



CENTRE FOR RESEARCH AND
EVIDENCE ON SECURITY THREATS

RESEARCH FOR UNDERSTANDING, MITIGATING AND COUNTERING SECURITY THREATS

Fourth Broad Topic Announcement

Call Specification

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Background.....	3
2	Invitation.....	3
2.1	Types of proposals and duration.....	3
2.2	Topic focus.....	4
2.2.1	Disengagement and desistance literature review and infographics	4
2.2.2	Drivers of involvement in terrorism	5
2.2.3	Further development of risk assessment schemes for Channel.....	6
2.2.4	Further development of risk assessment schemes for DDP.....	7
2.2.5	Knowledge management across the 4 CT 'P's'	8
2.2.6	Routes into and experiences within online communities promoting extremism and terrorism	9
2.2.7	Developing online counter-narrative interventions in response to search terms and website visits	10
2.2.8	Terrorist platform migration.....	11
3	Funding	12
4	Application process.....	12
4.1	Response format.....	12
4.2	Eligibility.....	13
4.3	Submission	13
4.4	Assessment process	13
4.5	Assessment criteria	14
5	Grant Conditions.....	15
5.1	Engagement with CREST	15
5.2	Communication and data-sharing	15
5.3	Reporting.....	16
5.4	Intellectual Property	16
5.5	Ethics.....	17
5.6	Security issues	17
6	Commissioning Timetable	17
7	Further information	18
8	Appendices.....	19
8.1	Appendix A	19
8.2	Appendix B	23

1 Introduction

The UK Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats wishes to commission a programme of activities that addresses some of the current security threats facing the UK. This Call Specification outlines the programme goals, the type of funding available, and the process by which eligible bodies may apply.

1.1 Background

The Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threats (CREST) was commissioned by the Economic and Social Research Council on 1 October 2015, with funding from the UK security and intelligence agencies. The Centre's mission is to deliver a world-leading, interdisciplinary portfolio of independent research that maximises the value of economic and social science research to countering UK and international security threats. More information on the scope and purpose of CREST, and the Centre's ongoing research activities, is available at: <https://crestresearch.ac.uk>

This commissioning call is a collaboration with the UK Home Office. CREST is seeking to identify and fund innovative and forward-looking economic, behavioural and social science research and research syntheses that will contribute to our understanding of contemporary security threats in eight areas. Individual researchers and research teams in academic institutions, research organisations, SMEs, and industry are eligible for commissioning funds (see Section 4.2 for full eligibility details). Successful applicants will become part of CREST's larger research programme, benefiting from resources for translating and communicating evidence for impact, and opportunities for sustained interaction with the user community.

2 Invitation

2.1 Types of proposals and duration

Applicants should propose a programme of work that addresses **one** of the Requirements identified in Section 2.2. It is anticipated that applications which simultaneously address multiple requirements will be too broad in scope to be effective. Applicants may submit more than one proposal. Applicants are invited to propose short projects that last no more than 6 months and address a topic in a targeted way. This may be, for example, the undertaking of a systematic review, a data re-analysis, or the construction and analysis of a case study.

Projects may include costs for workshops or other innovative dissemination activities that have clear objectives and offer more than what might reasonably occur at existing conferences or meetings. Where possible, the outcomes of these events should be of value to, and have impact on, an audience broader than the workshop attendees.

Details of successful projects from previous rounds of our commissioning are available on the CREST website.

2.2 Topic focus

Applicants are invited to submit proposals for short or long projects on the following topics. In some cases, the focus of the call is the synthesis of existing research. In other cases, the focus is on original research. The focus is stated in the second paragraph of each topic description.

2.2.1 Disengagement and desistance literature review and infographics

Indicative amount: £70,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

CREST is interested in helping policy makers better understand what is known about the mechanisms that move people away from violent extremism. How best can government and society support the rehabilitation of those already convicted of terror offences, or those who return from conflict zones?

The Home Office Desistance and Disengagement Programme (DDP) provides “a range of intensive, tailored interventions and practical support, designed to tackle the drivers of radicalisation as defined around universal needs for identity, self-esteem, meaning and purpose; as well as to address personal grievances that the extremist narrative has exacerbated.” The work will produce a review that incorporates the latest research findings on disengagement and desistance and makes an assessment of its quality. The end products should seek not only to improve background knowledge, but also provide recommendations on how to improve programme effectiveness and best practice within the DDP programme.

