Application Pack

SBE Technical Assistance Platform DAP Handbook

Application for the Appointment of experts to the Sustainable Blue Economies (SBE) Technical Assistance Platform Development Advisory Panel (DAP)

CEFAS25-02

February 2025

Contents

[1. Purpose of this guidance 3](#_Toc1262816455)

[1.1. Sustainable Blue Economies Programme 3](#_Toc1282000477)

[2. Glossary 5](#_Toc941049445)

[3. Development Advisory Panel (DAP) 6](#_Toc1083767679)

[3.1. Role and responsibilities 6](#_Toc417706246)

[3.2. Composition 7](#_Toc1628873527)

[3.3. Appointments and Balance of Expertise and Regions 7](#_Toc435016660)

[3.4. Location and Language 8](#_Toc890113484)

[3.5. Time commitment and frequency of meetings 8](#_Toc217238458)

[3.6. Format of meetings 9](#_Toc1047007072)

[3.7. Accountability for DAP 9](#_Toc692277912)

[4. Development Advisory Panel specific guidance 10](#_Toc56237172)

[4.1. Code of conduct 10](#_Toc2087392815)

[4.2. Time commitment 11](#_Toc186226173)

[4.3. Payment Information 11](#_Toc1796603929)

[4.4. Conflict of interest 11](#_Toc114981973)

[4.5. Transparency 12](#_Toc1622005875)

[4.6. Induction 12](#_Toc1298854117)

[5. Assessment process 13](#_Toc175558770)

[5.1. Summary of how requests for support come into the Platform 13](#_Toc306344505)

[5.2. Detail on how each request is assessed at Concept Note stage 13](#_Toc291719274)

[5.3. Detail on how requests develop into Project Initiation Documents 14](#_Toc1393862340)

[5.4. Responsibilities of the DAP 15](#_Toc1558962676)

[6. Assessment criteria and scoring 16](#_Toc366761958)

[6.1. Project Evaluation Criteria 16](#_Toc1408565762)

[6.2. Assessment scoring scale 19](#_Toc1837103281)

[6.3. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) 19](#_Toc1014067552)

[Annex A: The Seven Principles of Public Life 21](#_Toc1454044255)

[Annex B: Conflict of Interest Policy 22](#_Toc118349937)

[Annex C: Payment Information 25](#_Toc508483986)

[Annex D: Privacy Notice 26](#_Toc1050845591)

[Annex E: Safeguarding and Cefas’ Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH) Policy within International Development 29](#_Toc25317542)

# 1. Purpose of this guidance

This handbook provides guidance on the purpose, management, and activity of the Sustainable Blue Economies (SBE) Technical Assistance Platform (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Platform’) and the role of the SBE Development Advisory Panel (DAP). It is structured in the following sections, excluding annexes:

* Sustainable Blue Economies Programme
* Glossary
* Governance of Development Advisory Panel
* Development Advisory Panel member specific guidance
* Assessment process
* Assessment criteria and scoring

## 1.1. Sustainable Blue Economies Programme

The Sustainable Blue Economies (SBE) Programme, is part of the UK Blue Planet Fund (BPF) and led by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), which aims to support development of blue economies and enhance the resilience of Official Development Assistance (ODA)-eligible Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to the impacts of climate change and economic shocks.

Through a programme of activities working with local partners SBE will: ​

1. Facilitate better ocean management through targeted data collection and analysis,
2. This will help build local capacity and capability enabling greater use of nature-based solutions,
3. Which will boost blue economy planning and development,
4. Leading to poverty reduction and improved livelihoods for all.

**Table 1: List of SIDS eligible for support through the SBE Programme.** (Please note ODA-eligible British Overseas Terrestrials are NOT eligible for support through the SBE Programme.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Belize | Jamaica | Sao Tome & Principe |
| Cabo Verde | Kiribati | Solomon Islands |
| Comoros | Maldives | St Lucia |
| Cuba | Marshall Islands | St Vincent & The Grenadines |
| Dominica | Mauritius | Suriname |
| Dominican Rep | Micronesia | Timor-Leste |
| Fiji | Nauru | Tokelau |
| Grenada | Niue | Tonga |
| Guinea-Bissau | Palau | Tuvalu |
| Guyana | Papua New Guinea | Vanuatu |
| Haiti | Samoa | Wallis and Fortuna |

The SBE programme is made up of four components, each with a different offer across SIDS that all work towards the same objectives described above. Together they can support environmental policy development and scientific research, provide direct support to governments for implementation of effective ocean management plans, leverage collective action and expertise, and invest in community-led initiatives through a Blue Social Challenge Fund. Please see the [**SBE website**](http://www.sbe-platform.org.uk/) for more information on the Programme.

1.2. SBE Technical Assistance Platform

The SBE Technical Assistance Platform, here after referred to as the Platform, is one of the four components of the wider SBE Programme and is the main component that the DAP will support. The Platform enables SIDS governments, national and regional organisations to partner with UK marine science and management specialists to build their in-country technical expertise, develop new evidence, tools to improve capabilities to grow equitable, climate resilient, sustainable blue economies.

Eligible SIDS can apply to the SBE Technical Assistance Platform to partner with UK marine science and technical specialists to co-design research, generate evidence, and develop new tools, knowledge products and capacity needed to achieve their sustainable blue economy goals. The Platform focuses on capacity building, conducting research, supplementing short-term needs for technical advice and assessments, and building new inclusive knowledge products and tools, that will underpin sustainable inclusive development.

