

## Scoring definitions and attributes for OPEN funding schemes

Panel members will give each proposal a score on a scale from 1 to 6 that reflects their assessment of how well the proposal meets the assessment criteria outlined in the scoring grid below.

### Scoring grid

Score	Summary	Attributes	Definition	Band
6	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>Highly likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>Highly likely to address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by the policy partner(s); clear, logical pathway from activities, via outputs, to outcomes and goal; identification of key assumptions, risks, and issues that may affect implementation</li> <li>Input of Policy Partner and other stakeholders clear and appropriate</li> <li>Clear arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning, enabling partners and others to learn from project, reflected in: provision for iterative learning; theory of change; opportunities to share learning</li> <li>Excellent value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> </ul>	Fundable	A
5	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>Likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>Likely to address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by Policy Partner(s); clear, logical pathway from activities, via outputs, to outcomes and goal; identification of key assumptions, risks, and issues that may affect implementation</li> <li>Input of Policy Partner and other stakeholders clear and appropriate</li> <li>Clear enabling partners and others to learn from project, reflected in: provision for iterative learning; opportunities to share learning</li> <li>Good value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> <li>No more than a modest number of minor, fixable faults</li> </ul>	Fundable	A

Score	Summary	Attributes	Definition	Band
4	Minor weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>• Likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>• May address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by Policy Partner(s); key assumptions, risks, or issues unmitigated</li> <li>• Input of Policy Partner or other stakeholders needs clarifying</li> <li>• Arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning need clarifying</li> <li>• Good value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> <li>• A few major (or several minor) fixable faults</li> </ul>	Fundable	B
3	Moderate weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>• Unlikely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>• Unlikely to address public policy challenge(s)</li> <li>• Inadequate arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning</li> <li>• Questionable value for money; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C
2	Significant weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>• Value for money poor or unclear; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C
1	Severe weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>• Value for money poor; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C

Updated: 19 September 2025