

MACC funding call: how we will assess your application

We will assess your application using the following process.

Expression of Intent

Each hub team proposal must submit an Expression of Intent (EOI). The deadline for EOI has passed. There will be no assessment at this stage but submission of an EOI is mandatory to apply to the full application stage. Full details can be found in our guidance document.

Panel Assessment

An independent review panel will be appointed to evaluate applications. Panel members will be drawn from the MACC Programme and the UK adaptation research and practitioner community. Each application will be reviewed by three panel members and assessed against the criteria outlined in this document. Applicants will be notified of the outcome by email. There will be no interviews as part of the assessment process.

Timescale

We aim to complete the assessment process by early December 2025.

Feedback

We will give feedback from the reviewers on request, when we notify you of the outcome of your application.

Principles of assessment

We support the San Francisco [declaration on research assessment](#) (DORA) and recognise the relationship between research assessment and research integrity.

Find out more about the [UKRI Principles of Assessment and Decision Making](#).

We reserve the right to modify the assessment process as needed.

Assessment criteria

The criteria against which your application will be assessed are listed below. Please note that these criteria will **not** be weighted. Each will be scored on a scale of 1–10, with some guiding descriptions of the scores provided below.

Criteria	Scoring Guide (1–10)
1. Place-Based Focus: Projects should focus on specific geographical areas and address unique local needs and challenges.	<p>10– Exemplary place-leadership: Exceptional justification of place-specific approaches and deep integration of local knowledge systems.</p> <p>05– Weak place-tie: no tailored design or local partnerships.</p> <p>01– No location specified or justified.</p>
2. Vulnerability Focus: Projects must demonstrate a clear consideration of the groups and places most vulnerable to climate change and specifically identify the vulnerabilities being addressed. Proposals should outline how the project design and delivery aim to reduce these vulnerabilities and build resilience within the identified communities and places	<p>10– Systemic risk reduction: Co-created with vulnerable groups; redistributes resources/power; addresses root causes of inequity.</p> <p>05 – Weak consideration: Mentions vulnerability but no tailored actions or engagement.</p> <p>01– No mention of vulnerability.</p>
3. Policy Links: Projects must demonstrate clear relevance to current or emerging policy needs and priorities at local, regional or national levels. Projects must evidence how they are addressing critical barriers or levers to climate	<p>10– Policy-transformative: Directly shapes new policies; exceptional stakeholder engagement (e.g., co-creation with government).</p> <p>05– Weak connection: Policy links feel tacked-on.</p>

adaptation. This includes establishing clear pathways for engaging relevant stakeholders and amplifying the voices of those most impacted by climate impacts.	01- None: No policy consideration.
4. Community Engagement: Projects should demonstrate meaningful collaboration with local communities, groups and stakeholders, with particular attention to engaging and benefiting the vulnerable groups most at risk from climate change. Proposals should describe how these groups have been involved in the design and delivery of the project.	10- Co-ownership: Community leads design/delivery; shared decision-making and benefits. 05- Engagement only in non-critical phases. 01- No engagement plan.
5. Measurable Outcomes: Projects should prioritise implementation and measurable outcomes by embedding practical adaptation actions that are monitored and reflected upon in real time. They should generate valuable insights into the factors that enable or hinder transformational adaptation in practice. We also encourage innovative approaches, including novel methods for synthesis, dissemination and learning, such as leveraging creative arts-based techniques and technological innovations to advance adaptation research.	10- Transformative metrics: Tracks systemic change; innovative monitoring tools; clear scaling pathways. 05- Weak planning: No evaluation budget/staff. 01- None: No monitoring framework.
6. Impact, Scale and Replicability: Proposals should clearly outline how	10- Game-changing impact: Clear pathways for systemic change;

<p>the project will contribute to meaningful, sustainable outcomes beyond the funding period, including reducing vulnerability, improving resilience and driving lasting change. We also encourage projects that demonstrate scalable and replicable solutions with the potential to benefit other regions or address similar challenges across the UK.</p>	<p>innovative scaling model (up/out/deep) with institutional buy-in.</p> <p>05- Weak ambition: No consideration of impact beyond immediate outputs.</p> <p>01- None: No impact/scaling discussion</p>
<p>7. Project Management and Feasibility: Proposals should include a concise project plan with a clear timeline outlining major tasks, milestones, and deliverables. Additionally, describe your approach to managing the project effectively, including strategies to identify and mitigate potential risks.</p>	<p>10- Exceptional delivery: Robust governance; adaptive risk mitigation; optimal resource allocation.</p> <p>05- High-risk: Weak governance/poorly defined roles.</p> <p>01- Unworkable: Critical flaws in design.</p>
<p>8. Addressing Inequities: The proposal demonstrates a clear commitment to identifying and reducing disparities in access, opportunity, and outcomes among different groups, especially those historically marginalized or underserved. It includes strategies to promote fairness, inclusion, and equitable benefits throughout the project's design, implementation, and impact.</p>	<p>10- Structural justice: Redistributes power/resources; tackles root causes of exclusion.</p> <p>05- Weak addressal: Diversity mentioned without action.</p> <p>01- None: Ignores equity.</p>
<p>9. Team Fit: Proposals should demonstrate the ability and potential of the entire project team, including the lead and co-leads, to successfully deliver the proposed</p>	<p>10- Ideal ensemble: Interdisciplinary; lived experience; great role complementarity.</p>

<p>work. This should include relevant experience appropriate to career stage, a balanced mix of skills and expertise to cover the project, leadership and management abilities.</p>	<p>05- Weak composition: Unbalanced roles/oversight.</p> <p>01- Unqualified: Lacks capacity.</p>
<p>10. Ethical Considerations: Proposals should identify any ethical risks and considerations related to the project and explain how these will be managed. This includes demonstrating awareness of relevant ethical or responsible research and innovation aspects, as well as environmental impacts.</p>	<p>10 – Comprehensive: Fully identifies ethical/environmental risks and data considerations, with clear management plans.</p> <p>05 – Partial: Identifies some risks and addresses some data issues with limited plans.</p> <p>01 – Poor: Fails to identify risks or provide management for ethical, environmental, or data concerns.</p>
<p>11. Value for Money/Budget: Proposals should provide a concise justification of the proposed budget, explaining the rationale behind key expenditures. This includes demonstrating clear, justifiable use of funds in line with value-for-money principles and covering staff costs, significant travel, participant contributions, exceptional consumables, facility or equipment costs, and any budgeted exceptions.</p>	<p>10- Costs justified by exceptional outcomes; innovative cost-sharing.</p> <p>05- Moderate justification</p> <p>01- Unjustifiable</p>

Find further details of assessment questions and criteria in the call text and the guidance document on the website.