

Non-animal derived product validation grants: scoring criteria

Table 1 should be used as guidance when assessing applications. It is essential that Panel 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-derived products and reagents within research and testing 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 derived products or reagents?
- What is the broader applicability of the non-animal derived product or reagent being studied?

Table 1: Scoring criteria

| Score Indicators | Score |
|---|---|
| <p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crucial need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Outstanding potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Outstanding underpinning science; robust methodology and design. ▪ World-leading team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Very high potential to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Outstanding plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ Excellent value for money – resources appropriate and fully justified. | <p>10</p> <p>Highest Priority for funding</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data, ethical and/or responsible research and innovation (RRI) issues fully considered. | |
| <p>Outstanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crucial need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Excellent potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Excellent underpinning science; robust methodology and design. ▪ Outstanding team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Very high potential to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Outstanding plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ 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 characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Excellent potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Excellent underpinning science; robust methodology and design. ▪ Excellent team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ High potential to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Excellent plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ 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 characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Very good potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Very good underpinning science; robust methodology and design. ▪ Strong team and environment – capable to deliver the project. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ High potential to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Very good plans for disseminating the findings of the project. | <p>7</p> <p>Fundable</p> |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. | |
| <p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Good potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Good underpinning science; sound methodology and design. ▪ Good team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery – reasonable risk management plans. ▪ Potential to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Good plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ Resources appropriate and fully justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues well considered. | <p>6</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Average</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Limited need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Good potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Solid underpinning science; sound methodology and design. ▪ 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 build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Reasonable plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ 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 characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Low potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Underpinning science potentially worthwhile; predominantly methodologically sound study but areas require revision. ▪ Reasonable team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans. ▪ Unclear if would build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Unclear plans for disseminating the findings of the project. | <p>4</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Resources mostly appropriate and justified. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered. | |
| <p>Fair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Low potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Underpinning science potentially worthwhile; predominantly methodologically sound study but areas require revision. ▪ 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. ▪ Unclear if would build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Unclear plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ Resources mostly appropriate. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues partially considered. | <p>3</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |
| <p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for the characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ Very low potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Underpinning science poorly defined; methodologically weak. ▪ 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 build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ Weak plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ 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 characterisation and validation of the non-animal derived reagent(s) and product(s) being studied. ▪ No potential for the replacement of animal-derived products or reagents. ▪ Underpinning science poorly defined or flawed; methodologically flawed. ▪ Lack of track record of the team and environment – unlikely to be capable to deliver the project. | <p>1</p> <p>Unfundable</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Very low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans. ▪ Highly unlikely to build further confidence in the use of the non-animal derived reagent(s) or product(s) or for demonstrating that they are fit-for-purpose. ▪ No plans for disseminating the findings of the project. ▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the project. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered or serious concerns raised. | |
| Not in remit for funding (for Office use only) | 0 |