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1. **Introduction**

1.1. The MOE Academic Research Fund (AcRF) Tier 2 supports research in Singapore-based Autonomous Universities (AUs)\(^1\) so as to fulfil the following objectives:

(a) Advance high-quality research of international excellence that challenges current understanding or provides pathways to new frontiers;

(b) Support academic research as a foundation for discoveries that hold promise for impact on the economy and society;

(c) Support post-graduate research training in our universities.

1.2. AcRF Tier 2 funds research projects on a competitive basis across Singapore-based AUs. Each grant\(^2\) proposal submitted should have a total project value (TPV) of **between $500,000 and $1 million** over a **three-year duration**. In addition:

(a) Only Pure Mathematics and Statistics projects under the Informatics and Mathematics discipline cluster with TPV of **$250,000 and above** are also eligible for funding under AcRF Tier 2; and

(b) Projects under the Accountancy, Business, Humanities and Social Sciences discipline cluster with TPV of **$100,000\(^3\) and above** are also eligible for funding under AcRF Tier 2.

2. **Application and Approval of Project Grant**

**Application**

\(^1\) There are four AUs in Singapore, namely National University of Singapore (NUS), Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore Management University (SMU) and Singapore University of Technology and Design (SUTD).

\(^2\) “Grant” means the fund disbursed under the MOE Academic Research Fund Tier 2.

\(^3\) This threshold has been revised from the August 2012 grant call.
2.1. Principal Investigators (PI) and Co-investigators\(^4\) (co-PI) must be full-time faculty\(^5\) of the AUs in order to be eligible for AcRF Tier 2 funding. AcRF Tier 2 funding can only be spent on research conducted in our AUs, even if collaborators\(^6\) are based overseas.

2.2. The grant call for AcRF Tier 2 proposals will be held twice a year in February and August, unless otherwise communicated by MOE. Applicants should submit their grant proposals using MOE’s prescribed format via MOE’s Online Grant Administration System (OLGA). The grant call and closing dates will be communicated to the applicants by the AUs’ Offices of Research (OREs).

2.3. Each grant will normally be capped at S$1.0 mil over a funding period of 3 years, contingent upon satisfactory progress as assessed during annual reviews, although proposals for larger funding for a three-year period may also be considered if well justified. Similar versions or part(s) of the current AcRF Tier 2 proposal should not be submitted to other agencies for funding.

2.4. Prior to submission, all proposals have to be verified by the OREs and endorsed by the Director of Research (DOR). PIs should not communicate with MOE directly. OREs shall inform the PIs of the terms set out in this guideline and ensure compliance by the applicants.

2.5. PIs can check the status of their application via the OLGA system.

\(^4\)“Co-investigator” means the person or persons named in the Project Grant Approval as a Co-Investigator.

\(^5\) Full-time faculty members are those who hold appointment and perform duties at the university for a minimum of 9 months a year.

\(^6\) “Collaborator” means the person or persons named in the Project Grant Approval as a Collaborator.
Approval of Project Grant & Ethics Approval

2.6. PIs will be notified of the results of their applications through the OREs. Appeals for unsuccessful applications will not be entertained.

2.7. Proposals which have been rejected for AcRF Tier 2 funding will not be considered in the following grant calls and ORE should ensure that PIs do not resubmit the same proposal for consideration.

2.8. Applicants, whose proposals are allowed for resubmission, may do so during the next grant call, but has to provide a point-by-point rebuttal to the expert panel’s comments and address any concerns raised. All resubmissions will be within the overall quota set for each AU by MOE.

2.9. Where applicable, the PI has to obtain full ethics approval and any other research-related approvals (such as risk assessments) from the relevant authorities before the AcRF Tier 2 research grant account is activated by the AUs' Office of Finance or Office of Financial Services (collectively known as “OFN”). The AUs' ORE and OFN should ascertain that the necessary approvals are in place before grant disbursement.

