



Code of Practice

Funding Committees and Panels

March 2026

Contents

Contents.....	2
1 Purpose and scope.....	4
2 Roles and responsibilities.....	4
2.1. The role and remit of funding committees	4
2.2. The role and remit of expert review panels.....	5
2.3. Responsibilities of chairs of funding committees and panels.....	5
2.4. Committee and panel members' rights and responsibilities.....	7
2.5. Committee and panel secretariats	12
2.6. Role of other officials or observers.....	13
3 Committee and panel practices and procedures.....	13
3.1. General working practices	13
3.2. Balance of expertise.....	14
3.4. Dealing with dissenting views	15
3.5. Committee minutes and panel reports.....	15
3.6. Information exchange	16
3.7. Discussion of applications outside meetings.....	16
4 Conflicts of interest.....	17
4.1. Understanding conflicts of interest.....	17
4.2. Relationships that constitute a conflict of interest.....	17
4.3. Identification of conflicts of interest	19
4.4. Steps to be taken where a conflict is identified	19
4.5. Cases of uncertainty.....	20
4.6. Matters other than those concerning funding decisions.....	21
4.7. Raising concerns about the conflicts of interests of other individuals	21
5 Definitions	21
6 Related documents and version information.....	22
6.1 General funding committees terms of reference.....	22
6.2 Individual funding committee supplementary terms of reference: available under the relevant funding committee area on our website:	22
6.3 Conflicts of interest guidance	22
6.4 Policy on dignity at work in research.....	22

6.5 Use of generative AI in funding applications22

6.6 Guide to Assessing Grant Applications22

6.7 How we make funding decisions22

Appendix A.....24

 The Seven Principles of Public Life (Nolan Principles)24

1 Purpose and scope

We have a duty to ensure that funding application assessments and the development of scientific policy are carried out objectively, impartially and reflects the highest standards of governance.

This code of practice is intended for the use of all our peer reviewers, including:

- funding committees
- joint steering committees
- translational review groups
- strategic review panels, and
- expert review panels

(hereafter collectively referred to as committees and panels), together with their respective chairs, individual members and secretariats.

For the protection of other committee and panel members, and to ensure the impartiality of the scientific review process, if we have reason to believe that a member of a committee or panel has breached this code of practice, then they may be asked to resign their membership.

2 Roles and responsibilities

2.1. The role and remit of funding committees

2.1.1. Our funding committees fulfil one or more of the following three functions:

- (i) to make research grant or resource funding decisions (in the case of funding committees) and/or recommendations (in the case of strategic review panels) in a manner consistent with our research strategy
- (ii) to provide scientific advice which will inform our research strategy
- (iii) to advise on scientific policy decisions as required

2.1.2. Our funding committees are accountable to the Scientific Executive Board (SEB) for the oversight, development, review, funding and management of a

portfolio of awards within its remit, in line with our research strategy. The specific funding responsibilities of each committee are set out in that committee's supplementary terms of reference.

- 2.1.3. In fulfilment of their funding role, funding committees work with SEB and other funding committees to ensure co-ordination of research funding and the application of consistent standards of peer review.
- 2.1.4. The SEB is responsible for making scientific policy decisions. However, funding committees can provide advice on the development of strategies and policy relevant to their remits.
- 2.1.5. The SEB may also ask committees, or ad-hoc working groups, to provide advice on a wide range of issues affecting cancer research, including social and ethical issues and public and stakeholder concerns.

2.2. The role and remit of expert review panels

The role of expert review panels is to make recommendations about the scientific quality of the applications to their parent funding committee, who then makes a final funding decision or recommendation in light of the panel's recommendations and our overall research strategy.

The responsibilities of expert review panels are set out in our [General Terms of Reference for Expert Review Panels](#).

Strategic review panels, by contrast, are typically convened on an ad hoc basis and are accountable to SEB for the review of a particular funding arrangement (such as a core-funded institute or our centres and experimental cancer medicine centres network), and a recommendation as to whether and how it should be funded in future.

