

## Annex C: NSIP Evaluation Criteria and marking of 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:

- Innovation (35% weighting in overall score)
- Relevance of innovation proposed (25% weighting in overall score)
- Benefit to the UK (20% weighting in overall score)
- Sound management and planning (20% weighting in overall score)

Criteria	Scoring criteria
<b>1. Innovation</b>	<p>Considers what product, service or technology is being proposed including its novelty, originality, newness to space and suitability of the work proposed, including assessment of risk and benefits.</p> <p>All proposals will need to demonstrate that their idea is innovative and has applicability to the space sector.</p> <p><b>Highest scoring</b> proposals will provide a comprehensive demonstration of what is innovative about their proposed product, service or technology with a high probability of successful project outcomes. Proposals will describe the high-risk/high return potential of their innovation and includes excellent commercial and/or scientific opportunities. Proposals will contain realistic project deliverables in FY 20/21 with strong consideration given to technical or scientific risks of the project. Proposals will include robust plans to demonstrate the advancement/performance of their innovation.</p> <p><b>Moderate scoring</b> proposals will provide a good proposal that describes their innovation. The proposals will have a good chance of success, with any weaknesses able to be readily corrected. Proposals give some thought on the high-risk/high return potential of their innovation. Good project deliverables in FY 20/21 with some thought given to technical risks, mitigation or impact. Some consideration of how performance of their innovation will be demonstrated.</p> <p><b>Low scoring</b> proposals will not demonstrate what is innovative about their proposed product, service or technology and/or propose limited technological advancement. Unrealistic project deliverables with little or no thought as to risks, mitigation or impact</p>
<b>2. Relevance</b>	<p>Considers the applicability of the innovation to space market/sector and the degree to which the innovation product, technical or service has the potential to be disruptive in the market.</p> <p>All proposals will need to demonstrate that their innovation has strong market potential.</p> <p><b>Highest scoring</b> proposals will provide reliable evidence that their proposal has the potential of acquiring a UK and/or global market share. Proposals will demonstrate strong understanding of the current marketplace and how their innovation will create a new market and/ or disrupt existing markets.</p>

Criteria	Scoring criteria
	<p><b>Moderate scoring</b> proposals will provide reliable evidence of how their proposal meets the purpose of the call. Proposals will demonstrate a good understanding of the current market but a limited understanding of how their innovation will create a new market and/ or disrupt existing markets.</p> <p><b>Low scoring</b> proposals will demonstrate little or no consideration of the potential market for their innovation and with little or no evidence to support claims made for market size.</p>
<p><b>3. Benefit to the UK</b></p>	<p>Considers why the innovation should be funded: potential applications and the benefits it offers over existing products or services; who and how will benefit from the innovation, and the timeliness of the activity.</p> <p>All proposals 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><b>Highest scoring</b> proposals 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><b>Moderate scoring</b> proposals 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><b>Low scoring</b> proposals 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><b>4. Management and planning</b></p>	<p>Considers the strength of the proposal including background, experience and track record of the team, the credibility of the proposed project delivery plan, and also the value for money aspects of the project.</p> <p>All proposals 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.</p> <p><b>Highest scoring</b> proposals will 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 with 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><b>Moderate scoring</b> proposals demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is partially aligned with industry best</p>

Criteria	Scoring criteria
	<p>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><b>Low scoring</b> proposals 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>

### 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.
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.
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.
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.
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.