**Clarifications for Bidders Questions:**

**Farmer engagement with environmental data collection**

1. In the RfQ, the first paragraph says the submission date and time is 3rd July at noon, but the timetable states 10th July at noon, please can you confirm which is correct?

**Answer: 10th July is the correct submission date – apologies for confusion.**

1. The value of both projects is £41,665.83, are we correct in believing this is the value without VAT (as the tender says to submit the value with VAT).

**Answer: Yes, the value stated is Exclusive of VAT (so up to £49,999 including VAT).**

1. The RFQ states "Prices must be submitted in £ sterling, inclusive of VAT" but the Commercial Response Form states "costs should exclude VAT." Which approach should we use?

**Answer: Use the commercial Response form approach of quoting prices exclusive of VAT (the total maximum budget available of £41,665.83 is exclusive of VAT), but please add a line to the breakdown to indicate the VAT amount too.**

1. Generally, citizen science is defined as ‘collection and data analysis of data relating to the natural world by members of the general public’. Is Natural England using this general definition, or is there a wider scope that Natural England would like to use in this contract?

**Answer: NE doesn’t have its own definition it uses, but Defra uses this one in a strategy document: “scientific work undertaken by members of the general public, often in collaboration with or under the direction of professional scientists and scientific institutions.”**

1. If a supplier wanted to integrate both pieces of work into a single project (staggered or not) would it be acceptable for that supplier to send over a single proposal for both? Or would they have to still send over two different proposals?

**Answer: Unfortunately, even though the projects are interlinked, and it’s great to combine them etc, for fair assessment against other bids (some of which will only bid on one of the two), they will need to be separated into two proposals.**

1. Do you have any expectations regarding the number of qualitative ethnographic depth interviews that should be carried out?

**Answer: We don’t have a specific number in mind, but as longer form / in depth interviews take longer, as long as the range/sample is varied enough to get good representation, I imagine something within a range of 20 to 40 interviews would cover a lot of ground. But depends on sampling and depth of interview.**

1. Similarly, do you have a view on the number of surveys that should be completed as part of the research?

**Answer: No specific number, but ideally a significantly larger number than with in depth interviews as surveys tend to be much less detailed.**

1. Are you able to provide any contact details of the target audience (i.e. farmers)?

**Answer: We (at Natural England) will be able to provide some contacts through Area Managers / Farm advisors, but would be good to reach beyond the ‘usual suspects’.**

1. The ‘Detailed Evaluation Criteria’ listed under Q2.1 says “The response should also include examples of where the proposed consortium has leadership in delivering applied marine social science research and links to, or experience of researching coastal partnerships” – is this an error as it doesn’t seem relevant to this tender?

**Answer: This is an error pasted from another RfQ, thanks for spotting it.**

1. The tender states that ethnographic data should be used in the study. Do you have any particular ethnographic approach in mind, for example diaries?

**Answer: No specific ethnographic data in mind; mainly that the data should be qualitative and more in-depth than just a two or three word sentence (ethnographic in the widest sense of potentially including observations, field notes, informal conversations and other).**

1. From previous experience, we have an idea of how many farmers we require to engage with us for an effective sample size. Does Natural England already have a view of the number of responses you would require?

**Answer: We don’t have a view on the number of farmers required in the engagement piece of work; clearly a smaller sample for the more detailed interview based work and a larger one for the survey but no specific numbers.**

1. The RFQ mentions ethical approval for field work. Is the expectation that this can come from an internal ethical review process, or lacking this should we seek ethical approval from an external source?

**Answer: Ideally each institution/consultancy would have its own internal ethics for research, and if this isn’t available/possible it could go through NE (but would take time).**

1. From previous experience, we have an idea of how many farmers we require to engage with us for an effective sample size. Does Natural England already have a view of the number of responses you would require?

**Answer: We don’t have a view on the number of farmers required in the engagement piece of work; clearly a smaller sample for the more detailed interview based work and a larger one for the survey but no specific numbers.**