Field Electrical Power Supplies – Support

(FEPS-S)

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY – TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Contents

1 Technical Performance Evaluation 3
2 Step 1: Basic Technical Evaluation 4
3 Step 1A: FEPS-S Service Annex Acceptance 4
4 Step 1B: FEPS-S Service SoW Compliance 5
5 Step 1C: Carbon Reduction Plan 6
6 Step 1D: Quality Assurance 8
7 Step 1E: Service Provision and Transformation Contract (SPTC) Interface 10
8 Step 1F: Integrated Support Plan 12
9 Step 1G: Maintenance Plan 13
10 Step 1H: Exit Management 16
11 Step 2: Developed Technical Evaluation 19
12 Technical Question 1: Project Management and Governance 21
13 Technical Question 2: Project Schedule 26
14 Technical Question 3: Risks, Opportunities and Assumptions 29
15 Technical Question 4: Contractor Logistic Support 33
16 Technical Question 5: Equipment and GFA Transition 38
17 Technical Question 6: Supply Support 43
18 Technical Question 7: Technical Publications 46

1 TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

1.1 The Technical Performance Evaluation seeks to evaluate the solution proposed by the Tenderer (with minimum scoring criteria) of four key areas of the Field Electrical Power Supplies – Support (FEPS-S) service: Project Management, Contractor Logistic Support (CLS), Integrated Logistic Support (ILS), and Quality Management.

1.2 The Technical Performance Evaluation shall take place over two main Steps:

Step 1 – Basic Technical Evaluation (Pass/Fail);

Step 2 – Developed Technical Evaluation (Scored).

1.3 As noted in DEFFORM47 – Annex D "Evaluation Methodology", the entire Tender response shall be evaluated during **Part A** of the evaluation process. Following the negotiations that take place at **Part B**, only those elements which have been revised shall be re-evaluated at **Part C**.

1.4 The Developed Technical Evaluation (Step 2 of this Appendix) will account for 90% of the overall quality/non cost tender score. Where the remaining 10% of the scoring is based on the Social Value evaluation (found at DEFFORM 47 – Annex D - Appendix 4 "Social Value Evaluation").

1.5 The Tenderer must achieve a minimum "Pass" score against each of the two Steps following evaluation at **Part C**, to be deemed compliant and to be considered for Contract Award. At **Part D**, the Tenderer who is considered to have provided the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) will be the winning Tender.

1.6 Variant Bids will only be evaluated once the Authority has determined that the Tenderer has submitted a Reference Bid that has met the minimum requirements of Step 1 and Step 2 as detailed at 1.2. The Variant Bid will then be evaluated using the same process as the Reference Bid.

1.7 For more information on Variant Bids, please refer to Section E8 of DEFFORM 47 and section 2 of DEFFORM 47 – Annex D.

1.8 Each technical element (apart from Step 1A and 1B) includes the following:

1.8.1 The aim and/or background to the subject matter being assessed;

1.8.2 A list of referenced information (where applicable);

1.8.3 The artefacts and evidence required to be provided;

1.8.4 A list of Confidence Characteristics that the response needs to satisfy;

1.8.5 Scoring criteria for each element.

1.9 The Tenderer should read and understand the evaluation guidance as well as the list of required artefacts, the primary and secondary evidence required, and Confidence Characteristics sought before preparing their submission for each element.

2 STEP 1: BASIC TECHNICAL EVALUATION

2.1 The Basic Technical Evaluation aims to establish that the Tenderer meets the Authority's minimum technical expectations for the FEPS-S Service. The Basic Technical Evaluation covers the assessment across the following eight sub-steps.

Step 1A – FEPS-S Service Annex Acceptance;

Step 1B – FEPS-S Service Statement of Work (SoW) compliance;

Step 1C – Carbon Reduction Plan;

Step 1D – Quality Assurance;

Step 1E – Service Provision and Transformation Contract (SPTC) Interface;

Step 1F – Integrated Support Plan;

Step 1G – Maintenance Plan;

Step 1H – Exit Management.

2.2 The Tenderer must achieve a "Pass" following evaluation at **Part C** to be deemed compliant and proceed to **Part D,** where the MEAT will be determined**.** If a "Fail" is awarded, then the tender will be deemed non-compliant and discounted from the rest of the evaluation process and will not proceed to **Part D**. Please refer to section 4 of DEFFORM 47 – Annex D.

3 STEP 1A: FEPS-S SERVICE ANNEX ACCEPTANCE

3.1 This step shall evaluate the Tenderer's acceptance of the FEPS-S Service Annexes and if proposed modifications continue to meet the aim of the capability. The Tenderer shall submit a completed Compliance Matrix (held at DEFFORM 47 – Annex D – Appendix 2), indicating in Table 3 within that Matrix:

- whether they accept each Annex as drafted,

- details of any proposed new or amended Annex.

Scoring Criteria

3.2 The evaluation of Step 1A will be completed on a Pass/Fail basis using the scoring criteria detailed below:

Score	Description
Pass	1. The Tenderer accepts all non-negotiable Annexes as drafted by the Authority. And; 2. In the Authority's assessment, the Tenderer has proposed no amendments to any of the draft Annexes other than typographical and/or grammatical amendments. Or; 3. The Tenderer has proposed new Annex/es or amendments to the draft

	negotiable Annexes, which, in the Authority's Assessment, do not materially alter the Tenderer's deliverability and/or performance and/or the required transfer of risk to the Authority and are within the scope of the requirement as advertised.
Fail	1. No response is provided, or an insufficient response is provided to enable an evaluation. Or; 2. The Tenderer rejects any non-negotiable Annexes. Or; 3. The Tenderer amends any non-negotiable Annexes. Or; 4. The Tenderer has proposed new Annex/es or amendments to the draft negotiable Annexes, which, in the Authority's Assessment, give rise to moderate to major concerns in relation to deliverability and/or performance and/or transfer of risk to the Authority, and/or are outside the scope of the requirement as advertised.

Table 1 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1A

4 STEP 1B: FEPS-S SERVICE SoW COMPLIANCE

4.1 A self-assessment shall be completed by the Tenderer of their compliance and supporting evidence in accordance with DEFFORM 47 – Annex D – Appendix 3a "FEPS-S Service SoW Compliance Matrix", where the Tenderer shall record "Compliant" or "Non-compliant" for each SoW serial, and include evidence to justify their compliance.

Scoring Criteria

4.2 The evaluation of Step 1B will be completed on a Pass/Fail basis using the scoring criteria detailed below:

Score	Description
Pass	1. The Tenderer's evaluation response to all of the FEPS-S Service SoW serials detailed in DEFFORM 47 – Annex D – Appendix 3a is 'Compliant". And; 2. The Tenderer's evidence included in each SoW serial is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied, and appropriately references the FEPS-S Service SoW at Annex A and the processes within the FEPS-S Service Terms of Reference (ToRs) at Annex E. The response provides confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the SoW serial without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.
Fail	1. The Tenderer's evaluation response to one or more of the FEPS-S Service SoW serials detailed in DEFFORM 47 – Annex D – Appendix 3a is "Non-compliant". Or; 2. The Tenderer's evidence included in one or more SoW serial fails to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the SoW serial without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear, or lacks sufficient detail.

Table 2 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1B

5 STEP 1C: CARBON REDUCTION PLAN

Background

5.1 The UK Government amended the Climate Change Act 2008 in 2019 by introducing a target of at least a 100% reduction in the net UK carbon account (i.e., reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, compared to 1990 levels) by 2050. This is otherwise known as the 'Net Zero' target.

