Workshop 2 - Refining your entry for Transform Stage 2

Thu, Aug 24, 2023 10:47AM 55:48

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

assessors, entry, stage, questions, answering, project, judges, customer, innovation, point, give, clear, people, evidence, addressing, pitch, feedback, good, section, milestones

SPEAKERS

Andrea Wong, Science Practice, Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges

---

A Andrea Wong, Science Practice 00:00

What we're going to run through today, if you if you attended this same workshop, the transform workshop last year, some of this content may sound slightly familiar to you, because there's a lot I mean, the a lot of the questions are similar. So there's kind of similar points that we want to go over. But you can keep it as a refresher, we're also going to be going over some of the key feedback that came through from round one. And we're going to aim to finish up in an hour's time. Okay, so as Catherine mentioned, this meeting is being recorded. And I'm just going to go through all of the content. So if you do need to step away or take a break, that's up to you, I see that lots of people have opted to go camera off, that's totally fine. And if you do need to step away, just do so. We do ask that you remain muted, please, unless you are speaking. And if you have any questions that come up, while I'm speaking through some of the slides, do just use the chat to put those through and we can address those as they come up. There's also some dedicated pauses after each section where you can come off mute and share your question verbally as well, if you like. Another reminder, just between now and the final submission deadline, you do have the chance to get individual feedback and answers through one to one coaching calls, enter review and over email. So you can get in touch with myself and my teammate, Richard, at projects at science practice.com the email right here, if you do have a kind of longer Knottier individual question that you want to work through, but if you've got general questions that you feel open to sharing today, then please do go ahead and ask those when it's appropriate. Okay, so just to go over some key information, framing this part of the process. So you know, I'm sure that the deadline for stage two is on the second of February, at noon. And the stage two assessment process is from scratch. So it's not just it's not building on the stage one process, everyone is starting that assessment process, from the same point going through it in full. On the entry form, you can ignore any of the questions where there are n A's are not applicable. That's something that I think maybe a couple of people have come through with questions about and the net. Nesta challenge works is also offering surgery sessions. That's another option in addition to the coaching calls that science practice myself are offering that you can take up and that's a little bit more if you have any questions about the the actual submission form IPR stuff as well, right, Catherine. And anything more of the way that the actual competition is structured and things like that. I also want to call out that there is some opportunities to rerecord your pitch if you recorded it already during stage one. And so that's January 26, and 27th have some slots available if you haven't already booked in for that. Okay. So before we launch into some of the more detailed tips, are there any questions about the process or the rest of today's workshop? And Catherine, do you mind? Keeping an eye on the on the chat? Yep. Oh, do nothing in there right now. Okay, great. I'll move on then. But if you if something does come up for you, then as I said, please do put it in the chat. All right, so preparing a strong entry for stage two. So what's changed? Compared to stage one, there's a shift in emphasis. So stage two is asking you to provide more evidence in detail and a bit more of a reference narrative as well. So that's But that's what the judges and assessors are going to be looking for over the kind of complete package of your submission. Do you know the difference in ratings that are outlined in the entrant handbook? And those are on page 41? I believe. There's also some additional criteria for assessment, category three, and there's a couple of new questions for stage two. If you've gone in and looked at the form, or if you've pulled up the handbook, then you'll have noticed those. And just note that entering stage two, it's not just about answering the new questions. So we do encourage you to look through the whole entry and revise your entry as a whole. So that it is going to provide that really strong just be a really strong contender when when it's coming up against the judges and assessors who are going to be evaluating your package as a whole. Okay. And then, let's go into some of the specific feedback that's come out of stage one, then. So how did we do as a whole? So this is across all of the different submissions that were received for stage one. In section one. I believe that this this is kind of reversed results from what we saw come through last year. So I think last year, 1.3, and 1.4 were higher scores and 1.1 1.2 were looks like they were giving people a bit more of a challenge. It's flipped this year. So it seems that in section one, for stage one, this time around, most of the entries did a really good job addressing a significant need or opportunity for customer society and, and the environment. So really strong problem statements, good explanation of of what opportunity you're addressing there. as well. And the same thing with 1.2. So aligning with one or more of, of what's for Strategic Innovation themes. And hopefully, that's because the innovation themes are a bit more clearly expressed this year. So and maybe everyone had a bit of practice, getting to know getting a feel for explaining how you're addressing those as well. Not as good and with a bit more room to improve 1.3, the section around will or could be effective in addressing these problems or opportunities. Something that you might want to look at there is sending out a clear narrative showing your hypothesis is backed up by evidence. And we can go into a little bit more detail on what that might look like later on. But making sure that that you're not just pulling that out of thin air that whether that is when we say evidence, it doesn't necessarily have to be like a paper that could be there could be lots of different ways that you're gathering knowledge and making sure that your assumptions are backed by by information that you're gathering from the real world. 1.4 as well had some room to improve so that setting out a realistic reflection of external risks and how the how the potential benefits to customers, society and the environment outweigh these risks. So there is something that you might want to improve is alongside setting out a comprehensive view of the evidence to external risks your initiative is likely to face, you could set out what benefits your initiative could deliver if it fails. And that's just making sure that no matter what happens with your project, that it is bringing in that valuable learning. In section two, I think this was actually quite similar to last year, as well as for section three. So 2.1 use innovative approaches and or solutions which would not reasonably be expected to be funded as part of business as usual, and enabling innovation. You did a good job there. So I think it's not that that has to completely drop off the radar for this stage. But that's something that rather than wholescale kind of addressing. You know, where can we get better there? That's maybe something that you wouldn't prioritise. as much because it seems like there were high scores there for most of the entries, lower scores and room to improve is probably 2.2. So that you might want to prioritise that ahead of 2.1. That 2.2 is around setting up the potential for adoption at scale across the water sector. And for that, you might want to consider the potential for rollout. So would rollout be feasible, practically commercially, who would pick this up and what might stop them get a little bit more concrete there? Do you plan to consider a future business plan for any output, stuff like that. And then for Section three, so probably still a little bit of room to improve for 3.1 to 3.2. And that's around showing commitment to the entry and being delivered by a team with relevant skills and experience. And we've got some tips for how to improve that later on as well. Something you might want to particularly pay attention to is 3.3. Because there's the note says here, there's very low scores there. So that was around setting out a realistic and achievable programme. And for that, you'll want to ensure that you include a timeline and milestones. And, you know, how else can you? What else can you give to the judges to be confident in your plan and know that what you're setting out is achievable. Also, just to note for this section, there's a couple of new headings, so 3.4 around demonstrating a realistic and consider costing and 3.5. Around a clear proportionate approach to addressing risk. Those are new for section or sorry for stage two. So keep that in mind. And they'll pause there any questions? On the feedback from round one? Nothing in the chat just yet. Andrea? Thank you. I'll just give it a moment.

