

## **Network Plus: Industrial Systems in the Digital Age**

### **Feasibility Studies – Transcript of Q&A Session**

**18 November 2016 12pm – 1pm**

The purpose of this session was to provide an opportunity for those interested in submitting to the Feasibility Studies Call for Proposals (closing date 09 December 2016) to ask questions of the Network Plus Project team.

#### **Audio file URL:**

[Feasibility studies funding call Virtual Q&A-20161118 1149-1.arf](#)

**Moira Petrie (MP):** Thank you everyone for joining us today. We have an hour long Q&A session, which is being recorded so that those unable to attend have access to the information. We are going to provide a transcript as well covering some of the common questions being asked today. If you have a question, could you use the chat facility, below the Participants list on the right hand side of your screen and that will allow us to be able to read it out to everyone to hear and understand the question.

**Sarah Sharples (SS):** Can I also ask you to mute your microphones as well? We're getting quite a lot of background noise from people so if there is a need for a question that is too complicated to ask over the Chat, obviously we'll get you to unmute your microphone. But I think if you're not speaking at the moment.... there is certainly some background noise and someone with a not-muted microphone at the moment..... OK that's great, we've lost the background noise now.

So shall we give a brief overview of some of the issues that have come up through emails already?

**MP: Q.** The most common question we have been asked over email so far is what is the number of projects we expect to fund and what the value of each of those projects would be? The answer that has been provided is because we are at an early stage of our project, we are reserving the right to not allocate the full £600k in this current funding call and we may have a second call early next year. What we have been advising is, probably likely but not improbable that the upper limit would be £60k. If you have a project that is a really good project and you make a really good case for it but the budget is more than that, then we will consider it. But currently, the general recommendation is between £25k and £60k. Are there any questions regarding that?

**SS: Q.** So if I can clarify the [spoken] questions... the questions were do we have to follow the EPSRC rules in terms of the funding and can we employ part time researchers?

So the project should be costed the way you would cost an EPSRC bid; so the funds will pay for 80% FEC and yes it is acceptable to include researcher time within those particular project costings. So you should really treat it as the same rules and the same approach of a small scale EPSRC bid.

**MP:** Did that answer your question?

**HY:** Yes thank you

**MP:** Yes, lovely. So we have had a question in from Michael asking what the minimum timeframe for the projects should be?

What we have been advising is anything between 6 months and 24 months in terms of the timeframe. We don't want to be overly prescriptive because each project will require its own project timeline

**SS:** And obviously they can be variances within that 6 month or longer in terms of where the concentrated effort is actually going on.

**HY:** Can I ask another question?

**SS:** Yep

**HY: Q.** Regarding collaborators, since we have such short notice, do we need a formal supporting letter from project collaborators?

**SS:** So there isn't a need for formal letters of support at this stage. We would expect you to indicate the collaboration and the extent of the collaboration within the 4 pages. For the bids we select to come to the Dragons' Den pitch, that's probably something that we would probe at that point. But because we are able to have that face to face communication, we're not asking for formal letters of support as part of this first stage assessment.

**HY:** Ok thank you

**SS:** So can we ask that you ask your question on Chat so that we see who's asking the question and make sure that everyone can understand the question. There was another question that came up about industry collaborators and do we have any requirements, for example the difference between having SMEs or large corporations.

No we don't have any formal requirements. And I know that in the case of this particular topic area, both large organisations and SMEs would be potential partners. I think one thing I would say is that partnerships with SMEs would be particularly welcome. We do know that the SME engagement is absolutely critical to the future of this digital manufacturing area. David Brown (who is on our management group) is a very keen supporter of SME engagement and has particularly committed to looking at SME engagement throughout the Network's

life. So it's absolutely fine to have either type of industry involvement but SMEs would be particularly welcomed and encouraged if it is genuine contribution and engagement.

**SS: Q.** Ok this is working quite well. We have another question that has come in so...this question is..if the proposal makes it to the Dragons' Den pitch, are collaborators and industry partners required to attend as well? Or is it just the PI?

We haven't actually made the specific details of the Dragons' Den pitch at the moment but I would certainly expect that we would ask no more than 3 people to attend on behalf of the project and actually I think our recommendation is likely to be between 1 and 3. So certainly collaborators and industry partners would not be required to attend because we just appreciate the time constraints that people have and there wouldn't be a disadvantage for example if you chose that only 1 person would attend. But I think we'll say that between 1 and 3 people will be able to attend and we would of course expect one of those people to be the PI on the project unless there were absolutely exceptional circumstances.

