

<b>Assessed criteria</b>	
<b>Type of work</b>	Hands on/Hands in pockets/postal/non-active*  This category will count for 20% of the overall score in the assessment process. See <a href="#">Type of Work</a> for guidance
<b>Relevance to NDA mission</b>	This category will count for 35% of the overall score in the assessment process. See <a href="#">Relevance to NDA mission</a> for guidance on how to complete this section
<b>Skills and capabilities</b>	This category will count for 25% of the overall score in the assessment process. See <a href="#">Skills and Capabilities</a> for guidance on how to complete this section
<b>Project management</b>	This category will count for 20% of the overall score in the assessment process. See <a href="#">Project management</a> 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
<p><b>Type of Work</b></p> <p>20% of available score</p>	<p>The ideal proposal would provide the researcher with some practical experience of undertaking work with active materials on an industrial site</p>	<p><b>(0) No Evidence or very poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal does not involve working with active materials on a nuclear site</li> </ul> <p><b>(1) Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work will be a postal sample (or samples) with the researcher not being involved in the preparation or undertaking of the work on the site</li> </ul> <p><b>(2) Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work will be hands in pockets, with the researcher only observing work in an active lab on a nuclear site, but not being involved in the preparation</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work will be hands in pockets, and the researcher is involved in preparing for and observing work in an active lab on a nuclear site</li> </ul> <p><b>(4) Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The work will be hands-on, so the researcher will get the full experience of working in an active laboratory on a nuclear site</li> </ul>
<p><b>Relevance to the <a href="#">NDA mission</a> and associated <a href="#">strategy</a></b></p> <p>35% of available score</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to specific challenges on NDA sites that exist now or are likely to become issues in the future with examples from one or more NDA sites.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Describe how the work is novel and/or builds upon previous work or experience of the supervisory team. Applicants who have not previously worked with the NDA or with partners supporting the NDA mission are advised to seek support from industry experts to help complete this section.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(0) No Evidence or very poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response does not answer the specific question or provides no detail of how the active work relates to the <a href="#">NDA's mission</a> and associated <a href="#">strategy</a>.</li> </ul> <p><b>(1) Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response does not clarify how this proposal is relevant to the <a href="#">NDA's mission</a> and associated <a href="#">strategy</a></li> <li>The objectives are not stated or are unclear.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p><b>(2) Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives of the project have been defined.</li> <li>The response provides an explanation of how this is relevant to the NDA's mission and associated <a href="#">strategy</a>, but may lack specific examples of where knowledge gained could be applied in support of an <a href="#">NDA strategic outcome</a>.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed active research shows a clear link with a problem statement or challenge supporting a <a href="#">strategic</a> outcome within the <a href="#">NDA's mission</a>, building on prior research where appropriate.</li> <li>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 NDA group.</li> </ul> <p><b>(4) Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed research topic shows a strong connection with the <a href="#">NDA strategy</a> and an existing or future research challenge and <a href="#">NDA strategic outcome</a> and shows insight into the decommissioning challenge that goes beyond that purely communicated in published materials from NDA.</li> <li>The response makes clear the link to prior research, so the technical credibility of the research is soundly established.</li> <li>The benefits of undertaking the active experiments are clearly defined with credible examples of application and how it will help the NDA to achieve its mission faster, cheaper or safer.</li> </ul>

