

Question	Answer
HUBS (general)	
AI for health, does this mean within hubs this will not be addressed (project management thoughts)?	This is included as a priority within the UKRI AI CDT call and there will soon be an AI for health announcement that will be more focused on AI for health.
Will the AI target fall within the hubs?	The hubs are doing 2 separate things, the AI for real data, the data of the science is where the overlap will be, but the AI for Data, Science and Health are all around how they advance the state of the art of those disciplines using AI. For data as an example, although data is varied and wide, inherently it is how you deal with that data, and how it can be applied more broadly. Similarly with the Science is not looking at a specific area, but how you can improve across the breadth.
Can we apply for real data in AI for Health as some of the data that will be studied would be useful for the AI for Health call?	Make case for why this should be commissioned for the hub, use the outline stage to articulate mission, and how you will address at least one of the questions that are needing to be addressed, and if the justification is made that a proposal addresses the mission otherwise this may be more applicable to grants and standard mode as essentially there will be a very different scope between the hubs and standard mode grants.
3 separate hub calls, if there is an idea for foundations but can make a big difference in another area eg Health, can we still put forward a proposal	Yes, and we are looking for the connections to be made. We want distinct missions and if there is relevance then bring that into the proposal. It is likely that people will be on multiple hubs and that overlap is what we are looking for, for everyone to be linked to everyone else.
Does science in a 'Science and Engineering research hub' mean EPSRC science?	Yes, overall. Not all the science needs to be within EPSRC remit, however, the main outcomes should be within EPSRC remit and the main question here would be is it part of the EPSRC missions?
Why have so many AI focused calls been released in quick succession? Do you feel you will be over-stretching the community (academics, research support)?	We completely understand the feeling and anticipate that we as EPSRC are also going to be stretched for delivering these calls in quick succession. There are a number of reasons as to why they have been released like this, the stage of the spending review we are at being one, as well as when the details have been obtained. We are hoping it will drive behaviour for the community to be sensitive towards which they apply for as we don't want to just fund the same people on 5 hubs. We hope universities will think carefully about which opportunity they advise applicants to apply for, and hope that it will (as we have outline and full proposals) reduce the number of applications to fewer high quality applications with strong partnerships. We acknowledge the timeframe and difficulty and hope to simplify as much as we can where possible.
Around the leaderships of the hubs, there is mention of AI specialists, obviously in the AI4 calls there are separate communities, would co-directorship be accepted where there are representatives across the communities?	The JeS system has only allowed one PI to be listed, with all other staff as CO-I's, however with the new funding service we are hoping this will be more tailorable, so we would encourage you to build the model that you need and we will fit it into the system.
Can other institutes (not the Turing) lead a hub?	As long as the strengths needed for the mission of the call is apparent in the team. In your outline, you should make it apparent and supported with reasoning as to why you would need an institute to lead the hub.
Is there any steer / guidance on how many academic institutions should be involved in a Hub?	No perspective. This is about the quality not the number of people that are involved, think about who are the key people we need to work with and to deliver the proposed HUB objectives within the mission of the call.
How big should Hubs be?	This is up for the applicants themselves to articulate as this will be different from hub to hub. For the AI for real data and scientific and engineering research call, hubs are expected to be up to £12M.

Outline relevant	
Given tight timelines, do any outline stages prevent people from being involved in other calls?	No outline stages do not restrict, we do not want to limit the spread of ideas. We are anticipating people will be on multiple hubs, but also realise this may not be clear until the full proposal stage when they are actually funded.
Can you say a little more about the facilitation between the Outline and the Full proposal stage?	We will publish the successful outlines so that people can go and engage in their own way, see where the successes were and reach out to those they would like to get involved with, we are also hoping to have a number of events that we would be able to invite all the people at that stage to, enabling connections, discussions and networking. We do anticipate that others like the ATI may hold similar events, and we will be talking to each other to start conversations off between potential partnerships.
Is there a limit on the number of bids an institution can submit to each call? (The calls mention restrictions in terms of named individuals, but not caps on bids submitted.)	No but please do not apply for everything. There is a limit of 2 outline proposals per organisation for the UKRI AI CDT call. The EPSRC CDT call has an algorithm-based limit on the number of proposals organisations may submit. Organisations have been informed what their limit is.