We will consider proposals that review and synthesise academic research published since 2017. We will not consider original research or assessments that are not grounded in the existing literature. A successful proposal is likely to do the following:

- Provide a comprehensive, cross-disciplinary review of existing research and draw out insights for best practice guidelines for DDP programmes, including any improvements in the delivery of interventions and their effectiveness.
- Establish if the new research supports or contradicts present assumptions behind the intervention programmes.
- Produce in consultation with the Home Office a series of compelling infographics that explain the results to policy makers and practitioners. The costs associated with creating the infographics should be included in your proposal.

2.2.2 Drivers of involvement in terrorism

Indicative amount: £70,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

Much of our understanding of terrorist learning pre-dates Daesh's expansion, the subsequent decline of its 'caliphate' and the rapid growth of the threat from the far-right. CREST is interested in integrating the latest academic work on these threats into our understanding of the processes by which a person comes to support or engage with a terrorist cause and to develop intent and capability to commit an attack.

CREST is interested in the model(s) that might best explain drivers to terrorist violence in light of the shifts in the threat landscape. Are current models that pre-date Daesh still valid in describing why and how people become engaged and subsequently move from being mobilised into intent and capability to commit an attack? Does evidence suggest new or refined models are more appropriate? If so, what do they look like?

We will consider proposals that synthesise existing academic research and/or undertake comparative evaluations, based on the present threats, that identify differences in casual pathways to violent extremism. A successful project is likely to do the following:

- Use contemporary evidence to suggest a model(s) that has explanatory value for the present threat(s), and is applicable to the UK.
- Produces infographics that help explain the proposed model(s) to policy makers and practitioners. The costs associated with creating the infographics should be included in your proposal.

- Will focus on open source literature and data, will not be dependent on access to intelligence data.

2.2.3 Further development of risk assessment schemes for Channel

Indicative amount: £75,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

The Channel programme seeks to help people who are vulnerable to being drawn into violent extremism. CREST is interested in taking steps toward developing a risk assessment scheme for individuals referred to Channel, which may refine or replace existing schemes that support professionals undertaking this complex work.

The purpose of the scheme will be to help professionals understand the risk and vulnerabilities associated with a particular case and to identify how the individual may be best supported. The scheme will be based on a structured professional judgement (SPJ) approach. The purpose is not to create an actuarial instrument or checklist that provides a score. Whilst the drivers for engaging in violent extremism may be similar to those already convicted of terrorist offences, the risk factors will likely be different and this process focuses only on the non-criminal space. What is the best way (i.e., most accurate, most fair, most ethical) to risk assess and support individuals referred to the Channel programme? What might a SPJ scheme, method or process look like in terms of structure and content?

We will consider proposals that seek to develop a practical and detailed prototype scheme that may be fully tested at a later stage should further funding and resource become available. A successful proposal is likely to do the following:

- Undertake initial steps common to the development of Structured Professional Judgement risk assessment and management procedures, such as steps 1 through 8 as described by Logan and Lloyd (2018) (see <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/lcrp.12140>)
- Articulate and evidence the rationale for, and advantages of, the scheme they are adopting, ensuring the method's purpose, key subjects, conditions of use, and evidence types and use are specified.
- Balance present risk assessment methods based on the Vulnerability Assessment Framework (VAF) (see

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/118187/vul-assessment.pdf) with any proposed new risk assessment and management method.

- Produce a report detailing the steps followed in the scheme's development, what each step has achieved, and the evidence on which each step is based (e.g., nature of risk being assessed, by whom, in what circumstances, the published literature on risk factors, practitioner experience, subject-matter expert knowledge on SPJ, structure and content of the method).
- Gives consideration to conducting some preliminary tests of reliability and validity, being mindful of the duration of the project.
- Include opportunities to interact with relevant stakeholders and subject matter experts, including Channel Panel members, PREVENT policy and OSCT Research and Analysis staff.
- Provide a roadmap for the next steps in developing and validating the prototype scheme, to allow this to be taken forward in 2020/21 if funding and circumstances allow.

