

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
END OF AWARD REPORT**



For awards ending on or after 1 November 2009

This End of Award Report should be completed and submitted using the **grant reference** as the email subject, to **reportsofficer@esrc.ac.uk** on or before the due date.

The final instalment of the grant will not be paid until an End of Award Report is completed in full and accepted by ESRC.

Grant holders whose End of Award Report is overdue or incomplete will not be eligible for further ESRC funding until the Report is accepted. ESRC reserves the right to recover a sum of the expenditure incurred on the grant if the End of Award Report is overdue. (Please see Section 5 of the ESRC Research Funding Guide for details.)

Please refer to the Guidance notes when completing this End of Award Report.

Grant Reference	RES-181-25-0028		
Grant Title	The urban environment: Mirror and mediator of radicalisation?		
Grant Start Date	30/09/2007	Total Amount Expended:	£ 165,014.03
Grant End Date	30/06/2010		
Grant holding Institution	The University of Manchester		
Grant Holder	Ralf Brand		
Grant Holder's Contact Details	Address	Email	
	SED / MARC / HBS	ralf.brand@manchester.ac.uk	
	Oxford Road	Telephone	
	Manchester, M13 9PL	0161 2750317	
Co-Investigators (as per project application):	Institution		
Jon Coaffee	University of Manchester (formerly)		
	University of Birmingham (current)		

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Please provide below a project summary written in non-technical language. The summary may be used by ESRC to publicise your work and should explain the aims and findings of the project. *[Max 250 words]*

The initial assumption underpinning this project was that community polarisation and even radicalisation (as well as its opposite: community cohesion) might have some material aspects and mirror and mediate social trends. These assumptions led to four separate but connected research questions and tested in four carefully chosen cities with different types of tensions between certain sections of the population: Belfast, Beirut, Berlin and Amsterdam.

After extensive research with built environment professionals, politicians, NGO representatives and local residents of the case study cities, we can clearly confirm our initial assumptions: Socio-political conditions do manifest visibly and tangibly in the urban environment (UE). However, the mechanisms through which this causal link plays out on the ground are extremely varied. The 'reading' of the UE can sometimes reveal insights that would not otherwise be known to outsiders – however, there is also a great danger of mis-interpretation. For local residents, changes to the UE indicate rarely unknown social trends. We also found many examples of the reverse: Where the UE has the potential to influence and solidify the routines, stereotypes and social practices of most people, including children. We therefore suggest the term 'silent socialiser' to describe this effect of the UE.

We also discovered examples where the UE can be the trigger of social interaction across traditional divisions and we have proposed certain steps to create such physical interventions towards community cohesion. Key findings were translated into a professionally curated exhibition which travelled to all four case cities plus Manchester, Exeter and London.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

a) Objectives

Please state the aims and objectives of your project as outlined in your proposal to the ESRC. *[Max 200 words]*

The aim is to assist policy makers, planners, architects, urban designers and ordinary citizens in the creation of urban environments that are conducive to the friendly encounter of different social groups and thus help to tackle stereotyping, societal polarisation and possibly even radicalisation. This requires a better understanding of the recursive, socio-technical dynamics in

cities with polarisation trends. [...] The project thus aims to examine whether the dynamics between social trends and the urban environment differ in cities with different patterns of polarisation and radicalisation and how this relationship can be steered towards a more amicable constellation of artefactual and social conditions. These related objectives are:

1. To identify and categorise the ways in which polarisation becomes materially imprinted in cities characterised by conflict, polarisation, stereotypisation and radicalisation .
2. To analyse the design features of cities (buildings, infrastructures, public spaces, etc.) that are conducive to the generation and acceleration of polarisation and radicalisation.
3. To explore the possibility of steering the momentum of co-evolution between social conditions and the urban environment in a way to facilitate friendly encounters between groups that would otherwise diverge.
4. To assess the transferability of empirical findings between and beyond the case study cities.

b) Project Changes

Please describe any changes made to the original aims and objectives, and confirm that these were agreed with the ESRC. Please also detail any changes to the grant holder's institutional affiliation, project staffing or funding. *[Max 200 words]*

It turned out that the recruitment of volunteers willing to document their every-day urban environment with disposable cameras was more difficult than expected. Luckily, we found other key partners (youth worker, school teacher, university professor) who conducted such exercises on our behalf. The total amount of data gathered by 'ordinary' citizens was thus rather more than less than described in the proposal. The number of mental maps generated through this process, however, was lower than anticipated. Their analysis thus did not require GIS software as mentioned but was done manually.

