MODERATING PANEL GUIDANCE NOTES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF DISCOVERY SCIENCE LARGE GRANT APPLICATIONS

Published: February 2024

1. Introduction

Discovery Science is the funding stream that supports excellent research in response to unsolicited ideas from research groups, consortia or individuals in any area relevant to NERC's remit. Discovery Science funding can cross remit boundaries between Research Councils and, where this is the case, a co-funding agreement will have been considered. NERC promotes unrestricted and innovative thinking; as such, proposed research can be pure, applied or policy-driven, technology-led and/or multi-disciplinary, but must seek to address—or provide the means to address—clearly defined science questions.

Large Grants are intended to support adventurous, large-scale and complex research tackling big science questions that cannot be addressed through other NERC funding opportunities. Research funded via this scheme is expected to have the potential to be world-leading. Applications will often involve multidisciplinary approaches via inter- or intra-institutional collaboration, although this is not a requirement. Large Grants can address any area of science within the NERC remit, including NERC strategic priorities or new curiosity-driven research challenges.

2. Conflicts of Interest

NERC maintains a conflicts of interest policy, available at **Annex A**. We ask that you make yourself familiar with the policy and let us know as soon as possible if you have – or are unsure whether you have - any conflicts of interest with the applications to be discussed that have not already been identified in the documentation. **Please make these known to the panel secretary (via largegrants@nerc.ukri.org) as soon as possible, particularly if you are an introducer or reader so that the application can be reassigned to an alternative panel member**.

For any application where panel members have been identified to have a conflict of interest they will be required to leave the meeting whilst discussions are taking place. During the ranking process any panel member who is named as a Project Lead (PL) or Co-Lead (Co-L) on a application will be required to leave the meeting whilst their application is ranked. Panel members may remain in the meeting for the remainder of the ranking but must not make any comments during discussions for applications where they have a conflict of interest.

If there is doubt as to whether the member should be asked to leave, the Chair may discuss this with the rest of the panel and the NERC executive. The NERC executive have the final decision in any case where there is debate about whether a conflict of interest exists at all stages of the peer review process.

3. Panel Confidentiality

Research grant applications are submitted to NERC in confidence and may contain confidential information and personal data belonging to the applicant. NERC undertakes to the applicants to keep applications confidential and not to use or disclose them except as required for the peer review/funding decision process or as is required under the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (or any other law or regulation to which NERC is or may become subject).

Panel members may not disclose the fact that any of the enclosed grant applications have been submitted to NERC or any of the information contained in any of the applications to any person outside the Panel or otherwise involved in the peer review/funding decision process. Nor may they disclose or use the information in the grant applications for any purpose other than as part of NERC peer review/funding decision process.

The Panel's comments on and scoring of these applications will be recorded by NERC staff at the meeting at which they will be discussed. NERC will not use these minutes or score, nor disclose them to any person or body except:

- as is necessary to record the decisions of the Panel and to inform any other person or body within NERC or any other body that may be co-funding the applications as part of the funding decision process;
- to the applicant as part of NERC feedback to successful and unsuccessful applicants; or
- as may be required under the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (or any other law or regulation to which NERC is or may become subject).

NERC will not attribute any comments that are disclosed under the Data Protection Act 1998 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 to any individual panel member, but the fact that you are a member of the one of the Panels is publicly available information.

All personal data collected by NERC will be handled in accordance with the UK Data Protection Legislation and as set out in the UKRI Privacy Notice.

4. Role of the Panel

The primary role of the moderating panel is to review the grant applications assigned to it by NERC.

The moderating panel will receive the full application and any additional background information. In addition, the panel will receive all reviewers' comments and applicants' responses to reviewers' assessments as appropriate. For the Large Grant call, the panel meeting also includes a short presentation by the Project Lead and another member of the team, followed by some time for questions. Using this information for reference, all moderating panels are responsible for:

i.   commenting on the extent to which each application presented to them has addressed the assessment criteria
ii. providing an agreed overall score for each application presented to them,
iii. producing a final ranked list of these applications,

iv. satisfying themselves that the cost range indicated for applications in the funding frame are reasonable to meet the project objectives and recommending any areas of budget adjustment where necessary and

v. providing a summary of the panel's discussion of the application which will be used as feedback to the applicant(s) and the submitting Research Organisation Administration Office and as a record of the justification for the panel score and decisions.

To assist in the prioritisation process, panel members will be assigned, in advance of the meeting, to act as introducers or readers for individual applications. The roles of both introducers and readers are described below.

4.1 Role of Introducers

For each application, two panel members will be nominated as introducers and one panel member as reader. Their role is to moderate the comments made by the reviewers, and the applicant's response to them.

Prior to the panel meeting, it is the responsibility of the introducers to read all the application material including the reviewer comments and PL response and to moderate comments made. Introducers need to be prepared to lead the panel discussion to determine a final overall score. Your moderation of the reviewers' comments and PL response should consider the points highlighted in the 'How to Apply;' section of the call's Funding Finder webpage, detailed under the 'What the assessors are looking for in your response' subheadings of the Core questions.

Your assessment should consider:

The vision:

- is of excellent quality and importance within or beyond the field(s) or area(s)
- has the potential to advance current understanding, or generate new knowledge, thinking or discovery within or beyond the field or area.
- Is timely given current trends, context, and needs.
- impacts world-leading research, society, the economy, or the environment.

and:

- what the potential direct or indirect benefits and who the beneficiaries might be
- why a large-scale project is more effective and appropriate than several smaller projects to achieve objectives (i.e. fit to scheme)

The approach:

- is effective and appropriate to achieve objectives.
- is feasible, and comprehensively identifies any risks to delivery and how they will be managed.
- if applicable, uses a clear and transparent methodology.
- if applicable, summarises the previous work and describes how this will be built upon and progressed.
- will maximise translation of outputs into outcomes and impacts.
- describes how the applicant, and if applicable their team's, research environment (in terms of the place, its location, and relevance to the project) will contribute to the success of the work.

and does it:

- demonstrate access to the appropriate services, facilities, infrastructure, or equipment to deliver the application.

- provide a project plan including milestones and timelines in the form of a Gantt chart or similar.

The applicant and team capability to deliver:

To what extent has the applicant and their team demonstrated they have:
- the relevant experience (appropriate to career stage) to deliver the proposed work.
- the right balance of skills and expertise to cover the proposed work.
- the appropriate leadership and management skills to deliver the work and their approach to develop others.
- contributed to developing a positive research environment and wider community.

The assessment process will consider applicants' ideas and contribution relative to career stage, acknowledging that not all team members will have evidence against all criteria.

We expect all four aspects of the above to be addressed. Panel members should bear in mind that it is the team's capability to deliver, and that they have the necessary skills for this application, and not the excellence of individual applicants that is being assessed. Panel members should not be tempted to lower their score where the applicants do not have a long-standing track record in the research area (e.g., early career researchers, a discipline-hopping application, cutting-edge research areas) if sufficient evidence of suitable support mechanisms have been provided. Base your assessment on the application and not on your previous knowledge of, or the reputations of, the applicants or their host organisations. Please be careful to avoid any unconscious bias in your assessment on the grounds of a protected characteristic, such as age or gender.

Ethics and responsible research and innovation (RRI):

To what extent has the applicant demonstrated that they have identified and evaluated:

- the relevant ethical or responsible research and innovation considerations
- how they will manage these considerations

This may include:

- research involving animals
- research involving human tissues or biological samples, including the nature and quantity of the material used and its source
- research involving human participation, including the numbers and diversity of the participants involved and any procedures
- potential impacts of the proposed research on the environment or society in general

Please note that any technical assessments, detailed costings, and quotes will be assessed by NERC should the application be deemed to be fundable by the panel. Please note that letters of support from Project Partners were not required.

All of these assessment criteria should be considered when assigning an overall score for each application. When assigning an overall score, introducers must take into account all supporting documentation. The score awarded by reviewers may be at variance with their comments. Where this is clearly the case, introducers are asked to give careful consideration to the reviewer comments provided. Introducers must be prepared to justify fully their proposed score.

Introducers should also consider what questions they would like to ask the applicants during their interview; these can be on anything the reviewers raised, including any associated

studentships.

We are committed to the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment](). You should not use journal-based metrics, conference rankings and metrics such as the H-index or i10-index when assessing UKRI grants. The content of a paper is more important than publication metrics, or the identity of the journal in which it was published, especially for early-career researchers.

Please consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets, software, inventions, patents, preprints, other commercial activities, etc.) in addition to research publications. You should consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

We encourage you to challenge research assessment practices that rely inappropriately on journal impact factors or conference rankings and promote and teach best practice that focuses on the value and influence of specific research outputs. If you are unsure about DORA, please speak to the panel convener or the panel chair.