5.2 The Authority requires assurance that the supplier has a Carbon Reduction Plan (CRP) implemented into their business objectives, working towards the 'Net Zero' target.

References

5.3 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1C are:

5.3.1 "Procurement Policy Note 06/21: Taking account of Carbon Reduction Plans in the procurement of major government contracts"[1] – published 5 June 2021;

5.3.2 "Guidance on adopting and applying the PPN 06/21 – Selection Criteria"[2] – published June 2021;

5.3.3 Carbon Reduction Plan Appendix (DEFFORM 47 – Annex D – Appendix 3b).

Evidence Required

5.4 The Tenderer shall provide a CRP, in accordance with reference documents stated in 5.3, where information regarding completion guidance can be found. The scoring criteria taken from 5.3.2 can be found below:

Page Limit and Format

5.5 There is no page limit for Step 1C.

5.6 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

5.7 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

5.8 The evaluation of Step 1C will be completed on a Pass/Fail basis using the scoring criteria detailed below:

Score	Description
Pass	1. A CPR has been submitted which: confirms the supplier's commitment to achieving Net Zero by 2050, contains emissions reported for all required

[1] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1054374/PPN-0621-Taking-account-of-Carbon-Reduction-Plans-Jan22__1_.pdf
[2] https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1148143/Guidance-on-adopting-and-applying-PPN-06_21-_-Selection-Criteria-April-23.pdf

	Scopes (in accordance with the required methodology), indicates the environmental management measures that the supplier will be able to apply when performing the contract and reporting period is falls no more than 12 months prior to the date of commencement of the procurement. And; 2. [If applicable,] where the CRP applies to the supplier and its parent, the requirements of the CRP are met in full, as set out in the Technical Standard and Guidance, and all of the following criteria are met: a. The bidding entity is wholly owned by the parent; b. The commitment to achieving net zero by 2050 is set out in the CRP for the parent and is supported and adopted by the bidding entity together with a statement that this will apply to the bidding entity; c. The environmental measures set out are stated to be able to be applied by the bidding entity when performing the relevant contract; and d. The CRP is published on the bidding entity's website. Or; 3. [If applicable where] emissions in the CRP are not reported for any Scopes or only for some Scopes, an acceptable explanation has been provided. Or; 4. [If applicable where the] reporting period is more than 12 months from the date of commencement of the procurement, an acceptable explanation has been provided.
Fail	1. [The] parent CRP fails to meet the requirements of the CRP and additional requirements listed above; Or; 2. [A] CRP has not been submitted; Or; 3. [The] CRP fails to confirm supplier's commitment to achieving Net Zero by 2050; Or; 4. Emissions in the CRP are not reported for any Scopes or only for some Scopes, without explanation why; Or; 5. Reporting period is more than 12 months from the date of commencement of the procurement, [without explanation why]; Or; 6. Supplier fails to indicate the environmental management measures that the supplier will be able to apply when performing the contract.

Table 3 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1C

6 STEP 1D: QUALITY ASSURANCE

Aim

6.1 The Authority requires assurance that the supplier that will focus on delivering a quality product to agreed specifications, and that the Tenderer will implement clear management procedures for both internal facing controls and external delivery checks.

Background

6.2 An evaluation is to be completed of the relevant Quality Certifications and draft Quality Management Plan that the Tenderer provides.

6.3 The Tenderer will be required to manage Quality for the Contract in accordance with the Deliverable Quality Management Plan, conforming to AQAP 2105 Edition C. In addition, it is expected that the Tenderer will hold and maintain UKAS Accredited ISO 9001:2015 or equivalent Certification and be in scope of the Contract requirements.

References

6.4 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1D are:

6.4.1 AQAP 2105 Edition C; Date 2019;

6.4.2 Contract Data Requirement (CDR) 05-01.

Evidence Required

6.5 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the <u>primary aspects</u> detailed below:

6.5.1 An in-date and in-scope ISO 9001:2015 (or equivalent) certificate.

6.5.2 Quality Management Plan, to include but not limited to:

6.5.2.1 Details of how Quality Management and Assurance elements, and processes will be implemented for this Contract, in accordance with AQAP 2105.

6.5.2.2 Evidence and demonstration how quality management will be implemented within your organisation through Development, Production Supplier Inspection, Supplier / Sub Contractor Management, Configuration Management and Concession Management and detail any associated procedures.

6.5.2.3 The Tenderer’s response must specify whether they are describing direct experience, that of a consortium member or your proposed sub-Tenderer.

6.5.2.4 For each level of the Supply Chain, detail what procedures will be in place for identifying and recording non-compliant work and for subsequently implementing corrective and preventative actions.

6.5.2.5 Explain what processes and procedures will be implemented throughout the supply chain to prevent output delivery delays due to quality issues i.e., re-work having to be undertaken.

6.5.2.6 Explain the quality tools/techniques and methodology used within your organisation.

6.5.2.7 Advise on the Quality Assurance status of the company over the past three years; if there have been any changes and the reason(s) for this.

6.5.2.8 Explain the certification you will have in place through the life of this Contract.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

6.6 The evidence provided for Step 1D will need to demonstrate the following primary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution:

6.6.1 An in-date and in-scope ISO 9001:2015 (or equivalent) certificate.

6.6.2 Satisfy the Confidence Characteristics for the draft Quality Management Plan as detailed in the AQAP 2105 Edition C.

6.6.3 Confirmation the solution complies with the Quality standards called for in the Contract and all its Annexes.

Page Limit and Format

6.7 There is no page limit for Step 1D.

6.8 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

6.9 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

6.10 Certifications do not need to conform to Arial font and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

6.11 The evaluation will be completed on a Pass/Fail basis using the definitions detailed below:

Score	Description
Pass	1. The Tenderer has provided an in-date and in-scope ISO 9001:2015 (or equivalent) certificate. And; 2. The draft Quality Management Plan provided satisfies the Confidence Characteristics set out in the AQAP 2105 Edition C and complies with the Quality standards called for in the Contract and all its Annexes.
Fail	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The Tenderer has failed to provide an in-date and in-scope ISO 9001:2015 (or equivalent) certificate.

	Or; 3. The Tenderer has failed to provide a draft Quality Management Plan that satisfies the Confidence Characteristics set out in the AQAP 2105 Edition C, and does not comply with the Quality standards called for in the Contract and all its Annexes.

Table 4 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1D

7 STEP 1E: SERVICE PROVISION AND TRANSFORMATION CONTRACT (SPTC) INTERFACE

Aim

7.1 The Authority requires assurance that the Tenderer has a well thought-out and relevant plan to how they will interface with the SPTC provider, to ensure the standard variant FEPS equipment Maintenance Repair and Overhaul (MRO) Level 2-3 activities are completed with minimal impact to the FEPS-S service.

Background

7.2 The Contractor needs an understanding of the current SPTC agreement between the Authority and the SPTC provider prior to starting the FEPS-S Service, to ensure the MRO L2-3 exclusivity agreement is not breached, is followed correctly and support is provided to the SPTC provider to complete the work.

References

7.3 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1E are:

7.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

7.3.2 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs;

7.3.3 Annex H: Contractor's Final Tender Response;

7.3.4 CDR 01-15.

Evidence Required

7.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefact in their response, containing the <u>primary aspects</u> detailed below.