Changes to the original aims and objectives were not at all necessary. The Co-Investigator, Prof. Jon Coaffee, moved institutions after the original project end date which did not affect the project in any way. The project as such was extended to allow the exhibition to travel much more widely than envisaged. Also some other changes were rather positive: We managed to interview more people than anticipated and the project was short-listed for the Royal Institute of British Architects President's Award for Outstanding University-located Research. A final decision is expected in October.

c) Methodology

Please describe the methodology that you employed in the project. Please also note any ethical issues that arose during the course of the work, the effects of this and any action taken. [Max. 500 words]

The methodology employed followed tenets of Naturalistic Enquiry. All related methods were tailored to the particular research questions (RQs).

RQ1: *How does radicalisation become materially imprinted?* The pursuit of this RQ started with a literature review. Its results were discussed with representatives of all case cities in a kick-off workshop which also helped fine-tune the analytical parameters for our fieldwork which primarily entailed the assessment of changes to the urban environment with locals. This included semi-structured interviews, archival studies and the use of disposable cameras by volunteers. The interpretation of these impressions were elicited through focus group interviews; mainly conducted by local partners.

RQ2: *Are certain design features particularly conducive to the generation and acceleration of radicalisation?* Very few answers to RQ2 emerged from the literature review but it allowed us to form some working hypothesis which we tested empirically. Additional input to the analytical focus of our fieldwork accrued from the kick-off workshop. During the fieldwork we elicited the perceived qualities of the urban environment from a range of individuals like municipal representatives, community workers, police officers, some members of (allegedly) radical organisations and 'ordinary' citizens. We also contrasted recent social trends with concomitant changes to the urban environment.

RQ3: *Is it possible to steer the dynamic between social and material conditions to facilitate friendly encounters?* Existing knowledge from a scoping study suggested the Stewartstown Road Project in Belfast as good case of an architecturally-supported rapprochement strategy which was therefore the in-depth focus of our pursuit of RQ3 (as proposed in the bid). We also spent much effort to look for similar strategies anywhere in the other three case cities. Whereas the Belfast case was deliberately geared at an in-depth understanding of this particular case (and therefore involved interviews with key stakeholders of the project, its tenants, users etc.), our search in the other cities was more a scanning exercise but produced very valuable – contrasting and complementary – results.

RQ4: *How transferable are the findings between and beyond the case cities?* RQ4 explains the proactive involvement of practitioners into the fine-tuning of the research design (workshop I) and even more so into the assessment, interpretation and dissemination of our findings (workshop II). We also elicited the opinion of representatives from all case studies about the respective other cases during the 'member check' phase. The assessment of cross-case applicability was also the focus of the data analysis strategy through the inclusion of explicit 'transferability-codes' in our list of

NVivo codes.

Overall, we interviewed over 100 individuals; not all of them cared to sign an 'Informed Consent Agreement' (ICA). The Advisory Council suggested not to impose an ICA in such situations. All ethical challenges we tried to anticipate in the original bid's *Ethical Information* section turned out to be either just hypothetical or at least much less pronounced. Some minor adjustments to our data gathering ambition (esp. the inclusion of 'radicals' in our list of interviewees) was required but did not, we feel, impact on the validity of the research findings.

d) Project Findings

Please summarise the findings of the project, referring where appropriate to outputs recorded on *ESRC Society Today*. Any future research plans should also be identified. *[Max 500 words]*

Key findings were cast into a *Charter for Spaces of Positive Encounters*. Its essential points respond to the main research questions (RQs). Full version at <www.urbanpolarisation.org>

RQ1:

- Polarisation / radicalisation gets materially imprinted in very many ways. The interpretation of the urban environment (UE) thus requires detailed local knowledge.
- The UE can be read in many different ways. It is thus not a very reliable seismograph of polarisation / radicalisation.
- Polarisation is relational, i.e. more than one 'poles' can move – not only the non-mainstream one – with corresponding material consequences (e.g. gated communities).
- At certain stages radicalising groups seem to prefer different material strategies (e.g. rallying support versus deceiving opponents).
- Symbols are of particular importance. A tough approach on symbols by the state, however, can increase the sophistication and secretiveness of radical symbolism.

