



Home Office

Police Audio Visual Multi-Media (AVMM) Redaction Funding 2026 - 2027 (GRN:774)

Application, Assessment and Scoring Guide

May 2026



© Crown copyright 2021

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Contents

Contents	2
1. Introduction	4
2. How much can you apply for and how do you apply?	5
3. How Applications will be assessed	7
4. Scoring, Assessment and Ranking	11
5. Due diligence to support decision making	26

1. Introduction

The Home Office is the UK Government Department with lead responsibility for immigration and passports, drugs policy, crime policy and counterterrorism and works to support visible, responsive and accountable policing.

The purpose of this document is to provide organisations (“Applicants”) with information on how to apply for funding from the Audio Visual Multi-Media (AVMM) Redaction Programme, including the assessment guidance and the approach to assessing Applications.

It is recommended that this document should be read before attempting to complete any response via the Government Grants Management Function (GGMF) online application platform ‘Find-A-Grant’ (find-government-grants.service.gov.uk).

The Applicant must not include hyperlinks in their response to questions; these will not be reviewed as part of the assessment process.

The Home Office invites Applications from Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) in England and Wales, including mayoral authorities exercising PCC functions, on behalf of territorial police forces (in practice, Applications can be submitted directly by territorial forces themselves). This includes PCC Consortiums/Partnerships as detailed in the ‘Eligibility’ section of the Find a Grant Advert. Funding is to improve Audio Visual Multi-Media (AVMM) redaction capability and deliver time savings which can be redirected towards policing priorities, including the frontline.

Policing is facing a sustained and growing increase in the volume of AVMM material, including body-worn video and other digital evidence, which must be reviewed and redacted prior to disclosure. In many cases, existing redaction processes are manual, resource-intensive and inconsistent, resulting in officers and staff spending an estimated nine hours redacting one hour of footage. This diverts capacity away from frontline policing and public protection, and risks delaying justice outcomes and increasing compliance risks.

However, our engagement with forces and suppliers suggests that effective AI-enabled tooling, supported by efficient operational processes, can save up to 60% time spent on redaction, releasing thousands of hours for officers and staff which can then be redirected to other force and policing priorities. The AVMM Redaction Programme is supporting policing to adopt effective redaction technologies and operating models which save police time, improve productivity, reduce risk, and help ensure that AVMM material is handled in a legally compliant and consistent manner. In 2025/26, the programme funded and supported 26 forces to improve their capability through their own bespoke force-led projects, for example by trialing AI-enabled tooling or developing training.

This further funding in 2026/27 gives forces the opportunity to build on work last year, whether within their force or by the wider programme, to implement, embed and scale up proven redaction capability, while also identifying any areas of new innovation.

2. How much can you apply for, and how do you apply?

Applications must be submitted via the Find a Grant portal. Applicants may only submit one (1) Application, although they can apply under both Workstreams and/or as part of a consortium or partnership of multiple forces.

How much can you apply for?

The 'total amount of grant' (listed as £3,000,000) reflects a maximum for the overall programme. This figure may include additional activity supporting policing beyond this specific funding opportunity. The total amount available to Applicants may therefore be lower.

Applicants should only apply for funding relevant to the scope of this competition. Funding for any other additional activities referenced above is not available through this application process.

We are allowing a wide range of minimum (£5,000) and maximum funding (£500,000) amounts, to give Applicants flexibility and to accommodate different needs. However, all Applications must represent value for money and this will be considered in determining whether the Home Office offers full or partial funding. Funding is for the 2026/27 financial year only; costs must be incurred by 31 March 2027.

What work can you apply to fund?

The Home Office is inviting Applications in support of two Workstreams:

Workstream A intends to provide funding for Applicants to embed, scale and fully adopt proven AVMM redaction capability within their existing operational environment, building on any previous work completed in FY 2025/26, or based on clear evidence of a proven approach e.g. used in another force. The focus is implementation and adoption at scale, NOT testing, piloting or proof-of-concept activity. Applicants must have confirmed their long-term technology, operating model and process, and be able to evidence that this approach maximises efficiencies, drawing as necessary on information contained in the programme's AVMM Redaction Adoption Guide, available to all forces on the College of Policing's Knowledge Hub.

