

Biomedical Catalyst 2025: Industry led R&D small and large projects – Assessor guidance for applicants

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, including post code, of your organisation and any partners or subcontractors working on your project.

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

Question 2. 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 3. 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 which do not have the correct permits or licences in place by your project start date.

You must select one option:

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

Question 4. International collaboration (not scored)

Does your proposed work involve any international collaboration or engagement?

You must provide details of any expected international collaboration or engagement.

You must include a list of the names and the countries, any international project co-leads, project partners, visiting researchers, or other collaborators are based in.

You must also include details of any subcontractors or service providers.

If your proposed work does not involve international collaboration or engagement, your answer must confirm this.

Question 5. Export licence (not scored)

You must indicate whether an export control license is required for this project under the [academic export control guidance](#).

You must select one option:

- Yes
- No

Question 6. Trusted Research and Innovation (not scored)

You must explain if your proposed project work relates to [UKRI's Trusted Research and Innovation \(TR&I\) Principles](#), including:

- a list of any dual-use (both military and non-military) applications to your research
- a list of the areas where your project is relevant to one or more of the [17 areas](#) of the UK National Security and Investment (NSI) Act
- whether an export control license is required for this project under the [academic export control guidance](#) and the status of any applications
- a list of any items or substances on the UK Strategic Export Control List

If your proposed work does not relate to UKRI's TR&I Principles, your answer must confirm this.

We may ask you to provide additional TR&I information at a later date, in line with UKRI TR&I Principles and funding terms and conditions.

Question 7. Clinical trials (not scored)

Will your project involve any human clinical trials?

You must select one option:

- Yes
- No

Question 8. Specific theme (not scored)

Select the area that best describes the focus of your application:

- advanced therapies (cell, gene, RNA, regenerative)
- biosciences and platform technologies
- preclinical tools, target discovery and validation
- therapeutics and medicine development, including Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) and infectious disease
- diagnostics and biomarkers, including AMR and infectious disease
- medical technologies, devices and robotics
- precision and personalised medicine

- digital and data driven health
- healthy ageing and independent living

Question 9. Need or challenge

What is the business need, health or healthcare need, technological challenge, or market opportunity behind your innovation?

Explain:

- the main motivation for the project
- the business need, health or healthcare need, technological challenge or market opportunity
- whether you have identified any similar innovation, including competitors and substitutes, 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

You must provide:

- evidence that the health or healthcare challenge is real and has a 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

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 and must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 9. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The health or healthcare challenge is clearly defined and strongly evidenced.

The applicant has demonstrated an excellent understanding of the wider contextual factors such as economic, social, environmental, cultural or political challenges relevant to their innovation.

The applicant has demonstrated an excellent and substantiated understanding of the commercialisation opportunities for their innovation and is clearly linked to project outcomes. Market demand is well substantiated, nationally and internationally

The applicant has clearly articulated how the proposed project will allow them to make significant progress towards the development of their final commercial innovation. Prior work and stakeholder input are clearly described and relevant.

Scores 7-8

The healthcare challenge is clearly justified and is addressed by their innovation with good supporting evidence.

The applicant has considered the wider economic, social, environmental, cultural or political challenges relevant to their innovation.

The applicant has demonstrated a good understanding of the commercialisation opportunities for their innovation. Commercial potential is clear but not fully developed.

Market demand is evident but may lack depth.

The outcomes of the proposed project have the potential to deliver a commercial innovation that has a beneficial impact on the healthcare challenge. Prior work and stakeholder input are present and relevant.

Scores 5-6

The challenge is partially defined with limited evidence.

There are potential positive impacts of their innovation on the healthcare challenge, however these are not well defined or are minimal in nature.

The applicant has provided a limited review of the wider economic, social, environmental, cultural or political challenges relevant to their innovation.

The commercial opportunities for their innovations have some potential, but this has not been expressed and evidenced in a satisfactory manner. Market demand is mentioned but not well supported.

Prior work and stakeholder input are limited.

The outcomes of the proposed project have the potential to deliver a commercial innovation that has a beneficial impact, but they have not been explained in sufficient detail.

Scores 3-4

The healthcare challenge is vague, not clear or poorly justified and the potential impacts of their innovation are unrealistic, limited or poorly defined with significant gaps and inadequately evidenced.

The commercial opportunities for their innovation are tenuous or unrealistic and not well supported or described. Market demand and stakeholder input are weak or missing.