12:35

Okay.

A

Andrea Wong, Science Practice 12:41

Sorry. When you said about timelines, are you saying to include as a picture? Katherine, maybe, can you speak to that I mean, your images, you,

C

Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 12:55

you're welcome to use that as one of your visuals that you're able to upload. But I think realistically, we're kind of we're talking timelines here. I'm talking kind of both in the programme that you submit, and it's part of the entry template, and then also kind of just making sure that that kind of matches up to the narrative. So being really really clear with kind of what the timeline what you can achieve it at all of those points and being as clear as possible. And where there are kind of levels of uncertainty because for example, it's a pistol is a very long project. And being really clear about kind of when you will establish what activities you're gonna do in later stages early on your programme, being really clear about that one, so you're very welcome to use the timeline, use a visual on the verbs you're able to attach now to do that, and do please do do that if you feel the assessors and judges from that useful to better understand and get the head around your programme.

A

Andrea Wong, Science Practice 13:52

That to clarify not not a requirement, though, right, Catherine? No. Yeah, so it could be more helpful depending on how easy or difficult you found it is to express some of the decisions that you've made and how you're planning out your project plan in the rest of the country. Then

then you may find that option helpful. Is there an end date by which all the work must be completed? That's a that's a no. Right Catherine?

C Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 14:34

No, no, no. And date does not have to be in the current amp does not have to necessarily be finished by the next amp. Just an appropriate timescale for whatever you're doing.