Workstream B intends to provide funding for Applicants to pilot, evaluate and test new or unproven AVMM redaction technologies, workflows or operating models that have not previously been trialled in policing (to the programme's knowledge). The focus is innovation, structured experimentation and evidence generation, not implementation or rollout. Applicants must show that the proposed activity has credible transformational potential and could materially improve how AVMM redaction is delivered nationally. Projects must produce robust, transferable evidence with clear evaluation criteria, national relevance and a realistic pathway to future scalability. Where Applicants are unsure whether their proposed solution is novel within policing, they are advised to check with the

AVMM Redaction Programme Team and consider the AVMM Redaction Adoption Guide, available to all forces on the College of Policing's Knowledge Hub.

Applications – Single or Both Workstreams

Applicants can apply for either of the two Workstreams, or both. Where Applicants apply to both workstreams, each workstream project will be assessed and scored individually. However, assessors can also consider both projects in the round e.g. to identify any potential confliction or duplication and ensure value for money.

Partial Funding Awards

The Home Office reserves the right to offer partial funding awards to any Applicant. Such awards may be lower than the amount requested in the Application.

Where a partial award is offered, it will be subject to the following conditions:

- Applicants must confirm that delivery of their Application remains viable at the level of funding offered. Where the Home Office award is less than the amount requested, Applicants may choose to supplement the funding using their own resources (including match funding, as defined in the Grant Agreement), where they consider this appropriate. The Home Office will not negotiate or permit changes to Applications, including scope, deliverables, or milestones, following submission.
- Applicants will be required to confirm the value and source of any additional match funding contributing to delivery. The Grant Agreement will be revised to reflect the confirmed funding profile and will specify any ineligible expenditure that will not be reimbursed by Home Office funding.

The Home Office reserves the right to withdraw a partial funding offer where an Applicant is unable to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Home Office, that delivery of the Application remains viable at the level of funding offered. This includes circumstances where any proposed match funding contribution is considered insufficient or not credible.

Please refer to the Find a Grant Advert for full details on:

- **Eligibility**
- **Clarification Questions**
- **Information Sessions.**

3. How Applications will be assessed

Stage 1 Compliance checks

The Home Office will initially examine each online Application for compliance and completeness and may seek clarification where necessary. Prior to detailed assessment, the Home Office will determine whether an online Application is complete and substantially fulfils the Conditions of Participation (detailed in the Find a Grant advert).

If during this stage of the assessment it is apparent that requested information is missing from the Applicant's response due to genuine error, the Home Office may take the decision to allow the late submission of the required information. If this is the case, the Applicant will be advised of the missing information (from the specific Application), and arrangements made for their late submission, but this courtesy will be strictly time bound (e.g., to be submitted within 2 hours) in order to maintain a level playing field.

Otherwise, responses determined as materially incomplete and / or not substantially fulfilling the conditions in the documents will be rejected.

Stage 2 Assessment of Eligibility

This will comprise of initial pass/fail Eligibility Qualifying Questions. If the Applicant does not pass all the qualifying questions, then the remainder of their Application will not be assessed. Their Application becomes non-compliant, and they will be excluded from the competition. Only the Applications that fully meet the eligibility criteria will be assessed.

Stage 3: Assessment of Applications

Only then will Applications be passed for assessment to a group of assessors, comprised of subject matter experts drawn from the Home Office and AVMM Redaction Programme Team. The Home Office reserves the right to appoint independent external evaluators to provide additional support if required.

The assessors will assess all scored questions, as clearly marked out in the online Application Form, and make recommendations in accordance with the procedure described in this paragraph and according to the criteria described in this document and the online Application Form. The complete assessment of all Applications is a three-step process, comprising of:

- A) Assessment;
- B) Group consensus assessment (moderation);
- C) Final sign off of assessment and funding award decisions by a Senior Award Panel comprising representatives from the Home Office, NPCC Disclosure Portfolio, and Police AI.

During the Assessment process, each assessor will independently (i.e., without conferring with other assessors) scrutinise the quality of answers given by Applicants in their online Application. Each assessor will then assess the answer in accordance with the evidence the Applicant submits that is applicable to that question and award a score in accordance with the marking scale set out below.

Moderation

Assessments will then be submitted to the Moderator Chair, who will collate and check this information in preparation for a moderation meeting. During the moderation meeting, the panel of assessors will discuss the independent assessments until they reach a consensus regarding the score ('the consensus score') that should be attributed to each Applicant's response to each individual scored question.