**SS: Q.** There's another question that has come through... is there an expectation of the level of support from industrial partners? Should this be estimated in pound (£) value as per EPSRC partner?

Yes, it's useful, I think, to place a financial estimate on, but because these are feasibility studies and because one of the goals of this is about looking at the transfer of concepts from one context to another, actually the engagement of the industry partner or external partner in terms of the essence of what it will be delivering is much more important than the financial value. We know that SMEs will not be able to make significant commitment but we know having genuine engagement from an SME could be absolutely invaluable in terms of the contribution to the direction of the research. So do estimate the value in pounds values but actually the nature of the support.. it's much more important to describe the nature of the support and what that will actually mean in terms of the delivery of the project.

**MP: Q.** We've had another question about industry partners that are not based in the UK... the feedback from EPSRC has been that you can use those partners but you do have to indicate how the benefit will be transferred to the UK and the suggestion has been that you also try to align to a UK based partner to ensure that that transfer is there.

**SS:** It's worth remembering the underpinning objectives that EPSRC work towards. In line with the fact that these are early stage feasibility studies that we hope will help people produce, later, fuller proposals to funders such as EPSRC or Innovate UK, EPSRC have the underlying ambition to contribute to the Productive Nation, Connected Nation, Healthy Nation and the Resilient Nation. So, again, showing that the work we are doing has a clear contribution to make,

in terms of the partners it has and in terms of the delivery, in terms of performance or productivity is really important.

So we've got lots of questions coming through... it's quite exciting!

**SS: Q.** Can the main researcher do the pitch, as opposed to the PI (as it was the main researcher's idea)?

Absolutely. One of the things we have made absolutely core to this Network Plus is that we want to use this Network Plus to develop the future leaders in the area of digital manufacturing, Industry 4.0 and future industrial systems. So if there is a named researcher then they are very welcomed to clearly take the lead and do the pitch and we would strongly support early career researchers and named researchers being actively involved in the pitch.

**Q.** Do you provide any funding to the company involved in the proposal?

Right, Moira you might have to help me out here because there are EPSRC rules about this aren't there? And we will probably get this wording double checked after the meeting but it's my understanding that EPSRC do not allow direct funding for their time involved in proposals. However, I do believe that it is possible to pay for, for example, expenses, in terms of travel expenses and subsistence and things like this to company partners who are engaging in proposal activities. Just because I did that off the top of my head, I'm going to ask that we get the formal wording confirmed and I'm seeing Rhia on Monday at EPSRC so I'll get them to look over that wording before we put it out on the transcript.

**Q.** The next question that has come through .... Is there any cap on what you can budget for an individual equipment within the total budget?

That's a really good question actually. Because we are looking at around £60k total, then the EPSRC rules around equipment doesn't really come into it as we are looking at small amounts. No, we don't formally have a cap on the amount you can budget for individual equipment. But I would say that, actually, what we are looking for here are the sort of things that are going to test concepts and test notions and I would be looking for every clear justification for the need of any specific equipment in order to conduct feasibility studies. So I think it's just really important that any equipment is justified and it would be unusual for a £60k type project to have a large proportion of that funding being towards equipment.

**Q.** Next question..... the projects are called feasibility studies but in what way do they need to demonstrate feasibility? In other words, what would be a desirable form of outcome beyond the development of new collaborations? What is the aim of the funding?

So let's look at the call documentation and what we are actually looking to achieve here. So what we want to do is to enable early stage, so lower TRL, cross-disciplinary, foresight and speculative research. And when we say building

a demonstrative prototype is also welcomed, what we are looking at are opportunities for technology which might have been deployed in one context but hasn't necessarily been taken into the industrial context. So we are looking at the feasibility being about the transfer of that technology from one context to the industrial systems context.

In terms of outcomes, we have had some discussion internally amongst the management team in the last few days about desirable outcomes. All projects will be expected to clearly communicate an outcome in terms of some of the accessible media collaborations that we are going to ask projects to collaborate with. Really we are looking for a combination of academic outputs, so it would be sensible for example to note the journal or venues you will be targeting with the academic outputs that you will be delivering from the feasibility studies. But another outcome of the feasibility studies could well be a demonstrator, an actual thing, a story, an item, a concept, something that we can actually show what digital technologies will look like in future industrial systems.

And then a third one that the question sort of specifically hints at is collaborations, in terms of looking at new collaborations that would otherwise not have happened that then lead towards future proposals. So it's also, I think, worth noting what type of research funders might be targeted and how the collaboration and outcomes of the feasibility study will make those research opportunities more likely to be realised.

**Q.** Right, I'm going to pass this one over to Moira.... On a more practical note, should the 4 pages of the proposal include the breakdown of funds? Are figures allowed? And, is the 4 page limit 4 "sides" of A4 or can they be double sided (8 sides)? Excellent question, that's a scientist that asked that question.

So on the second point, 4 pages means 4 sides so it's not 8 sides in total. And actually we'll probably make sure that we clarify that within the document.

Are figures allowed? I wonder if that means are pictures allowed? In terms of images, absolutely and personally I would strongly encourage that. It often tells a story more effectively if you have got an image that can represent what's happening.

In terms of the funds, I think we would want a limited breakdown of funds

**MP:** What we have been advising as that the 4 pages do not include the breakdown of funds, this can be in a separate document.

**SS:** Remember at this stage, the 4 pages is a filter that is being used to invite people to the Dragons' Den and there will be a formal paperwork process that will happen between the submission and Dragons' Den and between the Dragons' Den and the successful proposals. So the most important thing that we are looking at here is the idea and the total costs and the activities that will be done but not detailed cost breakdowns.



**Q.** Right, next question. Are there any restrictions on the number of proposals in which a person can apply? For example, can a PI put in 2 proposals or can a named researcher be part of 2 proposals?

No I don't think there are any restrictions. Our absolute basis of the judgement is scientific quality and I think the only thing that I'd advise you is that you make sure that if you are involved in 2 proposals is that the contribution of the individuals is clear and the projects are distinct.

**Q.** Regarding level of research, what are your expectations on TRL? And is a demonstrator a requirement?

Because this is EPSRC, we are focussing on the lower TRL. I referred to this earlier but I will repeat it, and this is where our TRL classification perhaps isn't very helpful. I would class as low TRL taking a notion from one context and applying it to another context because the science is about "how does this translate, how does this transfer?". So we are looking towards the lower TRL and the new knowledge and new science that would emerge. This is not looking things, this is not an emphasis on a short period of time to market. It's about identifying the opportunities and potential digital technologies within industrial systems.

Is a demonstrator a requirement? No but I think we would look very closely at something that didn't have any technical or hands on activities. I would be surprised if a proposal had nothing in terms of hands on activity or demonstration capabilities.

**Q.** Do you consider the High Value Manufacturing Catapult centre as an industry partner in the feasibility studies proposals?

I think for these purposes, yes. In other contexts, I've seen other catapults been treated in the same way as industry partners so yes.

**Q.** Next question. Do partners need to formally submit a financial request via a full Je-S financial submission for the feasibility study?

Right Moira, correct me if I'm wrong but I believe at this stage, the 4 pages, we are not asking for Je-S. But there will be a need for a Je-S submission, I believe, for those who are successful

**MP:** I will seek further clarification, but yes that is my understanding. We are very keen that this is seen as an EPSRC grant rather than a grant from the University of Nottingham.

**SS:** And that's very important for the individuals who are awarded these grants and that we've done some investigations into the mechanisms we need to organise here to make that happen.

**Q.** There's a question here... can we be certain that a funding call will be held in 2017?

I think I'm going to say no. Our aim is that a funding call will be held in 2017 but if we have a very large number of outstanding proposals at this stage then we will probably look to see whether we can spend all the money this time round. But my strong preference is that there is an additional funding call in 2017.

I won't make a very good politician, would I? I gave a straight answer to that question.

**Q.** Right, will there be help, in addition to funding within the Network, to promote the outcomes via public engagement, social media or dissemination of the results via a wider audience? Should we cost such activities in budget or will they be centrally supported by the Network Plus?

We will be centrally supporting those and thank you for asking that question because we should have emphasised that more strongly. There is a separate budget line within the Network Plus that will be specifically at what we are calling accessible dissemination. So we are very aware that in this particular topic, it is incredibly important that sometimes difficult digital concepts are communicated to industrial users effectively. But also, that we are capturing the public's attitude towards these activities as well. So it's better to not emphasise that as a cost unless there is something particular that you wish to do within your project and there will be underpinning support for all of the feasibility studies from the Network Plus.