2.10. In the event that the ethics and other research-related approvals are withdrawn or suspended, affected PIs are to inform MOE, through their ORE, of such decisions immediately. MOE reserves the right to withhold funding if these approvals are not obtained, withdrawn or suspended.

3. Indirect Research Cost & Third Stream Funding

3.1. From FY 2007, MOE will support the indirect research cost (IRC)
at a flat rate of 20%\(^7\) of the total qualifying direct costs (less exceptional items) of each approved AcRF Tier 2 project. Total qualifying direct costs refer to the costs of items approved for funding in the AcRF Tier 2 grant. Exceptional items include but are not limited to, the following

(a) Equipment costing more than S$100,000;

(b) Intellectual property that is needed to carry out the proposed R&D work;

(c) Subcontracting of non-research work (e.g., the development of tools for the research);

(d) Payment to volunteers and research patients;

(e) Infrastructural work\(^8\) that is approved as a direct cost of the research grant; and

(f) Research scholarship\(^9\)

3.2. From FY 2008, MOE will provide a Third Stream Funding (TSF) at a flat rate of 5% of the total qualifying direct costs (less exceptional items) of each newly approved AcRF Tier 2 project. Total qualifying direct costs refer to the costs of items approved for funding in the AcRF Tier 2 grant. Exceptional items include but are not limited to:

(a) Equipment costing more than S$100,000;

(b) Intellectual property that is needed to carry out the proposed R&D work;

(c) Subcontracting of non-research work (e.g., the development of tools for the research);

(d) Payment to volunteers and research patients;

---

\(^{7}\) The rate of IRC funding is subject to revision at MOE’s discretion.

\(^{8}\) Infrastructural work is normally not funded under AcRF Tier 2 but, in exceptional cases where it is funded, it will be considered a direct research cost. The exclusion of infrastructural work in the calculation of IRC is to avoid double funding.

\(^{9}\) While MOE encourages Postgraduate by Research (PGR) scholars to gain as much exposure in research as possible, MOE does not allow any students to be getting stipend/pay from more than one type of AcRF fund (by being hired as research assistant and receiving stipend from AcRF Tier 2, for example).
(e) Infrastructural work\textsuperscript{9} that is approved as a direct cost of the research grant; and

(f) Research scholarship

3.3. The TSF should be ring-fenced for the AU’s Technology Transfer Office to support activities related to academic entrepreneurship and commercialisation of research, such as protection of intellectual property, patent applications, industry outreach and matching grants for industry funding.

3.4. AUs should implement a mechanism to track the actual expenditure of each project (including tracking of expenditure via items and categories) and ensure that the amount of IRC and TSF requested complies with MOE’s guidelines.

4. Grant Management & Disbursement

4.1. The start date of the AcRF Tier 2 project is the date on which the account for the project is activated. The activation of the account should be within 6 months of the Letter of Conveyance\textsuperscript{10} to the university, otherwise the project approval would be considered as lapsed.

4.2. AcRF Tier 2 grant, including IRC funding is provided on a reimbursement basis. AUs should therefore pay for the expenditure incurred for approved projects first, and subsequently claim for reimbursement from MOE. The grant disbursement for AcRF Tier 2 - IRC will be based on the actual expenditure less exceptional items (as listed in 3.1) incurred by approved projects.

4.3. AUs should use MOE’s prescribed grant request form to claim for reimbursement for AcRF Tier 2 projects, including funding.

\textsuperscript{10} The letter of conveyance refers to the letter that MOE sends to the AUs’ President after each grant call, conveying the specific budget approved for funding for each project.
The claims for reimbursement submitted by the AUs must be certified as true and correct by the Chief Financial Officer and Internal Auditors of the respective AUs. The form should be submitted once every 2 months.

4.4. With effect from AcRF Tier 2 projects awarded in the February 2013\textsuperscript{11} grant call, the funding arrangement for TSF has been changed to upfront disbursement in equal bimonthly instalments, distributed over the remaining months of the fiscal year in which the TSF (less exceptional items listed in 3.2) was awarded.