For the purposes of this process, all sections of the bid are "Showstopper" questions. Showstopper questions are essential questions that an Application must successfully answer in order to progress. If any Showstopper question does not achieve the Minimum Score required, the Application will be deemed non-compliant. It will not proceed to further assessment or moderation and will be excluded from further consideration for award and funding.

Once all responses to scored questions have been assessed and moderated, the appropriate weighting will be applied to the consensus score attributed to each question. The weighted scores will then be added together to provide the Overall Application Score and a recommendation to the Panel on whether funding is awarded, in full or in part.

Senior Award Panel

Following moderation, scores and recommendations on funding will be presented to the Senior Award Panel for sign off. The Panel will include senior representatives from the Home Office, the NPCC Disclosure Portfolio, and Police AI, the new centre for AI in policing.

Clarification

The Home Office reserves the right to clarify and/or challenge any information provided in response to any question posed and may request further information in support of any statements made therein.

Prior knowledge of any aspect of an Applicant's organisation or of its ability to meet the requirement must not be assumed and all responses should be completed in full, as applicable. Answers will only be evaluated up to any stated word limit.

During the assessment period, the Home Office may require an Applicant to provide further information or clarification regarding their Application. The Applicant must confirm receipt of such request, within 24 hours of issue and shall provide a binding response within a further 24 hours of confirming the request. If no reply is forthcoming during this

period, then the Home Office will evaluate without the Applicant's clarity and scores will reflect this position.

There will be no appeals process, and the decision of the Panel will be final.

Final Scores and Allocation of Funding

Following Assessment, an Overall Application Score will be calculated for each Application, described in Table 1.

Table 1. The Score Scale

Overall Application Score	Assessment Category
4.0 - 5.0	A strong level of detail and evidence has been provided that fully meets all requirements. There is a high level of confidence in the Applicant's ability to deliver against all objectives.
2.0 - 3.9	A good level of evidence has been provided and the response covers all relevant requirements. There is a good level of confidence in the Applicant's ability to deliver against the objectives but there are important omissions.
0 - 1.9	Ineligible for funding - The Applicant has provided very limited detail and evidence. This creates a major risk to delivery.

Any Application that results in an Overall Application Score of 1.9 or below will be excluded from funding.

If the total value of Applications to be awarded exceeds the total value of the funding available the Home Office shall rank Applications according to their Overall Application Score, and the lowest scoring Applications shall be excluded in turn until the total value of awards no longer exceeds the total fund value.

Should the total value of Applications still exceed the total fund value, (i.e. due to multiple Applications achieving the same total Application score), the Home Office shall apply the 'tie-break' criteria to the relevant tied Applications (i.e. those who are tied in the last qualifying ranking place) so that the total value of qualifying Applications no longer exceeds the total fund value.

Where the remaining fund is lower than the requested amount of the Applicant, the Home Office reserves the right to:

- Seek confirmation that the Applicant will accept a lower amount (detailed in **Section 2 – How much can you apply for, and how do you apply?**).
- Not award to the Applicant (if the Applicant will not accept a lower amount); and
- Allocate to the next ranked Applicant.

Tie Breaks

In the event of two or more bids both receiving an identical overall (moderated consensus) score, the following tie-breaker sequence will be applied to differentiate and rank the Applications:

- **First Tie Break:** The Application(s) with the highest moderated score for question 4.4 (Productivity and Efficiency Impact) for Applications under Workstream A and 5.4 (Transformation Potential and Scalability) for Applications under Workstream B in the Application Form will be ranked higher.
- **Second Tie Break (if required):** The Application(s) with the highest moderated score for question 4.1 (Strategic Fit – Alignment to Workstream A) for Applications under Workstream A and 5.1 (Strategic Fit - Alignment to Workstream B) for Applications under Workstream B in the Application Form will be ranked higher.

Award Criteria and Outcome

The Home Office reserves the right not to award funding if it deems an Application non-compliant or that it does not meet the threshold criteria as stated in the assessment criteria.

By electing to enter the Application process, Applicants are hereby accepting the mechanism adopted by the Home Office in awarding funding.

Award decisions will be subject to Home Office internal governance and approvals, before the outcome is communicated to Applicants.

