RCloud Tasking Form – Part B: Statement of Requirement (SoR)

Title of Requirement	Strategic Culture
Requisition No.	RQ0000019480
SoR Version	1.0

1.	Statement of Requirements
1.1	Strategic culture can be defined as "*that set of shared beliefs, assumptions and modes of behavior, derived from common experiences and accepted narratives (both oral and written), that shape collective identity and relationships to other groups, and which determine appropriate ends and means for achieving security objectives*". Assessing strategic culture has the potential to improve our understanding of adversary motivations, preferences and likely causes of action. However, given that no universally agreed definition of 'strategic culture' exists, and there is currently no widely accepted methodological approach to undertaking this type of analysis. This research aims to test and develop methods that will improve our understanding of other groups (e.g. potential adversaries) in terms of their strategic culture in order to improve foreign policy decision-making. **What is Strategic Culture?** The term 'Strategic Culture' originated in the 1970s, when it was used to describe the Soviet Union's approach to nuclear operations. Although a wide range of factors and themes have been proposed that potentially contribute to strategic culture, there is currently no widely agreed definition and therefore approaches to analysing strategic culture vary; although it can be countered that many concepts and ideas have disputed meanings and definitions. The definition of strategic culture that will be used for this research is that put forward by Johnson, Kartchner and Larsen in *Strategic Culture and Weapons of Mass Destruction: Culturally Based Insights into Comparative National Security Policymaking*[1]: *"Strategic culture is] that set of shared beliefs, assumptions and modes of behavior, derived from common experiences and accepted narratives (both oral and written), that shape collective identity and relationships to other groups, and which determine appropriate ends and means for achieving security objectives".*

---

[1] Palgrave Macmillan (2009), p. 9.

Another common criticism of strategic culture is that it is so broad a subject, covering so many aspects of what may be defined as 'culture', that it is difficult to distil down relevant elements in any given context and for any specific analysis.

However, whilst there is no set definition, the fundamental contributory factors which we feel need to be considered to produce a robust analysis are:

- Geographical factors
- Societal factors
- Cultural factors
- Environmental factors
- Historical factors
- Political factors

Why are we interested in it?

UK Ministry of Defence, through Dstl, has developed a method for developing deterrence campaigns in conjunction with United States Strategic Command Redacted for FOIA purposes with the emphasis on tailored deterrence and understanding the adversary and recognised that the development of deterrence-focused adversary profiles would be useful for the development of deterrence strategies.

In relation to this need, research has consistently uncovered the academic discipline of "Strategic Culture", as a concept that has the potential to increase understanding of the adversary. Johnson, Kartchner & Larsen (eds) (2009), *Strategic Culture & Weapons of Mass Destruction* is one such key text.

What research is required?

It is clear that assessing strategic culture has the potential to improve our understanding of adversary motivations, preferences and likely causes of action – which are key elements in the development of strategies to deter in particular.

However, given that no universally agreed definition of 'strategic culture' exists, and there is currently no widely accepted methodological approach to undertaking this type of analysis, this research aims to test and develop methods that will improve our understanding of other groups (e.g. potential adversaries) in terms of their strategic culture in order to improve deterrence and influence planning.

This research therefore intends to improve upon this by using two potential approaches to researching, analysing and structuring strategic culture. This will then inform evolving approaches to understanding the subject and its relevance to foreign policy decision-making.

1.2	Requirement

	1. Research Requirement
	
	The selected contractor will produce strategic profiles for different countries using one of the approaches below. The contractor can produce as many profiles as they are able to (which must be stated in the research proposal), but shall not have the same individual producing two profiles using the two different methods on the same country. The two approaches are:
	
	Approach 1: Application of the Cultural Topography Analytic Framework (CTAF), as developed by Jeannie Johnson and Marilyn Maines, and set out in Chapter 2 of *Crossing Nuclear Thresholds*[2].
	
	Approach 2: Conducting a thorough review of existing strategic culture national profiles available in the open source environment and synthesising these to produce a single comprehensive profile document. Many such profiles can be found available online, having been developed by academics and similar professionals.
	
	Nations of interest include Redacted for FOIA purposes but as the emphasis is on methodological development and understanding, suppliers are welcome to propose alternative subjects for this research.
	
