|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASTRID – TASKING FORM – Part A** | | | |
| Once complete please email the Tasking Form to:   • Official – ASTRID@baesystems.com.    • Official Sensitive – ASTRID@baesystems.r.mil.uk. | | | |
|  | | | |
| Note to Commercial Staff:  ASTRID has been let and is owned by Defence Science & Technology Laboratory (Dstl) and any work placed under it is subject to UK Govt DEFCONs. Full DEFCON definitions can be found here:  <https://www.aof.mod.uk/aofcontent/tactical/toolkit/content/defcons/defcon.htm> (note account required to access but easy to set up) | | | |
|  | | | |
| **TASKING FORM** | | | |
| **To:** | CORDA | **From (Organisation):** | Navy Command / DMS-NG |
|  | | | |
| **Framework contract number:** | | DSTL/AGR/01142/01 | |
| **Agreed quotation date (if known):** | |  | |
|  | | | |
| **REQUIREMENT SUMMARY AND AUTHORITY CONTACTS:** | | | |
| **Project Manager**  **(name & telephone)** | |  | |
| **Technical Lead**  **(name & telephone)** | |  | |
| **Commercial Officer**  **(name & telephone)** | | John Valentine | |
| **Task title** (for Dstl: max 30 characters inc AST/ prefix) | | DMS-NG V&V Exercise | |
| **Anticipated start date** | | 26 April 21 | |
| **Anticipated end date (core work)** | | 31 July 21 | |
| **Anticipated end date (options)** | | N/A | |
| **Requisition or Purchase Order ref** | |  | |
| **ASTRID task number** | | 041 | |
| **Task description** | | Please see attached Statement of Requirement | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SCHEDULE OF REQUIREMENTS:**  Brief list of requirements (core and options) – add rows as appropriate (full details appear in the attached Statement of Requirement) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Item No** | | **Core or Option** | | | **Description / Title** | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | | Please see attached Statement of Requirement | | | | | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Pricing:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Firm Price | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| Ascertained cost\*  \*only at Authority’s discretion | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| Firm Pricing shall be in accordance with DEFCON 127 or DEFCON 643 and DEFCON 648  Ascertained Costs shall be in accordance with DEFCON 653 or DEFCON 802. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Cyber Risk:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Risk level: | | | | | |  | | | | | |
| Assessment ref: | | | | | | Click or tap here to enter text. | | | | | |
| DEFCON 658 | | | | | |  | (applicable for all risk levels except ‘N/A’) | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **DEFCONS:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please confirm which specific DEFCONs are required for the task (Dstl staff click [here](http://wiki/o/Defining_IP_Requirements_using_the_NIPPY_process#tab=The_NIPPY_Guide) for greater DEFCON detail and NIPPY Guidance). If you are unsure, please discuss with your IP contact, or commercial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Edn 12/06 | | | Contractor's Personnel at Government Establishments  (The Contractor's liability under Condition 3 of DEFCON 76 (Edn 12/06) shall be limited to £50M per incident in accordance with the terms of the agreement between MOD and BAE Systems Plc reference DCS/04/02/32/01/07 dated 17/06/2014). | | | | | | |  |
| 91 | Edn 11/06 | | | Intellectual Property Rights In Software | | | | | | |  |
| 703 | Edn 08/13 | | | Intellectual Property Rights - Vesting In the Authority  To be specified on the Tasking Form | | | | | | |  |
| 705 | Edn 11/02 | | | Intellectual Property Rights - Research and Technology  To be specified on the Tasking Form | | | | | | |  |
| Acceptance or rejection of deliverables  This MUST match the number of days stated in the SOR. The default for reports is ‘up to 30 days’, and the default for software is ‘up to 60 days’. Please specify if requesting different and discuss with commercial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 524 | Edn 10/98 | | | Rejection | | | |  | | days | |
| 525 | Edn 10/98 | | | Acceptance  For the Purposes of schedule of requirements item 2 of this Contract the period for acceptance and rejection of deliverables shall be specified within the Tasking Form at Annex D. | | | |  | | days | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **DELIVERABLES:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please see attached SOR for full details | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **GFX:** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| No | | |  | | | | | | | | |
| If yes, please see attached SOR for full details of equipment / information / facilities | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Security Classification of the Work:** (delete as appropriate\*) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *\*Failure to delete unnecessary higher classifications will result in delays at the firewall* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offical-Sensitive Commercial | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The overarching ASTRID contract contains a Security Aspects Letter (SAL) covering tasks up to Official Sensitive at quotation stage. If the Statement of requirement (SOR) is a higher classification, please complete the relevant SAL and send with this tasking form and SOR. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| If this is the case, please tick the box to indicate you are attaching a separate SAL for your task | | | | | | | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Any task placed as a result of your quotation will be subject to the Terms and Conditions of Dstl contract number DSTL/AGR/01142/01 | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASTRID – TASKING FORM – Part B** | | | | | | | | |
