Review process for the feasibility projects.

Proposals received will be assessed under the following criteria:

Co-ordination and networking (partnerships, existing or new, inter-disciplinarily)  
What specific achievements will the project enable that would not be possible otherwise, in terms of fostering new connections.  
- Balance of skills of the project team, including academic partners.  
- The role of non-academic collaborators.

Research excellence- scientific quality (relationship to SECURE objectives, activities planned)  
- The novelty, relationship to the SECURE objectives, and timeliness.  
- The ambition, adventure, and transformative aspects identified.  
- The appropriateness of the proposed methodology.

Justification of resources-potential impact and sustainability  
- Impacts and the activities identified to help realise these impacts, including the resources requested for this purpose.  
- Whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified, particularly on any university or third party contribution.

- The above criteria will be weighted.  
- The review will be a blind review, with any reviewer with a conflict of interest replaced by another panel member.  
- Scores are added up and normalised for the number of reviewers (either 3 or 4, but mostly 4).

Guidance on your application

- Competitive process, where excellence is funded.  
- The application, although short, needs referenced - as one would submit to a RC.  
- In weaker applications, the aims may not be sufficiently explicitly aligned with the purpose of the network (statistics to address the challenges in living with environmental change).  
- EPSRC-funded network → more emphasis is expected on the aims synergistic with EPSRC aims, namely here the need for statistical analysis. Environmental science alone is not strongly aligned.  
- In weaker applications, excellence can be poorly conveyed e.g. the statistical development needed and / or the novelty of the statistical tools applied are not clear.  
- If the research need arises from on-going or recently completed research it should be very clear why this need is new and independent of the other activity, including why it cannot be carried out in the other activity.