|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROPOSAL NUMBER** |  |
| **PROPOSAL TITLE** |  |

**Assessors scoring sheet for “Enabling commercial access to space: Initial 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:

* 1. Technical feasibility of proposed operations (30% weighting in overall score)
  2. Commercial sustainability of proposed operations (30% weighting in overall score)
  3. Benefit to the UK (30% weighting in overall score)
  4. Sound management and planning (10% weighting in overall score)
  5. Financial viability of the organisations involved and their commitment to the success of the project (PASS/FAIL Criterion)

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 of proposed operations**  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the ‘Technical Proposal’ section) | *Proposals must be assessed against the technical feasibility of both the launch vehicle and the spaceport operation. The scoring should reflect your assessment of whether there are any technical (or physical) barriers to the enterprise achieving sustainable launch from the UK from 2020 or soon after.*  *The* ***highest scoring*** *projects will utilise a vehicle that could be launched regularly from the UK, with a first launch by the end of 2020, using reliable technology that requires no new research or development work to establish its practicability or viability. If it is a vehicle already in use in another launch setting, it will have a proven track record of successful operations and require no or minimal adaptation before it can be used commercially in the UK. If it is a new vehicle, it will draw on established and proven design practices already in widespread use in successful launch operations, and use technology and components that are at a high level of technical readiness and/or flight heritage. Safety critical subsystems are readily available, and can be shown to have been subjected to comprehensive and rigorous test and evaluation, including failure mode analysis.*  *These projects will also demonstrate the ability to launch from a UK spaceport that already has the majority of the required infrastructure in place and requires little to no major construction or development activity to build the necessary launch, accommodation, communications or transport infrastructure necessary before commencing commercial operations.*  ***Moderate scoring*** *projects will utilise a vehicle that requires some new research or development work to establish its practicability as a reliable launch system flying from the UK. If it is a vehicle already in use in another launch setting, it will have a successful, albeit limited track record of operations and/or require a small to moderate degree of adaptation and testing before it can be used commercially in the UK. If aspects of the vehicle are relatively new, its design will involve a limited degree of innovation or evolution which will have been successfully demonstrated during research and development phases but not in widespread operational use.*  *These projects will utilise a spaceport site that has some of the necessary infrastructure in place already, and a comprehensive understanding of the elements that remains to be built in order to accommodate the flight vehicle and ensure its ability to fly safely in the UK They will demonstrate a clear and achievable plan to construct the remaining infrastructure necessary to support commercial operations from 2020 or soon after, with substantial local support.*  ***Low scoring*** *projects will rely on technology that is untested, requires significant research and development to establish its practicality, requires extensive remodelling or adaptation for use in the UK, or may not be readily available in the UK. These projects will propose launching from a spaceport location that has little to no relevant infrastructure in place. Their plans for developing the necessary infrastructure are immature and they provide only weak evidence that this will be in place to support commercial operations from later than 2020.* |
| **2. Commercial sustainability of proposed operations**  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the ‘Commercial Case’ section) | *Proposals must be assessed against the commercial viability of both the launch vehicle and the spaceport to start and maintain operations in the UK. The scoring should reflect your assessment of whether the proposed activity would generate the necessary revenue for both the spaceport and launch vehicle operator to sustain a long term service provision.*  *The* ***highest scoring*** *projects will provide reliable evidence that they will sustain operations until 2030 based on detailed market research and a forensic examination of the likely revenues and costs involved in operating a spaceport and launch vehicle. These projects will demonstrate a strong understanding of their competition and a compelling strategy to sustain a leading position in the market. They will have launch customers already committed to using their services and a strong understanding of their business models. They will have a reasonable and evidence-based expectation of the amount of the wider market they aim to capture and will have taken practical steps towards doing so.*  ***Moderate*** *scoring projects will provide reliable evidence that they will sustain operations for several years, based on a good understanding the likely market for their services and a reasonable analysis of the likely revenues and costs involved in operating a spaceport and launch vehicle. These projects will demonstrate a good understanding of their competition and what they should do to protect their position in the market. They will have a good understanding of their customers’ likely identities and business models, a reasonable and evidence-based expectation of the amount of the market they aim to capture and a clear strategy for doing so.*  ***Low scoring*** *projects will be based on assumptions of the market for their services that are not supported by reliable evidence, or only look to the immediate future. They will provide limited consideration of some of their likely revenues and costs and may use assumptions that do not withstand challenge. They will demonstrate a limited understanding of their competition or what they should do to protect their position in the market. They will have a limited understanding of their customers’ likely identities and business models, or may make unreasonable expectations about how much of the market they might serve.* |