A Andrea Wong, Science Practice 14:47

Yep, so lead with lead with what fits with your project. Great, okay. I'm going to move on for now, but if you do have anything else, then Please do go ahead and keep putting that in the chat. Okay, so in these next few sections, I'm just going to go through some key areas, some key kind of dimensions, which I think, cut across the different sections. But they're all things that you might want to try and strengthen across them. So the first of these is making the business case and showing evidence. And so for this, something that's going to be important for you to do is to evidence the scale and extent of the problem. People seem to have done a good job at explaining what problem they are addressing. What's the opportunity in the previous stage, this time, you just want to make sure that you are backing up with some evidence. So what available evidence will strengthen your case? You might want to consider the scale of the problem and who it impacts that's around question. One point 1.3. If you have that information, that could be a kind of evidence to include the nature and extent of customer need now or later, why customer needs have not yet been met. Or maybe something around why alternative solutions haven't been as promising. Anything you're looking for anything that can help you validate or quantify what you're arguing is the is the problem and, and the scale and extent of it. You can also use the references section, and that that's a place where you can kind of list some information sources that can help support your credibility and save on the word count, if you're if you're worried about that. Okay, and something else is putting water users at the centre. So this fun is coming from customer money. I know that everyone knows that. But just making sure that it's really easy to go down a route and be making an argument. And then maybe not completely rounded out by returning to the customer at the end, and ending up kind of not making that last logical leap. So kind of ending at the point where you just be making the business case. But you've got to kind of make the customer interest case as well. So, assessors will be looking for how your innovation has the potential to help you meet the unmet and evolving needs of individual household water customers society at large and the environment. So you will need to make some sort of arguments around will it keep costs down without asking for sacrifice. Maybe it's about improving people's experience of water use or giving customers insights that help them then learn and adapt. Me Maybe it's around enhancing community's enjoyment of local water resources and their everyday environment. Or maybe your project is going to bring down customer costs by supporting resource recovery. So you should be looking for insights in places where customers have expressed needs in their own words that can be helpful to kind of help that can provide a helpful anchor for you. So that you can show how your project is delivered is directly meeting needs that customers have articulated. Using smart objectives is also something that you don't want to miss. So these are around one point one, sorry, you need to show how they're addressing the opportunity identified in one point 1.1 And building capability in two point 1.4. But I'm sorry, I actually don't have the the question. There's a SMART objectives question. And it will be very, very obvious. I just realised I don't have that specifically referenced in here. SMART objectives are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant time bound. I think that if you're putting out any kind of objective, you want to really make sure that it is specific, that it is achievable that it is relevant to to your project. And so I think that that's a no brainer. Sometimes people have a little bit more trouble with a measurable answer. time bound. time bound doesn't have to be like it's going to be completed by this exact date, it could be this after this kind of period of time since project start, or it could be a duration, it could be a range. So it doesn't, we don't have a pre existing idea, strict idea of what time bound needs to mean. So as long as you know what time is long as you can specify something time bound there, then that would take care of that. of the tea. And in terms of measurable, some things are primarily measurable, measurable with time. So that can get people a little bit confused as well. But you other things and other things. They're measurable by saying, well, is that completed or not? But wherever you can, wherever there's an opportunity to quantify that, then you want to specify that so that you will be able to go back and know without hesitation like, Have I completed that or not? Has that? Has that been done? Can I take that off? Okay, and then you'll also want to make a case with or sorry. So we talked about making a case of evidence. What does that what does that look like? Stronger entries are going to be able to address real water user needs that have either been expressed or observed. They will quantify the scale of benefit at short and long term. They'll also evidence why this is the best approach of many different possible approaches to try and what could be gained from trying this out. And they'll specify a plant to find an effective solution. Things that they'll avoid are addressing business needs without articulating how this benefits customer society or the environment. So it can't just be addressing business needs has to come back to the customers. Though avoid being projects that meet all or nothing long term benefits, you really want to make sure that there is learning that and potential benefit that's coming out before project end. They'll also avoid leaving known precedents left unsaid with no plans to recoup learning that fails. So I guess that's kind of similar point and also avoid pitching a product or solution that already exists. So that fits in with the evidence, just making sure that you've established what the current state of the art is. And you've given your your giving the judges and assessors a clearer idea of that as well. And I will pause there again, for questions, I see that there's