2.2.4 Further development of risk assessment schemes for DDP

Indicative amount: £75,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

The Disengagement and Desistance Programme (DDP) is focused on the mechanisms by which people can be effectively supported to move away from violent extremism. This includes the rehabilitation of terrorist offenders, returning foreign fighters and individuals subject to TEOs and TPIMs. CREST is interested in taking steps toward developing a risk assessment and management process for individuals on the DDP, which would ultimately support professionals undertaking this complex work.

The purpose of the scheme will be to help professionals understand the risk and vulnerabilities associated with a particular case, as well as identify how the individual may be best supported. The scheme will be based on a structured professional judgement (SPJ) approach. The purpose is not to create an actuarial instrument or checklist that provides a score, rather, CREST is interested in how we can provide an assessment that adds value to the existing frameworks carried out by DDP partners (such as HMPPS). What is the best way (i.e., most fair, most ethical) to risk assess individuals referred to the DDP? What might a SPJ scheme, method or tool look like in terms of structure and content?

We will consider proposals that seek to develop a practical and detailed prototype SPJ based method that may be fully tested at a later stage should further funding and resource become available.

A successful proposal is likely to do the following:

- Undertake initial steps common to the development of Structured Professional Judgement risk assessment and management procedures, such as steps 1 through 8 as described by Logan and Lloyd (2018) (see <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/lcrp.12140>)
- Articulate and evidence the rationale for, and advantages of, the scheme they are adopting, ensuring the method's purpose, key subjects, conditions of use, and evidence types and use are specified.
- Balance present risk assessment arrangements with any new proposed risk assessment and management method.
- Produce a report detailing the steps followed in the scheme's development, what each step has achieved, and the evidence on which each step is based (e.g., nature of risk being assessed, by whom, in what circumstances, published literature, practitioner experiences, subject-matter expert knowledge on SPJ, structure and content of the method, etc.)
- Gives consideration to conducting some preliminary tests of reliability and validity, being mindful of the duration of the project.
- Include opportunities to interact with relevant stakeholders and subject matter experts, including DDP practitioners and managers, Prevent policy and OSCT Research and Analysis staff.
- Provide a roadmap for the next steps in developing and validating the prototype method, to allow this to be taken forward in 2020/21 if funding and circumstances allow.

2.2.5 Knowledge management across the 4 CT 'P's'

Indicative amount: £70,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

CREST is interested in providing up-to-date syntheses of open-source social and behavioural science research relevant to the operational activities of the Prevent, Pursue, Protect and Prepare strands of the UK Government's Counter-terrorism strategy. How does recent evidence (since the start of 2017) alter our perspective on how things might be understood or done under each pillar?

Have elements of the policies or activities underlying these strategies received more or less empirical support over recent years?

CREST seeks proposals that will deliver a synthesis on each of these strands that are likely to inform security policy and practice. Examples of research impacts include effective security-related behaviour change interventions, improving operational activities that involve 'humans in the loop', increased understanding of terrorist threats and decision making and emergency services response to critical incidents. These examples are illustrative and a bidder should make a case for how they will prioritise the focus of the synthesis.

We will consider proposals that provide four comprehensive, cross-disciplinary reviews of existing research and draw out insights for security contexts. A successful proposal is likely to do the following:

- Accompany a final report with a series of knowledge exchange events (e.g., half-day workshops) to provide highlights of the syntheses, ensure government staff are up-to-speed with new and emerging research and provide opportunities for researchers to engage with practitioners.
- The syntheses and knowledge events will also deliver four roadmaps of gaps and opportunities for future social and behavioural science research on these strands, relevant to the CONTEST CT strategy.
- Focuses on engaged and evidenced critiques of operational activities within the four CONTEST pillars, but not a critical assessment of, or alternative to, the CONTEST pillars themselves.
- Shows an understanding of current security policy and practice to work out where the new research findings might have maximal impact.

