

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 working on your project.

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

### **Question 2. Minimal Financial Assistance declaration (not scored)**

If you are a business 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 no larger than 10MB and must be in 11 point font size.

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 six years and be prepared to release it to any public funding body which requests it.

You do not need to download or complete the declaration template if you are not a business.

### **Question 3. Animal testing (not scored)**

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

You must select one option:

- Yes
- No

**Question 4. Question 4. Permits and licences (not scored)**

Will you have the correct permits and licences in place to carry out your project?

We are unable to fund projects who do not have the correct permits or licences in place by your project start date.

You must select one option:

- Yes
- No
- In process of being applied for
- Not applicable

**Question 5. Pillar alignment (not scored)**

Which pillars does your project align with, or intend to align with:

- circularity
- green chemistry
- productivity and resource

### **Question 6. Consortium building**

How do you plan to leverage this seed funding to build a consortium capable of preparing a comprehensive case for Phase 2, Grand Challenge?

Describe:

- what activities you intend to carry out during this EoI phase to develop the consortium
- any planned research and information-gathering initiatives that will inform the Grand Challenge design, including feasibility studies, market analysis, and environmental impact assessments.
- how these activities will lay the groundwork for a robust and well-coordinated consortium to develop a strong, competitive proposal for the Grand Challenge award.
- the preliminary strategies and activities your network will undertake during the EoI phase to tackle sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector.

### **Question 6. Assessor guidance and scoring**

Scores 9 - 10

The proposed EoI phase activities for building the consortium and informing the Grand Challenge design are thoroughly defined and extensive. The applicant has meticulously outlined specific steps to develop the consortium, including detailed plans for identifying and engaging potential consortium members, with a particular emphasis on involving the supply chain where appropriate. Additionally, the response covers partnership development or building, and collaboration mechanisms.

The response presents a highly credible strategy for establishing a well-coordinated consortium for the Grand Challenge proposal. It demonstrates an excellent plan for linking consortium-building activities to understanding the benefits of addressing sustainability challenges in the medicines manufacturing sector. Furthermore, it makes a compelling, well-evidenced case for the advantages of a consortium-based approach, highlighting how it will benefit the sector and supply chain as a whole, not just the direct participants.

Scores 7 - 8

The proposed EoI phase and activities to inform Grand Challenge design are clearly defined and justified.

The applicant has outlined specific activities to develop the consortium with detailed plans including identification and engagement of potential consortium members with acknowledgement of the importance of engagement with the supply chain where appropriate, partnership development or building, and collaboration mechanisms.

The response puts forward a credible strategy for a well-coordinated consortium and Grand Challenge proposal.

The response demonstrates a good plan for linking consortium building activities to understanding the benefits of tackling sustainability challenges in the medicines manufacturing sector.

It also makes a reasonably strong case for the benefits of a consortium-based approach, and how it will benefit the sector and supply chain as whole and not only potential partners directly involved in its establishment.

Scores 5 - 6

The proposed EoI phase and activities to inform the Grand Challenge design are somewhat defined but lack detail or clarity. The applicant has outlined some activities to develop the consortium, with some mention of either identifying and engaging potential consortium members, partnership development or building, and collaboration mechanisms but limited engagement with the supply chain is demonstrated. The response puts forward a fair strategy for the consortium and Grand Challenge proposal.

The response demonstrates a need for plans to link consortium-building activities to understanding the benefits of addressing sustainability challenges in the medicines manufacturing sector but the plan lacks detail. It also makes a reasonable case for the benefits of forming a consortium, explaining how it will benefit the sector and supply chain as a whole, not just the partners directly involved in its establishment.

Scores 3 - 4

The proposed EoI phase and activities to inform the Grand Challenge design are poorly defined and lack sufficient justification.

The response demonstrates limited understanding of the focus area and the benefits of addressing sustainability challenges in the medicines manufacturing sector. The plans to engage with relevant stakeholders are minimal.

Overall, the proposal lacks a comprehensive strategy and fails to present a credible plan for developing a well-coordinated consortium or addressing the sector's sustainability issues.

Scores 1 - 2

The proposed EoI phase and activities to inform Grand Challenge design are not defined or justified.

The response demonstrates little or no understanding of the area of focus or the benefits of tackling sustainability challenges in the medicines manufacturing sector.

Plans to engage with relevant stakeholders outside the consortium are not defined.

Initial activity ideas are very limited or absent and bear no relation to sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector.

### **Question 7. 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 for this expression of interest
- how each potential consortium partner will contribute to the development of the Grand Challenge
- the current relationships between partners and how you expect these to develop during this EoI phase
- any additional roles or organisations you believe will be needed to bring into the consortium to suitably address sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector
- the anticipated benefits of a diverse and multidisciplinary team
- existing partnerships, initiatives or networks you plan to leverage in the development of your consortium
- how you propose to engage partners from across the medicines manufacturing supply chain to build your consortium, or explain why your project does not require partners from across the supply chain if you believe this is the case

## Question 7. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

**If a collaborative application has been submitted:** The project team is well-positioned to undertake consortium-building activities, supported by a clear rationale for each partner's position within the project and a comprehensive strategy for strengthening their position within the Grand Challenge. Each partner's contribution to the Grand Challenge's development is justified with clearly defined roles for each partner within the supply chain and recognition of existing gaps.

