

## NC3Rs networks – Business Interaction Vouchers: 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.

When assessing the potential of the proposal to achieve a 3Rs impact, please consider the following questions:

- Will the proposal replace/reduce animal use by a significant number of animals?
- Will the proposal refine a severe/moderate procedure (even if the number of animals affected is low) OR refine a mild procedure where animal numbers are high?
- How broad is the scope of the 3Rs impact? Will the proposal achieve a 3Rs impact at a local, national and/or international level?
- Could the outcomes be applicable to other models/research areas?
- What is the overall potential 3Rs impact?
- How instrumental is the partnership to delivering these 3Rs impacts?

Score Indicators	Score
<b>Exceptional</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is timely, important and of exceptional quality, with a robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Outstanding potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ World-leading team and research environment – providing exceptional collaborative potential and highly capable to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed.</li> <li>▪ Very high potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Excellent value for money and potential for high return on investment – significant in kind contributions.</li> </ul>	10  Highest Priority for funding

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or responsible research and innovation (RRI) issues fully considered.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is timely, important and of outstanding quality, with a robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Excellent potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Outstanding team and research environment – providing excellent collaborative potential and contributions to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed.</li> <li>▪ Very high potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Excellent value for money and potential for high return on investment.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered.</li> </ul>	<p>9</p> <p>Very high priority for funding</p>
<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is timely and of excellent quality, with a robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Excellent potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Excellent team and research environment – providing very good collaborative potential and contributions to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed.</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific.</li> <li>▪ Very good value for money and potential for significant return on investment.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered.</li> </ul>	<p>8</p> <p>High priority for funding</p>
<p><b>Very Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is timely and of very good quality, with a robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Very good potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Strong team and research environment – providing very good collaborative potential and contributions to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ High likelihood of successful delivery – risks well managed.</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific.</li> </ul>	<p>7</p> <p>Fundable</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Good value for money and potential for return on investment.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues fully considered.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is worthwhile and of good quality, with a robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Good potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Good team and research environment – providing good collaborative potential and contributions to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery – reasonable risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues well considered.</li> </ul>	<p>6</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Average</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is worthwhile and of average quality, with a sound methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Partially relevant to the BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Good potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Solid team and research environment – providing reasonable collaborative potential and likely capable to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Reasonable likelihood of successful delivery, but some concerns with risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Below average – Potentially useful but with significant weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is likely worthwhile, with a predominantly sound methodology and design but areas require revision.</li> <li>▪ Partially relevant to BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Low potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Reasonable team and research environment – providing some collaborative potential and likely capable to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p> <p>Unfundable</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resources mostly appropriate to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues adequately considered.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Major weaknesses – Potentially useful but with major weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is potentially worthwhile but outcomes not well defined, areas of the methodology and design require revision.</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Low potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Unclear track record of the team and research environment – low collaborative potential and limited capability to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery – limited risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Resources mostly appropriate to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues partially considered.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Poor – Poor quality proposal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is potentially worthwhile but outcomes not well defined, the methodology and design are flawed.</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Very low potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Lack of track record of the team and weak research environment – unclear collaborative potential and capability to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific community.</li> <li>▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered, or concerns raised.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p> <p>Unfundable</p>

<p><b>Very Poor – Unacceptable quality</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Underpinning science is poorly defined or duplicative, with a flawed methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ No potential for 3Rs impacts.</li> <li>▪ Lack of track record of the team and weak research environment – unlikely to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Very low likelihood of successful delivery – very limited or no risk management plans.</li> <li>▪ Highly unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the approach in the wider scientific.</li> <li>▪ Resources inappropriate to deliver the project.</li> <li>▪ Data, ethical and/or RRI issues not considered or serious concerns raised.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p>Not in remit for funding (for Office use only)</p>	<p>0</p>