

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 subcontractors working on your project.

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

Your answer to this question can be up to 400 words long.

Question 2. Minimal Financial Assistance declaration (not scored)

You must download the declaration template. You must complete this, declaring any funding received under Minimal Financial Assistance (previously referred to as Special Drawing Rights) or De minimis awards, (from any source of public funding) in the applicable period.

You must complete all the fields on your form before uploading.

You must write “declaration attached” in the question text box.

You must upload the completed declaration as an appendix. It must be a PDF and the font must be legible at 100% zoom.

You must keep all documentation relating to Minimal Financial Assistance (previously referred to as Special Drawing Rights) and other De minimis awards for a period of 6 years and be prepared to release it to any public funding body which requests it.

Your answer to this question can be up to 400 words long.

Question 3. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (not scored)

How have you incorporated equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) into your project delivery and project outcomes?

Describe any challenges or opportunities relating to equality, diversity and inclusion arising from your project and the methods and approaches used to address them:

- during project delivery
- for governance
- for project team and advisory boards
- for stakeholder and end-user engagement
- for design thinking

This question is not scored. Your answers to this question will not be included in the assessment and will not form part of the funding decision. We will use the information to:

- identify opportunities to support businesses in developing EDI strategies
- develop activities that support innovative businesses to fully understand the value of EDI, for example, networking and information sessions

Your answer to this question can be up to 400 words long.

Question 4. Need or challenge

What is the need for and market opportunity behind your innovation?

You must indicate whether your project is focusing on either the:

- provided healthcare use case
- open use case

Describe:

- the main motivation for the project
- the market opportunity behind your solution
- whether you have identified any similar innovation and its current limitations, including those close to market or in development
- any work you have already done to respond to this need, for example, if the project focuses on developing an existing capability or building a new one
- the wider regulatory, economic, social, environmental, cultural or political challenges which are influential in creating this market opportunity

If your chosen use case is the “open use case” option, you must submit the appendix for this question. If you chose the provided healthcare use case no appendix is required.

Your answer can be up to 400 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 12% of the overall proposal score.

If you are proposing an open use case, you must submit an appendix detailing:

- the background or context: what are you using an AI-enabled system for, what is the model and why is it being used, what problem does it solve
- the potential risks to fairness: what are the fairness challenges associated with this system for this specific use case or context why is it difficult to make this system fairer
- technical details: a description of the data set, including the size of the data set and any variables and a description of the learning algorithms used to train the models

It must be a PDF and can be up to 2 A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 4. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

There is a compelling motivation for the project. There is a clear understanding of any similar innovation identified and its current limitations. The applicant has shown, if applicable, how the project will build on previous relevant work. Any wider factors influencing this opportunity are identified.

Scores 7 - 8

There is a good motivation for the project. There is a good awareness of similar innovation identified and wider factors influencing the opportunity.

Scores 5 - 6

The project motivation is good, but there is a lack of understanding of similar innovation identified or wider factors influencing this opportunity.

Scores 3 - 4

Project motivation is poorly defined or not relevant to the applicant or team. References to the similar innovations available or wider factors influencing this opportunity are not offered or are not relevant.

Scores 1 - 2

There is little or no drive to the project. References to any similar innovations available or wider factors influencing this opportunity are not offered or are not relevant.

Question 5. Approach and innovation

What approach will you take and where will the focus of the innovation be?

Explain how you will respond to the challenge identified in your selected use-case, including:

- what stage of the process of addressing bias and discrimination will your solution focus on within your chosen AI system, you must include at least two stages from: access to demographic data (for bias detection), bias detection, bias mitigation, or ongoing monitoring and evaluation
- an explanation of how you will also ensure broader ethical or legal fairness within the UK context, for example, compliance with data protection legislation and equalities law, beyond just looking at technical or mathematical fairness

Explain your solution, the process you will undertake to address bias and discrimination in the AI system and the specific interventions including:

- why you have chosen this approach and these interventions
- how your proposed solution adopts a socio-technical approach to fairness
- how you will improve on any similar innovations that you have identified, for example, whether your innovation will focus on applying existing technologies in new areas, the development of new technologies for existing areas, or a totally disruptive approach

You can submit one appendix to support your answer. It can include diagrams and charts. It must be a PDF and can be up to 2 A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Your answer can be up to 750 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 20% of the overall proposal score.

