

UKRI-NHMRC Built Environment and Prevention Research Scheme 2019

CALL-SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR APPLICANTS

This guidance supplements the [standard MRC Guidance for Applicants](#). Please consult the [standard MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for information such as preparing the UK budget for your proposal.

It is also important that Australian researchers are aware of all relevant guidance provided by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC). Please refer to the [NHMRC call webpage](#), [Guideline documents](#) and [NHMRC's Research Grants Management System](#) (RGMS).

This call-specific guidance document provides additional information specific to this call. Where guidance in the present document differs from that in the [standard MRC Guidance for Applicants](#), it is important you follow the guidance in this present, scheme specific, document.

Contents

1. Important application information	3
2. Who can apply?.....	5
2.1 Types of research organisations (ROs)	5
2.2 People named on the grant.....	5
3. Application process	8
3.1 Intention to Submit (ItS)	8
3.2 Full application: process overview.....	8
3.3 Full application: summary of components.....	9
3.4 The Case for Support and Justification of Resources.....	11
3.5 Creating a Je-S account and application	12
3.6 Budgets	14
4. Assessment process and criteria	16
5. Agreements and ethics	18
5.1 Collaboration Agreement	18
5.2 Intellectual Property.....	18
5.3 Material Transfer Agreements	19
5.4 Ethics.....	19



UK Research
and Innovation



UK Research
and Innovation



5.5 Use of humans/human tissue	20
5.6 Use of animals	21
5.7 Use of Stem Cells	22
6. Terms and conditions	23
7. Contacts and Guidance	25
Annex 1: External peer review scoring system	26
Annex 2: Peer review panel scoring system	28

1. Important application information

The [Medical Research Council \(MRC\)](#) and the [Australian National Health and Medical Research Council \(NHMRC\)](#) together with the [Economic and Social Research Council \(ESRC\)](#) are pleased to invite proposals to the UKRI-NHMRC Built Environment Prevention Research Scheme.

For further information on the background, aim, objectives and scope please see the [Call webpage](#).

Researchers will be responsible for developing their own collaborations and, once a research proposal is developed, UK and Australian applicants must apply jointly for funding. For administrative purposes, all projects will have a Principal Investigator (PI) based at a UK Research Organisation (RO) and a Chief Investigator (CI) based at a Australian RO. Partners must work together to complete one joint application to be written in English and submitted to the MRC via the MRC [Joint electronic System \(Je-S\) System](#).

Research Grants under this call must be three years in duration and must start on **15th May 2020**.

The total funding available for this call is as follows:

- MRC/ESRC - up to £2m
- NHMRC - up to \$4m AUD

Funding for projects awarded under this call for proposals is jointly provided by the MRC, ESRC and NHMRC. The MRC and ESRC will fund the UK component of the proposal at the standard 80% of the full Economic Cost (fEC), and NHMRC will fund the Australian component of the proposal.

The size of the grants will vary according to the needs of each research project. UK and Australian applicants do not need to request equal amounts from both sides. The difference in values should reflect the difference in costs covered and local prices. The agencies also expect the costs on each side to accurately reflect the research effort to be carried out. It is expected, however, that the research effort on both sides is comparable.

It is expected that this funding will support approximately five projects subject to scientific quality.

Key dates

Activity	Date
Call launch	5 August 2019
Deadline for compulsory Intention to Submit	17 September 2019 (UK deadline 23:00 British Summer Time)
Deadline for investigators to submit full proposal on UK Je-S system	16.00 British Summer Time on 15 October 2019
Deadline for investigators to submit Australian budget on Australian RGMS	17.00 AEDT on 16 October 2019
External peer review	October-December 2019
UK PI to responds to peer reviewer comments on behalf of the researchers on the project	~late December 2019/early January 2020
Panel meeting	February 2020
Applicants notified of funding decision	~Mid-April 2020
Projects start	15 May 2020

2. Who can apply?

For support under this call, applicants and organisations must be eligible to apply for funding from their respective country's funding agency/agencies. The expectation is that the UK PI and associated costs for UK research would be funded by the MRC/ESRC, while the Australian CI and associated costs for Australian research would be funded by NHMRC.

2.1 Types of research organisations (ROs)

The UK Principal Investigator (PI) MUST be based at one of the following, as per standard MRC and ESRC eligibility criteria:

- Higher education institutions
- Independent research organisations
- Government funded organisations (other than MRC funded units and institutes)
- MRC units/institutes
- University units (former MRC units)

For the MRC/ESRC participants, standard UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) eligibility criteria as described on the [UKRI website](#) will apply. Applications cannot be accepted from UK principal investigators in commercial organisations. **See [section 1 of the standard MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for further details about eligible UK institutions. This call will follow standard MRC eligibility criteria.**

The Australian Chief Investigator CI MUST be based at an eligible Research Organisation. Please see NHMRC guidance for eligibility process and associated timelines ([NHMRC call webpage](#) and [Guideline documents](#)).

