

# SFI Terms of Reference for the 2-year Progress Review of the 2013 Research Centres

**November 2016**

## **Terms of Reference (ToR) for the 2-year Progress Review of the 5 x 2013 Research Centres**

### Contents

1. Background.....	3
2. Objectives of the Progress Review .....	4
3. Organisation of the Progress Review .....	6
4. Agenda Template .....	8
Panel Briefing.....	8
Day 1: Focus on Science .....	8
Day 2: Focus on Impact .....	11
5. Briefing Documents.....	12
6. Panel Report.....	13
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	13
II. QUALITY OF RC LEADERSHIP, ORGANISATIONAL AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES.....	13
III. RC BUDGET (Cost Share, Sustainability, Metrics/KPIs) .....	14
IV. PROGRESS OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMME .....	14
V. PROGRESS ON IMPACT .....	15
VI. Progress against EPE Action Plan .....	16
VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
7. Financial Audit procedure .....	17
8. Publication of the Panel Report .....	18

## **1. Background**

Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) is the national foundation for investment in scientific and engineering research. SFI invests in academic researchers and research teams who are most likely to generate new knowledge, leading edge technologies and competitive enterprises in the fields of science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM). The Foundation also promotes and supports the study of, education in, and engagement with STEM and promotes an awareness and understanding of the value of STEM to society and, in particular, to the growth of the economy.

A key objective of Science Foundation Ireland's Agenda 2020 strategy is to develop a set of world-leading, large-scale research centres that will provide major economic impact for Ireland.

Twelve SFI Research Centres have been established through an investment of €355 million from Government through Science Foundation Ireland and a further €190 million from industry collaborators. After an extensive review for scientific excellence and impact the first seven Centres were established in 2013 as a result of the 2012 SFI research Centres call for proposals. Five additional centres were established in 2015 as a result of the 2013 SFI research Centres call for proposals. These are known as the 5 x 2013 RCs and are Adapt, iCrag, Connect, Lero and Curam). Information on the Research Centres can be found here (<http://www.sfi.ie/investments-achievements/sfi-research-centres/>)

SFI Research Centres link scientists and engineers in partnerships across academia and industry to address crucial research questions; foster the development of new and existing Irish-based technology companies; attract industry that could make an important contribution to Ireland and its economy; and expand educational and career opportunities in Ireland in science and engineering. The 12 SFI Research Centres are focused on strategic areas of importance to Ireland with a focus on delivering scientific excellence with economic and societal impact.

Under the conditions of funding provided by SFI to the Research Centres, the RCs undergo progress reviews every two years. For the five Centres established in 2015, their first 2-year progress reviews are due to take place in May/June 2017. A review panel of 5-7 distinguished scientists, engineers and individuals with significant commercialisation and translational/applied experiences will be convened for each of the 5 x 2013 RCs. One of the panel members will have expertise of Education and Public Engagement activities.

This Terms of Reference document for the 2-year progress reviews has been developed to provide guidance to the Research Centre Directors, Research Centre Teams (co-PIs, FIs, operations staff) Research Office staff, Vice-Presidents of Research and University Presidents/Provosts in order to prepare for the site visits. The purpose of this document is also to provide guidance to the Site Review Panel who will review the progress on the RC award.

## **2. Objectives of the Progress Review**

The purpose of the 2-yr progress review is to gather expert scientific and impact evaluations from appropriate reviewers so that the Foundation can gather information relating to the progress on the Research Centre and make an informed decision if required in relation to either research redirection, budgetary adjustments or award termination. For Research Centres, failure to meet the required industry cost-share or milestones respectively, may have implications for continued funding.

