National Centre
for the Replacement
Refinement & Reduction
of Animals in Research

Partnerships and Impact Awards: Scoring criteria

The following table 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. 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 achieve a 3Rs impact, please consider the following questions:

- What is the likely scale of the impact, in terms of the number of animals and/or the severity of the approach to be replaced, reduced or refined?

- How broad is the scope of the 3Rs impact? Will the proposal achieve a 3Rs impact at a local, national and/or international level?

- How likely is the proposed project to achieve a 3Rs impact within the lifetime of the award?

Score Indicators	Score
Exceptional - Underpinning science is timely, important and of exceptional quality, with a robust methodology and design. - Proposed partnership(s) well defined with exceptional knowledge and skills transfer plans – the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). - Very likely to achieve a significant and immediate 3Rs impact. - World-leading team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. - Exceptional dissemination plans – very high potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. - Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. - Data, ethical and/or responsible research and innovation (RRI) issues fully considered. - Excellent value for money – resources appropriate and fully justified.	10 Highest Priority for funding

Outstanding ▪ Underpinning science is timely, important and of outstanding quality, with a robust methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) well defined with excellent knowledge and skills transfer plans – the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Very likely to achieve a significant and immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Outstanding team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Excellent dissemination plans – very high potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. ▪ Excellent value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified.	9 Very high priority for funding
Excellent ▪ Underpinning science is timely and of excellent quality, with a robust methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) well defined with excellent knowledge and skills transfer plans – the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Highly likely to achieve a substantial and immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Excellent team and environment – highly capable to deliver the project. ▪ Excellent dissemination plans – high potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. ▪ Very good value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified.	8 High priority for funding
Very Good ▪ Underpinning science is timely and of very good quality, with a robust methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) well defined with very good knowledge and skills transfer plans – the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Highly likely to achieve a substantial and immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Strong team and environment – capable to deliver the project. ▪ Very good dissemination plans – high potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered. ▪ Good value for money, resources appropriate and fully justified.	7 Fundable
Good	6

▪ Underpinning science is worthwhile and of good quality, with a robust methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) adequately defined with good knowledge and skills transfer plans – likely that the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Likely to achieve a good and immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Good team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Satisfactory dissemination plans – potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery – reasonable risk management plans. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues well considered. ▪ Resources appropriate and fully justified.	Unfundable
Average ▪ Underpinning science is worthwhile and of average quality, with a sound methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) adequately defined with reasonable knowledge and skills transfer plans – likely that the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Likely to achieve an immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Solid team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Average dissemination plans – limited potential for further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ Reasonable likelihood of successful delivery, but some concerns with risk management plans. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered. ▪ Resources appropriate and justified.	5 Unfundable
Below average ▪ Underpinning science is likely worthwhile, with a predominantly sound methodology and design. ▪ Proposed partnership(s) not well defined with limited knowledge and skills transfer plans – unclear whether the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). ▪ Potential to achieve a limited immediate 3Rs impact. ▪ Reasonable team and environment – likely capable to deliver the project. ▪ Limited dissemination plans – low likelihood of further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. ▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans. ▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered. ▪ Resources mostly appropriate and justified.	4 Unfundable
Fair	3

	- Underpinning science is potentially worthwhile, but areas of the methodology and design require revision. - Proposed partnership(s) not well defined with limited knowledge and skills transfer plans – unclear whether the 3Rs approach will be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). - Low likelihood of achieving an immediate 3Rs impact. - Unclear track record of the team and environment – may be capable to deliver the project. - Limited dissemination plans – low likelihood of further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined. - Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans. - Data, ethical and/or RRI issues partially considered. - Resources mostly appropriate.	Unfundable
Poor		2
	- Underpinning science is potentially worthwhile, but the methodology and design are flawed. - Proposed partnership(s) poorly defined with weak knowledge and skills transfer plans – 3Rs approach unlikely to be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). - Unlikely to achieve an immediate 3Rs impact. - Lack of track record of the team and environment – unclear on capability to deliver the project. - Poor dissemination plans – further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined are unlikely. - Low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans. - Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered, or concerns raised. - Resources inappropriate to deliver the project	Unfundable
Very Poor		1
	- Underpinning science is poorly defined or duplicative, with a flawed methodology and design. - Proposed partnership(s) very poorly defined with inadequate knowledge and skills transfer plans – 3Rs approach highly unlikely to be transferred and adopted into new research setting(s). - No immediate 3Rs impact or highly unlikely to achieve an immediate 3Rs impact. - Lack of track record of the team and environment – unlikely to be capable to deliver the project. - Very poor dissemination plans – further collaboration(s) and 3Rs impacts beyond the partnership(s) outlined are highly unlikely. - Low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans. - Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered or serious concerns raised. - Resources inappropriate to deliver the project.	Unfundable

Not in remit for funding (for Office use only)	0