The Home Office will write to all Applicants to confirm the scoring and decision on their application, and the amount of any funding offered. The Home Office will provide successful applicants with a grant offer letter and a customised Grant Agreement, including the project milestones set out in their application.

Successful Applicants will be required to submit progress reports to the Home Office as set out in clause 6 of the Grant Agreement. Successful applicants are also required to collect and report on benefits data to the Home Office, to ensure we can evaluate the impact of this investment.

4. Scoring, Assessment and Ranking

Each Application contains 12 scored questions (6 for each Workstream – found in Section 4 and 5 of the Application Form), detailed below.

Funding breakdowns (4.6(A) for Workstream A, and 5.6(A) for Workstream B) are unscored, but must be completed for compliance and eligibility purposes. Failure to respond to required questions may result in exclusion from funding.

Workstream A Assessment Criteria and Scoring Guidance

4.1 - Strategic Fit - Alignment to Workstream A

Describe how the proposal fits the purpose and scope of Workstream A.

Include:

- Confirmation that the force has selected a proved effective AVMM redaction tool, workflow and/or operating model.
- Evidence that the proposal is focused on implementation, embedding, scaling and sustainment.
- Confirmation that the proposal includes no pilots, testing, trials or experimentation.
- How the approach aligns with national practice and the AVMM Redaction Programme Adoption Guide (on the College of Policing's Knowledge Hub).

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Strategic Fit Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of strategic fit or information is irrelevant. Proposal includes unproven approaches and/or pilots.
1	Limited, or unclear alignment, and/or lack of long-term plans.
2	Partial alignment. Some elements of proven AVMM redaction practice are referenced, but long-term technology, operating model or process is unclear or not confirmed.
3	Moderate alignment. Proposal reflects mostly proven approaches and indicates a long-term model, but lacks clarity or completeness in adoption.
4	Strong alignment. Clear evidence of proven AVMM redaction

	implementation, embedding or scaling, with a defined long-term technology and operating model. Minor gaps remain.
5	Full alignment. Demonstrates established, sustained AVMM redaction practice; no pilots or testing; and confirmed long-term technology, operating model and process.

4.2 - Deliverability - Project Plan

Provide a clear, feasible Project Plan for delivery in FY 2026/27.

You must complete and upload the '[Force Name] - Workstream [A or B] Project Plan' template which is attached to the Find a Grant Advert, following the instructions contained within.

If you are applying for funding under both Workstream A and Workstream B, you will be required to submit two separate Project Plans:

- one for Workstream A (in response to this question), and
- one for Workstream B (in response to Question 5.2 below).

You must not combine or group milestones/activities for both Workstreams into a single document.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Deliverability Score Range	Description
0	No delivery plan or information provided; proposal is not deliverable in FY26/27.
1	Limited deliverability. Delivery plan is unclear or generic; mobilisation is uncertain; resource, training or licensing needs are not defined.
2	Partial deliverability. Some delivery elements are described, but mobilisation readiness, resourcing or sustainment plans lack clarity or realism.
3	Moderate deliverability. Clear delivery intent with outline milestones and generally realistic resource and training requirements, but gaps remain in

	mobilisation readiness or long-term sustainment.
4	Strong deliverability. Clear delivery plan with defined milestones; credible mobilisation approach; realistic resource, training and licensing requirements; embedding and sustainment approach mostly robust.
5	High confidence in deliverability. Detailed and credible delivery plan with clear milestones; ability to mobilise immediately; well-defined and realistic resource, training and licensing requirements; strong and sustainable embedding approach.

4.3 - Deliverability – Resourcing and Sustainability

Explain how you will resource and sustain the proposed capability.

Include:

- Resource, training and licensing requirements, and how these will be met.
- How the force will embed and sustain the capability beyond initial delivery.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Deliverability Score Range	Description
0	No information provided on resourcing or sustainment; proposal is not deliverable in FY26/27.
1	Limited evidence of deliverability. Resource, training, or licensing requirements are unclear, incomplete, or not defined; no credible plan for sustaining the capability.
2	Partial deliverability. Some resource, training or licensing requirements are identified, but lack clarity, detail, or realism; sustainment approach is underdeveloped or uncertain.
3	Moderate deliverability. Resource, training and licensing requirements are broadly defined and appear generally realistic; a

	basic approach to embedding and sustaining the capability is outlined, but gaps remain.
4	Strong deliverability. Clear and credible resource model, with well-defined training and licensing requirements; a coherent approach to embedding the capability and sustaining it beyond initial delivery.
5	High confidence in deliverability. Comprehensive and realistic resource model; clearly defined and fully costed training and licensing requirements; strong, well-evidenced approach to embedding, scaling and sustaining the capability as business-as-usual.