Specifically, the purpose of the 2-year progress reviews of Research Centres is:

### **I. To evaluate the Research Centre Strategy**

(Day 1 – Research Centre Director presentation)

- To evaluate what the Centre has achieved collectively which would not have been possible if a number of individual awards had been made instead of an overall Centre award
- To evaluate how the international competitiveness of the Centre has increased as a result of the Centre award
- To assess how the international ranking of the Centre has improved
- To evaluate how the Centre has developed its niche area
- To assess how the Centre has influenced national and/or international policy
- To evaluate how the Centre has benefitted from collaborating with other SFI Research Centres and any other international or national centres (e.g. NSF Engineering Research Centres, Fraunhofer Institutes, EI Tech Centres etc)
- A description of how the existing Communications plan will be expanded to build the profile of the Research Centre as a world leader (Day 2)

### **II. To evaluate the effectiveness of the Research Centre leadership, organisational and governance structure**

(Day 1 – Governance Committee Chair presentation)

- The review will consider the level of support provided by the host and partner Research bodies and how the operations teams of the Centres have integrated into the administration teams of the research bodies

### **III. To evaluate performance against the milestones and deliverables of the Centre award**

- Evaluation to include progress against the **KPI and cost share targets** (Day 2 – Impact presentation)

### **IV. To establish that the research being carried out by the Centre is scientifically excellent**

(Days 1 and 2)

- The outputs from platform and targeted projects as well as new, additional projects such as Spokes and US-Ireland C2C will be examined
- Winning of prestigious awards such as the SFI Research Professorship and Horizon 2020 European Research Council (ERC) awards

- The review will consider the effect of industry engagement on the scientific quality of the projects

**V. To establish that the research being carried out by the Centre is Impactful**

- Examination of the progress against the impact statements made in the original proposal (Day 2)
- Evaluation of the industry cost share achieved and the strategy that was used to achieve cost share. The review will consider if the industry partners are enabling the Centres to meet their milestones (Day 2)
- The review will consider the Centre's industry partner views of how they have benefited from their involvement with the Centre (Day 2)
- Consideration will be given to the TRL status of the Centre (Day 1)
- Consideration will be given to commercialisation activities undertaken in terms of growing industry partnerships – challenges and results (Day 2)
- Evaluation of the success of the Centre in leveraging funding from H2020 and other non-exchequer sources (Day 2)

**VI. To evaluate Education and Public Engagement (EPE) activities**

- The review will consider if the RC has developed and adopted a clear, robust education and public engagement plan that is embraced and delivered by all within the centre (Day 2)

**VII. To evaluate the Research Centre management of the SFI budget and the ability of the Centre to use the SFI budget to leverage industry and non-exchequer, non-commercial funding**

- A financial audit will be carried out in parallel with the progress review to ensure the budget is used effectively and the reported industry cost share commitments are accurate (more details are provided in Section 7)
- The review will establish if the SFI budget has been used effectively to date (Day 1- Centre Director presentation)

### **3. Organisation of the Progress Review**

The site review panel will comprise of 5-7 distinguished scientists, engineers and individuals with significant commercialisation and translational/applied experiences. One of the panel members will have expertise of Education and Public Engagement in the context of a research cluster or centre. Representatives from SFI will also participate in the review (namely the Programmes Director, Research Centres Manager, the relevant Scientific Programme Manager, the Head of Education and Public Engagement). Other SFI members of staff may also be in attendance at the review.

SFI and the site review panel will perform a 2-day site visit, following a briefing dinner which will have taken place the evening prior. During the site visit, the following Research Centre(RC) staff/researchers must be in attendance:

- RC Centre Director
- RC Centre Manager
- RC Principal Investigators (Presentations to be given by PIs)
- RC Funded Investigators and technical collaborators (if space permits)
- If a RC has a US-Ireland Centre-to-Centre partnership award, representatives from the US and NI Centres should be invited to attend the review.
- RC postdoctoral researchers and PhD/MSc students (poster presentations during breaks)
- RC Operations Team
- A selection of RC Industry Partners (Day 2)

The site visit will be divided into two sessions:

- **Focus on Science (Day 1)**
- **Focus on Impact (Day 2)**

On the evening before the site review, SFI and the Panel will meet for a briefing dinner, during which the review process and the programme for the site visit will be discussed. On Day 1, the Centre Director, Governance Committee Chair and co-Principal Investigators/strand leaders will make formal presentations followed by Q&A sessions. A closed/private discussion between the panel and the Centre's industry partners will take place on Day 2. The focus of Day 2 is on impact, with presentations to be given by the Centre Director, the EPE officer and industry partners.