Feedback	
Will rejection feedback and connections be given/made due to the repetition of the topic rather than the quality of the application?	Only if the panel think it is needed, at the outline stage. We will be having conversations with the panel about what is appropriate and the reasonings as to why proposals would not be taken onto the invite stage. We will be publishing the applications that were successful, but we will not be specifically going out and suggesting connections due to similar applications, but we would encourage for people to reach out to the successful applicants whose projects are in a similar area.
How can one communicate their research successes with UKRI?	Research Fish or get in contact with us at EPSRC, email addresses are available on the website.

Robotics	
To what extent are robotics involved in the AI investments?	The key mission of these investments are towards AI, how robotics are brought in is down to the hubs to identify. Although EPSRC see robotics more as 'robotics and autonomous systems', the key thing is how you are developing things that contribute to the AI development within the UK. This may well go into autonomous systems, but it must contribute to AI development.
Is there any learning that you can share from the 4 Robotics hubs funded through the ISCF?	We are approaching the hubs differently and approaching a different part of the ecosystem, however the sustainability and how they will carry on after the end of funding, and the legacy the leave is something we would be very keen to see roll into our hubs. The geographical spread could have been better with the Robotics hubs hence we have a keen view to see a geographical spread of the AI hubs.
How do we make the robotics people feel more 'loved'?	As long as they can show they are furthering the AI ecosystem within the UK then they can be involved, its about the thinking not the moving, not autonomous systems, although recognised it is the same RA.

Other investments (TMF)	
When will the details for the 'AI for Net Zero' webinar be released?	As it states in the pre announcement on the webpages, link is now live for the webinar.
Net Zero call, are climate change and the outcomes of climate change going to be within remit of EPSRC	Call document holds the information and will be able to be spoken about at a later date when all is announced.
AI for Health, should this include fundamental research or should we use off the shelf approaches?	For both the AI4 calls this is more likely to look like a traditional call than a hub investment, but again there is an influence of the business case which is still to be released, and there is likelihood of change. More details will be released later for AI for Health following the webinars.

CDTs	
Foundational and Applied for Hubs is shown, but is different for CDT's?	The UKRI AI CDT call includes the applications and implications of AI in priority areas across the breadth of the UKRI remit. Proposals focused on the mathematical and computational foundations of AI without a clear application to one of the priority areas of the UKRI AI CDT call should be submitted to the EPSRC CDT funding opportunity. The EPSRC call spans the remit of EPSRC within different focus areas. Applicants who are unclear about which funding opportunity is best suited to the vision for their CDT should seek advice from UKRI. AI.cdts@ukri.org
CDT calls between EPSRC CDT and UKRI AI CDT. I understand technological advance in AI is EPSRC, translational use of AI for non-EPSRC remit is UKRI. Where the translational use of AI for EPSRC remit (may be smaller area than non-EPSRC area) should be submitted?	CDT proposals which focus on the translational use of AI within EPSRC's remit but do not fit the priority areas of the UKRI AI CDT call should consider whether the vision for the CDT might fit within the focus areas of the EPSRC call. It may be the case that a proposal does not fit the priority or focus areas of either call.
Hubs & CDTs- partnerships & vision, how much is actually doing research?	Responsive mode still exists, we have the flow chart which shows which opportunity would be most appropriate for people to apply for, including new research projects as part of a hub. PhD students carry out research, these projects are co-created with their supervisors so there is plenty of opportunity for new research ideas to be explored within the scope of a CDT.
Will CDTs and hubs be look at as separate portfolios? Priority areas on EP CDT's are not as clear as AI CDTs	Yes this would be the case as we envisage there will be connections and people across CDTs and hubs. ATI to facilitate the whole ecosystem
What is the governance in relation to the ATI involvement and their support to applications	We anticipate that the ATI will put on an event to facilitate the connections between the outlines that have been submitted, we realise that some people will already have connections with the ATI, may even have a foot in the ATI but we are not mandating this.