2.2.6 Routes into and experiences within online communities promoting extremism and terrorism

Indicative amount: £75,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

CREST is interested in understanding the role internet subcultures can play in drivers towards terrorism and, if they are seen to play a role in mobilising people towards violence, what opportunities exist for counter-messaging. What role does subcultural discourse play in radicalisation and mobilisation among those taking part in it? What role do these subcultures play in shaping wider online discourse? What is the role of sub-cultures themselves in sustaining their networks, and to what extent do they pose a challenge for counter-messaging intervention? In particular CREST is interested not in fora that exist

to propagate ideological or terrorist learning, but in general fora where the discussion either acquires ideological/terrorist significance, or which encourages individuals to move to beliefs or actions supportive of violence.

We will consider proposals that include syntheses of existing research, including ethnographies of subcultural fora such as imageboards and discussion websites. The successful project will deliver a series of practitioner implications and recommendations as well as a couple of case-studies that help inform work done with TACT and Prevent referrals.

A successful proposal will likely do the following:

- Online communities of interest, where conversations include Salafi-Jihadi and Extreme Right Wing themes (for example pro-Daesh online networks and discussion boards on sub-fora on chan boards and other sites).
- What intervention opportunities exist for counter-messaging (by HMG or civil society actors) designed to mitigate against cognitive radicalisation.
- Broader implications related to the transmission of extremist ideologies and terrorist learning and the role of participation in online sub-cultural communities of relevance to Prevent practitioners.
- What implications exist within the Pursue space for the identification of potential imminent escalation toward violence from among participants in those online communities.
- How these communities relate to the wider internet, specifically what role do they play in the transmission of discourse out into the wider internet, e.g., the role of 4Chan forums in fuelling alt-right memes and broader internet culture, or the part played by 'Baqiya family' Twitter users in shaping Daesh as a Western cultural phenomenon.

2.2.7 Developing online counter-narrative interventions in response to search terms and website visits

Indicative amount: £75,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

CREST is interested in a synthesis of research that provides insight into the effectiveness of online interventions through advertising and attempts to alter intent in online interactions. How do people respond to online advertising? How does the existing research on this topic relate to online searches with illegal intent? How easy is it to divert or distract individuals from attempts to engage in illegal behaviour or groups – how much do searchers persevere when diverted to information contrary to their initial aims? How can vulnerability to

extreme messaging be characterised and measured in effects of online interventions?

The successful proposal will deliver an evidence-based report considering the likely impact of delivering counter-narratives. The report should inform the evidence base on how effective online interventions can be, providing base-lines for measuring success. A successful proposal will likely do the following:

- Consider the impacts of behavioural change interventions (and what are they) which are prompted by online search terms.
- Examine the impact and/or limitations of advertised content in contrast to organic material.
- Assess existing methods of measuring online action or change and propose viable new methods of measuring effect.
- Examine how responses to advertising vary based on searcher characteristics, including (but not limited to) pre-existing attitudes and values about illegal activity, acceptability of the use of violence, etc.

2.2.8 Terrorist platform migration

Indicative amount: £75,000 (at 100% full Economic Cost)

Daesh used more than 100 platforms in 2018 to host its propaganda. While use of some content-hosting or messaging platforms remained constant throughout the year, others experienced sporadic periods of apparently coordinated terrorist use, followed by low levels of activity.

CREST is interested in developing a more nuanced understanding of terrorists' online agility while performing a range of communicative functions, including: messaging (peer-to-peer and broadcast); content hosting; and aggregators, or collections, of propaganda. How do terrorists adapt their behaviour on different platforms in response to activity which reduces or closes down their access? Is platform migration prompted by a command-and-control style strategic decision or manifestation of a more organic, social pattern of behaviour? To what extent do reach, networking or security considerations play a role in terrorists' choice of platform for various communicative functions?

We will consider proposals that undertake analysis based on data obtained from networking and content hosting platforms or from collective case studies of terrorists' online behaviour. A successful project will deliver a final report that is likely to include the following:

- Use of evidence to suggest drivers for terrorists' platform migration against a range of communicative functions.
- Outlines of potential mechanisms for disruption of a range of forms of online communication carried out by terrorist users and networks.
- A focus on either open source or data collected from individuals convicted of terrorism offences.

3 Funding

It is intended that the total amount available for this Call will be up to £585,000 at 100 per cent full Economic Cost (fEC), of which 80 per cent fEC (i.e., up to £468,000) will be made available to successful applicants. In practical terms this means that UK HEI researchers should cost their projects using the same process as they would cost an UKRI grant. All other applicants must recognise that an application to CREST's commissioning programme requires a commitment to provide the remaining 20% of full Economic Cost from their own resources. That is, CREST will pay 80% of the total costs outlined within the proposal. All costs should be inclusive of VAT and/or any other applicable tax. A guide of fEC and the ESRC's position on its payment is available at: <https://www.ukri.org/files/funding/tcs/fec-questionnaire-pdf/>

The duration of work proposed under this Call should not last more than 6 months and should run between 1st January 2020 and 30th August 2020. CREST will not reimburse costs associated with the development or submission of a proposal.

All projects will be assessed on an individual basis against the Assessment Criteria in Section 4.5. Indicative costs for proposals are included within each topic focus.

4 Application process

4.1 Response format

Applicants must ensure that their proposal conforms to the format specified in Appendix A of this Call. Proposals must be costed and approved by the applicants' organisation authority before submission. The costings submitted should represent the 100% full Economic Cost (fEC) of completing the project, but applicants should recognise that they will receive only 80% fEC in accordance with normal UKRI practices (see section 3). The costings submitted

should be sufficiently detailed to enable the assessors to make informed judgements about the project's value for money.

4.2 Eligibility

The Call is open to Higher Education Institutions, research organisations, charities, commercial companies, and individuals from the UK and overseas who can demonstrate a capability to deliver a high-quality programme of research. Interested partners without such experience should consider partnering with established research institutes. We strongly encourage applications from researchers in all disciplines of the economic and social sciences, conceived broadly. We also encourage proposals that are interdisciplinary and that involve collaborations between stakeholders and researchers. Researchers who have not traditionally worked in the security domain, but believe their expertise may provide insights or new applications to the area, are particularly encouraged to apply. Eligible applicants may submit more than one proposal.

4.3 Submission

Applicants must submit an electronic copy of their proposal. An electronic copy must be emailed to submission@crestresearch.ac.uk by 15:00GMT on 13th November 2019. The electronic submission must be in a single document of PDF format.

Proposals that do not meet the format requirements (see Appendix A), or are submitted after the deadline, will not be considered. This includes proposals that are over length or submitted as multiple documents.

CREST will treat all proposals as competitive information and will disclose their contents only for the purpose of the commissioning assessment process. Copies of unsuccessful proposals will be destroyed at the conclusion of the evaluation process. Full details of submission requirements can be found in Appendix A.

4.4 Assessment process

The selection of one or more proposals for award of the commissioning funds will be based on an independent and competitive evaluation process. Once accepted, full proposals will be sent to: (1) at least three expert peer reviewers who will be asked to assess the proposal against the Assessment Criteria (see Section 4.5); and (2) an expert user panel who will be asked to assess the proposal against the Pathways to Impact criterion of the Assessment Criteria.

These assessments will inform the evaluation of proposals by a specially convened Commissioning Panel that comprises CREST's Director, a second member of CREST's leadership team, and four external representatives. The external representatives are drawn from the UK and international academic and user communities, from a range of relevant disciplines. A Home Office representative will also attend as a non-voting member of the panel, to offer advice and guidance on the fit of proposals to requirements.

As part of a submission, applicants are invited to nominate up to two academic peer reviewers, however, only one nominated academic reviewer will be approached. Applicants must ensure that nominated reviewers have no known conflicts of interest. Applicants must ensure that they seek the reviewer's permission before nominating them. Applications that do not nominate reviewers will not be disadvantaged.

We reserve the right to reject proposals that are deemed to fall outside the remit and scope of this call, without reference to peer review. Applicants are advised to contact CREST if they are unsure whether or not their proposal will be suitable for the call (see Section 7 for further information).

4.5 Assessment criteria

Applications will be assessed by reviewers and the commissioning panel on the following equally weighted criteria:

Quality of proposal

- Research excellence and contribution to knowledge.
- Identifies questions central to the remit of the Topic and addresses these directly.
- Clear work plan with realistic, testable milestones and clear deliverables.
- Grounding in existing knowledge and strong potential addition to the evidence-base.