RQ2:

- The UE doesn't cause polarisation; nor can it prevent it. However, it can accentuate or alleviate the effects of discrimination, grievances, ideologies etc.
- The effects of material interventions are unpredictable. Their appropriation depends on local practices, the role of leaders, the media, socio-economic contexts, etc.
- Seemingly 'neutral' material interventions (e.g. road construction) can have severe unintended effects. Anti-polarisation groups must be consulted in planning processes.
- Deeply ingrained habits of avoiding contact with 'others' are often perpetuated through material conditions (walls, retail locations, etc.).

- Attempts to 'harden' potential targets can sometimes be required to save life. However, they can also signal distrust, attract trouble, stimulate stigmatisation and defeatism.
- Drugs can increase the likeliness of opportunistic offences. This class of offences is easier to quell through material interventions than premeditated acts of aggression.

RQ3:

- This project wasn't designed to test whether spatial segregation triggers stereotypisation and antagonism. It simply operated on the reverse assumption: Bringing people together has the potential to reduce such problems.
- We found strong evidence that physical places can (!) have this effect. But there are no quick architectural fixes. Attempts to 'lure' people to artificially crated shared spaces are ethically problematic and risky because they can alienate certain groups. Social and material changes must not be out of sync.
- Normative arguments (“Be good and use this new space”) carry little weight. Strong economic, safety and convenience arguments are required. These are among the few necessary conditions of successful shared spaces. Overall, their appropriation seems to depend more on the design process than on the design content.
- Participation of future users appears highly recommendable to acquire knowledge about people’s fears, concerns etc. and to ensure everyone’s buy-in. Participation should not be substituted with strong leadership.
- Shared spaces do not generate automatic benefit but they generate new chances which are best harnessed through professional social work. This includes events, initiatives, festivals etc.

RQ4:

The above findings have passed the transferability test in principle. Their concrete application still has to be tailored to every specific context which generates the need for new action research in UK cities characterised by ethnic, religious or other tensions in the sense of 'urban laboratories'.

e) Contributions to wider ESRC initiatives (eg Research Programmes or Networks)

If your project was part of a wider ESRC initiative, please describe your contributions to the initiative’s objectives and activities and note any effect on your project resulting from participation. *[Max. 200 words]*

This project was an integral part of round III of the New Security Challenges (NSC) Programme. It was represented (usually by the PI but also, whenever possible, Co-I and research assistant) at all NSC events, including one with Security Minister Neville-Jones at the Chatham House and an international best-practice exchange event in Qatar. At these gatherings of radicalisation experts,

we tried to raise awareness for the importance of materiality in the study of polarisation and its opposite, community cohesion. This seemed particularly important given the massive dominance of disciplines like psychology, sociology, political sciences in the discourse about these issues. The project was also chosen as contributor to the RCUK initiative *Global Uncertainties* (www.globaluncertainties.org.uk), was featured in the ESRC publication *Britain in 2009* and selected for a pilot ESRC Impact Case Study. The most visible contribution to the NSC programme was the launch event of the project exhibition at the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) in London on July 2010 with 64 registrars. The project also clearly benefited from our participation in the NSC programme, for example, through the exchange of contacts and through the conceptual sharpening of our analytical focus for our field work phase in countless conversations with members of other NSC projects.

3. EARLY AND ANTICIPATED IMPACTS

a) Summary of Impacts to date

Please summarise any impacts of the project to date, referring where appropriate to associated outputs recorded on *ESRC Society Today*. This should include both scientific impacts (relevant to the academic community) and economic and societal impacts (relevant to broader society). The impact can be relevant to any organisation, community or individual. [Max. 400 words]

It was the project's explicit intention to raise the scholarly community's awareness for the importance of materiality in the study of polarisation and its opposite, community cohesion; especially considering what seems like a monocular treatment of such phenomena as purely psychological and sociological problems. We regularly reached key academics through our involvement in the *New Security Challenges* programme and a host of lectures and publications. The PI gave 14 talks (some invited keynotes) and the Co-I and RA gave several more, including an international best practice exchange event in Qatar. Four peer reviewed papers resulted thus far from this project; one of them in the prestigious journal *Urban Studies*. The PI also edited a special double issue of the *Journal of Urban Technology*, which has been very well received. Several other papers are currently being written and a monograph is planned for the near future as a compilation of all findings. The scholarly quality of this project is also underlined by its short-listing for the RIBA President's Award for Outstanding Research (final decision in October 2010).

