



# Guidelines for Projects Peer Review Proposal

---

Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP).....	1
Introduction .....	1
1. Aims of the scheme.....	2
2. Timetable .....	2
3. The Projects Peer Review Panel Remit .....	2
4. PPRP Application Process.....	2
5. STFC Resources and Guidelines .....	3
6. PPRP Proposal .....	4
7. Assessment Framework .....	7
Annex 1 – Finance Tables.....	9
Work-package tables .....	9
Summary Table .....	14
Annex 2 – Risk Management Guidance and Template .....	15
Suggested Risk Index Scheme .....	16

## Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP)

The Projects Peer Review Panel (PPRP) is responsible for the assessment of projects that are considered to have significant scientific priority in particle physics, nuclear physics, astronomy, particle astrophysics, accelerator and solar system science.

### Introduction

The purpose of these notes is to provide guidance and instructions to Applicants when preparing a grant application for consideration by the PPRP. They are intended to supplement the [STFC Grants Handbook](#) and [Je-S Handbook](#) by providing specific guidance on the PPRP process.

## 1. Aims of the scheme

The specific aims of the PPRP scheme are to assess each proposal in a systematic and time constrained process; calls for proposals and PPRP meetings are scheduled in advance with deadlines set to allow efficient and effective due diligence. Applicants who have submitted a successful Statement of Interest (SoI) will be invited to submit a full proposal to the PPRP.

## 2. Timetable

STFC provides research grant funding opportunities via quarterly PPRP calls. The corresponding PPRP meetings are scheduled in advance and STFC makes every attempt to ensure that the review process is carried out in a timely way. Should STFC need to cancel any meetings, applicants will be informed as soon as possible with an explanation of any delays; accordingly, applicants are required to meet any specified deadlines so that an efficient and effective review process can take place.

## 3. The Projects Peer Review Panel Remit

The PPRP is responsible for the assessment of projects that are considered to have significant scientific priority in particle physics, nuclear physics, astronomy, particle astrophysics, accelerator and solar system science. The panel will be supplemented with area specific experts for each proposal.

The PPRP will provide proposal recommendations to be submitted to the Science Board (SB).

## 4. PPRP Application Process

A flow chart of the PPRP process can be found [here](#).

### 1. Applicant liaison with Programme Manager

The applicant must contact the relevant Programme Manager of STFC to discuss the proposed programme. Once the Programme Manager agrees, the applicant is requested to send a Statement of Interest.

### 2. SOI

A Statement of Interest (SOI) must be completed for initial evaluation and review by the Science Board. This document details the key scientific aims and a full economic cost of the proposed programme of work.

### 3. Science Board Meeting

During the Science Board meeting, the SOI is reviewed by the Executive and Science Board committee. If agreed, the applicant will be asked to submit a comprehensive proposal to PPRP.

### 4. Proposal Submission to PPRP

The proposal along with the Joint Electronic Submission (Je-S) form must be submitted through the electronic submission system to the specified PPRP call. The submission deadlines are publicized on [STFC Funding Opportunities](#) web page.

Each proposal is assessed by external reviewers via Je-S. Reviewers submit written comments on the proposal; applicants will be given the opportunity to see and respond to all reviewer comments. There is a half a page limit per review for responses and it should be returned within 10 days of receipt.

Preliminary assessment of the proposal and resource work package will be explored by the PPRP Secretary, external experts and nominated PPRP members. Applicants will be contacted directly if there are any areas of the proposal that requires more detail or rework in advance of the PPRP meeting.

### 5. PPRP Meeting

The PPRP meeting is held to assess the proposal and question the applicant. The meeting consists of open sessions, where members of the public can attend, and closed sessions. In its assessment of proposals the panel will look at each category referred to in the [STFC Grants Handbook Assessment](#)

[Criteria](#) to ensure all requirements are met. Feedback questions from the meeting are sent to the applicant; the responses are assessed at the Visiting Panel Meeting.

#### **6. Visiting Panel Meeting**

The Visiting Panel meeting carries out a detailed assessment of the proposal. The meeting consists of Panel experts and members of PPRP. The final recommendation usually takes place at the end of this meeting during a closed session.

#### **7. PPRP Report**

A report from the Visiting Panel is written in conjunction with the STFC Office and agreed and finalised by the Visiting Panel Chair. The report presents the Visiting Panel's findings and is submitted to the next Science Board meeting.

#### **8. Science Board Meeting**

At the Science Board meeting, the Visiting Panel Chair presents the Visiting Panel's recommendations to Science Board. Science Board decides on the strategic recommendations and reports directly to Council.

#### **9. Outcome of Proposal**

After discussion with the STFC Executive on Science Board's recommendation, the Science Board Secretary will inform the applicant of STFC's decision. On average a successful proposal will take 6-9 months.

#### **10. Informing PPRP**

PPRP will be informed of the recommendations made to Science Board by the Visiting Panel and the actual funding decisions made by Science Board at the next PPRP meeting.

### **5. STFC Resources and Guidelines**

STFC policies and procedures are aligned with the Research Councils UK policies; applicants can refer to the following supporting documentation:

[RCUK Peer Review Framework](#)

[STFC Project Management Framework](#)

[STFC Grants Handbook](#)

[Je-S Handbook](#)

 [Pathways to Impact](#)

[Data management plan](#)

[Peer Review and Assessment](#)

[ResearchFish](#)

## 6. PPRP Proposal

All proposals should be submitted online using the Je-S System; there are links to tutorials and help areas on the system. Applicants should select the following options in the Je-S system when generating their proposal:

- Council: STFC
- Document Type: Standard Proposal
- Scheme: PPRP
- Call: PPRP Round X 20YY

Failure to select the options displayed above may result in the proposal not reaching the correct Research Council or department therein, and cause the Je-S proposal to be returned and resubmitted.

It is the responsibility of the submitting grant's Principle Investigator (PI) to insure that the institution's administration department submits the proposal before 4:00pm on the deadline day. Applicants can view the status of the proposal online by logging into the Je-S system. STFC are unable to view the proposal until has been submitted by the institution's administration department and has undergone initial checks by the RCUK Grants Operation Team.

Councils operate a 'page' restriction policy on attachment length; the proposal attachments should not exceed 40 pages including technical appendices. Applications that exceed the requested page restriction on any part of the submission may be rejected.

The completed Je-S proposal form will require an accompanying Case for Support, a Pathway to Impact and a Data Management Plan, each as a separate attached PDF file and all must be submitted by 4.00pm on the closing date. For information on other supporting documents please see the [STFC Grants Handbook](#).

### Case for Support

The Case for Support document should not exceed the 40 page restriction including technical appendices; STFC specific page format and style guidance is available on the [Je-S Handbook](#). The Finance Tables and Risk Register should be appended to the Case for Support document but are not included in the 40 page limit. The Case for Support should be clear and concise with minimal technical jargon, and address the following:

#### *Scientific Needs*

- **Objectives:** A description of the intended end result of the project should be given. This should be clearly stated so that the success or failure of the project can easily be determined at the end of the funded period. Any intermediate results upon which the final result depends should be identified.
- **Project Description:** A description of the applicants proposed contribution to the project should be given. The stage of the project (e.g. R&D, construction etc.) should be specified. The document should highlight any unique contributions, likely global impact and aspects of UK leadership.
- **STFC Science and strategy:** Identify the specific STFC science opportunities that this project addresses. How does this relate to STFC priorities? What aspects are particularly relevant? What is its potential impact? Are there any long-term implications or liabilities that may be generated as a result of investing in this project?
- **Awareness & Context:** Describe the present status of related research and development

worldwide. Where is this research field likely to be in 10 years' time? What is the current state of play? How important is it that we act now? Does the project have a strong supportive user base among the relevant community both in the UK and internationally?