Track record of applicants

- An outstanding track record of research and research application in the relevant field. This may be a field outside of security research (i.e., this call is not only open to researchers in security studies).
- A track record of successful project completion.

Pathways to Impact

- Likely importance and timeliness of research to potential users.

- Effectiveness of plans to involve potential stakeholders and users, as well as other CREST researchers and CREST's communication mechanisms.
- Evidence of well thought-through and realistic dissemination plans to maximise academic/societal/economic impact.

Value for money

- Reasonable and fully justified costs for the specified project.

5 Grant Conditions

Applicants who are successful will be required to meet the conditions outlined in CREST's Commissioning Subaward. To facilitate contracting arrangements, this contract is available at:

<https://www.crestresearch.ac.uk/commissioning/terms>. Applicants should ensure that they and their organisation are able to meet the conditions of this agreement prior to applying for funding. For transparency, we outline some of the conditions in this Section.

5.1 Engagement with CREST

All commissioned projects will be provided with a partner from CREST Programme Leads. The role of the Leads is to support the applicant's engagement in CREST to ensure that the benefit of CREST's activities for the applicant is maximised. The assigned Programme Lead will be a world-leading researcher in a cognate area and they will also offer topic expertise and advice to the applicant, without impinging on the applicant's independence.

There is an extensive network of stakeholders associated with the research topics proposed in this Call. Apart from the Home Office, who are the directly-intended users of this work, other stakeholders include UK and overseas security and intelligence agencies, government departments, police, businesses and organisations involved with the critical national infrastructure, not-for-profit organisations, and think-tanks. CREST runs a series of activities that enable researchers to engage with this network. Applicants will be encouraged to take part in such events.

5.2 Communication and data-sharing

All deliverables from commissioned projects will be expected to be unclassified, in the public domain, and published and disseminated through normal academic and other publication channels. In addition, applicants are encouraged to present their work at conferences, workshops, networks, and

other dissemination events, and costs associated with doing so may be budgeted in the proposal.

As per normal ESRC practices, all data collected as part of a commissioned project must be made available at the UK Data Archive (unless a case for exception is made). A record of available data (but not the data themselves) will also be kept by CREST's Centre Manager and made public. More details on the UK Data Archive are available at: <http://www.data-archive.ac.uk>

All publications that are produced by the commissioned projects must comply with the ESRC's policy on Open Access (see <https://www.ukri.org/funding/information-for-award-holders/open-access/open-access-policy/>) As far as possible, CREST will support the Open Access publication of work by applicants who do not have access to an UKRI OA block grant. This will be accomplished outside of the Commissioning process and costs associated with publication charges should not be included within the application.

All publications that are produced by the commissioned projects must also be reviewed by a nominated CREST point of contact for the UK security and intelligence agencies. This is intended to be a light touch and rapid turnaround process and there will be no obligation to make amendments unless draft publications contain information that is in breach of the Official Secrets Act or any confidentiality agreements, or could have a detrimental impact to national security through the disclosure of sensitive, classified and/or personal information.

5.3 Reporting

Applicants must articulate a set of milestones and specific, measurable deliverables as part of their proposal. In addition to these deliverables, successful projects will also be required to complete a quarterly update report. This report, which takes the form of completing a brief template, is to allow for the early identification of problems so that we can work constructively and quickly to find solutions. A final invoice must be submitted to CREST within 3 months of the end of contract.

5.4 Intellectual Property

All Commissioned projects will be subject to ESRC's standard terms and conditions in relation to Intellectual Property. These state that the intellectual property (IP) generated through the grant rests with the research organisation that holds the grant. However, wherever reasonable, researchers should expect to share the IP generated with CREST members and other

commissioned projects, for wider public benefit and for the purposes of achieving the aims and objectives of CREST. There will be no payments for this use of IP. Our funding organisations will have the right to copy and use all outputs for any government purposes.

5.5 Ethics

Applicants must ensure that the proposed research will be carried out to a high ethical standard. They must clearly state how any potential ethical issues have been considered and addressed, and they must ensure that all necessary approvals are in place, and that all risks are minimised, before the project commences. All applicants must comply with the ESRC Framework for Research Ethics (<http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/framework-for-research-ethics/index.aspx>).

