

## CRCRM Round 2 Call Webinars (5 and 11 September 2024) Q&A document

[Interdisciplinarity](#)  
[Scope](#)  
[Eligibility](#)  
[Resubmissions](#)

[Application process](#)  
[Finances/ costings](#)  
[Project partners](#)  
[Assessment process](#)

[Interdisciplinary Assessment college](#)  
[Developing Collaborations](#)  
[General scheme and Future of CRCRM](#)  
[EDI and demand management](#)

	<b>Interdisciplinarity</b>	<b>Answer</b>
1.	I do not think the distinction between transdisciplinary and interdisciplinary is clear. Can you speak to this?	Transdisciplinary research is working with organisations outside an academic research institution i.e. applications involving non-academic partners such as business, policy makers etc. Applications that are both interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary are eligible but applications that are only transdisciplinary are not eligible.
2.	Maybe also be worth talking about cross disciplinary research as it might help emphasize that all disciplines are needed for the project and are equal, i.e. no 'service' disciplines that add value to a project but are not 'equal'. Just a suggestion.	Cross-disciplinary research can be seen as linking disciplines, not integrating disciplines, but some people do use the term it to mean interdisciplinary research. You should refer to the definitions outlined in the call text based on the REF Interdisciplinary Assessment Panel when considering whether your application is eligible to the call.
3.	How would you judge how applicants balance the tension between recruitment issues for genuinely interdisciplinary researchers onto ambitious programmes of work and the need to develop researchers to become interdisciplinary from well-defined WPs within an overall interdisciplinary application?	If you're recruiting a team, they don't necessarily have to already be interdisciplinary. That is part of your role as the project leads to develop researchers in interdisciplinary approaches and expose them to working with other disciplines. It is really important to have a plan for how you might do that and make this clear in your application.
4.	Will all UKRI funders adopt the apparently clearer definitions of interdisciplinarity etc et al? Multiplicity of terminology confounds the researcher community.	Through this scheme UKRI has developed a clearer definition of interdisciplinary research based on the REF 2021 Interdisciplinary Assessment Panel definition and advice from interdisciplinary experts in the research community. The IRM team is now sharing this learning across UKRI which should lead to a harmonised use of terminology.
5.	If a project requires interdisciplinarity to succeed and address an outlined challenge – but is using already established approaches to interdisciplinarity to do so – is that sufficient? In other words, does a proposal also have to demonstrate novelty or originality in how they are being interdisciplinary?	The research needs to be novel and needs to be interdisciplinary i.e. applications have to demonstrate that the disciplines are genuinely integrated, and that there are reciprocal benefits for the different disciplines involved. However, the interdisciplinary approach does not need to be novel.

6.	<p>If a project requires interdisciplinarity to succeed and address an outlined challenge – but is using already established approaches to interdisciplinarity to do so – is that sufficient? In other words, does a proposal also have to demonstrate novelty or originality in how they are being interdisciplinary?</p>	<p>The research needs to be novel and needs to be interdisciplinary i.e. applications have to demonstrate that the disciplines are genuinely integrated, and that there are reciprocal benefits for the different disciplines involved. However, the interdisciplinary approach does not need to be novel.</p>
7.	<p>Often interdisciplinary integrated working methods are not well established or worth interrogating - especially across STEM and HASS. Is there space in the description of integration to enable experimentation with new methods - which might not work out? What is UKRI's attitude to risk in this domain?</p> <p>Interdisciplinary research is sometimes viewed as more risky, in case the attempted integration between disciplines fails to take place effectively or is resisted/contested by the related disciplines. However, it can also result in major steps forward. Would you say this scheme has a higher appetite for risk and reward than single-council responsive mode schemes?</p>	<p>We expect these interdisciplinary research projects to bring together different disciplines to develop new methodologies to approach a research question or challenge. Through the CRCRM scheme we wish to unlock new research, new approaches or new methods that would not emerge from established disciplinary thinking and we encourage speculative, early-stage and high potential interdisciplinary research proposals, embracing new concepts, techniques, or technologies.</p> <p>UKRI recognises that this speculative research will come with some risks. In the full stage <a href="#">generalised feedback</a> the Panels found that in the strongest proposals risks were clearly identified and had good mitigation plans in place.</p>
8.	<p>If a project requires interdisciplinarity to succeed and address an outlined challenge – but is using already established approaches to interdisciplinarity to do so – is that sufficient? In other words, does a proposal also have to demonstrate novelty or originality in how they are being interdisciplinary?</p>	<p>The research needs to be novel and needs to be interdisciplinary i.e. applications have to demonstrate that the disciplines are genuinely integrated, and that there are reciprocal benefits for the different disciplines involved. However, the interdisciplinary approach does not need to be novel.</p>
9.	<p>How do you apply for a multidisciplinary cross-council grant? Is it simply by standard responsive mode scheme? If so, how do we take leverage that this bid should be assessed under cross-council agreement? In TFS, is there a provision to indicate that? Please explain. thanks.</p>	<p>Please see advice on the UKRI website here for the <a href="#">Cross Council Remit Agreement</a></p>

10.	<p>If my research is interdisciplinary as it could fit in 2 different research councils equally and I draw from these disciplines' research, would that be interdisciplinary or does the team need to be built from different research schools effectively?</p>	<p>There are no expectations on how teams are configured in terms of spread of disciplines across team members. Teams may comprise of a team of a Project Lead and multiple Co-Leads, or one interdisciplinary Project Lead.</p> <p>The research project has to cross 2 council remit boundaries and has to be interdisciplinary (i.e. integration of the disciplines, all disciplines involved in the creation of the project and reciprocal benefits to each of the disciplines). Just because research could fit into 2 different councils does not necessarily make it interdisciplinary – it could be multidisciplinary. Some council remit areas overlap with each other with some research areas that are covered by 2 councils and therefore may not fit the scope of covering 2 council remits. There are links to all council remit areas on this page <a href="https://www.ukri.org/apply-for-funding/how-to-apply/preparing-to-make-a-funding-application/if-your-research-spans-different-disciplines/">https://www.ukri.org/apply-for-funding/how-to-apply/preparing-to-make-a-funding-application/if-your-research-spans-different-disciplines/</a></p>
11.	<p>Does integration refer to that of the disciplines (i.e. concepts, outcomes, methods, etc.) or also of the researchers' contributions? Also, in the context of demonstrating interdisciplinarity do various sections (for example fit &amp; vision) have partly overlapping content?</p>	<p>Yes, integration refers to integrating the disciplines. That's the difference between interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research. You need to demonstrate that the concepts and your methods are in some way integrated.</p> <p>There is a specific question on how your project fits the scheme in terms of the interdisciplinary approach which makes it easier for applicants to really articulate the interdisciplinary nature of their research, and it also gives the assessors a really clear idea of how your application fits to the scheme, but the interdisciplinary nature of your project should be evident throughout the whole proposal.</p>
<b>Scope</b>		
12.	<p>How do you assess whether a discipline participates on more than 10% of the project please?</p> <p>How is the 10% part of the second discipline defined? Is this the amount of people involved? NB: some disciplines might have more labour-intensive contributions.</p>	<p>The council subject matter experts will assess how much each subject is involved. It will be assessed on the contribution to the work packages/ research activities and not the number of individuals from that discipline. If you would like to discuss this with UKRI we recommend contacting the Council remit query mailboxes for advice. The contact details can be found via the <a href="#">Cross Council Remit Agreement</a> webpage.</p>
13.	<p>Please can you clarify the difference between something that would be funded under the cross-council remit agreement (thus out of scope) and what would be funded under this call - if a project is 10% ESRC and 90% NERC, I would have expected this to be able to be funded under the cross council agreement with NERC as the lead council, and therefore out of scope for this call, but you have explicitly said in the scope slide that this will be in scope.</p>	<p>For this scheme we expect a second discipline from a different research council to be a minimum 10%, a second research council. If the project is interdisciplinary and spans at least 2 research council remits with a minimum 10% from a second research council, then it is eligible for this scheme.</p> <p>In the example that you've given, it could go to either this scheme or to NERC under the Cross Council remit agreement. The question is whether the project is interdisciplinary.</p> <p>If it's interdisciplinary, you'll be eligible for this scheme, but if it is more multidisciplinary then it should go to NERC under the Cross Council remit agreement. You would need to decide whether it fits this scheme in terms of interdisciplinarity.</p>