- **Competing research:** Provide a summary of any competing experiments or research and level of investment. There should be some analysis of the benefits of this particular research against similar past and current research worldwide.
- **Track record:** Explain your track record in this field. Why do you consider your group the best or most appropriate to carry out this programme? How should the introducers be confident that you would be able to deliver the project? What is the competency of your group to perform this work?

### *Business Needs*

- **Project Management Plan:** The STFC Project Management Framework sets out the programme management framework within which projects are appraised, funded, and managed by STFC, and must be followed for all funded projects and programmes.
- **Project organisation and participants:** Proposals should identify the implementation strategy, duration, project deliverable ownership, and work packages; representation of this information in Gantt chart format is recommended. All funded UK participants, their staff category, FtE (full time equivalent) project/work package allocation per year, activity and justification for each post, should be listed. Key individuals, such as the UK Spokesperson and Project Manager(s), responsible for ensuring that the project and its constituent parts are kept on schedule and budget should be identified.

### *Finance Tables*

Finance tables must be appended to the Case for Support; exemplars can be found in Annex 1. Finance Tables ; cost tables should be completed for each work package.

Advice on costing should be sought from the relevant Programme Manager. All project costs should be presented in a clear and understandable way, and all resource requests must be fully justified; failure to provide full and explicit resource justification is likely to result in resource request being rejected.

All costs in the finance tables must be in agreement with the funding requested within the Je-S form; there should not be any discrepancies as the proposal will be returned where there is inconsistency.

**Working Allowance** This is used to cope with the uncertainties that occur in all projects, such as increased cost of materials, complexity of design and manufacture of components. It can be calculated in a number of ways and should take account of the project risks and their mitigation. There should be a reasonable chance (i.e. greater than 75%) that the project can be completed within the budget of the base cost plus the working allowance ; it is awarded as part of the grant at announcement (at 100%).

**Contingency** This should not be requested on the Je-S form; it is for the unknown and unexpected things that can occur within a project and which could not reasonably be predicted. It should be calculated on the basis of an understanding of the risks of the project and there should be a high expectation that the project can be completed without the use of contingency. Contingency will only be released on the approval of STFC Executive after it has considered advice from the STFC Oversight Committee or Project Board and explored the possibilities of de-scoping the project.

**STFC Laboratory costs** – these should be shown as 100% in the Full Proposal (case for support) document and staff costs, including overheads, based on the [Internal Research Funding for STFC Sites](#)

**Policy.** These always count as ‘new’ costs. Please consult with the Programme Manager for the latest advice on STFC costs and costing.


### ***Risk Management***

The systematic identification and analysis of the strategic, financial and operational uncertainties associated with the proposal helps devolve the responsibility for risk management to the appropriate level. It is recommended that a Risk Register identifying the proposal’s risks, mitigation activities and associated schedule/financial impact with an explanation of how these have been calculated. Further information about risk management and a risk template can be found in Annex 2.

**Collaborative Projects:** Describe linkages and/or collaborations with key collaborators and/or external players in this area. Include a description of how responsibilities are to be shared among the collaborators, both within the UK and internationally. For international collaborations, the membership of the international collaboration, a brief breakdown of responsibilities within it, and how the significance of the UK contribution to the project fits relative to those from other countries, should be given. The status of approval and funding of the international experiment should be provided.

**Key Stakeholders/Cross-Council involvement:** The key stakeholders in the project should be identified. Describe any links to other (non-STFC) research council or research establishment (Department of Business, Innovation and Skills; Ministry of Defence; Department of Health, etc.).

### **Pathway to Impact**

 [Grants Research Handbook provides Pathway to Impact guidance.](#) PPRP Grants will not be allowed to start without an acceptable ‘Pathway to Impact’ statement.

### **Data Management Plan**

The [Grants Research Handbook provides Data Management guidance.](#) PPRP Grants will not be allowed to start without an acceptable Data Management and Sharing plan.

## 7. Assessment Framework

The framework contains six areas for consideration: excellence, economic impact, societal impact, leadership, synergies and project management; and these are described below. Although each area is considered during the assessment process, scientific excellence is considered to be the most important. The panel will also refer to the [Research Grants Handbook Assessment Criteria](#).