7.4.1 SPTC Interface Plan, to include but not limited to:

7.4.1.1 Details and justification of how their solution will establish a successful method of working with SPTC provider to deliver the FEPS-S Service and to satisfy the relevant FEPS-S Service SoW serials.

7.4.1.2 An appropriately detailed list of the workstreams to be undertaken and the responsibilities of each stakeholder to ensure that MRO L2-3 activities for the standard variant FEPS equipment can be completed by SPTC. This must include a Responsible, Accountable, Consult and Inform (RACI) matrix to display the activities and the associated stakeholders' responsibilities.

7.4.1.3 Consideration of how spares provision, transportation and asset management will be incorporated into their plan, along with other activities they deem to be needed to allow for a successful solution.

7.4.1.4 Interdependencies, key risks and mitigation plans, communications and assumptions have been identified and appropriately detailed, and relate to the SPTC interface. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

7.5 The evidence provided for Step 1E will need to demonstrate the following primary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

7.5.1 The proposed plans are relevant to the FEPS-S Service and the supporting FEPS-S Service SoW serials, making references to the ID numbers, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the requirement.

7.5.2 The plan contains details on how the interface will be established at the start of the Contract and how the relationship will be maintained throughout the duration. The plan will detail stakeholder roles and responsibilities.

7.5.3 Risks and assumptions have been identified and appropriately listed in detail, where mitigations have been proposed and incorporated where applicable. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

7.5.4 A process has been identified and detailed to monitor the interfacing throughout the duration of the contract.

7.5.5 Stakeholder and communications management has been addressed, where roles, responsibilities and dependencies have been identified and mapped for the elements of the plan.

Page Limit and Format

7.6 The Tenderer must limit their response to 10 sides of A4, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

7.7 The existing title pages within the provided plan templates (Annex H) are not included within the stipulated response page limit.

7.8 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 - Checklist for Tender Returns - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

7.9 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

Score	Description
Pass	1. The response meets all 4 primary aspects set in 7.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the exit management phase. The plan provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 7.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the exit management phase. The plan provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Fail	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 4 primary aspects set in 7.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear, and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 7.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear, and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 5 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1E

8 STEP 1F: INTEGRATED SUPPORT PLAN

Background

8.1 The Integrated Support Plan (ISP) is the statement of the total ILS activity for the project and is the implementation plan for logistic support. It includes the requirements, tasks, interfaces and milestones for the current phase and plans for the succeeding stages. It shall provide all necessary support inputs to other project documents. It shall contain supportability goals, support strategy and all associated plans.

8.2 In accordance with Def Stan 05-057, the Tenderer shall prepare an ISP in response to this ILSP, describing in detail the Tenderer's ILS organisation and the activities planned to provide the Contractual deliverables. The ISP is the principal document by which the ILS content of a tender bid will be assessed, as such the inclusion of a comprehensive draft with the tender response is mandatory.

References

8.3 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1F are:

8.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

8.3.2 Annex D – Appendix i: Integrated Logistic Support Plan (ILSP);

8.3.3 CDR 03-01;

8.3.4 FEPS-S Equipment Army Equipment Support Publications (AESPs).

Evidence Required

8.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefact in their response:

8.4.1 Integrated Support Plan (ISP).

Confidence Characteristics Sought

8.5 The evidence provided within the draft ISP will need to satisfy the Product Description characteries found in Def Stan 00-600 pt. 3 (PD 0001-02) for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

Page Limit and Format

8.6 There is no page limit for this technical question.

8.7 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

8.8 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

Score	Description
Pass	1. The Tenderer provides a response that satisfies the Product Description characteristics found in Def Stan 00-600 pt. 3 (PD 0001-02) for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.
Fail	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The Tenderer fails to provide a response that satisfies the Product Description characteristics found in Def Stan 00-600 pt. 3 (PD 0001-02) for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

Table 6 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1F

9 STEP 1G: MAINTENANCE PLAN

Background

9.1 Maintenance includes all actions taken to retain equipment in or to restore it to specified conditions until the end of its use. It may include inspection, testing, calibration, servicing, serviceability classification, repair, rebuilding, reclamation, salvage, and cannibalisation.

References

9.2 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1G are:

9.2.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

9.2.2 Annex D – Appendix i: Integrated Logistic Support Plan (ILSP);

9.2.3 CDR 03-04;

9.2.4 FEPS-S Equipment Army Equipment Support Publications (AESPs).

Evidence Required

9.3 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response:

9.3.1 Maintenance Plan;

9.3.2 A supplementary document to the Maintenance Plan that supports the compliance of the following SoW serials:

9.3.2.1 SoW serial 037 (L4 Maintenance Scheme): The document shall detail how the Tenderer will develop, demonstrate and implement a L4 maintenance scheme for the FEPS generators within [INFORMATION REDACTED] of Contract Award; presenting a method of detailed Equipment inspection, identifying and recording all L4 maintenance activities required, and their respective processes to repair FEPS generators to Serviceable Condition.

9.3.2.2 SoW serial 039 (Mandatory Equipment Inspection (MEI) and Roller Brake Testing (RBT)): The document shall detail how the Tenderer will ensure the MEI (including RBT) activities conducted on the wading variant FEPS generators is completed by a vehicle inspector, who shall be Suitably Qualified and Experienced (SQEP), and formally appointed or DVSA registered.

9.3.2.3 SoW serial 041 (Additional L4 Repair and Maintenance of [INFORMATION REDACTED] Non-Serviceable FEPS Generators): The document shall detail how the Tenderer will select the [INFORMATION REDACTED] FEPS generators to repair, complete in-depth inspections, and how they will report to the Authority their findings and costs for the L4 repair work. The Tenderer shall also provide activity details, schedules, and plans on the estimated repair completion rate, highlighting how the [INFORMATION REDACTED] repairs will be completed over the [INFORMATION REDACTED] period in parallel with Business-as-Usual L4 maintenance activity, how the Tenderer will manage the workload and resourcing over the period effectively, and how they will ensure the additional L4 repairs do not impact the operations or KPIs of the FEPS-S Contract.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

9.4 The evidence provided for Step 1G will need to demonstrate the following primary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's maintenance solution:

9.4.1 Maintenance Plan;

The primary Confidence Characteristic for this artefact is:

9.4.1.1 The evidence provided within the draft Maintenance Plan satisfies the requirements set in CDR 03-04.

9.4.2 Step 1G supplementary document;

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

9.4.2.1 L4 Maintenance Scheme (SoW Serial 037): The Tenderer's solution, plans and demonstration techniques are detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S SoW and all aspects of the Contract. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant requirements and milestones without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.

9.4.2.2 MEI and RBT activities (SoW Serial 039): The Tenderer's solution, plans and demonstration techniques are detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S SoW and all aspects of the Contract. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant requirements and milestones without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. The Tenderer has provided (if applicable external) evidence that the vehicle inspector/s proposed to be used shall satisfy the criteria set within the SoW serial.

9.4.2.3 Additional L4 Repair and Maintenance of [INFORMATION REDACTED] Non-Serviceable FEPS Generators (SoW Serial 041): The Tenderer's solution, plans and demonstration techniques are detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S SoW and all aspects of the Contract. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant requirements and milestones without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.

Page Limit and Format

9.5 There is no page limit for the Maintenance Plan.

9.6 The Tenderer must limit their supplementary response (9.3.2) to 15 sides of A4 for this technical question, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit. If applicable, any supporting certifications are not counted in the page limit.