The funders are not seeking to support applicants/partners outside of the UK and Australia through this initiative. Please contact international@mrc.ukri.org if you are considering involving applicants/partners from a third country in your proposal.

2.2 People named on the grant

The UK Principal Investigator and Australian Chief Investigator

The proposal should be jointly developed by a UK PI and an Australian CI. They will develop a common research plan and vision. They will also equally share leadership and project management for each project.

PIs/CIs may only submit one application to this scheme as PI/CI but may be involved in more applications if listed as a Co-Investigator/Associate Investigator.

The maximum number of Australian CIs allowed on a UKRI-NHMRC Built Environment and Prevention Research Scheme 2019 grant application through RGMS is 10.

The UK PI and Australian CI are responsible for the intellectual leadership of the research project and for the overall management of the research. The PI/CI will be the funding agencies' main contact for the proposal. For administrative purposes when completing the UK Je-S form, you will only be able to input one PI; this will need to be the UK PI. The Australian CI will need to be listed as a co-investigator (Co-I) on Je-S.

The award of a UKRI-NHMRC Grant does not guarantee any further commitment to funding by the MRC, ESRC or NHMRC.

UK:

- MRC/ESRC-funded individuals can hold more than one grant at a time.
- The MRC/ESRC will consider proposals from any UK-based researcher who is based at an eligible research organisation and can demonstrate that they will direct the proposed research and be actively engaged in carrying it through. See standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for further details about UK PI eligibility.

Australia:

- At the time of acceptance and the duration of the grant, the CI must be an Australian or New Zealand citizen, or a permanent resident of Australia or have an appropriate work visa in place. The CI must also be based in Australia for at least 80% of the funding period.
- For additional eligibility requirements for individuals, please refer to NHMRC [eligibility guidance](#).

Co-investigators (Co-Is)/Associate Investigators (AIs)

The UK PI and Australian CI may be supported by a number of Co-Is/AIs named on the application. A Co-I/AI assists the PI/CI in the management and leadership of the research project. They would provide intellectual and/or practical input into the research and whose participation may warrant inclusion of their name on any outputs (e.g. publications).

All UK and Australian investigators MUST have verified Je-S accounts and must be added to the Je-S form under co-investigator. Please see section 3.5, below, 'Creating a Je-S application' for information on how to add an organisation on Je-S.

While, it is essential that all Australian CIs and Associate Investigators are added to the Je-S form, Australian costs should **not be** represented on the Je-S form.

Please note: The UK PI should liaise with the Australian CI and any other non-UK based Co-investigators/AIs as early as possible in the application process to ensure that they set-up their verified Je-S account as a matter of priority. Co-Investigators without Je-S accounts should be encouraged to visit the Je-S website (<https://je-s.rcuk.ac.uk>) to gain access to the Je-S System.

Further information when creating a Je-S account can be found in section 3.5 of this document.

Other support

For information on other parties involved in research including project partners, please see section 1 in the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).

If a UK project partner is from industry or if Australian investigators or project partners are from industry, then applicants must follow the [guidance](#) relating to the MRC Industrial Collaboration Agreement (MICA).

3. Application process

3.1 Intention to Submit (ItS)

- UK/Australian based researchers planning to submit to this scheme **must** submit a **compulsory** short [Intention to Submit \(ItS\)](#) by 23:00 British Summer Time (BST) on the 17 September 2019.

The PI and CI cannot change between ItS and full application, but additional participants can be added/removed at full application.

Failure to submit a valid ItS/registration by the deadline will invalidate your full stage submission. It is the responsibility of the UK PI to submit the Intention to Submit on behalf of the UK/Australian research collaboration.

Please note, this step does not form part of the review process. MRC, ESRC and NHMRC will not undertake eligibility checks at this point. Applicants should not await a response from the funders following the ItS submission, but simply continue with the development of the full proposal to be submitted by the deadline. The MRC, ESRC and NHMRC will use the ItS to help prepare for the review process.

3.2 Full application: process overview

Both of the following must be submitted:

- A Full Application jointly prepared by the UK and Australian researchers submitted on the UK Joint electronic Submission (Je-S) System by 16:00 BST on 15 October 2019.
- Australian applicants must submit the Australian budget to NHMRC by 17:00 AEST 16 October 2019 through [NHMRC's Research Grants Management System](#) and upload a PDF copy of the final full application (including an identical Justification of Resources and Case for Support) that has been submitted to MRC.

The UK and Australian applicants should jointly prepare a common research plan and jointly the full application, including:

- a jointly prepared '**Case for Support**' (including, if applicable, a one-page methodology annex and optional one-page Gantt chart) providing **full details of the work proposed for both the UK and Australian components**
- a jointly prepared **Justification of Resources** using the [call-specific template](#).

The Australian Electronic submission requires Administering Institutions and all CIs on an application to register for an account in [NHMRC's Research Grants Management System](#) (RGMS). Applicants who are not registered can submit a new user request via the login page of NHMRC's granting system.

Applicants should refer to NHMRC's granting system Training Program on [NHMRC's website](#) for detailed user instructions or contact their RAO or NHMRC's Research Help Centre for further assistance.