4.4 - Productivity and Efficiency Impact

Describe the measurable operational benefits expected in FY 2026/27.

Include:

- Frontline impact (highest priority).
- Force-wide scalability.
- Expected productivity and efficiency gains (e.g., time saved, cases processed, users onboarded).
- Clear, quantifiable metrics and baselines.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Productivity & Efficiency Impact Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of productivity or efficiency impact; no measurable operational benefit identified.
1	Limited impact. Minimal or unclear frontline benefit; little evidence of scalability; productivity gains not quantified or unlikely to be realised in-year.
2	Partial impact. Some expected frontline benefit and limited scalability; productivity gains described but weakly evidenced or lacking clear metrics.
3	Moderate impact. Clear frontline benefit with reasonable scalability; measurable in-year productivity gains identified,

	supported by basic metrics (e.g., users onboarded, cases processed, time saved).
4	Strong impact. Demonstrates meaningful frontline benefit, good scalability across the force, and credible in-year productivity gains with well-defined metrics.
5	High impact. Significant and clearly evidenced frontline benefit; strong force-wide scalability; substantial, measurable in-year productivity gains supported by robust and credible metrics (users onboarded, cases processed, time saved).

4.5 - Evidence and Assurance

Provide assurance that the proposal is justified, robust and risks can be mitigated.

Include:

- Evidence that the chosen approach is efficient and proven.
- Risks and credible mitigations.
- Benefits capture plan.
- Alignment with national guidance and regulatory requirements.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Evidence & Assurance Score Range	Description
0	No evidence or justification provided; no reference to processes, efficiency, risks, or benefits.
1	Limited justification. Minimal evidence of efficient or proven processes; efficiency claims unclear; risks not fully identified or mitigated; no credible benefits capture plan
2	Partial justification. Some reference to efficient or proven processes and estimated benefits, but evidence is weak; risks identified but mitigations lack credibility; benefits capture plan basic or incomplete.
3	Moderate justification. Clear intention to apply efficient processes and an operating model with evidenced or estimated benefits; efficiency of the approach reasonably demonstrated; risks and mitigations described; benefits

	capture plan outlined but not fully developed.
4	Strong justification. Good use of national guidance and proven processes; efficiency benefits well-evidenced; risks clearly articulated with credible mitigations; benefits capture plan robust and practical.
5	High-quality justification. Comprehensive evidence of efficient, proven processes and a well-defined operating model with clearly demonstrated or quantified benefits; risks fully assessed with strong mitigations; detailed and credible benefits capture plan showing how outcomes will be measured and assured.

4.6(A) - Funding Breakdown (Workstream A)

Profile all funding for Workstream A against FY 2026/27 (April–March),

You must complete and upload the '[Force Name] - Workstream [A or B] Funding Breakdown' template which is attached to the Find a Grant Advert, following the instructions contained within.

If you are applying for funding under both Workstream A and Workstream B, you will be required to submit two separate Funding Breakdown documents:

- one for Workstream A (in response to this question), and
- one for Workstream B (in response to Question 5.6(A), below).

You must not combine or group costs for both Workstreams into a single document.

SHOWSTOPPER – The Funding Breakdown is not scored. However, failure to provide a completed Funding Breakdown may result in exclusion from funding.

4.6(B) - Value for Money

Outline how you will ensure value for money is achieved.

The Home Office is required to ensure that the funding delivers value for money (VfM) – this will include illustrating economy i.e. minimising costs, and maximising efficiency i.e. the relationship between outputs and the resources used to produce them.

This should include benchmarking and cost justification – how costs have been informed by relevant benchmarks, previous delivery, comparable projects, or market rates - where appropriate.

Your Funding Breakdown, though not scored, will also be considered when scoring this question.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

The score for this question does not contribute to the Overall Application Score (detailed in Table 1). However, the assessment of Value for Money will be used to determine whether the level of funding requested is proportionate and justified, which may result in a partial funding offer.

Value for Money Score Range	Description
0	Provides no meaningful evidence of value for money, or includes significant unjustified or irrelevant expenditure.
1	Provides little evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs appear disproportionate or poorly explained.
2	Provides limited evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs appear only partially justified, with concerns about proportionality, efficiency, or deliverability.
3	Provides an adequate level of evidence of value for money. Some justification is provided, but there are clear gaps or uncertainties in cost assumptions, efficiency, or the relationship between funding and outputs.
4	Provides good evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs are broadly proportionate and justified; however, there may be some areas where the level of funding requested is higher than necessary relative to delivery.
5	Fully meets the requirement. Provides strong, well-evidenced assurance that value for money will be achieved. Costs are proportionate, clearly justified, and represent an appropriate and efficient use of public funds relative to outputs and outcomes.

Workstream B Assessment Criteria and Scoring Guidance

5.1 - Strategic Fit - Alignment to Workstream B

Demonstrate that the proposal fits the purpose and scope of Workstream B.

Include:

- What is innovative, untested or novel about the proposal.
- The transformational potential of the idea.
- Alignment with the scope boundaries (transformational, scalable, evidence generating).

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Strategic Fit Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of strategic fit or information is irrelevant.
1	Limited alignment. Proposal shows minimal innovation, unclear transformational potential, or includes activity that does not meet the scope boundaries.
2	Partial alignment. Some innovative or novel elements are present, but transformational potential is weak or unsubstantiated, and alignment with scope boundaries is incomplete.
3	Moderate alignment. Proposal demonstrates innovation and indicates potential for transformation, but lacks clarity, robustness or a convincing case for scalability or evidence generation.
4	Strong alignment. Clear evidence of innovative or novel activity with credible transformational potential, well aligned to scope boundaries, with a plausible pathway to scalability and evidence generation.
5	Full alignment. Proposal is clearly innovative, untested or novel within policing; demonstrates strong transformational potential; fits fully within scope boundaries; and presents a compelling case for scalability and evidence generation.

5.2 - Deliverability - Project Plan

Provide a clear, feasible Project Plan for delivery in FY 2026/27, including how the force will run a structured, time-bound evaluation.

You must complete and upload the '[Force Name] - Workstream [A or B] Project Plan' template which is attached to the Find a Grant Advert, following the instructions contained within.

If you are applying for funding under both Workstream A and Workstream B, you will be required to submit two separate Project Plans:

- one for Workstream B (in response to this question), and
- one for Workstream A (in response to Question 4.2 above).

You must not combine or group milestones/activities for both Workstreams into a single document.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Delivery & Evaluation Quality Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of deliverability or evaluation planning; methodology, success measures, pilot design and risks are not addressed.
1	Limited deliverability. Evaluation approach unclear or undeveloped; success criteria vague; pilot design weak; delivery within FY26/27 uncertain; risk controls minimal or absent.
2	Partial deliverability. Some evaluation methodology or success measures described, but evidence is incomplete; pilot design lacks robustness; delivery feasibility uncertain; risk controls insufficient for higher-risk innovation
3	Moderate deliverability. Evaluation methodology and success criteria are outlined and generally credible; pilot design feasible but not fully developed; delivery within FY26/27 likely but with some gaps; risk controls adequate but not comprehensive.
4	Strong deliverability. Clear evaluation methodology with measurable outputs; well-designed and feasible pilot; credible plan to deliver within FY26/27; appropriate and proportionate risk

	controls in place for higher-risk innovation.
5	High-quality deliverability. Comprehensive, structured evaluation methodology; clear, measurable success criteria; robust and operationally realistic pilot design; confident delivery within FY26/27; strong, well-defined risk controls for higher-risk innovation.

5.3 - Deliverability – Evaluation, Success Criteria and Risk Management

Describe how you will ensure robust delivery and assessment of your project in FY 2026/27.

Include:

- Your evaluation methodology, including how you will run a structured, time-bound evaluation.
- Clear success criteria and measurable outputs.
- The pilot design and intended operational environment.
- Appropriate risk controls, particularly for higher-risk innovation.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Delivery & Evaluation Quality Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of deliverability or evaluation planning; methodology, success measures, pilot design and risks are not addressed.
1	Limited deliverability. Evaluation approach unclear or undeveloped; success criteria vague; pilot design weak; delivery within FY26/27 uncertain; risk controls minimal or absent.
2	Partial deliverability. Some evaluation methodology or success measures described, but evidence is incomplete; pilot design lacks robustness; delivery feasibility uncertain; risk controls insufficient for higher-risk innovation
3	Moderate deliverability. Evaluation methodology and success criteria are outlined and generally credible; pilot design feasible but not fully developed; delivery within FY26/27 likely but with

	some gaps; risk controls adequate but not comprehensive.
4	Strong deliverability. Clear evaluation methodology with measurable outputs; well-designed and feasible pilot; credible plan to deliver within FY26/27; appropriate and proportionate risk controls in place for higher-risk innovation.
5	High-quality deliverability. Comprehensive, structured evaluation methodology; clear, measurable success criteria; robust and operationally realistic pilot design; confident delivery within FY26/27; strong, well-defined risk controls for higher-risk innovation.

5.4 - Transformation Potential and Scalability

Explain the potential future national impact of the proposal.

Include:

- Multi-force relevance and credible scalability.
- Potential to significantly improve productivity, quality or compliance.
- Alignment with national priorities for future AVMM redaction capability.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Transformational Potential & Scalability Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of transformational potential or scalability; proposal is irrelevant or provides no meaningful improvement.
1	Limited potential, unclear benefit or weak relevance beyond a single force; scalability not demonstrated.
2	Partial potential. Some potential benefits identified, but the case for multi-force relevance or scalability is incomplete or unconvincing.
3	Moderate potential. Proposal demonstrates credible innovation and indicates potential for meaningful improvement, with some evidence of scalability, but lacks a fully developed or compelling national case.
4	Strong potential. Clear innovation with credible, evidence-based potential to

	improve productivity, efficiency, quality or compliance across multiple forces; scalability is well-reasoned and realistic.
5	High transformational potential. Proposal is clearly innovative, materially different from existing approaches, and demonstrates strong, well-evidenced potential for national-level impact with credible, scalable application across forces.

5.5 - Evidence and Assurance

Provide assurance that the proposal is justified, ethical and well-governed.

Include:

- Rationale for testing.
- Risks and mitigations.
- Ethical, regulatory and operational considerations.
- Commitment to share findings nationally.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

Evidence & Assurance Score Range	Description
0	No evidence of rationale, risk consideration, governance, or assurance; information is absent or irrelevant.
1	Limited assurance. Rationale for testing unclear; risks only partially identified; ethical or regulatory considerations not addressed; no credible commitment to share findings.
2	Partial assurance. Some rationale provided and risks acknowledged, but controls are weak; ethical or operational considerations insufficiently addressed; commitment to national sharing unclear or incomplete.
3	Moderate assurance. Clear rationale for testing and reasonable identification of risks with basic controls; ethical, regulatory and operational considerations addressed but not fully developed; intention to share findings stated but lacking detail.
4	Strong assurance. Well-evidenced rationale; risks clearly articulated with appropriate controls; ethical, regulatory

	and operational considerations robustly addressed; credible plan to share findings nationally.
5	High-quality assurance. Comprehensive and well-justified rationale; risks fully assessed with strong, proportionate controls; ethical, regulatory and operational considerations thoroughly addressed; clear and proactive commitment to national dissemination of findings.

5.6(A) - Funding Breakdown (Workstream B)

Profile all funding for Workstream B against FY 2026/27 (April–March),

You must complete and upload the '[Force Name] - Workstream [A or B] Funding Breakdown' template which is attached to the Find a Grant Advert, following the instructions contained within.

If you are applying for funding under both Workstream A and Workstream B, you will be required to submit two separate Funding Breakdown documents:

- one for Workstream B (in response to this question), and
- one for Workstream A (in response to Question 4.6(A), above).

You must not combine or group costs for both Workstreams into a single document.

SHOWSTOPPER – The Funding Breakdown is not scored. However, failure to provide a completed Funding Breakdown may result in exclusion from funding.

5.6(B) - Value for Money

Outline how you will ensure value for money is achieved.

The Home Office is required to ensure that the funding delivers value for money (VfM) – this will include illustrating economy i.e. minimising costs, and maximising efficiency i.e. the relationship between outputs and the resources used to produce them.

This should include benchmarking and cost justification – how costs have been informed by relevant benchmarks, previous delivery, comparable projects, or market rates - where appropriate.

Your Funding Breakdown, though not scored, will also be considered when scoring this question.

