Mr Jeremy Guy Rodriguez-Peppiatt
Sent by email: request-741989-ea281442@whatdotheyknow.com

19 April 2021

Dear Mr Rodriguez-Peppiatt,

Freedom of Information request: FOI2021/00181

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 27 March in which you requested the following:

Your request:

Please could you provide the following information in regard to the two most recent Smart Grant competitions with the following details [August 2020 and November 2020 competitions]

1. *Total number of applications*
2. *Number of assessed applications (not disregarded due to being deemed out of scope etc)*
3. *Number of applications funded*
4. *Number of applications funded per 'innovation area'*
5. *Average funding amount per project*
6. *Smallest and largest amount of funding per project*
7. *Average score*
8. *Success threshold*
9. *Decision-making process based on portfolio (i.e. why higher scoring projects might not get funded and lower scoring project get funded).*

Our response:

I can confirm UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) hold the information relevant to your request. Please see the information below.

Under Section 21 (Information already reasonably accessible) of the FOIA the information you have requested relating to the Innovate UK Smart Grants: August 2020 competition is already available in the public domain:

- [WhatDoTheyKnow.com - Innovate UK Smart Grants: August 2020 response](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/innovate_uk_smart_grants_august#incoming-1748250)[1]

Section 21 is an absolute exemption which means that there is no requirement to conduct a public interest test.

The following information is in relation to the Innovate UK Smart Grants: November 2020 competition.

Please note that:

Stream 1: Projects 18 months or less in duration, with total project cost of £500k or less
Stream 2: Projects either over 18 months in duration and/or £500k project costs

1. *Total number of applications*

   There were 1,501 applications received for the Smart Grants: November 2020 competition, of which 202 were ineligible.

2. *Number of assessed applications (not disregarded due to being deemed out of scope etc)*

Stream	Number of Assessed Applications
Stream 1	1149
Stream 2	150
Total	1299

3. *Number of applications funded*

Stream	Number of Applications Funded
Stream 1	61
Stream 2	12
Total	73

4. *Number of applications funded per 'innovation area'*

   Stream 1

Innovation Area	Number of Funded Applications
Additive layer manufacturing (ALM)	2
Agricultural productivity	2
Bioscience	2
Chemical / bio processes	1
Composite materials	1
Creative industries	2
Diagnostics, medical technology and devices	3
Digital health	1
Digital industries	8
Digital manufacturing	3
Digital technology	11
Electronic materials and manufacturing	3
Electronics, sensors and photonics	2
Energy - other	3
Energy efficiency	1
Energy systems	1
Enhancing food quality	2
Independent living and wellbeing	1
Materials, process and manufacturing design technologies	1
Metals / metallurgy	1
Not Specified	1
Offshore wind	2
Robotics and autonomous systems	1
Smart infrastructure	2
Surface engineering, coatings and thin films	1
Sustainable materials	2
Rail transport	1

Stream 2

Innovation Area	Number of Funded Applications
Additive layer manufacturing (ALM)	1
Agricultural productivity	3
Assembly / disassembly / joining	1
Diagnostics, medical technology and devices	2
Digital health	1
Digital industries	1
Energy - other	1
Resource efficiency	1
Robotics and autonomous systems	1

5. *Average funding amount per project*

Stream	Average Funding per Project
Stream 1	£252,836
Stream 2	£855,306

6. *Smallest and largest amount of funding per project*

Stream	Smallest Funding Amount	Largest Funding Amount
Stream 1	£42,885	£394,297
Stream 2	£527,235	£1,391,322

7. *Average score*

Stream	Average score of funded projects
Stream 1	84.96%
Stream 2	85.47%

8. *Success threshold*

Stream	Lowest scoring funded project (success threshold)
Stream 1	82.8%
Stream 2	82.8%

9. *Decision-making process based on portfolio (i.e. why higher scoring projects might not get funded and lower scoring project get funded).*

The Smart Grants: November 2020 competition did not take a portfolio-based approach for funding. Funding was allocated from the highest scoring application, based on the scores provided by independent assessors, downwards until the funding had been depleted as detailed in the online competition brief. Therefore, no projects that score below the minimum successful score within their stream receive funding.

If you have any queries regarding our response or you are unhappy with the outcome of your request and wish to seek an internal review of the decision, please contact:

Head of Information Governance
Email: foi@ukri.org or infogovernance@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the internal 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: http://www.ico.gov.uk/

If you wish to raise a complaint regarding the service you have received or the conduct of any UKRI staff in relation to your request, please see UKRI's complaints policy: https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/complaints-policy/

Yours sincerely,

Andy Trotter
Information Governance
Information Rights Team
UK Research and Innovation
foi@ukri.org | dataprotection@ukri.org