		<p>What we're trying to do with this scheme is mitigate those challenges of assessing research where disciplines are really integrated, and there might be differences in the approaches taken that mean it would make traditional external peer review difficult and or unfair.</p> <p>There may be some projects where they could be suitable for both, but applicants need to decide which scheme is best to actually submit it to, taking into account the assessment process.</p>
14.	<p>You say that “IDR with disciplines from 2 or more research councils” is in scope, yet some of our “disciplines” are themselves from two or more councils. For example, their discipline might typically be considered ESRC territory, but they regularly draw on MRC and NERC data and are seeking to address MRC and NERC themed issues. What disciplinary area is this in, therefore?</p> <p><b>Follow up:</b> You say they’re definitely ESRC, which makes sense. However, if they’re aiming to address MRC and NERC problems, which ESRC panel members will not necessarily be aware of, how will the assessment work in that regard? And should we state which topic/problem areas we are focusing on, even though we may not be involving researchers from those areas?</p>	<p>In this example it would need to go to ESRC as the research itself all falls within ESRC even through its using data from MRC and NERC remit areas. They might have some people that they are consulting with and advising on that data. But the research actually being undertaken is ESRC. As outlined in the presentation you need to consider the scope of the research that is being undertaken not just the expertise that is involved in the project.</p> <p>Is the research challenge and the research you're doing spanning 2 different research councils?</p> <p>In terms of the challenge areas you are addressing with your research again unless the research spans the remits of 2 research councils it should be going to ESRC.</p> <p>If you have concerns about how your application will be reviewed by ESRC panel members please contact the ESRC remit team. The contact details can be found via the <a href="#">Cross Council Remit Agreement</a> webpage.</p>
15.	<p>Where a project spans 3 councils equally, how will UKRI deal with this in allocating to an interface panel at the full proposal stage? given that interface panels are all 2 research domains combined won't this necessarily disadvantage the third discipline not in one of these two areas?</p> <p>Why isn't there a cross-council pair between the BBSRC and NERC? Is an interdisciplinary research spans between biosciences and environmental sciences eligible?</p>	<p>We use interfaces between 5 research domains to make up the assessment panels. The research domains align closely with but not directly to the research council remit boundaries. This is because we want the assessment process to be agnostic of the research council boundaries and not siloed by them. It is possible to cross 2 council remits but still be within 1 research domain. When we talk about what is in and out of scope and crossing research council boundaries applications have to cross the boundaries of 2 research councils and not 2 research domains.</p> <p>Applications could span 3 research councils but only 2 research domains e.g. EPSRC, STFC (both in EPS domain) and MRC (in the BIOM domain).</p> <p>When projects span more than 2 research domains the UKRI team will review the application and allocate it to the panel that has the best fit. Your application will be assessed by IAC members with appropriate and relevant expertise. The IAC members</p>

		<p>work flexibly across the panels and the panel membership will vary each round depending on the applications that are submitted.</p> <p>Earth, Environment and Biological Sciences (EEB) - Includes the remits of NERC and some of BBSRC research areas of plant sciences, agriculture, aquaculture and animal research, as well as biotechnologies and tools that are relevant to these research areas would be included in this research domain. Some research areas funded through EPSRC energy, circular economy and advanced materials themes could also fit under this research domain.</p> <p>The BIOM research domain includes the remits of MRC and some of BBSRC research areas relating to human health including biotechnologies and tools that are relevant to these research areas would be included in this research domain. Some research areas funded through EPSRC healthcare technologies and advanced materials themes could also fit under this research domain.</p> <p>Further information on the all research domains and how they relate to the research council remits is in the <a href="#">CRCRM round two: guidance for applicants and research organisations document (PDF, 826KB)</a></p>
16.	The call guidance states that the scheme “support projects that span at least two research council disciplinary remits” but are there any restrictions on the max. number of disciplines?	No, there is no maximum number of disciplines from different research councils that a project can span. However, you should take into account the advice from the outline assessment panels that says do not overcomplicate the project by unnecessarily involving disciplines from more research council remits. Just because the project covers more research council remits does not increase the quality of the interdisciplinary nature of the research.
17.	Are projects that address a single research question / initiative more like to receive funding, compared to projects with a broad scope of inquiry and a more exploratory approach?	The scheme is open to projects that are combining disciplines to create new approaches to a research question, or new methodologies or new ways of working. We are looking for projects that catalyse new interdisciplinary research through co-creation and design. Projects can be applied or fundamental research, and we encourage speculative, early-stage interdisciplinary research projects with high potential. However, the project will need to be focussed on a specific aim and have objectives that can be delivered within the duration of the grant.
18.	Why do you restrict these projects to a 2-year timeframe...? That puts significant pressures on delivering successful outcomes within a short period?	The decision on project length was taken balancing the budget constraints and funding a suitable number of proposals. As this is a pilot scheme, we want to ensure we can evaluate the scheme and feed recommendations from an evaluation in to funding allocations under the next spending review. We are therefore balancing the need to provide sufficient time for projects and the ability to evaluate it within a timely manner. For potential future rounds beyond Round 2, we are currently modelling what this