5. Project-Level Performance Management

Annual Reports

5.1. PIs are to submit their annual progress reports for each project using Form RGF4 (Progress Report). For projects awarded from 2009/1 Grant Call onwards, PIs should submit this form in softcopy via OLGA. For all prior projects, ORE shall collate all softcopy annual reports in CD-ROM. All reports should be submitted by \textbf{31st August} to MOE after being endorsed by the ORE.

5.2. PIs who failed to submit the Annual Progress Reports may be:

(a) denied any grant disbursement, variation and/or extension until such progress reports are submitted; and

(b) issued a “Not Submitted” status in the Annual Appraisal Report for final reporting.

5.3. PIs do not need to submit their Annual Progress Report for the

\textsuperscript{11}The results of the AcRF Tier 2 February 2013 grant call was conveyed to the AUs on 5 August 2013. These projects have grant ID, MOE2013-T2-1. The funding arrangement for all AcRF Tier 2 projects awarded before the February 2013 grant call will continue with bimonthly reimbursement based on the actual utilisation less exceptional items listed in 3.2.
year if the project completion date falls between 1 April and 31 August of that year.

**Final Reports**

5.4. PIs are to submit their final reports **within 3 months** from the project completion date, using Form RGF5 (Final Report). For projects awarded from 2009/1 Grant Call onwards, PIs should submit softcopy via OLGA, after having it endorsed by the ORE. For all prior projects, ORE shall collate all softcopy final reports in CD-ROM and submit them once a year to MOE on 31st August together with the annual reports.

5.5. PIs are not required to submit published papers with the final report, but should include a comprehensive bibliography of all publications arising from the project.

5.6. PIs who fail to submit the Final Reports will not be eligible for future AcRF Tier 2 grant applications.

6. **Programme-Level Performance Management**

**Triennial Reporting Requirement**

6.1. For each discipline cluster, the AUs should submit a self-assessment report every three years on the Tier 2 projects in that cluster awarded four to six years earlier. The self-assessment should provide a critical review of all the projects in that vintage, with case studies\(^{12}\) on selected projects highlighting their achievement as well as lessons learnt and areas for improvement. The self-assessment report should be submitted to MOE by **30 September** every year.

\(^{12}\) The case studies should cover at least five Tier 2 projects awarded to the institution within the vintage years. Please refer to MOE (HED) Financial Circular HED/001/201 for details and a sample of the case study template.
6.2. The phasing of the Triennial report is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vintage for Assessment</th>
<th>Discipline Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>EP1, EP5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Review by Expert Panels

6.3. In years when there is no triennial reporting, a random sampling of Tier 2 final reports will be reviewed by expert panels convened by MOE. E.g. in 2012, a sample of EP1, EP2, EP4 and EP5 final reports will be reviewed. The annual review report should be submitted to MOE by **30 September** every year.

6.4. The triennial self-assessment report and the expert panels’ annual review of Tier 2 final reports serve to inform MOE of the quality of research in the AUs.

7. Intellectual Property

7.1. The AUs should use its best efforts to develop the project with a view to making the project commercially viable in Singapore or elsewhere, as is reasonably and commercially feasible. The AUs shall pay all costs and legal fees in connection with IP registration and management, where applicable.

7.2. The AUs may publish at any symposia, national, international or regional professional meetings or in any journal, thesis,

---

13 “Intellectual Property” means all know-how and intellectual property rights (including patents, copyrights, trademarks, designs, trade secrets, rights in confidential information, mask-works, and semi-conductor lay-out designs) worldwide arising under statutory or common law, and whether perfected. The university shall also procure that their research team which may include matriculated students, staff and other parties (external consultants or independent contractors) to enter into a written agreement to assign the IP to the university.
dissertation, newspaper or otherwise. All publications shall acknowledge the funding support by MOE by citing the Grant name “Singapore Ministry of Education Academic Research Fund Tier 2” and the MOE’s official grant number for the project. It is the PI’s and ORE’s responsibility to ensure that the protection of any IP is not compromised as a result of the publication of the research project.