### *Excellence*

- The scientific merit of the project and its potential to make a significant contribution to advancing or providing insight into our fundamental understanding
- The scientific importance of the project including the current state of the area and a longer term view of the future.
- The timeliness of the project.
- The key stakeholders, the strategic importance of the project to them and the benefits to them.
- The benefits of the project compared to past, current and future planned experiments worldwide.
- The technical importance of the project.
- The international relevance of the research, in both European and global arenas.

### *Economic Impact*

- The project contribution to new businesses, product processes or services.
- The impact in the development of people with transferable skills.
- The match to public policy and/or cross Research Council priorities.
- The potential to lever further funding to STFC and/or the UK.
- Engagement with UK industry including procurement relationships.

### *Societal Impact*

- The wider societal benefits including information on public outreach plans and activities, impact on young people, education in schools or on the wider publics.
- The potential media impact and its relation to the STFC mission.
- Increasing the effectiveness of public services and policy
- Enhancing quality of life, health and creative output.

### *Leadership*

- The level of UK leadership and track record in this area.
- The extent to which STFC/UK involvement will result in greater research output or a higher level of external funding to the project.
- The extent to which involvement in this project will provide STFC with an opportunity to influence policy and funding in the future.

### *Synergies*

- The alignment of the project/facility to STFC strategic objectives and core business activities.

- The extent to which the project/facility benefits from or contributes to coherence and synergies with other programmes, including international subscriptions.
- The relevance (if appropriate) to the strategies of the Daresbury and Harwell Science Innovation Campuses.

### *Project Management*

- The quality of the project management plan including the project schedule.
- Clear, detailed and justified costs including any resource implications associated with Pathways to Impact statement and corresponding activities.
- Evaluation of the Risk Register associated with implementation of the project and the risks associated with the economic impact, societal impact and leadership objectives.



## Annex 1 – Finance Tables

Applicants should note that failure to comply with the format requested will result in the proposal being returned for amendment. It is essential that all costs are consistent between Finance Tables and the Je-S forms.

The [Guidance for Finance Tables](#) is available on the STFC website.

### Work-package tables

These notes should be read in conjunction with the example provided. Applicants are required to adhere to the following guidance and to consult the office prior to submission if queries cannot be answered by reference to this guidance.

A separate table is required for each individual work-package. Where a work-package contains sub work-packages, costs need to be presented for each individual sub work-package and itemised individually as shown in the example. Each item requested must identify which Institution / Organisation is making the request.

All costs must be shown in financial years (NOT GRANT YEARS) STFC financial years begin on 1 April. Costs should be shown as two separate totals:

- 100% FEC costs
- Total cost to Research Council (RC)

In calculating the total cost to RC, the following percentages should be used for fund categories and Applicants are advised to add a footnote to the table explaining the calculation.

- Staff, Travel, ODI, ODA, Estate and Indirect costs, at 80%
- All STFC Laboratory costs at 100% including Exceptions - Staff, Exceptions - Other costs, Exceptions - Working Allowance,
- Equipment (Instrument Development) – 100%
- Most other Equipment - 50%, please refer to the Research Grants Handbook for further information on Equipment contributions

All costs must be presented in the correct year according to the following standard profiles:

- Applicant costs should show the FTE requested each year as information for the panel. However the costs need to be presented as a flat profile across the duration of the grant.
- Staff costs (Researchers, Technicians, Other etc.) should be presented as actual in year costs in accordance with start and end dates (i.e. not generally flat profiled) and in line with the Je-S entries. It is worth noting that where a post is entered as an average % FTE over the duration of the grant on Je-S, the associated salary costs will also be averaged. It is therefore worth having several entries where FTE differs between years. For example, a Researcher working for 3 years at 50% in year 1, and 80% in years 2 and 3, could be entered onto Je-S as a single post for 3 years at 70% FTE (an average across the duration which would be reflected in the payments). To be more accurate two entries could be made, 1 year at 50% and another for 2 years at 80%, therefore better reflecting the actual costs.
- Where staff are not working for an entire year, the start date and duration of the post must be presented in addition to the relevant percentage FTE.
- Travel, Other Directly Incurred, Other Directly Allocated, Exception, Estate and Indirect costs

should be presented evenly across the duration of the proposal.

