

Assessing Matrix – Biomedical Catalyst Round 1 2023 competition

Gateway question	
YES	The application contains the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project SME led? Does it meet the scope of the competition as defined in the competition brief?
NO	One or more of the above requirements have not been satisfied.

Research category (refer to definitions in Guidance for Applicants)	
INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the selected research category of the proposed project align with the predominant activity of the project? If there are work packages at different levels of research to be funded at different intervention rates within the project have these been properly explained and are they correct?
EXPERIMENTAL DEVELOPMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this align with the competition research category of industrial research?
If the wrong research category has been selected by the applicant, please select the appropriate category and explain why.	

Section 1: The business proposition and project details:

1. Applicant location (not scored)
2. Project category (not scored)

3. What is the healthcare need that this project addresses and what impacts will your solution have? (600 words)	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant(s) has demonstrated an excellent and substantiated understanding of the commercialisation/exploitation opportunities for the project The proposal clearly articulates with very strong and detailed supporting evidence the healthcare need, and the extent to which the intended outputs of the project will satisfy customer demand The applicant(s) have described in depth how a successful outcome has the potential to provide a significant positive impact on current healthcare challenges
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant(s) has demonstrated a good understanding of the commercialisation/exploitation opportunities for the project using good supporting evidence The healthcare need and customer demand are identified and are central to the project's objectives The outcomes of the project have the potential to provide a positive impact on current healthcare challenges
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commercial opportunities have some potential, but this has not been expressed and evidenced in a satisfactory manner The business opportunity is plausible but not clearly expressed in terms of identified customer needs or demands There are potential positive healthcare needs and impacts however these are not well defined or limited in nature
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commercial opportunities and demand from the intended customer are unrealistic, limited or poorly defined with significant gaps and inadequately evidenced The links between project outcomes and healthcare impact are tenuous and not well supported or described
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no commercial drive to the project and no supporting evidence provided The outcomes of the project will not provide solutions to current healthcare challenges

4.. What is the underpinning scientific evidence to support the solution? (600 words) Refer to appendix A for supporting information, max 4 pages

9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal originates from an excellent scientific base The relevant prior scientific evidence has been fully identified, is innovative and of high impact potential The bridge to the proposed study is well justified with a valid hypothesis
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal originates from a good scientific base The underpinning science is strong, the results presented relevant and comprehensive The link between prior research and proposed study is clear and convincing
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The supporting scientific evidence is good with detail relevant to the proposal The rationale for conducting the study has some basis in the prior research and appears valid however there are gaps in the evidence
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The underpinning scientific evidence presented is fair but lacking in originality, incomplete or out of date The link of the underpinning evidence to the proposed study is weakly argued
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is scientifically weak Supporting evidence is limited and lacking a strong link to the proposed study

5.. What is innovative about this idea? (600 words)

9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is extremely innovative both commercially and scientifically The project will make a substantial contribution to the field Solid evidence is presented to substantiate the level of innovation, for example literature surveys, patent searches and competitor analyses The timeliness of the work is highlighted and explained in an industrial and/or academic context
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is innovative both commercially and scientifically The project is relevant to the market/patient need There is high confidence that there is freedom to operate
5-6	The project is innovative but there is a lack of presented evidence as to the freedom to operate
3-4	The project lacks sufficient innovation both technically and commercially
1-2	The project is either not innovative or there is no exploitable route due to previous IP

6.. What technical approach will be adopted and how will the project be managed? (600 words) Refer to Appendix B – Gantt Chart and Study Design, max 4 pages

9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project plan is fully described; clearly defines appropriate/realistic milestones and go/no-go decision points; and the Gantt chart reflects this adequately 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 The arrangements for project management are fully supported (If applicable) very strong and detailed supporting evidence is provided of the consortium's ongoing commitment The use of patients, animals or other tissues has been fully justified and is deemed appropriate
------	--

7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 The arrangements for project management are supported (If applicable) good supporting evidence is provided of the consortium's ongoing commitment The use of patients, animals or other tissues has been justified and is deemed appropriate
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Gaps in the management plan of the activities, and resource management profile No acknowledgement of alternative R&D strategies The arrangements for project management are not satisfactory (If applicable) supporting evidence of the consortium's ongoing commitment is not satisfactory The use of patients, animals or other tissues has only been partially justified
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project plan has serious deficiencies or major missing aspects The plan has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project There is little justification for the use of patients, animals, or tissues
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan is totally unrealistic or fails to meet the objectives of the project There is no justification of the use of patients, animals, or tissues and/or it is impossible to understand whether their use is appropriate from the information given

7.. Do the applicants have freedom to operate? (600 words)	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is detailed and assigned Details of the intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project are provided The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is thorough Freedom to operate is clear and fully evidenced
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is noted and assigned Intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project is included The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is appropriate There is high confidence that there is freedom to operate
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing IP which may affect the project delivery and exploitation is not fully captured Information on intellectual property to be generated as a result of the project is not satisfactory The strategy for protecting the knowledge arising from the project is not clear There is some evidence to substantiate the freedom to operate but the situation is not entirely clear
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence for freedom to operate is poorly presented or poorly understood by applicant.
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no exploitable route due to the presence of existing IP.

