

RCloud Tasking Form – Part B: Statement of Requirement (SoR)

Title of Requirement	Maritime Precision Automated Interdiction of Targets (Maritime-PAINT)
Requisition No.	0000007765
SoR Version	0.1

1.	Statement of Requirements
1.1	Summary and Background Information
	<p><u>Summary</u></p> <p>Maritime-PAINT is the development and demonstration of a force protection system for surface vessels that increase their ability to detect, engage and defeat massed surface threats.</p> <p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>Accurate target detection, prioritisation and high probability of hit are the primary requirements for effective and rapid target defeat. These requirements are challenging in all military settings but are compounded when a human operator is facing massed targets and when firing from a moving platform.</p> <p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p>
1.2	Requirement
	<p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p> <p>Quality</p> <p>ISO 9001 (Quality Management Systems) shall be applicable to this task</p> <p>Government Furnished Assets (GFA)</p> <p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p>
1.3	Options or follow on work <i>(if none, write 'Not applicable')</i>
	<p>The Authority proposes to include a maximum Limit of Liability (LoL) of £1,000,000 for additional work to be provided under the contract, via a tasking mechanism for White Board Options.</p> <p>A customer review will be undertaken at the close of each financial year to identify and define additional requirements which fit within the scope of PAINT and contribute towards the final concept of employment. These additional requirements may be presented by the supplier.</p>

	<p>These requirements will be based on user feedback and progress against the technical requirements.</p> <p>The scope of these White Board Options may include, but is not limited to:</p> <p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p> <p>Note: Dstl sets out to confirm that the above list is provided for reference, and as an example of the type of work that might be subject to additional tasking. At this stage dstl sets out to confirm that these examples are not funded and Dstl does not offer a guarantee that any additional tasks may be placed.</p> <p>Where the Authority does identify a requirement, Dstl will request that the supplier provides a detailed proposal when each additional task arises and this will undergo technical and commercial review to ensure it is in scope with the aims of this requirement and offers value for money.</p>
1.4	Contract Management Activities
	Bronze, to be managed locally by the Dstl project manager
1.5	Health & Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement
	No specifics identified

1.6	Deliverables & Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)					
Ref.	Title	Due by	Format	Expected classification (subject to change)	What information is required in the deliverable	IPR Condition
D0	Kick-Off Meeting	T0	Presentation (.pptx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D1	Monthly Progress Reports	Monthly, until contract completion	Presentation (.pptx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D2	FY22/23 – End of Year Technical Report	End of FY22/23 (Mar-23)	Written Report (.docx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D3	Synthetic CONEMP demonstration	End of FY22/23 (Mar-23)	Video and Presentation (.pptx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply

						Full Rights Version
D4	Delivery of REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION standalone	FY23/24	Technical Demonstrator (TRL 6)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D5	Synthetic environment demonstration	FY23/24	Technical Demonstrator (TRL 5)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D6	Small Boat Local Network Demonstration	FY23/24	Technical Demonstrator (TRL 5)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D7	FY23/24 Deliver End of Year Technical Report	FY23/24	Written report (.docx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D8	CMS App Integration	FY 23/24	Concept Demonstrator	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply

						Full Rights Version
D9	CMS App Trials	FY 23/24	Training on System	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version
D10	Final Technical Report and Presentation	FY24/25	Written report (.docx and Presentation) (pptx)	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply Full Rights Version

1.7	Deliverable Acceptance Criteria
	<p>All Reports included as Deliverables under the Contract e.g. Progress and/or Final Reports etc. must comply with the Defence Research Reports Specification (DRRS) which defines the requirements for the presentation, format and production of scientific and technical reports prepared for MoD.</p> <p>Interim or Progress Reports: The report should detail, document, and summarise the results of work done during the period covered and shall be in sufficient detail to comprehensively explain the results achieved; substantive performance; a description of current substantive performance and any problems encountered and/or which may exist along with proposed corrective action. An explanation of any difference between planned progress and actual progress, why the differences have occurred, and if behind planned progress what corrective steps are planned.</p> <p>Any Final Reports: shall describe the entire work performed under the Contract in sufficient detail to explain comprehensively the work undertaken and results achieved including all relevant technical details of any hardware, software, process or system developed there under. The technical detail shall be sufficient to permit independent reproduction of any such process or system.</p> <p>All Reports shall be free from spelling and grammatical errors and shall be set out in accordance with the Statement Of Requirement (1) above.</p> <p>Failure to comply with the above may result in the Authority rejecting the deliverables and requesting re-work before final acceptance.</p> <p>Specific Acceptance Criteria:</p> <p>REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p>

2	Evaluation Criteria
2.1	Method Explanation
	<p>To enable the tenderers proposal to be assessed fairly, the supplier shall submit two response versions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Version 1 being a technical response containing only technical information/responses (i.e. redacting any pricing information) • • Version 2 being a commercial response that must be a full response to the ITT including technical, commercial and pricing information.

Note that in pricing your proposal, please be aware that DSTL's undisclosed budget limit for this task has been provided using a budget range shown at section 1.2 of this SOR. DSTL reserves the right to fail a tender exceeding the maximum budget limit on grounds of unaffordability. A range has been provided to give you (the supplier) an indication on the expected level of effort required – the undisclosed limit lies within this to ensure the Authority is not bound to accept purposely inflated tenders and receives Best Value for Money (BVM) for the UK taxpayer. The Authority reserves the right to reject any tender response that scores '0', or a 'Fail' for any Criteria.

Evaluation Methodology Overview

Weighted Value for Money Index (WVFM Index)

This requirement will be competed and awarded on the basis of the weighted Value for Money Index (WVFM Index) evaluating Technical and Cost scores using a weighting of **70% technical (wQ) to 30% cost (wC)**. This is the chosen approach from a selection of Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) 'absolute' methodologies. 'Absolute' refers to an individual tender being evaluated exclusively on its own merits. This method encourages tenders that more closely match the priorities of the requirement and therefore represent better value for money.

All bids received by the closing date will be assessed against the tender evaluation process detailed below. The Technical element will be weighted and scored as per the Technical Evaluation table and the Commercial element will be given a PASS/FAIL score as per the Commercial Criteria table.

This approach divides the total score of the non-cost score (WQ/WC) by the Tenderer's Price (shown as Cost £NPV – Net Present Value). This will apply to the core element of the Tenderer's proposal only.

The Value For Money Index will be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{---}}{(\text{---} (\text{£} \text{---}))}$$

*wQ = weighting of non-cost criteria (70%)

*wC = weighting applied to cost (30%)

Weighted Value for Money Index Worked Example – Procurement of a Research Project

The data below illustrates how the Weighted Value for Money Index scoring mechanism can be applied to the procurement of a project. Three different tenders (A, B and C) have been considered for procurement, each has different qualities, as measured by non-cost criteria, and different prices (Cost (£NPV)).

Tender	Non-Cost Score	Weighted NCS	Cost (£NPV)	Weighted VfM Index	Rank
A	620	3277786.1	20	163889.30	3
B	850	6844013.0	24	285167.21	2
C	1000	10000000.0	29	344827.59	1

The higher weighting applied to the non-cost score results in Tender C being the highest-ranking tender in this case.

NB: This calculation is worked out using This calculation is worked out using ^ (shift 6) on a keyboard therefore the following calculation is a worked example;

- Weighted NCS = $620^{70/30} = 3277786.1$
- Weighted VfM Index = $3277786.1 / 20 = 163889.30$

The supplier with a commercially fully compliant proposal, with the highest Weighted Value For Money (WVFM) Index score will be the winning tenderer.

In the Event of a Tie

In the event of a tie between tenders having achieved exactly the same overall score, precedence shall be the tender that has achieved the highest technically weighted score.

The Authority will use an evaluation model consisting of three criteria as follows:

- Commercial: PASS / FAIL – Noting a proposal that fails the commercial assessment shall not be considered for further evaluation.
- Technical
- Pricing

2.2 Technical Evaluation Criteria

The technical evaluation will be carried out by a team of 3 assessors who will review the technical proposals independently and then bring their scores to a moderation meeting. The moderation meeting will discuss each Tenderers response in turn and attribute a moderated technical score to each of the technical criteria (weighed by importance of the criterion) resulting in a final technical score.

A total technical score will be calculated by each assessor using a weighted sum of marks awarded for each of the seven questions, resulting in a maximum achievable technical score of 1000.