7.3. Ownership of the intellectual property created as a result of the research funded through AcRF Tier 2 is subjected to the standing IP policy of the AU.

7.4. Except for articles or papers published in scientific, technical or professional journals, the following disclaimer must also be included in all publications arising from the funded research: “Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Singapore Ministry of Education.”

7.5. The Singapore Government and public sector agencies shall reserve a non-exclusive, non-transferable, perpetual, irrevocable, worldwide, royalty-free right and licence to use, modify, reproduce and distribute the Intellectual Property created from AcRF Tier 2 funding for non-commercial, R&D and/or educational purposes only.

7.6. Information on disclosures of new Intellectual Property, patents and publications arising from the funded research should be provided to MOE as part of the regular annual and final progress reports submitted.

8. Training & Education Programmes

8.1. Wherever necessary, MOE may request PIs and/or the research
team to participate in education-related programmes, such as:

(a) Presenting their research work in MOE schools and institutions of higher learning;

(b) Organising teacher enrichment programmes; or

(c) Supporting MOE’s initiatives in creating a research culture in schools and institutions of higher learning.

9. Grant Variation

9.1. PIs should submit all grant variation requests through the AUs’ OREs, using the appropriate forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Type of Variation</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amendments to Projects</td>
<td>RGF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fund Virement</td>
<td>RGF2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Budget Revision</td>
<td>RGF3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. PIs should refer to “Guidance for Processing Variation Requests” (Annex A) in their preparation of the variation requests to ensure that all supporting documents have been duly completed.

9.3. OREs should evaluate the PIs’ requests and make decisions on all requests that fall within the AUs’ approving authority. For requests that require MOE’s approval, OREs should first evaluate the requests based on the considerations, norms and checks listed in Annex A and make recommendations for MOE’s consideration.

9.4. For all variation requests, MOE’s decision is final and appeals will not be entertained. Retrospective variation requests are not allowed.
10. **Closure of Project Accounts**

10.1. All projects are expected to be completed within 3 years from the start date of the project.

10.2. AUs and PIs are to close the research project account **within 3 months** from the date of project completion. MOE will not reimburse any expenditure incurred after the project completion date. The only exception is for the payment of Performance Bonuses (PB) for work done prior to project completion date, as PB payment may occur more than 3 months after the date of project completion. Upon payment of the PB, AUs and PIs are to close the research project/programme account immediately.

10.3. OFN should use **Form RGF6 (Closing of Research Project Account)** to close the account for the entire batch of AcRF Tier 2 projects and return any unspent funds to MOE, if any, upon completion of all projects within the same batch.

10.4. OREs and/or OFN must ensure that PIs are not to issue any new purchase orders after the project completion date.

11. **Compliance of Administrative Guidelines**

11.1. In the event of non-compliance of this administrative guidelines, MOE reserves the right to:

   (a) withhold or withdraw the current funding;

   (b) disqualify the PI from subsequent AcRF competitive funding; and/or

---

14 Expenditure incurred refers to the point **at which goods are delivered or services rendered.**
(c) carry out any action as MOE deems appropriate.

12. Financial Regulations on Expenditure and Payment

12.1. AUs and PIs should not commit to any expenditure before receiving the funding approval by MOE.

12.2. Similarly, AUs and PIs should not commit to any expenditure after the project end date, inclusive of any approved extension period. The only exception is Tier 2 Research Scholarships, where AUs and PIs are allowed to draw on the funding for up to 4 years from the project start date, if the Tier 2 scholars are not engaged in any other projects.

12.3. For projects approved and conveyed before April, PIs may issue purchase orders or incur any invoices or payments before the new financial year (i.e. in April). However, disbursement will only be made in the new financial year.