| **To:** |  | | | | | **From:** | CORDA | |
| **FAO:** |  | | | | | **PoC:** |  | |
| **Tel:** |  | | | | | **Tel:** |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **Proposal Reference AST\CMRCL\Prop\01841\1 (attached)**  **The proposal shall include, but not be limited to:**   * A full technical proposal that meets the individual activities that are detailed in Statement of Requirement (Part A to Draft Tasking Form) * A Work breakdown structure/project plan with key dates and Deliverables identified including required delivery dates for Government Furnished Assets. * A clear identification of Dependencies, Assumptions, Risks and Exclusions which underpin your Technical Proposal. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **COST BREAKDOWN (to be completed by the Contractor)**  You are to use rates that have been previously agreed within the Analysis for Science & Technology Research in Defence (ASTRID) at Annex E.  Please also provide a price breakdown which should include, but is not limited to: labour costs, transportation, travel and subsistence, overheads and profit. In support of your Proposal you are requested to provide clear details of all Dependencies, Assumptions, Risks and Exclusions that underpin your price | | | | | | | | |
| Price quotation of **£105,161.67** (ex VAT) is submitted for **Task No 041 - DMS-NG V&V Exercise** and breakdown attached | | | | | | | | |
| Ascertained Price | | |  | | | | | |
| Firm Price | | |  | | | | | |
| Hybrid\* | | |  | \*if hybrid, please specify which pricing mechanism applies to which work packages and/or deliverables in the “Milestones Deliverables and Payments” table | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **VALUE FOR MONEY EVIDENCE - KPI 1 (to be completed by the Contractor)**  The Collaborative sourcing mechanism was utilised for supplier selection. This maximises Value for Money by:  - Deploying the optimum team to deliver the work (maximising quality)  - Promoting discussions with the customer during proposal work up:  Better aligning the supplier's understanding of the requirement,  Better informing the customer's understanding of their problem and the solution to solving it,  Eradicating 'gold plating',  Deploying the appropriate SQEP and;  Reducing technical (and financial) risk.  - Enforcing use of suppliers lowest UK Government rates  - Reviewing effort levels to ensure that they are commensurate with the required level of work  - The Technical Lead will provide assurance that the Statement of Work is delivered as per the specification  Where possible, PA shall use existing MOD tools, templates and processes, we believe this will provide the most efficient approach and will fully meet the Authority’s requirements for review.  This offers Value for Money with regards to efficiency as:  1. Effort is not expended developing novel techniques.  2. Using the MoD report templates reduces the effort required to write-up the QA reports.  3. Presenting the QA findings using the familiar, trusted structure allows stakeholders such as CAAS CAT and scrutiny to quickly absorb content without the need to search through the document as they are familiar with interpreting the outputs.  Carrying out this activity is effective as:  1. The process is repeatable and comparable. Future QA tasks can use the same tools and techniques meaning that results and conclusions can be directly compared.  2. The report templates and processes have been tailored to meet MoD-specific requirements. However, if required due to the nature of the model, we can make minor customisations or enhancements to meet this requirement situation.  In particular this proposal contains the following elements:  - Confidence that a supplier will deliver the agreed requirements for an agreed firm price  - Task Lead rates have been scrutinised and actively challenged on framework signup to drive value for money.  In addition, whilst signing the supplier up to the ASTRID Framework business agreement, the PMO were successful in negotiating a decrease in the level of escalation applied to the Task Lead’s price rates, year on year. | | | | | | | | |
| Start date: | | 24/05/2021 | | | End date: | | | 11/07/2021 |
| Signed on behalf of the Contractor: | | | | | | | | |
| Printed name: | |  | | | Date: | | | 21/05/2021 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contractor’s Cost Breakdown** | | | | |
|  | | | | |
|  | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Milestones Deliverables and Payments** | | | | | |
| **Milestone No** | **Description** | **Pricing (Ascertained or Firm)** | **£ Ex VAT** | **Due Date** | **Deliverable DEFCON**  **703 / 705**  **(14, 90 & 91)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL £ Ex VAT** | | | **£105,161.67** |  | |
|  | | | | | |
| **Request for Limitation of Liability** | | | | | |
| Risk should sit with the party best placed to manage that risk. If the contractor believes that should be the Authority, they should provide a justification detailing the perceived risk, the limitation of liability requested, and link it to the relevant DEFCON where applicable. | | | | | |
|  | No limitation requested | | | | |
|  | Limitations requested – to be absorbed by Prime | | | | |
|  | Limitations requested – see attached justification at Annex A | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requested Amendments to Framework Conditions** | | | |
