

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

Title of Requirement	Military Deception
Requisition No.	As stated in the RCloud Portal
SoR Version	0.1

1.	Statement of Requirements
1.1	Summary and Background Information
	<p>This project will address the issue of Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security. The study will test the validity and reliability of a Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security which was previously created by Dstl. The overall aim is to work with an external supplier in order to design, conduct and analyse a series of experiments on both student and military samples in order to establish the reliability and validity of the Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security.</p> <p>The UK military, along with their allies and partners, have realised that the ability to conduct Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security.</p> <p>Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security</p> <p>However, despite possessing robust face validity and positive satisfaction amongst the military practitioner community, there is no experimental evidence as to whether it works and is robust for military application, i.e. validity, reliability, validation, verification. Therefore, there is a need to “test” the Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security in experimental settings, which is to say, do teams with the Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security. The aspiration is to test this hypothesis on different experimental samples (e.g. military and civilian participants). This research will also provide the much needed evidence base that is lacking in the domain of Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security.</p>
1.2	Requirement
	<p>To design, conduct and analyse a series of experiments on both student and military samples in order to establish the reliability and validity of the Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security. The chosen supplier will conduct the majority of the work (80-90%), but will be supported by the Dstl Technical Partner (TP) for guidance and support on the subject matter, MODREC application, access to military samples and data collection support.</p> <p>A definitive research plan will be established in due course, but for the purposes of this SoR a rough planning guide involves the following:</p> <p>FY22-23</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In conjunction with the Dstl TP and technical team consider and create an experimental design (methodology, data analysis plan, etc.)

- Begin to draft early aspects of future report templates.

FY23-24

- Work with the Dstl TP to produce and submit MODREC application
<https://www.gov.uk/government/groups/ministry-of-defence-research-ethics-committees>
- MODREC approval given
- Conduct experiments (12-18 months)
- Begin initial data entry

FY24-25

- Continue (and complete) experimental data collection
- Begin data analysis

FY25-26

- Continue and complete data analysis
- Write-up and deliver final report(s).

Funding profile

Redacted under FOIA Exemption 43 - Commercial Interests

Essential:

- Academic university department.
- Track record in conducting psychology-based experimental research.
- Expertise in research methods and data analysis (incl. both qualitative and quantitative analysis).

Desirable:

- Awareness of deception-related research (military and/or other).

Technical Partner (TP) relationship

The TP role will be discussed between Dstl and the successful supplier. There are a range of options, ranging from light touch TP (e.g. weekly/monthly communication) up to embedded TP (e.g. face-to-face [F2F] as part of a team 1-2 days per week).

MODREC process

As a piece of experimental human research it should be assumed that the study will require and application to, and the approval of, the MODREC committee.

Study Kick-off meeting

There will be a requirement for the supplier project team to meet with the Dstl project team to establish ways of working (WoW), communications and TP process.

Quarterly and annual progress reviews

	<p>Update review emails will be required quarterly, with the intention to meet the Dstl programme (Quarterly Progress Review (QPR) process. An annual review will be delivered in order summarise all work conducted within the relevant financial year (FY). Review updates are likely to include (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on technical progress (incl. key findings so far). • Progress report against project schedule. • Review of risk management plan. • Commercial aspects. • Review of deliverables. • Risks/issues. • Review GFA and supplier performance <p><u>Periodic Presentations</u></p> <p>There will be a requirement do deliver periodic presentations for certain events; either online (e.g. MS Team) or F2F. The number and dates of events cannot be named at present, but the expectation should be recognised.</p> <p><u>Final Technical Report</u></p> <p>A traditional academic-style technical report (see below under 1.6. Deliverables, D-5).</p>
1.3	Options or follow on work <i>(if none, write 'Not applicable')</i>
	N/A
1.4	Contract Management Activities
	N/A
1.5	Health & Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement
	MODREC process likely to be required.

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
D – 1	MODREC application	TBD but anticipated as being between Apr – Jul 2023.	MS Word	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	As per format of MODREC Application form(s) and process	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply – DEFCON 705
D - 2	Quarterly review update	Quarterly, exact dates TBC	Email	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	Concise and clear list of activities conducted in the previous quarter, incl. risks and opportunities, and anticipated activities for the coming quarter.	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply – DEFCON 705
D - 3	Annual end-of-FY review update	28/03/2023 28/03/2024 18/12/2025	MS Word	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	Annual update on in-year progress. To include information on positives, limitations, 'what next' plans for follow-on year	Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply – DEFCON 705

D - 4	Experimental data	18/12/2025	SPSS Excel .xls MS Word	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security The raw experimental data (quantitative and qualitative) collected during the experiments.	<i>Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply – DEFCON 705</i>
D – 5	Final full technical report	18/12/2025	MS Word Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Methodology • Results • Discussion • Recommendations • Conclusions Appendices	<i>Default RCloud Agreement Terms and Conditions shall apply – DEFCON 705</i>

1.7	Deliverable Acceptance Criteria
	As per Framework T&Cs and Dstl's technical review process (e.g. PM, PTA, LTR, MA reviews).