We regularly sent our newsletter to over 400 academics and practitioners. The PI gave four presentations to non-academic audiences following invitations, for example, from the Northern-Irish Community Relations Council (CRC) or the esteemed Royal United Services Institute. Sixty-four people registered for the latter event, among them Security Minister Neville-Jones and

representatives of the Home Office, Ministry of Defence, Cabinet Office, the Metropolitan Police, Demos, several consulting companies and the national media. Practitioners was also strategically targeted with publications in the professional press such as *Building Design*, the *Architect's Journal*, the *European Urban Knowledge Network* or two papers in the the CRC magazine. An official input from the project's perspective was also made to a related *Communities and Local Government Committee Inquiry*. We produced a dissemination video which is available at the project website and a project-specific YouTube channel (www.youtube.com/user/brandrg) which attracted several hundred hits. The flagship tool for the stimulation of lasting impact, however, was a professionally curated touring exhibition. It was shown in all case cities plus Manchester and – upon request – four additional locations. Through this and the strong related media coverage (incl. a live interview on BBC radio) we managed to raise the public's awareness about the socio-*material* nature of community tension and cohesion. As a result, this project was selected for a pilot ESRC impact case study.

b) Anticipated/Potential Future Impacts

Please outline any anticipated or potential impacts (scientific or economic and societal) that you believe your project might have in future. [*Max. 200 words*]

We trust this project will have an impact beyond its official lifetime. In particular, we hope that further publications we are currently working on will, again, meet the interest of our peers in our own but also other academic fields. In order to support this we will continue to give lectures and send related flyers to organisers of pertinent workshops and conferences. We also continue our engagement with the network of scholars and practitioners developed through our participation in the New Security Challenges programme. We will also offer the project exhibition mentioned in 3a) for display in additional locations. We are particularly keen to find partners who would be willing to show the exhibition in cities that suffered from riots in the summer of 2001 (e.g. Bradford, Oldham, Burnley, Leeds). We will also maintain our contacts to key individuals in the Home Office, the Police Service Northern Ireland and the CRC. Discussions are also under way to explore the possibility of a Design Studio at the Manchester School of Architecture to devise socio-technical alternatives to the so-called Peace Walls that blight many parts of Northern Ireland. The project also inspired a new AHRC/ESRC funded project (£452K FEC) that deals with the issue of co-existence in space: *Multi-faith spaces – Symptoms and agents of socio-political change?* as part of the *Religion & Society* programme.

You will be asked to complete an ESRC Impact Report 12 months after the end date of your award. The Impact Report will ask for details of any impacts that have arisen since the completion of the End of Award Report.

4. DECLARATIONS

Please ensure that sections A, B and C below are completed and signed by the appropriate individuals. The End of Award Report will not be accepted unless all sections are signed.

Please note hard copies are NOT required; electronic signatures are accepted and should be used.

A: To be completed by Grant Holder

Please read the following statements. Tick ONE statement under ii) and iii), then sign with an electronic signature at the end of the section.

i) The Project

This Report is an accurate overview of the project, its findings and impacts. All co-investigators named in the proposal to ESRC or appointed subsequently have seen and approved the Report. ✓

ii) Submissions to *ESRC Society Today*

Output and impact information has been submitted to *ESRC Society Today*. Details of any future outputs and impacts will be submitted soon as they become available. ✓

OR

This grant has not yet produced any outputs or impacts. Details of any future outputs and impacts will be submitted to *ESRC Society Today* as soon as they become available.

OR

This grant is not listed on *ESRC Society Today*.

iii) Submission of Datasets

Datasets arising from this grant have been offered for deposit with the Economic and Social Data Service. ✓

OR

Datasets that were anticipated in the grant proposal have not been produced and the Social Data Service has been notified.

OR

No datasets were proposed or produced from this grant.

SIGNATURE:



NAME: Ralf Brand, Ph.D.

DATE: Sept. 27 2010

B: To be completed by Head of Department, School or Faculty

Please read the statement below then sign with an electronic signature to confirm your agreement.

This Report is an accurate overview of the project, its findings and impacts.

