

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. 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 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 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. 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. Delivery location (not scored)

Where will your project be delivered?

You must select one option:

- Northern Ireland
- North-West England
- South-West England
- Yorkshire & Humber
- Northeast England

- East Midlands
- West Midlands

Question 6. Steering group endorsement (not scored)

Have you received endorsement from your local steering group?

- Yes
- No

You must submit the confirmation email received from your local steering group 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 in 11 point font size. A failure to submit this appendix will make you ineligible.

Question 7. Need or challenge

What is the need, challenge or opportunity behind your project?

Explain:

- the main motivation for the project
- whether you have identified any similar initiatives, including those close to market or in development and any current limitations
- 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

Question 7. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

There is a compelling motivation for the project. There is a clear understanding of any similar initiative identified and its current limitations. Any wider factors influencing this opportunity are clearly identified.

Scores 7 - 8

There is a good motivation for the project. There is a good awareness of the nearest initiative and some understanding of limitations and any similar initiatives. Any wider factors influencing this opportunity are identified.

Scores 5 - 6

The project motivation is appropriate, but there is a little understanding of the nearest initiative identified, limitations, similar initiatives or wider factors influencing this opportunity.

Scores 3 - 4

Project motivation is poorly defined or not relevant to the applicant or team. There is a lack of understanding of the nearest initiative. References to any similar initiatives 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. There is no understanding of the nearest initiative. References to any similar initiatives available or wider factors influencing this opportunity are not offered or are not relevant.

Question 8. Approach

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

Explain:

- how you will respond to the need, challenge or opportunity identified.
- How you will improve on the nearest current state-of-the-art identified.
- the freedom you have to operate

- how this project fits with your current product, service lines or offerings
- the nature of the outputs you expect from the project for example, report, demonstrator, know-how, new process, product or service design and how these will help you to target the need, challenge or opportunity identified

You can submit one appendix to support your answer. It can include diagrams and charts. It must be a PDF no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages but must be in 11 point font size.

Question 8. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

The approach addresses the need, challenge or opportunity identified in Question 7. The main initiatives are identified. Clear evidence is presented to show how the project outputs will differentiate from those alternatives already available. The project will make a substantial contribution to the cyber security sector of the area. Solid evidence is presented to substantiate the outputs of the project and freedom to operate.

Scores 7 - 8

The approach addresses the need or challenge, and the main initiatives are highlighted. Evidence shows that the proposed development is different from other alternatives already available, and that the applicant has the freedom to operate. It is demonstrated how the project outputs will contribute to the cyber security sector of the area.

Scores 5 - 6

The approach may address the need or challenge identified in Question 7 and the initiatives are highlighted. The project outputs or freedom to operate is not strongly backed up with evidence. Differentiation from alternatives already available is plausible and shows a link to improvements in the cyber security sector of the area.

Scores 3 - 4

The approach is not well defined or inconsistent with the need or challenge identified in Question 7. Improvement in the cyber security sector of the area is not very convincing.

Scores 1 - 2

The approach is poorly defined with an unconvincing or no link to the need or challenge identified in Question 7. There is little or no identification of how this will improve the cyber security sector of the area.

Question 9. 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
- 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

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 no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages but must be in 11 point font size.

Question 9. Assessor guidance and 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, equipment and facilities they will need. There is strong evidence that the project team will work well.

Scores 7 - 8

The project team makes sense given the approach described in Question 8. The applicant indicates how access will be obtained to all the resources, equipment and facilities they will need. The project team is likely to work well.

Scores 5 - 6

The project team has most, but not all, of the required skills and experience required. It is unclear whether or not 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 10. Outcomes and plan for continuation

How are you going to grow and continue your initiative after the funding period?

Please indicate if your initiative is a one-off 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
- your self sustaining mechanism
- your strategy for scalability and how the idea could expand within the area or be replicated elsewhere
- if your initiative is a one-off and detail the reason for this

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 10. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

Target end users are clearly identified along with the value proposition to them. The routes to self sustaining mechanisms are fully identified and evidenced mechanisms The exploitation, scalability or dissemination of the main project outputs is clearly outlined. If the project is a one-off initiative the reasons must be exceptionally justified in the context of scalability and overall scope.

Scores 7 - 8

Target end users are identified along with the value proposition to them. The routes to self sustaining mechanisms are outlined with sufficient evidence. The exploitation, scalability or dissemination of the main project outputs is outlined with some limitations. If the project is a one-off initiative the reasons must be exceptionally justified in the context of scalability and overall scope.