The SBE Technical Assistance Platform is delivered by six specialist UK government marine and environmental science and management organisations. The Technical Assistance Platform enables SIDS to partner with these organisations, using the skills, expertise and capabilities they can provide. These partners are:

* Cefas - Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science
* JNCC – Joint Nature Conservation Committee
* Met Office
* MMO – Marine Management Organisation
* NOC - National Oceanography Centre
* UKHO - UK Hydrographic Office

Cefas is the lead organisation that is managing the Platform, hereafter called Tier 1 Programme Team, and all the partners are equal delivery partners that can support requests from SIDS as part of the Platform.

To ensure the Platform’s outputs are co-designed to be as impactful as possible, the Platform is supported by a group of independent development advisors – the Development Advisory Pannel – who will provide specialist skills and experience in development, blue economies and climate change. The advisors will work with the platform and the SIDS to ensure that poverty alleviation, gender equality, social inclusion and local people’s needs are at the heart of all the support provided.

Additional information about the SBE Technical Assistance Platform is available via the Platform website: <http://www.sbe-platform.org.uk>

# 2. Glossary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BPF | The Blue Planet Fund |
| Platform Allocation Meeting | Meeting between the DAP, Tier 1 SBE Programme Team, and Tier 2 representatives to agree the evaluation scores for technical assistance requests and project proposals and to make final decisions on applications to progress and funding. These meeting are co-chaired by DAP and Tier 1. |
| Development Advisory Panel (DAP) | Development Advisory Panel is a group of independent experts in marine the social sciences and sustainable development who provides strategic advice, assesses proposals, and makes recommendations to SBE partners. |
| FCDO | Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office, UK Government. |
| POST | POST is a generic term refers which to British Embassies or High Commissions |
| Appointed Member | Appointed to the DAP based on fair and open competition following UK Government Public Appointments guidelines |
| Sustainable Blue Economies (SBE) | part of the UK Blue Planet Fund (BPF) and led by the FCDO, which aims to support development of blue economies and enhance the resilience of Official Development Assistance (ODA)-eligible Small Island Developing States (SIDS). |
| Technical Assistance Platform | Representatives from the Tier 2 Delivery Partners who provide strategic advice, assess proposals and make recommendations to SBE partners. |
| Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) | Technical Advisory Panel is a group of UK-based specialist organisation experts in coastal and marine sciences who provides strategic advice, assesses proposals, and makes recommendations on which proposals can be supported by the Technical Assistance Platform. |
| SBE Programme Board | High-level oversight and governance mechanism board overseeing delivery of the SBE programme. |
| Senior Responsible Officer (SRO) | FCDO official with overall responsibility for the Programme. |
| Tier 1 Programme Team | The programme team in Cefas, who manage and administer the Technical Assistance Platform on behalf of FCDO. |
| Tier 2 Delivery Partners | The UK specialist marine science and management agencies that are supporting delivery of Technical Assistance Platform projects. |

# 3. Development Advisory Panel (DAP)

## 3.1. Role and responsibilities

The primary role of the DAP is to provide high quality socio-economic and development advice to the SBE Technical Assistance Platform and SIDS applicants to ensure that the specialist technical marine assistance provided supports poverty alleviation in a manner that is sensitive to, and ideally empowering of, gender equality and social inclusion (GESI).

Their responsibilities of the members of the DAP include:

* evaluating whether Concept Note requests received from SIDS stakeholders for technical assistance are aligned with SBE Programme objectives, or can be adapted to be aligned with SBE Programme objectives,
* providing recommendations on the design of technical assistance projects to ensure they take appropriate account of socio-economic and development considerations in project design,
* evaluating project design documents (Project Inception Documents – PIDs) from a socio-economic and development perspective.

The project application, evaluation and development process are described in Section 5 below.

The Core group will also be required to participate in Concept Note and PID review meetings and funding allocation decision making boards.

In addition to the responsibilities of the Panel Members and the Core Group, the Chair will be expected to:

* coordinate the inputs of the Panel Members and to prepare consolidated review and recommendation responses from the DAP,
* chair meetings of the DAP and co-chair funding allocation meetings,
* prepare recommendations for project development and funding allocation decisions in collaboration with the Tier 1 Programme Management team.

In addition, Panel members may be asked to also:

* provide advice on the adoption of project outputs to improve impacts across the wider SBE programme,
* provide ad-hoc advice to the SBE Platform to improve its performance such as, short policy papers; advisory notes; think pieces; local delivered ITT, etc.

The DAP’s Terms and Conditions are set out in SBE DAP Appointment Letter and Terms and Conditions. Details of the Concept Note and Project Initiation Documents (PIDS) scoring are detailed in Section 6. The DAP will liaise with the Teir 1 Programme Team and will be supported administratively by the Tier 1 SBE Programme Team.

The members of the DAP are required to abide by Platform policies and procedures advised by the Tier 1 Programme Team. As a minimum these will set out standards for data protection and sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment. The Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office’s ‘How to’ Guidance Note on Gender Equality’ will be provided to all members as a practical guide to help members to get a good understanding of why gender equality matters, ensure gender equality objectives are integrated and considered across all projects and ensure Gender Equality Act compliance. The SEAH policy is set out in Annex E.

## 3.2. Composition

The DAP is an independent panel of marine and coastal social science and development experts and practitioners appointed by the Tier 1 Programme Team. The DAP will consist of a core group of five members, including a chair and up to a further ten members for the wider panel.

Appointed members will be made up of individuals with expertise and experience of coastal developing states (ideally SIDS), across a range of applicable social science and development fields. This may include, but is not limited to, experts with experience in: **gender studies; politics and marine governance; sociology; human geography; development economics; blue finance; marine-based anthropology; quantitative and qualitative data analysis; policy implementation and international development.** Appointed members will have demonstrated a proven track record of having worked on, and delivery of, high impact research or development approaches, and strong working knowledge of development challenges in the coastal and marine spaces which is relevant to SIDS.

DAP members are expected to have experience in some or all of the following: working with Official Development Assistance funded projects or programmes; Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI); developing sustainable finance opportunities (both nature and climate finance); and developing monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL). The overall balance of expertise and applied skills across all of the members of the DAP in these areas will be taken into account.

The final composition of the DAP will aim to reflect the regional focus of the SBE Platform with a target to recruit membership with experience of having worked in each of the Caribbean, Pacific, and Atlantic & Indian Ocean regions.

## 3.3. Appointments and Balance of Expertise and Regions

DAP members are appointed as individuals based on their expertise, experience and knowledge of development issues relevant to SIDS. The expertise of DAP members is based in the social sciences and/or development approaches. The range of expertise required may change or evolve over time, and therefore, the balance of skills, expertise and experience of members will be regularly reviewed. If necessary, further calls for new panel members will be made.

The Platform is committed to forming a DAP that is diverse, that represents different sectors and groups, and that is balanced in terms of regional experience. Appointed DAP members including the Chair are appointed for a fixed period of 2 years with the possibility of two extensions each for an additional year, funding dependent. The Terms and Conditions for members is provided in SBE DAP Appointment Letter and Terms and Conditions.

Consideration is given in appointment and reappointments to:

* meeting the strategic expertise and knowledge required by the Platform,
* the diversity of membership and representation,
* the performance and availability of the member to continue to contribute,
* the phasing and length of appointments to ensure continuity and fresh perspectives.

Appointments to the DAP will balance membership across the SIDS regions. Whilst attempts will be made to achieve a geographic balance of experience amongst the DAP, Cefas retains the right to appoint to achieve a wider balance of skills, experience and expertise across the DAP from the applications.

## 3.4. Location and Language

Given the broad geographic focus of the SBE Platform, the DAP will apply a remote working model with no need to travel and no expectation of in-person engagements. Engagement will take place either via Teams or Zoom and by email. The SBE Programme Management Team will determine the best mechanism of engagement for each area of activity. Best efforts will be made to allow for different time zones however it is expected that the operation of the DAP will centre around UK working hours.

English is the core operating language for the SBE Platform and virtually all activities will be undertaken in English. Members of the DAP are expected to have excellent English reading, writing and speaking ability.

## 3.5. Time commitment and frequency of meetings

Recruited members can expect to contribute between 5-10 day a year. In the case of the DAP Chair / deputy Chair this would increase to 12 – 15 days a year. Below is an estimate of time commitment per task.

**All members (~5 days)**

* Review, comment, feedback and general administration on Concept Notes and Project Initiation Document (PIDs) is expected to take round 2-3 hours each.
* Support to Tier 2 delivery partners during PID development between 1-2 days – these will be allocated to members (based on project need). Not all members will be needed during PID development.

**For Core members (+ 5-6 days)**

* Sift and moderation meetings will typically be held twice during each funding round, which happen typically twice a year (expect around 4 meetings), depending upon the work programme. For example, for one round:
  + First Concept Note stage, involving the review of concept notes is expected to take 0.5, max 1 day, followed by 0.5 day for meetings.
  + Second project plan review stage, involving the review of Project Initiation Documents is expected to take 1 full day, followed by 0.5 to 1 day meetings.

**For Chair / Deputy Chair (+ 2 days)**

* Preparation for meetings and coordination of inputs from the DAP expect around 0.5 days per meeting.

Additional tasks may be offered to all members (based on skills and expertise) with the additional time commitment for each task indicated when offered. Members are free to accept or decline these additional requests.

The first call for Concept Note applications for technical assistance will go live at the start of March with a deadline for Concept Note submissions on 14th May. For Concept Notes that are taken forward to full project proposal development the deadline for Project Inception Document submission is 18th July. Therefore, DAP members, and especially the Chair, will need to be available during the last 2 weeks in May and the last 2 weeks in July to support initiation of the first full round of project evaluations.

## 3.6. Format of meetings

For Allocation meetings (core members + Chair), the format of meetings will be agreed between the DAP chair, and the SBE Programme Team in advance, and will depend on the objective of the meeting. Allocation meetings seek to efficiently and fairly discuss the requests for support in order to produce a list of recommended proposals to move to the next stage.

For meetings between a DAP member and a Tier 2 delivery partner, discussions between the DAP members and the Tier 2 delivery partner will determine the right approach to be taken, taking into account different time zones. Members are expected to be available to support the development of the PIDs.

Additional meetings may be required to discuss any arising issues, updates on the fund or application rounds, however attendance at these meetings will be voluntary. The Teir 1 Programme Team will endeavour to give as much notice as possible with regards to meeting dates. The agenda items for discussion and supporting papers will be emailed to the DAP members, and any other persons required to attend, before the meeting

## 3.7. Accountability for DAP

The DAP will report to the Tier 1 Programme Team on a routine working basis, who in turn reports to the FCDO SBE Programme Board and the FCDO Senior Responsible Offices (SRO).

# 4. Development Advisory Panel specific guidance

## 4.1. Code of conduct

Members of the DAP must observe the highest standards of impartiality, integrity and objectivity in relation to the advice they provide. Members must at all times:

* comply with their Terms and Conditions of appointment (see SBE DAP Letter of Appointment and Terms and Conditions; and this handbook (all subject to change)).
* follow the Seven Principles of Public Life set out by the Nolan Committee on Standards in Public Life (see Annex A: The Seven Principles of Public Life).
* not misuse information gained for personal gain or for political purpose, nor seek to use the opportunity to promote their private interests or those of connected persons, firms, businesses, or other organisations.
* declare and register any interests they have that are relevant to the remit of the DAP (see 4.7).

Any appointment can be terminated early if the appointee fails to perform their duties to a satisfactory standard. In addition, members or the Chair can stand down if they so wish by providing at least three months’ notice in writing by email to the Tier 1 Programme Team: [sbeplatform@cefas.gov.uk](mailto:sbeplatform@cefas.gov.uk). However, members would normally be expected to complete the current funding round before standing down.

4.1.2. Ministers

Members are not restricted from communicating with SIDS or UK Ministers and others in their capacity as private individuals. However, if communication takes place in this individual capacity, it should be made clear that the individual’s view is not necessarily that of the DAP. Where members engagement or on-going relationships with SIDS or UK Ministers may present an actual or perceived conflict of interest, a Conflict of Interest should be declared, and the Tier 1 Programme Team should be made aware, who should then make FCDO aware.

4.1.3. Media

Should Media engagement opportunities present themselves to the DAP, the Chair will be the primary spokesperson for any contact with the media unless the Chair, Tier 1 Programme Team, or FCDO has made other specific arrangements.

If a member receives an approach for an interview or media engagement connected in any way to their role on the DAP, the request must be referred to the Tier 1 Programme Team who will liaise with the FCDO policy Team and in-country UK Embassy or High Commissions, often referred to as POST, and their press offices, as well as the DAP Chair.

The DAP must follow a “no surprises” policy when dealing with the media. This is to ensure that the Tier 1 Programme Team and FCDO remain informed and can respond or offer their own input to the media as appropriate.

Chairs and members may be invited to speak to the media independently of their membership of the DAP and it is their choice to accept or reject such an offer. When speaking in a personal capacity, this should be highlighted at the beginning of any interview and individuals should refrain from commenting on the DAP. Members may contact the Tier 1 Programme Team for further guidance and support on media engagement.

Social media is a public forum and therefore the same considerations apply. Where any personal social media accounts used by the Chair or members make reference to their role on the DAP, they should ensure that it is clear in what capacity they are communicating. Social media biographies should include an explicit line which makes clear that all views communicated via social media are the account holder’s own.

4.1.4. Political activity

In accordance with the Terms and Conditions (see SBE DAP Letter of Appointment and Terms and Conditions) provided with their appointment letter or updated subsequently: Members will not:

* occupy paid party-political posts or hold particularly sensitive or high roles in a political party; or
* lobby against Government policy.

Members will:

* inform the Tier 1 Programme Team of any intention to accept a prominent position in any political party and should understand that their DAP membership will be terminated; and
* resign from the DAP if they accept nomination for election to any political party or any Government parliamentary establishment.

Members must be, and be seen to be, politically impartial. At all times, members must remain conscious of their general public responsibilities and exercise proper discretion. Specific guidance in the run up to key political events such as UK local and general elections, may be issued by the Cabinet Office and shared with members. Members should contact the Tier 1 Programme Team for further guidance if required.

## 4.2. Time commitment

Members will be expected to commit to the expectations that are detailed in 3.5. Time commitment and frequency of meetings. Where this may be a challenge, members are encouraged to discuss this early with Tier 1 Programme Team and the DAP Chair.

## 4.3. Payment Information

Current rates (subject to review) are detailed in Annex C: Payment Information. Any queries regarding claims should be referred to Tier 1 Programme Team.

## 4.4. Conflict of interest

All DAP members will be required to sign and agree to a Conflict of Interest Policy and Declaration and declare any potential conflict of interests they may have upon being appointed. This policy details the SBE Platform approach to managing Conflict of Interests (see Annex B: Conflict of Interest Policy). All declarations will be filed in the SBE Platform SharePoint Site and all interests recorded in a Register of Interest for the DAP. To ensure the register is accurately maintained, members will inform the Tier 1 Programme Team of any changes as they occur, and declarations will be updated every six months or as changes are required. The Register of Interests is utilised to ensure that discussions are not influenced, or requests for technical assistance assessed by a member with a potential Conflict of Interest, reinforcing the need to keep it up to date and accurate. A record will be kept, with the potential to be published, to support a robust approach on how conflicts of interest have been addressed and managed.

## 4.5. Transparency

To support transparency and trust in the work of the programme, the Tier 1 Programme Team will publish details (including the names of members) on the SBE Platform website and in associated materials (see Annex D: Privacy Notice).

## 4.6. Induction

All DAP members will be invited to attend an online induction session to support onboarding and ensure all members understand the programme and necessary processes. At the start of each open call for Concept Notes, the Tier 1 Programme Team will hold a meeting with the DAP to provide an overview of requests received, allocate reviewers and recap on Terms of Reference, scoring and selection criteria, and provide a Q&A session.