9.7 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

9.8 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

Score	Description
Pass	1. The response meets all 3 requirements and aspects set in 9.3.2, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 4 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 9.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the Exit Management phase. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Fail	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 3 requirements and aspects set in 9.3.2, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 4 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 9.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 7 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1G

10 STEP 1H: EXIT MANAGEMENT

Aim

10.1 The Authority requires assurance that there will be a smooth transition of service from one supplier to another, or a successful Contract closure at the end of the FEPS-S Contract.

10.2 The Exit Management Plan (EMP) will be a supporting document to the Exit Management cost provided at ITN stage, for all necessary information, assets, management arrangements, responsibilities and core activities required for a controlled Contract close. The EMP will account for all potential requirements to manage exit from the Contract between the Authority and the Contractor.

Background

10.3 There is a need at the start of the Contract to identify all the necessary information, assets, management arrangements and responsibilities required at the closure of the FEPS-S Contract.

References

10.4 The documents that shall be considered for Step 1H are:

10.4.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

10.4.2 Annex N: GFE List;

10.4.3 Annex X: Exit Management Plan;

10.4.4 CDR 01-15.

Evidence Required

10.5 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefact in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below.

10.5.1 Exit Management Plan (EMP), to include relevant, clear and appropriate detail, but not limited to the following elements:

10.5.1.1 Objectives and purpose of the EMP.

10.5.1.2 Details of scope, assumptions, exclusions and constraints. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

10.5.1.3 A detailed list of Exit Management core activities including pre-exit service activities and within the Exit Period.

10.5.1.4 A schedule and a Gantt chart displaying the Exit Period, showing closedown and Transition activities.

10.5.1.5 Identification of how Information will be managed during the Exit Period.

10.5.1.6 Management and governance of the EMP throughout the duration of the Contract.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

10.6 The evidence provided for Step 1H will need to demonstrate the following primary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

10.6.1 The EMP:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

10.6.1.1 The objectives, purpose, scope, assumptions, exclusions and constraints are detailed clearly and appropriately, and relevant to the FEPS-S Service. A reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations has been applied to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the Exit Management phase in line with the relevant cost provided. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

10.6.1.2 Core Exit Management activities have been identified and included in a schedule and a Gantt chart, displaying activity durations and logic that are appropriate to the EMP. The EMP shall identify stakeholder responsibilities for activities. This must include a RACI matrix to display the activities and the associated stakeholders' responsibilities. Early identification of non-core activities to be highlighted where applicable.

10.6.1.3 Non-core activities, activities out of scope and assumptions have been identified where applicable. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

Page Limit and Format

10.7 The Tenderer must limit their response to 20 sides of A4 for this technical question, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

10.8 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

10.9 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

10.10 The project schedule and Gantt chart are not included in the page limit, however must be provided in clear and a suitable format.

Scoring Criteria

Score	Description
Pass	1. The response meets <u>all 6 primary aspects</u> set in 10.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the Exit Management phase. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets <u>all 3 primary Confidence Characteristics</u> set in 10.6, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the Exit Management phase. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Fail	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet <u>all 6 primary aspects</u> set in 10.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet <u>all 3 primary Confidence Characteristics</u> set in 10.6, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 8 - Pass/Fail Criteria for Step 1H

11 STEP 2: DEVELOPED TECHNICAL EVALUATION

11.1 The Developed Technical Evaluation is a scored assessment of the evidence provided in the Tenders using technical questions, with the aim of establishing a non-cost score to be used in calculating the Tender Score and to determine the MEAT.

Developed Technical Evaluation Scoring

11.2 Each technical question is scored by the evaluators, and in accordance with the corresponding scoring guidance that reflects how compliant the response is to the criteria set.

11.3 Each technical question will be scored based on the evaluator's confidence on the Tenderer's ability in satisfying the primary Evidence Required aspects and the primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics. A score ranging from High Confidence (100) to Low Confidence (0) will then be provided.

11.4 Each technical question response must achieve a minimum score of "Satisfactory Confidence" (30) to be considered for **Part D**. If a minimum score is not reached at **Part A**, feedback will be provided to Tenderers before negotiations (**Part B**) to support the Tenderer to meet the satisfactory threshold or above. Feedback on areas where a satisfactory score or above has been given may also be provided to enhance the Tenderer's score during negotiations.

11.5 Please refer to DEFFORM 47 – Annex D for further guidance on how the technical performance compliance will be evaluated.

Technical Evaluation Weighting

11.6 Each technical question has been assigned a weighting, which is used to calculate the final Technical Performance Score. This Technical Performance Score will account for 90% of the overall quality/non cost tender score (where the remaining 10% of the scoring is based on the Social Value evaluation).

11.7 The table below presents each technical question, the minimum score required and the set weighting:

Question	Section	Minimum Score Required	Weighting
Project Management			
1	Project Management and Governance	30	20%
2	Project Schedule	30	5%
3	Risk Opportunities and Assumptions	30	5%
CLS			
4	CLS Plan	30	30%
5	Equipment and GFA Transition	30	15%
Integrated Logistic Support			
6	Supply Support	30	20%
7	Technical Publications	30	5%
		Total Weighting Score:	**100%**

Table 9 – Step 2 Technical Question Weightings

11.8 Example Technical Performance Score calculation:

Technical Question	Score Achieved	Weighting	Final Weighted Score
1	70	20%	14
2	70	5%	3.5
3	100	5%	5
4	70	30%	21
5	30	15%	4.5
6	70	20%	14
7	30	5%	1.5
		Total Technical Performance Score:	**63.5**

Table 10 - Example Technical Performance Score calculation

11.9 Example of accounting for Technical Performance Score within total quality/non cost tender score:

Element	Score	Weighting	Final Weighted Score
Social Value	77.5	10%	7.75
Technical Performance	63.5	90%	57.15
		Total Quality/Non-Cost Tender Score:	**64.9**

Table 11 - Example Quality/Non-cost Tender Score

12 TECHNICAL QUESTION 1: PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE

Aim

12.1 The Authority requires assurance that the Tenderer can plan, implement and then deliver the FEPS-S Service.

Background

12.2 Effective project management and governance within the FEPS-S Service will be key for successful delivery, and this is required within the supplier's organisation.

12.3 The Tenderer is to demonstrate they have identified and assessed the activities required to satisfy the key milestone dates and develop a robust strategy and positive culture to deliver a successful project and service; committed to delivering to set time, cost and quality Parameters.

References

12.4 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

12.4.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

12.4.2 Annex B: Key Performance Indicators (KPIs);

12.4.3 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs;

12.4.4 CDR 01-01, 01-02 and 01-03.

Evidence Required

12.5 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below. Each aspect has a corresponding Confidence Characteristic:

12.5.1 A draft Project Management Plan (PMP). The PMP shall establish the Tenderer's understanding of the challenge and how they intend to deliver the FEPS-S Service. The PMP is to include relevant, clear and appropriate detail, but not limited to the following elements:

12.5.1.1 Details of key project objectives; details of scope, strategy, project lifecycle, assumptions, exclusions and constraints. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.1. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

12.5.1.2 Approach to project organisation governance strategy, and identification of stakeholders, including mechanisms for key stakeholder communication management This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.2.

12.5.1.3 Descriptions of key roles within the project, and the identified individuals nominated for each position within the Tenderer's project/support team. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.3.

