

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)**

Should ideally be Q1 but must definitely align with IFS.

You must state the name and full registered address of your organisation, any partners and subcontractors working on your project. We are collecting this information to understand the geographical location of all applicants.

Question 2. Animal Testing (not scored)

Will your project involve any trials involving animals or animal testing?

You must select one option:

- Yes
- No

We will only support innovation projects conducted to the highest standards of animal welfare.

Further information for proposals involving animal testing is available at the [UKRI Good Research Hub](#) and [NC3R's animal welfare guidance](#).

Question 3. Health need or challenge

What is the health need, technology challenge, business or market opportunity this project addresses and what impacts will the solution have?

Explain:

- the health challenge this project addresses and the impact your solution will have

- how your solution compares to the current gold standard
- 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 economic, social, environmental, cultural or political challenges which are influential in creating the opportunity, such as incoming regulations and using our [Horizons tool](#) if appropriate

Provide:

- evidence that the health or healthcare challenge is real and define the market, both nationally and internationally, that will generate demand for your proposed solution
- any input you have received from healthcare professionals, patients, potential partners or representatives of the onward supply chain

Question 3: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The applicant(s) has demonstrated an excellent and substantiated understanding of the commercialisation/exploitation opportunities for the project
- The proposal clearly articulates with very strong and detailed supporting evidence the healthcare need, and the extent to which the intended outputs of the project will satisfy customer demand
- The applicant(s) have described in depth how a successful outcome has the potential to provide a significant positive impact on current healthcare challenges

Scores 7-8

- The applicant(s) has demonstrated a good understanding of the commercialisation/exploitation opportunities for the project using good supporting evidence
- The healthcare need and customer demand are identified and are central to the project's objectives
- The outcomes of the project have the potential to provide a positive impact on current healthcare challenges

Scores 5-6

- The commercial opportunities have some potential, but this has not been expressed and evidenced in a satisfactory manner
- The business opportunity is plausible but not clearly expressed in terms of identified customer needs or demands

- There are potential positive healthcare needs and impacts however these are not well defined or limited in nature

Scores 3-4

- The commercial opportunities and demand from the intended customer are unrealistic, limited or poorly defined with significant gaps and inadequately evidenced
- The links between project outcomes and healthcare impact are tenuous and not well supported or described

Scores 1-2

- There is little or no commercial drive to the project and no supporting evidence provided
- The outcomes of the project will not provide solutions to current healthcare challenges

Question 4. Approach and innovation

What is innovative about your idea from a commercial, scientific and technical perspective?

Explain:

- how you will respond to the healthcare need, challenge or opportunity identified
- what is innovative about your approach, how does this address the health or healthcare challenge in a novel way
- how this innovation will fit into the current standard of care, will the innovation focus on existing technologies in new areas, the development of new technologies for existing areas or a totally disruptive approach
- the technical and commercial benefits and shortcomings of your approach
- the safety and performance characteristics by outlining the target product profile (TPP) if applicable

Question 4: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The project is extremely innovative both commercially and scientifically
- The project will make a substantial contribution to the field

- Solid evidence is presented to substantiate the level of innovation, for example literature surveys, patent searches and competitor analyses
- The timeliness of the work is highlighted and explained in an industrial and/or academic context

Scores 7-8

- The project is innovative both commercially and scientifically
- The project is relevant to the market/patient need
- There is high confidence that there is freedom to operate

Scores 5-6

The project is innovative but there is a lack of presented evidence as to the freedom to operate

Scores 3-4

The project lacks sufficient innovation both technically and commercially

Scores 1-2

The project is either not innovative or there is no exploitable route due to previous IP

Question 5. Scientific or Technical Evidence

What is the underpinning scientific evidence to support your solution?

Detail all relevant prior experimental or technical evidence and explain how this links to the proposed study. Include any preclinical or clinical work conducted to date and the outcomes.

You must submit one appendix to support your answer. It can include diagrams and charts. It must be a PDF and can be up to 4 A4 pages long and no larger than 10mb in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 5: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The proposal originates from an excellent scientific base

- The relevant prior scientific evidence has been fully identified, is innovative and of high impact potential
- The bridge to the proposed study is well justified with a valid hypothesis

Scores 7-8

- The proposal originates from a good scientific base
- The underpinning science is strong, the results presented relevant and comprehensive
- The link between prior research and proposed study is clear and convincing

Scores 5-6

- The supporting scientific evidence is good with detail relevant to the proposal
- The rationale for conducting the study has some basis in the prior research and appears valid however there are gaps in the evidence

Scores 3-4

- The underpinning scientific evidence presented is fair but lacking in originality, incomplete or out of date
- The link of the underpinning evidence to the proposed study is weakly argued

Scores 1-2

- The proposal is scientifically weak
- Supporting evidence is limited and lacking a strong link to the proposed study

Question 6. Team and resources

Does the team have the right skills, experience and access to facilities, to deliver your project and exploit it?

