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

Title of Requirement	Machine Learning PhD Projects for Sonar
Requisition No.	RQ0000030686
Contract Purchase Agreement.	PA0000000433
Purchase Order Number.	
SoR Version	0.1

1.	Statement of Requirements
1.1	**Summary and Background Information**

1.2	**Requirement**

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

███████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

██

██

████████████████████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

████████████████████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

████████████████████████████

██

██

████████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

██

████████████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

██

██

██

██

██

██

██

██

██

████████████

Redacted under FOI Exemption

Redacted under FOI Exemption

Redacted under FOI Exemption

Redacted under FOI Exemption

1.3	**Options or follow on work** *(if none, write 'Not applicable')*

	N/A
1.4	**Contract Management Activities**
	Bronze Level Contract Management Quarterly Progress & Technical Review Annual Technical Report Final Year submission of final thesis Bronze, to be managed locally by The Authority's Project Manager.
1.5	**Health & Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement**
	Redacted under

1.6	Deliverables & Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)				
Ref.	Title	Due by	Format	Expected classification (subject to change)	What information is r deliverab
D - 1	Annual report	31 March 2025, 31 March 2026 31 March 2027	Soft copy	Redacted under FOI Exempt	Annual report including a su project progress for each of and Year 3
D - 2	PhD Thesis	31 March 2028	Soft copy & hard copy	Redacted under FOI Exempt	Final version of PhD Thesis
D – 3	Final report	31 March 2028	Soft copy	Redacted under FOI Exempt	Final report including a sum project, project outputs (e.g. conferences, publications), recommendations
D – 4	Redacted under FOI Exemption	31 March 2028	Data in a standard readable format.	Redacted under FOI Exempt	Redacted under FOI Exemption

			Software in a non-proprietary format		

1.7	Deliverable Acceptance Criteria

2	**Evaluation Criteria**
2.1	Evaluation is based on technical compliance and affordability
2.2	Technical Evaluation Criteria

Scoring Category	Description	Weighting Factor
A – Technical Approach	The supplier shall provide confirmation that they will deliver a PhD project to meet the requirements of the project descriptions, including the requirements for meetings, placements, and reporting, and identify the roles and responsibilities of the team that will be involved in the delivery of the PhD project.	5
B – Project Plan	The supplier shall provide a work breakdown structure, project plan, and schedule for meeting the requirements of the PhD project description to time, cost and quality.	5

Each category will be scored as per the scoring table below and then multiplied by the weighting factor.

Has demonstrated inadequate experience or provided inadequate supporting evidence which gives no confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence and an unacceptably high level of risk to the project	0 – Unacceptable or no answer
Has demonstrated narrow experience or provided minimal supporting evidence which gives low confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence and a very high level of risk to the project.	1 – Poor response with Very High risk
Has demonstrated some experience and provided adequate supporting evidence which gives some confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence but with a high level of risk to the project.	3 – Acceptable with High risk
Has demonstrated sufficient experience and provided adequate supporting evidence which gives confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence and a moderate level of risk to the project.	5 – Satisfactory with Moderate Risk

	Has demonstrated broad experience to deliver the project and provided relevant supporting evidence which gives confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence and a low level of risk to the project.	8 – Good with Low risk	
	Has demonstrated considerable and detailed experience and provided sound and relevant supporting evidence which gives high confidence of the Potential Tenderer's competence and a very low level of risk to the project.	10 – Excellent with Very Low risk	
2.3	Commercial Evaluation Criteria		
	The commercial evaluation shall be based on the following Pass / Fail questions 1. Firm priced version submitted within budget of Redacted under FOI Exemption 2. Are Labour rates and price as per the rates uploaded to RCloud? 3. Has the bidder submitted one (1) completed copy of RCloud Form Part C – Task Response Form including Firm price within budget of Redacted under FOI Exemption completed SRGS at Annex A and DEFFORM 711 at Annex B? 4. Has the bidder completed Research Worker forms as necessary? A fail on any of the above questions will result in your proposal being excluded from further evaluation and consideration		