SIGNATURE:

NAME:

POSITION:

DATE:

C: To be completed by Finance Officer of Grant-Holding Research Organisation

Please read the statement below then sign with an electronic signature to confirm your agreement.

ESRC funds have been used in accordance with the ESRC Research Funding Guide. All investigators named in the proposal to ESRC or appointed subsequently have seen and approved the Report.

SIGNATURE:



NAME: Matthew Warrington

POSITION: Research Finance Officer

DATE: 29.09.2010

GUIDANCE NOTES ON THE END OF AWARD REPORT

What is the End of Award Report?

It provides ESRC with an overview of the project, an initial statement of outcomes and impacts and provides the information required to release the final payment on your grant. The report also forms part of the material considered in the ESRC's evaluation of your project.

Submitting the End of Award Report

Your completed End of Award Report should be submitted to reportsofficer@esrc.ac.uk on or before the due date, three months after the end date of your award. The Report will then be checked and approved by ESRC before it is uploaded and published on your grant page on *ESRC Society Today* (where possible). The ESRC will then release the final payment on your grant.

The Report will be returned to you if it is incomplete or has been completed incorrectly. Grant holders whose End of Award Report is overdue or incomplete will not be eligible for further ESRC funding until the Report is submitted and accepted.

Completing the End of Award Report

Please do not exceed the stated word limit for each section. The form is designed to reduce the amount of information that you need to provide to ESRC at this stage.

Please note that for certain ESRC schemes (eg Seminar Series/Follow-on Funding /Knowledge Transfer Schemes) specific guidance is provided under some sections. Please be sure to read the notes carefully and ensure that you complete the form according to the scheme specific guidance where appropriate.

Grant details

Please complete the fields relating to your grant. In the case of Grant Holder's Contact Details, this should be the most up to date institutional (or other if necessary) address details, so that the ESRC Evaluation team can contact you if necessary.

All footnotes will be included in the word count. Appendices are not permitted.

If you have changed your postal or email address please ensure that your Je-S details (where relevant) and your *ESRC Society Today* profile are updated. This will ensure that you receive all relevant correspondence from ESRC relating to your grant in a timely manner.

1. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY (max 250 words)

Please provide a plain English summary of your project, avoiding the use of specialist terms. The summary might be used by the ESRC to publicise your work and should explain the aims and main findings of the project.

Follow-on Funding/Knowledge Transfer Schemes:

This summary will be aimed at a variety of 'user' and academic audiences. A 'user' is defined as a non-academic stakeholder within public, private and third sector organisations who can apply research knowledge to policy or practice.

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

a) Objectives (max 200 words)

Please record here the aims and objectives of your project as described in your grant proposal to

the ESRC.

Follow-on Funding/Knowledge Transfer Schemes:

Please outline what impacts you originally anticipated achieving at the end of the project.

b) Project Changes (max 200 words)

Please describe any changes made to the original aims and objectives, and confirm that these were agreed with the ESRC. Please also record here any changes during the course of the project to the grant holder's institutional affiliation, the project staffing or funding.

c) Methodology (max 500 words)

Please describe the research methodology employed for the project, including, for example, sampling techniques and sizes. This is also the place to record any ethical issues that arose during the course of your work, the effect these had and any action taken as a consequence.

Seminar Series grants:

Please describe how the specified objectives were met through the seminar series. In your response please detail the approaches used to publicise the series, detail the actual programme of events and a brief description of the seminar participants.

Follow-on Funding/Knowledge Transfer Schemes:

Please describe the methods you used for the project, including arrangements for engaging potential users of the research at relevant stages of the project. Please state what, if any, original data was enhanced during the project.

d) Project Findings (max 500 words)

Please summarise your main research findings for the project, referring where appropriate to outputs recorded on *ESRC Society Today* that provide further details. It would also be helpful if you could indicate briefly any plans you have for further research on this or a related topic.

Seminar Series grants:

Please summarise the outcomes of the seminar series and what activities have arisen as a result of participation in the seminar series. Please also describe the level of demand there was for participation and give a summary of the feedback you have received from participants.

Follow-on Funding /Knowledge Transfer Schemes:

Please summarise your main findings for the project, referring where appropriate to outputs recorded on *ESRC Society Today* that provide further details. It would also be helpful if you could indicate briefly any plans you have for further dissemination of the project findings and exploitation of the impact generated to the 'user' community.

e) Contributions to wider ESRC initiatives (max 200 words)

If your project was part of a wider ESRC initiative (eg a research programme or network), please state what this was, describe your contributions to the initiative's objectives and activities and note any effect on your project resulting from the participation.

