

CDC Grant Programme 2025

Applications will be scored on the following criteria:

Scoring and assessment criteria for the panel (<i>total score 4-20</i>)				
1. Does the proposed project exploit innovative ideas to support one of the 3 thematic areas? (1-5) You should consider if the project is using innovative methods, ideas or approaches to research to address the thematic areas. Have they shown good awareness of the LCR data environment, the key stakeholder and any inherent risks from their innovation. Will the project bring benefits to the LCR? Where partners are present please consider partner engagement and how they contribute to the project outcomes.				
1. Poor (<i>un-fundable</i>)	2. Lacking (<i>un-fundable</i>)	3. Reasonable (<i>might be fundable</i>)	4. Good (<i>fundable</i>)	5. Excellent (<i>fundable</i>)
The project does not clearly support a theme is out of scope of the programme	The project only partly supports a theme or has shown only limited awareness of core issues involved in the programme	The project is fairly innovative and represents reasonable support for a key theme	The project is innovative and will provide good support for a key theme	The project is highly innovative and will strongly support a key theme
2. How strong is the project plan overall (1-5) You should consider if the workplan is clear and achievable. Will implementation lead to the stated objectives being accomplished within the specified time frame, what is the likelihood of success? Where partners are present, you should also consider if the involvement of the non-HEI partner strengthens the project overall and substantially contributes to the anticipated outcomes.				
1. Poor (<i>un-fundable</i>)	2. Lacking (<i>un-fundable</i>)	3. Reasonable (<i>might be fundable</i>)	4. Good (<i>fundable</i>)	5. Excellent (<i>fundable</i>)
The project plan is poor, unclear or unachievable and therefore project is unlikely to succeed	The project plan is unsatisfactory, lacks clarity or could be unachievable, and therefore project is less likely to succeed.	The project plan is reasonably clear and reasonably achievable, and therefore project has a reasonable chance of succeeding.	The project plan is clear and seems to be achievable, and therefore project is fairly likely to succeed.	The workplan is very clear and achievable, and therefore project is very likely to succeed.
3. Are project outputs likely to deliver demonstrable and sustainable impact within a reasonable timeframe?				

Supported by:



Funded by:



CDC Grant Programme 2025

You should consider if the project will likely lead to or support applications for further funding or impact creation, and that a reasonable pathway to further impact beyond the project has been developed? Is a specific scheme identified and are the plans clearly set out and realistic? Consider how implementable this follow on activity would be. Will impact be scaled up and/or become sustainable (through influencing policy, commercialization, social venture, external funding etc)

1. Poor (un-fundable)	2. Lacking (un-fundable)	3. Reasonable (might be fundable)	4. Good (fundable)	5. Excellent (fundable)
Project either unlikely to lead to further impact or these opportunities are not clearly scoped	Project either less likely to lead to impact or these opportunities are only partially scoped	Project has reasonable potential for further impact and these opportunities are reasonably well scoped	Project is quite likely to lead to further impact and these opportunities are well scoped	Project is very likely to lead to further impact and these opportunities are very well scoped

4. Value for money (1-5)

Is there any in-kind or cash contributions which overall strengthen the application? Are the overall costs realistic and well justified? What contribution is the CDC expected to make relative to any partner, if applicable?

1. Poor (un-fundable)	2. Lacking (un-fundable)	3. Reasonable (might be fundable)	4. Good (fundable)	5. Excellent (fundable)
Either costs are unjustified, partner contributions are imbalanced or it has a poor potential as a catalyst, and therefore it represents poor value for money	Either costs are hard to justify, partner contributions are questionable or project has limited potential to be a catalyst, and therefore it probably doesn't represent best value for money	Project represents reasonable value for money because costs and/or contributions are reasonable and justifiable, and there is some potential for this project to be a catalyst	Project represents good value for money because costs and/or contributions are reasonable and justifiable, and there is fair potential for this project to be a catalyst	The project represents significant value for money because costs and/or contributions are reasonable and justifiable, and there is good potential for this project to be a catalyst

5. In your opinion, should the proposed project be funded? (YES / MAYBE / NO)

Supported by:



Funded by:

