

International Bilateral Fund - Call 3 Grant Assessment Criteria

Applicants should use the below applicant guidance to guide their responses to all assessment questions

Mandatory	Question	Applicant Guidance	Evaluator Guidance
25%	1. How does your proposal advance the strategic goals of promoting international partnerships? *Only proposals that score at least 3/5 on both questions 1 and 2 will be reviewed further.	Strategic alignment. How does your proposal advance the strategic goals of promoting international partnerships? This question focuses on the international objectives of the IBF and answers should respond to these directly: How does the proposal build stronger relationships with international partners, cementing our place as a trusted space partner of choice. How does the proposal support the space strategies and priorities of both the UK and the international partner country. If the project enhances UK security and defence, this should be detailed in this section. Applications should outline the degree to which the proposal establishes or strengthens international partnerships. Proposals should demonstrate which international stakeholders are engaged and involved and to what extent. There should be evidenced benefits delivered to the international partner. Also considered is the value of the project in developing the UK's influence and reputation and championing of the UK space sector and how you will undertake this. Proposals will outline how the project will advance the UK's interests internationally and undertake activities to enhance the UK's reputation. Highest scoring proposals will show a significant advance in a strategic relationship through demonstrating: a clear interest for the project from key stakeholders; a high global interest and profile in the project; high relevance to partner country's strategic ambitions (e.g. through reference to the relevant strategies or priorities of proposed international partner country); and the potential for improved technological enhancements and/or commercial opportunities for both UK and the international contributors.	(5): Clear alignment to the strategic nature of the call. Clear and specific evidence provided about how the project supports the UK Space Agency and wider governmental international ambitions. Logical and articulated line of sight from project activities to outputs, outcomes and strategic impact. Evidence of alignment with the strategic priorities of both the UK and international partners is clearly articulated, drawing on the latest evidence, government publications and relevant policy reports. (4): Clear alignment to the identified call aims, with evidence provided that gives confidence that delivery of the project would advance the strategic objective. Wider Government priorities/strategic aims considered but links are unclear or there is limited confidence that the project would deliver on these. (3): Strategic alignment to the call given with clear supporting evidence but no further explanation of wider Government alignment. (2): Limited strategic alignment to the aims of the call, with partial supporting evidence. Very limited links to wider Government objectives clearly identified. (1): No clear alignment to the strategy of the call. Lack of evidence that delivery would support identified call objectives. (0): No evidence provided to demonstrate any alignment to strategic nature of the call or answer is missing substantial amounts of information that would be reasonably expected.
20%	2. With limited public funding, the UK Space Agency prioritises technical projects that push the boundaries of innovation. These should also be practically achievable and have strong technical or scientific foundations that make successful development more likely. How is your idea technically feasible and/or innovative and how are you developing UK capability in your chosen area? *Only proposals that score at least 3/5 on both questions 1 and 2 will be reviewed further.	How technically credible and innovative is the proposed approach, and how will it contribute to the development and/or strengthening of UK strategic capability in the chosen area through international collaboration? Responses must outline the challenge or opportunity being addressed, and how the potential solution is an improvement over existing or competitor alternatives. Please include: •Description of the problem being addressed or the opportunity being sought •Description of technical solution •The originality of the proposal and how it is differentiated from existing or competitor technologies •Anticipated IP or competitive advantage generation and how defensible it would be This section focuses on the inherent value of the proposed idea. If the project relates to technology development, responses should demonstrate the proposed feasibility of the technology to ascertain if the proposed project has a good chance of success. Responses should outline any research methodology relied upon, work undertaken on earlier stages of technology development and plans for future development during the proposed project. If the project relates to other areas of R&D (e.g., research, knowledge exchange), responses should demonstrate the viability and feasibility of their intended activities in the context in which they will be performed to demonstrate how a project will succeed in its aims by the given timeline. Proposals should outline how the project will support a capability area across the Space sector, how this gap has been identified and how the development will support UK national goals. Proposals should outline deliverables and acceptance criteria that are proportionate to the milestone value and clear.	