specific work packages are recommended
- Highlight where applicants will work collaboratively to deliver specific project requirements
- Include clear time commitments for each applicant

The Team Composition Table is the only section of the R4RI which requires a section on every individual who would previously have been expected to provide a CV in a traditional proposal. Team members should only be referenced in the four modules where relevant – there is no expectation that each team member is referenced in every section.

The Team Composition Table does not count towards any page or character limits. However, it is expected that the information within the table is kept concise, project specific, and does not reference past outputs (which should be referenced in the four modules as appropriate)

<u>The four modules:</u>

The four modules are designed to make you think about the breadth of your experience in the context of your proposal. You can include as much information as you like within each module (or leave modules blank), so long as it follows the <u>format requirements</u>.

For each module, the relevance to delivering the proposed project should be summarised. There is no expectation every team member is included in each module. The R4RI is assessed as a whole and therefore it is of no consequence which heading you include a piece of evidence under; the modules are simply designed to help you consider all aspects of your work. The balance of information across the four modules within the overall module section limit of 3 pages is entirely flexible.

Please note: <u>the examples below the individual modules are not an exhaustive list but are intended to give some steer as to the type of information that could be included.</u> The content for your proposal specific R4RI can be significantly different from the examples provided, as long as it adheres to principles of R4RI outlined in this guidance and is relevant to your BBR proposal.

Module 1 – Contributions to the generation of new ideas, tools, methodologies or knowledge
Evidence of contributions to ideas, tools, methodologies or knowledge in fields both within and complementary to your proposed resource area are encouraged. Examples might include: contributions to and skills acquired from past research projects, and key outputs such as data sets, software, and research and policy publications.

The most relevant examples are likely to relate to previous work related to the proposed BBR project.

Module 2 – The development of others and maintenance of effective working relationships

Examples might include: project management, supervision, mentoring or line management contributions critical to the success of a team or team members, or where you exerted strategic leadership in shaping the direction of a team, organisation, company or institution.

Examples provided should evidence the team's collective capability to lead and manage the proposed BBR project

Module 3 – Contributions to the wider research and innovation community

Examples might include: working across disciplines, institutions, and/or countries, commitments such as editing, reviewing and committee work, positions of responsibility, aiding improvement of research integrity or culture, or strategic leadership in influencing a research agenda.

In particular, evidence of contributions to wider collaborations and networks and community resources are particularly relevant for BBR.

Module 4 – Contributions to broader research/innovation-users and audiences and towards wider societal benefit

Examples might include: engagement across the public and / or private sectors or with the wider public, past research which has contributed to policy development or public understanding, and other impacts across research, policy, practice and business, and other examples of and how you have ensured your research reaches and influences relevant audiences.

Examples particularly relevant for BBR projects could include evidence of contributions to wider collaborations and networks; establishment of community resources; contributions to the improvement of research culture including equality, diversity and inclusion practices; and commitments such as editing, reviewing and committees.

Additions:

This section may include any additional relevant information you wish to include in support of your collective capability to deliver the proposed BBR project. Information relating to periods that may have impacted team members such as career breaks, secondments, part time work or career disruptions (e.g. caused by the COVID-19 pandemic or otherwise) can be included here. An explanation of the specific circumstances that have caused disruption of outputs or affected career progression is not required, however, any relevant details you wish panel members to consider in their assessment of the proposal may be included here. The contribution of collaborators, project partners and sub-contractors can be elaborated upon here if relevant. Note this section is entirely optional and can be left blank.

Please note: This section does not count towards the page limit, and must not be used to describe additional skills, experiences or outputs. Doing so may result in your proposal being rejected.

Team R4RI and Assessment

Your Team R4RI is used to inform the assessment of the proposal overall and will not be viewed in isolation. Assessors will never be asked to score individual modules. Your Team R4RI will form part of the proposal documentation and will be used to support your application in showing how your skills and experience make you the best person (or team) to carry out the proposed project. It is not an assessment of your writing or language skills.

Team R4RI facilitates an assessment process that is not, intentionally or otherwise, based on metrics (numbers of publications, impact factors, amounts of past funding, etc.), reducing focus on lists and quantity of outputs, and increases focus on quality of outputs, in line with UKRI's commitment to DORA and to Responsible Research Assessment (PDF, 55KB).

Team R4RI and eligibility:

Eligibility should be confirmed prior to including an applicant in the Team R4RI. Please see guidance above as to how to include an Eligibility Confirmation statement in your cover letter.

Formatting and submitting your Team R4RI

The Team Résumé for Research and Innovation should be organised into the sections provided in the template and must not exceed **3 pages of A4 in total**, excluding additions and the Team Composition Table. Publication references within the application should be provided as Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) wherever possible, aligned with UKRI's commitment to the principles of DORA. External links are **not** permitted, with the exception of ORCID/Gateway to Research profiles and DOIs.

At a minimum, font size 11 in Arial or other sans serif typeface of equivalent size must be used with a minimum of single line and standard character spacing. Page margins should be no less than 2 cm.

The Team Résumé for Research and Innovation should be submitted using the 'C.V.' attachment type descriptor. The amount of information provided within each section may vary depending on the requirements of the proposed project and the relevant skills and experience of each applicant. Guidance notes on how to approach each module can be found below.

Sharing of information:

Your completed R4RI will be seen by both reviewers and panel members and won't be anonymised. It will be treated in the same way as traditional CVs and shared with UKRI colleagues for evaluation purposes.

All personal data provided to UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) in connection to funding applications will be processed in accordance with current UK data protection legislation and the EU General Data Protection Regulations 2016/679(GDPR) where appropriate.

Find out more about how we use information provided in research funding applications (PDF, 121KB).

Further information on how we use personal data, and how you can exercise your rights as a data subject, can be found in the UKRI privacy notice.

Contact

Please provide as much information as possible in your email to ensure a rapid response.

For call-specific queries please contact: bbr.fund@bbsrc.ukri.org

For Je-S system queries please contact:

- Email: JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk
- Tel: +44 (0) 1793 44 4164