4.2 Role of Readers
To assist in the prioritisation process, panel members will be assigned, in advance of the meeting, to act as readers. Given that the Large Grants full bids panel meeting usually includes applications which cover all of the NERC science remit, it is unlikely that panel members will be readers on applications which are within their direct expertise. The running order will show which applications each panel member has been assigned to act as a reader.

The role of reader is not as comprehensive as an introducer. Readers are expected to be familiar with the applications to which they have been assigned so that they can provide a verbal summary and score, where the two introducers fail to agree. Readers should also consider what questions they would like to ask during the interview.

As well as the applications that have been allocated to an introducer or reader, panel members should read as many of the other applications as possible (time permitting and focussing on the application form and case for support). This allows them to put the applications on which they are speaking into context with the rest of those submitted and ensures a full discussion of each application at the meeting. Due to the Large Grants full bids meeting covering the whole of the NERC remit, NERC acknowledges that many of the applications will not be within a panel members' direct expertise.

4.3 At the Panel

i.   With the applicants

Applicants will enter the meeting, the Chair will welcome them and invite them to give a 10 minute presentation to the panel. Following the presentation for the next 20 minutes, panel members will have an opportunity to ask questions to gain clarification on any outstanding points. The chair will lead on asking the standard questions on objectives, EDI and the capability to deliver. Introducers and readers will have the opportunity to ask any further specific questions. The total time allocated to each application is **55 minutes**. Depending on timings there may not be enough time to open up questioning to everyone on the panel.

All panel members can listen to the presentation and question & answer session, but those listed as having conflicts of interest cannot participate in the questioning of the applicants, and must leave the meeting for the private discussion. Following the presentation and questions, the applicants and those panel members with conflicts of interest leave the meeting.

The remaining panel members then have 20 minutes for discussion, at the end of which the final score encapsulating the Vision & Approach, Team Capability to Deliver, and Ethics/Responsible

Research & Innovation for the application will have been agreed, along with feedback for the applicants.

Panel members should focus their questions on substantive issues raised by the reviewers and NOT introduce information to the discussion that has not been previously raised by them, unless a serious issue has been identified. If an introducer (or reader/panel member) considers there is a serious issue, they should raise this at the beginning of the meeting, **before the applicants enter the meeting**. The chair and the panel can then agree whether the issue should be raised with the applicant during the interview, so they have the opportunity to respond. Any such issues should not be raised later as the applicant will not have had an opportunity to respond to the additional information, and its introduction may raise serious risks of prejudicing the decision made by the panel. It also ensures that all applications are treated on an equal basis—an issue central to the management of the peer review process.

ii. Private discussion

The Chair and Panel Secretary will ensure that panel members with conflicts of interest leave the meeting before the application is discussed, then:

- Invite the first introducer to give their comments.
- Invite the second introducer to add any additional comments.
- Invite the reader to add any further comments.
- Then, each introducer (first then second introducer), then the readers are invited to give their proposed score.

The panel then discusses and agrees a final overall score that encapsulates the Vision (including fit to scheme), Approach, Team Capability to Deliver, and Ethics/Responsible Research & Innovation. **Please see further details regarding score descriptors and how to address the assessment criteria in Section 6 – Application scoring.**

If the overall score agreed is 7 or below, the application will not be discussed further. However, the first introducer should ensure they have sufficient information to complete their consolidated feedback.

If the score is 8 or more the following should be discussed:

- **Low, medium and high score** qualifiers – panel members should be encouraged to include the use of high, medium and low as within-score descriptors for the use when ranking applications.
- **Resources** – the panel will be invited to consider whether the cost range indicated for the application is appropriate for the activities proposed.
- **Studentships** – the panel should discuss any studentships in the normal way as detailed in Section 5**.**

Feedback will be provided for every application discussed at the moderating panel meeting.

It is the responsibility of the first introducer to provide a summary of the panel's discussion of the application as feedback to the applicant(s) and as a record of the justification for the panel score and decisions. The same feedback will also be copied to the applicant's Research Organisation Administration Office.

