
**CEOI 15th Call
Bidders Briefing
17th November 2022**

**Chris Brownsword, Director CEOI
Nicolas Lévêque, Technical Director CEOI
Charlotte Moretti, CEOI Administrator**

CEOI EO15 Bidders Conference – House Keeping

- Expected duration: 10:00 – 11:30 (with the possibility to go on until 12:00)
- Participants join the telecon via Microsoft Teams and can choose to remain anonymous
- No list of participants will be circulated
- Questions can be emailed at any time to Charlotte Moretti cm738@leicester.ac.uk who will ask them on your behalf
 - Please clearly indicate which proposal section/topic they are related to
 - Charlotte will ask them on your behalf either during or after the presentation
- CEOI will decide if any of the issues raised warrant the publication of a formal clarification notice, which will be issued on the CEOI 15th Call website
- The Announcement of Opportunity (AOO) and any clarification notices take precedence over anything stated during the bidders conference.
- **Please** read the AOO and other information contained on the Call website carefully; this Bidders Conference will not present all the information available.

CEOI EO15 Bidders Conference – House Keeping

- Expected duration: 10:00 – 11:30 (with the possibility to go on until 12:00)
- Participants join the telecon via Microsoft Teams and can choose to remain anonymous
- No list of participants will be circulated
- Questions can be emailed at any time to Charlotte Moretti cm738@leicester.ac.uk who will ask them on your behalf
 - Please clearly indicate which proposal section/topic they are related to
 - Charlotte will ask them on your behalf either during or after the presentation
- CEOI will decide if any of the issues raised warrant the publication of a formal clarification notice, which will be issued on the CEOI 15th Call website
- The Announcement of Opportunity (AOO) and any clarification notices take precedence over anything stated during the bidders conference.
- **Please** read the AOO and other information contained on the Call website carefully; this Bidders Conference will not present all the information available.

Microphones on Mute Please

Content of the presentation

- Summary of the Call
- Intention to bid
- Preparing your application
- Lessons learnt from the previous calls

CEOI 15th Call – Summary

- The Call is for EO Technology and Instrumentation Development Proposals directed at climate and environmental monitoring
- Proposals should be for one of three CEOI project types:
 - Flagship (from £500K to £1M) - Preparation of higher TRL technologies for a near-term or urgent space flight opportunity
 - Fast-track (up to £250k, 9 months) – high quality proposals that accelerate the development of innovative technologies for future scientific or commercial space missions.
 - Pathfinder (up to £75k, 6 months) – highly innovative with strong enabling potential for future space activities.
- Proposals should be aligned with the objectives of the National Space Strategy and EO Technology Strategy
- The budget available for the Call will be in the order of £2,000K, with additional PV funds required from industrial bidders.
- **Full proposals are due for submission by Friday 16th December 2022 at noon.**
- The Call is open to industry, HEIs and other research organisations based in the UK.
- Collaborative proposals involving industrial and other partners of all types are strongly encouraged.
- **Challenging schedule:** Contract negotiation in February 2023.

CEOI 15th Call – Intention to Bid

- Applicants were required to notify CEOI of their Intention to Bid (ItoB) by 11th November 2022 **at noon**.
- The purpose of this is to allow CEOI to gauge the size of the response and to inform the selection of reviewers.
- The notification and information therein will be held in confidence (see AOO Section 9).
- Submitting an ItoB form does **not commit the organisation to submit** a bid
- CEOI appreciate the details in the ItoB form may change during bid evolution
- CEOI appreciate the designate Lead Organisation may change during bid evolution

CEOI 15th Call –Extra Notes

Delivery of proposals

- Because the CEOI Contract is currently in competition, **proposals should NOT be sent to CEOI**
- Instead electronic submissions should be sent by email to the UKSA mailbox at EOIP@ukspaceagency.gov.uk.

Avoid confusion with other CEOI Calls for Proposals

- CEOI is currently running other Calls for UK Space Agency:
 - Space Science Call and Short-term EO Technology Preparation and Facility Enhancements
- Please ensure you **follow the procedures for the 15th EO Call**

Preparing Your Application

CEOI 15th Call – Preparing an Application



- See [Section 5 Guidelines For Preparing An Application](#)
- All Proposal Sections defined in the table and/or section 5 of the AofO must be supplied in the proposal, unless indicated otherwise.
- Proposals which do not include all of the Sections (unless explicitly indicated in the Content Table as optional) may be rejected.
- Should any part of the application overrun the specified page limit, the Assessment Panel will **only consider material up to the designated page limit** (including CV) in the correct format.
- **No additional annexes** or appendices will be considered.
- Bidders should note that the Agency, University of Leicester or CEOI will not refund any costs associated with preparing proposals responding to the CEOI Call

