

## Interview Panel Scoring Guidance 2022

### Guidance details:

You are part of the final stage assessment process for this competition and your assessment of the projects should be based on all the pre-reading, live presentation material and final Q&A. Before the live presentation stage, you will have pre-read all the following documentation:

- Application form
- Appendices
- Assessor feedback from the written stage

### Scoring matrix

Please review the competition brief document prior to the panel. You should make your scoring decision based on a balance of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, it may not be appropriate for all aspects of the guidance/matrix below to be taken into account, this should not result in a demerit.

As with written scoring, a judgment call needs to be made based on your experience and expertise, using the matrix as a guide.

Your individual scores, arrived at after the final interview stage, will be based on the 3 sections outlined below. A total of 25 marks are available, plus your response to the final unscored question.

### Business Case Scoring Matrix

**Section 1** 'The business case', principally covered by questions **2, 5, 6** and **7** will be **scored out of 10**. Your score should reflect your assessment of the strength of this business case, based on the following inputs:

- **Question 2: Need or challenge**  
What is the business need, citizen challenge, technological challenge or market opportunity behind your innovation?
- **Question 5: Market awareness**  
What does the market you are targeting look like?
- **Question 6: Outcomes and route to market**  
How do you propose to grow your business and increase your productivity into the long term as a result of the project?
- **Question 7: Wider impacts**  
What impact might this project have outside the project team?

This scoring section relates to questions 2, 5, 6 & 7	
9-10	<p>There is a compelling business motivation for the project. There is a clear understanding of the nearest state-of-the-art available. The applicant has shown, if applicable, how the project will build on previous relevant work. Any wider factors influencing this opportunity are identified.</p> <p>The target market size, drivers and dynamics are fully quantified and evidenced. Where the market is new or unexplored, possible routes are identified based on precedents. Relevant secondary markets are substantiated and described in brief.</p> <p>Target customers are identified along with the value proposition to them. The routes to market and how profit, productivity and growth will increase is identified and evidenced. . The exploitation and/or dissemination of the main project outputs is outlined.</p> <p>The positive impact on others outside of the team is understood (supply chain partners, customers, broader industry, etc) Social, economic and/or environmental impacts are considered. Expected</p>

**Innovate UK Official Sensitive**

	regional impacts are described with compelling evidence to justify claims. Any possible negative impacts are fully mitigated where appropriate.
7-8	<p>There is a good motivation for the project. There is a good awareness of the nearest state-of-the-art and wider factors influencing the opportunity.</p> <p>There is a good awareness of the target market's drivers and dynamics. The market size is quantified with some evidence. For a new market, a good attempt is made at describing the possible routes to market and estimating the market size. Relevant secondary markets are described showing good awareness.</p> <p>Target customers are identified along with the value proposition to them. The routes to market and how profit, productivity and growth will increase is outlined with some evidence. The exploitation and/or dissemination of the main project outputs is outlined.</p> <p>There is good awareness of how the project may impact others outside of the team. . Expected regional impacts are described. Any possible negative impacts are partially mitigated where appropriate.</p>
5-6	<p>The project motivation is good but a lack of understanding of the nearest state-of-the-art or wider factors influencing this opportunity.</p> <p>The general market size and dynamics are understood but the addressable market is poorly quantified. Secondary markets are mentioned but little information is offered.</p> <p>Target customer types are described but the value proposition to them is less clear. There is some information about how profit, productivity or growth increases may be achieved at some point.</p> <p>There is basic awareness of how the project could impact some others outside the project. Some relevant stakeholders are not considered. Little mitigation is offered where there may be negative impacts.</p>
3-4	<p>Project motivation is poorly defined or not relevant to the applicant or team. References to the current state-of-the-art are not offered or are not relevant.</p> <p>Some information about the general market is offered but the extent of the addressable market for the project is not described. Secondary markets are barely mentioned.</p> <p>There is some information about the target customer types but there is little about the value proposition or how profit, productivity or growth will be affected.</p> <p>The applicant provides some information about possible impacts but significant gaps remain.</p>
1-2	<p>There is little or no business drive to the project. References to the current state-of-the-art are not offered or are not relevant.</p> <p>The market is poorly defined or is irrelevant to the motivations of the project.</p> <p>The applicant provides little or no information about the target customers.</p> <p>There is no information about how the project might impact others or the project would be detrimental to other UK interests.</p>

**Section 2** ‘The technical case’, principally covered by questions **3, 4, 8** and **9**, will be **scored out of 10**. Your score should reflect your assessment of the strength of this technical case based on the following inputs:

- **Question 3: Approach and innovation**  
What approach will you take and where will the focus of the innovation be?
- **Question 4: Team and resources**  
Who is in the project team and what are their roles?
- **Question 8: Project management**  
How will you manage the project effectively?
- **Question 9: Risks**  
What are the main risks for this project?