C

Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 22:57

a couple of questions in the chat. I think I can kind of provide a little bit of guidance. But the first question is, are the references demonstrating that there is evidence or they'll be read as part of the assessment. So just in terms of kind of the assessment and the assessment process, assessors will not read external documents, externally linked files. And however they might check to make sure that that bol is there. And that that is something that shows that equally, if there's things that are kind of confidential that you can't include, and it's a kind of an internal only document, please do continue to reference them, but know that they're kind of not available publicly. Yet, but the kind of key point you're trying to make should be written in the answer. And then that kind of reference there will be provided to kind of backup and provide evidence of, of the point you've made. But you should make the point within the written answer, and not expect assessors to be going out and reading alternative documents. And I know that Andrew is going to cover quite a lot more around kind of building building evidence and talking about using evidence in entering this workshop. And Lisa's question. So smart objects in one point 1.1 And two, point four be a bit different. So it's tuple 1.4. I think there's also one other question which asks for smart objectives. It's about answering how that means you're going to meet the need of the customer. So that's what one point 1.1 is, what needs does your project, get the exact question up? What is the problem that the Post Entry is seeking to address the water sector? So how do your SMART objectives get to that solving of that need? is kind of what we're looking to do there.

A Andrea Wong, Science Practice 24:41

Thanks for asking that question. Without having the handbook in front of me at the same time. I started to get get a bit muddled with with those numbers, but the information as it's listed on the slide, it is accurate. And the last word Is the handbook. And so if you need so check the hand, always, always check the handbook, come back to us, we can dig into anything that is confusing there. Even if you're not ready to book a full one to one coaching call to go into how you're answering each of the questions in your entry. If you have a quick question about anything that's confusing in there, please do get in touch with me. If it's not something that I can answer, I have kind of a direct line to Nesta challenge works. And so between us, we can get that sorted out really quickly for you. Okay, I'm going to move on to the next section. So communicating a strong plan for your innovation projects. For this, what you want to be doing is showing how you will make the most of this opportunity. So how will you enable innovation and implementation? To do this, you want to add clear and precise details about how innovation enablers you plan to use and develop will build innovation capability in the water sector and put those sectoral gains in perspective. So asking yourself, how might the sector benefit? What mechanisms within your control could facilitate this? You could be looking at? What outputs will you share? How will you make it easier to pick up and roll out this this project? You might also want to ask how will you alleviate or manage or prepare for known persistent barriers to give your innovation, its best chance at succeeding. And you'll want to back up these claims of specific sensible commitments. So you don't want to say like oh, well, we're going to put on a whole there's going to be a huge learning event. And we're going to invite all these people and this big day, it's going to be a big splash, if that's not something that is that you're ready to commit to and also that you that maybe isn't quite what maybe isn't quite what your project is calling for. So think about what's really needed to share the the kind of evidence that you expect to have. And how will you pave the way so that others don't have to. And there could be all sorts of different ways of doing that. But just make sure that it is sensible and kind of targeted at the needs of your particular entry. Another thing to consider is planning to act on learning throughout and stay flexible. So how will your project plan specify opportunities to learn, reflect and adapt? This is relevant to questions 3.3 point two to three point 3.3. strategies for reducing risk may include monitoring KPIs, stage gating, milestones for no for go and no go decisions or a plan to capture and act on learnings throughout. However, however, you you have constructed that. So anything that will allow you to quickly adapt and change in response to failure or opportunity is good as well. sort of ask yourself, which risks and uncertainties Can you address through the structure of your project plan? And how will you resource learning over the whole project so that it's not just a quick transition, recoup those earnings at the end? Easy to forget what you what you learn Midway, the judges and assessors want to see that that learning is happening over the whole project course. And consider who needs to be involved in each of those as well. So it might not be the same people throughout. But on the other hand, it might be just depends on your project. And again, looking at what good looks like. So got kind of have a couple of images here of I guess Gantt charts, if you're struggling to make sense of what those are. So good should look like milestones that match your objectives. I mean, it's obvious, but it's something that a lot of people can go back and strengthen. Once you take a look at that once you've got something down on paper, short feedback cycles, or other ways of showing that you're learning through routes can also be a good thing to have in there. Having flexibility to adapt, knowing when to call it quits, how will you know what those points are failing fast and learning from it, and sharing successes as well as dead ends. So whether or not your project has been a success and success up until which point, you want to make sure that you are you have a plan in place to share those learnings more widely. And specifying a timeline, obviously, something that that you want to