Question 5. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

The approach addresses the need, challenge or opportunity identified in Question 4. The main innovations are identified and cover min. two stages of the process of addressing bias and discrimination in the chosen AI system. The project is significantly innovative and will make a substantial contribution to the field. Evidence is presented to show how the innovations adopt a socio-technical approach. Solid evidence is presented to address the broader ethical and legal context.

Scores 7 - 8

The approach addresses the need or challenge. It highlights and covers min. two stages of the process of addressing bias and discrimination in the chosen AI system. Evidence shows that the proposed development is innovative, and that it includes a socio-technical approach and references the wider context as it includes broader ethical and legal considerations.

Scores 5 - 6

The approach may address the need or challenge identified in Question 4 and it addresses min two stages in the process of addressing bias and discrimination in the chosen AI system. The socio-technical approach and references to the wider contexts, including broader ethical and legal considerations are not strongly backed up with evidence. Innovation focus is plausible.

Scores 3 - 4

The approach is poorly defined with an unconvincing link to the need or challenge identified in Question 4. It does not cover min. two stages in the process of addressing bias and discrimination in the chosen AI system. The socio-technical approach and references to the wider contexts, including broader ethical and legal considerations are not very convincing.

Scores 1 - 2

The approach is not well defined or is inconsistent with the need or challenge identified in Question 4. It does not cover min. two stages in the process of addressing bias and discrimination in the chosen AI system. There is no socio-technical approach to the solution nor innovation and no mentions of the wider context, including broader ethical and legal considerations.

Question 6. Team and resources

Who is in the project team and what are their roles?

Explain:

- the roles, skills and experience of all members of the project team that are relevant to the approach you will be taking
- the resources, equipment and facilities needed for the project and how you will access them
- the details of any vital external parties, including subcontractors, who you will need to work with to successfully carry out the project
- any roles you will need to recruit for

You can submit one appendix, with a short summary of the main people working on the project to support your answer. It must be a PDF, up to 4 A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Your answer can be up to 400 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 12% of the overall proposal score.

Question 6. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

The project team is well placed to carry out the project and exploit the results. There is a clear plan to obtain all the resources they will need. There is strong evidence that the project team will work well together.

Scores 7 - 8

The project team makes sense given the approach described in Question 5. The applicant indicates how access will be obtained to all the resources they will need. The project team is likely to work well together.

Scores 5 - 6

The project team has most, but not all, of the required skills and experience required. It is unclear whether the project team will work well together.

Scores 3 - 4

There are significant gaps in the project team, with little or no information about how these will be filled. There may be some members of the team with little relevance to the project activities.

Scores 1 - 2

The project team will not be capable of either carrying out the project or exploiting the results.

Question 7. Wider impacts

What wider impact might this project have?

Describe and explain:

- how you will disseminate the outputs of the project

- how you expect to use the results generated from the project in your own further research activities

Describe, and where possible, measure:

- any expected impact on government priorities
- any expected environmental impacts, either positive or negative
- any expected regional impacts of the project
- any expected economic impacts of the project
- any expected social impacts either positive or negative on, quality of life, social inclusion or exclusion, jobs, regulations, diversity

Your answer can be up to 600 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 20% of the overall proposal score.

Question 7. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

Dissemination strategies and plans to generate further activities for project outputs are mentioned.

Expected impact on government priorities are described with compelling evidence to justify claims. Social, economic and environmental impacts are considered. Any possible negative impacts are mitigated where possible and appropriate.

Scores 7 - 8

Sufficient evidence is provided for dissemination strategies.

Some evidence of impact on government priorities and wider impacts are considered. Possible negative impacts are partially mitigated where appropriate.

Scores 5 - 6

There is basic awareness of how the project could be disseminated and potential future impact. Some relevant stakeholders are not considered. Little mitigation is offered where there may be negative impacts.

Scores 3 - 4

The applicant provides some information about possible dissemination strategies and impacts to others outside of the project, but significant gaps remain.

Scores 1 - 2

There is no information about how the project might disseminate outputs and use the results of the project in further activities. There are no mentions of how this would impact others outside of the project or any expected impacts.

Question 8. Project management

How will you manage your project effectively?