**Q.** Am I correct in understanding that a convincing review report indicating the feasibility of transferring a technology into a manufacturing context would be an acceptable output without a software or system prototype?

So the answer to that question is yes with a small caveat because the question says review report. I would expect a level of analysis will have been done. For something that is purely a review, I think would not be as attractive to the panel. I'm only one member of the panel so I may have other panel members who have differing views to me. But I think we are looking at something that actually collects new knowledge or new data in some way in order to inform that opinion.

**Q.** For projects in "softer" business related e.g. skills or jobs (I have a personal dislike of the word softer there actually), or service design and customisation, would there necessarily be a hard technology element or could it be a demonstrator of, say, a novel business model?

A demonstrator of a novel business model would be very welcome, actually, and so there wouldn't necessarily be a technology element. Roger Maull, who is one of the members of the management team of the project, is very keen on ensuring that work that looks at the business side of things and the financial, economic context in which we are looking at these concepts is emerged. So a novel business model demonstrator would be very welcome.

**Q.** Attendance at network events is expected. Could you indicate roughly how many events per year this might involve?

I think the first thing to say is that we absolutely acknowledge that people have multiple demands on their time so there will be a small number of events where there is expected to be a presence from all feasibility studies and then other events which will be invited more broadly the membership of the Network. What we are for are feasibility contributors to be key and visible members of the Network.

In terms of the number of events per year, we're probably talking about 4 or 5 maximum. We've got the annual conference, which will be something where we absolutely expect to see the feasibility studies presented at. At the moment, we've got the proposal that the feasibility studies are also presented at an event on 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> March. We will have the other thematic events that will happen throughout the year and so obviously where feasibility studies very closely map onto thematic events, we will probably specifically prompt and ask those feasibility studies to be represented there. But I would say no more than 4 or 5 and I would encourage you to build a strong team to deliver a feasibility study so that you've got the capacity to be able to engage with the Network as closely as you can.

**Q.** Excellent question... regarding the submission deadline, can you clarify that the 12pm deadline on Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December actually means the 12 noon or 2400 hours? So that's an academic there, isn't it?

I think we probably meant 12 midday

**MP:** We did mean 12 midday. When the call was put on the EPSRC website, they put it down as 11.55pm so as long as it is in before the end of play Friday 9<sup>th</sup> December and that will be right up to midnight, we will accept it.

**SS: Q.** Can a proposal include more than one university?

Absolutely. That would be strongly encouraged.

I've had an apology for the use of the word "soft"...much appreciated.

**Q.** Are we strict on the 9<sup>th</sup> December deadline?

Yes we are. We've got a very tight deadline in terms of turning around the feasibility studies in order to shortlist them for the Dragons' Den pitches. So yes that is a firm deadline.

**MP:** This is because we would like to give you guys as much notice as possible to prepare for the pitch, we need to be able to turn it round very quickly.

**SS: Q.** Should we cost attendance at Network events into the proposal?

We will cover the costs of attending Network events and the things that we are requiring you to do, we will cover the costs of travel and subsistence involved in attending those events.



So we've had a very steady stream of questions but at the moment there aren't any questions on our list.

**Q.** I might have missed the answer, could you clarify the 4 page limit?

We'd like everything within 4 pages, and that is 4 sides. We have not provided a template but what we do have is the breakdown of the content on the final page of the Call for Proposals document. So project title, lead organisation, project team, start date and duration, context, aim and objectives and benefits, statement of the novelty, project plan, deliverables and plans for further funding. We do give you flexibility within that and we ask for a brief breakdown of costs in terms of directly allocated, directly incurred and indirect costs.

I wonder, Moira, if we should produce a standard tables in terms of costs for everyone to fill in. There have been a couple of questions about costs so maybe what we do... if we produce a very small [table]. Because I know, I've been in these shoes and you'll want to use as many of these four sides to be for the text. So, Moira will send out a standard template that is where you will complete the information about the costs and then you don't feel the need to put too much there as well.

**MP:** What we are trying to do is keep the application process as simple as possible and not make it involve too much background information or additional information so, for example, we are not necessarily looking for CVs of participants at this stage.

**SS: Q.** Does the consortium have to include Nottingham, Sheffield and Glasgow universities?

Absolutely not. In fact, those of us who are the named investigators of the Network are excluded from participating as formal investigators in these feasibility studies so that's myself, Paul Watson and Yun li. You should be choosing your partners on the basis of their merit and contribution in the feasibility studies.

