

ADOPT Full Grant: Round 6: 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 of your organisation and any partners or subcontractors working on your project.

You must also provide a list of any farmers, growers or foresters claiming or receiving grant funding in the project.

Note: you must have a minimum of 50% of any grant requested by farmers, growers or foresters in the project, allocated to farmers, growers or foresters based in England.

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 process of being applied for
- Not applicable

Question 4. Farmers, growers or foresters details (not scored)

The project lead must confirm that they are a farmer, grower or forester based in England and the other farming partners must confirm they are based in the UK.

All farming partners must provide details of their current engagement in English or UK farming, growing or forestry operations, as follows:

- name and role in the business
- the trading names of the farming, growing or forestry businesses if different from their registered name
- which county the main farming, growing or forestry activity is based in
- what is grown or produced, and the scale of the operation

We will use these answers to confirm the eligibility of the project lead and that there is at least one other commercial farming, growing or forestry business deriving income from these agricultural sectors.

Question 5. 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 6. 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 7. 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 8. What is the idea or solution you have identified to trial on-farm?

What is the problem that you are trying to fix, and what idea or solution do you wish to test?

Explain:

- what the idea or solution is
- where did you hear about it
- what is the problem this is seeking to address, and how this also affects other farming, growing or forestry businesses
- why is this idea or solution better than what already exists
- how will it solve the problem you have identified

Question 8. Assessor guidance and scoring

Score 9-10

There is a credible and compelling case made for the trialling of this solution on-farm which will address the well defined problem faced by farmers, growers or foresters. Highly credible evidence that the need or problem to be addressed is a critical issue for other farmers, growers or foresters in England has been provided.

The applicant has convincingly shown what benefits this approach would have over existing practices or solutions. The applicant has clearly demonstrated an understanding of the impact that this project can have in solving the problem.

Score 7-8

There is a good case made for the trialling of this solution on-farm which will address the problem faced by farmers, growers or foresters. The applicant has provided good evidence that the need or problem to be addressed is a critical issue for other farmers, growers or foresters in England.

The applicant has demonstrated how the idea or solution will answer the issue that has been identified and is an improvement on current practice, including an understanding of the positive impact that this project can have in solving the problem.

Score 5-6

There is a reasonable case made for the trialling of this solution on-farm which will address the problem faced by farmers, growers or foresters. The applicant has provided reasonable evidence that the need or problem to be addressed is a critical issue for other farmers, growers or foresters in England.

The applicant has reasonably demonstrated how the idea or solution will answer the issue that has been identified and is an improvement on current practice, including an understanding of the impact that this project can have in solving the problem

Score 3-4

There is a weak case made for the trialling of this solution on-farm which will address the problem faced by farmers, growers or foresters. The applicant has provided inadequate evidence that the need or problem to be addressed is a critical issue for other farmers, growers or foresters in England.

The applicant has not demonstrated how the idea or solution will answer the issue that has been identified and is an improvement on current practice. The applicant has not demonstrated an understanding of the impact that this project can have in solving the problem.

Score 1-2

There is a poor case made for the trialling of this solution on-farm which will address the problem faced by farmers, growers or foresters. The applicant has provided no evidence that the need or problem to be addressed is a critical issue for other farmers, growers or foresters in England.

The applicant has not demonstrated how the idea or solution will answer the issue that has been identified and there is no attempt to quantify the improvement on current practice. There is little to no understanding of the impact that this project can have.

Question 9. How will you trial and test this idea or solution on-farm?

What is your approach to carry out this trial or experiment and what will be the focus of this project?

Explain:

- how do you plan to test this on-farm
- how you will create a robust trial design to maximise the potential impact of the research
- how will you improve on any similar trials or experiments that have already been conducted on this topic
- how will you manage the trial and capture data to allow meaningful analysis of the results
- the nature of the outputs you expect from the project, for example, reports, data records, videos

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

Score 9-10

The on-farm trial has a very clear, well defined and realistic approach. Great evidence of a robust and rigorous trial design that is fit for purpose and will maximise the impact of the project.

