

Annex C - Scoring criteria

PROPOSAL NUMBER	
PROPOSAL TITLE	

Assessors scoring sheet for “Advancing research into space surveillance and tracking: Call for grant proposals”

Proposals should be assessed using the criteria and scoring scale shown below, designed to identify those proposals which offer the best Value for Money (VFM) overall. Assessors should complete the scoring sheet and provide a supporting narrative to justify their assessments against the following criteria:

- Technical feasibility (35% weighting in overall score)
- Commercial sustainability (25% weighting in overall score)
- Benefit to the UK (20% weighting in overall score)
- Sound management and planning (20% weighting in overall score)

Although criteria weightings above will apply once all proposals have been scored please do not consider these when conducting your own assessment.

Criteria	Scoring criteria
1. Technical feasibility	<p>Proposals must be assessed as technically feasible within the budget, range and timeframe offered. Proposals should demonstrate a realistic scope and achieve the aim of the opportunity, described in section 3 of the Call Document.</p> <p>Highest scoring applicants will provide a comprehensive proposal with a high probability of success, relying on evolvment or deployment of existing and working technologies. Proposals will not contain weaknesses in the techniques and/or measurements to be employed but provide excellent commercial and/or scientific opportunities. Proposals will contain realistic project deliverables against the proposed timescales with strong consideration given to technical risks of the project. Proposals will include robust plans to demonstrate the performance of the technology/system.</p>

	<p>Moderate scoring applicants will provide a good proposal relying on realistic technological advancements or using existing technology. The proposals will have a good chance of success, with any weaknesses in techniques and/or measurements able to be readily corrected. Good project deliverables against the proposed timescales with some thought given to technical risks, mitigation or impact. Some consideration of how performance will be demonstrated.</p> <p>Low scoring applicants will rely on untested technology and/or propose limited technological advancement. Unrealistic project deliverables with little or no thought as to risks, mitigation or impact.</p>
2. Commercial sustainability	<p>Proposals must be assessed against commercial understanding, knowledge and viability. The scoring should reflect your assessment of whether the proposed activity would generate a realistic and sustainable product for the UK market.</p> <p>Highest scoring applicants will provide reliable evidence that their proposal meets the requirements of UK and global SST markets. Proposals will demonstrate strong understanding of the current market as well as how their research will be both commercially sustainable and beneficial.</p> <p>Moderate scoring applicants will provide reliable evidence of how their proposal meets the purpose of the call. Proposals will demonstrate a good understanding of the current market and limited understanding of how their proposal will be sustained or delivered within the current market.</p> <p>Low scoring applicants will be based on assumptions of the market, which are not supported by reliable evidence or research. They will demonstrate little or no consideration of the sustainability or benefits of their research.</p>
3. Benefit to the UK	<p>All projects will need to demonstrate that the investment sought from the UK Government represents clear value for the UK public, through measurable benefits for the UK economy.</p> <p>Highest scoring applicants will provide excellent, detailed evidence of the benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy, including UK-based employment and contract opportunities. The costs of any activities proposed for grant funding will be very well justified and strongly linked to outcomes and benefits.</p> <p>Moderate scoring applicants will provide some evidence of the benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy and some justifications for grant funding are adequately linked to outcomes and benefits.</p> <p>Low scoring applicants provide little, poor or no evidence of the benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy OR the costs of any activities proposed for grant funding are poorly justified and not linked to outcomes and benefits.</p>

<p>4. Sound management and planning</p>	<p>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 programme aims on time and within budget.</p> <p>Highest scoring applicants demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is aligned with industry best practice. A strong team will be identified and resourced to enable the grant funding to be administered correctly. Risks to the project management will be clearly identified alongside costed and detailed mitigations, providing a clear picture of the practicality and viability of the proposal. Risks will consider the impact of COVID-19 on the ability to meet delivery milestones as planned. Value for money will be considered as well as good time management and clear and focused documentation of progress.</p> <p>Moderate scoring applicants demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is partially aligned with industry best practice. Moderate evidence of risks will be provided alongside, and mitigations will be provided, with some evidence of an appropriately resourced delivery team. Risks will consider the impact of COVID-19 on the ability to meet delivery milestones as planned. Proposals will consider value for money as well as project documentation but with limited thought as to how their time will be best focused.</p> <p>Low scoring applicants provide poor evidence or fail to demonstrate consideration of suitable risks and mitigations. No or little consideration of value for money and poor explanation of time management.</p>
---	---