**If a single applicant has applied:** The applicant is well-positioned to undertake consortium-building activities, supported by a clear rationale for the breadth of partner's required to build the consortium with comprehensive strategy for strengthening their position within the Grand Challenge. There is a clear and defined vision for the roles required within the supply chain.

The overall consortium's skill and experience gaps related to the sustainability challenge are well understood. A detailed plan is in place to engage with stakeholders from across the medicines manufacturing supply chain. The response justifies the absence of cross-supply chain collaboration where it is not deemed appropriate for the potential project.

The project team or applicant has identified existing partnerships, initiatives, and networks they plan to leverage in developing the consortium. The anticipated benefits of having a diverse and multidisciplinary team are well-articulated concerning both the EoI consortium and the future Grand Challenge.

There is strong evidence indicating that the project team will collaborate effectively or that the single applicant can engage effectively with a range of stakeholders with the skills required to form a consortium.

Scores 7 - 8

**If a collaborative application has been submitted:** The project team is in a good position to undertake consortium-building activities, supported by a clear rationale for each partner's position within the project and a plan for strengthening their position within the Grand Challenge. Each partner's contribution to the Grand Challenge's development is justified with defined roles for each partner within the supply chain and recognition of existing gaps.

**If a single applicant has applied:** The applicant is in a good position to undertake consortium-building activities, supported by some rationale for the breadth of partner's required to build the consortium with comprehensive strategy for strengthening their position within the Grand Challenge. There is a vision for the roles required within the supply chain.

The overall consortium's skill and experience gaps related to the sustainability challenge are understood. A plan is in place to engage with stakeholders from across the medicines manufacturing supply chain. The response justifies the absence of cross-supply chain collaboration where it is not deemed appropriate for the potential project.

Although existing partnerships, initiatives, or networks intended to be leveraged in developing the consortium are mentioned, the explanation lacks detail on how their expertise will be utilised.

The anticipated benefits of a diverse and multidisciplinary team are briefly mentioned in relation to the EoI consortium and the future Grand Challenge.

There is evidence that the project team will work well together or that the single applicant can suitably engage with a range of stakeholders with the skills required to form a consortium.

Scores 5 - 6

**If a collaborative application has been submitted:** The project team is in a fair position to undertake consortium-building activities; however, there is little justification for each partner's role within the consortium. There is minimal mention of how each partner will contribute to the development of the Grand Challenge.

**If a single applicant has applied:** The applicant is in a fair position to undertake consortium-building activities, however, there is little information regarding the breadth of partner's required to build the consortium with some explanation of the strategy for strengthening their position within the Grand Challenge.

A plan exists to engage partners from across the medicines manufacturing supply chain, but it lacks detail on how it will address the consortium's gaps in terms of skills and experience.

Existing partnerships, initiatives, or networks that the team plans to leverage in developing the consortium are mentioned, but there is a lack of detail on how their expertise will be utilised.

There is limited discussion on the anticipated benefits of a diverse and multidisciplinary team concerning the EoI consortium and the future Grand Challenge.

There is some evidence that part of the project team will work well together or that the single applicant can engage stakeholders with the skills required to form a consortium although there are some gaps anticipated.

Scores 3 - 4

**If a collaborative application has been submitted:** The project team will struggle to carry out consortium-building activities. There is no justification for each partner's role within the consortium. There is no mention of how each partner will contribute to the development of the Grand Challenge and detail is lacking in terms of consortium's gaps relevant to the required skills and experience needed to address sustainability challenges.

**If a single applicant has applied:** The applicant will struggle to undertake consortium-building activities and there is little information regarding the breadth of partner's required to build the consortium.

The plan to engage partners from across the medicines manufacturing supply chain is not convincing and lacks clarity and direction.

There is no discussion around the anticipated benefits of a diverse and multidisciplinary team.

There is limited evidence that the project team will work well together. There may be some members of the team with little relevance to the project activities or that the single applicant will struggle to engage stakeholders with the relevant skills required to form a consortium.

Scores 1 - 2

The project team will not be capable of either carrying out the expression of interest phase or preparing a case for the Grand Challenge.

**Question 8. Proposed innovation focus**



What will be the proposed innovation focus of your Grand Challenge, with reference to the three pillars and two enablers:

- circularity
- green chemistry
- productivity and resource
- regulations
- [measurements, standards and data](#)

Describe:

- the sustainability barriers and challenges faced in the area in which your proposed consortium will operate
- the expected challenges related to regulations, measurements, standards and data which you foresee potentially impacting the exploitation, commercialisation or adoption of your innovation
- how you propose to address the challenges related to regulations, measurements, standards and data
- the significance of advancing sustainable medicines manufacturing for your consortium
- initial Grand Challenge ideas for how your consortium will use the EoI phase to address those sector-specific challenges and unlock innovation
- the broader impact of implementing the output of your Grand Challenge, including sustainable practices in medicines manufacturing, and environmental, economic and social benefits
- any work you have already done to harness the power of sustainable medicines manufacturing innovation in your sector
- any previous work or funding received to support this or other skills that are relevant

If you are applying for funding to scale up and expand your existing consortium, you must explain how your planned activities within this EoI phase represent an expansion, scaling or change in focus from business as usual.