Further guidance can be found in the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) as well as in this present call-specific Guidance for Applicants document.

The MRC will organise joint peer review on behalf of the all funders (NHMRC, MRC and ESRC). **Peer review will be based on the jointly prepared proposal submitted on the UKRI Je-S system.**

Each PI and CI will also apply for funding to support their specific component from their respective funding agency. Applications submitted to only one side/funding agency will not be accepted.

Failure to submit a valid application to the MRC and NHMRC by the deadline will invalidate both submissions.

The MRC, ESRC and NHMRC will conduct a remit check/relevance review to identify applications that are in alignment with the scope of the call. Applications that are deemed not to be eligible or not to be relevant to the call may be withdrawn from the competition at any point during the peer review process.

UK and Australian researchers should discuss ethics and Intellectual Property before fully developing their proposal.

3.3 Full application: summary of components

The following documents must be included in the jointly-prepared full application submission on Je-S:

- **A completed Je-S form.**
 - All UK PIs/Co-Is and Australian CIs/AIs MUST be included.
 - The costing part of the online Je-S form must reflect the UK costs, so while the Australian investigators should be included, hours charged on the Je-S form for Australian investigators should be 0. Australian costs will instead be captured in the RGMS site.
- **A cover letter (optional).** If you have submitted a similar or related proposal to any of the UK Research Councils in the last year, please provide details in a cover letter including what has changed since the previous submission. The covering letter can be used to cover details such as conflicts of interest and names of conflicted experts that you request not to be used as peer reviewers by the MRC/ESRC/NHMRC.
- **A jointly prepared Case for Support**, including a one-page annex (optional but recommended) detailing the methodology and experimental design aspects and a project Gantt Chart – please see the separate call-specific guidance on preparing the Case for Support in section 3.4 of this current call-specific Guidance for Applicants.

- **CVs and publication lists** (uploaded individually) for each of the UK and Australian Investigators and named research staff on the application.
- **Justification of Resources** (using the [call-specific JoR template](#)) for the total costs requested for the project (both UK and Australian costs should be fully justified because this document will be provided to peer reviewers and panel members)
- **Pathways to Impact** – please see section 2.2.5 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).
- **Data Management Plan** – please see section 2.2.8 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).
- **MRC Industry Collaboration Agreement (MICA) form and Heads of Terms (if required)** – This is needed if industry is involved in the UK and/or in Australia. Please see the [relevant MRC webpage](#) for further guidance.
- **UK National Health Service (NHS) costs (if required)** – please see section 3.5 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).
- **Use of animals overseas form(s) (if required)** please see section 4.4.6 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) and the [use of animals overseas section](#) of the National Centre for the Replacement, Refinement & Reduction of Animals in Research (NC3Rs) website. This attachment should be uploaded as a ‘Letter of Support’.
- **Letters of support (dated and signed):**
 - from the UK Research Organisation(s) demonstrating support for the proposed research project.
 - from the Australian research organisation(s) demonstrating support for the proposed research project.
 - from any project partner where an in-kind payment is being contributed.
 - A **human participation/human tissue letter** signed by both the UK PI and Australian CI when human/human tissue research is proposed and/or when the Australian partner or another third party (ANY organisation other than the host UK RO) is responsible for recruitment of people as research participants and/or providing human tissue. See section 5.5.1 of this Guide for Applicants for further information.
 - **Use of Animals letter** (if applicable, 2 sides of A4 max) – see section 5.6.1 of this Guide for Applicants for information. This should be signed by both the UK PI and Australian CI.
 - **Use of Stem cells letter** (if applicable, 2 sides of A4 max) – please see section 5 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for further information.

All attachments should be completed in 11 point Arial typeface, with a minimum of 2cm margins. Applications will not be accepted where smaller or narrow typefaces have been used.

Page lengths (A4 size):

Document	Maximum length (Maximum)
Covering letter	2 pages
A jointly prepared Case for Support	11 pages (including illustration, references and a project Gantt Chart) + optional additional 1 page for methodology annex

CV	2 pages per CV
List of Publications	1 page per List of Publications
Justification of Resources	Please refer to the call-specific template for information about page limits
Pathways to Impact	2 pages
Data Management Plan	3 pages
Letter of supports (dated and signed)	2 pages each

Further guidance and details for all of the above content can be found in the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) and in this present call-specific Guidance for Applicants.

3.4 The Case for Support and Justification of Resources

The Case for Support

A jointly prepared Case for Support must be uploaded as a PDF to the Je-S application. The case for support may be up to 11 A4 pages in length (including illustrations, references and a project **Gantt chart**) plus an optional additional one-page methodology annex, using Arial 11pt typeface with margins of 2cms on all sides.

In your case for support you should address each of the following headings

- Title
- Importance of the research
- Scientific potential
 - People and track record
 - Research environment
 - Research plans and deliverables
- Ethics and research governance
- Exploitation and dissemination

Generic Guidance on content under each of these headings can be found [in section 2.2.3 of MRC's standard Guidance for Applicants](#) document.