SHOWSTOPPER – Minimum Score: 1

The score for this question does not contribute to the Overall Application Score (detailed in Table 1). However, the assessment of Value for Money will be used to determine whether the level of funding requested is proportionate and justified, which may result in a partial funding offer.

Value for Money Score Range	Description
0	Provides no meaningful evidence of value for money, or includes significant unjustified or irrelevant expenditure.
1	Provides little evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs appear disproportionate or poorly explained.
2	Provides limited evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs appear only partially justified, with concerns about proportionality, efficiency, or deliverability.
3	Provides an adequate level of evidence of value for money. Some justification is provided, but there are clear gaps or uncertainties in cost assumptions, efficiency, or the relationship between funding and outputs.
4	Provides good evidence that value for money will be achieved. Costs are broadly proportionate and justified; however, there may be some areas where the level of funding requested is higher than necessary relative to delivery.
5	Fully meets the requirement. Provides strong, well-evidenced assurance that value for money will be achieved. Costs are proportionate, clearly justified, and represent an appropriate and efficient use of public funds relative to outputs and outcomes.

Weighting

Following the above score allocation, a weighting will be applied. The weighting shows the relative importance of each question, and the total weighted score for each Application will be used to rank all Applications:

Table 2. Score Weighting Model

Workstream	Weighting
A	
4.1 – Strategic Fit	30%
4.2 – Project Plan	15%
4.3 – Resource and Sustainability	15%
4.4 – Productivity and Efficiency	30%
4.5 – Evidence and Assurance	10%
B	
5.1 – Strategic Fit	30%
5.2 – Project Plan	10%
5.3 – Evaluation, Success Criteria and Risk Management	10%
5.4 – Transformation Potential and Scalability	40%
5.5 – Evidence and Assurance	10%

The workstreams are weighted slightly differently to ensure that:

- Workstream A prioritises productivity and implementation.
- Workstream B prioritises innovation and transformational potential.

Table 3 provides an indicative example, to show Applicants how the scores are calculated.

Table 3. Example Scoring Scenario (Workstream A):

Question	Consensus Score	Weighted Score (Consensus Score x Question Weighting)	Overall Application Score (Weighted Score Total)
4.1 – Strategic Fit	4	1.2	4.05
4.2 – Project Plan	4	0.6	
4.3 – Resource and Scalability	3	0.45	
4.4 – Productivity and Efficiency	5	1.5	
4.5 – Evidence and Assurance	3	0.3	

5. Due diligence to support decision making

Due diligence checks will be carried out on all shortlisted organisations identified through the assessment process detailed above, as a condition of awarding the Grant and to understand more about your organisation.

Checks will cover your organisation's financial status and the organisation's ability to deliver the purpose of the Grant. This includes checks on an organisation's behaviour that does not meet the standards expected as set out in the Code of Conduct for Grant Recipients.

The Home Office has a duty to ensure all grants are made in the best interests of the public and the public purse, that they represent good value for money and fund activities that clearly and demonstrably support policies that fulfil the Government's manifesto commitments as set out in the Code of Conduct for Grant Recipients.

The code of conduct can be found here: [2019-01-15 Code of Conduct for Grant Recipients v. 1.01.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supplier-code-of-conduct)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/supplier-code-of-conduct>).

You must also adhere to the Government Functional Standards for a Grant (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/grants-standards>)
(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/grants-standards>.)

You may be contacted by the Home Office if this assessment identifies any significant causes for concern and the Home Office reserves the right to seek additional information and / or assurances in these circumstances. The Home Office reserves its right to exclude an Applicant who cannot demonstrate that they are of sufficiently stable financial standing or provide any other relevant due diligence assurances sought at any time prior to award of a Grant.

Depending on the concerns raised the Home Office also reserves the right to consider and implement other options to mitigate the associated risks, such as a reduction in grant value to lessen the Home Office' exposure, the conducting of further enhanced due diligence steps, or to pay funds in tranches with enhanced monitoring.

The Home Office reserves the right to exclude organisations where evidence is obtained during our due diligence activities that, in the Home Office's reasonable opinion, materially reduces the ability of the organisation to deliver the Grant purpose or meet the expected standards, as set out in the Code of Conduct for Grant Recipients above, or where evidence is obtained that the organisation has undertaken activities that are in conflict with the purpose of the Grant.