12.5.1.4 Acknowledgement and approach to FEPS-S Project Meetings to be held with the Authority. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.4.

12.5.1.5 Approach to KPI and data reporting processes. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.5.

12.5.1.6 Decision making strategy with identified levels of delegation and empowerment by the SQEP team. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.6.

12.5.1.7 Approach to Subcontractor / Third Party management throughout the Contract. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.7

12.5.1.8 Approach to Change Management. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 12.6.1.8.

12.5.2 A SQEP register with up-to-date CVs of nominated individuals for each of the key roles identified in the PMP.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

12.6 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution. Each Confidence Characteristic corresponds to an aspect in 12.5.1 (excluding 12.6.1.10).

12.6.1 PMP:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

12.6.1.1 The project scope, management strategy and breakdown structures, such as, Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and Product Baseline Structure (PBS) are detailed clearly and appropriately, to show a comprehensive understanding of the Authority's requirements. The scope, strategies and structures present a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.1.

12.6.1.2 Internal and external stakeholders have been identified and analysed, with a clear understanding of their power and influence, and needs and expectations, along with a plan how stakeholder communication will be managed throughout the Contract. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.2.

12.6.1.3 The key project/supporting roles have been identified, where the responsibilities of those positions are clearly defined and appropriate for the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.3.

12.6.1.4 FEPS-S Project Meetings have been acknowledged, referenced, and embedded into the project strategy. The attendees for each FEPS-S meeting have been identified. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.4.

12.6.1.5 Robust approach to recording KPIs is detailed clearly and appropriately, setting out how KPIs will be recorded in a timely, accurate manner. With considerations to the storage of the data and data assurance. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.5.

12.6.1.6 Appropriate decision making within the project has been detailed clearly, with appropriate levels of delegation and empowerment within the SQEP team identified to enable suitable and efficient decision making throughout the Contract. The plan must include a hierarchical organisation chart to demonstration levels of delegation and empowerment. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.6.

12.6.1.7 Where applicable, processes and mechanisms for the effective selection and management of Subcontractors / Third Parties has been detailed clearly and appropriately. If the Tenderer does not plan on using Subcontractors / Third Parties, they are to state this within the PMP. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.7.

12.6.1.8 Approach to Change Management explains clearly how the Tenderer will manage change driven by new requirements within the Contract. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.8.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

12.6.1.9 The Tenderer shall show an understanding of the nature of MOD's approach to change, and the PDS and Ad-Hoc processes set out in the Contract. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 12.5.1.8.

12.6.1.10 The company has a culture of openness and transparency and will share appropriate information with the Authority. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the whole artefact found at 12.5.

12.6.2 CVs shall provide evidence that the Tenderer's personnel will be SQEP and appropriate for the identified positions.

Page Limit and Format

12.7 The Tenderer must limit their PMP to 40 sides of A4, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

12.8 CVs provided are not counted in the PMP page limit. CVs can be anonymised and named via role titles at the ITN stage.

12.9 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

12.10 The PMP must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The PMP artefact meets all 8 aspects set in 12.5.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The PMP artefact meets all 10 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics set in 12.6.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 3. The CVs provide evidence that the Tenderer's key personnel are SQEP and appropriate for all of the identified positions.
Good Confidence	70	1. The PMP artefact meets all 8 aspects set in 12.5.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The PMP artefact meets all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic set in in 12.6.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 3. The CVs provide evidence that the Tenderer's key personnel are SQEP and appropriate for all of the identified positions.

Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The PMP artefact meets all 8 aspects set in 12.5.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The PMP artefact meets all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 12.6.1, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 3. The CVs provide evidence that the Tenderer's key personnel are SQEP and appropriate for all of the identified positions.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide the PMP artefact. Or; 2. The PMP artefact fails to meet all 8 aspects set in 12.5.1, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The PMP artefact fails to meet all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 12.6.1, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 4. The Tenderer has failed to provide CVs for all identified roles. Or; 5. The CVs fail to provide sufficient evidence that the Tenderer's key personnel will be SQEP and appropriate for all of the identified positions.

Table 12 – Technical Question 1 Scoring Criteria

13 TECHNICAL QUESTION 2: PROJECT SCHEDULE

Aim

13.1 The Authority requires assurance that the Tenderer will deliver the FEPS-S Service to the agreed contract milestones.

Background

13.2 Individual deliverables may be achievable in their own right, but when collated and coordinated into a project schedule, the cumulative effort could affect time, cost and performance.

References

13.3 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

13.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

13.3.2 Annex B: KPIs;

13.3.3 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs;

13.3.4 CDR 01-08.

Evidence Required

13.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below:

13.4.1 Project Schedule, to include but not limited to:

13.4.1.1 A list of activities and milestones that demonstrate the planned delivery of the FEPS-S Service.

13.4.1.2 3 point-estimate duration for each activity.

13.4.1.3 A risk adjusted and resourced schedule from point of Contract Award to FEPS-S Service (Full), displaying the critical path, in an easily readable format including a Gantt chart.

13.4.2 A relevant, clear and appropriately detailed narrative that supports the risk adjusted and resourced schedule, to include but not limited to how the bidder:

13.4.2.1 Generated their schedule; how they identified activities and logic, how they generated and incorporated the 3 point-estimate durations into their schedules.

13.4.2.2 Identified schedule risks and how they have been incorporated schedule.

13.4.2.3 Incorporated resource estimates into the schedule for a realistic approach.

13.4.2.4 Validated their schedule to ensure realism and confidence.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

13.5 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution:

13.5.1 Project Schedule:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

13.5.1.1 The list of activities and milestones that demonstrate the successful delivery of the FEPS-S Service from Point of Contract Award to FEPS-S Service (Full) is complete, clear, aligned to the WBS within the PMP and utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the milestones.

13.5.1.2 The schedule and Gantt chart provided are appropriately detailed and relevant, adjusted for project risk, providing clear logic and activity relationships from point of Contract Award to FEPS-S Service (Full) and aligned to the FEPS-S anchor milestones. A 3-point-estimate for each activity's duration has been included;

13.5.1.3 The schedule is resourced with the identified project/support team, with realistic, safe-working hours applied.

13.5.1.4 The critical path has been identified and is logical to the project;

13.5.2 Project Schedule narrative:

The primary Confidence Characteristic for this artefact is:

13.5.2.1 That narrative which covers the aspects in 13.4.2 is complete, clear, aligned and utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the milestones.

13.5.2.2 The narrative also identifies assumptions and dependencies upon the Authority and the Supply Chain in relation to the schedule. Any assumptions must also be included in your MDAL.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

13.5.2.3 Schedule challenges have been identified and mitigations have been detailed clearly and appropriately, to raise awareness to the Authority of any potential schedule risk and how they shall be managed.

13.5.2.4 The Contractor's approach to reporting their actual performance against their planned performance during the transition phase has been detailed and is appropriate to the project.

Page Limit and Format

13.6 The Tenderer must limit their Project Schedule narrative to 5 sides of A4, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

13.7 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

13.8 The Project Schedule narrative must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

13.9 The project schedule and Gantt chart are not included in the page limit, however must be provided in clear and a suitable format.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets <u>all 7 primary aspects</u> set in 13.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets <u>all 8 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics</u> set in 13.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets <u>all 7 primary aspects</u> set in 13.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets <u>all 6 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic</u> set in 13.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.

Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets all 7 primary aspects set in 13.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 6 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 13.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 7 primary aspects set in 13.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 6 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 13.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 13 – Technical Question 2 Scoring Criteria

14 TECHNICAL QUESTION 3: RISKS, OPPORTUNITIES AND ASSUMPTIONS

Aim

14.1 The Authority requires assurance that risks, opportunities and assumptions have been identified and will be appropriately managed throughout the Contract.

Background

14.2 Projects fail or do not perform to the best possible standard when risks, opportunities and assumptions are not appropriately managed. This can be avoided by ensuring that risk management is integrated into project management activities and having experience within the team that allows risks to be identified early.

References

14.3 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

14.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

14.3.2 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs;

14.3.3 CDR 01-09, 01-10, 01-11 and 01-12.

Evidence Required

14.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below:

14.4.1 A draft Risk and Opportunity Management Plan (ROMP), to include relevant, clear and appropriate detail, but not limited to the following elements:

14.4.1.1 The risk and opportunity management process, including; identifying and capturing, assessing, categorising, escalating and storing risks and opportunities.

14.4.1.2 The bidder's approach to the reviews and reporting, and treatment and closures of risks and opportunities.

14.4.1.3 The roles and responsibilities within the risk and opportunity management process.

14.4.2 A draft Risk Register, to include but not limited to:

14.4.2.1 Risks and opportunities related to the project, the FEPS-S Service, and the bidder's ROMP, identified and assessed at ITN stage.

14.4.3 A Master Data Assumptions List (MDAL), to include but not limited to:

14.4.3.1 All assumptions related to the project and the FEPS-S Service, identified and assessed at ITN stage.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

14.5 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution:

14.5.1 ROMP:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

14.5.1.1 The ROMP is to be detailed clearly and appropriate to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of risk and opportunity management, relevant to the FEPS-S Service.

14.5.1.2 The elements to be included in the ROMP are identification and capturing, assessment and categorisation, escalation, storage, reviewing and reporting, treatment and closure of risks.

14.5.1.3 The roles and responsibilities within risk and opportunity management are identified and are appropriate to the project and the project/support team.

14.5.2 Risk Register:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

14.5.2.1 Key risks and opportunities for the project have been identified and assessed in accordance with the ROMP.

14.5.2.2 All identified risks and opportunities are clear, relevant, and appropriately detailed.

14.5.2.3 All identified risks and opportunities have mitigation and/or fallbacks plans.

14.5.2.4 All identified risks and opportunities made to support the delivery of this Contract are not at conflict with the Authority.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

14.5.2.5 All identified risks and opportunities are assigned appropriate ownership.

14.5.2.6 All identified risks and opportunities assigned to the Tenderer have been appropriately costed.

14.5.3 MDAL:

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

14.5.3.1 All assumptions for the project have been identified and included in your MDAL;

14.5.3.2 All assumptions identified are clear, relevant, and appropriately detailed;

14.5.3.3 All assumptions identified made to support the delivery of this Contract are not at conflict with the Authority;

Page Limit and Format

14.6 The Tenderer must limit their ROMP to 15 sides of A4, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

14.7 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

14.8 The ROMP must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

14.9 The Risk Register and the MDAL are not included in the page limit, however must be provided in a spreadsheet that is compatible with Microsoft Excel.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets all 5 primary aspects set in 14.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 12 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics set in 14.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets all 5 primary aspects set in 14.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 10 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic set in 14.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets all 5 primary aspects set in 14.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 10 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 14.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.

Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 5 primary aspects set in 14.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 10 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 14.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 14 – Technical Question 3 Scoring Criteria

15 TECHNICAL QUESTION 4: CONTRACTOR LOGISTIC SUPPORT

Aim

15.1 The Authority requires assurance that the Tenderer will have complete competence to provide the CLS aspects of the FEPS-S Service throughout the duration of the Contract.

Background

15.2 The Tenderer requires a robust strategy to deliver the elements of the FEPS-S Service as required in the FEPS-S Service SoW, in order to reach the needs of the Authority and satisfy the KPIs throughout the Contract.

References

15.3 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

15.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

15.3.2 Annex B: KPIs;

15.3.3 Annex D: Contract Data Requirement List (CDRL);

15.3.4 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs.

Evidence Required

15.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below. Each aspect has a corresponding Confidence Characteristic:

15.4.1 A CLS Plan which details the Tenderer's proposed solutions and processes to the implementation, execution and management of the following primary aspects. The CLS plan is to include but not limited to:

15.4.1.1 Asset demands. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.1.

15.4.1.2 Issuing of Assets. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.2.

15.4.1.3 Receipts and inspections of Assets. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.3.

15.4.1.4 Repair Activity. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.4

15.4.1.5 Defect Management. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.5.

15.4.1.6 Asset Management, ownership and reporting of data and information. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.6.

15.4.1.7 Help line and technical support. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.7.

15.4.1.8 Establishment and Management of Electronic Business Capability (EBC). This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.8.

15.4.1.9 Financial recording and reporting. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.1.9.

15.4.2 FEPS-S Demonstration Plan, to include but not limited to:

15.4.2.1 How all of the serials of the FEPS-S Service SoW will be demonstrated prior to the start of the FEPS-S Service (Partial) and FEPS-S Service (Full) phases. This aspect corresponds with the Confidence Characteristic found at 15.5.2.1.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

15.5 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following <u>primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics</u> for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution. Each Confidence Characteristic corresponds to an aspect in 15.4 (excluding 15.5.1.10).

15.5.1 CLS Plan:

The <u>primary Confidence Characteristics</u> for this artefact are:

15.5.1.1 The Asset demand process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant KPIs without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.1.

15.5.1.2 The Asset issuing process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process

utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant KPIs without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.2.

15.5.1.3 The Asset receipts and inspections process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, the interface with Service Unit, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the aspect without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.3.

15.5.1.4 The repair activity process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The response describes how the Tenderer will manage repair activity for the FEPS-S Assets and Line Replacement Units (LRUs). The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy this aspect without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.4.

15.5.1.5 The defect management process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy this aspect without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.5.

15.5.1.6 The Asset Management process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The response describes the ownership and storage of data and information, how data will be kept accurate and data assurance. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy this aspect without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.6.

15.5.1.7 The help line and technical support solution is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant KPIs without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.7.

15.5.1.8 The establishment and management of the Electronic Business Capability (EBC) solution is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The plan to connect to MOD systems (e.g., MJDI, JAMES) is established and robust, including a schedule of activities for implementation that is led by the Tenderer. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy this aspect without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.8.

15.5.1.9 The financial recording and reporting process is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The process utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant KPIs without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.9.

15.5.1.10 All processes and aspects are relevant to the project milestones. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the whole artefact found at 15.4.1.

15.5.1.11 Risks, opportunities, innovation and forward thinking have been considered throughout the CLS plan where applicable. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the whole artefact found at 15.4.1.

15.5.1.12 The Tenderer has referred to the Industry Standards and Def Stans where applicable. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the whole artefact found at 15.4.1.

The <u>secondary Confidence Characteristics</u> for this artefact are:

15.5.1.13 Processes to identify trends in peak, excessive and inappropriate demands, and how they will be managed, have been detailed clearly and appropriately. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.1.1.

15.5.1.14 Process maps have been provided to illustrate methods and plans that have been proposed where appropriate. The process maps are clear, and appropriately detailed, supporting the bidder's solutions, the SoW serials and FEPS-S Service ToRs. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the whole artefact found at 15.4.1.

15.5.2 FEPS-S Demonstration Plan;

The <u>primary Confidence Characteristic</u> for this artefact is:

15.5.2.1 The FEPS-S Demonstration Plan provides a clear proposal on how the Tenderer will demonstrate their systems and processes in order to be accepted by the Authority, and to ensure all selected SoW serials have been accepted prior to the start of FEPS-S Service (Partial) and FEPS-S Service (Full) phases. This Confidence Characteristic corresponds with the aspect found at 15.4.2.

Page Limit and Format

15.6 The Tenderer must limit their CLS Plan to 60 sides of A4 for this technical question, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. Tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

15.7 The Tenderer must limit their FEPS-S Demonstration Plan to 20 sides of A4 for this technical question, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered. A FEPS-S Demonstration acceptance spreadsheet can supplement the response and is not within the page limit. This will need to be provided in the format compatible with Microsoft Office. All other tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

15.8 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" – within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

15.9 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets <u>all 10 primary aspects</u> set in 15.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets <u>all 15 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics</u> set in 15.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets <u>all 10 primary aspects</u> set in 15.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets <u>all 13 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic</u> set in 15.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.

Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets all 10 primary aspects set in 15.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 13 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 15.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 10 primary aspects set in 15.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 13 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 15.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 15 – Technical Question 4 Scoring Criteria

16 TECHNICAL QUESTION 5: EQUIPMENT AND GFA TRANSITION

Aim

16.1 The Authority requires assurance that the Tenderer will deliver the Contract to the agreed Delivery, Completion and Anchor Milestones at Annex C.

Background

16.2 Individual deliverables may be achievable in their own right, but when collated and coordinated into a plan, the cumulative effort could affect time, cost and performance.

References

16.3 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

16.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

16.3.2 Annex B: KPIs;

16.3.3 Annex C: Delivery, Completion and Anchor Milestones;

16.3.4 Annex E: FEPS-S Service ToRs;

16.3.5 Annex M: Contractual Assumptions;

16.3.6 Annex N: Government Furnished Assets (GFA) List;

16.3.7 CDR 04-02.

Evidence Required

16.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefacts in their response, containing the primary aspects detailed below:

16.4.1 Equipment and GFA Transition Plan, to include but not limited to;

16.4.1.1 A proposed plan and schedule with narration that details the transportation, receipt, inspection, configuration, asset management and reporting of the FEPS-S equipment and supporting GFA, that is part of the transition activity to take place in order to reach expected milestone.

16.4.1.2 A list of key activities and milestones to be undertaken towards a successful equipment and GFA transition.

16.4.1.3 Details on the proposed facilities which will take receipt of the equipment, to be ready for in-inspections and storage.

16.4.2 A supplementary document to the Equipment and GFA Transition Plan that supports the compliance of the following SoW serials:

16.4.2.1 For SoW serial 064 (Residual Fleet): The document details clearly and appropriately how the Tenderer will dismantle, categorise, report and process the required and non-required components from the Residual Fleet, providing a plan of activities and milestones to complete prior to commencement of FEPS-S Service (Full).

16.4.2.2 For SoW serial 065 (Residual Fleet): The document details clearly and appropriately how the Tenderer will inspect, test and assure the salvaged components, and then categorise, report and process the “working condition” (i.e., A2) and the “ready-for-disposal” components from the Residual Fleet, providing a plan of activities and milestones to complete the requirement. The Tenderer shall also describe their method of how the salvaged A2 stock shall be consumed, as a priority over new procurement, and at no cost to the Authority.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

16.5 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer’s solution.

16.5.1 Equipment and GFA Transition Plan;

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

16.5.1.1 The Equipment and GFA Transition Plan is detailed clearly and appropriately, and considers; the FEPS-S Service SoW, the stakeholder communication, and the processes within the FEPS-S Service ToRs. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide

confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant requirements and milestones without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.

16.5.1.2 The plan provides a robust solution to the how the following elements will be managed within the transition, and to provide confidence to the Authority that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant milestones and KPIs without compromise to the FEPS-S Service: transportation; receipt; inspection; configuration, asset management and reporting of the FEPS-S equipment and GFA that is part of the transition activity.

16.5.1.3 Activities and milestones have been identified and included within the plan, with logic and planned dates displayed.

16.5.1.4 A draft transport plan details the equipment movements that need to take place in a systematic and well-thought-out strategy.

16.5.1.5 The proposed facilities which will take receipt of the FEPS-S equipment have been identified, with details provided to satisfy the facilities requirements for safe and secure storage.

16.5.1.6 Risks have been identified, analysed and mitigation activities incorporated into plans.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

16.5.1.7 Workstream interdependencies have been detailed clearly and appropriately, highlighting any dependencies on MOD organisations or other stakeholders (e.g., external stakeholders and incumbent provider). This must include a RACI matrix to display the activities and the associated stakeholders' responsibilities.

16.5.1.8 Stakeholder and communications management has been addressed, where roles and responsibilities have been identified.

16.5.2 Technical Question 5 supplementary document;

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this artefact are:

16.5.2.1 The Tenderer's solution and plans are detailed clearly and appropriately and considers the FEPS-S SoW serials stated in the primary aspect. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations to provide confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the relevant requirements and milestones without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.

16.5.2.2 The Tenderer has provided a robust cost-saving opportunity and confidence to the Authority that the items salvaged and classified as A2 will be used within the FEPS-S contract at no cost to the Authority.

Page Limit and Format

16.6 The Tenderer must limit their Equipment and GFA Transition Plan to 20 sides of A4, and their supplementary technical response (16.4.2) to 10 sides of A4 for this technical question, any evidence provided over this page limit will not be considered.

16.7 A draft transport spreadsheet and two separate schedules can supplement the response and are not within the page limit. This will need to be provided in the format compatible with Microsoft Office and clearly labelled for which artefact it relates to. All other tables, graphs and images included in this document are to be counted in the page limit.

16.8 The existing title pages within the provided plan templates (Annex H) for the Equipment and GFA Transition Plan are not included within the stipulated response page limit.

16.9 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

16.10 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets <u>all 5 primary aspects</u> set in 16.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all <u>10 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics</u> set in 16.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.

Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets all 5 primary aspects set in 16.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic set in 16.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets all 5 primary aspects set in 16.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 16.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 5 primary aspects set in 16.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 8 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 16.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 16 - Technical Question 5 Scoring Criteria

17 TECHNICAL QUESTION 6: SUPPLY SUPPORT

Aim

17.1 There is a requirement to provide and sustain for the life of the Contract, a FEPS-S specific Integrated Logistic Support Package that will ensure that the equipment is able to be used and maintained to a standard that will underwrite the live FEPS-S Safety Case. The system support package is intended to maximise the equipment availability levels, and system reliability and maintainability are essential to achieving the required operational effectiveness.

Background

17.2 Supply Support is one of the key areas required to achieve operational effectiveness by making available to the User/Maintainer, when demanded, the correct spares item delivered to the demander within the specified Supply Priority Code (SPC) system. Industry is likely to have an important role in that chain of events.

17.3 The Authority is also keen to see how the Tenderer's proposed Supply Support package might reduce the current military resource burden required to support the FEPS-S equipment, whilst still complying with the timeframes specified within the SPC system.