Explain:

- the roles, skills and experience of all members of the project team, including collaborators and subcontractors
- the resources, equipment and facilities needed for the project and how you will access them
- if your project is collaborative, the current relationships between project partners and how these will change as a result of the project
- any roles you will need to recruit for
- how your project supports or builds on the existing UK supply chain and addresses end user needs

- how the work is being conducted internally where possible and, if subcontractors are being used, there is adequate justification for the choice made
- the details of any vital external parties, including subcontractors, who you will need to work with to successfully carry out the project
- how your project has access to the appropriate facilities, resources, tools, equipment and human capability

All subcontractor costs must be justified and appropriate to the total project costs.

Extenuating circumstances where overseas work may be allowable, include but are not limited to clinical trials in a specific patient population. You must provide justification for any overseas work by email to support@iuk.ukri.org at least 10 working days before the competition closes. Innovate UK will decide whether to approve your request via email.

If you are planning to use subcontractors outside the UK then you must provide evidence that no UK alternative exists and strong justification to support your choice of non-UK contractor.

The application assessors will also be asked to judge whether you have sufficiently made a case for the use of overseas subcontractors.

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.

Question 6: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates excellent capability to deliver the project and to exploit the output
- Excellent knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is demonstrated
- For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are very clear
- the project has access to the optimal facilities for the project
- strong justification is provided to support the applicant's choices of any subcontractors
- If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor unequivocal evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice

Scores 7-8

- The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates good capability in delivering the project and to exploit the output

- Sound knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is demonstrated
- For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are clear
- The project has access to the appropriate facilities
- The use of subcontractors is supported with justification to support the applicant's choices
- If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor solid evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice

Scores 5-6

- The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates some capability in delivering the project and to exploit the output
- Knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is not conclusive
- For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are unclear
- The project does not have access to the appropriate facilities
- The use of subcontractors is poorly justified
- If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor, insubstantial evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice

Scores 3-4

- There are notable gaps in the track record of the applicant(s)
- Evidence of the applicant(s) having access to the right skills and experience are unrealistic or poorly defined

Scores 1-2

- There is little or no supporting evidence that the applicant(s) has access to the right skills and experience to deliver the identified benefits
- The consortium is not capable of either carrying out the project or exploiting the results

Question 7. Technical approach and project management

What technical approach will be adopted and how will your project be managed?

Please provide an overview of the technical approach including the main objectives of the work with enough detail for the assessors to understand tasks involved and resources required.

Describe:

- the current status of your innovation and where you expect to be at the end of your project
- the stages of your project (the work packages) and link the main areas of work together with their resource and management requirements
- key milestones and any stage gates
- how the method and technical approach is appropriate to the needs of the project and the timescale
- how any study design is robust and that key milestone timings are realistic
- your resources and capability to undertake the project
- clear management reporting lines

If relevant, compare and contrast alternative R&D strategies and describe why your proposed approach will offer the best outcome.

You must provide justification for the use of animal or human subjects and the numbers of animals and samples to be tested.

You must submit a project plan or Gantt chart as an appendix to support your answer. You can also include a study design, protocol or approach. 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.

Question 7: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The project plan is fully described; clearly defines appropriate/realistic milestones and go/no-go decision points; and the Gantt chart reflects this adequately
- The project is achievable in the timeframe
- There is a very clear, detailed, and realistic management plan of the activities, and resource management profile
- The applicant has compared alternative R&D strategies
- The arrangements for project management are fully supported
- (If applicable) very strong and detailed supporting evidence is provided of the consortium's ongoing commitment
- The use of patients, animals or other tissues has been fully justified and is deemed appropriate

Scores 7-8

- The project plan is well described; defines realistic milestones and go/no-go decision points; and the Gantt chart reflects this adequately
- The project is likely to be achieved in the timeframe
- There is a realistic management plan of the activities, and resource management profile

- The applicant has acknowledged alternative R&D strategies
- The arrangements for project management are supported
- (If applicable) good supporting evidence is provided of the consortium's ongoing commitment
- The use of patients, animals or other tissues has been justified and is deemed appropriate