The first introducer should record the key points using the template document provided in **Annex B**. Second introducers, readers and other panel members should be prepared to provide the first introducer with inputs if they request it. NERC will, if possible provide time as part of the meeting for attendees to complete their feedback comments and expects panel members to use any available time to prepare feedback or agree the arrangements for coordinating feedback with other members.

Care should be taken to present the feedback constructively; this should not be a list of strengths and weaknesses like a review, but should give context to the key factors that led to the application getting the score it did and should explain how the applicants could have achieved a higher score. New information not raised by the reviewers should not be included in the feedback and comments should not be made that could reveal reviewer identities or score. Introducers should ensure that the feedback provided is of a sufficient length to ensure that it provides an appropriate level of detail so that the applicants are clear as to why the application received the score it did and can see how it could be improved.

When the score and feedback have been agreed any panel members with conflicts of interest return to the meeting so the whole panel can prepare for the next set of applicants.

4.4 After the Panel

The first introducer should send the feedback to the Panel Secretary by e-mail (largegrants@nerc.ukri.org) within one week of the meeting date.

5. Associated Studentships

The Large Grant full bids moderating panel assess studentships against two criteria:

  i.   the studentship research project must be sufficiently distinct from the main grant research activities for its outcome to not affect the research outcomes of the main project; and
  ii.   the research excellence of the studentship application must be of a suitable level for it to justify funding.

Introducers (and readers) should satisfy themselves that studentships are not being used to deliver key objectives of the proposed work. If this is not clear, they should consider whether to question the applicants during the interview, and comment during the private discussion.

All associated studentships satisfying the above criteria on large grant applications that are recommended for funding will receive additional assessment against the following NERC Training Success Criteria before being approved for funding:

  i.   Training excellence. Students are managed as a cohesive group and acquire both research and transferable skills. There is a strong and active community of students that are able – and encouraged – to integrate, work and learn together.
  ii.   Multidisciplinary training environments. Training embedded in multidisciplinary training environments to enrich the student experience and to encourage the knowledge-sharing and interconnectivity, which benefits research within the environmental sciences. This does not mean that individual PhD topics are required to be multidisciplinary.
  iii. Ability to attract excellent students. Attracting the right student. NERC funding goes to the right or 'best-fit' student: the individual whose previous training, experience and skills best suit the type of training being undertaken.

This additional assessment stage is to ensure that associated studentships receive training and support comparable to studentships supported through other NERC training programmes such as Doctoral Training Partnerships.

This assessment will be carried out by members of the NERC Talent and Skills Team, and will run alongside the peer review process for the application itself, and thus not affect the overall timescale should the application be funded. The team will provide appropriate feedback to the applicant should their studentship application be rejected under the additional review criteria detailed above.

6   Application Scoring

The panel is required to agree a single overall score out of 10 for each application. This score should encompass all four of the assessment criteria: Vision (including fit to scheme), Approach, Team Capability to Deliver, and Ethics/Responsible Research & Innovation. Full details of the questions to be addressed as part of the assessment are outlined in Section 4.1 (Role of Introducers) and Section 6.1 (Fit to scheme); these should all be considered when assigning a final overall score. The Panel should refer to the scoring definitions provided below when assigning and overall score. Once the panel has agreed on a final overall score for an application it cannot be changed.

Please note that any technical assessments, detailed costings, and quotes will be requested and assessed by NERC should the application be deemed to be fundable. Letters of support from Project Partners were not required.

Score	Definition
10	**Exceptional:** The application meets all the assessment criteria to the highest standard. It's hard to see how the application could be improved.
9	**Outstanding:** The application very strongly meets all the assessment criteria.
8	**Excellent:** The application strongly meets all the assessment criteria.
7	**Very Good:** The application meets the assessment criteria well but with some minor weaknesses or limitations.
6	**Good:** The application meets the assessment criteria well but with some clear weaknesses or limitations.
5	**Adequate:** The application meets the assessment criteria but with clear weaknesses or limitations.
4	**Weak:** The application meets the assessment criteria but with significant weaknesses or limitations.
3	**Poor:** The application meets the assessment criteria but has major weaknesses or limitations.
2	**Unsatisfactory:** The application does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria.
1	**Very Unsatisfactory:** The application does not meet any of the assessment criteria.

