



12 October 2026

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information request: FOI2026/00830

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 15 September in which you requested the following:

Your request:

I request clarity concerning some of the principles used in the assessment of applications to the recent CAM Pathfinder: Enable and CAM Pathfinder: Demonstrate competitions. They seem to differ from those of other Innovate UK competitions, with some aspects not aligning with best practice recommendations in GovS 015.

Questions

1. For each of these competitions, please provide the following information:
 - a) number of applications submitted. How many passed the written assessment stage?
 - b) the interview score of the highest and lowest scoring applications that were funded
 - c) the interview score of the highest and lowest scoring applications that were not funded
2. The Enable competition stated "UK Government will invest up to £15 million to fund up to six projects from this competition. This is subject to a sufficient number of high quality applications being received."
 - a) how many projects were funded from this competition?
 - b) what was the total grant value of projects funded?
 - c) from the interview stage, how many applications were considered to be of sufficiently high quality to be funded?
3. The Demonstrate competition stated "UK Government will invest up to £20 million to fund up to fifteen projects from this competition. This is subject to a sufficient number of high quality applications being received."
Please respond to the same three questions as in 2 above.
4. Was a 'top-down' approach used for selection within these two competitions? Or were portfolio criteria used? If the latter, please say what those criteria were and how they were made known to applicants.
5. Government Functional Standard GovS015, Section 5: Competition for Funding Para 30 states: "It is best practice to add weightings to the assessment criteria, as part of the details of the scheme, to signal their relative importance and help applicants to focus their efforts appropriately."

For some competitions, Innovate UK provides links to assessor guidance criteria, but with no explanation of the weightings that will be used.

However, for the two competitions under discussion, neither assessor guidance criteria nor explanation of any weightings were evident. I am concerned by this apparent lack of consistency and transparency.

Perhaps there are good reasons why IUK did not follow best practice recommendations for the CAM Pathfinder: Enable and Demonstrate competitions, but I believe it is in the public interest to know what these reasons were.

Does Innovate UK intend to comply fully and consistently with the recommendations of GovS015 Section 5 Para 30? If so, please indicate a time-scale for this to be implemented.

Our response:

I can confirm that UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) does hold information relevant to your request. Please see the information below requested at questions 1-3 on applications, assessment and awards, and a response to your questions asked about the competitions.

Questions 1-3: CAM Pathfinder: Enable and CAM Pathfinder: Demonstrate competition data

Question	CAM Pathfinder: Enable	CAM Pathfinder: Demonstrate
Number of applications submitted	13	39
Passed written assessment (invited to interview)	9	23
Highest interview score of funded applications	86.4%	88.0%
Lowest interview score of funded applications	81.6%	59.2%
Highest interview score of unfunded applications	80.4%	82.4%
Lowest interview score of unfunded applications	56.8%	44.0%
Total funded projects	2	7
Total grant value of funded projects	£7,176,967	£10,246,216
Number of applications considered to be of sufficiently high quality to be funded from interview stage	7	17

Question 4: Was a 'top-down' approach used for selection within these two competitions? Or were portfolio criteria used? If the latter, please say what those criteria were and how they were made known to applicants.

For [CAM Pathfinder: Enable](#)¹, a top-down approach was used.

For [CAM Pathfinder: Demonstrate competition](#)², the published competition guidance stated that funding allocations could be adjusted to reflect policy changes, portfolio considerations, or wider government funding decisions. As these circumstances applied, funding decisions were made using a portfolio approach and affordability considerations. Projects were prioritised based on a range of factors, including assessment scores, alignment with the priority technologies set out in the competition scope, strategic importance to the automotive sector, growth potential and, for Enable projects, value for money.

Question 5: Government Functional Standard GovS015, Section 5: Competition for Funding Para 30 states: "It is best practice to add weightings to the assessment criteria, as part of the details of the scheme, to signal their relative importance and help applicants to focus their efforts appropriately."

For some competitions, Innovate UK provides links to assessor guidance criteria, but with no explanation of the weightings that will be used.

However, for the two competitions under discussion, neither assessor guidance criteria nor explanation of any weightings were evident. I am concerned by this apparent lack of consistency and transparency.

Perhaps there are good reasons why IUK did not follow best practice recommendations for the CAM Pathfinder: Enable and Demonstrate competitions, but I believe it is in the public interest to know what these reasons were.

Does Innovate UK intend to comply fully and consistently with the recommendations of GovS015 Section 5 Para 30? If so, please indicate a time-scale for this to be implemented.

¹ <https://apply-for-innovation-funding.service.gov.uk/competition/2318/overview/39cd0e04-6f9c-40da-b0be-8eaae7f1603d>

² <https://apply-for-innovation-funding.service.gov.uk/competition/2315/overview/f02885bb-e043-4a60-8d0c-22242bd77fa9>

GovS015 states that the use of weightings is best practice rather than a mandatory requirement; some programmes publish these weightings, others do not. For the CAM Pathfinder Enable and Demonstrate competitions, assessment criteria were published without weightings to maintain consistency with adjacent Department for Business, Innovation, Science & Trade (BIST) programme approaches.

Your rights

If you have any queries regarding our response please do let us know. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review, explaining which elements of this decision you disagree with and why. Internal review requests should be submitted within 40 working days of the date of our response and should be addressed to:

Head of Information Governance

Email: foi@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: www.ico.org.uk.

If you wish to raise a complaint regarding the service you have received or the conduct of any UKRI staff in relation to your request, please see [UKRI's complaints procedure](#)³.

Yours sincerely,


Information Governance
Information Rights Team
UK Research and Innovation
foi@ukri.org | dataprotection@ukri.org

³ <https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/contact-us/make-a-complaint/#skipnav-target>