put in. And it looks less like milestones that are not about customer needs. That's something that you think it doesn't have to be every single milestone, extremely directly answering to those needs. But a good check could be to look at each of your milestones and think, how is this helping me get closer to answering those customer needs. And just framing framing your review, that way, could be a good way to just make sure that the customer need doesn't drop out of the picture. If you've got evaluation only at the end, learning it only at the end, that could be something that's that could be a sign that, oh, maybe I need to include that somewhere else as well. Don't want you to be sticking to the plan as if it's the only option. So keeping in mind sunk cost fallacy. If it really isn't working, make sure that there's a way to pull out. What we really don't want is a situation where you don't even know why you've failed in that scenario, or what happens next. So you know how, who's going to come together? What are those points where you'll be able to rapidly make those determinations. Okay, and I think there's other two points are kind of self evident, and we've already gone over them. Okay, also for this section, you want to value what your team brings. And that goes for resourcing and oversight. So when we were going over the feedback previously, I think that these questions had middling scores for stage one. And so this is this is where this is the moment where we're talking about how can you what are some things that you could do to improve? Answering these questions around? How will your team support your success? So you do want to think about what skills and resources specifically you'll need and who will make decisions on what's working what isn't and where our spending needs to be reallocated to give the entry its best chances at success. And if you do need to hire additional team members, if you get if you are successful and getting funding, then please do explain what skills they need and have a bit of a plan in place about how you're going to find that relevant talent. You want to think about people who are in those serve for the second bullet point, there's more senior decision making positions, and thinking about how they're not just giving lip service to that commitment. But you know, what is the valuable role that they're going to play as well? So are there ways that they're going to, or is there a committee that they're sitting on that they're going to have some sort of oversight over the project and be able to give their their input as in addition to this, the implementation type roles where you want to be considering skills and resources as well. So for this, our tip is that making cost efficiencies and adding value via in Kinder additional financial support can also demonstrate your commitment and show good use of customer money. But there's, there's lots of different ways to show commitment and just the best way to do it is to show it not to just tell it right and other details that you could pick up in this part of the entry. So around cost efficiency. Just make sure that you're making a clear Case for each budget item and how each of those will deliver value for customers, society and the environment and justify your contingencies around governance, how is governance going to support your collaboration. So this kind of builds on the previous slide around or on the people aspects of your entry. So just demonstrate that you've considered how decisions are going to be made and disputes are managed or managed. And we do ask you to provide an Organa gramme. Risk mitigation, specify a clear and appropriate approach to risk. And get as specific as possible. And the biggest tip for this is if you read back, what you have down around risk mitigation, and it could kind of apply to lots of different projects, then consider getting more specific to your particular entry. Because that's just that's an that's, I think, a quite easy win for a lot of people they can get more specific their inflation just be realistic and, and risk averse in calculating your inflation allowance and ensure that you take into account currency fluctuations where appropriate. Think Catherine, you've been getting quite a lot of questions about inflation. But we know just as little as you do, of course. And I think it's just really Yeah. Again, being realistic and risk averse, innovation themes. For this, we suggest that you opt to focus on one to two of those, that you are fulfilling really well, rather than making a weaker case for why you reach all five. It's just not necessary to go for all of them. So if you do want to go for more than one to two, then have a very, very good reason for doing so. But we'll just be looking for the judges and assessors will just be looking for one to two. And that's what I'll be looking for if you send me your entry for a review. Okay. Oh, yes, sorry. For this year. I thought it was four. And then I felt that you've corrected that to five Katherine. There's four innovation things. Okay, Melissa, any advice on how to handle the situation where the proposal genuinely hits all four innovation themes, but the word count is limited. I think that if you can prioritise, prioritise a couple of those. And explain though, and just choose to focus on those. That would be one way to approach it. Another way to approach it would be to say, it's really strong on one or two of these to give more airtime to the like priority, choose a couple of to prioritise and delve into those and a bit more of your word count. And then use a little bit less word count on the other two. If you really feel that you want to address all four. Just to kind of

C Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 38:37

add on that one, there are no additional points for hitting more than one theme. Whereas actually not having an evidenced answer is quite a common reason why kind of assessors would would score that part down, even kind of saying like, Look, you they've gone too broad and tried to shallow into each of these themes. And so you're kind of exactly in line with kind of what Andrea said there. But yeah, there are no additional points for hitting more than one theme, you need to demonstrate that you hit one and evidence that well.

