

## **Facilities for Academia: Scoring Matrix and Guidance**

### **October 2025**

When a proposal is received it will be sifted based on responses to the sections 1, 2 and 3 (personal details, technical requirements and research ethics). Successful proposals that pass this first stage of scoring will then be assessed according to the responses provided in the remainder of their proposal.

#### ***Notes for Applicants:***

- All questions are mandatory.
- Please ensure that you provide enough information for our assessment panel to score your responses.
- Please use plain English as far as possible and keep your response concise.
- We encourage you to contact us to discuss requirements before submitting your proposal to ensure that we can meet your needs successfully.
- We aim to notify any applicants as soon as possible if they are removed from the process at the sifting stage.

#### ***Initial Sift Review***

Scoring for the sift sections is as follows:

Section 1 – Personal Details – to be reviewed and scored by Service Delivery Manager and Academic Engagement Lead

- This is assessed as a pass / fail based on inputting sufficient details or not. Should you fail, your proposal will be removed from the process.

Section 2 – Technical Requirements – to be reviewed and scored by the Technical Facility Lead

- This is assessed as a pass / fail based on inputting sufficient details or not. We will discuss with you the requirements in further detail if there are challenges in accommodating these but your proposal is highly scoring. Should you fail, your proposal will be removed from the process.

Section 3 – Research Ethics – to be reviewed and scored by Technical Facility Lead, Service Delivery Manager and Academic Engagement Lead

- This is assessed as a pass / fail based on demonstrating a consideration of research ethics. Should you fail, your proposal will be removed from the process.

#### **Scoring for Sections 4, 5 and 6 (questions 15 to 19)**

- Each answer will be scored by our panel consisting of technical, knowledge exchange, and service delivery experts.
- Proposals that score highly will be checked for Satellite Applications Catapult mission alignment with our Mission Leads.
- Each response will be scored from 1 to 5 and definitions are set out in the table below.

## Technical questions – Reviewed by technical Facilities staff

Score	Overall Descriptor	1. Rationale and vision	2. Outputs, outcomes and impact	3. Wider benefits
5	Exceptional	<p>will make a step change in one or more TRL's with some confidence, noting the potential for high-risk/high-reward.</p> <p>well defined aim and objective, with clear beneficiaries and end-users in mind.</p> <p>significant clarity on significance and importance of work within the wider context and the applications and benefits the project will address, as well as barriers it can break down.</p> <p>some additional information, e.g. effective consideration of route to market, opportunity and/or market analysis.</p>	<p>significant clarity on intended outputs the project will deliver, e.g. follow-on funding, spin-out, potential CR&amp;D projects with Catapult and plans to realise this ambition.</p> <p>significant clarity over how the in-kind funding (potentially used with other funds) will enable the effective translation of said outputs into outcomes and impacts, what these outputs/impacts are, and how the in-kind facility funding received is critical to enabling these.</p> <p>significant clarity on what the impact of not accessing this facility would mean to the technology / project.</p>	<p>exceptionally clear links to the Catapults mission to grow the space sector, and mission values.</p> <p>exceptionally explains the potential for follow-on opportunities and how the work undertaken will strengthen future activities across the ecosystem.</p>
4	Very High Quality	<p>will make a step change in one or more TRL's with some confidence, noting the potential for high-risk/high-reward.</p> <p>well defined aim and objective, with beneficiaries and end-users in mind.</p> <p>strong clarity on significance and importance of work within the wider context and the applications and benefits the project will address, as well as barriers it can break down.</p> <p>some additional information, e.g. consideration of route to market, opportunity and/or market analysis.</p>	<p>good clarity on intended outputs the project will deliver, e.g. follow-on funding, spin-out, potential CR&amp;D projects with Catapult and plans to realise this ambition.</p> <p>good clarity over how the funding (potentially used with other funds) will enable the effective translation of said outputs into outcomes and impacts, what these outputs/impacts are, and how the in-kind facility funding received is critical to enabling these.</p> <p>good clarity on what the impact of not accessing this facility would mean to the technology / project.</p>	<p>very clear links to the Catapults mission to grow the space sector, and mission values.</p> <p>very well explains the potential for follow-on opportunities and how the work undertaken will strengthen future activities across the ecosystem.</p>
3	Quality	<p>will make a step change in one or more TRL's with limited confidence, noting the potential for high-risk/high-reward.</p> <p>defined aim and objective, with some consideration of beneficiaries and end-users in mind.</p>	<p>some clarity on intended outputs the project will deliver, e.g. follow-on funding, spin-out, potential CR&amp;D projects with Catapult.</p> <p>some clarity over how the funding (potentially used with other funds) will enable the effective translation of said</p>	<p>clear links to the Catapults mission to grow the space sector, and mission values.</p> <p>well explains the potential for follow-on opportunities and how</p>

		<p>some clarity on significance and importance of work within the wider context and the applications and benefits the project will address, as well as barriers it can break down.</p> <p>limited additional information, e.g. route to market, opportunity and/or market analysis.</p>	<p>outputs into outcomes and impacts, what these outputs/impacts are, and how the in-kind facility funding received is critical to enabling these.</p> <p>some clarity on what the impact of not accessing this facility would mean to the technology / project.</p>	<p>the work undertaken will strengthen future activities across the ecosystem.</p>
2	Useful – recommendation to not fund	<p>will possibly make a step change in one or more TRL's but there is very little confidence.</p> <p>relatively defined aim and objective, potentially with beneficiaries and end-users in mind.</p> <p>limited clarity on significance and importance of work within the wider context and the applications and benefits the project will address, as well as barriers it can break down.</p> <p>no additional information, e.g. route to market, opportunity and/or market analysis.</p>	<p>limited clarity on intended outputs the project will deliver, e.g. follow-on funding, spin-out, potential CR&amp;D projects with Catapult.</p> <p>limited clarity over how the funding (potentially used with other funds) will enable the effective translation of said outputs into outcomes and impacts, what these outputs/impacts are, and how the in-kind facility funding received is critical to enabling these.</p> <p>limited clarity on what the impact of not accessing this facility would mean to the technology / project.</p>	<p>some clear links to the Catapults mission to grow the space sector, and mission values.</p> <p>attempts to explain the potential for follow-on opportunities and how the work undertaken will strengthen future activities across the ecosystem.</p>
1	Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concern - unfundable	<p>has not demonstrated it will make a step change in one or more TRL's.</p> <p>weak or no clear aim and objective, with no beneficiaries and end-users in mind.</p> <p>limited or no clarity on significance and importance of work within the wider context and the applications and benefits the project will address, as well as barriers it can break down.</p> <p>no additional information, e.g. route to market, opportunity and/or market analysis.</p>	<p>no clarity on intended outputs the project will deliver, e.g. follow-on funding, spin-out, potential CR&amp;D projects with Catapult.</p> <p>no clarity over how the funding (potentially used with other funds) will enable the effective translation of said outputs into outcomes and impacts, what these outputs/impacts are, and how the in-kind facility funding received is critical to enabling these.</p> <p>no clarity on what the impact of not accessing this facility would mean to the technology / project.</p>	<p>does not make clear links to the Catapults mission to grow the space sector, and mission values.</p> <p>does not explain the potential for follow-on opportunities and how the work undertaken will strengthen future activities across the ecosystem.</p>

**END**