- Equipment costs should be presented in the FIRST year of the proposal only.
- STFC Laboratory costs should be presented as actually required.

### (1) WORKPACKAGE COST TABLE

*Work package reference number and title (WP 1 – Title)*

Financial year Staff - FTE / £	01/04/2016		01/04/2017		01/04/2018		Totals
	% FTE	Cost £	% FTE	Cost £	% FTE	Cost £	Cost £
<b>1.1: Title of sub work package</b>							
<i>Institution PDRA start 1.4.16 x 18 months</i>	100	10,000	50	5,000	0	0	15,000
<i>PDRA replacement - start 1.10.17 x 18 months</i>	0	0	50	5,000	100	10,000	15,000
<i>Institution – PhD</i>	100	1,000	100	1,000	100	1,000	3,000
<i>Institution - DI Technical support name</i>	50	15,000	50	15,000	50	15,000	45,000
<i>Institution - Details of support staff</i>	30	300	30	300	30	300	900
<i>Institution - Applicant name 1</i>	10	500	10	500	10	500	1,500
<b>Total PDRA FTE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>Total PhD FTE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>
<b>Total DI Technical FTE</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>45,000</b>
<b>Total Support Staff FTE</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>Total Applicant FTE</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>Total Staff costs</b>		<b>26,800</b>		<b>26,800</b>		<b>26,800</b>	<b>80,400</b>

<b>Non Staff Costs</b> <i>single line per item</i>	<b>Cost £</b>	<b>Cost £</b>	<b>Cost £</b>	<b>Totals</b>
<b>Travel</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	500	500	500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>Other Directly Incurred (ODI)</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>3,000</b>
<b>Exceptions</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	500	500	500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>Equipment Total</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	11,000	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,000</b>
<b>Other Directly Allocated (ODA)</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	2,500	2,500	2,500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>7,500</b>
<b>Indirect Cost</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	10,000	10,000	10,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>Estate Cost</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	10,000	10,000	10,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>ODA – Infrastructure Technicians</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	5,000	5,000	5,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>
<b>Total cost sub workpackage at 100% fEC</b>	<b>67,300</b>	<b>56,300</b>	<b>56,300</b>	<b>179,900</b>
<b>Total cost to Research Council</b>	<b>56,340</b>	<b>45,340</b>	<b>45,340</b>	<b>147,020</b>

Financial year	01/04/2016		01/04/2017		01/04/2018		Totals
Staff FTE / £	% FTE	Cost - £	% FTE	Cost - £	% FTE	Cost - £	Cost £
<b>1.2: Title of sub work package</b>							
<i>Institution - PDRA name</i>	100	10,000	50	5,000	0	0	15,000
<i>PDRA replacement (start 1.10.17 - 18 months)</i>	0	0	50	5,000	100	10,000	15,000
<i>STFC Lab (RAL,ATC etc) - Tech support name</i>	50	15,000	50	15,000	50	15,000	45,000
<i>Other Details of support staff per Institution (secretarial support etc)</i>	30	300	30	300	30	300	900
<i>Institution - Applicant name 1</i>	10	1,000	10	1,000	10	1,000	3,000
<i>STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc) - Applicant name 1</i>	30	4,000	30	4,000	30	4,000	12,000
<b>Total PDRA FTE</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>Total DI Technical FTE</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>45,000</b>
<b>Total Support Staff FTE</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>900</b>
<b>Total Applicant FTE</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>
<b>Total Staff costs</b>		<b>30,300</b>		<b>30,300</b>		<b>30,300</b>	<b>90,900</b>