Category	Ideal response will...	Assessment criteria
<p><b>Skills and capabilities</b></p> <p>25% of available score</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the specific skill set that will be developed by the proposed work and demonstrate how &amp; where that fits into the long-term NDA mission.</li> <li>Demonstrate with evidence where there are now (or will in the future be) subject matter expert requirements in the field in which the researcher will be trained.</li> <li>Identify “peripheral” skills/knowledge that will be developed during the research project and explain why these are now/will in the future be relevant to the decommissioning industry.</li> <li>Show how skills will be developed/retained within the wider supervisory team. This might include the student, the Principal Investigator (PI), industrial supervisor and any other industry experts who will be engaged throughout the project.</li> <li>Provide supporting evidence in the form of extracts from SLC T-BURD, NDA 5-year plan or other SLC document demonstrating the skills need.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(0) No Evidence or very poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response provides no information as to how the research will fill an identified skills gap relevant to the NDA mission.</li> </ul> <p><b>(1) Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response doesn’t get across the nature of the skills or capability that will be developed by the proposed PhD research project.</li> <li>The response provides limited information of how the research will develop skills that can fill a gap identified within the NDA group.</li> <li>No explanation of why an active research project is an appropriate way to develop the skills or how the wider supervisory team might benefit from this.</li> </ul> <p><b>(2) Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response defines the specific skills and/or capabilities that will be maintained and/or developed during the research project.</li> <li>A description is given as to why these skills are relevant to the NDA Group but may lack detail as to the existing or future need for the skills.</li> <li>Some benefits of undertaking the skills development in the form of an active research project are described but may not be definitive.</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response clearly defines the specific skills/capabilities that will be maintained and/or developed during the active research and the level to which it is expected the researcher will be elevated in their field.</li> <li>The response provides a description, with at least one credible example, of how the research will develop skills which are linked to specific skills gaps across the NDA estate.</li> <li>The proposal describes why an active research placement is an appropriate way to develop the defined skillsets and the benefits over alternative training routes.</li> <li>The applicant gives some thought to how (at least some of) the skills/capabilities might be developed within the wider supervisory team.</li> </ul> <p><b>(4) Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response provides a detailed and explicitly defined description of the skills/capabilities that will be developed during the active research project.</li> <li>The response defines, with credible supporting evidence, how the developed skills are linked to specific existing/future skills gaps across the NDA estate and may go beyond published information to define as-yet unidentified but credible skills and capabilities needs.</li> <li>Peripheral skills that will be developed during the active research project are defined along with their relevance to the NDA mission.</li> <li>An explanation is provided as to how the wider supervisory team’s skillsets would be developed.</li> <li>The response considers at a high level how follow up research could increase the embedding of skills within the NDA estate. This could involve opportunities for commercial investment, innovation funding or SLC investment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Project management</b></p> <p>20% of available score</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a breakdown of costs/facility hours as per Error! Reference source not found.</li> <li>Clearly define in the cost breakdown which elements you are seeking funding for as part of this call and include confirmation of any non-NDA funding sources being utilised noting that you can seek funding for all elements as part of this call</li> <li>Incorporate a project plan/Gantt chart showing the durations of the key phases of the work and identifying key milestones and deliverables.</li> <li>Identify any additional input/time/resources that would be required from the NDA group to support or enable the project.</li> <li>Identify any major risks to the project and associated mitigation that can be considered against these risks.</li> <li>Demonstrate value for money for any ‘large ticket’ items required to deliver the project, including in-kind access to equipment where appropriate.</li> <li>Itemise any leverage associated with the research. This can include use of existing facilities, in-kind support from other areas/projects, use of NNUF or other national infrastructure.</li> <li>Demonstrate that any proposed active work has been discussed in advance with the relevant facility owners/operators and is feasible within the bounds of the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p><b>(0) No Evidence or very poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The response provides no detail on how the research project is to be managed.</li> <li>No justification of project finances.</li> </ul> <p><b>(1) Poor</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited justification of project finances is provided with no or insufficient cost/hours breakdown.</li> <li>Milestones/deliverables/project phases are not defined.</li> <li>Risk analysis/mitigation is insufficient/not defined.</li> </ul> <p><b>(2) Acceptable</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major costs/facility hours are itemised and justified.</li> <li>Key project milestones/deliverables/phases are identified and logical.</li> <li>Some risks are identified although mitigation may be lacking.</li> <li>The application may recognise that NDA group or its supply chain organisations input would be required to undertake the research but lack understanding or detail.</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear and appropriate cost/facility breakdown is given</li> <li>Project milestones/deliverables/phases are identified and logical and supported with a Gantt chart (or similar).</li> <li>Key risks are identified, and credible mitigation is given.</li> <li>Any input required from the NDA group is considered and a reasonable estimation made as to the extent of this input.</li> </ul> <p><b>(4) Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A thorough and appropriate cost/facility breakdown is included with supporting confirmation for any existing secured funding.</li> <li>Key risks are identified, and credible mitigation is given. These risks will be linked to the relevant project milestones/deliverables/phases.</li> <li>Opportunities are highlighted and linked to specific milestones in the project plan/ Gantt chart.</li> <li>Any input required from the NDA group or other external bodies such as a supply chain organisation is recognised and defined, and evidence provided that the applicant has had up-front discussion with the appropriate people to allow for this input.</li> <li>Active work is appropriately scheduled and associated risks to the project schedule recognised and mitigated.</li> </ul>

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL