Dear [Name]

Freedom of Information request: 2018/0067

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request submitted on the 28th June 2018 in which you requested the following:

Your Request:

We would appreciate if you could give us more information relative on the competitions 1 and 2 above on the following subjects:

1. The overall score of our applications is higher than 75%. We would like to know what was the cut-off score for Competition 1 and 2 above (in order to know how likely are we to win the competition if we apply again)
2. Do micro-SMEs and other organisations have different cut-offs?
3. Is the cut-off score the only parameter to decide the success of an application for an SME? (i.e. for the same competition, if the cut-off is 76%, an SME requesting £500k with a score of 77% will get funded, while an SME requesting £50k will not get funded with a score of 74%?)
4. For the 'same' project we applied 2 times as follows. From our current feedback, the only slightly negative points appear to be the marketing awareness, but as it seems that we applied 2 times, we cannot re-apply again. What qualifies as resubmission? We changed the number of partners and funding requested, as well as the trials methods/approaches in the projects. Can we assume to be different projects? What is your 'objective' criteria for further applications in excess of the two to be allowed?

Our response:

I can confirm that we do hold this information that you have requested.

Please find the answer to your enquiries below:
1. The overall score of our applications is higher than 75%. We would like to know what was the cut-off score for Competition 1 and 2 above (in order to know how likely are we to win the competition if we apply again)

Strand 2 Emerging and Enabling competition:

The strand 2 Emerging and Enabling technologies competition took a portfolio approach. As this is the case it is best represented as below, which shows the breakdown of the lowest funded score for each innovation area and duration block.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation Area</th>
<th>0-12 month</th>
<th>13-24 month</th>
<th>25-36 month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative industries</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital technologies</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic sensors and photonics</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robotics and autonomous systems</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite applications</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Digital Health Technology catalyst round 2 competition:

We are unable to disclose this information as notifications have not yet been sent to all applicants.

2. Do micro-SMEs and other organisations have different cut-offs?

The quality threshold is applicable to everyone in a competition and does not differ based on organisation size.

3. Is the cut-off score the only parameter to decide the success of an application for an SME? (i.e. for the same competition, if the cut-off is 76%, an SME requesting £500k with a score of 77% will get funded, while an SME requesting £50k will not get funded with a score of 74%?)

Within each competition Innovate UK reserves the right to apply a portfolio approach. The portfolio will be spread across a range of:

- Scope areas
- Categories of research and development
- Project durations
- Project costs, including demonstrating value for money

For Digital Health Technology catalyst round 2 the successful applicants were ranked in score order once interviews had taken place and the approach was top-down until the funding had run out. For strand 2 Emerging and Enabling technologies, a wider portfolio approach was taken across project duration, project costs and scope areas.

4. For the 'same' project we applied 2 times as follows. From our current feedback, the only slightly negative points appear to be the marketing awareness, but as it seems
that we applied 2 times, we cannot re-apply again. What qualifies as resubmission? We changed the number of partners and funding requested, as well as the trials methods/approaches in the projects. Can we assume to be different projects? What is your ‘objective’ criteria for further applications in excess of the two to be allowed?

If your previous proposals were deemed ineligible, for example, having project costs outside of the defined eligible limits or being ruled out of scope this wouldn’t count as a resubmission. If your application went to assessment twice, you cannot submit the same proposal again into further competitions. Your proposal would need to be materially different from the previous two submissions to avoid being classified as a further resubmission. In this instance, changing partners and funding requested would not be considered a substantial change.

I hope this answers your questions.

If you have any queries about this response please contact me, or if you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to request a review of our decision, please write to:

Complaints Officer
UK Research and Innovation
Polaris House
North Star Avenue
Swindon
SN2 1FL
Email: foi@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner
Wycliffe House,
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

Enquiry/Information Line: Between 9am and 5pm Monday to Friday 0303 123 1113 or 01625 545745

Further information about the Office of the Information Commissioner can be found at http://www.ico.gov.uk/

Yours sincerely,
UK Research and Innovation, Information Governance Team

Email: foi@ukri.org