		scheme would look like as part of the standard UKRI portfolio of opportunities, including supporting longer grants.
19.	<p>Is it a requirement for the proposed project to realise its impact within the project's duration, or is it acceptable if the impact is anticipated to occur after the project has concluded? I ask because of the 2-year maximum duration to deliver the research because some projects require more time to realise the impact.</p>	<p>No, the full impact doesn't have to be realised within those 2 years. If you look at the full stage <a href="#">generalised feedback</a> the stronger proposals were able to articulate how this 2-year project fitted into a longer-term vision. Projects were not trying to be too overly ambitious but articulated how their project fitted into a longer-term plan.</p>
20.	<p>It seems there is a strong focus on impact and/or concrete deliverables that are used in the industry or the public. Does the scheme also support blue sky research?</p> <p>The examples of successful projects appear to reflect a strong focus on societal impact. How does the scheme view more fundamental, blue-sky research, with no clear applications? examples of successful applications were all very impact focused - how many 'blue skies'/conceptual projects (i.e. without obvious applications) were successful?</p> <p>The example of successful projects appear to reflect a strong focus on societal impact. How does the scheme view more fundamental, blue sky research, with no clear applications?</p>	<p>The scheme is open to a range of research along that the translation pipeline. We do want to see blue skies research coming in. The scheme encourages speculative, early-stage and high potential interdisciplinary research proposals, embracing new concepts, techniques, or technologies.</p> <p>The projects highlighted in the webinar are examples of more applied research projects and have clear societal impacts and benefits. That is a consequence of the fact that they were highlighted by the communications team in the press release and that tends to pick out applications with clearer societal and commercial impacts. More blue skies projects were funded as part of round 1 and these are all listed on the UKRI webpage <a href="#">here</a>.</p> <p>Feedback from the full stage panels is to make sure that you articulate what the impact of your project is. Now, that impact could be academic impacts such as new knowledge and/or new methodological approaches.</p>
21.	<p>Leverhulme Trust traditionally support interdisciplinary and blue skies projects that do not sit well within UKRI funding. I am curious why UKRI are apparently moving towards funding that is similar to Leverhulme? Can you clarify if this scheme has particular other objectives not shared by Leverhulme i.e. commercial application and impact?</p> <p>Leverhulme are much easier to apply to!</p>	<p>UKRI has implemented the CRCRM scheme in response to the <a href="#">2015 Nurse Review</a> and the <a href="#">2022 Grant Review</a> which identified a potential gap in UKRI funding for projects that significantly span the remits of different research council disciplines. In addition, the need to identify a lead research council and the difficulties in fairly assessing interdisciplinary research through traditional peer review can be barriers in applying for interdisciplinary research funding. The CRCRM scheme addresses both the gap in supporting research that significantly spans the remits of individual councils and the challenges of assessing interdisciplinary research.</p>

		<p>Both quantitative and qualitative evidence from the community received to date through our evaluation of the scheme demonstrate that there is clear demand from the research community for this funding opportunity (&gt;900 applications).</p> <p>With more of today's societal challenges requiring interdisciplinary approaches the demand for interdisciplinary research funding will undoubtedly increase.</p> <p>Leverhulme's website states that it will support research that crosses established disciplinary boundaries but excludes research on disease, illness and disabilities in humans and animals, or research that is intended to inform clinical practice or the development of medical applications. It offers funding for up to £500K for up to 5 years.</p> <p>Applicants are welcome to apply to the Leverhulme Trust if they prefer.</p>
22.	<p>I have a question about the projects funded in round 1: although they all sound very exciting and important, I don't quite understand why these projects (apart, perhaps, from the historical knowledge/ocean management project) would not be fundable by other routes. Please can you shed a bit more light on this? Thank you.</p> <p>Can you use the funded snake robot to demonstrate how it is CRCRM, rather than CCRA? From the brief description it sounds like it could have been led by EPSRC Healthcare Tech, through CCRA?</p> <p>The successful projects could have been funded by existing cross-councils either through responsive mode or challenge led calls- how was it decided that these projects couldn't be found a home in other councils</p> <p>Having seen the projects funded through R1, it is still not clear how some of them at least were not deemed fundable through other routes. (e.g. EPSRC's Healthcare Technologies remit; etc.?) Also, what would make a project one of the small number that would be suitable for both this funding</p>	<p>All the projects funded in round 1 spanned the remits of at least 2 research councils and are interdisciplinary, therefore are eligible for funding through this scheme.</p> <p>The University of Nottingham project led by Guru Aithal that combines a snake-like robot with wireless electrical-molecular signalling to tackle bile duct cancer spans the remits of EPSRC and MRC.</p> <p>UKRI funds excellent interdisciplinary research through our individual council responsive mode schemes as well as through UKRI's challenge led and strategic calls. This scheme will supplement and complement the outstanding interdisciplinary research supported through these existing programmes. There could be applications that could be supported through council responsive mode schemes, strategic funding opportunities or the CRCRM scheme.</p> <p>All the projects that have come through the CRCRM scheme span at least 2 council remits, and we have asked our colleagues across the councils as our subject matter experts to review the applications and they agreed that the applications going forward for assessment spanned 2 council remits. The awarded applications were also considered to be exceptional interdisciplinary research, and that makes them eligible for this scheme.</p> <p>It could be that an application awarded through the CRCRM scheme could have gone through the EPSRC under the healthcare technologies remit, as the given example in the question, but there is considerable overlap between EPSRC and MRC in this area. A very high-level overview of the projects was given and only by reading the full application would you fully understand the breadth of the remit areas covered and the interdisciplinary nature of the research.</p>



	opportunity and existing responsive mode schemes via the Cross-Council Remit Agreement?	<p>The CRCRM scheme assessment process has been designed specifically to assess interdisciplinary research using assessors with experience of interdisciplinary research and have been specifically trained to assess interdisciplinary research projects. This might be a factor when an applicant decides which funding opportunity to apply to.</p> <p>This funding opportunity is about ensuring there are no gaps in UKRI funding opportunities and that means there are now overlaps in our funding opportunities.</p>
23.	The call description suggests that proposals utilizing UKRI Facilities may be prioritized. Could you confirm if this is indeed the case?	Although UKRI Facility usage is available for projects, applications using facilities will not be prioritised or favoured during the assessment process.
24.	Does integration refer to that of the disciplines (i.e. concepts, outcomes, methods, etc.) or also of the researchers' contributions? Also, in the context of demonstrating interdisciplinarity do various sections (e.g. fit & vision) have partly overlapping content?	<p>Yes, integration refers to integrating the disciplines. That's the difference for us between interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. If you can demonstrate that the concepts and the way you do things. The methods are in some way integrated. That would be great. I'm not quite sure how that differentiates between the contributions of the researchers, because I would have thought they would be bringing their methods and approaches together to integrate that the various sections fit in vision. In terms of overlapping content, it's really about the disciplines. I mean, there will be some parts in there that you explain how you're actually going to do that. But in terms of the sections, they just have to form the narrative of how you're going to do what you're going to do.</p> <p>In round one, we didn't have a fit to scheme section. We only had the vision and approach. We've now added this sort of fit to scheme section so that it's easier for applicants to really articulate the interdisciplinary nature of their research, and it also gives the assessors a really clear idea of how your application fits to the scheme. So that's giving you that extra space. But it should that sort of intuitive and co-creation narrative should sort of go through, flow through the whole of your application in the vision and the approach.</p>
	<b>Eligibility</b>	<b>Answer</b>
25.	<p>What happens if a PL changes institution between outline and full stage?</p> <p>Is this grant transferable between institutions. i.e. should a PI or CO-I change institutions?</p>	It is possible for a Project Lead or Co-Lead to change research organisation during the application process and after the grant has been awarded. If you change research organisation during the application process please contact the IRM team on <a href="mailto:ukrirm@ukri.org">ukrirm@ukri.org</a> . If your grant is successful guidance will be available how to request this change on TFS.
26.	<p>Can co-leads be introduced after the outline stage if invited to full proposal?</p> <p>Does the lead have to ask permission to add new co-leads?</p>	Project co-leads or collaborators can be changed or added between the outline and full application stage with reasonable justification, however, please note that this funding opportunity is looking for co-creation and design of the proposal from all disciplines involved, and while project co-leads can be added at the full stage, we encourage collaboration at project inception. If the project lead changes since submission of the



