

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

<b>Title of Requirement</b>	Testing assumptions regarding potential behavioural responses during an emergency
<b>Requisition No.</b>	As stated in the RCloud Portal
<b>SoR Version</b>	0.1

<b>1.</b>	<b>Statement of Requirements</b>
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Summary and Background Information</b>
	<p>Dstl are seeking an external supplier to test and validate an existing 'matrix' of potential behavioural responses in emergency scenarios. The matrix is essentially a table that comprises a list of potential behaviours that might be seen in an emergency (e.g. assisting others, trying to hide), and a summary of 'evidence' for each behaviour listed. Types of evidence include a behaviour being: (a) reported in a number of academic studies on emergencies, (b) recorded as occurring in a simulated emergency, and/or (c) seen in CCTV footage of an actual event. <span style="color: red;">Redacted</span></p> <p style="color: red;">Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security</p> <p>The matrix currently identifies gaps in evidence regarding certain behaviours. For example, it identifies behaviours that are reported in academic studies on emergencies but not evident in models of crowd behaviour, and it identifies other behaviours that have been seen in simulated emergency events but not evident in case studies. As such, to further develop the matrix there is a requirement to gather additional evidence to understand how people are most or least likely to respond to different emergency situations. Data may be gathered from more traditional sources (e.g. video footage of real events, academic studies) and more innovatively (e.g. via experimental research (e.g. trials or simulations using human participants), virtual reality), in order to generate the evidence required. Findings may be used to prevent and/or prepare for future incidents.</p> <p>In order to identify ways to disrupt (to deny, deter and/or detect) and/or prepare for emergency incidents, there is a need to understand how people have responded to previous emergency incidents so that appropriate response and management plans can be implemented. Previous Dstl research in this area includes literature reviews and consultations with Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to draw upon social and behavioural science and evidence from case studies, in order to inform understanding of behavioural responses to emergency incidents. This previous research led to a 'behavioural matrix'. Within this matrix, various sources of evidence were sought and examined to determine broad likelihoods that each behaviour may occur during an emergency. This led to gaps in the matrix regarding the evidence for certain behaviours, and therefore it is difficult to determine whether these are likely to be seen, or likely to be absent, during certain emergency events. <span style="color: red;">Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security</span></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Therefore</p> <p>future research is required to develop the evidence base of behaviours outlined in the behavioural matrix, as well as the identification of any new behaviours that should be included.</p>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Requirement</b>
	<p>The supplier and research team must have the appropriate skills and experience in identifying and potentially generating various evidence sources to support analysis of behavioural responses (e.g. experimental research, case study analysis, analysis of CCTV footage, Subject Matter Experts engagement, trials, etc.). They should hold and demonstrate appropriate expertise in social and behavioural science, and relevant research methods (e.g. on understanding human behaviour,</p>

