

Grand Challenge

Tender Assessment Process

1. Introduction This page introduces assessment process and criteria for Grand Challenge Proposals for Group 1 and Group 2 selection.
2. Vision ***Produce an autonomous or semi autonomous system designed to detect, identify, locate and report a range of threats in a hostile urban environment.***
3. Assessment Criteria The Grand Challenge is looking for Innovation, Technical Quality, Novel System and Exploitation Potential. See Annex A for criteria.
 - a. Innovation Technical innovation to address the Grand Challenge Vision.
 - b. Technical Quality The technical proposal must explain the level of understanding of the Rules for the Finale. This should be in terms of whether the proposal is fully compliant, if trade-offs have been made or if some further development is required to address the requirements of the Rules for the Finale.
 - c. Novel System An explanation of what is new, novel or unique about the proposal.
 - d. Exploitation Potential The potential for exploitation as a defence capability.
4. Assessment Process Group 1 and Group 2 proposals will be assessed by the MoD using a panel made up of MoD staff and independent technical experts drawn from the Grand Challenge Judges Team. Group 1 proposals selected by the panel, and subject to successful commercial negotiations, will be offered an MoD Contract. Unsuccessful Group 1 bids may be offered places in the Grand Challenge as Group 2 Teams, or declined. Group 2 proposals selected by the panel will be eligible to compete in the Grand Challenge.
5. Guidelines Proposals should interpret the Grand Challenge problem and demonstrate their understanding of:
 - Innovation.
 - Technical Quality
 - Novel System
 - Exploitation potential

Assessment Criteria

An overall rating for each technical proposal will be determined by the expert opinion of the Tender Assessment panel in line with the table below:

Reference	Grand Challenge Objective
a	Innovation
b	Technical Quality
c	Novel System
d	Exploitation potential

The following tables shows details of a ranking for each of the objectives stated above:

Grand Challenge Objectives	Ranking	Assessment Criteria
a	Excellent	The functional description from the proposal demonstrates a high degree of innovation for the Grand Challenge Vision.
b	Excellent	The technical proposal is fully compliant with the rules and shows a robust approach to any remaining risks in development.
c	Excellent	The proposal has unique components or sub-systems and is a new way to address defence capability.
d	Excellent	The idea is compatible with the time scales for Defence capability insertion and the technical, business and process interfaces in the stakeholder network that the idea depends on can be developed and cost effectively financed.

Grand Challenge Objectives	Ranking	Assessment Criteria
a	Good	The technical proposal demonstrates a direct relevance to the Grand Challenge Vision.
b	Good	The technical proposal understands the rules and has made some trade-offs. There is a strong approach to any development risks.
c	Good	The proposal has integrated unusual or different components or sub-systems and is a different way to address defence capability.
d	Good	The idea challenges the time scales for Defence capability insertion and the technical, business and process interfaces in the stakeholder network that the idea depends on has some gaps but can most likely be cost effectively financed.

Grand Challenge Objectives	Ranking	Assessment Criteria
a	Weak	The functional description from the proposal does not clearly articulate its relevance to the Grand Challenge rules, and there is limited scope to improve this.
b	Weak	The technical proposal is somewhat aligned to the rules. There are un-mitigated development risks.
c	Weak	The approach does not bring anything new, novel or unique.
d	Weak	The idea has poorly defined time scales for Defence capability insertion and the technical, business and process interfaces in the stakeholder network has substantial gaps that puts the investment case at risk.

Grand Challenge Objectives	Ranking	Assessment Criteria
a	Poor	The proposal does not demonstrate any relevance to the Grand Challenge Vision, it has little or no capacity to improve on this.
b	Poor	It is unclear how the technical proposal is aligned to the rules.
c	Poor	There is nothing new, novel or unique about the proposal.
d	Poor	The idea has poorly defined stakeholder benefits that makes it practically impossible to build an investment case.