6.1 Fit to Scheme
Reviewers of Large Grant applications have been asked to provide comments on Fit to Scheme. As detailed in the funding opportunity, Large Grants are intended to support adventurous, large-scale and complex research tackling big science questions that cannot be addressed through other NERC funding opportunities. Multidisciplinary approaches, via inter- or intra- institutional collaboration, are encouraged and appropriate management arrangements are required. It is important to consider the justification of why a large-scale project is more appropriate than several smaller ones to achieve the proposed objectives. This aspect of the application should be assessed as part of the project vision and it is important that the panel's overall score reflects the extent to which this criterion has been met – it is expected that any application recommended for funding would be considered to have a good fit to scheme.

7. Application Prioritisation

Once all the applications under discussion have been scored at the meeting, the panel is then asked to place them in priority order based upon the score given. A ranked list of the applications will be compiled based on the final score assigned to each application. If the panel assigned a grade qualifier of low, medium or high at the point of scoring the application these will be used in forming an initial ranking to aid the comparison of similarly scored applications. However, these score qualifiers will not be recorded as the final score for the application and can be discounted if the panel conclude that they do not accurately reflect the comparative excellence of the application.

All panel members will be present during application prioritisation (ranking), but those with conflicts will not be allowed to contribute to discussions when a application for which they were conflicted is being compared with another application. If any member of the panel would prefer not to be present for any part of the application prioritisation process, then they can of course leave the meeting.

8. Consideration of Resources Requested

When submitting their applications via The Funding Service (TFS), applicants were asked to tick a funding box (cost range) but no other costs were submitted. The NERC office will contact those in the funding frame after the panel to collect more detailed costing information. The panel therefore do not need to comment on any equipment or related costs. For applications ranking within the funding frame, the panel will consider whether the cost range indicated is appropriate for undertaking the work proposed.

9. Funding for International Collaborations

We work internationally with other funding organisations to help support excellent research collaborations. Agreements exist with priority funders to allow researchers to submit a single collaborative application. These agreements help minimise the risk of double jeopardy - instead of being reviewed by both funders, each collaborative submission is reviewed by a single panel, avoiding duplication of effort for applicants and peer reviewers. These agreements do not represent additional funding, their aim is to make routes to collaboration as 'normal business' as possible.

Agreements operate with the NSF division of environmental biology (DEB), the NSF directorate for geosciences (GEO) and the Research Council for the State of São Paulo, Brazil (FAPESP).

More details on funding for international collaborations can be found on the NERC website.

Any applications submitted under these mechanisms should be assessed in the same way as other applications submitted to this round. The panel should satisfy itself that the collaboration is well thought out, that it is an integrated part of the project and that it will add value.

> **Handling Conflicts of Interest in Peer Review - Guidance for NERC Reviewers and Panel Members**

UKRI defines a conflict of interest as a situation in which an individual's ability to exercise judgement or act in one role is, could be, or is seen to be impaired or otherwise influenced by their involvement in another role or relationship. If you are asked to take part in NERC peer review, either to review a NERC application or be a member of a NERC moderating or assessment panel, then you need to be aware of the UKRI policy on conflicts of interest for members of NERC boards, advisory groups and peer review panels.

You will have connections and collaborations both formal and informal with a range of organisations and individuals. In order to help you interpret the broad definition above, this advice aims to set clear expectations of the specific situations considered to represent a material conflict of interest, and when conflicts of interest need to be declared to NERC so that appropriate action can be taken. Definitions of the individuals that may be involved in a application (investigators, project partners etc) can be found in the NERC Grants Handbook.

NERC will try to avoid asking you to review or introduce applications where you have conflicts that can be identified from our own records, but many will not be obvious to us. The final responsibility for identifying and reporting conflicts of interest must therefore rest with the individual. Timing is very important as late notification is much more difficult to manage. A conflict for a panel member identified when the panel is being set up is straightforward to manage, the same conflict identified on the day of the meeting can create major problems, so please check the applications assigned to you carefully as soon as you receive them.

What Constitutes a Conflict of Interest?

Due to the complexities of relationships between researchers it is challenging to provide definitive and exclusive definitions. Some cases will be clear cut, others will be less so and will require a judgement call. We expect researchers who work in the same field to know each other, and this doesn't bar you from commenting on their applications. The test should be 'will a neutral observer have confidence in the impartiality of any advice provided' and in any case where there is significant doubt the relationship should be treated as a conflict. The NERC Executive have the final decision in any case where there is debate about whether a conflict of interest exists.