Real Data	
Real data call, does this have to be within the EPSRC remit? What kind of data can be included?	This is more about how the challenge is approached and the sort of data it is, and for this in particular we will be working with large holders of data, and government and to bring them together to address the challenge.
TRLs not mentioned, are the higher levels most relevant to real data?	It is more applied in AI 4 calls although it does depend on the approach you take as to how applied it is, there is an expectation for Novel AI research to be involved. But interpretation can come into this as to what you believe is going to advance the AI ecosystem across the UK, and how the HUB will come together to address the research questions and the mission of the call. There is likely to be some research in the areas between EPSRC and Innovate, but we are hoping to work with IUK programmes and how flexible we can be with the HUBS. The HUBS will be expected to work with relevant investments and help reach the targets of the higher TRLs as well.
Real data, with different data this can attract different industries, so how can it be addressed when there is a broad spectrum of data?	Ultimately this comes down to how you frame the approach and how this will be applicable to the missions of the hubs, but it will come down to peer review to judge how it fits, so justification of the data being used and the approach that will be taken is key here.

Foundations

Foundations of AI, would it be appropriate for a computer science group to lead this? Or would you be looking more for a Mathematician or Statistician?	Yes computer scientists as well as mathematicians can apply, applicant would need to justify why the lead is appropriate. As long as the strengths needed for the mission of the call is apparent in the team. It would then be down to the leadership team to manage the community around the mission, that is the real key thing for the leadership group.
---	--

Responsible and Trustworthy

Responsible trustworthy AI- is this applying existing research opportunities to do new things?	This is specifically not a hub. It is a champion-based model to convene the community. Due to this being an interdisciplinary investment it cannot only be one person, it must be a leadership groups. We are looking for ONE investment to be taken forwards and then we will work with them as to what the larger scale will look like. We anticipate they will come with some programmes and work across the community to start with but we will work with them to work out what the last stages (years 2-5) will look like when they are then funded. Help define with the community, Alan Turing Institute, Ada Lovelace Institute, hubs and wider EPSRC investments.
--	--

Industry

EPSRC funding may not attract industry but will there be input from IUK?	We are currently talking with IUK about how this can happen, and it seems that a lot on IUK competitions are bringing in universities. Once hubs are funded we can work with them and see what the landscape to build those additional interactions can be. The key thing to remember is this is not the end of the funding but the start of this as we want to work with the hubs to build that ecosystem even more.
--	---

Industry role- how do we get involved in application stage?	Industry owns the data and can bring the problems to be addressed, we are hoping to create networking after the outline stage. We want to work with innovate on these hubs in the 'sweet spot' for universities to be involved with business, have additional interactions and build the ecosystem more.
---	--

Can you comment more on the role of industry interests and involvement?	Integral to the calls and being able to show that 'real' data and how we can fix the problem through looking at this data from industry, but it is still seen as valuable for the other hub calls too. We would like to see that where questions are answered they can be helped to percolate out into the areas that they can be applied.
---	--

Funding

Will funding information be required at the outline stage for the Hubs - can or will we be held to this budget at the full bid stage?	We are open to being flexible to this, but this is as a conversation rather a stipulation, the call documents do not state the 10% and this is due to the fact of being in more partners between stages as well as inflational changes.
---	---

Is the budget stated at the outline stage binding (e.g. +/- 10%) for full proposal stage?	We're not stipulating 10%. We're just asking that it doesn't exceed 8 million at the at the full stage, and also that the core leadership team and the vision won't change between those two stages
---	---