In advance of the site review, a financial audit is carried out by members of the SFI Finance team. This comprises a review of the financial budget for the core SFI grant plus a review of the actual and committed Industry Cost share achieved for the Research Centre.

In preparation for the site visit the following is requested:

- **A suitable seminar room or meeting room will be required for two full days**  
This is required to comfortably accommodate the panel of up to 7 international experts, up to 5 members of SFI, and part of the Research Centres team (Centre Director, Centre Manager, all co-PIs and all FIs, if space permits). It is preferable to have a room with a large table rather than student-style desks if at all possible.

*[From previous experience, a U-shaped arrangement of the tables has worked well, at which the Director, Manager, co-PIs and the SFI RC SPM sit, with additional seating around the room for other attendees.]*

All members of the Research Centre team are invited to be present for the site visit (including all funded investigators and technical collaborators). For various sessions throughout the review, the Panel will be working at times in closed session and will be using laptops to write the site visit report. As such, extension leads and international adaptors should be available in the room to allow for the use of 6+ laptops. Internet access should also be available.

- **Catering**

Please arrange for tea/coffee to be available in the seminar/meeting room at all times throughout the review. Additional snacks should be provided at scheduled breaks according to the final agenda and also a buffet style lunch including vegetarian options should be provided on both days. Water should also be available throughout the day. On Day 2, a continental style breakfast should be provided.

- **Additional Information**

Any additional information (e.g. draft manuscripts that are in press), should be emailed to the relevant scientific programme manager. This will be supplied to the panel in advance of the site review. The panel will have access to a secure web link where they can download the original application, annual reports and any other relevant documentation for the review.

- **Schedule**

Each Centre will be contacted by their SFI programme manager to work through and agree the final agenda. This should be finalised no later than 3 weeks before the progress review.

- **Presentation Slides**

Copies of all presentation slides will need to be submitted to SFI in advance of the site visit. Draft versions are required approximately 3 weeks in advance, and the final versions should be submitted no later than 1 week prior to the site visit.

**It should also be noted that due to the scale of these review, timings of presentations should be strictly adhered to according to the final schedule. The panel may need to cut presentations short if they exceed the time allotted.**

## **4. Agenda Template**

The template for the 2-year progress review Agenda is outlined below. The times indicated are for guidance purposes only. Each Centre will be contacted by their SFI scientific programme manager to work through and agree the final agenda which should be finalised no later than 3 weeks before the date of the review.

The progress review will run over one and a half days:

### ***Panel Briefing***

#### **(6.00-9.00 pm) Briefing Dinner**

- SFI and the Panel will meet for dinner and at dinner will discuss the review process and the programme for the site visit.

### ***Day 1: Focus on Science***

#### **(8.00-9.00am) Welcoming address and Presentation from the Governance Committee Chair**

- Overview of the RC governance structures in place to be presented by the Governance Committee Chair
- Members of sub committees such as IAB and SAB are welcome to present during this session
- Optional presentation/introduction to be given by the University President of the Host Institution

**Note: The University Presidents are encouraged to at least attend the Welcome session and the Centre Director presentation and are of course welcome to attend the full review if time permits. The VPRs are encouraged to attend as much of the review as their time will permit.**

#### **(9-10am) Introduction to the Research Centre**

A presentation providing an introduction to the Research Centre should be given by the Centre Director and the following should be included:

- RC vision, mission, objectives and strategy
- Details on the RC budget and leveraged funding
- Governance and management structures which are in place (a summary will suffice for the Governance component as the Governance Chair will have given covered this in the previous presentation)
- Institutional support of the host, and other institutions
- RC operations team information
- Research programme information and an overview of the progress on such, i.e. platform/spokes/additional awards (Spokes, C2C etc.)
- RC model in place
- Information on the industry partners involved in the RC (#s, who they are, are they reengaging etc.)