	2. Reporting Requirements
	
	The following outputs are required:
	
	Strategic culture profile report
	
	A fully referenced report will be produced for each country and structured using the following headings:
	
	   1. Executive Summary – a concise bullet point standalone summary of key findings and conclusions
	   2. Introduction
	   3. Methodological approach
	   4. Country profile findings
	   5. Conclusions
	   6. Annex – References

---

[2] **INSERT REF**

Each report should be between provided in Word and be between 12,500 and 25,000 words, excluding Annexes.

The report will describe the salient and dominant characteristics and features of the nation in question's strategic culture. This will be fully referenced, citing all sources.

The report should, as a minimum:

o Identify the characteristics of the group's strategic culture.

o Explain the contributory factors that have led to this strategic culture.

o Include examples, wherever possible, of where the nation's strategic culture has manifested itself in a decision, action or behaviour at the political or strategic level.

Dstl will provide a template for the report once contract is awarded.

Strategic culture profile presentation x 1

The contractor shall provide a face to face briefing to Dstl at Dstl offices at Portsdown West supported by a Power Point presentation.

A briefing will cover:

i. The methodology employed

ii. the main elements of the national profile created for each country; and

iii. Feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the method(s) employed in identifying the dominant strategic culture traits of the two national profiles created.

The slides for the briefing will be provided at least three working days before the briefing.

Methodological evaluation report x 1

Produced in Word, this short paper (2,500-5,000 words) describing the strengths and weaknesses of the two methods employed will include feedback on the analysts' view of the utility and applicability of the method employed, and how this can be improved.

Project implementation

Contractors are required to attend a face-to-face project start up meeting at Dstl's Portsdown West offices near Portsmouth supported by a presentation pack to include but not limited to:

- Proposed activity, resourcing and timelines
- Review of intended deliverables and deadlines

The presentation pack will be provided to Dstl two working days prior to start up meeting which will be within 2 weeks of contract award (CA).

The contractor will also facilitate a progress meeting (either face-to-face or virtual) at the most appropriate point in their project plan e.g. after initial discovery work has been completed. However, we expect that the contractor and the Dstl Technical Partner to keep regular communications on an ad hoc, when necessary basis, as the project progresses.

The contractor provide a briefing at the end of the project as outlined above. This will be face-to-face at Dstl's Portsdown West offices near Portsmouth.

Monthly reports will be provided (email) outlining:

- Work completed to date e.g. source material reviewed etc.
- Initial findings e.g. emerging themes / patterns in the nation in question's strategic culture etc.
- Issues and risks e.g. delivery timings etc.

Project Milestones

The work will be completed no later than six months from contract let (D0) and suppliers will provide Dstl with a detailed project plan and timeline, including the following milestones:

- D+1 month: briefing to Dstl to present the suppliers' understanding of the CTAF and how it will be applied to developing the national profile in question.
- Monthly progress reports
- Progress meeting
- D+4 months: draft / outline national profile, to include:
    - Dominant factors / traits of the nation's strategic culture.
    - Causal / explanatory factors, as far as can be determined from the evidence.
    - Example manifestations of these factors / traits influencing the decisions and / or actions of the strategic leadership of that nation.
- D+5 months: delivery of DRAFT FOR COMMENT national profile document.
    - Dstl will provide feedback within two weeks.

D+6 months: final delivery of national profile report, strengths and weaknesses report, and briefing slides; supplier and Dstl to agree a session for the supplier to brief the findings to Dstl at a date as close to D+6 as possible that is acceptable to both parties.

1.3	**Options or follow on work** *(if none, write 'Not applicable')*
	Contractors are free to suggest further options and / or outline potential follow up work.

1.4	**Contract Management Activities**
1.5	**Health & Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement**
	There is no requirement to work from a Dstl of other Defence site.

1.6	Deliverables & Intellectual Property Rights (IPR)					
Ref.	Title	Due by	Format	Expected classification (subject to change)	What information is required in the deliverable	IPR Condition
PO 1	Start-up Meeting Presentation	Redacted for FOIA purposes ▮▮▮ ▮▮▮ ▮▮	MS PowerPoint	N/A	OFFICAL	See 1.2 Requirement section
FD 1	Strategic Profile report (per country)	Redacted for FOIA purposes ▮▮▮ ▮▮	MS Word	N/A	OFFICIAL	See 1.2 Requirement section
FD 2	Strategic culture profile presentation x 1	Redacted for FOIA purposes ▮▮▮ ▮▮	MS Power Point	N/A	OFFICIAL	See 1.2 Requirement section
FD 3	Methodological evaluation report x 1	Redacted for FOIA purposes ▮▮▮ ▮▮	MS Word	N/A	OFFICIAL	See 1.2 Requirement section

1.7	**Deliverable Acceptance Criteria**
	All reports included as deliverables under the contract must comply with the Defence Research Reports Specification (DRRS) which defines the requirements for the presentation, format and production of scientific and technical reports prepared for MoD.
	Final reports shall describe the entire work performed under the contract in sufficient detail to explain comprehensively the work undertaken and results achieved, including all relevant technical details of any hardware, software, process or system developed there under. The technical detail shall be sufficient to permit independent reproduction of any such process or system.
	All Reports shall be free from spelling and grammatical errors and shall be set out in accordance with the Statement Of Requirement above.
	Failure to comply with the above may result in the Authority rejecting the deliverables and requesting re-work before final acceptance.

2	**Evaluation Criteria**
2.1	Method Explanation
	This requirement will be competed and awarded on the basis of the Value for Money Index (VFM Index) evaluating Technical and Price using a lowest price per technical point scored. This will be ascertained by dividing each bidder's quoted price by their own final moderated technical score.
	All bids received by the closing date will be assessed against the tender evaluation process detailed below.
	The Authority will use an evaluation model consisting of three criteria as follows:
	• Commercial: PASS / FAIL
	• Technical
	• Pricing
2.2	Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical evaluation will be carried out by a team of between 3 and 5 assessors who will review the technical proposals independently and then bring their scores to a moderation meeting. The moderation meeting will be chaired by the Dstl Project Manager.

The moderation meeting will discuss each Tenderers response in turn and attribute a moderated technical score to each of the technical criteria and a final score calculated. Technical criteria is provided below.

Note 1: The Authority reserves the right to reject any Tender if a contractor scores below a 3 for any technical criteria. Please see beneath for further information on how each limb will be scored:

Ref	Criteria	Available Score	Weighting	Total Available Score
T1	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement.	0-5	1	5
T2	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor has the expertise and knowledge to successfully deliver the requirement.	0-5	2	10
T3	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the personnel the Contractor has nominated to work on the requirement have the relevant experience to successfully deliver it.	0-5	2	10
T4	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractors proposed approach will fully address all the key research questions / mandatory requirements stated in the RCA. Proposal should include the following: a detailed work breakdown structure, schedule, roles and responsibilities.	0-5	6	30

Technical Scoring Guide - Definition of Terms:

Word or phase	Meaning
Comprehensive	Including or dealing with all or nearly all elements or aspects
Close to comprehensive	Including or dealing with slightly less elements or aspects than comprehensive
Satisfactory	Acceptable
Limited	Missing some minor / important elements
Inadequate	Missing some major / important elements

T1. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement.

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	· Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Authority's requirements and objectives, – illustrating knowledge that goes significantly beyond that presented in this Statement of Requirement;
	· Provides excellent insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going well beyond the material presented in the statement of requirement.
4 = Fully meets	· Demonstrate**s a** close to comprehensive understanding of the Authority's requirements – illustrating knowledge that goes beyond that presented in this Statement of Requirement;
	· Provide good insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going beyond the material presented in the statement of requirement.

3 = Adequately meets	· Demonstrate**s** an understanding of the Authority's requirements;	
	· Provide some insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going beyond the material presented in this statement of requirement.	
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	· Has shortfalls in demonstrating an understanding of the question area / requirement – for example, simply mirroring the information presented in this Statement of Requirement;	
	· Offers little insight into how the context and associated requirements may evolve.	
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	· Fails to demonstrate understanding of the question area / requirement;	
	· Offers no insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve.	

T2. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor has the expertise and knowledge to successfully deliver the requirement.

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	· Demonstrates comprehensive expertise of relevance to the requirement.
4 = Fully meets	· Demonstrates close to comprehensive expertise of relevance to the requirement.
3 = Adequately meets	· Demonstrates satisfactory expertise of relevance to the requirement.
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	· Demonstrates limited expertise of relevance to the requirement.
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	· Demonstrates inadequate expertise of relevance to the requirement.

