

## Criteria Indicators

Indicators	1	2	3	4
Innovation	<p>Product or service is clearly a reworking of an existing approach.</p> <p>Limited or no comparison with other approaches to show how they are innovative.</p>	<p>Information provided shows that there is likely to be some form of innovation being undertaken.</p> <p>Some form of comparison with existing approaches is made that shows the difference and innovation.</p>	<p>The innovation present is clear to the reader with use of effective qualitative and quantitative evidence.</p> <p>Comparisons with existing approaches are specific, relevant, and well-evidenced.</p>	<p>The innovation present is clear and likely to be transformative as shown through effective qualitative and quantitative evidence.</p> <p>Comparisons with existing approaches are specific, relevant, and well-evidenced.</p>
Public Benefit	<p>Product or service will clearly not benefit the public beyond the organisational benefit of the submitting organisation.</p> <p>Limited or no attempt to quantify the breadth or depth of benefit to the public of the product or service.</p>	<p>Product or service is likely to bring some benefit to the public beyond the benefit of the submitting organisation.</p> <p>A reasonable attempt is made to quantify potential public benefit in terms of breadth and depth and supported with some quantitative and/or qualitative evidence</p>	<p>The breadth and depth of potential public benefit created by the product or service is clear and significant.</p> <p>Effective qualitative and quantitative evidence is provided to support the application.</p>	<p>The breadth and/or depth of public benefit present is clear and likely to be substantive and transformative.</p> <p>Compelling qualitative and quantitative evidence is provided.</p>

Indicators	1	2	3	4
Sandbox plan viability	<p>Sandbox activity and mechanisms proposed do not look like they fall within the scope of our suggested approach.</p> <p>The organisation does not appear to have sufficiently mitigated any of the risks they raise.</p> <p>Exit plan has clear deficiencies and/or does not adequately mitigate risks or provide redress.</p>	<p>Mechanisms proposed clearly fall within the scope of the intended approach.</p> <p>There are clear risk mitigations and control mechanisms in place that appear efficient and effective.</p> <p>There is a clear exit plan in place that attempts to mitigate risk to participants and provide redress where needed.</p>	<p>Mechanisms have been well thought through, relate to the intended scope with clear relation to timescales and resources likely to be needed.</p> <p>There are risk mitigations and control mechanisms in place that appear efficient and effective.</p> <p>There is a clear exit plan that evidences how risks will be mitigated and any redress needed will be provided.</p>	<p>Mechanisms have been well thought through, relate to the intended scope with clear relation to timescales and resources likely to be needed.</p> <p>There are sophisticated risk mitigations and control mechanisms in place that have been shown to be efficient and effective through the provision of evidence.</p> <p>There is a clear exit plan that evidences how risks will be mitigated, how any redress needed will be provided, and in effect ensure a 'failsafe' approach.</p>