#### ***Coffee Break***

### **(10.30-12.30am) Platform Research Presentations**

A number of presentations to be given on the scientific detail behind the platform research projects:

- Each strand/work package leader is expected to present
- Provide detail on how this strand feeds into targeted projects and spokes applications
- Each work package leader/PI is to provide detail of their team's specific role and contribution to delivery of the centre EPE programme.
- Note that the added value of the Centre will be assessed throughout these presentations

Please note that the platform research presentations will continue after lunch (total duration of this session is 3.5 hrs, a brief coffee break should be allowed for at the midpoint of each slot (10 minutes))

### **(12.30-2.00pm) - Lunch/ Working lunch**

- Poster presentations by students and postdoctoral researchers (if possible, these should be arranged according to projects/strands of research)
- Student short pitches (e.g. 3-minute overview)
- Laboratory/facility tour
- Demonstrations (if applicable/time permits)

### **(2.00– 4.00pm) -Platform Research and additional SFI RC award presentations (continued)**

As before:

*A number of presentations to be given on the scientific detail behind the platform research projects:*

- *Each strand/work package leader is expected to present*
- *Provide detail on how this strand feeds into targeted projects and spokes applications*
- *Each work package leader/PI is to provide detail of their team's specific role and contribution to delivery of the centre EPE programme.*
- *Note that the added value of the Centre will be assessed throughout these presentations*

Additionally, presentations on Spokes award(s) and US-Ireland C2C partnerships should be given in this session

*SFI Spokes Project Presentations (if relevant to the Centre)*

- How the Spoke enhances RC research, expansion/growth of the centre
- How does the Spoke project(s) integrate into the RC/align with its overall vision?
- Progress and industry involvement

*C2C Partnership Presentations (if relevant to the Centre)*

- Overarching aims of the US-Ireland research programme
- What is the added value of the partnership?
- Are the aims of the tripartite proposal being met?
- What is the impact of the partnership?

### ***Coffee Break***

#### **(4.00 – 5.00pm) Co-PI/Director private discussion**

This is a private session between the Centre Director, Centre Manager, co-PIs and the review panel to facilitate any questions that may have arisen during the day. The panel may choose to have a private meeting with the Centre Director

#### **(5.00 – 6.00pm) Private Panel Session**

- Roundup discussion,
- Key points to be noted in the report
- Any issues raised

#### **(6.00pm) End of Day 1 of the review**

#### **(7.30-9.30pm) SFI and Panel convene for dinner to discuss key points from Day 1 of the review**

## **Day 2: Focus on Impact**

### **(8.00-9.00am) Breakfast with University VPR(s) and Presidents**

### **(9.00-11.00am) Industry Partner Presentations**

A number of presentations should be given by a selection of the industry partners on the targeted projects and how they are meeting the needs of the industry partners.

- This session will encompass individual presentations by each industry partner to the review panel and SFI, (estimate 20mins per project so a maximum of 6 projects could be presented).
- SFI reserves the right to pick the projects to be presented.
- The RC Director, Manager or co-PIs/FIs will not be present during this session.