Details of key issues included in the Collaboration Agreement, for example management of Intellectual property, should be detailed in the 'consideration of ethical, governance and Intellectual Property issues around the project' section of the Case for Support.

A one-page annex may be included in addition to the case for support page limit providing additional detail of the methodology and experimental design aspects of the proposal. This information must be provided as a clearly marked annex at the end of the main Case for Support entitled '**Methodology and experimental design annex**'. Please note that you are not required to duplicate information presented elsewhere in the application.

The use of this annex is strongly advised where the proposal includes the use of animals and/or human participants, or where the methodology/experimental design proposed is practically novel. Please see sections 2.2.3.4 and 4.3 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).

Justification of Resources (JoR)

Please complete the [call-specific JoR template](#) available on the call webpage, it must be written in a minimum font size of Arial, 11 point, with margins of at least 2 cm, justifying that the resources requested are appropriate to undertake the research project. The call-specific template includes details of the page limits.

You must complete one Justification of Resources (JoR) document justifying both the UK costs and Australian costs and attach it to your application under “Justification of Resources”. The JoR must contain a breakdown and explanation of the costs requested for this funding scheme by each partner taking into account the requirements outlined under the ‘Funding available’ section of this document.

The JoR should explain why the resources requested are appropriate for the research proposed, taking into account the nature and complexity of the research proposal. It should not be simply a list of the resources required.

In addition to the standard content for the Justification of Resources, applicants should include:

- the UK value of resources requested by the UK researchers.
- the UK value of resources requested by the Australian partner.

This is so that the value of the total funds requested for the research project can be assessed.

The costs on both the UK and Australian side should be separate with a clear justification of each cost.

An identical version of the Justification of Resource should be submitted to NHMRC via RGMS.

3.5 Creating a Je-S account and application

To submit full proposals, please login to your Je-S account via <https://je-s.rcuk.ac.uk>, using the username and password you have chosen (if you do not have a Je-S account, or have forgotten your password, please see the guidance provided further below).

Please note that ONLY the UK Principal Investigator creates the Je-S application, any collaborating investigators from other research organisation (UK or Overseas) are added to the application depending on their involvement and responsibilities whilst working on the project.

New Je-S users: In order to gain access to the Je-S System, [create an account](#).

Important information when creating a Je-S account:

- **All Investigators (from the UK, Australia and any third country) involved in a grant project will need to be registered on Je-S. It is important to register on Je-S at least two weeks before the deadline as the process takes time to complete.**
- It is recommended that overseas Co-Investigators should ensure that their Research Organisation (RO) has been added to the Je-S database before they commence the Je-S account creation process.
- The create account process will require the applicant to accept the terms and conditions using the Je-S System, before the applicant can proceed with the account creation.
- Applicants can choose to 'Skip the ORCID identifier' as this is NOT required for the purposes of being added to the proposal as an 'Investigator', priority is to create a verified Je-S account to enable the Investigator to be included within the Je-S application.
- Investigators should select the account type 'Applicant on a Standard or Outline Proposal' (within the Research Proposals section).

Should the overseas Co-Investigators not be able to select their RO when attempting to create their Je-S account, MRC recommend that the Investigator emails the [Je-S Helpdesk JeSHelp@je-s.ukri.org](mailto:JeSHelp@je-s.ukri.org), with the full name and address details of the Overseas Organisation and they will contact you with further instructions.

Creating your Je-S application:

- Select '**Documents**' from left hand menu list from your Je-S account home page
- Select '**New Document**' from within the Functions/create section of your documents page

The '**Call/type/mode**' listed below can only be selected when the call opening date has been reached (until the advertised call closing date of **15 October 2019**).

All MRC funding calls close at **16:00 local UK time**, on the advertised closing date.

- Select council: **MRC**
- Select document type: **Standard Proposal**
- Select scheme: **Research Grant**
- Select call/type/mode (optional): **UKRI-NHMRC Built Environment and Prevention Research Scheme 2019**
- Select '**create document**' option

Please telephone Je-S Helpdesk +44 (0)793 444164 should you require any assistance with the Je-S system.

Project details: Project start date **must be 15 May 2020**.

3.6 Budgets

In total, up to approximately ~£4m will be made available through this initiative: up to £2m of MRC and ESRC funding in support of the UK components; and up to \$4m AUD from NHMRC in support of the Australian components.

The funding agencies intend to use these available funds to support approximately five collaborative projects, subject to the quality of the applications received to the call.

Projects must be three years in duration and must start on 15 May 2020.

Funding for projects awarded under this call for proposals is jointly provided by the MRC, ESRC and NHMRC. The MRC and ESRC will fund the UK component of the proposal at the standard 80% of the full Economic Cost (fEC), and NHMRC will fund the Australian component of the proposal.

The size of the grants will vary according to the needs of each research project. UK and Australian applicants do not need to request equal amounts from both sides. The difference in values should reflect the difference in costs covered and local prices. The agencies also expect the costs on each side to accurately reflect the research effort to be carried out. It is expected, however, that the research effort on both sides is comparable.

The agencies also expect the costs on each side to accurately reflect the research effort to be carried out. It is expected that the research effort on both sides should be comparable.

It is the responsibility of the Australian CI and UK PI to ensure the conditions of their respective funder are understood.

Australian applicants should refer to the Australian guidance for information regarding submission of costs relating to the Australian component of the grant (see the [NHMRC call webpage](#) and [Guideline documents](#))

All the UK investigators (PIs/Co-Is) and Australian investigators (CIs/AIs) must be inputted onto the UK Je-S form. However, any costs for Australian investigators must be inputted with the correct hours but with the hours charged as £0. The Australian partner costs will be recorded in the Justification of Resources ([call-specific JoR template](#)) that can be downloaded from the MRC webpage for this call.

UK Full Economic Costing (FEC)

The MRC and ESRC will make up to £2m available for this call. The MRC and ESRC will provide funding for the UK-based applicants under standard arrangements and at 80% Full Economic Cost (FEC). **The UK element of funding will not cover UK PhD studentships or requests for capital items.**

Please see section 3. Resources – Full Economic Costing in the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for information on FEC.

UK funding available

	<i>UK (MRC/ESRC) funding</i>
Research costs:	
Staff – directly incurred post (e.g. Researchers, Technicians)	Yes
Staff – directly allocated posts (PI and Co-I time)	Yes
Equipment below £10,000: Costs should be claimed as 'Other Directly Incurred Costs'	Yes
Equipment above £10,000	No
Other Directly Incurred Costs Including (e.g. Consumables, Sub-Contracting costs)	Yes
Research studentships	No
Research assistants/postdoctoral researchers/research technicians	Yes
Studentships (degree programmes)	No
Travel and subsistence for exchange/mobility activities	Yes
Cost of workshops, meetings etc. Should be costed as 'Other Directly Incurred'.	Yes

UK equipment:

Capital costs above £10,000 cannot be funded via the MRC/ESRC as part of this call and therefore any capital costs requested will not be accepted by the UK funders.

Costs for 'small equipment' under £10,000 (such as consumables) are accepted by MRC/ESRC from UK applicants. These should be listed within the 'Other Directly Incurred Costs' section on Je-S.

UK spending obligations

UK: Due to the tight time scales of this call, successful UK research organisations will need to adhere to strict spending requirements. For this call, the end date of the proposed research should be **no later than 14 May 2023**. The UK payment profiles are likely to be slightly irregular for this scheme. If you have any questions about the payment profiles, please contact international@mrc.ukri.org

4. Assessment process and criteria

Following submission, peer-review will be undertaken by the funding agencies. To be funded, proposals must be internationally competitive and at a standard equivalent to that normally expected to be supported by each funding organisation. Applicants will be given the opportunity to provide a written response to peer review comments around December 2019/January 2020 prior to the panel meeting.

Key assessment criteria for the submissions will be:

- significance and impact of the research
- Scientific rationale: novelty, importance, and timeliness of the joint research proposal
- design and feasibility of the project plan
- leadership and partnership: including strength and clarity of collaborations and opportunities provided, quality of the project management structure proposed, track record of the team and the added value of the UK-Australian collaboration
- quality and suitability of the research environment and of the facilities
- value for money for Australian and UK science
- ethical considerations and governance arrangements

The MRC will organise joint peer review on behalf of the all the funders (NHMRC, MRC and ESRC). **Peer review will be based on the jointly prepared proposal submitted on the UKRI Je-S system.**

Peer review process

- Eligible applications will be externally peer reviewed, including written reviews by reviewers selected by the UK and Australian funders.
- The PI will be offered the opportunity to provide a written response to these reviews on behalf of all applicants.
- Following this process, applications will be assessed by a joint MRC-ESRC-NHMRC Peer Review Panel Meeting of academics selected by the UK and Australian funders.
- Applications will be given one overall score. The proposals with the highest scores will be funded in rank order above the funding cut off.

It is envisaged that all applications will go through the full peer review process described above. However, the MRC/ESRC/NHMRC reserve the right to adjust the process and introduce a shortlisting/streamlining step if a high number of proposals are submitted to the call.

Peer review assessment and scoring

The external peer reviewers and will be asked to comment on all of the points listed in the table below in their written review. External reviewers will also be asked to give the proposal an overall score from 1-6. Further information on the scoring system is included in Annex 1.

The panel members will also be asked to consider the points listed in the table below. Their assessment should be based on the proposal, the written reviews and the PI/CI response to

reviewer comments. Panel Members will be asked to give the proposal an overall score from 1-10. Further information on the scoring system is included in Annex 2.

Applications received, comments from all peer-reviewers and PI response will be assessed by the joint MRC UKRI - NHMRC Review Panel. This panel will consist of academic experts selected by both the UK (MRC/ESRC) and Australia, where final decisions will be made.

For further information on the peer review process, please see the [MRC peer review](#) page.