This is to ensure all members understand and are confident with the processes and to promote consistency across scoring. The meeting will be recorded and shared, along with meeting slides, to all DAP members so that they can refer back to the meeting whilst conducting their reviews. The Tier 1 Programme Team will also be available to respond – in writing or verbally - to any queries received from or relating to the DAP. The Tier 1 Programme Team can be contacted on [sbeplatform@cefas.gov.uk](mailto:sbeplatform@cefas.gov.uk)

# 5. Assessment process

## 5.1. Summary of how requests for support come into the Platform

The Platform adopts a two-stage process for receiving and assessing requests for support. An Open call is communicated to all SIDS stakeholders. Requests for support are submitted by the deadline in the form of Concept Notes by either government bodies or regional or national bodies from any eligible SIDS. In all cases a government body (agency, ministry) needs to be supportive of a request coming from their territory. All concept notes that meet the required standards will be assessed. Concept Notes are then screened by the Tier 1 Programme Team for compliance before compliant requests are sent to the DAP and the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP), the sister panel to the DAP, for review. Once reviews are complete, allocation meetings are then held and the most suitable requests for support are agreed for further development. Each of the Concepts Notes progressing to full project plan development will be worked up into a Programme Initiation Document (PID) by a dedicated team in partnership with the SIDS applicant before being reassessed for before a final funding decision is made. Below is a visual overview of the process:
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Description automatically generatedThe Platform follows a strict code of practice around conflict of interest (CoI): all reviewers need to declare any involvement or close association with any request for support, applicants, or project partners so the assessment can be undertaken by independent member. All CoI will be managed by the Tier 1 Programme Team with panel support.

## 5.2. Detail on how each request is assessed at Concept Note stage

Once the deadline for open call is passed:

1. **An Initial Review by the Tier 1 Programme Team is undertaken**: Concept Notes from SIDS which are incomplete, do not meet the essential eligibility criteria or are not compliance will be rejected. Applicants will always be informed of the reasons for rejection
   1. Tier 1 Programme Team will confirm Conflict of Issue (CoI) risk across Panels
2. **Request sent and reviewed by Panels:** Concept Notes from SIDS are sent to reviewed and scored members of the DAP and TAP against the assessment criteria.
   1. The DAP (and the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)) will be sent compliant Concept Notes by the Tier 1 Programme Team
   2. Each Panel member will individually review a set of Concept Notes (between 3-5 per request per panel) against a suite of criteria
   3. The DAP Chair will combine and send the average scores on each Concept Note to the Tier 1 Programme Team who will then prepare the suite of scores, rank requests and assess for strategic alignment, ready to present and for discussion at the Platform allocation meetings.
3. **First allocation meeting take place**: Tier Programme Team, DAP, TAP, and observer meet, discuss scores, comments and agree which applications progress for further development.
   1. The Platform allocation meeting is co-chaired by a Tier 1 Rep and the DAP chair. Updates to any CoI will be noted. Using this information, the Co-Chairs will structure the discussions.
   2. The Tier 1 Programme Team will provide guidance on funding and any regional, thematic allocations to take into consideration.
   3. DAP core group and TAP attend ready to explain their panels score. Observers may also join this meeting if approved by the Tier 1 Programme Team.
   4. Requests progress based on consensus from the meeting on the scoring and ranking of requests for further development within the funding envelope.
   5. If consensus cannot be reached a decision will be made by the co-chairs. Due to Cefas operating as both the Tier 1 Programme Team and as a Tier 2 delivery partner, if consensus on a project likely to be allocated to Cefas is not achieve, the DAP chair will have the final word on approving or rejecting the Concept Note.
4. **Request assigned to Lead UK delivery partner and to DAP members for support**: Tier 1 Programme Team and the co-chairs confirm which Tier 2 delivery partner should lead on development and delivery of each request, and providing a summary of which areas need strengthening and further DAP support, if needed, to do this.

## 5.3. Detail on how requests develop into Project Initiation Documents

Once allocated to the development team:

1. **SIDS partners and Tier 2 delivery teams are notified of results:** For each Concept Note progressing to full project development the Tier 2 delivery partner will take forward development with the requesting SIDS partner(s) and an allocated DAP member.
2. **Each PID will get developed:** These will be developed over a set period.
   1. Tier 2 delivery team and allocated DAP member will meet with SIDS partners as requested to strengthen the PID over the time period.
   2. Teams will respond to the comments and recommendations, or justify if not, from the Concept Note evaluation.
3. **PID submitted to the Tier 1 Programme Team**: the same process to allocate and assess the concept notes will be used for the PID with additional scoring criteria provided.
   1. Where possible requests at PID stage will be reviewed by the same reviewers as at concept stage.
4. **Second Allocation Meeting and final decision:** co-chairs lead discussion on PIDs and agree on the funding allocation across PIDS. Outcomes are share with FCDO for awareness.
5. **Awarded and support commences**: Partners and POST are informed of outcome and projects commence.

The Tier 1 Programme Team retains the right to clarify any issues raised during the process, to revise the project development and evaluation process, or to award funding subject to required amendments. If any of the original requesting SIDS partners or Tier 2 delivery partners are subsequently unable to meet the requirements of the award, the Tier 1 Programme Team retains the right to withdraw the offer. If a request for support is not funded, it may be resubmitted during future calls, but it must clearly demonstrate that they have addressed and responded to any feedback provided.

In some cases, the assessment process will be adapted, for example where a rapid response funding round seeks to provide time sensitive technical assistance in response to an opportunity or risk. Any changes to the process will be clearly set out in the guidance for any such technical assistance round.

## 5.4. Responsibilities of the DAP

All requests must meet a standard in ambition, value for money, quality of design, capabilities and capacity, matching the requirements as set out in the guidance. DAP members are critical in assessing this. During assessments DAP members must:

* report Conflict of Issue (CoI) risks.
* review independently using the provided Scoring Criteria and supporting guidance.
* review all associated documentation ready to discuss the applications they have reviewed.
* prior to discussing any application, members with Conflicts of Interest will leave the (virtual/in person) room and play no role in the discussion or decision.
* attempt to reach consensus when assessing each application. Co-Chairs will make the final decision where consensus is not possible. In the case of an application involving Cefas, the DAP chair will make the final decision.
* treated each request fairly and consistently with participants adhering to the principles of public life.
* irrespective of each requests score, any member can challenge or champion any application, supporting its case for consideration or flagging risks/issues.
* support discussions when requests have received a range of scores to challenge, test and understand the assessment scores.
* provide constructive feedback to support of strengthening the standards of projects and future requests.