	<p>modelling human behaviour, and/or the psychology of group behaviour) to allow meaningful interpretation of analyses. The supplier should demonstrate a research plan and approach which accommodates for contingency measures and mitigations in the event of additional COVID restrictions to enable the research and data collection in being able to proceed.</p> <p>The analysis should include methods to critically evaluate those behaviours included in the matrix, to ensure these are valid and reliable representations of how people are likely to react during emergencies. This may also include the identification of other behaviours which have not already been captured in the matrix. Any findings should be supported by social and behavioural science research and theories that can help explain observed behaviours.</p> <p>The analysis should support the continued development of the behavioural matrix to help provide a comprehensive understanding of how crowds are likely to behave in various emergency scenarios.</p> <p><u>Ethical Approval – (if required)</u></p> <p>With the support of a Dstl Technical Partner (TP), the need for ethical approval will be considered. If this is necessary then the Supplier shall develop a study protocol that documents the proposed activities, and the process required to gain a favourable opinion from the MoD Research Ethics Committee (should it be needed) will be followed.</p> <p>If ethical approval is required the supplier will be responsible for presenting the protocol for review by the Dstl Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC), to ensure the proposed experimental plan is scientifically rigorous and will deliver the evidence required (i.e. that sufficient participants are intended to be recruited, that data will be sufficient to support the detection of behaviours and changes in these behaviours). The supplier is also required to present the protocol to the MoD Research Ethics Committee (MODREC) to ensure it is ethically sound. The supplier will be responsible for making any changes to the protocol in order for it to receive a favourable opinion from MODREC. These activities shall be conducted within 5 months of contract award. The supplier should incorporate the associated costs of the ethical process into their response to this requirement, (e.g. sufficient funds should be allocated for potential travel &amp; subsistence costs <sup>Red</sup></p> <p><i>Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security</i></p> <p><u>Timeline and Deliverables</u></p> <p>The start date for this contract is anticipated to be no later than the end of April 2022. The supplier will be required to attend a start-up meeting (<i>Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security</i>, or via teleconference) during which they will deliver a presentation of their planned approach. Following this, the Dstl Technical Partner will provide the supplier with the behavioural matrix.</p> <p>Dstl will provide a Technical Partner to support this activity and to ensure that findings meet the proposed requirements. The supplier is to provide monthly email summaries of activities and progress to the Dstl Technical Partner and Project Manager, to include key updates, any changes to the work plan and any risks or issues affecting delivery, with potential mitigations when possible. Any delivery risks are to be highlighted to the Technical Partner promptly to enable swift resolution. These will be in addition to the regular technical-based communications with the Dstl Technical Partner.</p> <p>Findings from the analysis are to be delivered towards the end of financial year 2022/2023 in the form of a Technical Report (exact date to be arranged by Dstl nearer the time). A draft copy of the technical report should be submitted to Dstl for review no later than one month before the delivery deadline of the final Technical Report. The supplier will then be required to address feedback and make revisions to the report and re-submit the updated version by the delivery deadline. A closure meeting or teleconference will be arranged post-delivery to discuss the findings.</p>
1.3	<b>Options or follow on work</b> <i>(if none, write 'Not applicable')</i>
	N/A
1.4	<b>Health &amp; Safety, Environmental, Social, Ethical, Regulatory or Legislative aspects of the requirement</b>

<p>Dstl encourages all bidders to be mindful of legal and ethical considerations, particularly where experiments may impact on privacy under Investigatory Powers legislation (the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 and Investigatory Powers Act 2016) and obligations under the Data Protection Act.</p>
--

1.5 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	Monthly Progress Report	<i>T0+1 Month</i>	Email	Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security	<p>Monthly brief email summary of progress, including, any:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highlights</li> <li>• Lowlights</li> <li>• Concerns/issues affecting delivery</li> <li>• Dependencies</li> <li>• Assumptions</li> <li>• Envisaged risks and associated mitigations that will be put in place and whether the supplier will own the risk</li> </ul> <p>Delivery Date: Monthly from contract start date</p>	<i>DEFCON 705 shall apply</i>
D - 2	Draft of Final Technical Report	T0+10 months	Written Report (MS Word)	Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security	<p>A draft copy of the Final Technical Report to be provided (in MS Word) to Dstl for review no less than one month prior to the Final Technical Report delivery date.</p> <p>To include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approach/Methodology</li> </ul>	<i>DEFCON 705 shall apply</i>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Key findings and supporting evidence</li> <li>- Amended Behavioural Matrix</li> <li>- Conclusions</li> </ul> <p>Recommendations</p>	
D - 3	Final Technical Report	T0+11 months	Written Report (MS Word)	<small>Redacted under FOIA Section 24 - National Security</small>	Finalised version of the above.	DEFCON 705 shall apply.

1.6	Government Furnished Assets (GFA)				
GFA to be Issued - Yes					
<i>If 'yes' – add details below. If 'supplier to specify' or 'no,' delete all cells below.</i>					
GFA No.	Unique Identifier/ Serial No	Description: <i>Classification, type of GFA (GFE for equipment for example), previous MOD Contracts and link to deliverables</i>	Available Date	Issued by	Return Date or Disposal Date (T0+) <i>Please specify which</i>
GFI-1	DSTL/ CR121243	WP001 Behavioural Matrix	Following start up meeting (est. T0+2 weeks)	Dstl	All copies to be deleted at end of contract