Section	Further Information	Proposal Maximum Page Count			Marks
		Pathfinder	Fast Track	Flagship	
Cover letter	See 5.1	2 pages			Mandatory
Application Form	See 13	1 page			Mandatory
Project Summary, with picture or diagram	See 5.2	1 page			Mandatory
Technical Case	See 5.3	4 pages	8 pages	10 pages	30%
Exploitation Plan and Enhancement of National Capability	See 5.4	1 page	2 pages	4 pages	20%
Project Team	See 5.5	1 page	2 pages	2 pages	10%
<u>Annex A1</u> : Organisational background and track record		2 pages per organisation			
<u>Annex A2</u> :CVs		1 page each			
Project Management	See 5.6	2 pages	3 pages	5 pages	20%
<u>Annex B1</u> : Gantt Chart (landscape or portrait)	See 5.6	1 page	2 pages	2 pages	
<u>Annex B2</u> : Risk Table	See 14	1 page	1 page	2 pages	
<u>Annex B3</u> : Work Package Descriptions	CEOI template	1 page each			
Project Finances	See 5.7	4 pages			10%
<u>CEOI</u> Cost Schedule	Use <u>CEOI</u> Excel template	Separate Excel file; Summary sheet plus 1 sheet per partner			
Collaboration	See 5.8	0.5 page			5%
Grant Conformance	See 5.9 and 8	0.5 page			5%
Eligibility - supporting information (Proposal Annex C1)	See 8	2 page			
Letters of Support (Proposal Annex D)	See 0	1 page each			Optional

CEOI 15th Call – Covering Letter - Notes

- The cover letter includes a statement of acceptance of the standard CEOI Terms and Conditions (T&Cs), defined in the CEOI Grant Agreement document which is available on the CEOI website.
 - Bidders should note that **these T&Cs will not be open to negotiation** and that in submitting this statement you are accepting the T&Cs on behalf of your organisation
 - Please ensure that authorisation is obtained from your organisation before submitting your bid.

CEOI 15th Call – Application form



Title of Project		
Lead Organisation and Grant Requested for Lead		£
Project Partners and Grant Requested for each Partner		£ £
Address of Lead Organisation including postcode		
Lead Contact – Contractual (Name and e-mail)		
Lead Contact – Technical (Name and e-mail)		
Subsidy Control Category (see Section 15)		
Total Grant Funding Requested (£ and % of Total Project Cost)	£	%
Academic Contribution (£ and % of Total Project Cost)	£	%
PV Contribution (£ and % of Total Project Cost)	£	%
Total Project Cost (£)	£	100%
Proposed start date and duration		
Project Type	Pathfinder/Fast Track <i>(delete as applicable)</i>	
Titles and dates of related projects or proposals to CEOI, NSTP or other UKSA programmes	<i>(List on separate sheet if necessary)</i>	

← CEOI contribution to total project cost; for collaborative proposals see requirements in AOO Section 15

} % have to comply with subsidy control rules (see AOO Section 15)
 ← Total FEC cost of the project = CEOI grant plus partner contributions

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Section	Subject	Mark
5.3	Technical Case	30%
5.4	Exploitation Plan and Enhancement of National Capability	20%
5.5	Project Team	10%
5.6	Project Management	20%
5.7	Project Finances	10%
5.8	Collaboration	5%
5.9 & 8	Grant Conformance	5%
	TOTAL	100%

See the AOO for a description of the content in each Section

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Technical Case – Notes

- CEOI calls are aimed at the development of **upstream EO technologies**; Proposals that solely focus on downstream algorithm development, or the science to raise Science Readiness Level (SRL), are not appropriate.
 - However if you are developing for instance sensor inversion models, then that would be a suitable piece of work as long as it is supporting a broader hardware technology development programme as the main activity in the proposal.
 - Development of on-board processing is applicable, but must have a direct impact on the effectiveness of the EO instrument/sensor. In contrast, the development of downstream applications is something more appropriate to other UK Space Agency and UK Research and Innovation funding routes.

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Exploitation Plan and Enhancement of National Capability - Notes

“...with a particular focus on climate, environmental and societal applications”

- Proposals not aligned to these themes will be acceptable, but will be funded as a second priority if funding available, after all good quality fully aligned projects
- For projects targeting future operational or scientific EO missions, such mission(s) should be clearly identified, the possible route to achieving flight should be described, together with how the benefits for any related opportunities will be achieved.
- In the case of projects targeting commercial opportunities, the proposal should include a brief business plan.
- Technologies just focussed solely on non Space markets e.g. defence, will not be funded under this Call. But technologies addressing Space and other market(s) e.g. Defence dual-use will be allowable
- The proposal should clearly explain the relevance and benefit technologies offer to all application domains they are targeting.

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Project Finances – Notes



Full Economic Costs

- Academic Partners and Government institutions will be funded at no more than 80% of Full Economic Cost (FEC).
- See AOO reference [RD5] for further information on FEC.