In addition, the applicants' proposed research will also be reviewed by CREST's Security Research Ethics Committee (SREC). The remit of SREC is to consider issues particular to security research that may require expertise not available on institutional ethics boards. These issues relate, inter alia, to: (1) the potential misuse of the research; (2) the risks and benefits of public sharing, especially to national security; (3) the best way to promote public consumption and ensure transparency; and, (4) the wellbeing and security of personnel. SREC will offer recommendations to the applicant in a constructive process. An applications' proposed research must be approved by SREC before it is conducted.

5.6 Security issues

Applicants should demonstrate an understanding of any potential personal, cyber- and physical security risks that may stem from their proposed work. This includes paying due regard to overseas travel advice provided by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Applicants should outline a risk mitigation strategy in their 'Case for Support', outlining both why the risk is necessary and what steps will be undertaken to mitigate its potential. Further guidance on issues relating to security will be provided by CREST's Security Ethics Research Committee to successful applicants.

6 Commissioning Timetable

5 November 2019 15:00 (GMT) – Deadline for questions and queries.

13 November 2019 15:00 (GMT) – Deadline for submitting full proposals

17 December 2019 – Commissioning panel meeting

w/c 23 December 2019 – Successful applicants informed

1 January 2020 – Award commencement (or as soon as possible thereafter)

7 Further information

A list of questions and answers provided is available from our website (<https://www.crestresearch.ac.uk/commissioning/faqs>), if you have any questions not already answered or you require further information please contact:

Nicola Ronan (Centre Manager)

Email: commissioning@crestresearch.ac.uk

8 Appendices

8.1 Appendix A

All proposals under this Call must be completed using the requirements outlined in this Appendix. CREST reserves the right to reject any submission that does not conform to these requirements.

All sections outlined below are mandatory, and applications must not exceed the maximum length of each section. Applicants should include the section with the entry 'Null' if they do not believe it is relevant to their submission. Applications should have at least 2cm margins and use a minimum sans serif font size of 11pt. The use of diagrams, tables, and other graphics that aid comprehension is encouraged.

The following sections must be included in the proposal which should consist of no more than 11 pages (excluding additional references and CVs, see below):

Cover Page (2 page maximum)

You must complete the provided cover page which can be found in Appendix B and also as a downloadable PDF version at <https://crestresearch.ac.uk/commissioning/>.

Summary (1 page maximum)

- Describe the proposed workshop or research in simple terms in a way that could be publicised to a general audience [up to 4000 characters]

Case for Support (4 page maximum)

- **Introduction.** Describe the aims and objectives of the study in context, briefly outlining the main work on which the research will draw, with references. Any relevant policy or practical background should be included
- **Research questions.** The detailed research questions to be addressed should be clearly stated
- **Design and method.** Give a full and detailed description of the proposed research methods, or workshop design. Where data collection is involved, the data, materials or information to be collected should be clearly stated, and the procedures for achieving this explained and justified. Where access to people or archives is needed, indicate clearly the records, population or samples to be consulted and the steps that have been taken to ensure this access (bearing in mind that all outputs from commissioned projects must be unclassified).

Particular care should be taken to explain any innovation in the methodology or where you intend to develop new methods

- **Risk mitigation.** CREST is committed to funding excellent research which is also adventurous, speculative and innovative, and with the potential for high scientific and/or user impact. Where there are risks associated with such research, please outline any measures which will be taken to mitigate them.

Pathways to Impact (1 page maximum)

- **Academic impact.** Describe the anticipated and/or potential contribution of the proposed work to academic knowledge and how the proposed work will ensure that this will be achieved. Such contributions may include significant advances in understanding, methods, theory and application, both across and within disciplines.

- **Stakeholder impact.** Describe the anticipated and/or potential contribution of the proposed work to enhance stakeholder understanding of, and their capacity to, mitigate or counter security threats. Make a case for the importance and the timeliness of the research for potential users. Describe plans for dissemination, stakeholder involvement and production of any resources that includes how you anticipate these activities having a positive effect on practice and/or policy.

