

## Annex E: Evaluation Criteria and Marking of proposals

Proposals will be assessed using the following criteria and scoring to identify those proposals that offer overall value for money, taking account of:

- Understanding of current and future spaceflight market (30% weighting in overall score)
- Excellence of work proposed (25% weighting in overall score)
- Value for Money, including benefit to the UK (25% weighting in overall score)
- Sound management and planning (20% weighting in overall score)

Criteria	Scoring criteria
<b>1. Understanding of current and future spaceflight market</b>  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the 'UK Benefits' or 'Commercial and Technical viability' sections in the Application Form)	<p><i>The <b>highest scoring</b> projects will demonstrate a comprehensive current understanding of the market for spaceflight in the UK and globally, augmented with an initial analysis of how their proposition may fit into this market now or in the future. These projects will show comprehensive knowledge of potential customer, competitors or suppliers, with a plan for refining their offer through the proposed research activities.</i></p> <p><i><b>Moderate scoring</b> projects will demonstrate a basic understanding of the current UK and global spaceflight market, alongside a logical but untested analysis of how their spaceport proposition could fit in this market. These projects will show an initial understanding of some, but not all, their potential suppliers, competitors or customers.</i></p> <p><i><b>Low scoring</b> projects will have little understanding of either the UK or global spaceflight market, and show no evidence of how their proposition could serve this market in future. These projects will show a limited understanding of potential customers, suppliers or competitors, having conducted little market engagement previously.</i></p>
<b>2. Excellence of work proposed</b>  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the 'Commercial and Technical viability' section in the Application Form)	<p><i>The scoring should reflect your assessment of the proposed research's technical and commercial merits, and whether it will help advance the applicant spaceport's plans to raise finance and achieve horizontal spaceflight operations.</i></p> <p><i>The <b>highest scoring</b> projects will demonstrate an initial understanding of the technical and commercial strengths and weaknesses of their spaceport's proposition, alongside an achievable and realistic proposal for how to overcome any weaknesses or build required information. The proposed research will give confidence that it will enable spaceports to successfully seek private finance upon completion.</i></p> <p><i><b>Moderate scoring</b> projects will request research that will increase both the spaceport's technical and commercial understanding of their readiness, though an ambitious increase in knowledge is required before a spaceport could be fully ready. The proposed research could, with some further additions from other sources, give the spaceport a good chance of securing private finance upon completion.</i></p>

Criteria	Scoring criteria
	<i><b>Low scoring</b> projects will demonstrate almost no current knowledge of the technical and commercial considerations for their project, and request studies that are either overly ambitious or poorly defined in terms of scope, method or output. Even if the proposed research were completed, it is unlikely the spaceport would be able to raise finance and realise their ambitions.</i>
<b>3. Value for Money</b>  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the 'UK Benefits' and 'Financial and management information' sections in the Application Form; and from the Milestone Costs Form)	<p><i><b>The highest scoring</b> projects will have the potential to create major benefits for the UK economy, backed up with a clear initial plan on how these benefits will be realised. Robust evidence on both costs and benefits may already be available or there will be a clear plan to gather this from independent sources. The costs of any activities proposed for grant funding will be justified and strongly linked to outcomes and benefits.</i></p> <p><i><b>Moderate scoring</b> projects will have the potential to create some benefits for the UK economy, though there may be barriers to realising these benefits that are not yet understood. Evidence on potential UK costs and benefits will be proposed as part of the project. Costs of any activities for grant funding will be reasonable, albeit with some potential for further savings, and can be linked to potential benefits.</i></p> <p><i><b>Low scoring</b> projects will only have the potential to provide minimal benefits to the UK economy, or the proposal will not consider wider benefit at all. Little if any further analysis to examine UK costs and benefits will be requested, with any work that is requested poorly defined. There will be little obvious link between benefits and costs for the activities that could be funded by the grant, and the costs themselves may seem unjustified or with scope for substantial further savings.</i></p>
<b>4. Sound management and planning</b>  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the 'Methodology' and 'Financial and management information' sections in the Application Form)	<p><i>All projects will need to demonstrate that they have an effective structure in place for managing the administration of the grant requested, and demonstrate that they have a sound approach to planning to achieve their project aims on time and within budget.</i></p> <p><i>The <b>highest scoring</b> projects will demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is aligned with industry best practice. They will demonstrate understanding of the majority of third-party approvals needed to support their spaceport proposition. A strong team will be identified and resourced to enable the grant funding to be administered correctly.</i></p> <p><i><b>Moderate scoring</b> projects will show a mature approach to risk and programme management, with a number of processes identified and resourced appropriately including a consideration of key risks and potential mitigations. They will demonstrate an understanding of their programme dependencies, including some third-party approvals necessary for their spaceport proposition. The project team will have some experience of delivering similar projects, though some further resource will be needed to administer the grant funding.</i></p> <p><i><b>Low scoring</b> projects will demonstrate only a limited grasp of the management needed to complete the project. These projects will not have adequate processes in place to identify and manage any risks that may arise, leading to a lack of confidence that they would succeed. The project team may have need for significant further resourcing in order to give confidence they will administer the funding correctly.</i></p>

### Scoring Guidance

The proposals should be scored on the scale of 1 to 10 for each criteria using the table below as a guide to the scale.

Score	Assessment
0	No response is offered in respect of the criteria.
1	An incomplete or <u>very poor</u> response, which fails to address the criteria; and/or the response is not credible, with <u>no evidence</u> to support the claims made meaning there is <u>no confidence</u> of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>low scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
2	A <u>poor</u> response which only partially addresses the criteria and would require significant revision to become acceptable; and/or <u>very limited, and inadequate</u> , evidence to support the claims made meaning <u>low confidence</u> of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>low scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
4	A <u>limited</u> response with deficiencies apparent against the criteria, requiring some revision to become acceptable; and/or <u>limited</u> evidence provided supporting the claims made meaning <u>limited</u> confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>low scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
5	An <u>acceptable</u> response which could have been expanded upon, with identified weaknesses correctable; and/or <u>just sufficient</u> evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning a <u>reasonable</u> confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>moderate scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
7	A <u>good</u> response which addresses the criteria well, with identified weaknesses readily correctable; and/or <u>solid</u> evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning a <u>solid</u> level of confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>moderate scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
9	A <u>very good</u> response which addresses the criteria very well with very few weaknesses; and/or <u>good evidence</u> provided in support of the claims made meaning a <u>high</u> level of confidence of success; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>highest scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.
10	An <u>excellent</u> response which is considered to absolutely address the criteria without weakness; and/or <u>compelling</u> evidence provided in support of the claims made meaning success is considered to be <u>virtually assured</u> ; and/or the response is assessed as ' <u>highest scoring</u> ' against the scoring criteria shown in the table above.