In-kind contributions – a good way to look at this is to ask yourself questions along the lines of:

- Has this a definable monetary value?
- Can I account for this contribution in a way an auditor would recognise?
- Can I show it was required to deliver the project?
- Is its contribution to the project commensurate with the value declared?
- Will it be provided during the project timescale
- For equipment purchases; residual value (or re-sale value) at the end of the project needs to be taken off the purchase price

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Allowable costs - Notes



- Equipment purchases
 - CEOI Grants arising from this call are intended to fund a specific programme of work and should not be used for the procurement of equipment, unless they can be shown to be necessary for a specific project.
 - If equipment is funded then CEOI has an expectation that equipment purchased for instrument development would normally be funded at no more than 50%
 - However if your organisation has limited capability to fund the equipment procurement you could request a higher % funding, but this should be fully explained in your proposal
 - You should also note that this request would be referred to the UKSA, whose policy is to fund at no more than 80%
- Airborne trials
 - Flight trials arranged as an external service, procured through a commercial sub-contract, would be expected to be funded at the intervention rate of the partner procuring the service.

CEOI 15th Call – Assessment Criteria

Collaboration - Notes

- For Flagship & Fast-Track proposals, **preference will be given to those involving collaboration** between partners
 - Collaboration also attracts **beneficial intervention rates**.
- For this reason it is important to understand what collaboration entails:
 - ‘**Partners**’ are defined as entities/organisations which share and/or retain the Intellectual Property generated by them in the project.
 - In contrast, ‘Suppliers’ and ‘Consultants’ supply goods and/or services to one of the Partners.
- It is possible that some consortia bidding for projects may need to **involve non-UK entities**. This is allowable in principle subject to the following conditions:
 - The UK must lead the consortium;
 - The UK work must represent a substantial proportion of the whole project;
 - A non-UK based organisation cannot receive national funding – **any monies awarded cannot go outside the UK to a partner body**.
 - The consortium must demonstrate that the proposed non-UK capability is essential and not available in the UK. In such instances, the work can be subcontracted out (the subcontractor cannot be a partner to the project).

Lessons Learnt from Previous CEOI Calls

Lessons Learned from Previous CEOI Projects



- **Technical problems**
 - Unforeseen technical difficulties - things harder than expected
 - Manufacturing delays / accidents / component failure
 - Under-estimation of initial technology maturity
 - Quality of out-sourced work poor and slow
- **Resources**
 - People: Internal reallocation post-award, resignation, slow recruitment processes
 - Facilities: Prioritisation, scheduling conflict, failures
 - Procurement: Took longer than expected, relying on a single specialist UK supplier (impacting time & cost)
- **Project management**
 - Poor control of scope / control of partners / no clear identification of project goals
 - Lack of cohesion of team
 - Poor leadership /poor decision making
 - Limited contingency in baseline plan
 - Contracting; Partner contracting delays, difficulty in flowing down Ts & Cs
- **External factors**
 - Loss of key people
 - Market redirection: Changing project exploitation route requiring work/schedule re-planning
 - “Business” Prioritisation: Pressure within organisations to prioritise other work – perception that part-funded work is of lower priority than commercial/academic activities
 - Dependency on completion of other projects
 - Dependency on time-critical contributions from unfunded collaborators

Lessons Learned from Previous CEOI Projects



Ways to avoid

- **Better contingency / mitigation planning:**

- Being more pragmatic at bid stage on what is achievable in allocated time
- Better assessment of project delivery risks and possible mitigation action
- Inclusion of contingency in baseline delivery plan (timescales)
- Earlier procurement of long lead items
- Are academic leads thinking of these projects in more “commercial” terms

- **Tighter Project Management**

- Use of experienced PM’s – some academic teams successfully sub-contract PM role from outside
- Frequent team meeting drumbeat – weekly at critical times
- Avoidance of dual-hatted PMs – either technical delivery or management, not both (n/a to Pathfinder Projects)
- Preference for industrial lead on larger projects
- Evidenced through provision of Project Management Plans (for larger projects only)

Common Proposal Shortfalls

- Assumption of pre-knowledge on the background to the technology
 - Cannot assume that the reviewers are aware of previous projects
- Failure to show how **this development step fits into a larger story** and how it could end in a flight opportunity;
- Generic, **generalised risks**, without much thought to impact or mitigation
- Poor quality Gantt charts
 - A few blocks stuck end to end is not a good or informative Gantt chart.
 - Unreadable pictures of very complex Gantt charts
- Using non-grant receiving partners could be considered a delivery risk
 - Show support by letters of commitment
- You can submit or be a Partner in multiple proposals
 - But the assessors may question if you **have the resources** to deliver all
- Staff **resources** may appear unrealistic:
 - Reliance on a yet to be recruited person, and/or giving e.g. 80% of the hours to an unspecified RA
 - Unrealistic number of hours assigned to a senior technical specialist
- Simplistic business plan
 - e.g. global market is £4B; we will win 1%, hence this is a multi-million £ ROI
- Poor rework of a previously submitted proposal that does not meet the criteria
- Poor quality and/or no review of bid documents

Contact Points

- If you have any questions during the bid phase you are welcome to contact members of the CEOI team for clarification;
- These will be conducted in confidence;
- The Points of Contact are:
 - Chris Brownsword; cbrownsword@qinetiq.com
 - Nicolas Lévêque; nicolas.leveque@airbus.com
 - For contracts & administration, Charlotte Moretti cm738@leicester.ac.uk
- Note: the CEOI are not part of the proposal evaluation team.