12.4. All expenses incurred and paid must be submitted to MOE for reimbursement within 3 months from the payment date. The claim must be based on paid expenditure incurred and no projections should be included. For example, expenditure paid in April 2014 must be claimed/submitted latest by July 2014.

12.5. The final grant claim for each FY must be submitted by the first week of March every year. For example, grant claims for expenditure paid from 1 January 2015 to 28 February 2015 must be submitted by the first week of March 2015. Claims received after this date would not be able to tap on FY2014 funds.

12.6. To ensure tighter budgetary control, better utilisation of resources and proper budgeting of grant applicants, AUs should achieve a minimum utilisation rate of 95% of the total approved budget for each AcRF Tier 2 project or suffer a penalty on the
baseline budget for the next FY.

12.7. AUs and PIs are to follow AUs’ procurement procedures and guidelines to ensure that all purchases made using AcRF grants are value-for-money and processes are transparent.

12.8. AUs should ensure that there are adequate internal financial controls and processes as well as adequate cost control measures to ensure that resources are utilised prudently and cost inefficiencies are minimised.

12.9. As and when directed by MOE, AUs will allow an auditor appointed by MOE to carry out an audit of its financial and related processes/procedures pertaining to the utilisation of AcRF grants.

13. Miscellaneous

13.1. MOE reserves the right to revise this administrative guidance. The AUs will be informed accordingly.
### Guidance for Processing Variation Requests

**Annex A**

**(Effective from 11 August 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Type of Request</th>
<th>Key considerations</th>
<th>Norms</th>
<th>Supporting Document required</th>
<th>Types of checks by ORE</th>
<th>Approval authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Considerations</td>
<td>The critical role of the proposed items to project outcome and the reason it was not budgeted in original proposal</td>
<td>Fund virement is to support the project only, not for support of “follow-on” research</td>
<td>RGF2</td>
<td>RGF2 is duly completed and endorsed. All supporting document attached. Check is done on whether requested item was in the approved budget and whether requested item is within Tier 2 fundable list.</td>
<td>Fund virement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost-savings principle</td>
<td>It is possible for PI to use cost-savings within approved project cost to purchase essential new items not previously budgeted. However, purchase must be based on needs; availability of savings is not a reason for new purchase.</td>
<td>Latest statement of account</td>
<td>Fund availability</td>
<td>Relevant quotations</td>
<td>Reasonableness of quotes by cross-referencing similar purchase or independent checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage of project</td>
<td>Compelling justifications to be provided for virement requests if project is ending in a year of less. Virement would not be approved if project is ending in 3 months or less, unless in exceptional cases</td>
<td>The PI has no outstanding annual/final reports for any MOE grants. (PIs with overdue reports are not allowed to submit variation requests.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virement &gt; 10% of Total Project Value (TPV), excluding Research Scholar, Indirect Research Cost (IRC) and Third Stream Funding (TSF) by MOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund Virement (Additional Requirement)