# 6. Assessment criteria and scoring

The initial assessment and scoring criteria are set out below. Assessment and scoring criteria may be revised prior to each round of requests for technical assistance. The DAP and TAP will be advised of any revisions to the scoring criteria prior to any evaluation rounds.

Each application will be assessed against the evaluation criteria outlined in the table below. The Table identifies which of the Advisory Panels will be responsible for reviewing projects against each criteria.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Evaluated for Concept Notes** | **Evaluated for PIDs** | **Evaluated by DAP** | **Evaluated by TAP** |
| **Do No Harm & GESI** | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  |
| **Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction** | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |  |
| **Marine Environmental Benefit** | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |
| **Deliverability** | ✔ | ✔ |  | ✔ |
| **Legacy and Impact** | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |
| **Project Design** |  | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |

The evaluation criteria are the same for the Concept Notes and PIDs, expect for the Project Design criteria that will only be considered at the PID evaluation stage.

Although the scoring criteria are broadly the same for the Concept Note and PID evaluation stages, it is expected that the proposed project will provide more detail and clarity on project intentions and delivery plans at the PID stage. The allocation of scores for Concept Notes and PIDS for each criteria should reflect this.

The scoring for each evaluation criteria should take account the relative scale of the proposed project, with larger projects expected to demonstrate higher levels of impact and alignment than more focussed or smaller projects.

All Concept Notes and PIDs will be scored by both the TAP and the DAP by at least three experts within each panel and then scores combined by each panel to be submitted to the Tier 1 Programme Team.

## 6.1. Project Evaluation Criteria

All requests for support will be assessed for their potential against the following evaluation criteria and scoring criteria. Each criteria will be scored on a scale of 0-5 points, taking into consideration the key questions to consider set out for each evaluation criteria. This criterion maybe subject to change / updated as required.

**Do No Harm and GESI:** *Will the project do no harm, and does it take account of and seek to address issues of gender equality and social inclusion?*

Projects must be designed and delivered in a way that provides confidence they will not cause harm and take account of gender equality and social inclusion (see below for the GESI evaluation framework). The risk of causing harm should be considered at all stages of project design and implementation.

Questions to consider in relation to this evaluation criteria include:

* Does the technical assistance carry risk of exacerbating existing inequality or causing harm?
* Does the request seek support for sectors where expansion or development risks harming vulnerable and resource dependent groups?
* Does the request for support risk creation of new knowledge that may disadvantage vulnerable groups?
* Is there significant risk of misrepresentation local people’s views and understanding of their seascape / marine resources?
* Are the gender and social inclusion aspects explained in the ask for technical assistance? If not, is clear justification for why not provided?

**Vulnerability and Poverty Reduction:** *Does the project have the potential to reduce poverty and vulnerability of marginalised groups?*

A multidimensional definition of poverty should be considered when assessing concept notes against this evaluation are, causal links must be identifiable to, one or several, of the following:

* Income and livelihoods
* Food security and nutrition
* Economic resilience
* Climate adaptation and resilience
* Health improvements
* Wellbeing

The focus for support may consider:

* Direct support for poorest people
* Broader focus on national economic development
* Support tackling a global public good

Questions to consider in relation to this evaluation criteria include:

* Do the project objectives demonstrate how it aims to deliver lasting benefits for poor and/or marginalised and vulnerable communities, or aim to deliver national economic development?
* Are the most vulnerable impacted by the issue aiming to be supported, identified and where possible quantified?
* Does the project contribute to the conservation and/or sustainable use of marine environments in a manner that will support blue economic development or climate resilience?
* Is inclusion of local context, local organisational capacity and local communities’ knowledge understood and build into the project where appropriate?

**Marine Environmental Benefit:** *Does the project have the potential for positive marine environmental benefit?*

Evaluation of environmental benefit should consider how the project addresses:

- climate change adaptation or mitigation

- protection, restoration or sustainable management of marine biodiversity

- marine pollution

- sustainable resource utilisation

This can include actions that reduce the drivers of environmental degradation, increase protection, or support enabling factors for environmental benefit, such as governance, evidence, capability and capacity across private and public sectors.

Questions to consider in relation to this evaluation criteria include:

* Will the project make a clear contribution to an identified need for the SIDS environment?
* Does the project have the potential to improve the conservation, restoration, resilience or sustainable use of the SIDS marine environment?
* Is there clear logic behind how the project actions could contribute to marine environmental benefit?

**Deliverability:** *Is the proposed project practical with a high likelihood to deliver its proposed outputs?*

This evaluation criteria takes account of the overall risk to a project effectively and efficiently delivering its outputs based on multiple factors including logistical, technical, capacity and engagement risks.

Questions to consider in relation to this evaluation criteria include:

* Is the work applying known and tested methods in criteria where they have been deployed before?
* Will the project require deploying untested equipment or deploying equipment in criteria where it has not previously been deployed?
* Is the project likely to require utilising in-country significant in-country capabilities such as vessels or laboratory facilities?
* Will the project require special permissions to complete the work?

**Legacy and Impact:** *Does the project have the potential to support lasting and impactful change aligned with SBE objectives?*

This criteria considers the potential of the outputs of a project to have impact aligned with SBE Programme objectives and the potential to have lasting impact beyond the lifetime of the project.

Questions to consider in relation to this evaluation criteria include:

* Is there clear potential that project outputs will support high-quality in-country actions that will support climate resilience or development of the blue economy?
* Is there potential for the benefits of the project outcomes to be maintained and continued in-country without further programme support? If not, are there reasonable expectations that long term benefit of the intervention will be sustained?
* Is the work new and additional or building on, and not duplicating past or current activities?
* Do the Beneficiary Partners and intended recipients of the project outputs have the capacity to absorb and act on the project outputs?
* Does the request for support have the potential to deliver impactful outcomes that are aligned with the higher-level objectives of the SBE programme?

**Project design [for PID evaluations only]:** *Is the project well designed to effectively deliver value for money impact?*

The criteria takes account of the extent of co-design in PID development, whether the PID sets out clearly defined outputs and outcomes, is applying appropriate methods and expected to deliver value for money impact.

* Are the methodology and budget outlined robust, clear, and appropriate to meet the identified need and achieve the targeted outcome, within a realistic timeframe?
* Does the project demonstrate evidence of a highly collaborative approach, involving early and strong participation and empowerment of local partners, stakeholders, and communities?
* Does the project design define clear, targeted and measurable Outputs and Outcomes?
* Are safeguarding and health and safety risks identified, and robust mitigation actions proposed?
* Would the proposed work be undertaken anyway if not supported by the SBE Technical Assistance Platform?
* Does the project provide value for money for the outcomes proposed?

## 6.2. Assessment scoring scale

Scores for each criteria should be assigned based on the guidance in the assessment scoring scale below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scoring | Description |
| 5 | Strong Demonstration:  Substantial evidence presented that the proposal clearly meets all aspects of the criteria to a high standard, with no concerns raised. Based on this criteria it is likely to strongly contribute to the objectives of the SBE Programme. |
| 4 | Good Demonstration:  Good evidence presented that the proposal meets most aspects of the criteria to a high standard, with no concerns raised. Based on this criteria it is likely to significantly contribute to the objectives of the SBE Programme. |
| 3 | Satisfactory Demonstration:  Good evidence presented that the proposal meets most aspects of the criteria with no significant concerns raised. Based on this criteria it is likely to contribute to the objectives of the SBE Programme. |
| 2 | Moderate Demonstration:  The proposal meets several aspects of the criteria with some, or limited concerns raised. Based on this criteria alone the project will make limited contribute to the objectives of the SBE Programme. Actions could be taken to strengthen the proposal with respect to this criteria. |
| 1 | Weak Demonstration:  The proposal shows weak alignment with this criteria with some concerns raised as to project alignment and fit. Based on this criteria alone the project will not make substantive contribution to the objectives of the SBE Programme. Actions may be required to strengthen the proposal with respect to this criteria. |
| 0 | Not Demonstrated:  The proposal fails to meet the requirements of the assessment criteria or raises serious concerns e.g., potential to cause harm, flawed approach, subject to serious technical difficulties or risks, unclearly written that it cannot be properly assessed, or is duplicative. |

## 6.3. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

SBE is committed to ensuring that all projects supported will not cause harm or exacerbate inequality and ideally enable progress Gender Equality and Social Inclusion. The framework below can be used to support evaluation of GESI considerations in addition to reviewers own social science expertise and development experience. Projects that are deemed GESI unaware will not be eligible for SBE Platform funding. All projects must be GESI sensitive as a minimum with the aspiration for the programme to support GESI empowering and GESI transformative projects where possible – whilst remaining aligned with wider SBE objectives.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GESI unaware | GESI sensitive | GESI empowering | GESI transformative |
| Lack of social and gender analysis means that the project may fail to acknowledge the role of gender and exclusion. These do not necessarily do harm but may indirectly support the status quo.   Failure to effectively consult with women and marginalised groups (including people living in poverty, Indigenous People and Local Communities) that are impacted by the project.   Lack of disaggregated data in MEL systems.  Lack of expertise / resourcing dedicated to GESI. Lack of social and gender analysis may result in safeguarding risks not being identified or adequately mitigated against. Safeguarding policies and procedures may not be well established and/or project stakeholders may not be aware of available reporting channels to raise concerns. | Social and gender analysis conducted and used to be confident that the project will “do no harm” and will not exacerbate inequality. Projects assess impact of activities on women and men, and relationships between them.   Stakeholder consultation includes women and marginalised groups, with evidence presented to support this. Logframe includes data disaggregated to track impacts of activities on women and other targeted groups, where relevant. Relevant GESI expertise and resources are drawn on as needed Social and gender analysis supports identification of suitable Safeguarding / GESI risks and mitigation actions which are monitored via the risk management process. Delivery partners have robust safeguarding measures in place, assessed through due diligence. Safeguarding policies and procedures are well established and effectively managed by all project partners. All project stakeholders are made aware of reporting channels to raise any concerns. | Social and gender analysis used to understand and address practical barriers & support opportunities for increased equality in access to assets, resources, capabilities and opportunities, such as jobs, markets, services, skills, knowledge and decision-making. Participation of women and marginalised groups in planning/ design processes. Logframe includes data disaggregated to track impacts of interventions on diverse groups, includes a GESI focused outcome and/or indicators. Dedicated staff time working on GESI and ability to draw on relevant expertise and resources. Social and gender analysis supports identification of GESI / Safeguarding risks and mitigation actions which are monitored via the risk management process. Delivery partners have robust safeguarding measures in place, assessed through due diligence. Safeguarding policies and procedures are well established and effectively managed by all project partners. All project stakeholders are made aware of channels to raise any concerns. | Social and gender analysis used to address prevailing power relations and support institutional and societal level change to be gender & Inclusion sensitive. Involves challenging social norms and breaking stereotypes for women, men and marginalised people. Women and marginalised groups have active control over resources and decisions in the context of the project, including support for rights-based civil society such as women’s/Indigenous Peoples/OPDs, enabling their leadership and collective action to strengthen their decision-making, agency and control. Data disaggregated to track impacts of interventions on diverse groups, gender and inclusion as a principal programme objective. Significant dedicated resources and GESI experts a core part of the delivery team. Social and gender analysis supports identification of Safeguarding risks and mitigation actions which are monitored via the risk management process. Delivery partners have robust safeguarding measures in place, assessed through due diligence. Safeguarding policies and procedures are well established and effectively managed by all project partners. All project stakeholders are made aware of channels to raise any concerns. |

