Questions and Answers

Question

To understand the amount of secondary data available and the amount and type of primary data collection required, could you please provide an estimate for the following:

1. Seagrass mapping - number of project survey responses

2. Installation of interpreter panels - number of responses to QR code survey and number of fieldwork responses collected

3. Workshops and training of recreational coastal users - number of completed attendee surveys

4. Delivery of learning programmes in schools - number of completed attendee surveys

5. Installation of VNAZ and voluntary codes of conduct - number of boater observations recorded and number of completed attendee surveys

6. Installation of AMS - number of boater observations recorded and number of completed attendee surveys

Answer

In the interest of maximum transparency, there hasn’t been a standardised approach to data collection across the project. At the moment we don’t have exact figures, but we can give you a rough indication that survey responses and data collected is limited and won’t be in the hundreds/thousands. The below patches together some estimates of what we know:

* Seagrass mapping survey responses: likely none
* Interpretation panels number of responses to QR code survey and number of fieldwork responses collected: likely none as these have only been installed recently.
* Workshops and training of coastal users: The Royal Yachting Association have collected these and we have not yet checked or analysed responses.
* Delivery of learning programmes in schools: Ocean Conservation Trust have delivered the programmes and surveyed the workshops they have held. There are a few hundred surveys which have been crunched and analysed by the lead. They relate to behaviour change but do not directly answer the questions in the evaluation plan so assessing to what extent they can indicate behaviour change is required.
* Installation of VNAZ and voluntary codes of conduct: No voluntary codes of conduct have been done due to being identified as not the most effective solution in these areas (for example, some areas have other codes of conduct in place). For VNAZ, we are just starting to collect observational data, but it will not be standardised across the sites.
* Installation of AMS: Around 2-4 completed interviews with mooring owners.

The job will be patching it all together and identifying gaps. It is worth mentioning that the contractor won’t be collecting all data to fill the gaps e.g. VNAZ surveys may be done in-house as part of the monitoring of the project, though it will be valuable for the first part of the contract to identify gaps.

A contractor with a degree of flexibility will be required. There will have to be a check point once the evaluation plan is revised, and it may be useful to at that stage indicate what can be filled within the budget, what will be filled in-house and then if there are any further options which would incur further cost, which we can assess whether we will deliver with underspend. The intention is the evaluation plan will be revised to a reasonable scope once this is assessed.

Question:

•            What are the sample sizes for the different data sets (e.g. number of participants for surveys or interviews)?

•            Is the data in a standardized format across the different interventions?

•            Has analysis been done to the data showing whether behaviour has changed and why is it a necessary or would we receive the raw data?

Answer:

* Sample sizes are unknown. There are five sites delivering the project which are engaging with boaters and harbourmasters.
* Data is not in a standardized format and there hasn’t been a standardized approach to data collection across the project.
* No analysis has been done on behaviour change. Analysis has only been done on the delivery of learning programmes in school after-session survey data, done directly after school workshops with students. Otherwise data is not analysed as far as we are aware.

Question:

Did you segment your target audiences and quantify them?

Did you set measurable behavioural goals for your target audiences and if so, could we have access to them?

We see that you used the COM-B/Planned Behaviour model behavioural theories to help guide and develop the project did you also investigate other theories?

You have primary research that shows the key motivators and barriers to change from the perspective of the target audiences?  Have you continued research to monitor progress?  And if so would we have access to this insight during our work?

In terms of outputs and outcomes did you set timescales for these to be achieved?

Answer:

For a bit of context, the evaluation plan was created in 2021 and some baseline work to understand the behavioural context was done by Collingwood (now Eunomia) which is available [here](https://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/5864273489428480) which may provide some more information.

There hasn’t been a standardised approach to data collection across the project and due to staff turnover and time the people who did this work are no longer involved directly in the project, which makes it difficult to answer the questions you have asked. Any contractor would need to have some flexibility in that the discoveries in the first stage will be informing the revised evaluation plan.

Did you segment your target audiences and quantify them?

* The initial behaviour change project looked at different target audiences but we are unaware of any quantifying of these.

Did you set measurable behavioural goals for your target audiences and if so, could we have access to them?

* The behaviour insights and indicators were outlined in the evaluation plan annexed in the specification and were intended to be measurable. Some are related to certain audiences e.g. children in schools or harbourmasters. The project itself has a number of KPI’s which can be shared upon project inception to help prioritisation. For example, there is an expected outcome in the grant agreement of a 60% increase in boaters awareness of Annex 1 habitats and their locations and understanding/demonstrating behaviour change to avoid sensitive habitats and implementing good anchoring techniques.

We see that you used the COM-B/Planned Behaviour model behavioural theories to help guide and develop the project did you also investigate other theories?

* See published report linked above.

You have primary research that shows the key motivators and barriers to change from the perspective of the target audiences?  Have you continued research to monitor progress?  And if so would we have access to this insight during our work?

* No

In terms of outputs and outcomes did you set timescales for these to be achieved?

* No, though the ReMEDIES project has run from 2019 and funding ends in October 2024. We are aware outcomes could occur beyond the lifetime of this funding and this project is intended to capture the outputs and outcomes related to behaviour change from 2019-2024.

Question:

We were very interested in the project... however we don’t think that it would be possible to carry out the project for the indicated budget of 30 – 40 k, given the tasks involved (e.g. further data collection) and understanding the complexity of the ReMEDIES project . If there is an opportunity for a revised budget (which we could provide an indication of) then we would potentially interested in bidding for it.

Answer:

At this stage of the procurement process the budget cannot be changed. As per the process outlined in the specification, there may be scope to increase the budget within the contract but at the moment we will be following the contracts finder process in the budget published.