<b>1.7</b>	<b>Deliverable Acceptance Criteria</b>
	<p>Standard Deliverable Acceptance Criteria:</p> <p>All Reports included as Deliverables under the Contract e.g. Progress and/or Final Reports etc. 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.</p> <p>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. The reports should be delivered in MS Word format and include: Approach/Methodology, Key findings (and supporting evidence), Additions or Amendments made to the Behavioural Matrix, Conclusions and Recommendations.</p> <p>All Reports shall be free from spelling and grammatical errors and shall be set out in accordance with the Statement Of Requirement (1) above.</p> <p>Failure to comply with the above may result in the Authority rejecting the deliverables and requesting re-work before final acceptance.</p> <p>The supplier must request authorisation from Dstl 'Permission to publish' if they wish to consider publishing any results.</p> <p>Specific Deliverable Acceptance Criteria:</p> <p>Raw data - Any resulting datasets must include methodology, raw data, results, guidance notes and referenced sources to allow for additional analysis if required by Dstl.</p> <p>Final Report: the report is to meet all the requirements stated in the Requirements section (1.4).</p>

<b>2</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>
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 overleaf.

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 requirement needs to be fully understood and the project team need to have the skills and expertise in the research area. They need to be named along with their qualifications.	0-5	15	5

T2	The project team has previous experience in the research and /or it is detailed how inexperienced members of the team will be adequately supervised by someone with relevant expertise.	0-5	15	5
T3	The project team have extensive experience in conducting relevant trials/experiments using human participants and can provide examples to evidence this.	0-5	20	5
T4	The project team have extensive experience in understanding behaviour particularly in emergency situations, and have their research published in various academic articles. Evidence and/or example to be provided.	0-5	20	5
T5	The proposed approach is logical and will answer the research question. The theory is relevant to the research and the proposal should include the following: a detailed work breakdown structure, schedule, roles and responsibilities.	0-5	20	5
T6	Technical risks with mitigations, dependencies and assumptions are identified.	0-5	10	5
			100	30

<b>Technical Scoring Guide - Definition of Terms:</b>	
<b>Word or phase</b>	<b>Meaning</b>

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
<p><b>T1. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor understands the requirement. The project team need to have the skills and expertise in the research area. They need to be named along with their qualifications.</b></p>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Key Indicators</b>
5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the Authority's requirements and objectives, – illustrating knowledge that goes significantly beyond that presented in this Statement of Requirement;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides excellent insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going well beyond the material presented in the statement of requirement.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates comprehensive skills and expertise of relevance to the requirement and provides the relevant qualifications of the project team.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates a close to comprehensive understanding of the Authority's requirements – illustrating knowledge that goes beyond that presented in this Statement of Requirement;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide good insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going beyond the material presented in the statement of requirement.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates close to comprehensive skills and expertise of relevance to the requirement and provides the relevant qualifications of the project team.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates an understanding of the Authority's requirements;</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provide some insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve - going beyond the material presented in this statement of requirement.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates satisfactory skills and expertise of relevance to the requirement and provides the relevant qualifications of the project team.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Has shortfalls in demonstrating an understanding of the question area / requirement – for example, simply mirroring the information presented in this Statement of Requirement;</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The suggested method is unlikely to meet the requirements of the research question, or is not achievable in within the budget or timeframe;</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not directly apply to airport screening- for example, simply gives an experiment examining the problems discussed in the Statement of Requirement but does not apply it to real work screening.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Offers little insight into how the context and associated requirements may evolve.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates limited skills and expertise of relevance to the requirement and provides the qualifications of the project team.</li> </ul>
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Fails to demonstrate understanding of the question area / requirement;</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fails to provide a potentially valid and reliable method that answers the problem in the Statement of Requirement</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Offers no insights into how the context and associated requirements may evolve.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates inadequate expertise of relevance to the requirement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T2. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the personnel the Contractor has nominated to work on the requirement have the relevant experience to successfully deliver it. It details how any inexperienced members of the team will be adequately supervised by someone with relevant expertise.</b></p>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Key Indicators</b>
5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement. Any inexperienced members of the team will be supervised by someone with the relevant expertise.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has close to comprehensive expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement. Any inexperienced members of the team will be supervised by someone with the relevant expertise.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has satisfactory expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has limited expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has inadequate expertise and relevant experience to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T3. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the Contractor has the expertise and knowledge of conducting trials/experiments using human participants in order to successfully deliver the requirement.</b></p>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Key Indicators</b>