The list below shows examples of conflicts of interest, including but not limited to review and panel stages. The list is not exhaustive. You must declare any actual or perceived conflict of interest, reflecting on the perception of both yourself and others.

Personal conflict

There is a personal conflict if:

- you are named on the application
- you have assisted the applicants in preparing the application
- you are named as a project partner, subcontractor, visiting researcher or have any type of relationship with the application
- you have written a letter of support for the application
- you have agreed to be a member of a committee or board connected with the proposed project, for example an advisory group, or steering committee or board

- you are in close regular collaboration with any individuals named in the application, including investigators, research staff, collaborators, subcontractors and project partners, to an extent where you feel uncomfortable being involved in the discussion or you feel unable to give an unbiased opinion
- you have a personal, financial or professional relationship with any individuals named in the application
- you have been any of the applicants' PhD supervisor, line manager or group leader, or they have been your PhD supervisor, line manager or group leader in the last three years
- you stand to gain a financial or professional advantage from a particular outcome for an application you are asked to review

Organisational conflicts

There is an organisational conflict if:

- you are a current, Emeritus, secondment or visiting member at the same or proposed organisation as any individuals named on the application (this includes holding a position on the governance body or an honorary position within the applicant's current or proposed organisation)
- you belong to an organisation that is a project partner or subcontractor, or you are a visiting researcher from or to the organisation
- you have any type of recognised significant organisational collaboration with the application which would mean that your participation in the assessment would be seen as a conflict
- you are personally paid more than £5,000 per year from the applicant's current or proposed organisation

Commercial or financial conflicts

There is a commercial or financial conflict if:

- you have any commercial, financial or pecuniary interest, for example where you are a member of an organisation that may benefit financially, directly or indirectly, from any decision made
- you have stocks or shares in a company named in an application

Managing conflicts

Reviewers - NERC aims to avoid selecting reviewers where a conflict of interest is clear or applicants have requested that specific reviewers are not used. This will include anyone with a personal or organisational association with the application identifiable from the information available to NERC. In the peer review of funding calls with a specific research scope NERC will also avoid selecting reviewers that have submitted a application to the same call. Anyone asked to provide a review should check to ensure they have no other material conflicts, if so they should decline the request citing 'conflict of interest' as their reason. Please contact NERC quickly for advice if you are unsure. Where a material conflict is identified after a review is submitted that review will be classed as unusable and excluded from the process.

Panels - Panel members are reminded to identify any material conflicts of interest, especially with applications they have been asked to introduce, as early as possible in advance of the meeting. Where a conflict of interest is identified, panel members' meeting papers will be

edited to remove relevant information regarding the conflicted application and the member will be asked to leave the meeting when it is discussed. The meeting record will note all instances where a conflict of interest was identified and managed at a panel. For some panels, particularly where these are interview panels, the standard practice of members leaving the meeting for a conflicted application may not be practical. However, they will never participate in the discussion of that application, or be permitted to influence the final ranking of an application where such a conflict exists. In the peer review of calls with a specific research scope NERC will avoid appointing anyone to a panel that is a named investigator on any application to be considered by that panel. For Discovery Science panels, where the research scope can be broad, NERC will only involve applicants in panels when their expertise is critical, the meeting procedures will prevent them being able to influence or receive immediate information on the score or ranking of their application.

NERC staff

NERC staff may also have connections with applicants that constitute a conflict of interest. Although their opportunity to influence outcomes is limited, in such circumstances staff will not be involved in reviewer selection or any decision stage for applications where a material conflict exists.

Annex B

Panel Feedback Form

This form should be used to provide a description and justification of the moderating panel's assessment of research applications. Comments included will be used as feedback to the applicant and as a record of the panel's discussion for NERC. The same feedback will also be copied to the applicant's Research Organisation Administration Office.

Please note:

- The first introducer for each application is responsible for completing this form and sending it to the Panel Secretary within one week of the meeting date.

Application details	
Introducer name	
Grant reference	
PI name	
Application Assessment details and feedback to applicant	
Panel Score (0 – 10)	
Please detail the panel's justification for this overall score, covering the Vision (including fit to scheme), Approach, Team Capability to Deliver, and the Ethics and Responsible Research Innovation.	
Please detail any specific comments relating to the Fit to Scheme	
Please detail any comments and recommendations made by the panel (including any adjustments)	
Additional comments. Please add any other comments pertinent to the assessment of this application at the moderating panel meeting which have not been included above	