Bids will be deemed to fall short of the Authority's technical requirement and therefore be technically non-compliant in the following case:

- A score of 3 or less (Adequate to Inadequate), prior to weighting, is recorded on two or more questions in any of the technical criteria
- A score of 3 or less (Adequate to Inadequate), prior to weighting, is recorded on any one of the Criteria marked ID 1, 2, and 3.

ID	Criteria	Score	Weighting
1	<p>The PAINT tenderer provides a series of detailed technical plans against the REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION requirements list demonstrating how they would deliver given the budget and time available.</p> <p>The tenderer must set out clearly how they are building on previously conducted work in line with the requirements.</p>	0-10	25%
2	<p>The PAINT tenderer provides a series of detailed technical plans against the REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p>	0-10	25%

	requirements list demonstrating how they would deliver given the budget and time available. REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION		
3	<p>The Tenderer demonstrates evidence of how they would approach REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION to support the user in target detection, prioritisation, point of aim optimisation and engagement on a host platform REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p> <p>This should include detail of how sub-system components will be developed to provide the optimum solution rather than stacked COTS components. The tendered must set out how they plan to scale up and down the REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION components in line with the requirements document.</p>	0-10	20%
4	<p>The Tenderer provides evidence of specific subject matter expertise to deliver individual sub-system components or a joint bid to provide the best possible solution between suppliers to deliver all sub-system components. REDACTED UNDER FOIA EXEMPTION</p>	0-10	15%
5	The Tenderer demonstrates a clear understanding of complex system design and integration, with specific evidence of previous projects requiring a systems approach to balance user requirements against technical specifications	0-10	5%
6	The Tenderer demonstrates (showing evidence of prior research and development) a deep knowledge of technical components and system design to meet the technical requirements.	0-10	5%
7	The Tenderer is able to demonstrate confidence of successfully completing the project within the required timescales identifying risks and risk mitigations.	0-10	5%

The following scoring guide will be used to evaluate technical scores against each criteria.

Score	Rating	Characteristic
10	Excellent	The response addresses all elements of the requirement, and provides a comprehensive, unambiguous and thorough explanation of how the requirement will be fulfilled.
7	Good	The response addresses all of the elements of the requirement and provides sufficient detail and explanation of how the requirement will be fulfilled.
3	Adequate	The response addresses the majority of elements of the requirement but is weak in

		some areas and does not fully detail or explain how the requirement will be fulfilled.
0	Inadequate	The response does not address or explain how the requirement will be fulfilled and fails to demonstrate the ability to meet the requirement.

2.3	Commercial Evaluation Criteria
-----	--------------------------------

Evaluation of Commercial bids will be undertaken against responses to the sub-criteria detailed below and scored in accordance with the ‘Commercial Scoring Definitions’ underneath.

The Authority reserves the right to reject any Tender if a supplier scores a ‘Fail’ in any of the criteria below:

Ref	Sub-Criteria Description	Scoring	Sub- Maximum	Range	Criteria Weighted Weighting	Score
1	The supplier has uploaded One unpriced technical proposal, and One priced Commercial & Technical proposal	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
2	The supplier has completed and submitted a Part C Task Response form	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
3	The proposal has been submitted as a Firm Price and is affordable against the Authority provided budget & financial profile	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
4	The supplier accepts the R-Cloud terms and conditions, and any additional conditions specified under Tasking Form Part A.	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
5	The supplier has submitted a Supplier Assurance Questionnaire (SAQ) in response to the specified Cyber Risk Assessment with the appropriate approval and all documents submitted.	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
6	The submitted proposal has a validity period of a minimum of 60 days from the tender closing date	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
7	The supplier has submitted a completed DEFFORM 711, or provided a confirmed ‘Nil Return’	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail		
						Pass/Fail

The score (Pass/Fail) awarded to each of the Commercial Sub-criteria will be in accordance with the following definitions:

		Score	Definition
		Pass	Fully meets the Authority's requirement. Provision and acceptance of the sub-criteria information in the format requested, which is clear, unambiguous and transparent.
		Fail	Unacceptable/Nil Return. Tenderer did not respond to the question or the response wholly failed to demonstrate an ability to meet the sub-criteria requirement. Any proposal marked as a Fail will be excluded from the competition, and shall not be considered for Task Award.