### **Coffee Break (10 minutes)**

### **(11-11.30) Education and Public Engagement (EPE)**

This presentation should be given by both the EPE officer/manager and the Centre Director and the following should be included:

- Details of how the EPE plan is developed and delivered both with and by the RC research community. This should include an indication of the numbers of staff involved in EPE activity.
- The achievements against the EPE plans, in terms of outputs and outcomes.
- Progress against expected impacts of EPE activity.
- How the RC communications plan supports public engagement and enhances the profile of the Centre

### **(11.30-1.00pm) Impact**

The RC Director will present on progress against the Impact Statement which was made in the original Research Centre Proposal. This session should include a discussion on:

- Key Performances Indicators (KPIs) – results versus targets
- EU Horizon 2020 and other sources of leveraged funding
- Cost share and industry engagement
- How the RC communications strategy has impacted on industry engagement
- Commercialisation outputs

### **Lunch**

### **(1.30-2.00pm) Private session with Co-PI's and Directors**

This session will involve a discussion on the issues raised from previous day

### **(2.00-6.00pm) Private Panel Session - Report Write-up**

The panel will write the progress review report in this closed session (see panel report section for further details)

### **6.00pm – End of review**

## 5. Briefing Documents

The progress review panel will be sent the following documents:

- Table of Contents, inclusive of a brief description of each document
- Site review Terms of Reference
- SFI Briefing Presentation which will be inclusive of information on the following:
  - Overview of the Foundation and its context within the Irish funding landscape
  - The Irish landscape – EI/IDA etc.
  - SFI RC Model and overview of the 2013 RC Call
  - SFI Spokes programme
  - SFI US-Ireland C2C partnerships
  - Specific RC information (team composition, structure, Governance etc.)
  - RC Education and Public Engagement
- SFI Research Centres 2013 call document
- Original proposal and anonymised reviews
- RC guidance documents
- Latest list of industry partners and status of collaborative research agreements
- Latest status on Research Centre recruitment
- An overview report on KPI performance to date
- RC Annual reports
- RC Governance reports and the validation letters, inclusive of the KPI results tables (up to H2 2016)
- Publication lists, award and associated, including the top 5 publications from the Centre in 2016/2017
- SFI Education and Public Engagement briefing document
- SFI Impact Briefing Presentation and Webinar
- Other area relevant specific government documents e.g. National IP Protocol, National Policy Statement on Ensuring Research Integrity in Ireland etc.
- Reviewer code of conduct and confidentiality agreement

The panel will be asked to complete a short report in advance of the review. This report will be in the form of a 3 - 5 page summary which will be shared with other panellists and SFI. The report will include but is not be limited to:

- Initial impressions
- Any concerns raised
- Scientific Excellence
- Potential Impact
- Progress of RC in delivering its EPE programme
- Progress against Key Performance Indicator (KPI) Targets
- Other aspects which are of relevance to sections within panel report form

## 6. Panel Report

The panel report will include the following sections to reflect the objectives of the review. Each section will include a narrative plus a tick box indicating the degree of progress.

### I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Overview
- Strengths and weaknesses of the Centre
- Assessment of the Research Centre Strategy, Mission and Vision
- Significant issues raised during the review
- Recommendations for the Centre, and SFI, to consider

### II. QUALITY OF RC LEADERSHIP, ORGANISATIONAL AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

Discuss the RC organisational structures taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- Are governance structures in place and are they effective?
- Is there an operationally-effective management structure and organisation in place?
- Is the RC director leading the Centre team effectively?
- Is the Centre truly operating as a national centre?
- Are the co-PIs engaged and working as a team?
- Are there any infrastructural issues (space, refurbishment, equipment, support services, etc.) that need to be addressed?
- Is there effective institutional support?
- Has the RC effectively attracted, recruited and trained key personnel?
- Is the team of the necessary size and expertise currently in place to deliver on the objectives of the project?
- Is any gender under-represented within the team? If so, what actions are being undertaken to redress the imbalance?
- Is the EPE programme led by a senior member of the operational team?