T3. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the personnel the Contractor has nominated to work on the requirement have the relevant experience to successfully deliver it.

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	· Demonstrates that the project team has comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
4 = Fully meets	· Demonstrates that the project team has close to comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
3 = Adequately meets	· Demonstrates that the project team has satisfactory expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	· Demonstrates that the project team has limited expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	· Demonstrates that the project team has inadequate expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.

T4. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractors proposed approach will fully address the key research questions / mandatory requirements stated in the RCA. Proposal should include the following: a detailed work breakdown structure, schedule, roles and responsibilities.

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	· Provides a comprehensively detailed technical approach, illustrating how it may evolve during the life of the contract;
	· Comprehensively addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;

		· Provides significant additional relevant information and clear insights;
		· Provides strong examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;
		· Demonstrates excellent awareness of key challenges and provides significant detail on how they may be addressed.
	4 = Fully meets	· Provides a comprehensively detailed technical approach;
		· Comprehensively addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;
		· Provides some additional relevant information or insights;
		· Provides some examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;
		· Demonstrates good awareness of key challenges and how they may be addressed.
	3 = Adequately meets	· Provides a satisfactorily detailed technical approach;
		· Satisfactorily addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;
		· Provides little additional relevant information or insights;
		· Provides few examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;
		· Demonstrates awareness of some of the key challenges and how they may be addressed.
	2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	· Provides limited detail in the technical approach;
		· Limited consideration of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;

		· Provides no additional relevant information or insights;
		· Provides insufficient examples, and/ or little reasoning, to back up any arguments presented;
		· Demonstrates only limited awareness of key challenges and how these may be addressed.
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	· Provides an inadequately detailed technical approach;	
	· Inadequate consideration of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;	
	· Provides no additional relevant information or insights;	
	· Provides no examples or reasoning, to back up any arguments presented;	
	· Demonstrate no awareness of key challenges and how these may be addressed.	

The weighted scores on each limb will be added together to give a final technical score. Each technical assessor will perform an individual evaluation and then a final moderated technical score will be arrived at in the moderation meeting.

A minimum score of **3** is required on each technical limb, give an overall minimum score of **33** to be compliant. Dstl reserve the right to reject any bid deemed to be non-compliant.

Pricing

The price of each proposal will subsequently be divided by the final moderated technical score to arrive at the lowest price per technical point scored. The bidder with the lowest price per technical point scored will be adjudged as the winner.

Example:

Supplier A submits a proposal costing £150,000. Their proposal receives a final moderated score of 50.

£150,000/50 = £3000 per technical point scored.

Supplier B submits a proposal costing £125,000. Their proposal receives a final moderated score of 40.

£125,000/40 = £3125 per technical point scored.

In this scenario, Supplier A would be the winner as their price is lower per technical point scored.

2.3	Commercial Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation of Commercial bids will be undertaken against responses to the sub-criteria detailed below and scored in accordance with the 'Commercial Scoring Definitions' underneath.

The Authority reserves the right to reject any Tender if a supplier scores a 'Fail' in any of the criteria below.

Ref	Sub-Criteria Description	Scoring Range	Sub-Criteria Weighting	Maximum Weighted Score
C1	Please submit your full firm price breakdown for all costs to be incurred, including: • What rates are being used for what Grade • Quantity of manpower hours per Grade • Travel & Subsistence costs • Journal publication fees • Any Materials costs	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail

		• Any Facility costs • Any sub-contractor costs • Any other costs			
	C2	Compliance with the Task specific terms and conditions as stated within the Statement of Requirement and Tasking Form.	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail
		Subtotal Available Weighted Mark			**Pass/Fail**

The score (Pass/Fail) awarded to each of the Commercial Sub-criteria will be in accordance with the following definitions:

Score	Definition
Pass	Fully meets the Authority's requirement. Provision and acceptance of the sub-criteria information in the format requested, which is clear, unambiguous and transparent.
Fail	Unacceptable/Nil Return. Tenderer did not respond to the question or the response wholly failed to demonstrate an ability to meet the sub-criteria requirement.