How can additional partnerships be created after outline, if costs are relatively fixed after outline (If I remember correctly only deviation of 10% permitted - apologies if I got this wrong)?	Although we say relatively fixed we are open to be flexible, realigned conversation. If you support a compelling bid to include and bring in more partners then this will be possible and there are multiple ways that we can address this when the conversations are had. It is also the intention that the hubs will be going out and funding stand alone projects in the community either within the hub or with additional partners. 10% eitherway is normally an EPSRC standard but it does not apply to the hubs calls.
--	---

Flexible funding & pump priming take advantage of other opportunities. Are these 2 activities totalling £1M or one £1M each?	It is a flexible fund to be able to take advantage of additional opportunities, and we want hubs to be flexible as to how they use it. 2x pots of £1M funding. It is also viewed as a way to bridge the valley of death between EPSRC and IUK.
--	--

OPEX to support capital expenditure?	Capital expenditure is allowed and available on this call, you can ask for capital expenditure including cloud compute.
--------------------------------------	---

International

Could you please discuss the desirability/viability of international partners and funding, from researchers, to industry, etc?	We cannot supply direct funding to the international partners, but sub contracting arrangements with university should be encouraged and we are looking for the hubs to have these international partnerships. The ecosystems we envisage needs to be internationally recognised so people can come to the ecosystem, ask questions and be directed to the people that can effectively answer their question. The hubs could also be used as front door for your work with ATI to bring together the international community.
--	---

what role / participation do you anticipate or support for overseas partners?	
---	--

Jes/TMF

The community strongly hope the system you use for each call will not change throughout the call selection process (outline-full proposal). Would it be possible the new system to be used for full proposal after outline stage is done in JeS?	Once we have TFS information we will share and manage, we are aware of complexity, and that this is not ideal. We have been in conversations with the teams that are working on getting TFS ready and it is most likely that full proposals will be on TFS as we are at the change over time.
--	---

Risk

Portfolio management- is there a risk that weaker proposals will be funded above better proposals to meet some quota?	We will be using a banding system and the highest quality of proposals will be funded. The difficulty will come in when there are very similar proposals, looking at the same or very similar questions and are very closely ranked in the banding system. We need to be very careful with doing this and have absolute transparency at every point and with every part of the community. We will be talking to the community and providing feedback in these areas.
---	--

Other application mechanisms

With understanding the hubs and CDTs are all about partnerships, so what mechanisms are there for actually completing the research?	We do hope the hubs will complete some research, we have the flow diagram to show the mechanisms we are hoping to offer as opportunities. But responsive/standard is still open, and this can still be applied for and we would imagine that in the future after we have funded the hubs there will be more funding opportunities that can be tailored to how the community and ecosystem will look at that point in time, hoping these will gap fill and enable to pulling together of the community. Another thing that is worth highlighting is that it is also the intention that the hubs will be going out and funding stand alone projects in the community either within the hub or with additional partners essentially like a network plus model that has been previously used.
---	---

How will applying for these opportunities affect and impact the standard mode budget for AI related projects?	Our colleague Glen Goodall looks after the budget for AI and this comes through the ICT theme and covers responsive mode, fellowships, programme grants and new investigator awards, we look at the more managed activities. What we would like to see in the AI responsive mode is covered in the AI data and digitisation part of the delivery plan. https://www.ukri.org/publications/epsrc-strategic-delivery-plan/epsrc-strategic-delivery-plan-2022-to-2025/
---	--

Geographical Influence

Any comment on the geographical spread of a hub?	Geographically we are looking for a diversity across the whole of the UK, and we are also looking for the hubs to bring together the regional strengths that they represent and how it will benefit those areas. This does not mean that we will dictate that there has to be one in a specific region, we want the leadership of the hubs to be crossing as much of the UK ecosystem of AI as possible.
--	--