Description	Tick Box
The RC team, leadership and organisational structures have many serious deficiencies.	
The RC team, leadership and organisational structures are lacking in several critical areas.	
The RC team, leadership and organisational structures are lacking in some aspects; key issues need to be addressed.	
High quality RC team, leadership and organisational structures, in nearly all respects.	
Outstanding RC team, leadership and organisational structures	

### **III. RC BUDGET (Cost Share, Sustainability, Metrics/KPIs)**

Discuss the RC budget, taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- Based on the approved proposal, is spending on the project closely tracking its budget?
- Has the budget been used effectively to date, particularly for leveraging funding from industry and non-exchequer sources?
- Should the budget be modified to reflect changes in the research plan?
- How much cost share is being received by industry partners, is this sustainable?
- How much non-exchequer funding is being secured by the RC; is this sustainable?

### **IV. PROGRESS OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMME**

Please provide your assessment of the RC's activities to date under the platform research and targeted projects, relative to the goals and objectives set out in the original proposal and also relative to the RC 2013 programme objectives. Provide a separate assessment of any new Spoke awards or US-Ireland Centre to Centre awards. Questions that should be considered, amongst others, before completing the following section include but may not be limited to:

#### **Platform Research**

Discuss the scientific excellence of the platform research taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- Based on the approved proposal and work plan, has the team delivered on its objectives so far?
- How has the RC met the objectives outlined in the 2013 RC programme call document?
- Are the original stated goals still relevant and if not, has the team shifted its direction to accommodate the changes in science, industry, or technology?
- Are there components of the project that should be removed or expanded?
- Who are the international competitors in this field and what makes the Centres team competitive?
- How do you rate the excellence of the team's publications and presentations?
- Are the co-PIs internationally competitive, are they being invited to present at international conferences?
- Is Ireland's reputation overseas being enhanced?
- Are the RCs attracting international scientists to come and work in Ireland?

#### **Targeted Projects**

Discuss the scientific excellence of the targeted projects, taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- Comment on the dynamic nature of the industry partners, have many partners left the RC, are industry partner re-engaging?
- How are the targeted projects driving the overall strategic agenda of the RC?
- Is the RC effectively attracting new Spokes projects to grow the RC?

#### **Additional Spokes Awards (where relevant)**

Discuss the scientific excellence of the any additional Spokes awards, taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- How has progress been against the objectives of the Spokes award (s)
- Have new industry partners engaged with the Centre as a result of the Spoke award (s)

- How has the Spokes award (s) impacted on the overall Centre strategy?

### US-Ireland C2C Partnerships (where relevant)

Discuss the scientific excellence of the any additional US-Ireland C2C award, taking into account, but not limiting to the following questions:

- Added value of the partnership
- How is the C2C driving the overall strategic agenda of the RC?

Description	Tick Box
The scientific programme has demonstrated little progress towards achieving the goals of the RC or has moved in a direction that is not optimal	
The scientific programme has demonstrated progress towards achieving some the goals of the RC, progress towards other goals is less than expected	
The scientific programme has demonstrated progress towards achieving most of the goals of the RC but progress and direction lacking in one or two aspects that need to be addressed	
The scientific programme has demonstrated significant progress towards achieving all of the goals of the RC	
The scientific programme has demonstrated outstanding progress in all respects	

### V. PROGRESS ON IMPACT

Discuss the Impact being made by the RC to date, taking into account, but not limiting your considerations to, the following questions:

- Is the RC on track to achieving the proposed impacts outlined in the implementation plan within the impact statement at full proposal stage?
- In your opinion, how would the potential impacts from the research programme be best realised?
- Is the team actively collaborating with partners in the private sector including industry? If yes, how do these collaborators facilitate an increase in impact arising from the programme of research? What supports are they providing? If relevant, have all routes to commercialisation been considered?
- How would the team's outputs, in terms of commercialisation activity e.g. invention disclosures, patent applications, licensing agreements and spinout creation, be rated?
- Are there cash and / or in-kind contributions to the project from the partners, including industry and other private sector entities?
- Is the team co-authoring publications with partners in the private sector?
- What is the potential impact of the research activity on the education and training of Ireland's students, and on the infrastructure for further research and education, e.g. facilities and instrumentation?
- Has this engagement changed any direction taken in the research?
- Have any individuals from the RC left to take up employment in the private sector?
- Has the RC successfully demonstrated impact in any of the following areas:
  - Societal Impacts and International Engagement
  - Impacts on public policy, services and regulation
  - Health and Wellbeing Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts

- Impacts on Professional Services
- Impacts on Human Capacity

Description	Tick Box
The programme has demonstrated little or no potential for impact	
The programme has demonstrated limited potential for impact	
The programme has demonstrated some impact and potential for impact in most aspects, one or more issues need to be addressed	
The programme has demonstrated significant impact and potential for impact in all respects	
The programme has demonstrated outstanding impact and potential for further impact in all respects	

#### VI. *Progress against EPE Action Plan*

- How is the RC performing against their education and public engagement operational plan?
- How is the RC engaging all of its research community in delivering the public engagement plan?
- Is there evidence of applying learning or evaluation from EPE activity to research strands?
- How is the EPE agenda driving the overall Impact agenda of the RC?

Description	Tick Box
The programme has demonstrated little or no systematic delivery of EPE activity	
The programme has demonstrated limited systematic delivery of EPE activity	
The programme has demonstrated some systematic delivery of EPE activity but there are some issues that need to be addressed	
The programme has demonstrated significant impact and systematic delivery of EPE activity	
The programme has demonstrated outstanding impact and systematic delivery of EPE activity in all respects	

#### VII. *SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS*

Description	Tick Box
Project funding should be withdrawn	
Project has serious deficiencies; funding should be reviewed	
Strong project lacking in some aspects; key issues need to be addressed	
High quality project in nearly all respects; recommend continued funding	
Outstanding project in all respects; deserves highest priority for continued funding	

## 7. Financial Audit procedure

The SFI Finance teams will arrange to meet with both the Research Centre manager and Research Accountant of the host Research Body, in advance of the site review. Any issues that arise during the financial audit may be raised with the scientific review panel if required.

During the audit, the SFI Finance team will review the following for each Research Centre to date:

- A Master schedule of Collaborative Research Agreements made with all Industry partners to date, showing the following:
  - Cash amounts committed for each calendar year of the agreement and in total over the contract
  - In-Kind amounts committed for each calendar year of the agreement and in total over the contract
- The individual Collaborative Research Agreements
- The **Consolidated Industry Partner Cost Share Reports** for the Research Centre for each 6-month period up to Dec 2016
- The **Individual Industry Cost Share reports** – signed by the Industry partner (for each 12-month period up to Dec 2016)

The above reports will be checked in detail by SFI Finance to ensure the following;

- The reports are compiled correctly and reflect all active and completed Platform and Targeted projects for each RC
- That the cash amounts received and in-kind amounts received have been accurately reported and can be traced to the Research Body bank account
- The values placed on the In-Kind Contributions are fair and reasonable, have been signed as 'received' by the RC and the Research Bodies in the period under review and can be traced to the **Individual Industry Cost Share reports** where applicable
- That overheads received from Industry partners which have been diverted directly to the Research Centre activity have been correctly accounted for

## **8. Publication of the Panel Report**

When the panel report has been completed, a covering letter highlighting the pertinent points of the review and financial audit, along with final recommendations, will be prepared by SFI which will require approval of the SFI Executive committee. Following approval, the outcome of the progress review and the financial audit, covering letter and panel report are delivered to the Research Centre Director, RC Governance Chair, RC Centre Manager and Vice-Presidents of Research of the Host Institution(s). The Centre Director, as lead investigator, is given a period of time (typically up to 6 weeks) in which to submit a response to the reviewers' comments and recommendations. A feedback meeting between the Centre Director, Centre Manager and SFI will take place once this response is submitted to facilitate further discussion on the outcomes and recommendations from the progress review.