A Andrea Wong, Science Practice 39:09

Thank you, Katherine. And any other questions? Oops. Okay. So the last area of tips we have here are around strengthening your pitch and written entry. It's more about the mechanics around that. Do you think about your entry as a whole? And so this goes with the point that I said at the very beginning that entering stage two is not just about answering the new questions for stage two. You should make sure that you go back and do a review and just make sure that you're strengthening the whole thing and that it's all hanging together as a whole because you may have made some tweaks Since the previous submission, or resolved some bits and pieces, and just make sure that that's consistent, and it's really telling that holistic story as you want it to be told. So yeah, check that you're telling a consistent story, especially if there have been changes the business model. And that may mean sending a few different people through to check for those key points. Avoid excessive repetition. Basically, if you find yourself repeating similar, very, very similar content and an answer, then it might mean that you're just not using that word count as effectively as you could be. Because you're not, you're not answering the question on the nose as you could be. So if you, you find yourself in that situation, and you're not really sure how to where to go from there, you're you think that you're not sure how a question is different from a previous one? That is absolutely something that I'm happy to answer specific questions about, if you email, or if we have a call. But do keep in mind that assessors are going to review the whole entry. So if you do have a little bit of repetition, I mean, you just, that's just they're going to look at the whole, the whole entry. You don't want to tell them stuff that they already know. But of course, emphasising and anchoring to your your key narrative is something that could help. And but yeah, I think that that would be more around covering key points, rather than asking you to kind of repeat similar content. Okay, and so yeah, a way to check in on this area of feedback is to ensure that all aspects of your story are covered somewhere in your whole entry package. And you may want to try checking your answers and kind of in line with this, this rough, rough division that we've got on the slide here. So in section one, it's kind of why why your why should your entry be funded? Category? Section two is around, you know, well, what are you going to do? And how are you going to do that. And then three is a bit more of the detail about when, where, and who got a checklist here, if you are looking for something to help you make an impactful revision, so I won't go through each of these points individually. But you know, feel free to screencap this right now, if that's useful to you, and I think these are going to be circulated as well, aren't they, Katherine? Yes. So you can also use the slide once it goes out over email. But I think that the first points around testing your entry of an educated outsider, and just making sure that your story is clear and compelling, that's worth calling out. And so in the templates, I don't think that they're so new this year. But just make sure that you are filling those out. And if there are any questions that you have, for each of those different parts, like the question that we had about timeline earlier, and images, do feel free to get in touch, because we just want you to not be missing out on any of the essential parts there. Okay, so this is usually something that we get quite a lot of questions about. And that's about the pitch. And previously, there was only a video pitch this year, there is an option to pitch in person. That's at the judging stage. The assessment stage happens before so the assessors will see your video pitch. If you do it, once it gets to judging, then there is an option to pitch in person. And if you choose to pitch in person, it means that the judges can ask questions. But if you can't make those live judging pitches, or you just don't want to do Your pitch video will be shown to the judges, just like it was shown to the assessors. And, of course, since you won't be there, then there won't be an opportunity for them to ask you questions. So you just have to make that call about what you think is the best approach for your team. What we do recommend is that you try to use the pitch as an opportunity to bring your entry to life for judges. Your pitch is the last thing that the judges will see before they make their decision on which entries receive funding. So just make sure that you're using that opportunity and making it count. If you are coming to the live pitch, then you do have to be prepared to answer those questions briefly and succinctly. I think it's the five minute pitch and 10 minutes for questions and answers. Not a lot of time. So you want to make sure that people who are there are the right people to be able to provide that key information on the spot. All right. And then in terms of strengthening your video pitch since we talked about how lots of people I spoke to Katherine previously, and it sounds like lots of people are already signed up to rerecord their video pitch. Good looks a bit more like conveying the most important points for the judges and assessors to remember making sure that you're highlighting customer benefits, using appropriate visual aids to support points that the speaker is making and naming all the partners. It looks less like providing lots and lots of technical detail without making the overall case for the entry. Save that for the written entry. That's where the judges and assessors can delve into that technical detail. It looks less like focusing only on benefit to water companies really make sure that you highlight that customer benefit, bring that story home looks less like someone speaking to the camera for just four minutes straight without any visual aids or in this case, it would be speaking to a very boring slide. If you don't have a slide, there will just be a very boring slide like we've tried to mock up here shown instead of a slide of yours. So make sure that it's a good slide of yours that that's shown. There aren't actually your presenters face is not going to be shown to the judges and assessors and that's for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion reasons. So yeah, it will just be a pretty much blank slide if you don't show something else. And just obviously, if it's unclear who is pitching that, it can be a bit difficult as well. So you want to be naming all the partners and making it clear who is doing that pitch. And it looks like some questions are coming through where will okay sorry, that's already been addressed? Where will the live pitch take place online or in person and it is via zoom but it is it is like live as in the judges are going to be there and they're going to be able to ask you questions rather than a recording any other questions about the the live pitch or pitching in general? Okay, I will go on to the summary then. So we looked at key feedback from judges and assessors for stage one. And you're going to be getting a copy of that. So if you need to go back and look you can. Then we went into those three different sections of areas that you might like kind of different lenses that you might want to take on your entry when you're reviewing when you're going back and strengthening different parts. So looking at making the business case and showing evidence, communicating a strong plan for your innovation project, and thinking about ways to strengthen your pitch and written entry what is next. So science practice myself, my colleague Richard, we are offering 30 minute coaching calls you can bring, you can come by yourself, you can bring your team, it works best if you send your dry draft entry beforehand. And give us a couple of days to look at that. If if you need to book a call, and you only have one day before, sometimes we can accommodate that. So don't not book a call just because you're not you don't have the two days ahead. Just get in touch with us and see if we can accommodate you. But what happens during those calls is that we can go through some of the key feedback that we that we can see, based on our review of your draft entry, no matter what state that's in, we can we can say, Well, we think this questions answering the answering to the criteria better than this other one over here. We can suggest things like it seems like this section that you've got here is answering the question from another part of the entry. So maybe you could consider shifting that around. We can't obviously write your content for you. But we what I can say is that we know the guidance and we can provide that kind of critical friend. Second perspective. Neutral and and independent of the assessor and judging process to just give you that look into how your entry is doing. Do get in touch with us. There's a Calendly link, you can book in coaching calls with us there. All right. So if you're looking for more sources of pointers, you can look at previous webinars and events that are on the on the Challenge website. You can book into one to one surgeries with Nesta challenge works. We just went over the entrance. The there sorry, there's the entrance support page that has an overview of all of this. And that's what's linked here. There's of course, the entrant handbook. But I think that people are using that as quite indispensable resource. So definitely be using that as your guide. And don't forget the materials that share feedback from previous rounds, you can dig into the website more for that. There's also a blog post on seven tips here. And I think that those are all still relevant for this year's entries. So that could be a good one to look at as well. All right, so any final questions? We've got a question here. And my understanding is that there are different assessors at stage one and stage two? If that is correct, how confident can we be that stage one feedback slash concerns are shared by stage two panel? Catherine, did you want to take this so

