Call for Proposals

Assessed Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessed Criteria** | |
| **Phase 1 Scope** | This category will count for 40% of the overall score in the assessment process. See Assessment Criteria category Phase 1 Scope below for guidance on how to complete this section. |
| **Phase 2 Scope – Relevance to the ARC and/or NDA mission** | This category will count for 60% of the overall score in the assessment process. See Assessment Criteria category Phase 2 Scope - Relevance to the ARC and/or NDA mission below for guidance on how to complete this section |

**NOTE: Primarily, this call covers access to active\* facilities and equipment. However: \*access to non-active equipment and facilities will be considered if it is an essential   
pre-cursor to future active work.**

Assessment Criteria

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Ideal response will…** | **Assessment criteria** |
| **Phase 1 Scope**  40% of available score | • Provide the researcher with some experience of being on a nuclear licensed site. • Familiarise the researcher with NNL’s facilities and equipment. • Specify any necessary inspection of sample records, technical reports and/or archived material (if feasible) to be undertaken during the visit. • Explain how the visit will be used to develop a detailed experimental proposal. • Detail a clear benefit to the researcher. • Detail a clear benefit to the research. | **(0) No Evidence or very poor**  • The Scope does not involve or benefit from a visit to NNL facilities.  **(1) Poor**  • The Scope includes a ‘hands in pockets’ visit to a non-active NNL facility as a necessary pre-cursor to future active work.  **(2) Acceptable**  •The Scope includes a ‘hands in pockets’ visit to an NNL facility on a nuclear licensed site to see the facility and equipment and to discuss projects with SMEs in order to write a detailed experimental proposal for future active work. The proposal does not detail a clear benefit to the researcher.  **(3) Good**  • The Scope includes a ‘hands in pockets’ visit to an NNL facility on a nuclear licensed site to see the facility and equipment and to discuss projects with SMEs in order to write a detailed experimental proposal for future active work. The proposal details a clear benefit to the researcher.  **(4) Excellent**  • The Scope includes a ‘hands in pockets’ visit to an NNL facility on a nuclear licensed site to see the facility and equipment and to discuss projects with SMEs in order to write a detailed experimental proposal for future active work. In addition, the work requires the retrieval of samples, sample records and/or technical reports for inspection. The proposal details a clear benefit to the researcher and the research. |
|  |  |  |
| **Phase 2 Scope - Relevance to the ARC and/or** [**NDA mission**](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021) **and associated** [**strategy**](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021)  60% of available score | • Refer to specific challenges on ARC and or NDA sites that exist now or are likely to become issues in the future with examples from one or more ARC and or NDA sites.  • The response will describe the gap in the current understanding/knowledge base that the work will address and demonstrate understanding of the challenge and the sites/process/technologies it relates to.  • Describe how the proposed research relates to those problems and will tackle them increase understanding of them/contribute to or produce an alternative tool or technique for dealing with them.  • Describe how the work is novel and/or builds upon previous work or experience of the applicants(s).  Applicants who have not previously worked with the ARC and or the NDA or with partners supporting the NDA mission are advised to seek support from industry experts to help complete this section. | **(0) No Evidence or very poor**  • Response does not answer the specific question or provides no detail of how the active work relates to the ARC and/or [NDA’s mission](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021) and associated [strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021).  **(1) Poor**  • The response does not clarify how this proposal is relevant to the ARC and/or [NDA’s mission](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021) and associated [strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021).  • The objectives are not stated or are unclear.  • The response is unclear with respect to the methodology that is to be employed and/or is unclear as to how the response builds on prior research.  **(2) Acceptable**  • The objectives of the project have been defined.  • The response provides an explanation of how this is relevant to the ARC and or NDA’s mission and associated [strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021), but may lack specific examples of where knowledge gained could be applied in support of an ARC and/or [NDA strategic outcome](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021).  • The response describes the methodology to be employed but may lack detail on why that methodology is appropriate and/or be unclear as to how the response builds on prior research.  **(3) Good**  • The proposed active research shows a clear link with a problem statement or challenge supporting a [strategic](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021) outcome within the ARC and/or [NDA’s mission](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021), building on prior research where appropriate.  • The response provides some supporting evidence of how the research meets the challenge and/or includes credible examples of where the research could be applicable across the ARC and/or NDA group.  **(4) Excellent**  • The proposed research topic shows a strong connection with the ARC and/or [NDA strategy](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-strategy-effective-from-march-2021) and an existing or future research challenge as well as an ARC and/or [NDA strategic outcome](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nuclear-decommissioning-authority-mission-progress-report-2021). The proposed research shows insight into the decommissioning challenge that goes beyond that purely communicated in published materials from ARC and/or NDA.  • The response makes clear the link to prior research, so the technical credibility of the research is soundly established.  • The benefits of undertaking the active experiments are clearly defined with credible examples of application and how it will help the ARC and/or NDA to achieve its mission faster, cheaper or safer. |