5. Agreements and ethics

5.1 Collaboration Agreement

As the research projects will be carried out by multiple research organisations and project partners, the basis of collaboration between the organisations and project partners, including ownership of intellectual property (IP) generated during the project and rights to exploitation, and costs of IP management [this is not an eligible cost to MRC UKRI], is expected to be set out in a formal Collaboration Agreement between the research organisations involved. It is the responsibility of the research organisations to put such an agreement in place before the research begins. **The terms of collaboration shall not conflict with MRC UKRI and NHMRC terms and conditions.**

The collaboration agreement should also include the allocation of resources throughout the project.

Arrangements for collaboration and/or exploitation must not prevent the future progression of academic research and the dissemination of research results in accordance with academic custom and practise and the requirements of the funding bodies. A temporary delay in publication is acceptable in order to allow commercial and collaborative arrangements to be established.

Details of key issues included in the Collaboration Agreement, for example management of Intellectual property, should be detailed in the 'consideration of ethical, governance and Intellectual Property issues around the project' section of the Case for Support.

5.2 Intellectual Property

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) means any copyright and related rights, patents, rights to inventions, registered designs, database rights, design rights, topography rights, trademarks, service marks, trade names and domain names, trade secrets, rights in unpatented know-how, rights of confidence and any other intellectual or industrial property rights of any nature including all applications (or rights to apply) for, and renewals or extensions of such rights and all similar or equivalent rights or forms of protection which subsist or will subsist now or in the future in any part of the world.

Ownership of intellectual property (IP) generated during the project and rights to exploitation, as well as any costs regarding management of IP, are expected to be agreed between the collaborating research organisations before the research begins, unless otherwise stated. It is up to the respective UK and Australian research teams to determine in advance how any exploited IP will be divided amongst the partners. Details of this agreement must be included in the Collaboration Agreement (as above).

Agreements must not conflict with MRC, ESRC or NHMRC policies or terms and conditions. Any agreements in place between a research organisation and their respective funding

organisation must be adhered to, including the sharing of IP costs or benefits. Any IP sharing agreements in place between a research organisation and their national funding body would be expected to apply only to the IP share of that research organisation.

The MRC will follow its standard rules/terms and conditions regarding IP, please see relevant sections of the UKRI and MRC terms and conditions for research grants at <https://mrc.ukri.org/funding/guidance-for-mrc-award-holders/information-for-award-holders> and the [NHMRC funding guidelines](#).

5.3 Material Transfer Agreements

Collection and exchange of material may occur between collaborating institutions, as necessary, in strict compliance with the legislation in effect in both countries.

5.4 Ethics

Any research involving humans/human tissue and/or animals (whether undertaken in the UK or Australia) must comply with legislation in both the UK and Australia. It must also comply with relevant policies and guidance of MRC, ESRC and NHMRC.

It is the absolute responsibility of the PI/CI and the ROs to ensure that appropriate ethical approval is granted and adhered to, and that no research requiring ethical approval is initiated until it has been granted.

The ethical information sub-sections in the Je-S proposal form should be completed to give details of any human participation, research using animals, genetic and biological risk **in all countries** (stating clearly which country/countries the relevant research will be done in), and should state any UK and Australian ethical committee approvals required. Section 5 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) has recently been updated to reflect amendments to this section of the Je-S form.

Applicants must be clear in their applications in which country the proposed research involving humans and/or animals will take place and must fully complete the ethical information section for research taking place in either country.

MRC/ESRC ethics guidance

Applicants must comply with all of the MRC's relevant policies and guidance regarding the use of humans/human tissue and/or animals in research. Further details are given below, although it is unlikely that proposals for this call will include animal research.

Approval(s) for the research detailed in an MRC grant proposal must be granted by the appropriate bodies before any work can commence. Institutions, applicants and grant holders have absolute responsibility for ensuring that the necessary approvals are granted for the research considered by the MRC, ESRC and NHMRC.

The principal investigator/ research organisation must be prepared to furnish the MRC/ESRC with a copy of the ethical approval, and any correspondence with the committees, if requested by the UK council. The principal investigator must notify the MRC if a regulator or a research ethics committee requires amendments that substantially affect the research question, methodology or costs to the extent that the project is no longer the same as that approved for funding by the MRC.

Please see section 3.3 of this Guidance for Applicants for a summary of ethical documents required.

5.5 Use of humans/human tissue

5.5.1 MRC/ESRC guidance

A signed and dated letter of support must be attached to the proposals when human/human tissue research is proposed (in either country). The letter should be titled 'Human participation/human tissue letter' and **MUST** be signed by both the UK PI and Australian CI. It must be clear from the letter which human/tissue research is being proposed in which country.

The letter should state that all applicants will comply with the relevant MRC policies and guidance in the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) and call-specific Guidance for Applicants. The letter should also acknowledge that the UK PI and Australian CI understand that MRC's current policy for research involving humans to take place overseas, is that **for research to be undertaken internationally, both local and UK ethical approval is required**. The letter should also state that the UK PI and Australian CI understand that for clinical studies involving human participants and/or patients in the UK or overseas, appropriate consent must be obtained.