Evidence of significant work using supporting information and past research to shape and support the project. Excellent attention to capturing key metrics and there are ample resources allocated to analysis and interpretation of the results. The nature of the results that will be generated are very clearly stated and comprehensive.

Score 7-8

The on-farm trial is clear and well-defined with a realistic project plan proposed. Good evidence of a robust and rigorous trial design that is fit for purpose and will maximise the impact of the project.

Evidence of using some supporting information and past research to shape and support the project. Good attention given to capturing key metrics and there are good resources allocated to analysis and interpretation of results. The nature of the outputs are clear and appropriate.

Score 5-6

The on-farm trial plan has been satisfactorily defined. Reasonable evidence has been provided of a trial design that is fit for purpose and will maximise the impact of the project.

There is some awareness of previous work, supporting information or past research to shape and support the project. The trial design identified some metrics but there appear to be limited resources allocated to analysis. The nature of the outputs are acceptable.

Score 3-4

The on-farm trial plan has been poorly defined. There is weak evidence of a trial design that is fit for purpose and will maximise the impact of the project.

There is little evidence of attempts to understanding previous work done in the area to use as supporting information to shape and support the project. Few metrics identified but very limited resources available for analysis. The nature of the outputs are not clearly defined or understood.

Score 1-2

Very poorly defined project plan to describe the on-farm trial. Poor evidence of a trial design that is fit for purpose and will maximise the impact of the project.

No evidence of using supporting information and past research to shape and support the project or little evidence to understand previous trial work. no identification of key metrics and there are no resources for analysis. The nature of the outputs are vague, poorly defined or not mentioned.

Question 10. Team and resources for the trial

Who is in the project team and what are their roles?

Explain:

- the role of the ADOPT Project Facilitator within the project: include their skills and experience, and their business relationship, if any, to your project or partners
- 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
- the current relationships between project partners and how the project will maintain a farmer or grower-led focus

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 10. Assessor guidance and scoring

Score 9-10

Details of the Project Facilitator working on the project have been provided and they are clearly well placed to support this project.

The consortium and project team are well placed to carry out the project and are relevant to the approach being taken. There is a convincing plan to obtain all the resources, equipment and facilities they will need. There is a clear and appropriate plan of including external parties where project skills are missing or inadequate. There is strong evidence that the consortium, including the Project Facilitator, will work well.

Score 7-8

Details of the Project Facilitator working on the project have been provided and they appear well placed to support this project.

The consortium and project team are suitable to carry out the project and are relevant to the approach being taken. There is a clear plan to obtain all the resources, equipment, and facilities they will need. There is a plan of including external parties where project team skills are inadequate. The consortium, including the Project Facilitator, is likely to work well.

Score 5-6

Details of the Project Facilitator working on the project have been provided.

The consortium has most, but not all, of the required skills and experience required. There is a weak plan of including external parties where project team skills are inadequate. It is unclear whether the consortium, including the Project Facilitator, will work well together.

Score 3-4

Project Facilitator details have been provided but it is unclear if their skills are best placed or relevant to support the approach for this project.

There are significant gaps in the consortium with little or no information about how these will be filled. There may be some partners with little relevance to the project activities.

Score 1-2

This project did not include a Project Facilitator.

The consortium will not be capable of carrying out the project.

Question 11. Outcomes and impacts

What improvements will this idea or solution offer you and other farmers, growers or foresters like you?

Explain how your idea or solution will impact:

- productivity
- resilience
- sustainability and progression towards net zero emissions

Explain, how you have determined whether the proposed idea or solution has any negative impacts, and how you have mitigated against them.

How could the idea or solution be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters?

Describe:

- the applicable farming or forestry business sectors
- the ease of integration or adoption into existing systems

Question 11. Assessor guidance and scoring

Score 9-10

The idea or solution to be trialled has strong and clear impacts that will benefit farmers, growers or foresters in the UK farming sector. This includes compelling evidence to justify claims of impacts to most or all factors of productivity, resilience and sustainability of farming.

