



Technologies to Tools Assessment Panel: Scoring criteria

This document is intended as a guide for Panel members to score applications. It is essential that Panel members consider a range of factors when deciding on the overall score for a proposal.

1. Science/Technology Development and 3Rs potential

Panel members should consider both the excellence of the science/technology development proposed and how this will progress the technology/model towards [mTRL 5-7](#); and the likely 3Rs impact should the proposed development work be successful. In order to help Panel members determine a combined score for the scientific/technology development and 3Rs potential of an application, the NC3Rs uses the scoring system shown below.

2. Overall score

Panel members are asked to score the application from a range of 1 – 10, where one is the lowest score and ten is the highest. Scores should be whole numbers (0.5 integers are not accepted).

Proposals with a median score between seven and ten are considered fundable.

The scoring system should be used to determine the overall science/technology development and 3Rs score to give an application. Panel members should refer to Annex 1 for guidance when determining descriptors. The science/technology development and 3Rs descriptors should be used to form the basis of the overall score.

| SCIENCE and TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT | POTENTIAL 3Rs IMPACT | | | | |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|------|-----------------|
| | Exceptional | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Not competitive |
| Exceptional | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 5 |
| Excellent | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| Very Good | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| Good | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| Not competitive | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

The following table should be used as guidance when determining the appropriate science/technology development and 3Rs descriptors. It is not necessary to meet all of the individual criteria as this is not intended to be prescriptive but rather to provide a general framework.

| Science/Technology Development | 3Rs |
|--|---|
| <p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Excellent likelihood of success in meeting the deliverables (project feasible*, risks identified and well managed) ▪ Strong team providing excellent collaborative potential and significant contributions to deliver the project ▪ Significant scientific/industry opportunity with excellent dissemination and uptake plans ▪ Highly original and innovative ▪ Excellent value for money and potential for high return on investment ▪ Excellent potential for scale up | <p>Exceptional</p> <p>Potential to have a very high impact on the 3Rs e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacing/reducing a large number of animals ▪ Replacing/reducing animals undergoing severe procedures (even if numbers are low) ▪ Applicable to other models or disciplines ▪ Will have a local impact on animal use with a very high likelihood of adoption by other groups nationally/internationally** |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very good likelihood of success in meeting the deliverables (project feasible*, risks identified and sufficiently managed) ▪ Very good team providing good collaborative potential with excellent contributions to deliver the project ▪ Very good scientific/industry opportunity with excellent dissemination and uptake plans ▪ Original and innovative ▪ Robust methodology and design (innovative in parts) ▪ Very good value for money and potential for significant return on investment ▪ Very good potential for scale up | <p>Excellent</p> <p>Potential to have a high impact on the 3Rs e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacing/reducing a significant number of animals ▪ Replacing/reducing animals undergoing severe/moderate procedures (even if numbers affected are low) ▪ Could be applicable to other models or disciplines ▪ Will have a local impact on animal use with a high likelihood of adoption by other groups nationally/internationally** |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High likelihood of success in meeting the deliverables (project mostly feasible*, risks mostly identified and sufficiently managed) ▪ Good team with the potential to collaborate, providing appropriate contributions to deliver the project ▪ Good scientific/industry opportunity and dissemination and uptake plans ▪ Robust methodology and design ▪ Value for money and potential for return on investment ▪ Good potential for scale up | <p>Very Good</p> <p>Potential to have a medium impact on the 3Rs e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacing/reducing a significant number of animals ▪ Replacing/reducing animals undergoing moderate procedures (even if numbers affected are low) OR replacing/reducing a mild procedure where numbers are high ▪ Could be applicable to other models or disciplines ▪ Will have a local impact on animal use with the likelihood of adoption by other groups nationally/internationally** |
| <p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good likelihood of success in meeting the deliverables (project mostly feasible*, risks mostly identified but poorly managed) ▪ Good team that has potential for collaboration ▪ Acceptable scientific/industry opportunity and dissemination and uptake plans ▪ Methodologically sound approach ▪ Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal ▪ Potential for scale up | <p>Good</p> <p>Potential to have a medium to low impact on the 3Rs e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacing/reducing a modest number of animals ▪ Replacing/reducing a mild/unclassified procedure ▪ Not directly applicable to other models or disciplines ▪ Will have a local impact on animal use but unlikely to be adopted more widely** |
| <p>Not competitive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not likely to meet the deliverables ▪ Weak team and little potential for collaboration and contributions not likely to deliver the project ▪ Weak scientific/industry opportunity and dissemination and uptake plans ▪ Methodologically weak study ▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal ▪ Limited potential to scale up | <p>Not competitive</p> <p>Will have no (or a very low) impact on the 3Rs e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Will not replace/reduce any animal use ▪ Not applicable to other models or disciplines ▪ Will not have a local impact on animal use or be adopted by more widely** |

*Feasibility refers to, for example, scale of model development required (i.e. throughput, endpoint analysis, genetic tractability as well as freedom to operate)

**Local impact refers to within an applicant's own laboratory and/or institution