Scores 1-2

There is no clear healthcare challenges or project outcomes.

There is little or no commercial drive to the project and no supporting evidence provided.

No evidence of stakeholder engagement or commercial potential.

Question 10. Approach and innovation

What approach will you take and 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 and how it addresses the challenge and end user needs in a novel way
- how your innovation compares with existing products, standards of care, or alternatives, including competitors and substitutes, and how it improves on them
- whether the innovation will focus on existing technologies in new areas, the development of new technologies for existing areas, or a totally disruptive approach
- the freedom you have to operate and current state of intellectual property (IP) ownership
- the underpinning scientific or technical evidence supporting your solution, including prior experimental, preclinical or clinical work to date and outcomes
- how this project fits with your current product, service lines, UK supply chain or offerings
- how it will make you more competitive
- the nature of the outputs you expect from the project, for example, reports, demonstrator, know-how, new process, product or service design, and how these will help you to target the need, challenge or opportunity identified

- your strategy for protecting the knowledge and IP resulting from your project
- the technical and commercial benefits and limitations of your approach, including characteristics of a minimal viable product (MVP), if applicable

Do not repeat the problem description; focus on your approach and innovation.

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.

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 and must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 10. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The outputs and deliverables of the project are clearly defined and directly address the healthcare challenge. The project is highly innovative from commercial, scientific and technical perspectives, with strong supporting evidence for example, literature surveys, patent searches and competitor analyses.

The applicant has provided strong evidence that they have freedom to operate and a clear IP strategy, if relevant.

There is a convincing explanation of how the innovation will be deployed in practice and how it would be superior to current approaches, if applicable.

The approach is well-developed, builds on prior work, and is clearly superior to existing solutions.

Scores 7-8

The outputs and deliverables of the project are reviewed and should help to address the stated healthcare challenge.

The project is innovative with good supporting evidence.

The applicant has provided good evidence that they have freedom to operate

There is a review of how the innovation will be deployed in practice and how it would be superior to current approaches, if applicable.

There is a clear review of their activities in developing their innovation to this point.

Scores 5-6

The outputs and deliverables of the project are not reviewed in sufficient detail to demonstrate how they will address the healthcare challenge.

There is some evidence that the project is innovative from a commercial, scientific and technical perspective.

There is some explanation how their innovation would be superior to current approaches, if applicable.

Freedom to operate is partially evidenced.

The approach is underdeveloped or lacks clarity in comparison to existing solutions.

Scores 3-4

The outputs and deliverables of the project are unclear.

There is limited evidence that the project is innovative from a commercial, scientific and technical perspective.

Freedom to operate is weak or missing.

The approach lacks differentiation from existing solutions.

Scores 1-2

The outputs and deliverables of the project are not reviewed.

There is no evidence that the project is innovative from a commercial, scientific and technical perspective.

The applicant has provided no evidence that they have freedom to operate

Question 11. 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 to demonstrate their ability to deliver your project and exploit the output
- 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 for and how this process will be managed

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 and must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 11. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates excellent capability and relevance to deliver the project and to exploit the output.

The project has access to the optimal facilities for the project.

For collaborative projects, the consortium's configuration and objectives are very clear, with strong justification provided to support the applicant's choices of any subcontractors.

The management of future recruitment or resources is well defined, if applicable.

Scores 7-8

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

The project has access to the appropriate facilities.

For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are clear.

The management of future recruitment or resources is reviewed, if applicable.

Scores 5-6

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

It is unclear that the project has access to the appropriate facilities.

For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are unclear.

The management of future recruitment or resources is unclear, if applicable.

Scores 3-4

Evidence of the applicants having access to the right skills and experience are unrealistic or poorly defined.

The project does not have access to the appropriate facilities.

Scores 1-2

There is little or no supporting evidence that the applicants 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 12. Market awareness

What does the market or markets you are targeting look like?

Describe:

- the target markets for the project outcomes and any other potential markets, either domestic, international or both
- your target customers or end users, and the value to them, for example, why they would use or buy the product
- the size of the target markets for the project outcomes, backed up by references where available
- the structure and dynamics of the target markets, including customer segmentation, together with predicted growth rates within clear timeframes
- the target markets' main supply or value chains and business models, and any barriers to entry that exist
- the current UK position in targeting these markets
- the size and main features of any other markets not already listed

If your project is highly innovative, where the market may be unexplored, describe or explain:

- what the market's size might be
- how your project will try to explore the market's potential

Question 12. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The applicant has demonstrated an excellent and substantiated understanding of target markets, customers, and value proposition.

