

This document contains the guidance and scoring used by the Assessors when reviewing your application. Assessors will review your answers for each scored question and mark each of them between 1 and 10 (1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest).

Any questions that are not scored will not be reviewed by the Assessor.

Question 1 - Applicant location (not scored)

You must state the name and full registered address of your organisation and any partners and or subcontractors working on your project.

We are collecting this information to understand the geographical location of all applicants.

Question 2 - Your idea and innovation

What is your idea and innovation, and why is it game changing?

Assessor guidance and scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

There is a compelling reason for the project and innovation including how it is game changing and of the highest technical merit.

It credibly addresses the need and opportunity identified, including a full understanding of nearest state of the art, and how the innovation described builds on, or is materially different to, other alternative solutions that are already available.

Challenges and opportunities relating to equality, diversity and inclusion have been considered and embedded in the proposal where applicable.

Scores 6 -7

There is a clear reason for the project, and the innovation described has merit and will address the need and opportunity identified.

Nearest state-of-the-art is detailed, but it is not clear how the innovation described will improve on or is different to currently available offerings.

Further development of the idea is required.

Scores 4 – 5

The reason for the project is good, but the innovation lacks merit or is not different to other alternative solutions.

Nearest state-of-the-art has not been fully explored, and the opportunity identified has not been fully realised or understood.

Scores 2 – 3

The reason for the project is poorly defined, and the innovation described has little merit.

It is unclear what need or opportunity the innovation intends to address. The nearest state-of-the-art has not been explored, and the innovation described does not improve on current offerings.

Scores 1

There is no clear reason for the project, and the innovation described is not game-changing or disruptive.

References to current state-of-the-art are not offered or are not relevant, and the idea described will not impact on current offerings.

Question 3 - Justification for funding

Why is your innovation and proposal suitable for Smart funding, and why do you need public funding to help you succeed?

Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

A strong and compelling case for Smart funding has been presented.

The project team have clearly articulated their readiness for grant funding and the journey leading to a Smart application. Valid and justified arguments as to why other funding mechanisms are not appropriate have been presented.

Smart funding will materially change the trajectory or outcome of the project and will bring unique advantages.

Scores 6 -7

A reasonable case for Smart funding has been presented.

The project team have described their journey leading to a Smart application. This includes details of other funding opportunities considered and discounted, but further details are required.

The advantages of public funding have been explored and Smart funding will positively impact on the project.

Scores 4 - 5

Some justification for Smart funding has been provided, including high level detail surrounding their journey and readiness for grant funding, but this could be expanded.

Some consideration has been given to other funding opportunities, but a more in-depth review is required.

Advantages of public funding are limited, and the impact of Smart funding would be minimal.

Scores 2 - 3

The reason for Smart funding is unclear and the argument for public funding has not been substantiated or justified. Limited detail has been provided surrounding the applicant's readiness for grant funding.

Other funding opportunities have not been explored in a meaningful way.

Scores 1

No justification for public funding has been provided, or the project could be self-funded.

The project team have not described their journey to the point of application, and no other funding mechanisms or opportunities have been explored.

Question 4 - The potential market

What is your target market and what is your strategy for securing the market opportunity you have identified, including your route to market and commercialisation of project outputs?

Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

The target market size, structure and dynamics are well understood and are fully quantified and evidenced. The likely impact that the innovation described will have is significant and any claims relating to this have been substantiated.

Barriers to market entry have been understood and a realistic plan to address these has been presented. Target customers have been identified and there is an evidence-based understanding of the value proposition to them.

Strategies for route to market are realistic, well defined and evidenced, and show significant potential for healthy ROI, as well as an increase in market share and opportunities.

Scores 6 -7

There is a good awareness of the target market's structure and dynamics, and the market size is quantified with some supporting evidence provided.

Barriers to market entry have been identified but further detail is required as to how these will be addressed to allow successful commercialisation. Target customers have been identified and there is some understanding of the value proposition to them.

The route to market, exploitation and commercialisation of project outputs is broadly outlined and shows some potential for ROI and an increase in market share.

Scores 4 - 5

The general market size and dynamics are understood but the specific target market is poorly quantified, and no supporting evidence has been provided. Target customers are described but the value proposition to them is not clear.

The route to market is not clearly defined or explained and plans for commercialisation lack clarity and detail. It is not clear how ROI will be achieved.

Scores 2 - 3

Some information about the general market is offered but the extent and size of the target market for the project is not described.

There is some information about target customers, but it is not clear what the route to market will be or how the innovation will be commercialised.

Scores 1

The market is poorly defined or is irrelevant to the reasons for the project.

No information on customers has been presented, or there are no plans to bring the innovation to market or commercialise project outputs and outcomes.