		<p>outline stage application, please contact us, so that we can confirm eligibility to proceed with your full stage application.</p> <p>You do not need to seek permission from UKRI to add new co-leads.</p>
27.	<p>Good morning. I had understood that there could be two PIs in round two of this scheme. Will that be the case?</p>	<p>Joint leadership is not a possible option in TFS yet and we don't have an indication of when that will be ready. Project leads and Co-LS should be working together as a leadership team.</p> <p>The project lead will be the main point of contact for the grant with UKRI and is taking overall responsibility for the grant. But the applications are being reviewed and assessed as a full team of researchers and how they lead together for the different activities and work packages as part of your project.</p> <p>We hope we will have that functionality soon as TFS evolves.</p>
28.	<p>Is there a limit in the number of applicants in the core team?</p>	<p>We have not specified a maximum number of co-investigators allowed on the grants. You need as many that are necessary to deliver the project. We do not have a minimum number of hours or percentage of time. However, each investigator should have a clear role and contribution on the project, which should be justified.</p> <p>If you have more than necessary, this may be picked up by the panel, as it brings into question what contribution these investigators are bringing to the project and if they have appropriate time to commitment to the project.</p>
29.	<p>The call allows for international collaboration, my question relates to the scope of international involvement. How is an application seen when one of the PIs would be from outside the UK bringing in one of the disciplines for the interdisciplinary work?</p> <p>Can we have Co-Is from overseas institutions?</p> <p>Can non-UK partners be funded as co-leads in applications?</p>	<p>This funding opportunity is primarily to support interdisciplinary ideas emerging from the UK research community, but in specific circumstances we will allow international project co-leads. It is ok for the international Co-Lead to be providing the expertise for one of the disciplines.</p> <p>A project co-lead (international) is an individual employed by a research organisation (RO) in an overseas country, who would otherwise fit the normal definition for a project co-lead. That is, they are a member of the project leadership and management team. However, a project co-lead (international) cannot take over the leadership of a project as they do not meet the residency criteria for a project lead.</p> <p>To be a project co-lead (international):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• you would be expected to make a significant intellectual contribution to the design and conduct of the project</li> <li>• your contribution and added value to the research collaboration should be clearly explained and justified in the application</li> </ul>

30.	Is it possible to know a bit more about what can constitute a 'public contributor' as a specialist?	Public contributors are a diverse range of people who bring different life experiences, knowledge and perspectives to a project. They can be members of the public, patients, voluntary or community groups. They typically would not be employed by the research organisations involved on the grant. UKRI are currently establishing a consistent set of principles and guidance about payments to public partners that recognise their contributions. To date we are only aware of MRC's publishing <a href="#">guidance on payments for public partners</a> .
31.	For UK universities with international campuses, does UKRI consider staff based on those campuses as international co-leads? Are there any eligibility concerns?	No, if you are a staff member employed by a UK organisation but based at a campus overseas, you can be considered as a UK project co-lead. As a UK project co-lead, you would be eligible to take on the leadership as the project lead if the need arose, however for us to approve this we would need assurances that any UK-based staff on the project, such as Research and Innovation Associates, are fully supported.
32.	How is a lecturer grade or equivalent identified? Would PostDoc Researchers be considered as CoLeads?	<p>Project leads and project co-leads must meet all the eligibility requirements, including a contract of employment of at least lecturer level or equivalent. By equivalent we mean employed at the same grade, or higher, than lecturer level. For example, if you are on a research-only academic career pathway (rather than teaching and research), you may not be employed as a lecturer, but on the same grade, such as a research fellow.</p> <p>Specific eligibility rules apply for certain UKRI staff at research council centres e.g.: NERC staff at band six level and above are eligible to apply as a project lead. NERC staff at band six must have at least three years' postdoctoral research experience and have been employed by NERC for at least a year. Staff at BBSRC research organisations at band E level or above are also eligible.</p> <p>For researchers of postdoctoral level but who have provided significant intellectual input to grant writing and design, they may be eligible to apply as a researcher co-lead.</p>
33.	The video of past projects mentioned post-docs working on their project - would these have been "research associates"? I assume they would need to already be post-docs, is that right?	They would be Post doctoral research associates and would have been recruited by the research organisation to work on the project.
34.	I imagine quite a lot of administrative work around the logistics of individual work package delivery. May I know how the roles of admin folk can be situated and costed - would this be as an RA (although technically they would be helping with paperwork rather than research)? Would they be	<p>There are a number of additional grant roles that are available outside of those we presented today, including grant manager and professional – enabling staff, who would be employed by the collaborating organisations.</p> <p>Please see the full list of grant roles here and how to cost them:</p>

	sub-contracted instead as a 0.2 day-to-day admin manager for example?	<a href="https://www.ukri.org/publications/roles-in-funding-applications/roles-in-funding-applications-eligibility-responsibilities-and-costings-guidance/">https://www.ukri.org/publications/roles-in-funding-applications/roles-in-funding-applications-eligibility-responsibilities-and-costings-guidance/</a>
35.	<p>Can a part-time PhD student be involved in as Research Associates for proposal development and final project?</p> <p>I saw that PhD funding is not allowed. If a student already has funding and wants to work on this project outside of their PhD, can they be listed as a collaborator?</p>	<p>Funding for PhD studentships is ineligible for this scheme. A PhD student could be involved in the project as long as it does not contravene the T&amp;Cs of the studentship funding. Students can be employed to undertake specific activities on a project and in these cases the most appropriate role type which aligns to the work they will be undertaking on the project should be selected.</p>
36.	<p>What is the difference between a co-lead/lead and a "research and innovation associate" regarding the terms for funding their positions?</p>	<p>Please see the UKRI website for descriptions of different roles and how they should be costed on your applications: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/publications/roles-in-funding-applications/roles-in-funding-applications-eligibility-responsibilities-and-costings-guidance/">https://www.ukri.org/publications/roles-in-funding-applications/roles-in-funding-applications-eligibility-responsibilities-and-costings-guidance/</a></p> <p><b>Research and innovation associate ('researcher' or postdoctoral research assistant' in Je-S)</b>  A research and innovation associate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• carries out research or innovation work on a project</li> <li>• must be employed by the lead organisation or one of the collaborating organisations</li> </ul> <p><b>Researcher co-lead ('researcher co-investigator' in Je-S)</b>  A research and innovation associate who is not eligible to be a project lead or project co-lead but has made a substantial contribution to the formulation and development of the application and will be closely involved with the project.</p>
37.	<p>Is it possible that a current postdoc (NERC funded) at the project lead university, who significantly contributes to the proposal, can be named as a researcher co-lead, and can be costed as a postdoc/senior research fellow?</p>	<p>Yes, if a research and innovation associate has made significant contributions to the design of the project, they can be named as part of the core team as a researcher co-lead. They are employed on the grant as a Research and Innovation Associate as staff under Directly Incurred costs.</p> <p>If their contract on the existing grant overlaps with the proposed project duration, their involvement in the grant will need to meet the requirements of the existing contract and grant terms and conditions. The researcher co-lead role may attract estates and indirect costs, providing double charging requirements are met.</p>

