

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 or subcontractors working on your project.

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

Question 2

Minimum Financial Assistance (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.

Question 3

Animal testing (not scored)

Will your project involve any trials with 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 4

Innovation Priorities (not scored)

Will your proposal for a Regulatory Science and Innovation Network align with one or more innovation priorities for the UK Government, as outlined in policy statements such as the following:

- the [Science and Technology Framework](#) (2023)
- the [Pro-innovation Regulation of Technologies Review](#) (2023)
- areas of interest identified by the [Regulatory Horizons Council](#) in either its reports to Government, or other publications.

Describe the priority or priorities with which your proposal aligns.

Question 5

Proposed focus

In which area or sector will your proposed network operate, and how will its proposed activities help innovators overcome existing regulatory barriers and challenges to bringing new products and services to market?

Applicant guidance:

Describe and explain:

- the regulatory barriers and challenges faced by innovators in the sector or area in which your proposed network will operate

- initial ideas for how your network will use regulatory science to address those sector-specific regulatory challenges and unlock innovation
- any work you have already done to harness the power of regulatory science in your sector
- existing partnerships, initiatives or networks you plan to leverage in the development of your network
- any previous funding received to support this or other skills that are relevant.

Assessor guidance & scoring:

9 - 10

The proposed area of focus is very clearly defined and justified using one or more sources of evidence.

The response demonstrates an excellent understanding of the benefits of regulatory science in advancing business innovation in the proposed area of focus. It also makes a very compelling, well evidenced case for the benefits of a network in that sector, and how it will benefit the sector as whole and not only potential partners directly involved in its establishment.

The response puts forward a highly credible strategy for influencing regulatory policy, practice and standards in the sector. This includes detailed, well considered plans of how the network partners intend to engage relevant government departments, regulators and any other public bodies with responsibility for regulatory innovation policy to ensure that the evidence generated by the proposed network is influencing policy development systematically.

Initial activity ideas to use regulatory science tools to improve innovation outcomes in the sector are well articulated and take account of the sectoral context.

7 - 8

The proposed area of focus is fairly clearly defined and justified using one source of evidence.

The response demonstrates a good understanding of the benefits of regulatory science in advancing business innovation in the proposed area of focus. It also makes a reasonably strong case for the benefits of a network in that sector, and how it will benefit the sector as whole and not only potential partners directly involved in its establishment.

The response puts forward a credible strategy for influencing regulatory policy, practice and standards in the sector. This includes some plans of how the network partners intend to engage relevant government departments, regulators and any other public bodies with responsibility for regulatory innovation policy to ensure that the evidence generated by the proposed network is influencing policy development systematically.

Initial activity ideas to use regulatory science tools to improve innovation outcomes in the sector are somewhat defined and take account of the sectoral context.

5 - 6

The proposed area of focus is defined, but not well justified and evidenced. The response demonstrates some understanding of the potential for regulatory science to advance business innovation in the area of focus.

There is an outline of the potential benefits of a network in the area of focus, and of plans to engage relevant public sector stakeholders.

Some credible plans for initial activity to use regulatory science tools to improve innovation outcomes in the sector are put forward, although not very well defined or evidenced.

3 - 4

The proposed area of focus is poorly defined and justified. The response demonstrates limited understanding of the area of focus and/or the benefits of regulatory science.

The benefits of a potential network in the area of focus to the sector as a whole, and not only potential network partners, are not clearly defined.

Initial activity ideas are limited, or are unlikely to improve innovation outcomes in the sector

1 - 2

The proposed area of focus is not defined or justified. The response demonstrates little to no understanding of the area of focus and/or the benefits of regulatory science to innovation in that sector.

The benefits of a potential network in the area of focus to the sector as a whole, and not only the potential network partners, are not defined.

Initial activity ideas are very limited or absent, and/or bear no relation to regulatory science with no impact on innovation in the sector.

Question 6

Team and resources

Who is in the collaboration and what are their roles?

Applicant guidance:

Explain:

- the roles, skills, experience of all members of the collaboration that are relevant to the approach you will be taking and your ability to develop the network
- the current relationships between collaborators and how you expect these to develop during this phase
- the resources, equipment and facilities needed for the project and how you will access them
- the details of any subcontractors you expect to work with to successfully carry out the project
- any roles you reasonably believe you will need to recruit for.

Assessor guidance & scoring:

9 - 10

The collaboration is ideally placed to develop a network in their proposed area of focus. There is a complimentary mix of relevant skills and experience and clear rationale for why the collaboration will work well

7 - 8

The collaboration is well placed to develop a network in their proposed area of focus. There is a complimentary mix of relevant skills and experience and a rationale provided for why the collaboration will work well.

5 - 6

The collaboration is well placed to develop a network in their proposed area of focus. There is a mix of relevant skills and experience.

3 - 4

There are significant gaps in the collaboration. There may be some collaborators with little relevance to the formation of a regulatory science and innovation network.

1 - 2

The collaboration is unlikely to be capable of forming a regulatory science and innovation network.