Question 5 - Impact and benefits

What will be the impact of receiving the grant both for your business and outside your organisation?

Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

Project outputs are well defined, and a wide range of positive impacts relevant to the proposed innovation have been described, evidenced, and are embedded in the development of the proposal.

Timelines for benefits realisation are fully developed and realistic.

Any possible negative impacts are outlined and fully mitigated where appropriate.

Scores 6 - 7

There is good awareness of how the project may produce positive impacts, but these could be further developed, and more evidence is needed to support claims.

Timelines for benefits realisation are broadly described and appropriate.

Negative impacts are identified and mostly mitigated against where appropriate.

Scores 4 - 5

There is basic awareness of the positive impacts of the project, however, there is little evidence to suggest that it will bring about significant benefits.

Timelines for benefits realisation are provided but are poorly described or are unrealistic.

Negative impacts have been identified but little mitigation is provided.

Scores 2 - 3

Some information is provided about possible benefits, but it is not clear how this will bring about positive impact.

Negative impacts are not considered.

Scores 1

There is no information given about the impact or benefits of the project.

Any information provided is unsubstantiated or is not relevant to the innovation or sector discussed.

Question 6 - Delivering your project

Who is in the project team, why do you have the right skills and experience to succeed, and how will you successfully deliver your project?

Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

The team described have the relevant skills, expertise and experience, and give confidence that they will successfully deliver the project. The approach to project management is structured and well designed to meet the aims and objectives described.

A comprehensive risk register is provided, including mitigation plans that allow for continued delivery in the timelines specified.

Where applicable, relationships between consortium members show evidence of true collaboration. Post-project plans for commercialisation are fully resourced and embedded in ongoing business as usual.

Any gaps in knowledge and expertise are identified, and appropriate recruitment plans are in place.

Scores 6 - 7

The team described have the relevant skills, expertise, and experience to successfully deliver the project, but some areas are weaker than others. The approach to project management is sound, and the project plan allows aims and objectives to be achieved within the timeframes detailed.

A risk register covering key risks is provided, and mitigation plans are sensible and appropriate.

Relationships between consortium members (where applicable) are defined and provide confidence that each partner is committed to the project. Post-project plans for commercialisation have been considered and described at a high level.

Gaps in knowledge and expertise within the project team are identified.

Scores 4 - 5

The team described has some level of skill, expertise and experience, but it is not clear how this will translate to the successful delivery of the project. Gaps in knowledge or project management skills are evident but are not identified or mitigated.

A project plan and risk register are provided and cover key areas at a high level, but more detail is required.

It is unclear what will happen once the funded project has completed and how the team will move forward towards commercialisation.

Relationships between consortium members (where applicable) are not clearly defined, and it is not evident how each partner will work together to deliver their input.

Scores 2 - 3

The team described does not have the skills, expertise and experience required to deliver the project, with significant gaps in knowledge evident. Project planning and risk management is at a very high level and is missing vital information.

No consideration has been given to post-project planning. Relationships between consortium members (where applicable) are not defined and it is not evident what each partner brings to the project.

Scores 1

It is unclear how the project team will be able to achieve delivery of the identified aims and objectives.

The project plan and risk register give no confidence or has not been provided.

Question 7 - Value for money

How will you spend your grant funding and how does this represent good value for money for the taxpayer?

Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 8 - 10

The project costs are entirely appropriate for the research and development work described and represent excellent value for money, with evidence provided to show how costs have been determined where appropriate.

The organisations involved have a clear idea of how they will finance their contribution and are fully committed to the project. The balance of costs and grants between any consortium members and use of subcontractors is justified.

Commitment to post-project activities is evident, and these are fully resourced and funded.

Scores 6 - 7

The project costs are appropriate based on the work proposed. The balance of costs and grants between any consortium members and use of subcontractors seems reasonable and organisations have considered how they will fund their contribution.

Overall, the project represents good value for money, but more detail could be provided surrounding how best value for money has been decided.

Post-project activities are defined, and some detail is given surrounding how these will be resourced and funded.

Scores 4 - 5

The project costs seem reasonable, but the breakdown and justification could be clearer to determine if this represents good value for money.

The balance of costs and grants between any consortium members or subcontractors is acceptable for the works to be undertaken. It is unclear how organisations will finance their contribution to the project or how post-project activities will be funded or resourced.

Scores 2 - 3

The project costs seem too high or too low given the proposed project.

The split of costs and grants between any consortium members is unbalanced, or inappropriate use is being made of subcontractors.

Little consideration has been given to best value for money.

Scores 1

The costs are not appropriate or justified.

There is no balance between consortium members and subcontractors involved.

The project does not represent good value for money.