3. EARLY AND ANTICIPATED IMPACTS

This section asks you to provide an indication of your project's impact to date, but please note that you will have the opportunity to make a fuller statement in your Impact Report 12 months after the end of the grant when there will have been more time for impacts to emerge. The Impact Report will be the primary statement used in the evaluation process.

In completing this section of the form it will be useful to note the following explanation of what the ESRC means by ‘impact’.

The ESRC funds research based on excellence and quality. The Council aims to achieve impact across its whole portfolio of activities and therefore wishes to stimulate both scientific impact and impact on the UK society and economy. Impact is defined in the following terms:

- *Scientific impact:* the demonstrable contribution that excellent social and economic research makes to scientific advances, across and within disciplines, including significant advances in empirical understanding, methods, theory, and application. Scientific impact is also achieved through creating new research capacity, tools and networks. ESRC’s resource projects and seminar awards, for example, play important roles in these areas.

Economic and societal impact: the demonstrable contribution that excellent social and economic research makes to society and the economy, of benefit to individuals, organisations and nations. These benefits include: fostering global economic performance, and specifically the economic competitiveness of the UK; increasing the effectiveness of public services and policy; and enhancing quality of life, health and creative output.

Please also note that the ESRC does not expect all of its investments to achieve economic and societal impact. Grant holders who report only scientific impact will not be penalised in any way. The evaluation of projects provides for the award of the highest grade (‘Outstanding’) for work that has achieved a major academic impact without immediate practical application.

a) Summary of Impacts to date (max 400 words)

Please summarise any early impacts, either scientific or policy and /or practical, that have already emerged from the project to date.

Follow-on Funding /Knowledge Transfer Schemes:

Please describe any academic, economic and/or societal impacts that are relevant to the wider ‘user’ community. The impacts can be relevant to any organisation, community, or individual. You should give evidence of the ‘user’ engagement through the course of the project.

b) Anticipated/Potential Future Impacts (max 200 words)

Please outline any anticipated or potential impacts (scientific or practical) that you believe your project might have in future on academia and the ‘user’ community. ESRC will not expect that these impacts are all achieved and will not evaluate your project against them, but it will be helpful to have your early assessment of possibilities. Your Impact Report, submitted 12 months after the end date of your award, will capture details of impacts that have been achieved at that point.

4. DECLARATIONS

The declarations in this section are crucial to the ESRC’s decision to release the final payment on your grant, so please ensure that sections A, B and C are completed and signed by the appropriate persons. Section A is to be completed by the Grant Holder; Section B by the relevant Head of Department, School or Faculty, and C by the Finance Officer of the grant-holding institution. The End of Award Report will not be accepted unless ALL three sections are completed and authorised.

Please note that electronic signatures are acceptable and should be used. Paper copies are NOT required and should not be submitted.

Section A

i) The Project

Please note that it is mandatory for the grant holder to secure the agreement of all co-investigators (ie those named in the grant proposal or appointed subsequently to the project) to the statements made in the Report.

ii) Submissions to *ESRC Society Today*

Grant holders are required under the ESRC's funding rules to submit details of outputs and impacts arising from their project, to *ESRC Society Today*. For queries on managing your grant on *ESRC Society Today* (including how to upload outputs) please contact: societysupport@esrc.ac.uk or 0871 641 2115

Not all ESRC grants are currently listed on *ESRC Society Today*. If this is the case for your grant, please tick the appropriate box on the form.

iii) Submission of datasets

Please tick only one box in this section. The ESRC's funding rules require grant holders to offer for deposit with the Economic and Social Data Service (ESDS) any data arising from their project within three months of the end date of the grant. Should any problem relating to the deposit of the data be foreseen, grant holders should contact ESDS at the earliest opportunity.

Please note that the ESRC will withhold the final payment of a grant if data has not been deposited to the required standard within three months of the end of the grant, except where a modification or waiver of deposit requirements has been agreed in advance.

Sections B and C

Please send the form to your Head of Department/Faculty/School (as appropriate) and your Finance Officer for their electronic signatures.

Once all signatures have been secured please send the completed form by email to: reportsofficer@esrc.ac.uk