<b>Non Staff Costs</b> <i>single item per line</i>	<b>Cost - £</b>	<b>Cost - £</b>	<b>Cost - £</b>	<b>Totals</b>
<b>Travel</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	500	500	500	1,500
<i>STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc )</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>4,500</b>
<b>Other Directly Incurred (ODI)</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
<i>STFC Lab (RAL, ATC etc)</i>	1,000	1,000	1,500	3,500
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>6,500</b>
<b>Exceptions</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	500	500	500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,500</b>
<b>Equipment Total</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	13,500	0	0	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13,500</b>
<b>Other Directly Allocated</b>				
<i>Institution - Item description</i>	2,500	2,500	2,500	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>7,500</b>
<b>Indirect Cost</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	10,000	10,000	10,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>Estate Cost</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	10,000	10,000	10,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>
<b>ODA – Infrastructure Technicians</b>				
<i>Institution</i>	5,000	5,000	5,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>
<b>Total cost sub workpackage at 100% fEC</b>	<b>75,300</b>	<b>61,800</b>	<b>62,300</b>	<b>199,400</b>
<b>Total cost to Research Council</b>	<b>67,240</b>	<b>53,740</b>	<b>54,240</b>	<b>175,220</b>
<b>Total cost WORKPACKAGE at 100% fEC</b>	<b>142,600</b>	<b>118,100</b>	<b>118,600</b>	<b>379,300</b>
<b>* Total cost of WORKPACKAGE to RC</b>	<b>123,580</b>	<b>99,080</b>	<b>99,580</b>	<b>322,240</b>
<p>* RC contribution costed at 80% with the exception of:  STFC Lab Staff, STFC Non staff requests, PhDs, Equipment which have been costed at 100%</p>				

## Summary Table

Applicants should ensure that all costs on the Summary table are consistent with those presented in the individual Work Package Tables. Contingency costs and Working Allowance should be included in the Summary Table only. Should Working Allowance be awarded then STFC will amend the request from ODI at 80% Research Council Contribution to Exceptions at 100% contribution

There is a requirement for Particle Physics, Particle Astronomy and Nuclear Physics Projects to provide details of Consolidated Grant support in the Summary table. The numbers presented should be an estimate of the total Consolidated Grant costs, including salary, estates in-directs and any other resource, and presented as the actual cost to the Research Council.

### (2) SUMMARY COST TABLE FOR WHOLE PROJECT

Financial Year	01/04/2016	01/04/2017	01/04/2018	Totals
	£	£	£	Cost £
<i>Applicants</i>	5,500	5,500	5,500	16,500
<i>PDRAs</i>	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
<i>STFC (RAL, ATC etc)</i>	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
<i>PhD</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
<i>Technicians</i>	15,000	15,000	15,000	45,000
<i>Other Staff</i>	600	600	600	1,800
<i>Travel</i>	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
<i>Other Directly Incurred</i>	3,000	3,000	3,500	9,500
<i>Exceptions</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000
<i>Equipment</i>	24,500	0	0	24,500
<i>Other Directly Allocated</i>	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
<i>Indirect Costs</i>	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
<i>Estate Costs</i>	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000
<i>Infrastructure Technicians</i>	10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
<i>Exceptions - Working Allowance *</i>	5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
<b>TOTAL 100% Costs</b>	<b>147,600</b>	<b>123,100</b>	<b>123,600</b>	<b>394,300</b>
<b>Total Cost to Research Council</b>	<b>128,580</b>	<b>104,080</b>	<b>104,580</b>	<b>337,240</b>
<b>Contingency</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>
<i>Total Consolidated Grant - please refer to the guidance</i>	100,000	150,000	150,000	400,000

*\*Use a single line to identify each Institution requesting a Working Allowance*

**Please note that a download template of these finance tables is available on the STFC website.**

## Annex 2 – Risk Management Guidance and Template

### Guidance on Risk Management

Risk is any action or event that affects a project's ability to achieve its objectives. Risks can be seen as a threat to the success of a project because they have a negative impact on cost, schedule and technical performance. However, with appropriate procedures, risks can be managed and in so doing, present new opportunities with a positive impact. It is as much concerned with good things not happening as bad things happening.