Scores 5-6

- The project plan is described; but milestones and go/no-go decision points are not clear.
- The project appears unlikely to succeed in the timeline
- Gaps in the management plan of the activities, and resource management profile
- No acknowledgement of alternative R&D strategies
- The arrangements for project management are not satisfactory
- (If applicable) supporting evidence of the consortium's ongoing commitment is not satisfactory
- The use of patients, animals or other tissues has only been partially justified

Scores 3-4

- The project plan has serious deficiencies or major missing aspects
- The plan has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project
- There is little justification for the use of patients, animals, or tissues

Scores 1-2

- The plan is totally unrealistic or fails to meet the objectives of the project
- There is no justification of the use of patients, animals, or tissues and/or it is impossible to understand whether their use is appropriate from the information given

Question 8. Intellectual Property and Freedom to operate (FTO)

Do you have freedom to operate?

Describe:

- any existing intellectual property (IP) which may affect, or which is relevant to, project delivery and exploitation
- the current state of IP ownership and, where necessary, how rights have been assigned

- your freedom to operate and who conducted any FTO analysis, if applicable
- your strategy for protecting the knowledge resulting from your project if it is a collaborative project and how will you assign IP rights to project partners
- any IP that you expect to be generated as a result of your project, and who will own it
- where IP is limited for your project what strategies will be used to stop exploitation by external parties

You must provide evidence that you have freedom to operate and that you can work without infringing other patents, for example by summarising the results of patent searches.

Question 8: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is detailed and assigned
- Details of the intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project are provided
- The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is thorough
- Freedom to operate is clear and fully evidenced

Scores 7-8

- Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is noted and assigned
- Intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project is included
- The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is appropriate
- There is high confidence that there is freedom to operate

Scores 5-6

- Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is not fully captured
- Information on intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project is not satisfactory
- The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is not clear
- There is some evidence to substantiate the freedom to operate but the situation is not entirely clear

Scores 3-4

- Evidence for freedom to operate is poorly presented or poorly understood by applicant.

Scores 1-2

- There is no exploitable route due to the presence of existing IP.

Question 9. Outcomes and route to market

How are you going to grow your business and increase long term productivity as a result of the project?

Explain:

- your current position in the markets and supply or value chains outlined, and whether you will be extending or establishing your market position
- your target customers or end users, and the value to them, for example, why they would use or buy your product
- your route to market
- how you are going to profit from the innovation, including increased revenues or cost reduction
- how the innovation will affect your productivity and growth, in both the short and the long term
- how you will protect and exploit the outputs of the project, for example through know-how, patenting, designs or changes to your business model
- your strategy for targeting the other markets you have identified during or after the project

If there is any research organisation activity in the project, describe:

- your plans to spread the project's research outputs over a reasonable timescale
- how you expect to use the results generated from the project in further research activities

Question 9: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The principle exploitable outputs of the project are identified together
- Clear, realistic, and achievable plans of the next steps for commercial exploitation are clear
- The target market is well understood and potential barriers to commercial exploitation/adoption and strategies for overcoming these are detailed
- ROI predictions are thoroughly evidenced

Scores 7-8

- The main exploitable output of the project is identified, and a realistic approach defined
- Next steps in development and towards commercialisation are discussed and appropriate
- There is an awareness of potential barriers to exploitation/adoption
- ROI predictions are plausible

Scores 5-6

- Next steps and exploitation approach are defined but lack detail
- There is limited understanding of target market
- Details on further development and plans for commercial exploitation are provided but are poor
- ROI predictions are implausible

Scores 3-4

- The exploitation methods described are unrealistic or ill-defined

Scores 1-2

- The exploitation method is missing or implausible and unlikely to succeed

Question 10. Technical, commercial and environmental risks

Innovate UK recognises that projects of this type are risky, we expect that your project has adequate arrangements for managing these risks.

What are the technical, commercial and environmental risks to project success?

Explain:

- your project's risk management strategy
- the main risks and uncertainties of your project and provide a detailed risk analysis for your project's content and approach
- the technical (including regulatory), commercial, managerial and environmental risks as well as other uncertainties, such as ethical issues associated with your project
- the potential impact of these risks and how your project would mitigate them
- the project management tools and mechanisms that will be used to minimise operational risk

You must submit a risk register as an appendix where possible to support your answer. It must be a PDF and can be up to 2 A4 pages long and up to 10 MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 10: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- Key risks and uncertainties of the project are clearly identified in a detailed risk analysis, including the technical, regulatory, commercial, managerial, and environmental risks
- If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., ethical issues) associated with the project are detailed
- A comprehensive risk register is provided, identifying the main risks as high/medium/low (H/M/L)
- The potential impact of these scenarios is comprehensively explored
- Good mitigation of all significant and relevant risks is provided