(5): Robust technical plan put in place with significant chance of success for the desired TRL development. Planned approach is technically robust. Technica risks have been clearly identified, supported by credible mitigation and contingency plans. High confidence that the TRL progression is achievable within the proposed timescale. Plans demonstrate strong knowledge of current sector capability and how this project will contribute to the UK space sector with demonstrated potential for significant impact. Project is innovative. (4): Technical approach is considered good, with good confidence that the technology development is realistic within the proposed timescale. Technical risks have been identified and appropriate mitigations proposed, although there are some deficiencies in the approach. (3): Technical approach is considered adequate with confidence that the project could deliver proposed TRL progression, but some deficiency in the propose technical approach such as unidentified technical risks, unrealistic assumptions or an overambitious delivery timetable. (2) Technical approach is considered concerning with additional risks likely to arise that will impact delivery of the project. Limited degree of innovation demonstrated. (1) Technical approach is highly risky with no clear plan for managing project risks. Major concerns as to the deliverability of the project within the desired timescale. Very limited degree of innovation demonstrated. (0) Technical approach has major concerns that would make the project undeliverable. No consideration of innovation.
20%	3. The Agency seeks to ensure that the investment it makes delivers a strong return and supports the space sector's future growth. What economic benefits do you expect this project to deliver for your organisation and beyond? Please describe both the anticipated outcomes at the end of the grant and the longer-term benefits if the project is fully realised.	What economic benefits do you expect this project to deliver for your organisation and beyond? Please describe both the anticipated outcomes at the end of the grant and the longer-term benefits if the project is fully realised. Responses should clearly set out the commercial opportunity, including potential applications, advantages over existing products or services, target customers and markets, and the organisations or communities expected to benefit. Applicants should identify the key milestones, technology developments or commercial activities that will unlock investment, secure contracts, generate export revenue or accelerate growth such as increased industrial competitiveness and improved supply chain resilience. Proposals should demonstrate that the funding sought represents good value for money by delivering measurable benefits for the UK economy. High-scoring proposals will provide robust evidence of the economic benefits expected from the project, including investment, exports, contract opportunities and UK-based employment. They will present a credible strategy for securing follow-on investment or commercial revenue, supported by a quantitative assessment of the likely scale of growth enabled by the project. Applications should clearly describe planned funding and commercialisation pathways, including key investment stages, anticipated timelines and the types of investors or customers being targeted. Risks, dependencies and uncertainties associated with benefit realisation should be transparently assessed and supported by appropriate mitigation plans. Projects that are expected to achieve a commercially viable and/or exportable product, service or capability by the end of the grant period are likely to demonstrate a particularly strong return on investment for HM Government. Responses must seek to provide realistic estimations quantifying the value of the opportunity through: •Expected economic impact year on year: Private investment and revenue into the UK Space Sector from sales and/or contracts. Please exclude public investment grants. Public revenue and ESA contracts may be included, and, or; •Market Opportunity and Share: Size of the target market (e.g. TAM/SAM) and the proportion that could reasonably be captured through successful exploitation, and, or; •Job Creation: Direct and Indirect as a result of the grant Applicants are not required to provide precise financial forecasts where these are not feasible. Indicative estimates, scenarios, or evidence of market potential are acceptable where appropriately justified.	(5): Exceptional market opportunity with strong economic impact, scalability and global significance, representing benefits for the wider sector. Excellent methodology and rationale with significant, realistic benefits identified from the funding being requested. High confidence they will be delivered through the delivery of the project. Expected economic return and/or indicated market opportunity robustly understood and evidenced with reference to high quality publicly available, independent or otherwise credible analysis providing good confidence in methodology.Proposal provides a logical and attainable adoption pathway between project activity and realisation of stated economic benefits. Highest scoring proposals will create a commercially viable product within the project timelines or shortly thereafter, presenting the strongest return on investment for HMG. (4): Good confidence in the methodology for catalysing investment and good identification of investment to be catalysed. Return provides a good likelihood of strong benefits being delivered. Projections are supported by evidence, but this could be clearer or more robust. (3): Some positive evidence of the project catalysing investment. Some deficiencies identified with the methodology or narrative that may risk the investment not being fully delivered, or the path to investment being catalysed is unclear or unrealistic and supporting evidence is weak. (2): Identification of investment to be catalysed and there is some potential, but limited confidence this will be delivered. Supporting evidence is vague, unrealistic or missing key details. (1): Low confidence on any investment to be catalysed due to major concerns or insufficient evidence being provided. (0): No evidence of any investment being catalysed through the project.

