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

Title of Requirement	Information Disorder & Confrontation – Task 1
Requisition No.	2022230805
SoR Version	0.1

1.	Statement of Requirements
1.1	**Summary and Background Information**

This activity will identify current trends, emerging technologies and social change to develop a clear understanding of the future (10-15 years) landscape in which the UK, its allies and adversaries can expect to be conducting influence campaigns, in support of both sub-kinetic (grey zone) and kinetic conflicts. With particular focus on Information Disorder and Confrontation (IDC), opportunities and threats; the challenges to influence in the NextGen/GAN (Generative Adversarial Networks) information environment and how this might impact Defence Influence capabilities.
The output of this task will inform and provide content to Task 2, which will synthesise the outputs into scenarios, which will be used to communicate the findings of Task 1 to a range of Influence and Command (IC) stakeholders, utilising novel mediums.

Dstl has a requirement understand how ICD of the future will evolve. Specifically, what changes (sociological, geopolitical and technological) will facilitate (or hinder) the influence operations conducted by the UK, friendly forces, adversaries and competitors. This activity sits within Dstl's Influence and Command (I&C) programme, contributing to the goal of understanding the future (10-15 year) information environment.
The world is facing its first information civilization, which will be typified by increased information confrontation in the information environment, as well as information disorder (i.e. disinformation , misinformation and malinformation ; DMM), all of which will likely affect the military's influence capabilities (incl. Understand, Plan, Execute, Assess).
Therefore, there is a need to better understand how anticipated future changes in society and technology will impact ICD, and identity ways in which UK Defence might counter, mitigate and future proof against these anticipated threats, incl. implications for military Influence capabilities.
This work will build on previous initial Dstl analysis of the future threats from disinformation (DSTL/TR130028, March 2021).
Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security

The Integrated Review of Defence and Security 2021 (IR) and Defence Command Paper recognise this issue and set out the centrality of Information Operations, that they should be present at every phase of any combat operation(s) (Protect, Engage, Constrain, War Fight), be proportional to any other aspect of campaigning, and be enabled by upstream engagement. This will enable an intensified focus on the information contribution to the sub-threshold, and those delivering engage & deter effects; especially in deterrence, detection, anticipation, and exposure of adversary.
The Defence Command Paper also emphasises the need to increase the speed and agility of decision making in delivering a greater complexity of effects at home and overseas. In the very same way in which Defence needs to harness the social technical aspects of understanding its overseas audiences and actors and influencing their behaviour, it needs to harness that

behavioural and analytical science to help its own people with Command and Control (C2) concepts, and the socio-technical 'system of systems' nature of C2.

The Influence and Command Programme is required to reinforce Defence socio-technical capability, covering key behavioural science interventions i.e., how we understand ourselves and a wide range of overseas audiences and actors, and how we influence the behaviours of others and change our own for the better.

The overall aim is to develop S&T capability for Defence and Security which can both improve 'next generation' and 'generation after next' UK capability to influence behaviour and understand the impact of others' actions upon UK Defence and Security.

There is significant risk that the coming Information Civilisations will be dominated by Information Disorder, due to an adversary's ability to:

- Exploit emerging trends that increase capability (e.g. reach, precision and effectiveness), reduce costs (e.g. automation) and increase opportunities (e.g. wedge issues in society);
- Freely engage in prototype warfare in the creation, targeting and delivery of disinformation, misinformation and malinformation (DMM).

This enables adversaries to:

- Undermine UK Defence operations (e.g. weaken campaign authority and Fighting Power; both kinetic and sub-kinetic);
- Embolden adversary operations (e.g. foster their campaign authority and Fighting Power);
- Undermine key individuals at critical moments;
- Exploit individuals for influence, espionage, subversion or gain.

1.2	**Requirement**

Task 1 will review the currently available information (academic sources, authoritative projections, opinion pieces etc.) to facilitate an understanding of how the future information environment will be (or could be) leveraged by the UK, friendly forces, adversaries and competitors to meet their influence goals in support of kinetic and sub-kinetic engagements.

Task 1 will focus on 'generation after next' developments and produce outputs (see 'Requirements' below) that inform our understanding of the likely future operating environment for UK influence campaigns.

Dstl will provide a Technical Partner (TP) who will facilitate Dstl's technical input, be the 'day-to-day' Point of Contact (POC) and review task technical progress/outputs.

Task Kick-off Presentation
This deliverable will present an opportunity for the contractor project team to meet with Dstl representatives, facilitating working-level engagement through key POCs. The presentation to include, but not limited to:

- Introduction of key individuals
- Outline of current assumptions
- Review project plan (at a higher granularity than included in the proposal)

Review communications plan (at a higher granularity than included in the proposal), e.g. who will be the working POC, who will lead QPR/TR presentations etc.

This deliverable will enable agreements to be reached on plans, assumptions etc. that have been further refined since the submission of bid documentation (and following contract award).

Quarterly Progress and Technical Review
These deliverables (to be reoccurring every 4 months from contract award) will enable the contractor and Dstl TP to review progress and agree technical change requests (should they arise). Presentation pack to include but not limited to:

- Update on technical progress (inc. 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

Final Technical Presentation

To supplement the 'Final Technical Report' (see below), this deliverable will enable the contractor project team to present their key findings to Dstl POC and facilitate any discussion regarding the Final Technical Report content.

