Team Leidos

USER ASSESSENT PANEL DIRECTIVE

SHOES FITNESS TRAINER (SFT) & PTI SFT

Prepared by:	Nick Stacey
Title:	Team Leidos Trials Manager
Date:	2 Feb 22
Approved by:	Maj Lee Davison
FLC:	Requirements Manager
Date:	7 Mar 22

Version Control

This document uses version control history. Draft documents for review shall have a 'DRAFT' watermark on each page. The first draft version is shown as D01C00 in the document header (then D02C00, D03C00 etc., for subsequent drafts). The first approved, fully released document is shown as R01C00 (then R02C00, R03C00, etc., for subsequent approved versions). A minor change (such as a formatting change or a spelling mistake) within a draft or a released document is shown as C01, C02 etc.

Version	Date	Author	Amendment
D01C00	2 Feb 22	Nick Stacey	First Draft
R01C00	7 Mar 22	Nick Stacey	First Approved Issue

Note: When updating this document and the Version Control table, the document header needs to be updated with the latest version number.

Contents

1 Scope 4
1.1 Introduction 4
1.2 Aim 4
1.3 Outcome 4
2 User Assessment Panel 5
2.1 Description 5
2.2 Evaluation .... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
2.3 Reporting 5
3 Responsibilities 6
Appendix A Questionnaire 7
Appendix B Scoring Methodology 9
Appendix C Plan of Test (Not included in Tender Pack) .... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1 Scope

1.1 Introduction

The User Assessment Panel (UAP) forms part of the process which Team Leidos uses to evaluate submissions from bidders in response to an Invitation to Tender. Royal Navy, Army and Royal Air Front Line Command representatives will assess tender samples that have passed the Commercial and Technical documentation evaluation.

1.2 Aim

The aim of the UAP is to conduct a qualitative assessment of the tender samples, that have met the technical criteria, in order to assist in the tender evaluation process.

1.3 Outcome

A fair and unbiased summative report of the user assessment. The highest scoring solutions to a maximum of 4 per bidder (2x SFT and 2x PTI SFT) will be permitted to go through to the FUT. The overall highest scoring solutions to a maximum of 8 (x4 STF and x4 white PTI SFT) will go through to FUT. In the event of a same style being utilised within 2 successful solutions intended for FUT, there will be no duplication of trial pairs required.

2 User Assessment Panel

2.1 Description

The User Assessment Panel (UAP) will comprise of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) nominated by Front Line Commands who will assess the tender samples that have passed the technical evaluation. Team Leidos staff and the MOD Requirements Manager will be in attendance.

- The question set and scoring to be used at the UAP can be found at Appendix A.
- The scoring methodology to be used at the UAP can be found at Appendix B.
- The Plan of Test of the UAP including location and dates can be found at Appendix C. (Not included in the Tender Pack.)

2.2 Evaluation

The tender samples which are presented to the UAP will have passed the Commercial and Technical documentation evaluation and will be deemed compliant with the specification agreed with the Front Line Command. The UAP scores will determine which solutions will go through to the next stage of the tender evaluation.

- Visits or contact with suppliers are not permitted during the tender process.
- All questionnaires will be completed by the members of the UAP using software application.
- All tender samples to be evaluated and an average overall score determined per solution.
- The benchmark score to proceed to FUT is 70% (84/120).

2.3 Reporting

Team Leidos Trials Team will produce a report summarising the outcome of the UAP in a separate document.

3 Responsibilities

3.1 Team Leidos Commodity

- Ensure all tender samples are appropriately marked (A, B, C etc) prior to the UAP.
- Transport or arrange for all samples to be delivered to the UAP location.
- Provide staff to assist the panel members on matters of clarification during the UAP

3.2 Team Leidos Trials Manager

- Ensure the UAP is conducted fairly.
- Ensure all questionnaires are completed by panel members.
- Collate and evaluate scores.
- Produce a report of the findings.

3.3 MOD

- Provide the Chair of the UAP

3.4 Front Line Commands

- Provide lines of communication with the Trials Team.
- Provide a list of nominated SMEs to form the Panel
- Provide Compatibility Equipment where items cannot be provided form stores

Appendix A Questionnaire

1.	Rank and Name					
	Unit					
	Email					
2.	Type of Trainer (SFT/PTI, Male/Female)					
3.	Sample Reference					
No.	Statement	**High Confidence**	**Confidence**	**Concerns**	**Major Concerns**	Comments You must fill in the 'comments' box if you have selected 'Concerns' or 'Major Concerns' and give **an explanation WHY**
ACCEPTABILITY						
4.	The construction of the whole shoe is acceptable for the intended use?	10	7	3	0	
5.	The overall appearance of the shoe is suitable?	10	7	3	0	
FIT						
6.	The fastening and lacing system of the shoe is suitable?	10	7	3	0	
SUPPORT						
7.	The rigidity of the shoe is suitable for conducting military physical training activities?	10	7	3	0	
8.	The design of the forefoot area appears to give adequate comfort and support?	10	7	3	0	
9.	The design of the rearfoot area appears to give adequate comfort and support?	10	7	3	0	
10.	The sole/midsole material appears to provide a suitable element of shock absorption?	10	7	3	0	
COMFORT						

11.	There are no apparent areas of discomfort inside the shoe?	10	7	3	0	
12.	The weight of the shoe is suitable?	10	7	3	0	
13.	The foot bed (front and back) appears to provide comfort?	10	7	3	0	
14.	When placed on a flat surface the shoe is balanced?	10	7	3	0	
DURABILITY						
15.	The design of the sole appears suitable for the surfaces used when conducting military physical training activities?	10	7	3	0	
Total Scores		**120**	**84**	**Benchmark Score**		
			Maximum Available Score			

Appendix B Scoring Methodology

The User Assessment Panel (UAP) is asked to assess each tender sample and mark accordingly.

Marking

Responses to each Question will be marked according to the following four point scale, based solely on the Users qualitative assessment on utility and usability.

Mark	Marking Criteria
4	**High Confidence**
3	**Confidence**
2	**Concerns**
1	**Major Concerns**

Scoring

The table below shows how scoring will be awarded based on the priority of the question;

		Score
Mark Awarded	4	**10**
	3	**7**
	2	**3**
	1	**0**

END OF DOCUMENT