	...cont	Reponses must provide justification for the economic benefit indicated to provide confidence. Examples could include: • How big of an opportunity could this be for your organisation and the UK if fully realised • Export potential • Access to new markets • Commercial revenue streams • Potential public/private contracts generated from this R&D • Potential sources of future funding (public and/or private) that may be unlocked where relevant • IP creation • Job creation or as a result for your collaborators/supply chain • Productivity gains or cost savings • Access to new space and non-space markets Estimates provided should be justified and realistic, making use of credible sources of market insight, publicly available projections and indicating any methodologies used to give confidence. Responses should be proportionate to the maturity of the project and supported by transparent methods and evidence.	
15%	4. Benefits should be tracked throughout the life of grant funded projects to help us understand the impact that public investment makes on the sector and any wider benefits to society that emerge. What will be the impact of receiving the grant, both for your organisation and outside your organisation?	Benefits should be tracked throughout the life of grant funded projects to help us understand the impact that public investment makes on the sector and any wider benefits to society that emerge. What will be the impact of receiving the grant, both for your business and outside your organisation? The proposal should provide clear description of how the proposal will deliver the benefits of the call (outlined in Annex A), including a clear methodology for tracking and recording benefits. The response should include, but not be limited to: The identified benefits in the call you intend to deliver against and how your project will deliver them. Consider economic, social and reputational benefits and how the project can champion space in the UK and internationally. A clear methodology for how you will deliver and track these benefits, including a quantitative table. Metrics or Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that will be used to track project benefits (e.g. interaction hours expected in outreach activity) How you will monitor progress and address any deviations from the expected outcomes Any potential barriers or challenges to realising project benefits and how you plan to overcome them A clear list of assumptions Benefits should also consider Public Sector Equality Duty and Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) within the proposed activity areas, to consider the effects on the project team, stakeholders and wider society.	(5): Clear identification of significant wider benefits identified from the project, with clear success criteria and strong confidence that they will be delivered as identified within the proposal (4): Good identification of wider benefits with confidence most can be delivered as proposed. (3): Alignment to benefits identified but limited confidence based on the evidence that they will materialise. (2): Some evidence of benefits or concerns that they will not deliver as identified. (1): Limited evidence of benefits or significant concerns that they will not deliver as identified. (0): No clear benefits identified
10%	5. The spending of grant funding should deliver Value for Money to the UK tax payer, including robust financial accounting practices. Why do you need grant funding, how will you spend it and how does this represent good value for money for the taxpayer?	The spending of grant funding should deliver Value for Money to the UK taxpayer, including robust financial accounting practices. Why do you need grant funding, how will you spend it and how does this represent good value for money for the taxpayer? What would happen to the project in the absence of this UK Space Agency funding? Responses should identify how proposals have calculated project costs to ensure they represent the minimum budget required to deliver project objectives and offer good value for money. Where costs have been mitigated this should be demonstrated. You should confirm that quotes have been confirmed and verified. This provides evaluators with confidence that the programme has been budgeted effectively, and costs have been accurately captured, with sufficient planning. Responses should demonstrate why public funding is the most effective mechanism to deliver the project and what would happen to the project in the absence of UK Space Agency funding. Proposals should outline how match funding contributions will be sourced and tracked to ensure the project budget is dependable.	(5): Strong justification for the requested costs with clear process detailed that demonstrates costing has been robustly prepared with supporting quotes obtained for the duration. Justification for public funding is clear and value for money has been established with clear evidence that the costs included represent the most efficient costs. (4): Good justification for requested costs with clear process and robust costings, but supporting quotes or evidence is incomplete. Justification for public funding is clear. (3): Justification for requested costs, but process is unclear or costings are not robust. Some explanation of how costs have been prepared but some key cost elements not explained, justified or are incomplete. Justification for public funding is limited or unclear. (2): Large parts of the costed proposal fails to adequately describe how costs have been priced, leading to limited confidence that accurate financial controls have been implemented to ensure value for money. Justification for public funding is very limited or very unclear. (1): Limited evidence with no or poor justification of costs being requested. Proposal fails to adequately identify how costs have been developed or how they offer value for money. No justification for use of public funds. (0): No evidence of adequate costing practices or completed budget template is not submitted. No justification for use of public funds.