In addition, where the Australian partner or another third party (ANY organisation other than the UK RO) is responsible for recruitment of people as research participants and/or providing human tissue, details should be included in the case for support and the 'Human participation/human tissue letter' **MUST** include confirmation of the following:

- which international partner is involved and that the partner has agreed to recruit the participants/provide tissue
- that what is being supplied is suitable for the research being undertaken
- that the quantity of tissue (where relevant) being supplied is suitable, but not excessive for achieving meaningful results.

The letter of support must be an integral part of the application (as an attachment) and must focus on the proposal it accompanies.

5.6 Use of animals

5.6.1 MRC guidance

Applicants must ensure that all of the proposed research, both that in the UK and in Australia will comply with the principles of the MRC common guidance on [responsibility in the use of animals in bioscience research](#) and [NC3Rs Guidelines: Primate Accommodation, Care and Use](#).

In particular, UK institutions should be aware of the following aspect of the guidance relating to research or collaboration outside the UK:

“When collaborating with other laboratories, or where animal facilities are provided by third parties, researchers and the local ethics committee in the UK should satisfy themselves that welfare standards consistent with the principles of UK legislation (e.g. the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986), and set out in this guidance, are applied and maintained.

Where there are significant deviations, prior approval from the funding body should be sought and agreed. International research should also be compliant with all relevant national and local regulatory systems in the host country where the research is to be conducted.”

Investigators proposing the use of animals (in either country) should read the guidance and:

- provide a signed and dated letter with the heading ‘Use of Animals letter’ (uploaded as a Letter of Support to the Je-S application) which MUST be signed by both the UK PI and Australian CI stating that:
 - all animal research (undertaken in either country) will adhere to all relevant national and local regulatory systems in the UK and Australia
 - they will follow the guidelines laid out in the [responsibility in the use of animals in bioscience research](#) document and ensure that work is carried out to UK and Australian standards. If primates are used they should also confirm that they will follow the [NC3Rs Guidelines: Primate Accommodation, Care and Use](#)
 - before initiation of the proposed research work, appropriate approvals from institutional and/or central animal ethics committees will be obtained for experimental protocols to be adopted in their projects. Successful proposals may be expected to provide copies of these permissions before funding is released.
 - details on which animal research will take place in which country (UK, Australia or elsewhere) and through which funder the resources are being sought. Applicants should include confirmation that animal welfare standards at these institutions meet the requirements outlined above.
- If applicable, applicants should also submit the MRC ‘Use of Animals Overseas’ form(s) - please see section 4.4.6 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants and the use of animals overseas section](#) of the National Centre for the Replacement,

Refinement & Reduction of Animals in Research (NC3Rs) website. This attachment should be uploaded as a 'Letter of Support'.

All applicants are required to comply with Section 4: 'Proposals involving animal use' of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#). Applicants should detail in the letter any additional information which was not included in the proposal document but which is pertinent to the animal research proposed and which the funders should be aware of.

In addition, researchers should be reminded that sufficient information and justification regarding any animal research proposed, regardless of country, must be provided in the proposal order to allow full peer review to take place.

5.7 Use of Stem Cells

5.7.1 MRC guidance

Please see section 5 of the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for further information.

If applicable, a signed and dated letter with the heading 'Use of Stem Cells letter' (uploaded as a Letter of Support to the Je-S application) should be submitted and **MUST** be signed by both the UK PI and Australian CI.

6. Terms and conditions

For the UK grant's terms and conditions please follow the link:

<https://www.ukri.org/funding/information-for-award-holders/grant-terms-and-conditions/>

UK grant starting procedures

The UK side of the grant must start on **15 May 2020**. The start of the grant may NOT be delayed beyond this date.

UK applicants should refer to the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#) for information on what the starting procedure entails. Please inform the relevant support staff in your organisation of this requirement to ensure the project starts on time.

Please note that due to the requirement to start by 15 May 2020, the normal three months start period rules outlined in the UKRI Terms and Conditions RGC4, does not apply to this project.

Ethical requirements

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator and the research organisation to ensure that appropriate ethical approval is granted for this study and adhered to, and that no research requiring ethical approval is initiated until it has been granted.

MRC's [current policy for research involving humans](#) is that for research to be undertaken overseas, both local and UK ethical approval is required.

For clinical studies involving human participants and/or patients, appropriate consent must be obtained.

For grants that include the use of animals, the [responsibility in the use of animals](#) guidance should be adhered to, and in particular: 'When collaborating with other laboratories, or where animal facilities are provided by third parties, researchers and the local ethics committee in the UK should satisfy themselves that welfare standards consistent with the principals of UK legislation (such as the ASPA) and set out in this guidance are applied and maintained.'

The principal investigator/research organisation must be prepared to furnish the Medical Research Council with a copy of the ethical approval, and any correspondence with the committees, if requested. The principal investigator must notify the Medical Research Council if a regulator or a research ethics committee requires amendments that substantially affect the research question, methodology or costs to the extent that the project is no longer the same as that approved for funding.

The grants must comply with the ethical sections within this call-specific Guide for Applicants and within the standard [MRC Guidance for Applicants](#).

UK government support

This award is dependent on continuing government commitment for this initiative and continuing match from the partner funder. In the event that this support is withdrawn, the MRC and ESRC reserve the right to terminate the award.

NHMRC support

NHMRC's CEO or delegate may withdraw or vary an offer of a grant if they consider that it is reasonably necessary to protect Commonwealth revenue.

UK requests for extensions to awards

Due to financial restraints of the Fund for International Collaboration, grant extensions will only be considered under exceptional circumstances (in line with the Equality Act 2010) and will require MRC (and if applicable ESRC) agreement on a case-by-case basis. The Research Organisation remains responsible for compliance with the terms of the Equality Act 2010 including any subsequent amendments introduced while work is in progress; and for ensuring that the expectations set out in the Medical Research Councils' statement of expectations for equality and diversity are met.

7. Contacts and Guidance

Please read:

- the [call text](#)
- the current document, the call-specific Guidance for Applicants
- the [standard MRC Guidance for Applicants](#)
- the [summary of requirements for proposals submitted to this call on Je-S](#)
- any relevant NHMRC guidance including the UKRI-NHMRC Built Environment and Prevention Research Scheme 2019 Grant Opportunity Guidelines available via <https://www.grants.gov.au>.

An identical version of the [call-specific Justification of Resources document](#) should be submitted to both the MRC and NHMRC.

For further information, UK (MRC and ESRC) applicants should contact:
international@mrc.ukri.org

For further information, relating to the call or the NHMRC application Australian applicants should contact:
help@nhmrc.gov.au

Annex 1: External peer review scoring system

Proposals will be evaluated and rated overall on a scale ranging between 1 and 6 by scientific reviewers who will utilise the following score indicators.

Categories 1-2 are not worthy of funding.

Categories 3-6 are worthy of funding, subject to the availability of resources.

Score Indicators	Score
<p>Exceptional - Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance - Original and innovative; novel methodology and design - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>) <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>) - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>) <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered 	6
<p>Excellent - Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally, or of national strategic importance</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance - Original and innovative; novel methodology and design - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>) <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>) - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>) <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered 	5
<p>Very High Quality - Internationally competitive in parts</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance - Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) - Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>) <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for significant return on investment 	4

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>) <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered 	
<p>High Quality</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap or a valuable scientific resource - Methodologically sound study - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>) <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for significant return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of projected delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>) - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>may be scope strengthen management of the project</i>) <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/ or governance issues are well considered 	3
<p>Good Quality</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes - Methodologically sound study but areas require revision - Likelihood of successful delivery <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate leadership (<i>scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators</i>) <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially more limited return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, and anticipated knowledge generation</i>) - Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered 	2
<p>Poor Quality</p> <p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly defined question - Methodologically weak study - Limited likelihood of new knowledge generation <p>Scientific potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poor leadership <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potentially poor return on investment <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/ or governance issues are not adequately considered 	1

Annex 2: Peer review panel scoring system

Proposals will be evaluated and rated overall on a scale ranging between 1 and 10 by panel members who will utilise the criteria and category descriptors in the table below:

Proposals scoring 1-5 are not worthy of funding.

Proposals scoring 6-10 are worthy of funding, subject to the availability of resources.

Score	Indicators
Fundable	
10	<p>Exceptional – Top international programme or of exceptional national strategic importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highly original and innovative ○ Novel methodology and design ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators are amongst the best in a broad field</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Internationally unique resource of value to many disciplines • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for high return on investment ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
9	<p>Excellent - Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Original and innovative ○ Novel methodology and design ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators e.g. among the best in a specialist area</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Internationally significant resource of value to many disciplines • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for high return on investment ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed))
8	<p>Very High Quality - Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Original and innovative ○ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) ○ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK ○ Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Resource of value to many disciplines

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for significant return on investment ○ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
7	<p>High Quality - Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Innovative ○ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) ○ Strong leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Key scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK ○ Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact ○ Valuable scientific resource • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for significant return on investment ○ High likelihood of successful delivery
6	<p>High Quality –Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically robust study ○ Appropriate leadership (<i>team; environment; collaborators</i>) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap ○ Justifiable scientific resource ○ Potential for reasonable health and/or socioeconomic impact • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal ○ High likelihood of successful delivery
Non-Fundable	
5	<p>Good Quality - Nationally competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically sound study but areas require significant revision ○ Leadership not optimal (scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators) • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes ○ Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge generation • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal ○ Good likelihood of successful delivery
4	<p>Potentially Useful - With significant weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Methodologically weak study (approach or study design requires significant revision) ○ Leadership/environment not optimal

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Contains potentially useful ideas but requires major revision ○ Moderate likelihood of successful delivery • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal ○ Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge generation
3	<p>Potentially Useful - With major weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Question poorly defined ○ Methodologically weak study ○ Poor leadership/environment • Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation
2	Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable.
1	Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns.