

## **Annex D to Part B of the Task**

### **Limits on Electromagnetic Activities (EMA) - Notes to Bidders**

**Dated 15 July 2022**

**Tender return 15:00 on Friday 04 Aug 2022**

#### **1. Tender Submission**

- a) The Limits on EMA task will be split into three independent Lots, as detailed in the Statement of Requirements (Part B of the Task form).
- b) Each bid must refer to only one Lot.
- c) If a bidder seeks to tender for more than one Lot, separate responses must be given against each evaluation criteria for each Lot.
- d) For each Lot, you are required to submit two versions of your tender response as follows;
  - Version 1, a technical response containing only technical information/responses (i.e. redacting any pricing information) and
  - Version 2, a full Commercial response to the proposal including technical and price/cost information.
- e) For each Lot, separate tasks will be awarded to the Most Economically Advantageous Tender, as detailed below. Should the same Bidder be successful for multiple Lots the Authority reserves the right to combine the applicable Lots into a single Task and Purchase Order upon award.

#### **2. Evaluation Methodology Overview**

##### **a) Value for Money index**

This requirement will be assessed using the Value for Money Index methodology. 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. 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 (quality) criteria by the Tenderer's Price (shown as Cost £NPV – Net Present Value). It ranks tenders on the quality (represented by the non-cost score) for each £ (or £k or £m) of cost. It should be noted that very different solutions can give the same VFM index and be considered equal.

The Value For Money Index will be calculated as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Non-cost Score (quality)}}{\text{Tenderer's Price (Cost (£NPV))}} \times 1,000 = \text{Value For Money Index}$$

**\*Note:** For this task 1,000 – multiplication by this figure gives a workable whole number Value For Money Index figure.

## b) Value for Money Index Worked Example:

Using a VFM ratio (Non-cost score / Price (£NPV)) gives the following results:

Tender	Non-cost score	Cost (£NPV)	VFM Index	Rank
A	62	20	3.10	3
B	85	24	3.54	1
C	100	29	3.44	2

The highest VFM Index provides more 'quality'/non-cost score per £ and is therefore the winning tender.

## c) In the Event of a Tie

In the event of a tie between tenders having achieved exactly the same overall score for each Lot, precedence shall be the tender that has achieved the highest technically weighted or 'Non-Cost' Score.

## d) Moderation

Following completion of the technical evaluations, a moderation exercise will be undertaken by the Authority's team to establish the successful tender under the Value For Money Index MEAT assessment.

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

## e) Commercial Evaluation

The Commercial Criteria is: **Pass/Fail**. Tenders must achieve unqualified passes for all elements identified to be deemed commercially compliant.

## f) Technical Evaluation

- Responses for Lot 1 and 2 will be assessed against technical evaluation criteria one to five. Responses for Lot 3 will be assessed against technical evaluation criteria two, three, four, and six. This is also detailed below.
- Each Lot will be separately scored as** detailed below and the overall weighted score(s) awarded to the highest technically compliant tender(s) will be:

	Maximum weighted score	Maximum raw score
Lot 1	80	50
Lot 2	80	50
Lot 3	70	40

- The proposals will be scored technically using the scoring mechanism with descriptions detailed below and the weighted criteria supplied in the following table.
- The Technical Authority reserves the right to reject any tenders that achieve a score of '0' in two or more Technical Questions.

The response to each technical criteria will be assessed against the scoring matrix in Appendix A. A final score will be a weighted sum of the scores for each technical criteria, as defined at Table 2.

### Technical Evaluation Criteria:

- Literature review as evidence for choice of S&T sub-family/sub-families

- *It is vital that the selection for research focus area is made on the grounds of a strong scientific evidence-base.*
- 2. Expected findings of the research
  - *It is vital that the research be impactful. The Authority requires an understanding of the questions the research seeks to answer.*
- 3. Research timeline
  - *Mindful of the six month timescale, it is vital that a strong plan is in place to ensure the research outcomes are met.*
  - To include key research milestones and means for achieving them.
- 4. Identification and evaluation of risks to the research
  - *While the Authority welcomes aspirational approaches that may carry a degree of uncertainty and technical risk, it is important to understand and monitor these risks to increase the chance of success where possible.*
  - The Authority requires an understanding of the risks, and how they balance against the level of aspiration, to make an informed decision when selecting a proposal.
- 5. Evidence of delivering high quality research for Defence, since 2017, between technology readiness levels one to four. Evidence must be relevant to the Lot in question.
  - *Mindful of the six month timescale, it is vital that we partner research active organisations who already have the necessary skills and capabilities in place to deliver the research.*
  - See the GOV guidance on Technology Readiness Levels<sup>4</sup>:
- 6. Description of the mathematically-skilled community to be engaged through workshops, and means of securing this engagement.
  - *It is vital to Defence that UK academia is engaged in the research portfolio.*
  - The Authority seeks proof of engaging a diverse mathematics community in workshop-style activities within the last two years.
  - Evidence in the last two years of delivering research, at Technology Readiness Levels one to four<sup>4</sup>
  - It is required that the response include a plan to secure workshop attendance of at least 15 mathematically-skilled individuals, from at least five UK institutions.

Technical Evaluation Criteria	Weighting	Max available score (score x weighting)
1 (Lot 1 and 2 Only)	2	20
2	2	20
3	1	10
4	1	10
5 (Lot 1 and 2 Only)	2	20
6 (Lot 3 Only)	3	30

<sup>4</sup> See: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/defence-and-security-accelerator-terms-and-conditions-and-contract-guidance> [Accessed June 2022].

**Appendix A: Scoring Matrix:**

Rating	Characteristic	Score
High Confidence	The Tenderer's approach/justification/evidence to this subject matter and the delivery of the confidence characteristics sought results in the Authority judging that it is highly likely to achieve the objectives sought in this area.	10
Good Confidence	The Tenderer's approach/justification/evidence to this subject matter and the delivery of the confidence characteristics sought results in the Authority judging that it is likely to achieve the objectives sought in this area.	7
Minor Concerns	The Tenderer's approach/justification/evidence to this subject matter is satisfactory in the main however there are some minor areas where either the level of risk to the Authority, the combination of issues or the lack of particular justification/evidence will require managing.	3
Just Acceptable	The Tenderer's approach/justification/evidence to this subject matter has some significant areas of concern and demonstrates either a lack of understanding or a reluctance to fully meet/deliver the entire needs of the Authority. These are however deemed manageable and resolvable either prior to contract award or once on contract and so do not warrant exclusion.	0
Major Concerns (Fail)	The Authority does not have sufficient confidence in the tenderers response in order to successfully deliver the needs of the Authority in this area and is therefore unable to proceed with this tender (Bid Rejected).	n/a Tender Rejected

**g) Commercial Evaluation Criteria**

The commercial element of the requirement will be assessed against the following **Compliant/Non-compliant** criteria, each Lot will be separately evaluated:

1	Confirmation the supplier's proposal is valid for Acceptance by the Authority for a minimum of 30 days.	Pass/Fail
2	Confirm acceptance of R Cloud Version 4 Terms and Conditions	Pass/Fail
3	No limiting IP issues. Any background IP claims must be specified in proposal.	Pass/Fail
4	Firm priced version submitted within a total budget of £450K for all three Lots (Lot 1 = £125K, Lot 2 = £125K and Lot 3 = £200K). It is noted that this is an estimated breakdown.	Pass/Fail
5	Labour rates and price as per rates uploaded to R Cloud.	Pass/Fail
6	Please provide pricing assumptions, dependencies and exclusions.	Pass/Fail
7	Redacted	Pass/Fail
8	Redacted	Pass/Fail

For the Commercial Evaluation Criteria responses in the table above, the following scoring system will be used:

Score	Definition
Compliant (Pass)	Fully meets the Authority's requirement. Provision of the information stated in the format requested, which is clear, unambiguous and transparent in accordance with any applicable terms and conditions.
Non-compliant (Fail)	Unacceptable/Nil Return. Tenderer did not respond to the criteria in full.