5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates comprehensive expertise of conducting trials/experiments using human participants in order to successfully deliver the requirement.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates close to comprehensive expertise of conducting trials/experiments using human participants in order to successfully deliver the requirement.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates satisfactory expertise of conducting trials/experiments using human participants in order to successfully deliver the requirement.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates limited expertise of conducting trials/experiments using human participants.</li> </ul>
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates inadequate expertise conducting trials/experiments using human participants.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T4. The project team have extensive experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations, and have their research published in various academic articles. Evidence and/or example to be provided.</b></p>	
5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates comprehensive extensive experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations, and has research published in various academic journals.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates close to comprehensive experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations, and has research published in various academic journals.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates satisfactory experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates limited experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations.</li> </ul>

1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates inadequate experience in understanding human behaviour, particularly in emergency situations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T5. The proposal clearly demonstrates a logical approach which will fully address the key research questions / mandatory requirements stated in the RCA. The theory is relevant to the research and the proposal should include the following: a detailed work breakdown structure, schedule, roles and responsibilities.</b></p>	
<b>Score</b>	<b>Key Indicators</b>
5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides a comprehensively detailed technical approach, illustrating how it may evolve during the life of the contract;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Comprehensively addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides significant additional relevant information and clear insights;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides strong examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates excellent awareness of key challenges and provides significant detail on how they may be addressed.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides a comprehensively detailed technical approach;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Comprehensively addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides some additional relevant information or insights;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides some examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates good awareness of key challenges and how they may be addressed.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides a satisfactorily detailed technical approach;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Satisfactorily addresses all of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides little additional relevant information or insights;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides few examples and reasoning to back up any arguments presented, including reference sources;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates awareness of some of the key challenges and how they may be addressed.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides limited detail in the technical approach;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Limited consideration of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides no additional relevant information or insights;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides insufficient examples, and/ or little reasoning, to back up any arguments presented;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates only limited awareness of key challenges and how these may be addressed.</li> </ul>
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides an inadequately detailed technical approach;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Inadequate consideration of the key research questions / mandatory requirements;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides no additional relevant information or insights;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Provides no examples or reasoning, to back up any arguments presented;</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrate no awareness of key challenges and how these may be addressed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T6. The proposal clearly demonstrates any technical risks with mitigations, dependencies and assumptions are identified.</b></p>	

Score	Key Indicators
5 = Exceeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has comprehensively considered any technical risks and identified relevant dependencies and assumptions. They have also provided comprehensive mitigations for these to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
4 = Fully meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has given good consideration to any technical risks, dependencies and assumptions and have provided mitigations for these to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
3 = Adequately meets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has considered some technical risks, dependencies and assumptions and have given some mitigations in order to successfully deliver this requirement.</li> </ul>
2 = Fails to meet in a minor respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has identified technical risks, assumptions and dependencies but has not provided appropriate mitigations for these.</li> </ul>
1 = Fails to meet in a major respect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Demonstrates that the project team has not considered possible technical risks, assumptions and dependencies and has not provided mitigations for these.</li> </ul>
<p>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.</p> <p>A minimum score of <b>3</b> is required on each technical limb, give an overall minimum score of <b>18</b> to be compliant. Dstl reserve the right to reject any bid deemed to be non-compliant.</p>	
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>

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	<p>Please submit your full firm price breakdown for all costs to be incurred, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What rates are being used for what Grade</li> <li>• Quantity of manpower hours per Grade</li> <li>• Travel &amp; Subsistence costs</li> <li>• Journal publication fees</li> <li>• Any Materials costs</li> <li>• Any Facility costs</li> <li>• Any sub-contractor costs</li> <li>• Any other costs</li> </ul>	Pass/Fail	n/a	Pass/Fail
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
<b>Subtotal Available Weighted Mark</b>				<b>Pass/Fail</b>

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.	
--	--	--	--	--