38.	Are there specific rules about what role sub-contractors are able to perform (other than not being Project Leads)?	<p>Sub-contractors need deliver a specific piece of work. Subcontractors will be allowed in line with UKRI terms and conditions for research grants. More information can be found in our guidance document, found on the URKI funding finder page.</p> <p>Sub-contractors would not be part of the core research team.</p>
39.	<p>What if the project is to be done abroad in collaboration with a charity? Would this scheme fund workshops done by them as part of the research process? To be clear, these workshops and their outcomes (e.g. policy papers, academic publications for dissemination) would be designed in collaboration between several colleagues (UK lead and co-lead, international co-leads) and the host charity. Thanks.</p>	<p>Charities are not fundable through this scheme. But they could be involved as project partners and as project partners, they wouldn't receive funding. In the situation described here, I think we would regard anybody associated through a charity to be listed as subcontractors in order to receive payment for their work.</p> <p>Get in touch with us on <a href="mailto:ukrirm@ukri.org">ukrirm@ukri.org</a> and we'll be able to help you if you've got specific questions on that.</p>
40.	Can international research institutes (not universities) be eligible as part of the core team?	<p>I think this is in reference to independent research organizations. They are in the most part eligible. You will need to check, though, that they've been approved by UKRI to receive funding, and there is a list available on the website under the eligibility of your organization.</p> <p>So, you should go there in the 1st instance. If you find you're not on that list, but you think you would be eligible as an independent research organization. Get in touch with the team, and we'll can investigate that a bit further.</p> <p>Please visit <a href="#">Eligibility as an organisation – UKRI</a> for more information.</p> <p>International research institutes would be expected to meet the general equivalent requirements for being <a href="#">eligible to receive UKRI funding</a> taking into account the national context of the international RO. This means the international RO should meet the relevant equivalent criteria specified in the guidance applicable for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ registered Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)</li> <li>▪ research institutes receiving long term investments through relevant national funders</li> <li>▪ independent research organisations with existing in-house capacity to carry out and lead research, including but not limited to approved charitable or non-governmental organisations (NGOs)</li> </ul> <p>Further information on the eligibility criteria for international research organisations is provided in the <a href="#">CRCRM round two: guidance for applicants and research organisations document (PDF, 826KB)</a> and in the <a href="#">UKRI project co-lead (international) policy and guidance</a>.</p>

	Resubmissions	Answer
41.	Are Round 1 successful applicants able to apply to Round 2 with a different application/submission?	Yes, successful applicants can apply to round 2 on a different project.
42.	It seems wrong to me that an unsuccessful application could not be resubmitted---stipulating resubmissions need to be basically a different question and a different set of work packages is very wasteful and unfair. surely you can accept that researchers can improve based on quality feedback and thus warranting a resubmission of a failed first bid is a valuable way of our communities proceeding. You appear to be happy to discount the idea of feedback and the time and effort researchers put together to address their research projects.	<p>We recognise the hard work of applicants in developing and submitting applications. However, we are bound by central UKRI policies which does not allow resubmissions of applications that have gone through the full peer review stage unless specifically invited to do so.</p> <p>So, the resubmission policy we have on this is, if it's gone to the full stage and is not successful, it cannot resubmit the same project, it would have to be significantly changed to be considered a new project unless they are specifically invited to resubmit.</p> <p>So, in terms of if they're unsuccessful as part of the randomisation process; This would count as being as unsuccessful. In a similar way. Panels have been asked to rank applications, and they just miss out on funding that that's considered unsuccessful.</p> <p>For round one we did invite those applications that were unsuccessful through the randomization through to Round 2. We allowed that, and this will be taken on a case-by-case basis for each round that we have. So, we've only got one more. This is the pilot scheme, and we've only got one more round the pilot, and the project board will look at that, but we felt that there was a small enough number of applications that were unfortunately, through the randomization process, not to be awarded funding that we would allow them to come through to Round 2. But this has to be a part of the institutional caps that we've put in place, and it will be up to the research organisations to decide what the process is, and whether they have to go through an internal sift, or where they automatically get given one of the places under the institutional caps.</p>
43.	Where randomisation takes place at the final stage of selection for awarding - If an applicant is unsuccessful would they be eligible to submit in a future round?	<p>If an application has gone to the full stage and is not successful, it cannot be resubmitted unless they are specifically invited to resubmit. It would have to be significantly changed to be considered a new project.</p> <p>If an application is unsuccessful as part of the randomization process this would count as being as unsuccessful. This is similar way to other UKRI assessment panels that have ranked applications, and an application may just miss out on funding by being just below the funding cut off and would not be allowed to resubmit under the UKRI policy.</p> <p>For round one we did invite those applications that were unsuccessful through the randomisation through to Round 2 but they will need to be included as part of their institutional caps. It will be up to the research organisations to decide what their sift process is, and whether those applications have to go through an internal sift, or whether they will automatically be given one of the places under the institutional caps.</p>

		This is the pilot scheme, and we only have one more round of funding and therefore we may not be able to invite applications unsuccessful in the round 2 randomisation process to resubmit.
44.	<p>Do resubmissions of applications that were unsuccessful at outline stage Rd1 need to be changed/amended from the one submitted first time around?</p> <p>About resubmissions: on one of the slides, it was stated that "To be considered as a new submission, the application should represent a substantially different package of work, with a different idea, aims and objectives." Does that apply to any resubmission, or only those that wish to be considered as a new application by the same applicants? In other words, are improved version of a previous application (i.e. same basic idea) permitted?</p>	<p>If an application was unsuccessful at the outline stage of round one of this scheme, it can be resubmitted to round two subject to the selection of the application by the lead organisation for submission within the institutional cap on the number of applications.</p> <p>The questions have been modified between round 1 and 2, therefore your application will need to take this into account. If you submit the same application that was unsuccessful in round 1 it is unlikely to be successful in round 2. Therefore, we recommend reading the <a href="#">generalised feedback</a> and considering how this might apply to your application.</p> <p>Applications unsuccessful at the full stage of round 1 are not able to resubmit their application unless specifically invited to do so. These would need to be submitted as new applications under the following guidance:</p> <p>A new submission can be an entirely new application or an application that includes some elements that have been considered previously by any UKRI Council as part of an unsuccessful application, if overall it represents a substantially different package of work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be evidenced through either a substantially different research endeavour or via a notion to utilise existing research in order to apply it in a new way, such as the development of technologies based on existing research.</li> <li>• These major changes may be materialised through different aims and objectives, methodology and other specific areas of assessment as appropriate to the Funding Opportunity.</li> </ul>
	<b>Application Process</b>	<b>Answer</b>
45.	Should references also fit within the 2 pages?	Yes, references should be included within the two pages of the PDF.
46.	250 words is very short, particularly for larger teams. Could you provide more information on key information the panel will look out for?	<p>You should showcase the range of relevant skills you and, if relevant, your team have and how this will help deliver the proposed work. You should focus on describing the relevant skills the team will have as a whole to deliver the work, including experience of the methods, approaches or technologies you are using. It does not require information on publication record, positions held or any other elements of a track record.</p> <p>What the assessors are looking for in your response: Evidence of how you, and if relevant your team, have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relevant experience and skills to develop and deliver the proposed research programme</li> </ul> <p>Within this section we also expect you to:</p>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consider if the team represents the right set of skills and mix of perspectives to approach the proposed work</li> </ul> <p>The core leadership team should consist of the project lead and the project co-leads identified on the outline application. We expect the full team of project leads and co-project leads to be established as part of the outline application and involved in the co-creation of the project. There may be exceptional circumstances where team members may need to change between outline and full stage, for example, a change in circumstances for a team member meaning they are no longer able to be part of the project. Further guidance will be given for full stage applications on addressing these changes.</p>
47.	<p>Can someone highlight the specific changes from round 1 in the format of the outline application? Previously the section on team and capability was included in the 2 pages.</p>	<p>The guidance for Round 2 is linked <a href="#">here</a>. See pages 26-32</p> <p>In round 1 the application was submitted via JeS. We have provided additional space for a “fit to scheme” question and the team capability to deliver based on feedback from applicants and assessors from round 1.</p>
48.	<p>On p33 of the guidance document at <a href="https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/MRC-28082024-CRCRM-round-two-guidance-for-applicants-and-research-organisations-v1.2.pdf">https://www.ukri.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/MRC-28082024-CRCRM-round-two-guidance-for-applicants-and-research-organisations-v1.2.pdf</a> you say "You will be asked at the outline stage of round two to identify which interface panels are most relevant to your application." and it lists the 5 research domains. Are you looking for (1) proposals which bridge two different research domains (e.g. are at the interface of Engineering and Physical Science (EPS) and Arts and Humanities (HE), or are you looking for (2) ones which are across research councils, but could lie in only one domain, e.g. are you expecting proposals which are across EPSRC and STFC but in only one domain (EPS). I assume you would be happy to receive proposals in category (1), so I guess my question is whether category (2) is acceptable, or perhaps even what you are expecting (as the name of the call suggests).</p>	<p>Apologies we had planned on asking applicants this question for round 2 but this is now no longer part of the application questions. We will use the summary section and the keywords to allocate your application to the most appropriate interface panel.</p> <p>We had updated the guidance document but missed this reference. We will update it shortly.</p> <p>Your application needs to span the remits of at least 2 research council remits. It does not necessarily need to span 2 of the research domains that forms the interface panels.</p>