Scores 7-8

- Key risks and uncertainties of the project are clearly identified in a risk analysis, including the technical, regulatory, commercial, managerial, and environmental risks
- If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., ethical issues) associated with the project are captured
- A good risk register is provided, identifying the main risks as high/medium/low (H/M/L)
- The potential impact of these scenarios is appropriately demonstrated
- The applicant has defined reasonable mitigation of all significant and relevant risks

Scores 5-6

- There are gaps in the risks and uncertainties of the project
- If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., ethical issues) associated with the project are not fully captured
- A risk register is provided, but incorrect assessment has been applied in identifying the potential impact of these scenarios
- The applicant has insufficiently applied appropriate control to the all the risks identified

Scores 3-4

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

Scores 1-2

- The risk analysis is superficial
- There is minimal mitigation or management suggested

Question 11. Resources required

What are the resources required to deliver your project and how much will they cost?

You must:

- provide justification of the breakdown of your costs, for example, any quotations you have received
- include all internal and external costs for your project which must be consistent with the category of R&D being undertaken
- describe how funding will be available to cover cash flow pending quarterly reimbursement of costs from Innovate UK
- explain your eligible project costs, from each of the project partners and the level of funding required
- explain the resources required to carry out your project including materials, capital, equipment and people

This information should complement the financial summary table in the application form.

Question 11: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The applicant(s) has clearly set out with very strong and detailed supporting evidence a realistic and entirely appropriate total costs and budget breakdown of the project in line with the project plan
- The applicant(s) has clearly demonstrated with very strong and detailed supporting evidence the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project
- For projects seeking to leverage private investment to support the matched element there is strong evidence of investor engagement and ability to convert interest quickly into commitment
- The applicant has realistic plans for management of cash flow
- All large subcontracts have been fully justified, are appropriate and provide good value for money

Scores 7-8

- The applicant(s) has set out with good supporting evidence an appropriate total costs and budget breakdown of the project including its key component parts in line with the project
- The applicant(s) has demonstrated with good supporting evidence the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project
- For projects seeking to leverage private investment to support the matched element there is good evidence of investor engagement and potential ability to convert interest quickly into commitment The applicant has realistic plans for management of cash flow
- Subcontracts are well justified and appropriate

Scores 5-6

- The applicant(s) has provided some supporting evidence of the total costs and budget breakdown of the project including its key component parts which are broadly in line with the project
- There is some supporting evidence that the amount is the minimum necessary to deliver the project
- There may be some concerns on the appropriateness of subcontractors or other costs
- The match funding element is clearly described and accessible
- The applicant has indicated that funding will be available to cover cash flow

Scores 3-4

- The level of funding commitment required for the project is unrealistic (too high or low) or poorly defined and not well aligned with the project
- The evidence supporting the level of funding required is limited and ability to cover cash flow is unclear. There is no justification for subcontracting costs
- It is unclear whether the business will have the ability to raise the match funding element

Scores 1-2

- There is little or no supporting evidence of the level of funding commitment required for the project
- The costs are not appropriate or justified
- The business has not evidenced where it will obtain the match funding element or be able to cover cash flow

Question 12. Financial support and added value

How will this public funding help you to accelerate or enhance your approach to developing your project towards commercialisation? What impact would this award have on the organisations involved?

Explain:

- what advantages public funding would offer your project, for example, appeal to investors, more partners, reduced risk or a faster route to market
- the likely impact of the project outcomes on the organisations involved
- what other routes of investment or means of support you have already approached and why they were not suitable
- how any existing or potential investment or support will be used in conjunction with the grant funding
- what your project would look like without public funding
- how this project would change the R&D activities of all the organisations involved
- justify any claims for activity performed by senior and C-suite people, and why this activity could not be performed by lower cost members of staff and clarify the value of this activity to the project outcomes

Question 12: Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

- The project will significantly increase the industrial partners' R&D spend during the project and afterwards
- The additionality arguments are very strong and believable

Scores 7-8

- The project will increase the industrial partners' commitment to R&D
- The additionality arguments are good and justified

Scores 5-6

- The project will improve the industrial partners' commitment to R&D
- The additionality arguments are just about acceptable

Scores 3-4

- It is unlikely that the project will enhance the industrial partner's commitment to R&D
- The additionality arguments are poor or not sufficiently justified

Scores 1-2

- The work should be funded internally and does not deserve state funding