Final Technical Report

This report should be delivered in a .pdf format and include a 2 page Executive Summary (to function as a standalone document, outlining principle findings, opportunities, threats and remaining unknowns).

The report will address the overarching question 'How will the future information environment change and what are the implications for UK defence in conducting, or responding to I&C activity?' To that end, the report should address the following key questions:

- What current trends (technological, sociological and geopolitical) exist, or are expected to emerge that will affect future I&C operational effectiveness (both for the UK and friendly forces; and adversaries and competitors)
- How will these trends affect I&C operations, and what is their anticipated level of impact
- What key challenges do these pose to UK defence and its ability to freely operate in the future information environment when conducting I&C operations
- What might the 'Wild Card'/'Black Swan' events (those that might seem to come out of nowhere) look like. What key risks, or opportunities to future UK defence I&C operations might they pose.

The report should follow academic report writing conventions (e.g. it should be referenced using a recognised academic referencing methodology, it should have clearly defined sections and follow a logical flow of arguments etc.) and should include sections that address the following (although they may not necessarily be named or formatted in this way

- A detailed list of sources and the rationale for their inclusion, or exclusion used to construct the evidence base
- A list of search terms and the rationale for their inclusion, or exclusion used to construct the evidence base
- A list and explanation of the assumptions that have shaped the evidence base
- Key findings from the evidence base. An outline/overview/introduction to the following point
- Detailed review of the evidence base. This should provide the detail of the findings of the source/literature search, compare and contrast the different predictions of future developments and how the anticipated interplay between domains will affect the information environment. What trends have been identified, and what future trends are expected to emerge.

Final Project Report

This deliverable will focus on the project delivery aspects of the task (rather than the technical, which should be contained within the Final Technical Report). The principle aim of this deliverable is to review the project delivery, to enable both the contractor and Dstl to improve the delivery of similar future projects. The report to include, but not limited to:

- Key decision log (including decision requestor, approver and the reason why the decision arose).
- Change log (including nature of the change, requestor, approver and the reason the change was required).
- Lessons learned
  - Key project challenges.
- Recommendations for future approaches in this field

1.3	**Options or follow on work** *(if none, write 'Not applicable')*
	<u>Costed Option</u> Task 2 will synthesize the evidence presented from the Task 1 outputs and develop these in to rich probable future scenarios in which the UK, friendly forces, adversaries and competitors will be required to operate; and what risks or opportunities these developments might present. These scenarios should be considered from the perspective of 'best probable scenario' through to 'worst probable scenario' and be sufficiently rich in detail so as to inform Task 3. Task 3 (a separate activity) will then use these outputs to develop rich and engaging presentations to clearly articulate these scenarios to a range of I&C stakeholders.
1.4	**Contract Management Activities**
	N/A
1.5	**Health & Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement**
	N/A

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
D1	Task kick-off presentation	>T0+1 Months	Face to face presentation (.pptx)	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	To include, but not limited to: • Introduction of key individuals • Outline of current assumptions • Review project plan (at a higher granularity than included in the proposal) Review communications plan (at a higher granularity than included in the proposal), e.g. who will be the working POC, who will lead QPR/TR presentations etc.	DEFCON 705
D - 2	Quarterly Progress and Technical Review	T0+4 Months	Presentation (.pptx),	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security	Presentation pack to include but not limited to: • Update on technical progress (inc. key findings so far). • Progress report against project schedule. • Review of risk management plan.	DEFCON 705

						• Commercial aspects. • Review of deliverables. • Risks/issues. • GFA and supplier performance	
D - 3	Final Technical Presentation	T0+18 Months	Presentation (.pptx) face to face	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security			DEFCON 705
D – 4	Final Technical Report	T0+18 Months	Report Document (.pdf)	Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security		Report to include but not limited to: • 2 page Executive Summary (to function as a standalone document, outlining principle findings, opportunities, threats and remaining unknowns) • Detailed findings from sources • List of search terms, sources, inclusion/exclusion criteria and rationale • Assumptions and the basis upon which they are formed	DEFCON 705

| D - 5 | Final Project Report | T0+18 Months | Report Document (MS Word compatible or .pdf) | Redacted under FOIA Exemption 24 - National Security | Report to include, but not limited to:

• Lessons learned

    o Key project challenges

Recommendations for future approaches in this field | DEFCON 705 |

1.7	**Deliverable Acceptance Criteria**
	As per R-Cloud V4 T&Cs.

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

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.

2.2	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.

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 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.

Score	Key Indicators
3 = Adequately meets	• 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	• 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 provides details of key risks, dependencies, assumptions and any relevant ethical issues.

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	• Provides a comprehensive overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
4 = Fully meets	• Provides a close to comprehensive overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
3 = Adequately meets	• Provides a satisfactory overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	• Provides a limited overview of key risks, dependencies, assumptions.
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	• 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	• 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.

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	• 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.

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	• 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.

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 • Any Facility costs	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail

			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.