Stakeholders should be understood broadly to refer to security and intelligence agencies, law enforcement, other government departments, industry, charities and not-for-profit organizations, and, where relevant, the public. It is not anticipated that all proposals will have impact with all stakeholders. Rather, applicants should demonstrate a considered understanding of who is the target audience for their work and what impact it will have.

Timetable and Deliverables (1 page maximum)

- **Timetable.** Give a clear and structured account (e.g., using a Gantt chart) of the timing of activities that will take place over the period of the grant. Within this timetable identify clear milestones against which progress may be judged.
- **Deliverables.** Identify the deliverables of the project, and justify the choice of medium. Deliverables may include, but are not limited to, academic publications, training materials, briefing notes, reports, technology demonstrators, multimedia presentations, and toolkits. Applicants are encouraged to be innovative in the deliverables they offer, giving particular attention to what will be useful for stakeholders. They should also consider how they engage with existing CREST delivery mechanisms, such as CREST Guides and CREST Security

Review. Examples of these mechanisms are available at the CREST website.

Summary of Resources Required (1 page maximum)

- **Staff costs.** Identify each contributing member of staff and how many hours per week they will work on the project, the cost of this contribution in GBP (£), and an outline of what they will contribute.
- **Travel and subsistence.** Identify each trip proposed, provide the cost in GBP (£), and provide a short justification for this trip and its costing.
- **Other costs.** Identify at the per item level other costs that are being requested under the application (e.g., for equipment, licensing, fees), provide the cost amount in GBP (£), and provide a short justification for this item and its costing.
- **Indirect costs.** Identify the indirect costs in GBP (£) associated with completing the proposed project.
- **Total cost.** A summary of total proposal cost in GBP.

Capabilities and Relevant Expertise (1 page maximum)

- **Past performance and related work.** Describe a record of performance by the applicants in completing activities (either workshops or research) relevant to the proposed work. Include details of current and complementary work and how this project may connect with this work, as well as how this work will be distinct from any related work. Applicants may also describe existing connections with stakeholders that will be leveraged to ensure the proposed work has impact.
- **Synergies and added value.** Describe how this project interrelates with, or adds value to, other ongoing or recently completed research. Identify how this project will be distinct from past or current work. If this proposal will receive support in kind from other organisations or the host institution(s) of the applicant(s), then this should be outlined in this section.
- **Security and ethics.** Describe the applicants' capability for ensuring the ethical integrity of the proposed activity, and the applicants' capability to manage any security risks that may stem from their proposed work.

Additional

- **Reference list.** Provide a bibliography for the references cited in the proposal. There is no formal page limit for this additional material, though typically no more than 2 pages of references will suffice.
- **Investigators' Curricula Vitae.** Provide a CV (Résumé) for each named investigator and research staff, including consultants. Each CV should be no more than two pages. It should give full name, degrees and

postgraduate qualifications, academic and professional posts held, a list of relevant and recent publications, and a record of all relevant research funded by the ESRC and other bodies.

8.2 Appendix B

CREST Commissioning Call Cover Page

PROPOSAL DETAILS	
Title of proposal	
Topic addressed (as per section 2 of call specification)	
Proposed start date	
Cost (100% FEC of project in GBP including all taxes)	

CONTACT DETAILS	
Contact details for Principal Investigator	
Name	
Address	
Post Code	
Email	

CONTACT DETAILS	
If you have chosen to nominate a reviewer, please provide contact details below. Please leave blank if not applicable.	
Proposed reviewer 1 Please provide name, institution and email address	
Proposed reviewer 2 Please provide name, institution and email address	

ADDITIONAL CONTACT DETAILS

Please provide the for contracting	
Name of contract officer	
Email address	
Name of press officer	
Email address	

SUBAWARD AND SPECIFICATION DETAILS

Query	Response
<p>As per page 1 point 2, of the subaward, please provide the correct text for the following section:</p> <p>"[INSERT NAME OF PARTY] an [educational body created by Royal Charter/limited company registered in England and Wales under Company Number #####] of [insert address] (the "Contractor")"</p>	
<p>As per section 11, page 12 of the subaward, please provide response to the following section:</p> <p>"The Contractor's representative for the purpose of receiving reports and other notices shall until further notice be:"</p> <p>"[INSERT NAME OF PARTY] of [insert address and email address]"</p>	