

Transport Research and Innovation Grant Programme 2021

Scoring Criteria

Question	Score				
Challenge – 25%	2	4	6	8	10
Challenge identification	The project team has not identified a transport challenge, or the challenge is poorly described with little evidence	The project team has identified a transport challenge that is described with limited detail and lacks evidence	The project team has identified a transport challenge that is adequately described with some supporting evidence	The project team has identified a transport challenge that is well described with good supporting evidence	The project team has identified a transport challenge that is described in a high level of detail with substantial supporting evidence
Challenge alignment	The challenge has weak links to department priorities and is not a significant barrier to transport	The challenge has some links to department priorities and a low potential of being a barrier to transport	The challenge has links to department priorities and could represent a barrier to transport	The challenge is a priority for the department and is understood to be a barrier to transport	The challenge is a high priority for the department and is acknowledged as a major barrier to transport
Innovation – 25%	2	4	6	8	10
Description of innovation	The innovation is poorly described	The innovation is described with limited detail	The innovation is described in adequate detail	The innovation is described with a good level of detail	The innovation is described with a high level of detail
Understanding and evidence of innovation	The project team fail to explain how the project is innovative	The project team shows some attempt to articulate how their project is innovative, but this lacks evidence	The project team have articulated in adequate detail how their project innovation meets the challenge identified	The project team show a good understanding of why their project is innovative and meets the challenge with	The project team have provided a strong case as to how their innovation meets the challenge and provide

		and shows a lack of knowledge and understanding of the challenge area		some supporting evidence	solid supporting evidence
Project Management – 10%	2	4	6	8	10
Project planning	There is a poor project plan with limited detail No Gantt Chart is provided	The project plan provides some detail on the project timelines, including limited evidence to suggest the project can be delivered effectively A Gantt Chart is provided but lacks detail	The project plan provides adequate detail and evidence to suggest the project can be delivered effectively A Gantt Chart is provided with adequate detail	The project plan provides good detail of how the project will be delivered effectively with good supporting evidence A comprehensive and detailed Gantt Chart is provided	The project plan is highly credible and provides confidence that the project will be delivered effectively with strong supporting evidence A comprehensive and detailed Gantt Chart is provided
Deliverables, milestones and risk	Little or no details are given of the aims and objectives, milestones, deliverables or the team No information provided on risks	Lack of detail provided on work packages, deliverables, project team and milestones identified Limited or insufficient information on risks	Adequate detail provided on work packages, deliverables, project team and milestones clearly shown An assessment of risks and a cursory consideration of mitigating measures	There is a compressive level of detail of milestones, project team, and an assessment of risks Suitable risk mitigation measures are given. The project team's skills and expertise are noted in sufficient detail	The plan clearly conveys the aims and objectives, deliverables, timescales, milestones and skill of project team Comprehensive risks are identified and suitable mitigation measures are given
Exploitation 15%	2	4	6	8	10
Market understanding	Project team shows little understanding of	Project team shows some understanding of	Project team shows an adequate	Project team shows good understanding of	Project team shows excellent

	relevant market, and lacks detail on aspects including market value and importance	relevant market, but lacks detail on aspects including market value and importance	understanding of relevant market, including market value and importance	relevant market, including market value and importance	understanding of relevant market, including market value and importance
Opportunity and route to market	The project's market opportunity and a route to market is poorly described with limited detail and understanding	The project's market opportunity and a route to market is described but with limited detail and market understanding	The project's market opportunity is adequately understood and a route to market is described	The project's market opportunity is understood and described and a route to market is well described	The project's market opportunity is comprehensively understood and described and an achievable route to market is well described
Impact – 15%	2	4	6	8	10
Outcomes	No detail is provided on the desired outcomes the project will have and how these will be measured	Some (albeit limited) detail is provided on the desired outcomes the project will have and how progress against them will be measured	There is an adequate level of detail provided on the desired outcomes of the project and how progress against these will be measured	There is a good level of detail provided on the desired outcomes of the project and how progress against these will be measured	There is a high level of detail provided on the desired outcomes of the project and how progress against these will be measured
Impacts	There no detail provided on the desired impacts the project will have and how progress against these will be measured	There is limited detail provided on the desired impacts the project will have and how progress against these will be measured	There is adequate detail provided on the desired impacts the project will have and how progress against these will be measured	There is a good level of detail provided on the desired impacts the project will have and how progress against these will be measured	There is a high level of detail provided on the desired impacts the project will have and how progress against these will be measured
Alignment to DfT priorities	No detail on how the desired outcomes and impacts of the project align with DfT priorities	Some limited information on how the desired outcomes and impacts of the project align with DfT priorities	Adequate information provided on how the desired outcomes and impacts of the project align with DfT priorities	A good level of information provided on how the desired outcomes and impacts of the project align with DfT priorities	A high level of information provided on how the desired outcomes and impacts of the project align with DfT priorities

Project Finances – 10%	2	4	6	8	10
Project costs	The project cost information provided is limited and lacking detail	The project cost information provided is limited	The project cost information provided is adequate	The project cost information given is comprehensive	The project cost information given demonstrates elements of value-add and is fully justified
Value for money	The information provided does not represent value for money	A breakdown of costs is provided that demonstrates elements of value for money	It demonstrates adequate value for money and there is sensible breakdown of information	It demonstrates good value for money and there is sensible breakdown of the information	It demonstrates excellent value for money and there is clear breakdown and justified set of information
Resource costs	Staff costs/ day rates are well-above the expected market rates The number of staff days are very low relative to other projects. No detail provided on staff, material or sub-contract costs	Staff costs/ day rates are high compared to market rates Number of staff days are low relative to other projects. Limited detail provided on staff, material or sub-contract costs	Staff costs/ day rates are a fair reflection of market rates Number of staff days are adequate. Sufficient detail provided on staff, material or sub-contract costs	Staff costs/ day rates are competitive vs. market rates Number of staff days demonstrates VfM. Number of staff days are adequate. Good detail provided on staff, material or sub-contract costs	Staff costs/ day rates are very competitive vs market rates Number of staff days demonstrates VfM. Clear and concise detail provided on staff, material or sub-contract costs Evidence of in-kind contributions to the project provided