<b>This section relates to questions 3, 4, 8 &amp; 9</b>	
9-10	<p>The approach addresses the need, challenge or opportunity identified in Q1. The main innovations and risks are identified. Evidence is presented to show how the innovation and project outputs will differentiate from those of competitors. The project is significantly innovative either commercially or technically and will make a substantial contribution to the field. Solid evidence is presented to substantiate the level of innovation and freedom to operate.</p> <p>The applicant or consortium is well placed to carry out the project and exploit the results. There is a clear plan to obtain all the resources, equipment and facilities they will need. There is strong evidence that the consortium will work well.</p> <p>The project work packages are outlined with the research category, lead partner and total cost provided for each one. The approach to project management is described. The plan is designed to meet the objectives of the project in a realistic and efficient way. Any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.</p> <p>The key risks and uncertainties of the project are considered and mitigated. Critical inputs to the project are identified. Relevant constraints or conditions on the project outputs (regulatory requirements, certification or ethical issues) are identified. The risk analysis is appropriate and professional.</p>
7-8	<p>The project addresses the need or challenge and the main innovations and risks are highlighted. Evidence shows that the proposed development is innovative and that the applicant has the freedom to operate. It is demonstrated how the project outputs will differentiate from those of competitors.</p> <p>The applicant or consortium makes sense given the approach described in Q2. The applicant indicates how access will be obtained to all the resources, equipment and facilities they will need. The consortium is likely to work well.</p> <p>The project work packages are outlined with the research category, lead partner and total cost provided for each one. The approach to project management is stated. The plan seems appropriate to the project objectives. Any links or dependencies between work packages or milestones are identified.</p> <p>The key risks and uncertainties of the project are considered with appropriate mitigations. Relevant constraints or conditions on the project outputs are identified.</p>
5-6	<p>The project may address the need or challenge identified in Q1 and the innovations are highlighted. The level of innovation or freedom to operate is not strongly backed up with evidence. The main risks are not fully identified. Innovation focus is plausible and shows a link to improvements in competitiveness and/or productivity.</p> <p>The applicant or consortium has most, but not all, of the required skills and experience required. It is unclear whether or not the consortium will work well together</p>

**Innovate UK Official Sensitive**

	<p>The project work packages are outlined but there are some details missing. The plan seems reasonable but not tailored to the objectives of the project.</p> <p>Most major risks have been identified but there are some gaps or the mitigation and management is insufficient to properly control the risks.</p>
3-4	<p>The approach is poorly defined with an unconvincing link to the need or challenge identified in Q1. Improvement in competitiveness and/or productivity is not very convincing.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The plan has serious deficiencies or major missing aspects. The plan has little chance of meeting the objectives of the project.</p> <p>The risk analysis is poor or misses major areas of risk. The mitigation and management is poor.</p>
1-2	<p>The approach is not well defined or inconsistent with the need or challenge identified in Q1. There is no identification of how this will improve competitiveness.</p> <p>The applicant or consortium will not be capable of either carrying out the project or exploiting the results.</p> <p>The plan is totally unrealistic or fails to meet the objectives of the project.</p> <p>The risk analysis is superficial with minimal mitigation or management suggested.</p>

**Section 3** 'Funding and added value', principally covered by questions **10** and **11**, will be **scored out of 5**. Your score should reflect your assessment of the strength of the funding and added value in this project based on the following inputs:

- **Question 10: Added value**

Describe the impact that an injection of public funding would have on this project.

- **Question 11: 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?

<b>This section relates to questions 10 &amp; 11</b>	
5	<p>There is a compelling case for the positive difference funding will make. Alternative sources of support are described with an explanation of why they are discounted or used in conjunction with the grant funding. The project will significantly increase the industrial partners' R&amp;D spend during the project and afterwards.</p> <p>The project costs are entirely appropriate and represent excellent value for money compared to alternative approaches outlined (including doing nothing).. The partners have a clear idea of how they will finance their contribution. The balance of costs and grants between partners, and use of subcontractors is justified and reasonable for the proposed project.</p>
4	<p>The arguments for public funding are good and justified. The project will significantly increase the industrial partners' commitment to R&amp;D.</p> <p>The project costs are appropriate and should be sufficient to successfully complete the project. 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).</p>

**Innovate UK Official Sensitive**

3	<p>The public funding arguments are acceptable but the difference made by the grant will be modest. The project will improve the industrial partners' commitment to R&amp;D.</p> <p>The project costs seem ok but the justifications are not clear. 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.</p>
2	<p>The funding arguments are poor or not sufficiently justified. There is not likely to be any improvement to the industrial partner's commitment to R&amp;D.</p> <p>The project costs seem too high or too low given the proposed project. The split of costs and grants between partners is unbalanced, or inappropriate use is being made of subcontractors.</p>
1	<p>There is no justification for public funding and no reason why the applicant should not fund the work.</p> <p>The costs are not appropriate or justified. The balance between partners and subcontractors is not justified.</p>

**Final Question**

In addition to the above questions you will be asked a final 'yes' or 'no' question based on whether you recommend this project for funding, the answer to this should be based on your view of the application as a whole.

**Would you recommend this project for funding? – Yes / No**