| **3. Benefit to the UK.**  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the ‘UK benefits’ or ‘Financial and management information’ sections) | *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.*  ***The highest scoring*** *projects will provide detailed evidence of the major benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy. They will provide a significant number of new UK-based employment and contract opportunities, spread across a range of sectors along the end to end value chain for spaceport activities (including UK-based Research and Development activities), and in their totality lasting throughout the next decade (although some may be short term contracts). The proposal will rigorously identify a clear and substantial range of spillover benefits that will be created by their activity. They will have identified specific companies that will be involved in the manufacturing, assembly or operation of a space vehicle launched from the UK. The costs of any activities proposed for grant funding will be justified and strongly linked to outcomes and benefits.*  ***Moderate scoring*** *projects will provide some evidence of the benefits that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy. They will provide a substantial number of new employment and contract opportunities to UK firms primarily in the space sector, with some consideration of the opportunities created in other sectors. Opportunities in other sectors are likely to lead to some spillover benefits, which will have been estimated in the proposal. There will be some lasting opportunities identified for UK suppliers, but further work will be needed to cement agreements for UK firms to be involved in the manufacturing, assembly or operation of a space vehicle launched from the UK. Costs of any activities for grant funding will be reasonable, albeit with some potential for further savings, and can be linked to potential benefits.*  ***Low scoring*** *projects will only outline the benefits they expect that the government funding would enable them to provide to the UK economy, or not consider their wider benefit at all. Assumptions on the benefit they might create for the UK will not be supported by reliable evidence. They will have little understanding of the potential UK supply chain, and have conducted only limited outreach (if any) to the UK space sector or other sectors. There will be little rigorous examination of the potential spillover benefits of the proposed activity outside of the space sector. Very few, if any, agreements will be in place for UK companies to be involved in their activities. 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.* |
| **4. Sound management and planning**  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the ‘Company and organisation’ or ‘Financial and management information’ sections) | *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.*  *The* ***highest scoring*** *projects will demonstrate an approach to risk and programme management that is aligned with industry best practice. They demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the third party approvals necessary for their vehicle and spaceport, and have taken practical steps towards securing these.* *A strong team will be identified and resourced to enable the grant funding to be administered correctly. Risks should be clearly identified alongside costed and detailed mitigations, providing a clear picture of the practicality and viability of the proposal.*  ***Moderate scoring*** *projects will show a mature approach to risk and programme management, with a number of processes identified and resourced appropriately. A number of key risks should be identified alongside potential mitigations that will provide an emerging picture of the practicality and viability of the proposal. They will demonstrate an understanding of their programme dependencies, including the third party approvals necessary for their vehicle and spaceport, and a clear and achievable plan to secure these.*  ***Low scoring*** *projects will demonstrate only a limited grasp of the management needed to successfully launch to space from the UK. 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. They demonstrate a limited understanding of the third party approvals necessary for their vehicle and spaceport before they commence commercial operations.* |
| **5. Financial viability of the organisations involved and their commitment to the success of the project**  (Information for this criteria will be drawn primarily from the ‘Company and organisation’ or ‘Financial and management information’ sections) | ***This is a Pass/Fail criterion***  ***Pass:*** *Proposals will contain clear evidence that – while they require government funding in order to deliver their plans – with that in place, they possess the resources needed to deliver the proposed activity and withstand potential eventualities. Substantial investment into the project will have been made already, or will be made following signing of the grant agreement. Local, national and international partners will all be prepared to invest resources to make the project a success. The advisory panel will be confident that the partners are committed to achieving successful launches from the UK. The respective roles of the various partners will be clearly defined and cover all aspects of the proposed project. A clear collaboration agreement between parties should already be in place, or be imminent upon signing the grant agreement. Clear detail will be provided on the ownership, expertise and respective roles of all parties.*  ***Fail:*** *Proposals will not give confidence that there is a defined plan or rationale for government funding, or that with this funding the required resources or investment are in place to deliver the activities listed in the proposal. The parties have not identified sources to cover the full cost of development and operation of the spaceport and vehicle, or the panel are not confident that the sources identified will reliably cover all costs. An informal arrangement to the consortium may be in place, or a collaboration agreement has yet to be initiated. Some roles and responsibilities will not yet be clearly defined between party members.* |

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

**Assessors Criteria Scoring Sheet**

**Proposal number and title:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Technical feasibility of proposed operations | Commercial sustainability of proposed operations | Benefit to the UK | Sound management and planning | Financial viability of the organisations involved and their commitment to the success of the project |
| **Score** |  |  |  |  | PASS/FAIL |
| **Comments (Justification for the score in a few sentences)** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Narrative justifying the assessment (200 words maximum):**