49.	Can explanatory diagrams be included (to convey links between disciplines / concepts / methods) in the outline application and/or full application?	Images can be included in the Fit to Opportunity and Capability to Deliver sections of TFS or included in the PDF (keeping within the two-page limit).
50.	if you are working with people from different institutions, at what point is the institutional support letter needed from the organisations with co-leads?	Letters of support from collaborating research organisations are not required in the Funding Service as part of the application for either the outline or full stage. By submitting the application, the lead organisation indicates its formal approval of the application and the eligibility of the applicants and support of the collaborating organisations.
51.	Is working with institutions outside your organisation for this call considered to strengthen the application please?	Your core team should provide all the necessary expertise to deliver the research project. This may come from a single research organisation or across multiple research organisations.
52.	What are the earliest and latest start dates for the work?	Awards are expected to be offered by January 2026. A period of up to six months from the date of the award letter (Jan 2026) to the commencement of grant activity is permitted, as per standard UKRI terms and conditions.
<b>Costings</b>		
53.	What % of a budget could be set aside to support the career development of researchers?	There are no specified minimum or maximum of budgets for career development, but these costs would need to be justified within the application, the same as other costs.
54.	Do applicants need to submit a financial budget (or any estimates) at this outline stage?  Do we need to provide costing information at the outline stage?  So, is a ballpark costing needed at the outline stage as it just sounded like some cost input is requested?	No costing figures are needed at outline, but you need to contact <a href="mailto:ukrim@ukri.org">ukrim@ukri.org</a> if you need to request the additional funding to access the NERC large facilities where there is an exception for cost.  We will be holding some technical webinars for those applications invited through to full stage and we will provide further information and answer any questions on costings at those webinars.
55.	In international collaborations - is the participating overseas institution also responsible for providing 20% of the co-funding, or is the lead institution responsible for everything?	For international project co-lead costs, UKRI will award funding to the UK lead organisation, this organisation will then be responsible for distributing funds to the international research organisation. Justified costs will be funded at 100% and should be included under exceptions. Estate and indirect costs are not eligible. The total costs claimed for international project co-lead contribution to a project must not exceed 30% of the overall cost of the project, calculated at 100% full economic cost.

	<b>Project Partners</b>	
56.	At which point in time does the collaboration agreement have to be submitted?	We only ask for the formal collaboration agreements to be put in place if an award is made. The expectation is that this is in place within 6 months of the grant start date.
57.	<p>If a start-up would be involved as project partner, can and at what would their costs be covered and are their requirements such as number of employees?</p> <p>What role can a private company have in the project? Can they be costed to receive funding for their work on projects?</p>	<p>A project partner is defined as a third-party person or organisation who provide specific contributions to the team and project; there are no requirements for the size of the business or restrictions on the number of people from the business who can be involved as a partner.</p> <p>Project partners are expected to provide contributions to the delivery of the project, either in cash or in kind, and should not therefore be seeking to claim funds from UKRI. However, where there are specific circumstances where project partners require funding for minor directly incurred costs such as travel and subsistence, these can be included and paid at 80% FEC.</p>
58.	<p>if a collaborator were to provide a service at (for instance) 50% of their standard commercial price, could they be designated as a Project Partner? Since they were providing a direct contribution, but still also being funded?</p>	<p>Project partners are able to also be included as a subcontractor under a dual role, allowing them to receive funding for specific elements of the project while also contributing as a project partner. Please see Section 3.2.3.4 of the Round 2 guidance document for more details on this. <a href="#">CRCRM round two: guidance for applicants and research organisations document (PDF, 826KB)</a></p> <p>A discount on a service alone is unlikely to qualify as project partner status to allow access to any intellectual assets arising from the research.</p> <p>We advise applicants to speak to their organisation's tech transfer office or equivalent department (i.e. the department who would be responsible for drafting and signing the collaboration agreement and/or subcontracting agreement if funded) as soon as possible, who will be able to advise on how to manage partnerships.</p>
59.	<p>You state in your slides: "Organisations with applicants as core team members on the project cannot be included as project partners or sub-contractors" - does this mean that project partners or sub-contractors can't be core team members?</p>	<p>The roles of 'Project Partner' and 'Sub-contractor' do not fall under the 'core team' category which covers roles within eligible research organisations. This category includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• project lead (PL)</li> <li>• project co-lead (UK) (PcL)</li> <li>• project co-lead (international) (PcL (I))</li> <li>• researcher co-lead (RcL)</li> <li>• specialist</li> <li>• grant manager</li> <li>• professional enabling staff</li> <li>• research and innovation associate</li> <li>• technician</li> <li>• visiting researcher</li> </ul>