Any possible negative impacts are addressed and fully mitigated where appropriate. The positive impact to the relevant agricultural sector and to others outside of the team, such as supply chain partners, customers and broader industry, is clearly understood, realistic and of significantly positive social, economic or environmental impact in the long term.

There is a good analysis of how the idea or solution trialled on-farm can be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters and integrated into existing systems.

Score 7-8

The solution or idea to be trialled has clear impacts that will benefit farmers, growers or foresters in the UK farming sector. This includes evidence on impacts to one or more factors of productivity, resilience, and sustainability of farming.

There is good awareness and description of the expected long term economic, social and environmental impacts the idea or solution may have on the relevant agricultural sector and other external parties. Any possible negative impacts are partially mitigated where appropriate.

There is good consideration of how the idea or solution trialled on-farm can be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters and integrated into existing systems.

Score 5-6

The idea or solution has satisfactory impacts that can benefit farmers, growers or foresters in the UK farming sector. Consideration was given to impacts upon one or more factors of productivity, resilience, or sustainability of farming

There is basic awareness of the economic, social and environmental impacts the project could have on the relevant agricultural sector and others outside the project. Little mitigation is offered where there may be negative impacts.

There has been some consideration of how the idea or solution trialled on -arm can be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters, or how it can be integrated into existing systems.

Score 3-4

The applicant provides limited information on the benefits of the idea or solution to farmers, grower or foresters. There are impacts to productivity, resilience, or sustainability of farming mentioned but significant gaps remain.

Impacts to the relevant agricultural sector or to external parties are vague or are not considered. There is little consideration for possible negative impacts and where appropriate, no mitigations are considered.

There is little consideration of how the idea or solution trialled on-farm can be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters, or how it may be integrated into existing systems.

Score 1-2

There is no information about how the idea or solution could have an impact on the UK farming sector.

No information is provided about how the idea or solution might impact the relevant agricultural sector or on external parties. There is no information or consideration given to how the project may have negative or detrimental impacts upon the sector.

There is no consideration given to how the idea or solution trialled on-farm can be adopted by other farmers, growers or foresters, or integrated into existing systems.

Question 12. Adoption and communication of results

How are you going to communicate and share the outputs from the trial or experiment during and after your project to help with adoption?

Explain:

- Who is the target audience is or applicable farming sector for your communication
- What methods or approaches will you use to reach your target audience, for example physical events, social media, newspapers, journals
- what other organisations will you collaborate with to share your project idea and results with the wider farming community
- how you expect to use the results generated from the project to be used by your project team and other farmers

Question 12. Assessor guidance and scoring

Score 9-10

The trial is structured to maximise knowledge sharing. There is a detailed and highly credible plan of how to communicate the progress and outcomes of the project to the relevant farming sectors and the groups they intend to communicate with.

A very well developed plan for communication of progress and results, including routes to market, is clearly explained and evidenced. This should include identified channels such as events, articles, videos, reports and social media.

Very clear plan of collaboration with key organisations to share results and drive adoption amongst other farmers is detailed.

Score 7-8

the trial is structured to enable knowledge sharing. There is a detailed plan of how to communicate the progress and outcomes of the project to the relevant farming sectors, including the groups they intend to communicate with.

A well developed plan for communication of progress and results, including routes to market, is explained and evidenced. This can include identified channels as events, articles, videos, reports and social media.

A clear plan of collaboration with key organisations to share results and drive adoption has been included. This includes a view of how the results generated will make a positive impact and drive adoption amongst other farmers.

Score 5-6

The trial has been structured to enable some knowledge sharing. There is a reasonable plan of how to communicate the progress and outcomes of the project to the relevant farming sectors.

A reasonable plan for communication of progress and results is clearly explained and evidenced. This can include some identified channels such as events, articles, videos, reports and social media.

A reasonable plan of collaboration with key organisations to share results and drive adoption among farmers is included.

Score 3-4

The trial indicates limited knowledge sharing focus. There is a weak plan of how to communicate the progress and outcomes of the project to the relevant farming sectors.