10%	6. Projects have a greater chance of being delivered to time and budget if they are well managed throughout their delivery. How will you ensure effective delivery of this project throughout its full duration?	Projects have a greater chance of being delivered to time and budget if they are well managed throughout their delivery. How will you ensure effective delivery of this project throughout its full duration? Responses should clearly set out how the proposed project shall be delivered. This section will focus on elements such as project management approach, identification and management of risks, timescales etc. The UK Space Agency is looking for assurance that the project has a robust plan for delivering the project. Responses should identify the resources needed to deliver the proposed project, including the team that will deliver the programme and the necessary skills they possess. We strongly encourage teams to ensure sufficient project management is in place to keep delivery on track, coordinate the consortium and adhere to all UK Space Agency reporting requirements. Information should be provided on any project partners, linked to the specific work packages they will deliver and how these relationships will be effectively managed by the lead organisation. The project should be managed in line with the Public Sector Equality Duty to ensure that due care and attention is given to protected characteristics. Participating organisations should have equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) policies in place. Project management processes that will be used to ensure successful project delivery should be identified. Timescales should be clearly documented, including the different stages of the programme and the required output at each stage and any dependencies identified. Risks should be clearly identified & scored with suitable mitigations identified. Suitable risk mitigation methodologies should be identified within the project management approach for the project. Working internationally can carry complex risks and teams should outline how they have considered challenges surrounding areas such as travel, IP and export controls. Proposals should also ensure the project is undertaken within a strong ethical framework that supports equitable partnerships and research integrity. Projects should appropriately consider partner due diligence, information management and commercial application plans. Responses should include the following: * A Gantt Chart or similar diagram that sets out the proposed project schedule, with each work package detailed * A breakdown of each work package, including the key milestone deliverables and resources allocated to achieve these * A scored risk register that identifies key risks and mitigations * Information about the resources required to deliver the project, and the skills and experience of the team, including any that are external to the business and the resourcing/recruitment plan associated.	(5): High confidence that robust project management approaches have been considered and will lead to successful project delivery. Project management documents are robust and well thought out. Identified team is of a high level of skill and covers all elements required to effectively deliver the project. Dedicated or earmarked staff time is identified to manage the project, lead the UK-International consortium and deliver on all UK Space Agency reporting requirements. (4): Good approach to project management overall with good confidence that project can effectively be delivered throughout its duration. Some concerns raised but these are not considered material to the delivery of the project. (3): Adequate confidence that the project can be delivered. Some discrepancies identified within the management approach or documents. Improvements could be delivered, but overall confidence that the project could be delivered within the requested period is moderate. (2): Limited project management methodology or concerns identified within the documents that are substantive - suggesting the project would not be managed to a high level, likely resulting in issues within the delivery of the project. (1): Deficiencies identified within the Project Management approach. High confidence that the identified deficiencies likely to lead to issues within the project delivery. (0): Material deficiencies identified within the approach being adopted for the project. High confidence that the project is undeliverable.