**Q.** This says great, what kind of funding allocation model will be used? Will you allocate the requested funding at the start? Or will you apply a pay as you go model to reimburse the cost afterwards?

Right, we will do whatever normally happens with an EPSRC project.

**MP:** It's likely to be step payment in arrears. Currently the EPSRC pay quarterly in arrears and we will probably do something similar, with the final payment being made once all of the outputs have been delivered.

**SS: Q.** There's a question here about the projects being low TRL. Does the project spell out the pathway to impact?

We are not, at this 4 page stage, looking for explicit pathways to impact. But what we do have within the criteria for the projects are the context and the benefits of the work. So it will be sensible, when you are talking about the context of the work and the benefits of the work to give some indication of the engagement with the external context at that stage. But because the Network as a whole as a pathway to impact, and because the impact will actually be done in collaboration between the feasibility studies and the Network itself, we are not asking for explicit pathway to impact documents at this stage.

It's also worth saying that if there are opportunities for feasibility studies to work together in impact events or activities, that's something we will look at when we have got the documents with us and we have made our decision.

**Q.** We've got a question here... do we need industry support letters to hand by the 9<sup>th</sup> December?

No we had that question a little earlier actually and the answer is that we don't need formal industry support letters by the point of submission on the 9<sup>th</sup> December, no.

**Q.** There's a question here about... collaboration from industry partners is clearly important; would working with an industry association rather than or as part of two individual SMEs be acceptable?

I think that that's a really good idea actually. I can see that, particularly with SMEs industry, associations might be a very, very good route. I think what we would be interested in probing is how that is actually going to work in practice and what the real link to SMEs, in that particular example, would be... so how effective the industry association would be in facilitating the access you needed.

Do we have any other questions? The question have dried up again. We've had a lot of questions so far. We'll give people a few more minutes and wait and see if there are any further questions people have got.

**Q.** I assume we can still write to Moira if we have more questions later?

Absolutely. And actually what we will try to do is that with these questions, we will put up a transcript and some FAQs and we can always add to that if more questions come up.

**Q.** Question here... does digital healthcare fit into the call, applying digital technology to NHS challenges, e.g. innovative digital devices?

It's not core to the call. Obviously, Industry 4.0 and future industrial systems are very broad. This is a project that is funded by the Manufacturing the Future theme within EPSRC and it is funded under the digital manufacturing heading within EPSRC. From an EPSRC perspective, the notions around innovative medical devices really fit within Healthcare Technologies. However, if we were looking at the manufacturing context and the sort of industrial production and use context, perhaps procurement, I can see a link there. But I think that design of innovative digital medical devices does feel like it's out of scope.

**Q.** there's a question here... is a pFACT required?

If I understand correctly, pFACT is usually an internal costing system that's used to ... I know we use it at Nottingham at the moment... to cost proposals. Just to clarify the answer earlier, what Moira will do is to put together a very short standard table that will required to be used in order to communicate the full costings of the project. And so you won't need a full pFACT costing, you'll just need to have done the calculations internally to be able to feed into that table.

**Q.** We've got a question here that we had earlier... what funding level is there for a project?

So, we said earlier that we are looking at top end £60k.

**Q.** Can we employ a researcher/fellow with consumables?

Yes if that's appropriate and we just expect it to be costed in the normal EPSRC way.

**Q.** So this is a good question... is the grant partial to some industries? Our proposed industry partner... maybe I shouldn't give away who the proposed industry partner is but it's a consumer product that you would drink on a Friday evening when you're not writing a grant or maybe when you are...

No there is no particular preference for industry type. The only thing I'd say, that came up at the workshop, is that there are clearly some usual suspects that are emerging and actually something novel, like the food production area where you don't get so much emphasis about digital technologies in future industrial systems that you do, perhaps, in maybe the obvious ones, like the digital products, the electronic products for example. So again, speaking as one of the members of the panel and I have colleagues who may have different views, I personally would welcome a variety of different industries, especially if they present different challenges on how we implement digital technologies in future industrial contexts.

**Q.** a question from email.... So "One area that I'm keen to find out more about is support for research that looks at the data generated through energy use, in particular the elderly demographic. The research group that I'm part of is using this data to develop networked concepts and prototypes." And this fits within the data analytics side.