2	Evaluation Criteria										
2.1	Method Explanation										
	<p>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.</p> <p>The Authority will use an evaluation model consisting of three criteria as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercial: PASS / FAIL• Technical• Pricing <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>										
2.2	Technical Evaluation Criteria										
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <table><tr><th>Ref</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Available Score</th><th>Weighting</th><th>Total Available Score</th></tr><tr><td>T1</td><td>The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement.</td><td>1-5</td><td>1</td><td>5</td></tr></table>	Ref	Criteria	Available Score	Weighting	Total Available Score	T1	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement.	1-5	1	5
Ref	Criteria	Available Score	Weighting	Total Available Score							
T1	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement.	1-5	1	5							

T2	The proposal provides details of key risks, dependencies, assumptions and any relevant ethical issues the Contractor has identified.	1-5	1	5
T3	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor has the expertise and knowledge to successfully deliver the requirement.	1-5	2	10
T4	The proposal clearly demonstrates that the personnel the Contractor has nominated to work on the requirement have the relevant experience to successfully deliver it.	1-5	2	10
T5	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.	1-5	6	30
				60

Technical Scoring Guide - Definition of Terms:

Word or phrase	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to demonstrate understanding of the question area / requirement; • Offers no insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve.
	T2. The proposal provides details of key risks, dependencies, assumptions and any relevant ethical issues.	
	Score	Key Indicators
	5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comprehensive overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
	4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a close to comprehensive overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
	3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a satisfactory overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
	2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a limited overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
	1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an inadequate overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
	T3. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor has the expertise and knowledge to successfully deliver the requirement.	
	Score	Key Indicators
	5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates comprehensive expertise of relevance to the requirement.
	4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates close to comprehensive expertise of relevance to the requirement.
	3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates satisfactory expertise of relevance to the requirement.
	2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates limited expertise of relevance to the requirement.
	1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates inadequate expertise of relevance to the requirement.
	T4. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates that the project team has comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.

	4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the project team has close to comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
	3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the project team has satisfactory expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
	2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the project team has limited expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
	1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates that the project team has inadequate expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.
	T5. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates only limited awareness of key challenges and how these may be addressed.										
	1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.												
2.3	Commercial Evaluation Criteria											
<p>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.</p> <p>The Authority reserves the right to reject any Tender if a supplier scores a ‘Fail’ in any of the criteria below.</p>												
	<table><tr><th>Ref</th><th>Sub-Criteria Description</th><th>Scoring Range</th><th>Sub-Criteria Weighting</th><th>Maximum Weighted Score</th></tr><tr><td>C1</td><td><p>Please submit your full firm price breakdown for all costs to be incurred, including:</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• What rates are being used for what Grade• Quantity of manpower hours per Grade• Travel & Subsistence costs• Journal publication fees• Any Materials costs• Any Facility costs</td><td>Pass/Fail</td><td>n/a</td><td>Pass/Fail</td></tr></table>	Ref	Sub-Criteria Description	Scoring Range	Sub-Criteria Weighting	Maximum Weighted Score	C1	<p>Please submit your full firm price breakdown for all costs to be incurred, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What rates are being used for what Grade• Quantity of manpower hours per Grade• Travel & Subsistence costs• Journal publication fees• Any Materials costs• Any Facility costs	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail	
Ref	Sub-Criteria Description	Scoring Range	Sub-Criteria Weighting	Maximum Weighted Score								
C1	<p>Please submit your full firm price breakdown for all costs to be incurred, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What rates are being used for what Grade• Quantity of manpower hours per Grade• Travel & Subsistence costs• Journal publication fees• Any Materials costs• Any Facility costs	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail								

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<p>Fully meets the Authority's requirement.</p> <p>Provision and acceptance of the sub-criteria information in the format requested, which is clear, unambiguous and transparent.</p>
Fail	<p>Unacceptable/Nil Return.</p> <p>Tenderer did not respond to the question or the response wholly failed to demonstrate an ability to meet the sub-criteria requirement.</p>