| The Prime should detail below any requests for amendments to the terms and conditions of the Framework if deemed necessary for this particular task | | | |
| It is assumed that there is no requirement for a deliverable quality plan.  It is assumed that there is no requirement for the ASTRID PMO to store deliverables which are classified above Official Sensitive or which hold commercially sensitive information. | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Options and Payments** | | | |
| **Item No** | **Description / Title from Part A** | **£ (ex VAT)\*** | **Expiry Date** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| \*Price(s) quoted to be held valid until end date of options   *(If unticked a requote will be required)* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ASTRID – TASKING FORM – Part C** | | | | |
| **1. Offer of Contract:** *(to be completed by Authority Commercial Services)* | | | | |
| **Commercial Officer:** | Hazel Ward | | **Tel:** |  |
| **Vendor Agreement No** (if applicable)**:** | 701561390 | | | |
| **Purchase Order Number:** |  | | | |
| **Start date (T0) is deemed to be:** | 28/05/21 | If preferred, CORDA has given permission for you to amend the table in Part B to show actual due dates. If you make any changes, please change the font to RED and draw attention to them in the ‘comments & clarifications’ box below. | | |
|  | | | | |
| **Commercial comments and clarifications to proposal:** | | | | |
|  | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| **Commercial Approval:** |  | | | |
| **Date:** | 28/05/2021 | | | |
| Please Note: Task Authorisation to be issued by Authority Commercial Services Department once the Vendor Agreement and Purchase Order numbers have been inserted. Any work carried out prior to issue is at the Contractor’s own risk | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Unqualified Acceptance of Offer made in Part C.1 above:** *(to be completed by the Prime Contractor and returned to Authority’s Commercial Services)* | | | |
| **Name:** |  | **Tel:** |  |
| **Position in Company:** |  | | |
| **Signature :** |  | **Date:** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ASTRID – TASKING FORM – Part D** | | |
| **COMPLETION OF TASK** *(to be completed by the Prime Contractor and returned to the nominated Authority Task owner as detailed in Part A - failure to return could result in payment being delayed)* | | |
|  | | |
| **For the avoidance of doubt, Section D confirms the final value of the task. The value stated in this section will be the contracted value for the task and will take precedence over any previous values referred to in sections above.** | | |
|  | | |
| **Confirmation of Deliverables as per Part A:** | | |
| **Yes** | **No** | |
|  | | |
| **Actual Task start date:** |  | |
| **Actual Task completion date:** |  | |
| **Final invoice submitted on:** |  | |
| **For firm price of:** | £ | |
| **For the final LoL price of:** | £ | |
|  | | |
| **Comments from Contractor on the task:** | | |
|  | | |
| ***Task completed to Authority’s satisfaction*** *(to be completed by nominated Task owner)* | | |
| **Comments from Task owner on the task:** | | |
|  | | |
|  | | |
| **Anticipated exploitation inc timescales:** |  | |
| **Follow-up date with End User if necessary:** |  | |
|  | | |
| **Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):** | | |
| **Timeliness of deliverables:**  This KPI is a pass or fail question and each deliverable will be given a score of either 1 for meeting the required date or 0 for failure to meet the required date.  Where any agreed contract amendments or changes to the delivery dates have been made, the revised delivery date will supersede the previous agreed date. Where a Deliverable is late as a result of the Authority’s actions, and this is agreed to by the Authority, the deliverable shall be marked as on-time. | | |
| **Total number of deliverables within task: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | |
| **Of which on time:** |  | |
| **Of which deemed late:** |  | |
| **Comments / Notes:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Quality of Deliverables:**  Deliverables are deemed to be accepted once the Authority has reviewed them and has confirmed that they are of an acceptable standard and is willing to pay the invoice associated with the deliverable. Deliverables can be rejected on the grounds of technical, financial and grammatical errors. | | |
| **Mark:** | **Measure:** | **Number of deliverables in this category:** |
| **Accepted** | Technically and editorially acceptable. Minor changes may be needed to improve exploitability of the output or to tailor the output for the end customer. |  |
| **Minor revisions** | Deliverables require minor editorial and/or technical revisions prior to acceptance. Minor changes may also be needed to improve exploitability of the output or to tailor the output for the customer. |  |
| **Major revisions** | Deliverables require significant editorial and/or technical revisions and further review by the Authority. |  |
| **Rejected** | Deliverables do not meet the requirement and are rejected |  |
|  | | |
| **Any additional comments / Notes:** | | |
| **Signed:** |  | |
| **Date:** |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIRECT LOSS - DEFCON 76 (Damage to Government Establishments)** | | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | | Impact |