There is a weak plan for communication of progress and results. There is little mention of identified channels for communications.

There is a weak plan of collaboration with key organisations to share results and drive adoption among farmers.

Score 1-2

The trial approach suggests there will be negligible knowledge sharing. There is no plan of how to communicate the progress and outcomes of the project to the relevant farming sectors.

Little or no plan of collaboration with key organisations to share results and drive adoption among farmers.

Question 13. Project management and risks

How will you and your Project Facilitator manage the project effectively?

Explain:

- the main work packages of the project, indicating the responsible lead person 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
- a risk register identifying the key risks including, but not limited to, technical, commercial, managerial, and environmental
- your project plan in enough detail to identify any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones

You must submit a project plan or Gantt chart as an appendix to support your answer. It must be a PDF and can be up to two A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

You must also submit a risk register, indicating the main risks for your project, including, but not limited to, technical, commercial, managerial, and environmental. You must include any identified interdependencies between these risks and the likely impact. It must be a PDF, up to two A4 pages long and no larger than 10MB in size. The font must be legible at 100% zoom.

Question 13. Assessor guidance and scoring

Score 9-10

The approach to project management is fully described. The responsible leads for each work package have been clearly identified, as are the costs for each package. Very comprehensive analysis of major and minor risks. Uncertainties are identified and addressed with mitigations. The plan is designed to meet the objectives of the project in a realistic and efficient way. All links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.

Score 7-8

The project management approach is evident. The responsible lead and costs for each work package are stated. Key risks and uncertainties are identified and addressed with mitigations. The plan is structured to achieve the project's goals, demonstrating a systematic approach. Major links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.

Score 5-6

Project management approach seems reasonable but is not tailored to the objectives of the project. Not all the work packages have an identified responsible lead. Overall costs of the work packages have been stated. Key risks and uncertainties are identified. The plan is not realistic or clear on how the work packages will deliver the project goals. Some links or dependencies between work packages are identified.

Score 3-4

The project management approach has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project. It is not clear if responsible leads have been identified for the work packages. Some work packages include overall costs. Key risks are only superficially identified. The plan shows a limited connection to the project's objectives. The overall approach lacks evidence of planning. Links between work packages are weak or missing.

Score 1-2

The project management approach will not meet the objectives of the project. No responsible leads have been identified for any work packages in the project nor are any costs stated. Risks and uncertainties are either not identified or poorly considered. The plan fails to align with the project's objectives, lacking in structure and realistic timelines. There is no discussion of links between work packages.

Question 14. 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
- the grant amount you are requesting
- how each partner will finance their contributions to your project
- how this project represents value for money for you and the taxpayer
- what your project would look like without public funding
- 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 your project

Question 14. Assessor guidance and scoring**Scores 9-10**

The project costs are clearly justified and entirely appropriate. The partners have a clear idea of how they will finance their contribution. There is a compelling case for the positive difference funding will make.

The balance of costs and grants between partners, and use of subcontractors, is justified and reasonable for the proposed project. The project represents excellent value for money compared to alternative approaches outlined, including doing nothing.

Scores 7-8

The project costs are appropriate and should be sufficient to successfully complete the project. The arguments for public funding are good and justified.

The balance of costs and grants between partners, and use of subcontractors, seems reasonable. The project represents good value for money compared to alternative outlined approaches, including doing nothing.

Scores 5-6

The project costs seem ok, but the justifications are not clear. The public funding arguments are acceptable, but the difference made by the grant will be modest.

The balance of costs and grants between partners is acceptable. Little information is offered about alternative approaches and the value for money this project offers.

Scores 3-4

The project costs seem too high or too low given the proposed project. The funding arguments are poor or not sufficiently justified. The split of costs and grants between partners is unbalanced, or inappropriate use is being made of subcontractors.

Scores 1-2

The costs are not appropriate or justified. There is no justification for public funding and no reason why the applicant should not fund the work.

The balance between partners and subcontractors is not justified.