# **Annex E – Evaluation Criteria and marking of applications**

Proposals will be assessed using the criteria and scoring scale shown below, designed to identify those proposals which offer the best Value for Money (VFM) overall. Assessors should complete the scoring sheet and provide a supporting narrative to justify their assessments against the following criteria:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Scoring criteria** | **Percentage Weighting %** |
| **1.****Technical feasibility** | Proposals must be assessed as technically feasible within the budget, range and timeframe offered.Proposals should demonstrate a realistic scope and achieve the aim of the opportunity, described in section 2 of the Call Document.**High scoring** applicants will provide a comprehensive proposal with a high probability of success, relying on evolvement or deployment of existing and working technologies. Proposals will not contain weaknesses in the techniques and/or technologies to be employed but provide excellent commercial and/or scientific opportunities. Proposals will contain realistic project deliverables against the proposed timescales with strong consideration given to technical risks of the project. Proposals will include robust plans to demonstrate the performance or development of the technology/system. | 30 |
| **2.****Commercial sustainability** | Proposals must be assessed against commercial understanding, knowledge and viability. The scoring should reflect your assessment of whether the proposed activity would generate a realistic and sustainable product for the UK market.**High scoring** applicants will provide reliable evidence that their proposal meets the requirements of UK and global ADR markets. Proposals will demonstrate strong understanding of the current market as well as how their research will be both commercially sustainable and beneficial. Proposals will seek to develop products or services which will be evidenced as meeting future market needs | 15 |
| **3.****Benefit to the UK** | All projects will need to demonstrate that the investment sought from the UK Government represents clear value for the UK public, through measurable benefits for the UK economy.**High scoring** applicants will provide excellent, detailed evidence of the benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy, including UK-based employment and contract opportunities. The costs of any activities proposed for grant funding will be very well justified and strongly linked to outcomes and benefits. | 20 |
| **4.****Management and planning** | All projects will need to demonstrate that they have an effective structure in place for managing the administration of the grant requested and demonstrate that they have a sound approach to planning to achieve their programme aims on time and within budget.**High scoring** applicants demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is aligned with industry best practice. A strong team will be identified and resourced to enable the project to deliver and grant funding to be administered correctly. Risks to the project management will be clearly identified alongside costed and detailed mitigations, providing a clear picture of the practicality and viability of the proposal.Value for money will be considered as well as good time management and clear and focused documentation of progress. | 20 |
| **5.****Value for Money** | All projects will need to demonstrate that they represent value for money for the taxpayer. This is demonstrated by providing appropriate budgets allocated to appropriate tasks providing significant outputs with excellent value for money.**High scoring** applicants will:* Demonstrate a cost-effective proposal.
* Demonstrate the added value that the investment will bring.
* Show that the proposed resource is sufficient to deliver in the proposed timelines.
* Show that the proposed work, level of proposed effort and overall expense is fair, reasonable and will deliver a cost-effective outcome.
* Present an appropriate amount of resource allocated to work packages.
* Make good use of existing project technology

/outputs /partners to maximise value for money and speed of delivery.* Not demonstrate any financial red flags.
* Use freely available data / platforms where possible.
 | 15 |

**Scoring Guidance**

The proposals will be scored on the scale of 1 to 10 for each criteria using the table below as a guide to the scale. The scores for each criteria will then be weighted using the percentages shown below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Assessment** |
| 0 | No response is offered in respect of the criteria. |
| 1 | An incomplete or very poor response, which fails to address the criteria; and/or the response is not credible, with no evidence to support the claims made meaning there is no confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘low scoring’ against the scoring criteria shown in the table above. |
| 2 | A poor response which only partially addresses the criteria and would require significant revision to become acceptable; and/or very limited, and inadequate, evidence to support the claims made meaning low confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘low scoring’ against the scoring criteria shown in the table above. |
| 4 | A limited response with deficiencies apparent against the criteria, requiring some revision to become acceptable; and/or limited evidence provided supporting the claims made meaning limited confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘low scoring’ against the scoring criteria. |
| 5 | An acceptable response which could have been expanded upon, with identified weaknesses correctable; and/or just sufficient evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning a reasonable confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘moderate scoring’ against the scoring criteria. |
| 7 | A good response which addresses the criteria well, with identified weaknesses readily correctable; and/or solid evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning a solid level of confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘moderate scoring’ against the scoring criteria. |
| 9 | A very good response which addresses the criteria very well with very few weaknesses; and/or good evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning a high level of confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ‘highest scoring’ against the scoring criteria. |
| 10 | An excellent response which is considered to absolutely address the criteria without weakness; and/or compelling evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning success is considered to be virtually assured; and/or the response is assessed as ‘highest scoring’ against the scoring criteria. |
|   |  |