		Project partners and subcontractors can however, work closely the core team in the delivery of the project.
	<b>Assessment Process</b>	
60.	<p>Is the 550-word summary that's put in as part of the application purely for publication, on Gateway to Research, and so on for the successful projects? Or is it actually used as part of the evaluation of the application? Is it possible to explain concepts in the summary and then not repeat that explanation in the Vision and Approach? Or does the Vision and Approach have to contain EVERYTHING needed to assess the project?</p>	<p>The summary will be published on the UKRI Gateway to Research portal. In addition, the UKRI IRM team will use the summary and your keywords to assign the most appropriate assessors to your application. The summary really should be written for “the layperson” and should be accessible to anybody who reads it, even members of the public, whereas a Vision and Approach probably should be more focused and a bit more with the language that you might typically have put in a grant. The summary is a different type of way to communicate your project and you might need to change the language slightly for a more generalized audience.</p> <p>The summary is viewable by the panel but is not assessed on its own. It is likely to be the first part of the application that the assessor reads to understand what your project is going to be about. Therefore, our advice is to make sure that is clear and well written.</p> <p>In terms of whether the concepts should be in both the summary and Vision and Approach, I'd say yes, it needs to be in both. The summary is a summary of everything that's in your Vision and Approach and you should make sure that everything is in your Vision and Approach.</p>
61.	<p>We were told earlier in the webinar that applications will be announced in Jan 26 - can you clarify which is correct? Jan 26 or Nov 25?</p>	<p>Successful applicants will be notified in November. The formal public announcement will be in Jan 2026.</p>
62.	<p>Can you give specific examples of what panels are looking for in judging the differences between A and A* - what makes something clearly distinguishable between projects that otherwise meet the criteria, are of the highest standards and obvious added value... what is the next level looking for after that?</p> <p>What is outstanding? How is this measured? Often, this is subjective, as there are so many ways to judge the excellence. How well the evaluation panel is educated to understand the science behind to be able to judge the rest of the criteria and decide about whether the proposal is outstanding?</p>	<p>The panels have an allocation of up to 10% of their total number of applications which they can assign as A* if applications fit the definitions. If more than 10% of applications are scored as exceptional or outstanding the panel may consider that they cannot distinguish between applications and therefore it would be fair for all applications to go into the randomisation process. For round 1, all panels allocated their 10% quota of A* applications.</p> <p>Applications that are banded A* are considered to be of exceptional or outstanding quality and can clearly be distinguished from other applications. At panel, applications are scored out of 10 using the standard UKRI scoring definitions (we will add these to the <a href="#">CRCRM round two: guidance for applicants and research organisations document (PDF, 826KB)</a> as they are published on some council webpages but don't appear to be on the UKRI webpages yet) . These are currently not published on the UKRI website so we will add these to the guidance for applicants document shortly. The terms outstanding and exceptional align with the top scores of 9 and 10 respectively. This is</p>

		<p>based on the assessment criteria outlined in the call text. Specific examples for what the panels saw in the strongest proposals is provided the full stage <a href="#">generalised feedback</a>.</p> <p>Peer review is a subjective process. The panel membership - we have appointed a college of &gt;300 people and the membership reflects the breadth of disciplines and subjects across UKRI, including those working in new and emerging areas to help respond to the potential demand and breadth of applications. College members are assigned to applications that fall within their remit of expertise and are well placed to assess the research proposed. The majority of college members have a high level of experience on peer review assessment panels. In addition, college members have a high level of experience in working on or supporting interdisciplinary research and the college. We have been working with the college providing training specifically to support them in their approaches to assessing these interdisciplinary proposals.</p>
63.	<p>What is the assessment weighting for the three areas for reviewing. Or are they equally balanced?</p> <p>Will there be equal weighting across the three assessment criteria in terms of scoring?</p>	<p>All assessment areas are weighted equally.</p>
64.	<p>Are the 3 panel members allocated to evaluate an outline also going to assess the corresponding full proposal (assuming the outline is selected), or members are likely to change?</p>	<p>As we will have a reduction in the number of applications that come through from outline stage to full stage, the number and areas in the applications in each panel will change. We need to balance the workload of assessment of the applications between panel members and ensure the panel makeup reflects the applications in that panel.</p> <p>We try, where possible, to keep the same, or some of the same introducing members who have assessed the application at outline stage assessing the full stage application.</p>
	<b>Interdisciplinary Assessment College</b>	<b>Answer</b>
65.	<p>Can I ask about the diversity - especially in terms of Black &amp; Global Majority membership of the Review College/ Review Panel constructions? Are there any policies in place to guarantee diversity of representation?</p> <p>Can I ask about EDI procedures for guaranteeing diversity of presentation on the various review panels - esp for Black and Global Majority representation?</p>	<p>The College appointments broadly reflects the pool of applications submitted, and you can find that information on our web pages, including the EDI data, where we have <a href="#">published the membership of the college</a>.</p> <p>When we are selecting the assessors to make up our panels we consider a number of factors including the EDI across the panel. When assigning assessors to applications we take into account a number of considerations, not just their expertise, but also the balance of what their backgrounds are, for example, whether they are early, mid or late career researchers, and making sure that we've got a good representation of different perspectives on each application.</p> <p>At the full stage for round 2 we are looking to assign a couple of readers on each application, in addition to the 3 college members that will be assessing it. This way we can bring in even more voices on the panel to be able to look at your applications and</p>

		they'll look at them as a whole. So, there will be a number of perspectives and different people with different backgrounds looking at your application.
66.	Will there be any future opportunities to apply to be part of the Interdisciplinary Assessment College, or was this a one-time opportunity in May 2023?	The current Interdisciplinary Assessment College has been appointed to cover Round 1 & 2 of the CRCRM scheme. Should future rounds beyond Round 2 be announced in the future, we would consider further recruitment to the college at this stage.
67.	Are the awardees and members of the IAC available for would be applicants to discuss and for advice-as you say this. Will they expect and be available to provide meaningful input to developments?	Whilst it is not part of the T&Cs of the IAC membership or the CRCRM grant holders we have asked the members of the college to be advocates for this scheme and share their insights with the colleagues across the research community. We would also like our awardees to be advocates of the scheme and be open to helping the research community. We hope that you would get a positive response if you approach them.
	<b>Developing Collaborations</b>	<b>Answer</b>
68.	Given the low rates of submissions from Arts and Hums / AHRC disciplines, is there scope for setting up a matching scheme where A&H researchers can express interest in involvement with interdisciplinary research and set out their specific expertise?	The UKRI IRM team does not have the resources to organise events to support the development of collaborations. We are sharing the data from round 1 with colleagues across the research councils, who may decide to organise some events for their research communities to support this type of activity. However, this may be better led by the research organisations themselves.
69.	What support are you expecting from institutions in terms of providing a matchmaking service to facilitate collaborations? Especially given that internal deadlines for demand management will be quite soon to allow time for panels.	We made the pre-announcement in May so that research organisations could consider how they might facilitate and support their researchers in building collaborations. UKRI does not have the resources available to run matchmaking services considering the breadth and number of people who may be interested in this scheme. It is the responsibility of the research organisations in supporting the development of applications to this scheme.
	<b>General Scheme Questions</b>	<b>Answer</b>
70.	Will there be a round 3 for this scheme? When would this decision be reached and announced?	We just launched round 2 of the pilot scheme. Future rounds of the CRCRM scheme will be dependent on the outcome of the spending review. Therefore, we currently don't know if there will be a round 3 and when it would launch. We are in the process of modelling what round 3 and onwards could look like for the scheme and gathering information through the scheme evaluation so that we can put together a robust case for further funding.
71.	Arts and humanities seem to be underrepresented in the way this scheme is being described today - do you have data on how well A&H disciplines did in round 1 please?	We are looking to publish a data pack with some statistics on round 1 of the scheme including how the applications fell across the research domain interfaces, but we are still collating and preparing the data. We did see just over 50% of the applications submitted at outline stage being aligned to the Engineering and Physical Sciences research domain and interfaced with 3 research domains; social sciences, biomedical and health and the earth environment and biosciences domains. The other 50% of applications were spread across the other 7 interfaces.



		As the applications have progressed through to the full stage submissions and the funded applications the proportion across those interfaces has been consistent. We are working with our colleagues across the research councils to consider how we might increase the number of applications coming into the interfaces that have been less well represented in round 1.
72.	Please comment on the low success rate of applications to this scheme.	<p>We didn't know what the demand for this scheme would be, and that is why we had an outline stage for the pilot scheme. If we had received over 900 full stage applications that would have been a huge burden on the community both in terms of writing the applications and assessing them.</p> <p>We have only the budget that we have been allocated, which is £65 million over 2 rounds, and there are restrictions on how much we can spend in each round.</p> <p>With the £32.5 million allocated to round 1 we were only able to fund 36 applications. We made sure that we had a minimum 20% award rate by capping the number of applications invited through to full stage at 180 proposals. 20% is on the lower scale for award rates that UKRI would like and especially with a 2-stage process, but we also wanted to ensure that we were allowing the full breadth of applications coming through to full stage. Therefore, the number of applications invited through to full stage aimed to balance of having that breadth of applications with a reasonable award rate.</p>
73.	<p>Is there a full list of projects funded under round 1 for information?</p> <p>Please share the link for the list of all funded projects so far - interested in blue sky thinking</p>	<p><a href="https://www.ukri.org/news/first-projects-from-ukris-new-interdisciplinary-scheme-announced/">https://www.ukri.org/news/first-projects-from-ukris-new-interdisciplinary-scheme-announced/</a></p> <p>A list of the funded projects can be found at the link above. Full project summaries will be made available on Gateway to Research in due course.</p>
74.	What was the average award amount for the successful projects?	<p>Submitted applications ranged between ~£315K and £1.1M (FEC). The average amount applied for was ~£860K (FEC). Awarded applications ranged between ~£440K and £960K (based on UKRI awarded amount and not including any indexation). The average awarded amount was ~£860K.</p> <p>The cost of research varies greatly across the disciplines and therefore comparing applications on the scale of the budget alone would be inappropriate. The applications will be assessed at the full stage against value for money.</p>
	<b>EDI/Demand Management</b>	<b>Answer</b>
75.	From a research office perspective, can you give some guidance as to how we can collect EDI data from multiple institutions whilst ensuring GDPR compliance?	We are running some workshops with ARMA in October to discuss and share best practice with the research management community. The workshops will cover a few models from different research organisations based on their submissions to UKRI Future

		<p>Leaders Fellowship scheme and providing guidance on how you might return that data and how you can stay compliant with GDPR.</p> <p>We do encourage that research managers attend those. The workshops are aimed at the research management departments not academic researchers.</p> <p>The workshop places are now fully allocated. However, if you are interested in the workshops, please contact ARMA and they will be able to check if someone from your research organisation is represented and if not might be able to make a space where an RO is represented multiple times</p> <p>10<sup>th</sup> October  <a href="#">Joint UKRI and ARMA RD SIG workshops on demand management and EDI data collection – ARMA</a></p> <p>11<sup>th</sup> October  <a href="#">Joint UKRI and ARMA RD SIG workshops on demand management and EDI data collection – ARMA</a></p> <p><b>We are now aware that there are no more spaces available on the ARMA workshops. These are aimed at the research management departments not academic researchers. If you are interested in the workshops please contact ARMA and they will be able to check if someone from your RO is represented and if not might be able to make a space where and RO is represented multiple times. The workshops will not be recorded due to the nature of their structure but we should be able to share a report from the workshops. Please register your interest with ARMA so that you receive it. We may update our guidance based on feedback from the workshops so it is clearer what ROs need to submit</b></p>
76.	Please could you confirm how institutions should submit their inclusivity statement? do they send it as an email attachment rather than uploading information to TFS? Thank you	The <a href="#">CRCRM R2: Inclusive selection process statement and diversity monitoring Excel template (XLXS, 218KB)</a> provided in the 'Additional information' section for both the inclusive selection statement and anonymised diversity data must be completed and submitted to the Interdisciplinary Responsive Mode (IRM) team at <a href="mailto:ukrirm@ukri.org">ukrirm@ukri.org</a> by the opportunity deadline, 19 November 2024 4:00pm UK time.
77.	Can you please explain eligibility if not submitted to the REF2021?	<p>Research grants are open to UK organisations normally eligible for funding from the UKRI research councils, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK higher education providers</li> <li>• research council institutes</li> <li>• UKRI approved independent research organisations (IROs)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• public sector research establishments (PSREs)</li> </ul> <p>Eligible organisations who did not submit to the REF, including NHS bodies, public sector research establishments and independent research organisations, are permitted to submit a maximum of 2 applications to this funding opportunity.</p>
78.	<p>An observation - if all organisations submit the maximum number of bids they are allowed under the cap, this doesn't significantly reduce the number of outline bids you will receive compared to round 1. Considering the additional work involved in demand management for HEIs, it doesn't seem like a significant reduction in potential bids for the assessment college to process.</p>	<p>We know from round 1 that scheme is highly competitive, with nearly 1,000 outline applications submitted in round one. We now also know the capacity of the Interdisciplinary Assessment College and the IRM team in assessing and process the outline applications.</p> <p>An increase in submissions in round two would exceed the assessment capacity of the Interdisciplinary Assessment College. We know from data collected through the round 1 webinar registration process and from speaking to the research community that there are likely to be a high number of projects that were suited to the round 2 timeline and because we are allowing unsuccessful round 1 outline applications to be resubmitted, we could easily exceed the number of applications submitted to round 1. Therefore, we have made the decision to apply institutional caps.</p> <p>We cannot retrospectively apply institutional caps in the scenario where the number of applications far exceeds the number that we can process and assess after the applications have been submitted. Therefore, research organisations have to play a role in prioritising which applications to submit.</p>
79.	<p>Regarding EDI, would you consider in future increasing the cap for underrepresented candidates? The Royal Academy of Engineering does this for some of their fellowship schemes to encourage a greater diversity of applicants.</p>	<p>For a UKRI wide scheme this is difficult to implement as different demographics are underrepresented in different areas.</p> <p>The caps have been allocated at a research organisation level. We have asked research organisations to submit an inclusive selection process statement and supporting data in a diversity monitoring template.</p> <p>This is to support and ensure organisations are employing good practices in identifying and prioritising applications to this scheme. The statement needs to describe the inclusive process they used to identify and select the applications for submission and must also provide anonymised information on the number of prospective applicants by sex and gender, ethnicity, disability and broad interdisciplinary groupings.</p> <p>By having the research organisations consider and ensure their selection process are inclusive, underrepresented groups should be supported and represented in the applications submitted to round 2.</p>