<p>| 1 a)  | Travel/Conference budget | Only for PIs, project researchers and students on the project | Follows the travel norms of Host Institution. | ORE has to ensure the institution’s travel norms are adhered to in PI’s amendments to the travel/conference budget during Budget Phasing. | No virement of funds is allowed into this sub-vote after approved budget phasing. |                         |
|       |                          |                                                                   |                                         |                                                                            |                                                                                                           |                     |
| 1 b)  | Additional Expenditure on Manpower (EOM) | If new headcount is requested, PI has to explain the staff’s job scope | Job scope of additional EOM | ORE needs to assess the reasonableness of request, e.g. the job scope is not too small for the headcount. If the need is short-term, ORE needs to assess if part-time manpower is more appropriate | DOR or above can approve Tier 2 grant variation requests that involve changes in category and number of research staff, including in categories not originally requested, as long as the combined Expenditure on Manpower (EOM) budget (excluding Visiting Professor) approved for that project remains unchanged. |                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Type of Request</th>
<th>Key considerations</th>
<th>Norms</th>
<th>Supporting Document required</th>
<th>Types of checks by ORE</th>
<th>Approval authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Visiting Professor (VP)</td>
<td>Relevance and contribution to project outcome (e.g., not because AU requires VP to give public lecture or other activities.)</td>
<td>The need for VP must be driven by the project need. ORE should assess feasibility of the visiting faculty. If in doubt, request independent assessment from the dean of department.</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae of prospective candidate.</td>
<td>ORE needs to assess the role and expertise of the visiting faculty. If in doubt, request an independent assessment from the dean of department.</td>
<td>Requests involving the replacement or addition of Visiting Professors within the approved Visiting Professor budget shall be approved by DOR (or above). For requests that exceed the approved Visiting Professor’s budget, MOE’s approval will have to be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Track record</td>
<td></td>
<td>Job scope/deliverables of VP</td>
<td>ORE needs to assess reasonableness of request, e.g. the job scope is commensurate with the duration requested. Particularly, ORE needs to assess if the consultation can be done via email/tele-video conferencing, rather than through appointment of visiting professor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of stay</td>
<td>The job scope and deliverables of VP must be clear for assessment of the duration required of his/her service.</td>
<td>For equipment costing &gt;$20k: • Letter of approval from University Faculty Committee.</td>
<td>University Facility Committee should assess the likely utilization and ensure that there is no duplication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Pay for VP must be aligned with university’s norms.</td>
<td>For equipment costing &gt;$20k and whose useful life is &gt;5 years: • Letter of commitment to co-fund equipment</td>
<td>For equipment costing &gt;$20k and whose useful life is &gt;5 years, letter of commitment to co-fund equipment must be furnished from co-funders, who can be department, university or other agencies.</td>
<td>All requests involving purchase of new equipment/OOE items (regardless of amount) that was not in the approved budget phasing, must be approved by MOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Purchase of New Equipment/OOE Items</td>
<td>Cost and useful life of equipment</td>
<td>Equipment costing &gt;$20k and whose useful life is &gt;5 years should be amortised for project duration only. This encourages prudent purchase and fair sharing of costs by those who will stand to benefit from the equipment even after the project has ended.</td>
<td>Equipment costing &gt;$20k and whose useful life is &gt;5 years should be amortised for project duration only.</td>
<td>Equipment costing &gt;$20k and whose useful life is &gt;5 years, letter of commitment to co-fund equipment must be furnished from co-funders, who can be department, university or other agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Amendments to Project (General)</td>
<td>Stage of project</td>
<td>There should not be any amendments 3 months from end of project</td>
<td>RGF1</td>
<td>RGF1 is duly completed and endorsed. All supporting document attached.</td>
<td>All amendments must be approved by MOE. (See exceptions at 2b and 2c).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendments should support the original objectives of the project only, not for support of “follow-on” research</td>
<td>Latest statement of account</td>
<td>Fund availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The need for amendments</td>
<td>The PI has no outstanding annual/final reports for any MOE grants. (PIs with overdue reports are not allowed to submit variation requests.)</td>
<td>The PI has no outstanding annual/final reports for any MOE grants. (PIs with overdue reports are not allowed to submit variation requests.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments to Project (Additional Requirement)</td>
<td>2a) Change of PI/Co-PI</td>
<td>Suitability of proposed PI</td>
<td>Ability of the new PI to capture the benefits and achieve the intended objectives of the project</td>
<td>Information on outgoing PI: last day of work in University, name of institutions he will be joining, etc</td>