C

Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 53:22

we can't guarantee that those will be the same. However, kind of the what was shared at the beginning of the call was kind of an average across all of the entries that have received at stage one this time. And they have slightly changed. And I could have very much averages. The assessors can can be different, there are kind of a pool of assessors that slightly vary. And you'll likely have kind of at least one different assessor reviewing your entry. But they definitely very much kind of read them from scratch, and they're reviewing entries from scratch. So if not Kareena, they're going to base it on it. Well, last round, they said this, it's very much what's in your entry when you submit it at stage two. And it could be an entirely different set of assessors. And we do ensure that they have kind of technical assessments as a capability. So it is likely that we'll have both very similar perspectives. But based on the assessment criteria, but we kind of can't guarantee that at by any means. And what you do regularly see is that often the judges kind of perceive and look at entries quite differently, albeit guided by the technical assessors and feedback, particularly when it comes to any technical aspects. But again, it's kind of looking at that, that in the round and in line with the assessment criteria. And so both all of the assessors both at stage one and stage two, and judges are very much guided by those assessment criteria. So please do have a look at those. Obviously kind of we had that. The by far the lowest kind of scoring as a cohort was that final 3.3 This time, which was looking kind of providing that clear timeline kit clear plan that is very low weighted at stage one, like there's a reason why it didn't look like that. That is the lowest scoring is because it's very low weighted. And that's not the case at stage two. So kind of that one definitely focusing on. But I think the fact that that one has the lowest scoring is a good sign that kind of everyone's taken note with the fact that how low weighted that is, at stage one, I think kind of a positive aspect there.

A Andrea Wong, Science Practice 55:32

Well, just don't let it drag for stage two.

C Catherine Thompson, Nesta Challenges 55:35

Yeah, any other questions come through. I'm just gonna launch the poll and survey. I'd really appreciate it if you fill this in. And I'm also going to then stop the recording if anyone's got any other questions they'd like to ask.