References

17.4 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

17.4.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

17.4.2 Annex D – Appendix i: Integrated Logistic Support Plan (ILSP);

17.4.3 Annex N: GFE List;

17.4.4 CDR 03-05;

17.4.5 FEPS-S Equipment Army Equipment Support Publications (AESPs).

Evidence Required

17.5 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefact in their response, containing the <u>primary aspects</u> detailed below:

17.5.1 Supply Support Plan (SSP), that includes the following:

17.5.1.1 The planned approach to support to the FEPS-S equipment, by ensuring that spares are supplied when demanded within the expected KPI timeframe, to prevent the capability being reduced to an unacceptable level.

17.5.1.2 Demonstration of the Tenderer's understanding of supplying the required spares to support the FEPS-S equipment In-Service activities wherever globally they are required.

17.5.1.3 Detail the methodology and processes followed to ensure that the User/Maintainer can have confidence in the Tenderer to obtain the correct spare needed to complete the replacement/repair within the stated lines and levels of the Authority's support infrastructure.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

17.6 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this technical question are:

17.6.1 The Tenderer has provided a proposed Def Stan 00-600 compliant SSP, that satisfies the Product Description characteristics found in Def Stan 00-600 pt. 3 (PD 3002-02), on how the provision of spares to support the FEPS-S equipment will be supported. Evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, and provides confidence that the support aligns with the Authority's requirements.

17.6.2 The SSP includes further evidence of how re-provisioning and optimisation of spares shall reflect peacetime SPC delivery timelines, as well as meeting any unexpected temporary increases in demand, e.g., to meet crisis/war needs.

17.6.3 Acknowledgement by the Tenderer that they shall hold the MASTER Inventory list, which has been identified and included within the plan.

17.6.4 The Tenderer has demonstrated their understanding of their codification, packaging and labelling responsibilities, and how they will conform in accordance with DEFCON 117 and 129.

17.6.5 Consideration on how the spares supporting data will be configuration managed throughout the In-Service phase, including updates and reports to the Authority.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this technical question are:

17.6.6 Process of incorporating changes to the known FEPS-S inventory, as a result of any future engineering changes have been identified and detailed.

17.6.7 Stakeholder and communications management has been addressed, where roles and responsibilities have been identified.

Page Limit and Format

17.7 There is no page limit for the SSP.

17.8 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

17.9 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets all 3 primary aspects set in 17.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 7 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics set in 17.6, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets all 3 primary aspects set in 17.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic set in 17.6, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets all 3 primary aspects set in 17.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 17.6, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet all 3 primary aspects set in 17.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 17.6, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 17 - Technical Question 6 Scoring Criteria

18 TECHNICAL QUESTION 7: TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS

Aim

18.1 The Authority has a responsibility to ensure that all elements of Through Life Support (TLS) are provisioned in order to facilitate complete system operational effectiveness with the desired availability, whilst keeping the logistical burden to an acceptable minimum.

Background

18.2 A key element of ensuring that operational effectiveness is kept at its highest level whilst driving logistic efficiency is to have a comprehensive set of Technical Publications in the AESP standard in accordance with Def Stan 00-601 Pt 4. The regular upkeep of Technical Publications is intended to improve safe operation of the equipment by ensuring that all relevant information is available to Users/Maintainers in a consistent format and with minimum requirement for further assistance.

References

18.3 The documents that shall be considered for this technical question are:

18.3.1 Annex A: FEPS-S Service SoW;

18.3.2 Annex D – Appendix i: Integrated Logistic Support Plan (ILSP);

18.3.3 Annex N: GFE List;

18.3.4 CDR 03-02;

18.3.5 Def Stan 00-601 Pt 4.: MOD Business Rules – Contracting for Technical Documentation;

18.3.6 FEPS-S Equipment AESPs.

Evidence Required

18.4 The Tenderer shall provide the following artefact in their response, containing the <u>primary aspects</u> detailed below:

18.4.1 Technical Documentation Management Plan (TDMP), that includes the following:

18.4.1.1 The planned approach to support the Technical Publications of the FEPS-S Service, to ensure that each AESP continues to provide the Operator, Maintainer or Operational Infrastructure Desk Officer with the correct information to carry out their duties in support of the FEPS-S equipment.

18.4.1.2 Details of who internally or externally that the Tenderer's organisation may engage with, to support the ongoing upkeep to the Technical Publications and the process followed to achieve the required quality.

Confidence Characteristics Sought

18.5 The evidence provided to this technical question will need to demonstrate the following primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics for the Authority to have confidence in the Tenderer's solution.

The primary Confidence Characteristics for this technical question are:

18.5.1 It details clearly how the FEPS-S equipment Technical Documentation will be supported throughout the Contract. The plan utilises a reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight in undertaking the obligations and applies to the existing AESPs, outlining; how the current documentation will be stored; when and how it will be reviewed; and how potential updates will be identified, assessed and completed. The response provides confidence that the Tenderer will be able to satisfy the requirement without any compromise to the FEPS-S Service.

18.5.2 It contains appropriate references to Defence Standard 00-601 Pt 4, that satisfies the Product Description characteristics found in Def Stan 00-600 pt. 3 (PD 2001-03), and details how this has been tailored for the programme, and how it maps to the TDMP sections.

18.5.3 Acknowledgement by the Tenderer that they shall hold the MASTER Technical Documentation has been identified and stated.

18.5.4 Consideration has been provided on how the Technical Documentation will be configuration managed throughout the In-Service phase, including communication, updates and reports to the Authority.

18.5.5 Control of classified information process has been explained.

The secondary Confidence Characteristics for this technical question are:

18.5.6 Methods of incorporating engineering changes, and instructions/information furnished by the MOD, for inclusion in documentation has been detailed.

18.5.7 Stakeholder and communications management has been addressed, where roles and responsibilities have been identified.

Page Limit and Format

18.6 There is no page limit for the TDMP.

18.7 References to other documents provided as part of the Tenderer's response (see Paragraph C13 – "Checklist for Tender Returns" - within DEFFORM 47) are allowed and are not included in the technical question's page limit. References must be clearly labelled and specific.

18.8 The response must be provided in Arial font, with a minimum font size of 11 for text, and 10 for tables and graphs. The Authority reserves the right not to consider evidence provided that does not conform to these fonts and sizes.

Question Scoring Criteria

Scoring Level	Score	Criteria
High Confidence	100	1. The response meets both (2) primary aspects set in 18.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 7 primary and secondary Confidence Characteristics set in 18.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Good Confidence	70	1. The response meets both (2) primary aspects set in 18.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics and at least 1 secondary Confidence Characteristic set in 18.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Satisfactory Confidence	30	1. The response meets both (2) primary aspects set in 18.4, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority. And; 2. The response meets all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 18.5, to enable a successful implementation, execution, and management of the FEPS-S Service. The evidence provided is relevant, clear, and detailed, with reasonable degree of resource, prudence and foresight applied to provide confidence to the Authority.
Low Confidence	0	1. Nil; the Tenderer has failed to provide a response. Or; 2. The response fails to meet both (2) primary aspects set in 18.4, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority. Or; 3. The response fails to meet all 5 primary Confidence Characteristics set in 18.5, where the evidence provided is irrelevant, unclear and lacks sufficient detail to provide confidence to the Authority.

Table 18 - Technical Question 7 Scoring Criteria