2.3. Responsibilities of chairs of funding committees and panels

- 2.3.1. The SEB appoints a chair to each funding committee and strategic review panel. Expert review panel chairs are appointed by the head of our research team supporting the expert review panel. In some cases, we also appoint a

vice chair. The vice chair may step in to act as chair in relation to matters where the chair has a conflict of interest or is otherwise unavailable.

The expert review panel and translational review groups need not have a vice chair, but where one is appointed, they will be based at a different institution from the chair and will generally act as chair of the translational review group meeting on any matters where the chair has a conflict of interest.

2.3.2. Chairs of funding committees and panels have responsibility for the following:

- (i) Proper conduct of the meeting. Ensuring members maintain high standards of behaviour during the meeting and managing the operation and output of the committee, including assessing the workload to ensure that the volume of work does not compromise the rigour of the discussion.
- (ii) Taking action to resolve improper conduct. Should any issues arise that risk compromising the proper conduct of the meeting, chairs should take swift and appropriate action during the meeting. Chairs will be provided with guidance from our office on how to handle such issues, including potential actions to take to resolve issues.
- (iii) Members' opportunity to be heard. Ensuring that every member of the committee or panel has the opportunity to be heard, and that no view is ignored or overlooked, using, where appropriate, a structured process which ensures that all views are captured and explored.
- (iv) Effective participation of patient representatives. Ensuring that the role of any member who is a patient representative is understood by the committee or panel as a whole, that the patient representative has sufficient opportunity to provide specialist input and ask questions in relation to the matters before the committee or panel, and supports the patient through provision of informal and formal feedback about how they are fulfilling their role.
- (v) Full range of scientific views and minimising unconscious bias. Ensuring that the full range of scientific opinion, including unorthodox and contrary scientific views are encouraged and appropriately taken into account, that any uncertainty and knowledge gaps are identified and significant diversity of opinion among members is fully explored and

discussed and, if it cannot be reconciled, is accurately reflected in the minutes. The chair should look out for and encourage members to actively check their thinking or constructively challenge any assumptions (e.g. where members are giving ‘the benefit of the doubt’ and signs of unconscious bias, such as stereotyping). Key points should be summarised prior to scoring, without ‘priming’ members to think a particular way before scoring.

- (vi) Accuracy of minutes or report (as applicable). Ensuring that the secretariat accurately documents the proceedings of the committee or panel so that there is a clear audit trail showing how the committee or panel reached its decisions.
- (vii) Chair’s actions. Authorising appropriate actions affecting committee or panel business outside the normal meeting cycle.
- (viii) Reporting. Where appropriate, reporting the committee or panel’s advice to the SEB.
- (ix) Adherence with our code of practice. Ensuring that the committee or panel act in accordance with this code of practice and ensuring that reviews and scoring are consistent with the criteria in our [Guide to Assessing Grant Applications](#).
- (x) Meeting efficiency and clarity of outcomes. Ensuring that discussions are managed in a way that enables the committee or panel to reach clear, well-defined outcomes, and that the meeting proceeds in line with the planned schedule.

2.3.3. The SEB may also ask committees, or ad-hoc working groups, to provide advice on a wide range of issues affecting cancer research, including social and ethical issues and public and stakeholder concerns.

2.4. Committee and panel members’ rights and responsibilities

2.4.1. Commitment and attendance

Members must confirm before accepting an invitation to serve on a committee that they understand the period of appointment and that they can fulfil the required commitment in terms of meeting attendance, committee business and preparation for meetings.

2.4.2. Expertise

Members must ensure they understand why they are being appointed and in what capacity, and the role they are expected to play on the committee or panel. Members should understand the nature of any expertise that they are asked to bring. Members with a particular expertise have a responsibility to make the committee or panel aware of the full range of opinion within the discipline. Lay members must be clear about the capacity in which they have been appointed and the role they are expected to fulfil.

2.4.3. Induction information

As part of the appointment process, members joining committees or panels will be provided with all the information they require to familiarise themselves with their role as a committee or panel member. As a minimum this will include:

- details of their term of appointment and responsibilities as a member
- the terms of reference of the committee (for committee members)
- the role of the secretariat
- the rules governing potential conflicts of interest and details of honoraria (if any) and reimbursement of expenses

2.4.4. Scientific and strategic deliberations

All members should regard it as part of their role to do the following:

- (i) Examine, and challenge, if necessary, the assumptions on which scientific advice is formulated and ask for explanations of any scientific terms and concepts which are not clear.
- (ii) Ensure that the committee or panel have the opportunity to consider contrary scientific views and where appropriate, the concerns and values of stakeholders before a decision is taken.
- (iii) Share in the general responsibility to consider the wider relevance of their decisions to the field of cancer research and relation to our research strategy.

2.4.5. Objectivity

Members must ensure that the assessment of applications for funding and the development of scientific policy and strategy are carried out objectively and impartially and must guard against introducing bias during the committee's or panel's deliberations.

2.4.6. Consideration and participation in full range of matters before the committee or panel

A member's role on the committee must not be circumscribed by the expertise or perspective they were asked to bring to that committee. Members should regard themselves as free to question and comment on the information provided, or the views expressed by any of the other members, notwithstanding that the views or information do not relate to their own area of expertise. If members believe the committee or panel's method of working is not rigorous or thorough enough, they have the right to ask that any concerns they have be put on the record.

2.4.7. Views of the individual member

Unless specifically stated otherwise, members of committees complying with this code are appointed as individuals to fulfil the role of the committee, not as representatives of their particular profession, employer or interest group, and have a duty to act in our interest. Where members declare an organisation's views rather than a personal view, they must make that clear at the time of declaring that view.

2.4.8. Confidentiality

Committee and panel discussions, papers and correspondence relating to applications for funding and funding policy are strictly confidential, and therefore the following applies:

- (i) All committee and panel members must sign a confidentiality agreement with us before receiving any papers relating to funding applications.
- (ii) Papers must not be disseminated or discussed outside of the committee or panel process.

- (iii) Papers must be secure and be under our absolute control or the user at all times. Under no circumstances should this control be relinquished or compromised, e.g. using a web-based storage provider (Google Docs, DropBox etc.), unless provided by us.
- (iv) Committee and panel members must not use generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools during our peer review process, including the following:
 - Inputting any content from a funding application provided by us into generative AI tools. Sharing with a generative AI tool constitutes a breach of our peer review confidentiality and research integrity requirements.
 - Using generative AI tools in formulating or editing peer review critiques for funding applications or reviews.

Our policy on the [Use of generative AI in funding applications](#) applies to all our peer reviewers. Should there be a breach of our policy, we retain the right to apply sanctions such as a restriction from future peer review.

- (i) Candidates for research funding must not be informed of the composition of an interview panel other than by our staff, or details of other applicants.
- (ii) No aspect of the deliberations or recommendations of committees or panels should be discussed with applicants, either in connection with their own application, or any other application. Any requests for such information must be referred to our staff, who will provide feedback, verbal or written, as appropriate and according to current practice.
- (iii) When members are connected to an application and absent themselves from the meeting room during discussion of the application, they must not be informed of the outcome of the application by other committee or panel members, but will be informed by our staff in due course.
- (iv) Members have a right to expect that their comments will be treated in confidence by both our staff and other members of the committee or panel.

- (v) The identity of referees must be kept confidential at all times, even if they indicate a willingness for it to be made known to the applicants.
- (vi) Members must not offer advice to members of the scientific community on our policy and practices, for example on application procedures: all such enquiries should be directed to our office.

2.4.9. Understanding the role of the patient representatives

Where appointed, patient representatives are full members of the committee or panel and provide particular insight into the relevance, study design and study feasibility from the patient perspective. All committee and panel members should respect and take steps to increase their understanding of the role and perspective of any patient representatives on the committee or panel.

2.4.10. Raising concerns

An individual who is concerned about another individual's conduct during the meeting should raise the matter privately by email as set out below:

- (i) Issues concerning a member of a committee or panel should be raised with the chair and/or secretariat of that committee or panel (or, where the chair is conflicted, the vice chair).
- (ii) Issues concerning the chair should be raised with the secretariat of that committee.
- (iii) Issues concerning our staff must be raised with the chair.

2.4.11. Treating others with dignity and respect

Our policy on [Dignity at work in research](#) applies to all members. We expect all people involved in our research funding activities, including members, to treat each other with dignity and respect. We consider bullying and harassment of any kind, in any context, unacceptable. Members must immediately notify us if their employer decides to formally investigate any allegations of bullying or harassment, abuse or harm against the member, as well as the outcome of that investigation. If an allegation is upheld, the member will be required to resign from any of our committees or panels on which they serve. We may apply other sanctions as outlined in the policy.

2.4.12. Ambassadors for Cancer Research UK

Members are asked to act as our ambassadors and for our aims. Members are expected to abide by the seven principles of public life (or “Nolan principles”) set out by the committee on standards in public life (see Appendix A). If a member acts in a manner that may bring us into disrepute, that member may be asked to step down from their role as a committee or panel member.

2.4.13. Clarity over tobacco company links

We expect that committee and panel members won't be in receipt of research funding from tobacco companies or have commercial links to tobacco companies (other than indirectly through a pension fund, managed fund, index fund or similar instrument). If this changes, we would need to be informed and ask this individual to resign their membership. Please see our [Tobacco industry funding to universities](#) policy for more information on our policy.

2.4.14. Expenses

Members are entitled to fair and prompt repayment of legitimate expenses, provided that they follow our rules governing the submission of claims and their timing. Members are asked to be always mindful of the reasonableness of their expenses, in light of our status as a charity funded purely by public donations.

2.5. Committee and panel secretariats

2.5.1. The primary function of the secretariat is to support the committee or panel by assembling and analysing information, receiving and processing applications for funding and recording the decisions and recommendations of the committee or panel. The secretariat will advise on procedure and bring to the attention of chairs and members emerging issues of concern so as to inform the deliberations. The secretariat will arrange regular briefing meetings with the chair.

2.5.2. The secretariat will, as far as it is aware, identify all relevant and appropriate scientific information and ensure that it is made available to the committee or panel. In rare cases the secretariat may need to withhold information from the committee or panel on the grounds of confidentiality. When this is

necessary, the secretariat must make the chair aware of the existence of any information that has been withheld.

- 2.5.3. The secretariat will be impartial in representing our interests. It must at all times respect the committee or panel's independent role. It should guard against introducing bias during the preparation of papers, during meetings, or in the reporting of deliberations.
- 2.5.4. The secretariat will ensure that the proceedings of the committee or panel are properly documented in the minutes of each meeting, following our standard formats where required.
- 2.5.5. The secretariat will communicate our procedures for the handling of confidential material to suppliers of such information and will participate in the review of these procedures by us as necessary.

2.6. Role of other officials or observers

- 2.6.1. Committee and panel members will be made aware of the role of other officials and advisers having contact with committees or panels and/or attending meetings, as observers or in any other capacity. Such officials must at all times respect the committee or panel's independence. secretariats must ensure that the balance between officials attending, and members present is kept within reasonable limits.
- 2.6.2 In instances where a meeting is attended by early-mid career researcher observers for the purpose of their own career development, the secretariat and chair will ensure they do not comment on any application or participate in discussions. They will also be absented from the meeting for the discussion of any applications for which they have a conflict of interest (as per section 4). Where possible, the secretariat will ensure such observers are not present for any discussion concerning their interests, including funding decisions.

3 Committee and panel practices and procedures

3.1. General working practices

3.1.1. Openness and transparency

Committees and panels must operate from a presumption of openness and must maintain high levels of transparency during routine business. The proceedings of the committee should be as open as is compatible with the requirements of confidentiality. In this regard, members should be comfortable that their individual comments and views will not be shared or attributed but, by contrast, the view of the committee or panel as a whole will be shared.

3.1.2. Preparing for meetings in advance

To ensure that meetings run efficiently, and that decisions are fully and effectively considered, members should allow sufficient time to prepare for meetings by familiarising themselves with the meeting papers. For this purpose, the secretariat should ensure that meeting papers are distributed at least three to four weeks in advance of the meeting.

3.1.3. Out-of-cycle committee decisions

Where a funding decision demands a rapid response, certain committee decisions may need to be made out-of-cycle with scheduled meetings. On such occasions, the secretariat shall ensure that at least three members are asked to consider the relevant decision on behalf of the committee as a whole, and that the full committee is informed of the decision that has been taken at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

3.1.4. Reliability of information

Committees must be able to assess or otherwise satisfy themselves as to the reliability of any research quoted or used in their decision making process.

3.2. Balance of expertise

3.2.1. Chairs, our staff and secretariats are responsible for ensuring that a funding committee or panels have the relevant expertise to assess all applications that fall within its remit.

3.2.2. Our staff and secretariats are also committed to ensuring, as far as possible, that the composition of committees and panels reflects diversity across

protected characteristics as defined under the Equality Act 2010 (as amended), and our [published diversity targets](#). Where a lack in expertise has been identified, recommendations for potential committee members must be proposed to our Research & Innovation Leadership team or, alternatively, the experts may be co-opted or sub-groups established to include such people on an ad hoc, time-limited basis where appropriate.

3.3. Procedures for arriving at conclusions

- 3.4.1. Each committee or panel must ensure that it is comfortable with the mechanisms by which it reaches funding decisions or agrees its view.
- 3.4.2. Mechanisms for reaching funding decisions, including scoring systems, will wherever possible be consistent across our funding committees and panels.
- 3.4.3. Whatever mechanism is used to reach decisions, it is essential that the minutes of the meeting or panel report clearly set out the result of the discussion.
- 3.4.4. In reaching its funding decisions, we seek to apply peer review of the highest international standards and to engage the appropriate additional expertise in the assessment of applications and the evaluation of funded research programmes. Committees must adhere to our current [Guide to Assessing Grant Applications](#).

3.4. Dealing with dissenting views

When offering scientific advice, members must be clear about whether or not they are expected to reach a consensus on particular issues. Committees must not seek unanimity at the risk of failing to recognise different views on a subject.

3.5. Committee minutes and panel reports

- 3.5.1. It is good practice for the secretariat to prepare minutes within two to four weeks of the meeting. The committee should formally approve minutes at the meeting following the one to which the minutes relate. Where meetings are infrequent, committees must develop written procedures to ensure that the minutes can be agreed more expeditiously.

- 3.5.2. Minutes must show clearly how the committee reached its decisions. The minutes must accurately reflect the proceedings of the committee and any significant diversity of opinion among the members of the committee will be accurately reflected. (In the case of panel meetings, the same is true of the panel report).
- 3.5.3. The chair is required to review and sign off the meeting minutes within two weeks of receipt to confirm an accurate record of the committee's or panel's proceedings. This helps prevent unnecessary delay in progressing post-meeting actions, including the issuing of grant award letters (GAL) and the communication of outcomes.
- 3.5.4. Minutes of funding committees must include accurate financial details consistent with our award letters and financial award schedules and presented in a manner acceptable to our auditors.
- 3.5.5. The minutes of our funding committees are confidential, but details of all funded awards will be published on our website.

3.6. Information exchange

- 3.6.1. Committees and panels will be told how the activities of our other committees and panels might affect their business and have opportunities to exchange information with them where necessary. This might involve giving advance notice of significant decisions, copying relevant documents or sharing best practice through joint meetings.
- 3.6.2. Secretariats must ensure appropriate consideration of funding applications that have relevance to more than one committee or panel. Where beneficial, consideration will be given to setting up a system of cross-representation or asking the SEB to consider doing so.

3.7. Discussion of applications outside meetings

- 3.7.1. Where committee members feel it necessary to discuss an application prior to the meeting, this must be declared to the chair and/or the secretariat.
- 3.7.2. If an individual is approached by an applicant for technical advice on an application in his or her area of specialisation, the individual may provide such

advice but must disclose this fact to the secretariat of any committee of which they are a member and which is considering the application. The individual may be excluded from all or part of the meeting at which the application is considered.

4 Conflicts of interest

4.1. Understanding conflicts of interest

4.1.1. In order for us to make high quality funding decisions that have credibility with the research community and with donors, it is essential that those decisions are – and are seen to be – objective and free from bias.

4.1.2. A conflict of interest arises when a member of a committee or panel, or other expert reviewer, has an interest which could, actually or as a matter of perception, cast doubt over the objectivity or independence of our funding decisions.

4.1.3. The procedures set out in this code of practice are intended to:

- (i) assist reviewers and the secretariat in the identification of potential conflicts of interest
- (ii) minimise the potential for conflicts of interest arising
- (iii) guide reviewers and the secretariat in how to manage any conflicts of interest that do arise
- (iv) protect our reputation and that of our reviewers

4.2. Relationships that constitute a conflict of interest

4.2.1. Automatic exclusions

An individual will automatically be deemed to have a conflict of interest in relation to a grant application if the following applies:

- (i) They are the lead applicant, joint lead applicant, co-investigator, named collaborator or any other research staff named on the grant application, even if they are a minor collaborator or someone who has provided a letter of support. If an individual is a lead applicant or joint

lead applicant on an application, that individual will also be excluded from considering any other applications that directly compete for funding.

- (ii) They are, or have been within the last 12 months, a member or employee of the same university, or other research institution, as the lead or joint lead applicant (even if they don't know the individual personally). The University of London, for these purposes, is not regarded as a single institution.
- (iii) They have collaborated substantively with one of the lead applicants or joint lead applicant(s) within the last three years (in the sense that they have provided intellectual input on a project/trial). Co-publication will generally indicate collaboration, but there may be exceptions, for example, where a paper acknowledges a significant number of contributing authors who have not collaborated on the work in a substantive sense.
- (iv) They are a relative of one of the lead applicants, joint lead applicant, co-investigators or collaborators ("relative" for this purpose includes, but is not limited to, spouse or partner (current or past), children, siblings and parents).
- (v) They are a business partner of a lead applicant, co-investigator or collaborator, or have a direct or indirect financial interest in the grant application.
- (vi) They have had a supervisory relationship with the lead applicant or joint lead applicant now, or within the last five years

4.2.2. Additional automatic exclusion for the chair

If the chair of the meeting is applying for funding from that same committee or panel, they will be automatically excluded from all applications considered at that meeting, except for those for which funding will be awarded from a budget that is separate or ring-fenced from the budget for awards to which the chair's application relates. This is the case wherever funding is directly attributed to the chair, regardless of their stated role on the application (i.e. lead or joint lead applicant, co-investigator or collaborator).

4.2.3. Case-by-case exclusion

An individual will also have a conflict of interest in relation to a grant application if the individual has any other connection to the grant application (whether academic, scientific, financial, business, personal or otherwise) which could compromise, or cause a reasonable outsider to doubt, the objectivity of the evaluation of the grant application or decision making. Any other relationships might include, but are not limited to:

- consultancies
- advisory roles
- directorships or board roles or membership of special interest groups

4.3. Identification of conflicts of interest

4.3.1. Identification by the secretariat. Before allocating and distributing meeting papers, the secretariat will take reasonable steps to identify any grant applications or other matters in respect of which a member has a conflict of interest, based on the information available about that member.

4.3.2. Identification by members. Members are also responsible for ensuring that they do not participate in the evaluation of any grant application or other matter in relation to which they have a conflict of interest. If a member becomes aware of any other matter that would reasonably be expected to give rise to, or be viewed as, a conflict of interest (whether academic, scientific, financial, personal or otherwise) then they must declare the matter to the secretariat of the committee before the meeting or, if not practicable, as soon as the potential conflict becomes apparent at the meeting.

4.4. Steps to be taken where a conflict is identified

4.4.1. Where a member has a conflict of interest in relation to a grant application, that member:

- (i) may not receive any papers relating to that grant application and, should they receive the papers in error, must immediately destroy them and notify the secretariat
- (ii) must absent themselves from the relevant part of any meeting where matters concerning that grant application are discussed

- (iii) may not take part in any decision in relation to that grant application
- 4.4.2. The secretariat must bring to the chair's attention all relevant information concerning any form of connection between an application and a member of the committee or panel.
- 4.4.3. The fact that a conflict of interest was identified must also be recorded in the minutes or report of the meeting.
- 4.4.4. In rare circumstances, major conflicts of interest may not be compatible with continued membership of the funding committee or panel. In such cases, the conflict will initially be discussed with the member by a senior member of the secretariat, in consultation with the chair. The chair and the secretariat shall determine whether the interest is compatible with continued membership of the committee. Where agreement is not possible, or where a member disputes the decision of the chair and the secretariat, the matter shall be referred to the Director of Research Operations & Communications of Research & Innovation (R&I). The decision of the Director shall be final.

4.5. Cases of uncertainty

- 4.5.1. If an individual is in any doubt as to the relevance of an interest that they have, such interest must be disclosed to the secretariat before the meeting or, if not practicable, as soon as the potential conflict becomes apparent at the meeting.
- 4.5.2. The secretariat will consult as necessary with the chair, or the vice chair if the chair is conflicted. If it is determined that the interest does give rise to a conflict of interest, then the rules in section 4.4 apply. If it is determined that the interest does not give rise to a conflict, the secretariat and chair may determine that the interest should nonetheless be disclosed to the committee and/or panel and that the individual should:
- (i) be permitted to take a full part in the meeting
 - (ii) be permitted to comment on the application and participate in discussions but not present the application to the committee
 - (iii) be permitted to comment on the application and participate in discussions but not take part in the decision

- (iv) absent themselves from the relevant part of the meeting

4.6. Matters other than those concerning funding decisions

Where a member has a conflict of interest in relation to a matter other than the assessment of a grant application, except to the extent permitted explicitly by any other part of this code, that member must not:

- (i) be present at any discussion concerning their interests
- (ii) take part in any decisions relevant to such interests

4.7. Raising concerns about the conflicts of interests of other individuals

An individual who is concerned about another individual's potential or actual conflicts of interest must raise the matter as set out below.

- (i) Issues concerning a member of a committee or panel must be raised with the chair or secretariat of that committee or panel (or, where the chair is conflicted, the vice chair).
- (ii) Issues concerning our staff must be raised with the chair.

5 Definitions

Expert review panels:

Funding committees will use panels of experts in order to review applications and recommend a funding decision. These decisions will need to be confirmed by the relevant funding committee.

Funding committees:

Responsible for overseeing aspects of our funding within a remit defined by our R&I leadership team and included in the funding committee's supplementary terms of reference. It will comprise of expert scientists at the appropriate level, providing a broad range of scientific expertise essential for that committee.

Lead applicant:

The individual investigator(s) who propose to lead the work set out in the application.

Papers:

Within this code of practice the term 'papers' covers all documents containing information relating to, and regarding the activities of the funding committees, held in both paper and electronic forms.

Scientific Executive Board (SEB):

The role of the SEB is to develop and implement our strategy and policy. The SEB meets regularly, with meetings chaired by the Executive Director of R&I. Members of the scientific community are invited to attend SEB meetings to provide expert advice, and chairs of our funding committees are invited to attend annually to discuss areas of particular importance to their committee's remit.

6 Related documents and version information

6.1 [General funding committees terms of reference](#)

6.2 Individual funding committee supplementary terms of reference: available under the relevant funding committee area on our website:

<https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/for-researchers/apply-for-and-manage-your-funding/how-we-make-funding-decisions>

6.3 [Conflicts of interest guidance](#)

6.4 [Policy on dignity at work in research](#)

6.5 [Use of generative AI in funding applications](#)

6.6 [Guide to Assessing Grant Applications](#)

6.7 [How we make funding decisions](#)

Version information:

Directorate	Title	Version	Effective date
Research & Innovation	Code of practice for funding committees & panels	10	October 2023
Research & Innovation	Code of practice for funding committees & panels	11	March 2026

Appendix A

The Seven Principles of Public Life (Nolan Principles)

Selflessness

Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

Integrity

Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty

Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interest.

Leadership

Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

These principles apply to all aspects of public life. The Committee has set these out here for the benefit of all who serve the public in any way.

(Extract from *First Report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life* (p. 14), by Chairman Lord Nolan, 1995)