8.. How do the applicants intend to exploit the opportunity? (600 words) Refer to Appendix C – Exploitation Plan, max 4 pages	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principle exploitable outputs of the project are identified together Clear, realistic, and achievable plans of the next steps for commercial exploitation are clear The target market is well understood and potential barriers to commercial exploitation/adoption and strategies for overcoming these are detailed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ROI predictions are thoroughly evidenced
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main exploitable output of the project is identified, and a realistic approach defined Next steps in development and towards commercialisation are discussed and appropriate There is an awareness of potential barriers to exploitation/adoption ROI predictions are plausible
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next steps and exploitation approach are defined but lack detail There is limited understanding of target market Details on further development and plans for commercial exploitation are provided but are poor ROI predictions are implausible
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exploitation methods described are unrealistic or ill-defined
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exploitation method is missing or implausible and unlikely to succeed

9.. What are the risks (technical, commercial, and environmental) to project success? What is the projects risk management strategy? (600 words) Refer to Appendix C – Risk Register, max 2 pages	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key risks and uncertainties of the project are clearly identified in a detailed risk analysis, including the technical, regulatory, commercial, managerial, and environmental risks If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., 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
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key risks and uncertainties of the project are clearly identified in a risk analysis, including the technical, regulatory, commercial, managerial, and environmental risks If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., 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) The potential impact of these scenarios is appropriately demonstrated The applicant has defined reasonable mitigation of all significant and relevant risks
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are gaps in the risks and uncertainties of the project If appropriate, other uncertainties (e.g., 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 the all the risks identified
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The risk analysis is poor or misses major areas of risk The mitigation and management plans are poor
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The risk analysis is superficial There is minimal mitigation or management suggested

10.. Does the team have the right skills and experience and access to facilities to deliver the project and exploit it? (600 words)	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates excellent capability to deliver the project and to exploit the output Excellent knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is demonstrated For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are very clear the project has access to the optimal facilities for the project strong justification is provided to support the applicant's choices of any subcontractors

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor unequivocal evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates good capability in delivering the project and to exploit the output Sound knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is demonstrated For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are clear The project has access to the appropriate facilities The use of subcontractors is supported with justification to support the applicant's choices If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor solid evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expertise and track record of the project participants, including collaborators and subcontractors, demonstrates some capability in delivering the project and to exploit the output Knowledge of the supply chain and how the project relates is not conclusive For collaborations, the consortium's formation objectives are unclear The project does not have access to the appropriate facilities The use of subcontractors is poorly justified If the applicant is using a non-UK contractor, insubstantial evidence is provided to support a non-UK choice
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are notable gaps in the track record of the applicant(s) Evidence of the applicant(s) having access to the right skills and experience are unrealistic or poorly defined
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no supporting evidence that the applicant(s) 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

Section 2: Funding and added value:

11.. What are the resources required to deliver the project and their cost? (600 words) (see finance form for supporting information)	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant(s) 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(s) has clearly demonstrated with very strong and detailed supporting evidence the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project 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 The applicant has realistic plans for management of cash flow All large subcontracts have been fully justified, are appropriate and provide good value for money
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant(s) 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(s) has demonstrated with good supporting evidence the minimum amount necessary to deliver the project 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 The applicant has realistic plans for management of cash flow Subcontracts are well justified and appropriate

Innovate UK

5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant(s) 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 There may be some concerns on the appropriateness of subcontractors or other costs The match funding element is clearly described and accessible The applicant has indicated that funding will be available to cover cash flow
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of funding commitment required for the project is unrealistic (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
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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

12.. How does financial support from Innovate UK and its funding collaborators add value? (600 words)	
9-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will significantly increase the industrial partners' R&D spend during the project and afterwards The additionality arguments are very strong and believable
7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will increase the industrial partners' commitment to R&D The additionality arguments are good and justified
5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will improve the industrial partners' commitment to R&D The additionality arguments are just about acceptable
3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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
1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work should be funded internally and does not deserve state funding

Recommendation for Funding?

Do you believe this application is suitable for funding?	
YES	If you believe overall the proposed project is a good business proposition, is innovative, will be successfully delivered, will be effectively exploited, is value for money and public funding is justified.
NO	If there is a reason why the proposed project is a poor business proposition, is not innovative, would not be successfully delivered or exploited, is poor value for money or public funding is not justified.