| Risk that electronic files, exchanged within the course of this task contain viruses which infect the MOD networks upon which they are installed | Loss of MOD networks.  Loss of MOD classified information to adversaries that are able to gain access | Unknown – high multi-millions | MOD to virus check any electronic files and assure they are free from virus infection prior to loading onto any MOD hardware.  Subcontractor to virus check files, prior to provision to MOD.  MOD to avoid installing software onto large networks where potential impact would be exponentially increased | Unknown – high multi-millions  Or  0 | Excluded | Unknown – high multi millions  Or  0 | Low | | Very high |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | | **Unknown** | **Excluded** | **Unknown** |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |
| **DIRECT LOSS - DEFCON 514 (Material Breach)** | | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | Impact | |
| Under Clause 2 of DEFCON 514 shall not exceed 150% in aggregate of the Task Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | |  | the Contractor's liability to the Authority under or in connection with this Contract shall be limited as follows:  Under Clause 2 of DEFCON 514 shall not exceed 150% in aggregate of the Task Value |  |  | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIRECT LOSS - DEFCON 611 (Loss of or damage to Issued Property)** | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | Impact |
| Loss, of or damage to, Issued Property | Loss of Authority Data | Unknown | Adherence to BAE Systems security protocols and data in accordance with SAL specifications. SAQ has been undertaken and RAR has been shared with our subcontractor for completion of their SAQ | Unknown | 100% of Task Value | £0 | Very Low | Very Low |
| Loss, of or damage to Issued Property | Damage or loss due to contractor actions/negligence | £0 | No hardware or equipment is being received for this task | £0 | 100% of Task Value | £0 | Very Low | Very Low |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | | £0/Unknown | Shall not exceed 100% in aggregate of the Task Value | £0 |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **DIRECT LOSS - DEFCON 612 (Loss of or damage to Articles)** | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | Impact |
| Clause 1 of DEFCON 612 shall not exceed 150% in aggregate of the Task Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | |  | The Contractor's liability to the Authority under or in connection with this Contract shall be limited as follows:  Clause 1 of DEFCON 612 shall not exceed 150% in aggregate of the Task Value |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIRECT LOSS - NEGLIGENCE (that is not included within DEFCON 76, 514, 611 & 612 above)** | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | Impact |
| Negligence for professional liability; Damage as a result of services or advice provided by the contractor (or one of its subcontractors). For example: Damage or Loss due to an act, error and/or omission. | Corda or Vedette may incorrectly analyse the data within the scope of this task, leading to incorrect ‘advice’ being provided, which could go on to incorrectly inform a strategic or operational decision. | **Unknown (depends on the situation in which the outputs of this task are used, which is current unforeseeable).** | 1. ASTRID PMO and any subcontractor shall ensure that SQEP are used. 2. Ensure that all deliverables and outputs are peer and manager reviewed before formal release. 3. Task Lead will work closely with the Authority SQEP to minimise chance of errors / omissions.   MOD are heavily involved with the acceptance testing and assurance of the outputs of this task, mitigating the risk of the worst case scenario. | **Unknown (depends on the situation in which the outputs of this task are used, which is current unforeseeable).** | Excluded | **Unknown (depends on the situation in which the outputs of this task are used, which is current unforeseeable).** | Low | Medium |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | | **Unknown** | **Excluded** | **Unknown** |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **INDIRECT/CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS** | | | | | | | | |
| RISK  (Situation) | Worst Case Scenario | Worst Case Cost  £ | Mitigation | Post Mitigation Cost  £ | Proposed LOL | Contingent Liability | Probability | Impact |
| There is a risk that there is an error within the Analysis or the MOD provided GFI or that information is entered incorrectly within one of the Models, which leads to an error within the analysis and in turn an incorrect budgetary decision.  We would expect MOD to take responsibility for any future procurement decisions and also the impact of any resultant changes to Navy Budgets, wider Navy Capability and Strategic Risk; which are informed by this analysis and other decision support interventions. | MOD proceed to procure a platform/equipment which is based on incorrect cost analysis.  There is an impact to Navy Budgets, wider Navy Capability and an increase in Strategic Risk, due to inaccurate or incorrect analysis. | Not currently foreseeable. | MOD should not soley rely upon the outputs of this Task to inform a procurement decision.  The analysis provided via this Task forms part of a larger MOD strategic budget and capability analysis which leads to the decision to alter budgets.  In addition to the rigorous process within the Task Lead’s organisation to review the outputs of the Task, the MOD will be directly involved with reviewing the analysis. | Not currently foreseeable. | Excluded | Not currently foreseeable. | Not currently foreseeable. | Not currently foreseeable. |
| **TOTAL PROPOSED CONTRACTOR’S LIMIT OF LIABILITY** | | | | **Not currently foreseeable.** | **Excluded** | **Not currently foreseeable.** |  | |