<td>Application should reach MOE 3 months’ in advance before PI leaves (for contract expiry/termination cases) and as soon as practicable for resignation cases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost implications</td>
<td>Must be within approved EDM.</td>
<td>CV of proposed new PI/ Job scope of replacement PI/Letter of recommendation</td>
<td>ORE needs to determine whether the proposed PI is eligible based on Tier 2 eligibility criteria and whether he/she is suitable and has the skills to continue and complete the research work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOE reserves the right to terminate the grant if: • No suitable replacement is found; • Proposed PI is rejected; or</td>
<td>Mitigation Plan: Department and new PI should jointly develop a mitigation plan to sustain/ reanimate the project, including: • setting new milestones/KPIs</td>
<td>Mitigation Plan: Department and new PI should jointly develop a mitigation plan to sustain/reanimate the project, including: • setting new milestones/KPIs</td>
<td>ORE needs to assess the feasibility of the mitigation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Key considerations</td>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Supporting Document required</td>
<td>Types of checks by ORE</td>
<td>Approval authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 b)</td>
<td>Change of Collaborator</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Changes in Collaborator to be approved by DOR (or above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 c)</td>
<td>Project Extension</td>
<td>Impact on deliverables and usefulness of final research outcome in view of the delay</td>
<td>To ensure currency of research, extension will be capped at 6 months</td>
<td>Evidence of satisfactory progress (e.g. copies of publication arising from the research, abstracts of conferences attended etc)</td>
<td>ORE needs to assess if it is realistic for the project to achieve closure with a short extension. Request for extension will not be supported merely due to manpower constraints. Request must reach MOE at least 3 months before end date of project.</td>
<td>Extension ≤ 3 months: DOR or above MOE may consider a no-cost extension of up to 6 months if the PI is able to demonstrate excellent progress with savings in the project account. PI must however submit a 1-page write-up on the additional research to be done during the extension that is beyond the original scope of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 d)</td>
<td>Change of scope</td>
<td>Change of scope to pursue new research objectives is not allowed; this should be submitted as new proposal at grant calls.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 e)</td>
<td>Termination/ Lapse of Project</td>
<td>Alternative options to termination</td>
<td>Other options should be explored to ensure that the best outcome is achieved with the investment already made.</td>
<td>Winding-down Plan: Department and PI should jointly develop a winding-down plan, including Propose a winding-down budget Ensure results are published/disseminated Students are transited to other projects or otherwise not disrupted due to the termination Equipment, material/consumables purchased are properly accounted for and transferred to the department</td>
<td>ORE to assess the adequacy of the winding-down plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automatic Termination</td>
<td>If the original PI has become unavailable (e.g. resignation, passing), AU should propose a replacement PI. If the replacement PI is not acceptable to MOE, the project is automatically terminated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orderly conclusion of project</td>
<td>Project accounts should be frozen immediately once termination proceeding is initiated. A separate winding-down budget should be drawn up for MOE’s consideration. This covers expenses necessary to effect an orderly conclusion, for a period not exceeding 3 months from the date of termination.</td>
<td>The plan should be signed off by both the dean of department and the PI. A final report should be submitted for terminated grants if funds had been drawn down from the grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>Type of Request</td>
<td>Key considerations</td>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Supporting Document required</td>
<td>Types of checks by ORE</td>
<td>Approval authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department report: Department should prepare a report that includes:</td>
<td>Assess the adequacy of the report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A review of what went wrong for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the alternatives to terminations and why they are not applicable in this case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preventive measures to avoid future occurrence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The report should be signed off by both the dean of department and the director of research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Budget Revision

The critical role of the proposed budget revisions to project outcome and the reason it was not anticipated in the original proposal.

Amendments should support the original objectives of the project only, not for support of “follow-on” research.

RGF3

ORE to ensure that RGF3 is duly completed and endorsed and all supporting documents are attached.

The PI has no outstanding annual/final reports for any MOE grants. (PIs with overdue reports are not allowed to submit variation requests.)

MOE

Glossary:
ARB: Academic Research Board
AU: Autonomous University
CV: Curricula Vitae
DOR or above: Director of Research or more senior university management e.g. President and Provost.
EOM: Expenditure on Manpower
MOE: Ministry of Education
OOE: Other Operating Expenses
ORE: Office of Research
PI: Principal Investigator
RA: Research Assistant
RF: Research Fellow
RGF: Research Grant Form
VP: Visiting Professor