

A programme of work to identify new product opportunities and resolve technical and cultural issues relevant to the bedding and pot plant sectors

Programme outcomes

Beneficiaries appropriately identified. Approach to deliver industry knowledge exchange (KE) and links to existing AHDB KE activities. Programme benefits and impact for industry identified. Appropriateness and clarity of industry engagement. Timeframe qualified to deliver impact. Clarification over additional activities/resource required to deliver impact. Environmental benefits appropriately identified and any negative impacts detailed. Key Performance Indicators identified. Clear IP exploitation plan where relevant. 0-10 score; weighting of 3

Technical approach and work plan

Evaluation of current knowledge (appropriate references used) and awareness of other work. Clarity of aims, objectives, trials and milestone schedule. Originality and innovation. Effective collaboration with commercial companies. Is the approach statistically robust? Feasibility and risk management. Is the range of KE employed including innovative approaches fully explained? Is project management addressed and sufficient? Are the timescales against the milestones described achievable? 0-10 score; weighting of 4

Relevant expertise

Knowledge and expertise. Quality of past contributions to, and impact on, the topic. Potential to bring added value through current and/or past contributions. Complementarities of expertise of the team. Is there sufficient industry contact capability within the team? Delivery record on previous AHDB funded work satisfactory. 0-10 score; weighting of 1

Programme costs

Are costs reasonable, clearly defined and necessary? Are the resources for time, equipment and management clearly identified, including a breakdown of time inputs by each member of the project team, and are resources sufficient to deliver the programme goals? Will the total budget be adequate to carry out the proposed activities? Added value of co-funding from other parties? 0-10 score; weighting of 2

Any proposal that scores less than 50% overall in the evaluation process will be rejected. AHDB reserves the right to liaise with the successful applicant to further develop proposal content as required.

For each of the four criteria under examination the following scoring system will be applied:

9-10 Excellent	Exceptional quality; cutting-edge; highly likely to produce benefits/impact of great importance to the industry; highly innovative; impactful KE activities proposed; applicant is widely recognized in the field with an outstanding record of accomplishment; consortium is strong across all technical areas needed to accomplish the proposed outcomes. Strongly recommend support
---------------------------------	---

<p>7-8</p> <p>Very good</p>	<p>High quality; potential to make an important contribution; innovative; likely to produce significant benefits/ impact for the industry; impactful KE activities proposed; applicant has a good reputation in the field; consortium appears to have more than adequate expertise across all technical areas required to deliver the proposed outcomes. Strongly recommend support</p>
<p>5-6</p> <p>Good</p>	<p>Interesting; innovative; likely to produce good benefits/impact; good grasp of appropriate KE activities; applicant has a solid reputation in the field; consortium appears to have adequate expertise across all technical areas required to deliver the proposed outcomes. Should be supported</p>
<p>3-4</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p>Interesting but little originality; likelihood of making significant impact is small; may require significant additional investment to deliver benefits; applicant/team lacks experience, has not established leadership in the field or demonstrated the potential to make impactful contributions. Support may be considered if strong in other areas</p>
<p>1-2</p> <p>Poor</p>	<p>Poor quality; not well planned; lacking expertise; not feasible; unlikely to make an important contribution to fundamental or applied knowledge; unlikely to produce benefits/impact; lacking convincing evidence that the proposing team has sufficient and appropriate expertise to accomplish all of the tasks as outlined in the proposal. Should not be supported</p>
<p>0</p> <p>Very poor</p>	<p>Very poor quality; duplicative of other work; fails to address the issues; no evidence for demand; cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information. Should not be supported</p>