The size of the market and growth potential is significant, compelling and well evidenced.

There is a detailed and highly credible analysis of the market structure and dynamics.

If applicable, the current UK position in targeting these markets is reviewed in detail.

Scores 7-8

The applicant has a clear understanding of the potential markets target markets, customers, and value proposition.

The size of the market and growth potential is well described.

There is a detailed analysis of the market structure and dynamics.

If applicable, the current UK position in targeting these markets is reviewed.

Scores 5-6

The applicant has provided a limited review of the potential markets for their innovation. Market understanding is limited or lacks depth.

The size of the market and growth potential is not reviewed in sufficient detail or not well evidenced.

There is a limited analysis of the market structure and dynamics.

Scores 3-4

The market claims for this innovation are vague, unrealistic or ill-defined.

Scores 1-2

There is no credible market for this innovation.

Question 13. 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 supply or value chains outlined, and whether you will be extending or establishing your market position
- 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
- regulatory requirements for your innovation and strategies to demonstrate conformity
- how you will protect and exploit the outputs of the project, for example, through know-how, patenting, designs or changes to your business model
- long term potential economic benefits to the UK, including revenue, profitability, and job creation
- 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

Do not repeat market description already covered in Question 12; focus on your strategy, outputs, and exploitation.

Question 13. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The market is well understood with a detailed review of targeted customers and the potential barriers to commercial exploitation or adoption.

There is a compelling explanation of how the principle exploitable outputs of the project relate to the drivers and value propositions of the targeted customers.

There is a clear, realistic, and achievable route to market, including a detailed review of their current market position.

ROI predictions for the company and the UK are thoroughly evidenced.

Excellent understanding of regulatory requirements for the innovation and strategies to demonstrate conformity.

Scores 7-8

The market is reviewed in detail in terms of targeted customers and the potential barriers to commercial exploitation or adoption.

There is a clear explanation of how the principle exploitable outputs of the project relate to the drivers and value propositions of the targeted customers.

There is a viable route to market, including a review of their current market position.

ROI predictions for the company and the UK are clear.

Good understanding of regulatory requirements for the innovation and strategies to demonstrate conformity.

Scores 5-6

The market is reviewed in limited detail in terms of targeted customers and the potential barriers to commercial exploitation or adoption.

There is a limited explanation of how the principle exploitable outputs of the project relate to the drivers and value propositions of the targeted customers.

The route to market is unclear.

Limited understanding of regulatory requirements for the innovation and strategies to demonstrate conformity.

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 14. Wider impacts

What impact might this project have outside the project team?

Describe and, where possible, measure the economic benefits from the project such as productivity increases and import substitution, 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 environmental impacts, either positive or negative
- any expected regional impacts of the project

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

- quality of life
- social inclusion or exclusion
- jobs, such as safeguarding, creating, changing or displacing them
- education
- public empowerment
- health and safety
- regulations
- diversity

Question 14. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9 - 10

Outstanding evidence of significant wider impact beyond the project team.

Economic benefits to customers, supply chain, industry or the UK economy are clearly quantified and realistic.

Strong alignment with government priorities, with clear description of contribution and supporting evidence.

Environmental, regional and social impacts are well articulated, specific and, where possible, measured.

Risks and any negative impacts are acknowledged, with proportionate mitigation.

Overall benefits are material, credible and strongly justified.

Scores 7 - 8

Clear benefits outside the project team, with good description and some quantification where possible.

Economic impacts beyond the applicant and partners are reasonable and mostly evidenced.

Alignment with government priorities, environmental, regional or social impacts are explained with good rationale.

Some consideration of risk or potential negative outcomes.

Most claims are plausible and supported.

Scores 5 - 6

Benefits outside the project team are described but lack clarity, depth or supporting evidence.

Economic impacts are speculative, weakly quantified, or only partially linked to project activities.

Government priority alignment or environmental, regional or social impacts are mentioned but in general terms.

Limited recognition of risks, uncertainty or potential negative impacts.

Some credible potential, but not well demonstrated.

Scores 3 - 4

Limited evidence of meaningful benefits beyond the core project team.

Claims are vague, generic, unsubstantiated or disconnected from project activities.

Little or no evidence of economic, environmental, regional, social or government impact.

Scores 1 - 2

No credible evidence of wider impact outside the project partners.

Claims are unrealistic, unsupported or absent.

Benefits to external stakeholders, wider industry or the UK economy are highly unlikely.

Question 15. Project management

How will you manage your project effectively to achieve its objectives?

Explain:

- the current status of your innovation and where you expect to be at the end of the project
- 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
- how your method and technical approach are appropriate to the project's needs and timescale
- the robustness of any study design, protocol, or approach
- the management reporting lines
- your project plan in enough detail to identify any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones and how milestone timings are realistic
- if relevant, comparison with alternative R&D strategies and why your proposed approach offers 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. It must be a PDF no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages and must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 15. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The project plan is fully described; clearly defines clear, appropriate or realistic milestones and go, no-go decision points, and the Gantt chart reflects this adequately. Work packages and costs are well defined.

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.

If applicable, the use of patients, animals or other tissues has been fully justified.

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.

If applicable, the use of patients, animals or other tissues has been justified.

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.

There are gaps in the management plan of the activities, and resource management profile.

Limited acknowledgement of alternative R&D strategies.

If applicable, 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.

If applicable, 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.

If applicable, there is no justification of the use of patients, animals, or tissues or it is impossible to understand whether their use is appropriate from the information given.

Question 16. Risks

What are the main risks for this project and how will you manage them?

Explain:

- the main risks and uncertainties of the project, including the technical, regulatory, ethical, 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 no larger than 10MB. It can be up to two A4 pages and must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 16. 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, ethical commercial, managerial, and environmental risks.

If appropriate, other uncertainties, for example, 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, ethical, commercial, managerial, and environmental risks.

If appropriate, other uncertainties, for example, 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) covering key risks and critical inputs, with appropriate mitigation.

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, for example, 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 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 17. 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 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 and how this would affect the R&D activities of all organisations involved
- how this project would change the R&D activities of all the organisations involved

Question 17. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

Public funding is clearly shown to accelerate development and complement other support. Strong case for additionality and long-term impact.

The project will significantly increase the industrial partners' R&D spend during the project and afterwards.

There is a compelling explanation of why alternative funding sources were not viable for this project.

There is a clear explanation of the options to progress the innovation if not funded via this call.

Scores 7-8

The project will increase the industrial partners' commitment to R&D.

There is an explanation of why alternative funding sources were not viable for this project.

There is a review of the options to progress the innovation if not funded via this call.

Scores 5-6

The project will improve the industrial partners' commitment to R&D.

There is a limited review of why alternative funding sources were not viable for this project.

There is a limited review of the options to progress the innovation if not funded by this call.

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.

Question 18. 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 your project goals, explain:

- your total eligible project costs, broken down by project partner
- the grant you are requesting
- how each partner will finance their contributions to your project, including how funding will be available to cover cash flow pending reimbursement from Innovate UK
- how this project represents value for money for you and the taxpayer
- how it compares to what you would spend your money on otherwise

- how costs compare to what you would spend without public funding, and why public funding accelerates or enhances your project
- the balance of costs and grant across the project partners
- any subcontractor costs and why they are critical to your project
- any claims for activity performed by senior or C-suite staff, why this activity could not be performed by lower cost team members, and the value of this activity to project outcomes

You must submit supporting documentation such as a detailed cost breakdown or quotations as an appendix. The appendix should be a PDF no larger than 10MB and can be up to two A4 pages, legible at 100% zoom.

Question 18. Assessor guidance and scoring

Scores 9-10

The applicant 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 has clearly demonstrated with very strong and detailed supporting evidence and justification for the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project.

Clear value for money for both the team and taxpayer.

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.

Match funding and cash flow are well managed. All large subcontracts have been fully justified, are appropriate and provide good value for money.

Any activities requiring senior staff is justified in terms of costs and value to the project, if applicable.

Scores 7-8

The applicant 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 has demonstrated with good supporting evidence the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project.

Value for money is clear.

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.

Match funding and cash flow are well considered. Subcontracts are well justified and appropriate.

Any activities requiring senior staff is reviewed in terms of costs and value to the project, if applicable.

Scores 5-6

Costs are broadly appropriate but lack detail.

The applicant 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.

Value for money is not well evidenced.

There may be some concerns on the appropriateness of subcontractors or other costs.

Match funding and cash flow are described but not fully assured. The applicant has indicated that funding will be available to cover cash flow.

There is a limited review of activities requiring senior staff, if applicable.

Scores 3-4

The level of funding commitment required for the project is unrealistic, either 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.