I think the important thing to emphasise is the industrial systems and actually from this particular context, the home context, unless you are talking about users of products that come from industrial systems, I don't think it's quite as relevant within this grant. The sort of thing that I think could be part of the Industry 4.0 notion is the monitoring and use of technologies by consumers and understanding how that may affect their production in the future or their maintenance or things like this. So data generated through energy use and the elderly demographic feels out of scope actually to me. It's a worthwhile thing to research, it just doesn't quite fit into this project.

I don't know if there are any other, further questions that people would like to ask.

Oh someone didn't hear what I said earlier... so we are looking for projects of around up to £60k. Just because we have got a total of £600k available, we are looking to not necessarily award all of that money in this first round. The guidance we have been giving to people is up to £60k.

I think it's worth saying that the most important thing at this stage is the idea. This is a feasibility study and so what we are really looking for are new concepts and new ideas that really challenge and help us explore this notion of future industrial systems in the digital age.

**Q.** This is an excellent question. If there are sensitive IP issues relating to the invention behind the proposal, it might be difficult to engage industrial partners at this stage and limit what might be disclosed at the conference. How do we handle this?

The first thing to say that in terms of the proposal, we will expect our reviewers and our panel members to treat the proposal with the exact level of confidentiality and ethical approach that we are expected to treat EPSRC proposals with, and any other sort of funding proposals. So, Moira I am happy for you to write a statement to emphasise that. And we will make sure we re-iterate that to all of our reviewers as well.

In terms of limiting what can be disclosed at the conference, my advice would be that we are happy to talk through how you deal with that. I completely understand the need to protect IP and the need to manage industrial partners. I think what we would hope is that you are able to disclose the notion or the concepts more generally without making the... giving away the licensable or patentable elements of the concept.

I think the other thing is, of course, to remember that this is EPSRC funding, it's public funding, and so what we need to be finding out here is what's the general knowledge that is going to emerge from these particular projects. So we wouldn't look at anything that was just purely developing a product or concept if there wasn't going to be some general learning for the Network to be able to handle. So that's maybe ever so slightly different from say a responsive mode bid to EPSRC because we would expect there to be an ability to communicate the notion of what's being explored within the Network context. If it was something that was so confidential it couldn't be dealt with like that, we would probably advise you to go to other sources of funding and deal with it through responsive mode for example.

**Q.** Ok this is a good question... how far out of the scope of manufacturing can we go, for example design concept or end of life? Or do we have to link it back to manufacturing?

No, I think we can look at the whole of the product lifecycle here, so everything from the design concept through to end of life and disposal or recycling or whatever.

And I think this is where... this is one of the reasons we are challenging this difference where we've got digital manufacturing and we've got Industry 4.0 and why we've sort of used these future industrial systems as a notion. It is broader than manufacturing and the manufacturing context but I think we'd want to look at, because it's funded by Manufacturing the Future, we would want to look at what the learning is in the manufacturing part but design to end of life and the entire product lifecycle is within scope.

**Q.** Is the development of digital sensors through the Internet of Things architecture to collect medical data, which is data analysis, in scope?

If there was a clear understanding as to how these new sensors would change the way that future industrial systems work, then yes. But I think it needs to be seen within that context of future industrial systems. I think that if there is a very specific project that is being thought about, actually the best thing to do is submit a very short paragraph and I can send it round the management group and we can form an opinion. It's slightly difficult to advise on the specifics of particular projects here.

Are there any further questions?

**Q.** So there is a question... can we send emails with further questions?

Absolutely, if you send your emails to Moira, Moira will make sure that they are answered by the appropriate person.

Are there any further questions?

**Q.** OK, we've got one last question... are collaborations with Group Training Associations (GTAs) eligible as an industrial partner? They provide training for engineering apprentices working in local businesses.

They are not an organisation I have worked with personally before. Certainly the skills agenda is something that is really, really coming through and it feels like those organisations would feed into that. So yes, if you feel it's justified within the project, that seems like a really good partner.

I suppose industrial partners really refers to industry but also the societal and third sector and the council type partners as well.

Are there any further questions?

Ok, well I think that unless we get any further questions in in the next minute or so, I'd like to say thank you very much. You are never sure how these things are going to work. I am certainly glad it wasn't just Moira and me sitting in a room on our own. I realise I didn't introduce myself at the beginning – I'm Sarah Sharples, I'm the PI on the project.



Thank you very much for your enthusiasm for the call and we will put the transcript of this Q&A on the website and send it out to all the Network members so you've got that information. So thanks for your enthusiasm and we look forward to receiving your proposals.

-end-