Procedure for Demand-Managing the Submission of Funding Applications to NERC (Standard Grants only)

In July 2015, NERC introduced a demand management (DM) policy that limits the number of grant applications that some institutions can make — the quota is based on each organisation's historic grant-success rate. Originally, the University of Glasgow was permitted to submit ONE application. From 1 February 2016 the quota has been increased to THREE applications per round. Therefore THREE applications will be submitted in each of the next two funding rounds (July 2016 and January 2017 deadlines). Note that the DM policy applies to standard grant (including New Investigator) calls only.

More detail on NERC's DM policy, including FAQs, can be viewed here: http://www.nerc.ac.uk/funding/available/researchgrants/demand/

The following procedure has been introduced to ensure the coordination of applications from groups with relevant research interests, and the submission to NERC of the best-quality proposals:

1. Submissions will be split on a rotational 2:1 basis. In July 2016 CSE will be allocated TWO submissions and MVLS will be allocated ONE. This will reverse in January 2017 with MVLS being allocated TWO submissions and CSE being allocated ONE.
2. The most competitive proposal would be identified through an internal selection process. Prospective applicants from the relevant College should prepare a two-page outline of their proposal and submit it to their College coordinator (Lynne Brown in CSE and Lorna Kennedy in MVLS) by the deadline outlined in the table below. A template for preparing this outline is provided on Pages 4–5 of this document.
3. A College-level selection panel chosen by the Dean of Research (DoR) would score the proposals within a two-week timeframe and choose the most promising one to be developed as a full application. The College coordinator would request that prospective applicants indicate their interest to submit an application; the DoR would use this information to appoint an appropriate panel that avoids conflicts of interest (see table for deadline). Where conflicts exist and are insurmountable at College level, the proposals should be sent to the VP for Research (vp-research@glasgow.ac.uk), Miles Padgett, who will seek external input to inform his assessment.
4. To avoid multiple submissions to NERC, the Research Strategy and Innovation Office (RSIO) will communicate the name of the selected applicant to the pre-award team in the Research Support Office.

5. The selected applicant would then prepare a full grant application approximately 6 weeks before the NERC deadline and submit it for consideration by an internal review panel drawn from the Schools/Institutes that conduct NERC-eligible research: Maths & Stats, GES/SUERC, Engineering, BAHCM.
6. The panel would provide prompt feedback in advance of a full application to NERC.
7. It is important to note that NERC's DM policy applies to standard mode grants only – there is no barrier to Glasgow researchers wishing to apply to any other NERC funding scheme.

NERC standard grant submission deadline:	**Prospective applicants are identified; Panel is assembled avoiding COI**	**Prospective applicants submit a 2-page proposal to College coordinator**	**Panel shortlists ONE/TWO proposals^**	**RSIO notifies RSO of applicant name**	**Applicant submits full application for internal evaluation**	**Panel provides feedback on full application**	**Applicant submits final application to funder**
22 July 2016 (date tbc) **^(CSE-2, MVLS-1)**	8 April 2016	22 April 2016	29 April 2016	2 May 2016	3 June 2016	10 June 2016	By 22 July 2016
20 January 2017 (date tbc) **^(MVLS-2, CSE-1)**	12 October 2016	26 October 2016	2 November 2016	3 November 2016	7 December 2016	14 December 2016	By 20 January 2017
Responsibility:	*College Coordinator* identifies prospective applicants ➔ DoR for panel appointment*	*College coordinator ➔ DoR/Panel, if no conflict; otherwise VP Research***	*DoR/Panel ➔ College coordinator feeds back to applicants and notifies RSIO***	*RSIO ➔ Research Support Office*	*Applicant ➔ College coordinator ➔ DoR/Panel*	*DoR/Panel ➔ College coordinator ➔ Applicant*	*Applicant*

***College coordinators**: MVLS: Lorna Kennedy (Lorna.Kennedy@glasgow.ac.uk); CSE: Lynne Brown (Lynne.Brown@glasgow.ac.uk);
****VP Research:** Miles Padgett/RSIO (vp-research@glasgow.ac.uk)

Two-Page Outline for Internal Evaluation of NERC Grant Proposals

(11 pt Arial, minimum 2 cm margins all around)

1. Which panel is this aimed at?
2. Names of participants:
3. Is this a single institution proposal?
4. Is this proposal a resubmission? If so, what mark did it achieve (attach document with panel comments)

Details of proposal

1. Summary of background and motivation for project
   Approximately half or 2/3 of a page, explaining the gap in knowledge that this project will fill, stating why the project is topical, timely, and important and how it will advance the field (*'This will be the first measurement of X, which will allow Y and will be of enormous significance for Z')'*.
2. Specific objectives
   Given in full, as they would be in the final proposal (so occupying half a page), so that the review panel can evaluate whether they are interesting/focussed/novel/cohesive.
3. Methodology/feasibility
   Approximately half a page, giving a brief summary of approach to be adopted (e.g. lab or field, experimental or correlative, modelling or empirical), mentioning any pilot data that have been gathered, protocols that have been tested, the names of any collaborators, and any other details that will convince the panel that this project is well planned and feasible ('*We have already proven that we can measure W, have circumstantial evidence that X is likely to happen, and will collaborate with Y who is an expert in measuring Z')* . Also include details of resources — what staff and major resources would be needed from UofG vs funded by the grant ('*The project will fund a postdoc for 3 years, plus 30% buy-out of technician X; it will require access to equipment Y and use of facility Z in year 2'*).
4. Impact
   A few lines on the potential impact and beneficiaries of the study.
5. Expertise and track record
   A sentence or two on the expertise that you bring to the project and how this might be complemented by that of collaborators.