The objective of risk management is to identify, assess, reduce, accept and control risk in a systematic and proactive way, while at the same time taking into account the project's technical and programmatic constraints (e.g. costs, timescales, specifications, etc.). To achieve this, risk needs to be captured effectively so that appropriate management attention can be directed to the essential issues. The various stakeholders can then agree on the best course of action for mitigating the risk. This approach underpins the key objective of risk management.

### Basic Principles and Process

STFC's risk management policy requires well-structured information about the nature of risk so that the information can facilitate communication and the management decision making process. Certain activities must be implemented as part of a risk management plan and risk management must be seen as part of the normal project management structure and internal reporting within the STFC's Science Programme Office (SPO) through its project assurance process.

An outline of the steps used in the risk management process is shown below. Generally trade-offs are made among the different, and often competing, project goals. Undesired events are assessed for severity/impact and likelihood. In the assessment of mitigating risk and devising an action plan, risk is considered tradable against known project resources within the management (e.g. cost and schedule) and technical domains (e.g. specification). Key steps comprise:

- Identifying the full spectrum of potential risks through appropriate techniques (e.g. engineering analysis, project team meetings etc)
- Analysing and assessing the risks to determine the most serious and rank them through a risk index scheme (see below)
- Capturing and tracking risks on a standard risk register. This should distinguish between inherent and residual risk. The former is the risk present before taking any mitigation action, while the latter is what remains after mitigation
- Devising action plans to mitigate risks either by avoiding the risk, transferring the risk, reducing the probability/impact or accepting the risk; this requires an understanding of the cost and schedule impact of the risk as part of determining an appropriate level of working margin and contingency. Some types of risk lend themselves to a numerical diagnosis – particularly financial or technical risk. For other risks such as reputational risk, a more subjective view is all that is possible.
- Implementing action and control plans and taking appropriate actions when unforeseen risks occur. This will include monitoring, communicating and accepting risks as well as alerting the management team of new risks.

## Suggested Risk Index Scheme

A risk index scheme should be used to score or measure the magnitude of the each risk scenario. It is a combination of the likelihood of occurrence and the impact or severity of the consequence of the risk materialising. Scores are used to measure the likelihood and impact.

It is important that periodic assessment and review of all identified risks and up-dating of results takes place as part of the project management reporting. For this reason, risks should be captured and tracked using a Risk Register (suggested template attached below).

### Likelihood

### Risk Index: Combination of Impact and Likelihood

0.8-1.0	Medium	Medium	High	High	High	
0.6-0.8	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High	
0.4-0.6	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High	
0.2-0.4	Low	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	
0.0-0.2	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium	
	0-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	81-100	<b>Impact</b>

Risk index	Risk severity or magnitude	Proposed actions
50 - 100	High risk	Unacceptable risk: implement new mitigation process or change baseline (e.g. de-scope, re-schedule) – seek high level project management intervention as defined in the risk management plan.
25 – 50	Medium risk	Unacceptable risk: actively manage, consider alternative mitigation process or baseline (e.g. de-scope) – seek attention at appropriate management level as defined in the risk management plan.
0 – 25	Low risk	Acceptable risk: control, monitor – seek responsible work package management attention.

NB. For further information please contact the relevant SPO programme manager.



**RISK REGISTER**

Total risk is product of  
Likelihood and Impact

0 - 25	low
25 - 50	med
50 - 100	high

**Project Title:**  
**Project**  
**Manager:**

**Last Update:**

Ref.	Risk Description	Potential impact on project	Owner	Inherent Risk			Existing Controls	Current/ Proposed mitigation	Residual Risk			Risk Exposure		Action Required
				Likelihood	Impact	Total			Likelihood	Impact	Total	Description	Cost (£k)	
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			
						0					0			

**Notes**

Likelihood scale of 0.1 to where 0.1 is low.

Impact scale of 1 -100 where 1 is low.