Scores 5 - 6

Target end users are described but the value proposition to them is less clear. There is some information about how self sustaining mechanisms may be achieved at some point. If project is a one-off initiative the reasons for that are limited or lack detail.

Scores 3 - 4

There is limited information about the target end user types and there is little information about the value proposition or how continuation will be achieved. If the project is a one-off initiative, the reasons for that are poorly justified or missing.

Scores 1 - 2

The applicant provides little or no information about the target end users.

Question 11. Wider impacts

What impact might this project have outside the project team?

Describe and, where possible, measure the economic benefits from the project to:

- external parties
- customers
- others in the supply chain
- broader industry
- the UK economy

Describe and, where possible, measure:

- any expected impact on government priorities
- any expected regional impacts of the project

Describe any expected social impacts, either positive or negative on, for example:

- social inclusion or exclusion
- jobs, such as safeguarding, creating, changing or displacing them
- education
- public empowerment
- regulations
- diversity

Question 11. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

The positive impact on others outside of the team is understood, for example, formation of new partnerships, the broader industry. Social and economic impacts are considered. Expected regional impacts are described with compelling evidence to justify claims. Any possible negative impacts are fully mitigated where appropriate.

Scores 7 - 8

There is good awareness of how the project may impact others outside of the team. Some evidence of social and economic impacts is considered. Expected regional impacts are described. Any possible negative impacts are partially mitigated where appropriate.

Scores 5 - 6

There is basic awareness of how the project could impact some others outside the project. 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 impacts to others outside of the project, but significant gaps remain.

Scores 1 - 2

There is no information about how the project might impact others outside of the project or any expected social impacts.

Question 12. Project management

How will you manage your project effectively?

Explain:

- the main work packages of the 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 project outcome.
- the management reporting lines
- your project plan in enough detail to identify any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones

If you are leading or collaborating in multiple applications, explain how you would effectively manage resources to deliver in multiple projects.

You must submit a project plan or Gantt chart as an appendix to support your answer. It must be a PDF no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages but must be in 11 point font size.

Question 12. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

The project work packages are clearly outlined, lead partner and total costs evidenced for each one. The approach to project management is fully 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. When delivering multiple applications, they demonstrate that the resources will be effectively managed.

Scores 7 - 8

The project work packages are outlined, lead partner and total costs 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 stated. When delivering multiple applications, they explain how the resources will be managed.

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. When delivering multiple applications, the management of resources seems reasonable.

Scores 3 - 4

The plan has serious deficiencies or major missing aspects. The plan has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project. When delivering multiple applications, there is risk of it impacting the delivery or quality of the projects.

Scores 1 - 2

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

Question 13. Risks

What are the main risks for this project?

Describe:

- 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, data sets
- any output likely to be subject to regulatory requirements, certification, ethical issues and so on, and how you will manage this
- any risks that may arise from delivering multiple projects

You must submit a risk register as an appendix to support your answer. It must be a PDF no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages but must be in 11 point font size.

Question 13. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

The key risks and uncertainties of the project are fully considered and mitigated. Critical inputs to the project are identified. Relevant constraints or conditions on the project outputs (regulatory requirements, certification 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. The risk analysis seems realistic.

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 14. Added value

How will this public funding help you to accelerate or enhance your project? 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 engaged with 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

Question 14. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

There is a compelling case for the positive difference that public funding will make. Alternative sources of support are described with an explanation of why they are discounted or used in conjunction with the grant funding.

Scores 7 - 8

The arguments for public funding are good and justified. Alternative sources of support are described, with an indication of why they are discounted.

Scores 5 - 6

The public funding arguments are acceptable, but the difference made by the grant will be modest. Any alternative sources of support are not fully described or discounted.

Scores 3 - 4

The funding arguments are poor or not sufficiently justified. Alternative sources of support are not described, or no reason is given why they are discounted.

Scores 1 - 2

There is no justification for public funding and no reason why the applicant should not fund the work.

Question 15. 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
- the grant you are requesting
- how each partner will finance any contributions to the project
- how this project represents value for money for you and the taxpayer
- how it compares to what you would spend your money on otherwise
- the balance of costs and grant across the project partners
- any subcontractor costs and why they are critical to the project
- any in-kind support such as venues, facilities and events

Question 15. 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 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.