

Non-animal methods Infrastructure awards: scoring criteria

Table 1 should be used as guidance when assessing applications. It is essential that Board members consider a range of factors when deciding on the score for a proposal. The score should be a whole number between 1 and 10 where 1 is the lowest score and 10 is the highest. Please note that 0.5 integers are not permitted. The Table is not intended to be prescriptive but should rather act as a general framework and guide for assessing and scoring applications. Applications that address an area of high strategic importance to the NC3Rs, and score within the fundable range, may receive an uplift in the recommendations for funding.

When assessing the potential of the proposal to replace the use of animal studies please consider the following questions:

- What is the likely scale of the replacement of animal use to result from the proposed project?
- How broad is the scope of the animal replacement impact? Will the proposal achieve this impact at a laboratory, institute, cross-institutional level?
- Does the proposal address a realistic barrier to the use of non-animal methods?
- Does the infrastructure requested have broader applicability?

Table 1: Scoring criteria

| Score Indicators | Score |
|--|---|
| <p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crucial need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Outstanding potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ World-leading team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Very high potential to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Outstanding plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Excellent value for money – resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or responsible research and innovation (RRI) issues fully considered. | <p>10</p> <p>Highest Priority for funding</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crucial need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Excellent potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Outstanding team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Very high potential to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Outstanding plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Excellent value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. | <p>9</p> <p>Very high priority for funding</p> |
| <p>Excellent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Excellent potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Excellent team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Excellent plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Very good value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. | <p>8</p> <p>High priority for funding</p> |
| <p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Very good potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Strong team and environment – capable to deliver the project. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Very good plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Good value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. | <p>7</p> <p>Fundable</p> |
| <p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. | <p>6</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |

| | |
|---|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Good team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery – reasonable risk management plans. ▪ Potential to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Good plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues well considered. | |
| <p>Average</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Good potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Solid team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Reasonable likelihood of successful delivery, but some concerns with risk management plans. ▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Reasonable plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources appropriate and justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered. | <p>5</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Below average</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Low potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Reasonable team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans. ▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Unclear plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources mostly appropriate and justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered. | <p>4</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Low potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Unclear track record of the team and environment – may be capable to deliver the project. ▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans. | <p>3</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Unclear plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources mostly appropriate. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues partially considered. | |
| <p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ Very low potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Lack of track record of the team and environment – unclear on capability to deliver the project. ▪ Low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans. ▪ Unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific community. ▪ Weak plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the project. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered, or concerns raised. | <p>2</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Very Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for the resource/equipment to the host organisation and/or wider scientific community. ▪ No potential for the replacement of animal use. ▪ Lack of track record of the team and environment – unlikely to be capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans. ▪ Highly unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or for uptake of the non-animal method(s) in the wider scientific. ▪ No plans for sustainability of the infrastructure post award. ▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the project. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered or serious concerns raised. | <p>1</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Not in remit for funding (for Office use only)</p> | <p>0</p> |