Explain:

- the main work packages of your project, indicating the lead partner assigned to each and the total cost of each one
- your approach to project management, identifying any major tools and mechanisms you will use to get a successful and innovative project outcome
- the management reporting lines
- your project plan in enough detail to identify any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones

You must submit a project plan or Gantt chart as an appendix to support your answer. It must be a PDF, up to 2 A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Your answer can be up to 400 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 12% of the overall proposal score.

Question 8. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

The project work packages are outlined with the research category, lead partner and total cost provided for each one. The approach to project management is described. The plan is designed to meet the objectives of the project in a realistic and efficient way. Any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.

Scores 7 - 8

The project work packages are outlined with the research category, lead partner and total cost provided for each one. The approach to project management is stated. The plan seems appropriate to the project objectives. Any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.

Scores 5 - 6

The project work packages are outlined but there are some details missing. The plan seems reasonable but is not tailored to the objectives of the project.

Scores 3 - 4

The plan has serious deficiencies or major missing aspects. The plan has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project.

Scores 1 - 2

The plan is totally unrealistic or fails to meet the objectives of the project.

Question 9. Risks

What are the main risks for this project?

Explain:

- the main risks and uncertainties of the project, including the technical, commercial, managerial and environmental risks
- how you will mitigate these risks
- any project inputs that are critical to completion, such as resources, expertise, and data sets
- any output likely to be subject to regulatory requirements, certification, ethical issues and other requirements identified, and how you will manage this

You must submit a risk register as an appendix to support your answer. It must be a PDF, up to 2 A4 pages long, and no larger than 10MB in size.

The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Your answer can be up to 400 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 12% of the overall proposal score.

Question 9. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

The key risks and uncertainties of the project are considered and there is a plan for mitigation. Critical inputs to the project are identified. Relevant constraints or conditions on the project outputs (regulatory requirements or ethical issues) are identified. The risk analysis is appropriate and professional.

Scores 7 - 8

The key risks and uncertainties of the project are considered with appropriate mitigations. Relevant constraints or conditions on the project outputs are identified.

Scores 5 - 6

Most major risks have been identified, but there are some gaps, or the mitigation and management are insufficient to properly control the risks.

Scores 3 - 4

The risk analysis is poor or misses major areas of risk. The mitigation and management are poor.

Scores 1 - 2

The risk analysis is superficial with minimal mitigation or management suggested.

Question 10. Costs and value for money

How much will the project cost and how does it represent value for money for the team and the taxpayer?

In terms of the project goals, explain:

- the total eligible project costs
- any subcontractor costs and why they are critical to the project
- how this project represents value for money for you and the taxpayer
- what advantages public funding would offer your project, for example: appeal to investors, more partners, reduced risk or a faster route to market (this list is not exhaustive)
- what your project would look like without public funding

Your answer can be up to 400 words long.

The answer to this question will represent 12% of the overall proposal score.

Question 10. Assessor guidance & scoring:

Scores 9 - 10

The project costs are entirely appropriate and represent excellent value for money for the team and the taxpayer. The partners have a clear idea of how they will finance their contribution. The balance of costs and grant between partners, and use of subcontractors, is justified and reasonable for the proposed project. There is a compelling case for the positive difference public funding will make.

Scores 7 - 8

The project costs are appropriate and should be sufficient to successfully complete the project. The partners have explained how they will finance their contribution. The balance of costs and grant between partners, and use of subcontractors, seems reasonable. The project represents good value for money for the organisation and the taxpayer. The arguments for public funding are good and justified.

Scores 5 - 6

The project costs seem to be acceptable, but the justifications are not clear. The partners have indicated how they will finance their contribution. The balance of costs and grants between partners is not entirely satisfactory and use of subcontractors not completely appropriate. Little information is offered about the value for money this project offers. The public funding arguments are acceptable, but the difference made by the grant will be modest.

Scores 3 - 4

The project costs seem too high or too low given the proposed project. The partners have not been clear on how they will finance their contribution. The split of costs and grant between partners is unbalanced. There is inappropriate use being made of subcontractors. The public funding arguments are poor or not sufficiently justified.

Scores 1 - 2

The costs are not appropriate or justified. The partners have not indicated how they will finance their contribution. The balance of costs and grant between partners and use of subcontractors is not justified. There is no mention to the added value of public funding.