### **Question 8. Assessor guidance and scoring**

## Scores 9 - 10

The initial approach strongly addresses the proposed innovation focus outlined in question 5. The primary sustainability barriers and challenges are clearly articulated, referencing one or more of the three core pillars and both enablers with a defined vision in place as to how these can be addressed in the Grand Challenge. The application provides a detailed and evidence-backed explanation of how the innovations and project outputs will advance sustainable medicines manufacturing for both the consortium and the wider sector as a result of the Grand Challenge, with the benefits and impact clearly and convincingly described.

The innovation concept to be addressed at the Grand Challenge stage is highly innovative, either commercially or technically, thereby justifying the freedom to explore during the EoI phase. The initial activities that the consortium will undertake during the EoI phase are well-articulated, specifically aimed at addressing sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector and are considerate of the sectoral context.

The application outlines substantial prior work in sustainable medicines innovation where relevant, clearly defining how this foundation will support the proposed work.

## Scores 7 - 8

The initial approach addresses the proposed innovation focus outlined in question 5. The sustainability barriers and challenges are addressed, referencing one or more of the three core pillars and both enablers with a vision in place as to how these can be addressed in the Grand Challenge. The application provides explanation of how the innovations and project outputs will advance sustainable medicines manufacturing for both the consortium and the wider sector as a result of the Grand Challenge, with the benefits and impact mentioned. The overall plan could be enhanced with additional evidence or detail.

The innovation concept to be addressed at the Grand Challenge stage is suitably innovative, either commercially or technically, thereby justifying the freedom to explore during the EoI phase. The initial activities that the consortium will undertake during the EoI phase are well articulated, specifically aimed at addressing sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector, are somewhat defined and take account of the sectoral context.

The application describes prior work in sustainable medicines innovation where relevant but does not plausibly define how this will support the proposed work.

#### Scores 5 - 6

The initial approach addresses the proposed innovation focus outlined in question 5. The sustainability barriers and challenges are somewhat addressed but the answer could benefit from additional detail. One or more of the three core pillars and both enablers are addressed although the vision as to how these can be addressed in the Grand Challenge is not plausible. The application provides some explanation as to how the innovations and project outputs will advance sustainable medicines manufacturing for both the consortium and the wider sector as a result of the Grand Challenge. The overall plan could be enhanced with additional evidence or detail.

The innovation concept to be addressed at the Grand Challenge stage is somewhat innovative, either commercially or technically, thereby justifying the freedom to explore during the EoI phase. The initial activities that the consortium will undertake during the EoI phase are mentioned but lack sectoral context.

The application describes prior work in sustainable medicines innovation where relevant but does not plausibly define how this will support the proposed work.

#### Scores 3 - 4

Some barrier and challenges faced are described with little reference to one or more of the three pillars or limited reference to the two enablers.

The approach is poorly defined with an unconvincing link to challenges in medicines manufacturing sustainability or how the EoI phase and Grand challenges will address challenges in the sector.

Applicants have little prior experience on sustainable manufacturing innovation to support the proposed project.

Initial activity ideas are limited and unlikely to tackle sustainability challenges within the medicines manufacturing sector.

#### Scores 1 - 2

The approach is not well defined or inconsistent with the proposed innovation focus in Question 5.

The proposal makes little reference to addressing the three pillars nor the two enablers.

There is no identification of how the EoI or proposed Grand Challenge will impact the consortium or supply chain.

### **Question 9. Costs and value for money**

How much will the EoI phase 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
- the grant you are requesting
- how this project represents value for money for you and the taxpayer
- the balance of costs and grant across the project partners, if applicable

### **Question 9. Assessor guidance and scoring**

Scores 9 - 10

The project costs are entirely appropriate and represent excellent value for money for the team and the taxpayer. The balance of costs and grant between partners (if applicable) is justified and reasonable for the proposed project.

Scores 7 - 8

The project costs are appropriate and should be sufficient to successfully complete the project. The balance of costs and grant between partners (if applicable) seems reasonable. The project represents good value for money for the organisation and the taxpayer.

Scores 5 - 6

The project costs seem to be acceptable, but the justifications are not clear. The balance of costs and grants between partners (if applicable) is not entirely satisfactory. Little information is offered about the value for money this project offers.

Scores 3 - 4

The project costs seem too high or too low given the proposed project. The split of costs and grant between partners (if applicable) is unbalanced.

Scores 1 - 2

The costs are not appropriate or justified. The balance of costs and grant between partners (if applicable) is not justified.