# Annex A: The Seven Principles of Public Life

The Seven Principles of Public Life (also known as the Nolan Principles) apply to anyone who works as a public officeholder. DAP members are expected to apply these principles in their approach to their term on the DAP.

1) Selflessness

Act solely in terms of the public interest.

2) Integrity

Avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

3) Objectivity

Act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.

4) Accountability

Accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.

5) Openness

Act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.

6) Honesty

Be truthful.

7) Leadership

Exhibit these principles in their own behaviour and treat others with respect. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

# Annex B: Conflict of Interest Policy

Introduction

Requests for support can come from organisations with which the Platform (DAP, TAP, Tier 1 Programme Team) may have personal and/or professional connections with, potentially resulting in a conflict of interest, as they have the ability to influence decisions and the allocation (or not) of funds and support.

|  |
| --- |
| To protect the quality of and trust in the funds, whilst delivering on the Seven Principles of Public Life, it is critical and a collective responsibility that Conflicts of Interest be effectively managed to a high standard at all times. |

Conflicts of Interest have the potential to impact on the quality of assessments/recommendations that will result in reputational damage, or reduced value for money and impact of the programme. The perception of a Conflict of Interest is considered as serious as an actual Conflict of Interest.

To be able to mitigate the risk, it is vital that everyone proactively identifies and declares at the earliest opportunity any potential conflicts of interests by keeping their Register of Interest up to date and complete. All members of the Platform and the DAP will be required to complete and sign the Conflict of Interest Declaration detailed at the end of this Policy.

The Register of Interests will capture the interests of all those working on the SBE Platform including members of the DAP, TAP and Tier 1 Programme Team and any individual that is asked to provide a view on an application from the point that it is received until a final decision is made.

Definition of a Conflict of Interest

|  |
| --- |
| A connection or relationship where an individual’s objectivity, integrity or judgment can be or be perceived to be compromised or impaired, and potentially attract perceptions of bias and unfair treatment. |

Register of Interests

To manage and prevent conflicts of interests from impacting the objectives or reputation of the programme, it is the responsibility of the DAP, TAP and Tier 1 Programme Team to identify and declare at the earliest opportunity any factor or interest that may result in a real or perceived Conflict of Interest.

The Tier 1 Programme Team maintains a Register of Interests to support the identification of potential conflicts of interest. The Register of Interest will be reviewed prior to the assessment of proposals, but can be updated at any point to ensure it is kept up to date. Individuals must actively confirm, at a minimum annually, that the information held about them is correct.

Potential Conflicts of Interest

Individuals must declare any private financial or non-financial interests of their own, or of close family members which may, or may be perceived to, influence judgements in performing any functions.

Each individual should consider and declare the following examples of potential sources of Conflicts of Interest Register:

* The organisation which employs or has employed them within the past 5 years;
* On the board of, or a trustee of, an organisation;
* Consultant or unpaid advisor to an organisation, including recent collaborations;
* Personal connection with an applicant, partner or project team;
* Post-graduate level teaching collaboration with an organisation or an individual named in an application;
* Close relative, extended family, friend or household member, neighbour employed or involved in the organisation.

The individual’s connection with an organisation can be paid or unpaid.

This list is not exhaustive, and where a member has a doubt as to whether there is a potential conflict of interest, the interest should be declared to support transparency.

Managing Declared Conflicts

The Tier 1 Programme Team, and DAP Chair, will seek to assess and mitigate any risks arising from the register of declared interests. Interests may only become apparent later on given the range of projects and partners involved. The management of potential conflicts of interest requires an ongoing and collective effort from everyone involved to hold themselves and their colleagues to the highest standards. It is the responsibility of individuals to clearly declare the interest as soon as they become aware so applications can be reallocated, or they can leave application discussions.

A Register of Interests will be maintained to capture the interests of everyone involved with the assessment and award of grants. Where an interest assessment is unclear or there is insufficient time to assess, it will be considered to be high-risk by default. There are two main ways that an interest could influence the integrity of the funds:

* Direct interest: where an interest in or connection exists to the Lead Organisation or Partner.
* Indirect interest: where an interest in or connection exists to a direct competitor of the Lead Organisation or Partner of an application.

In assessing potential direct interest:

* Low Risk Interest: The interest is on record, but no further action is required, as the interest is not significant enough to warrant concern, for example the connection has not been active for a number of years, or contact is minimal.
* High Risk Interest: Where an individual has a connection to a proposal, including being named (as an individual or an organisation) on the proposal, or having advised on the proposal, or other close connection or potential interest, they will then play no role in the assessment or discussion of the proposal.

Assessing potential indirect interest is more challenging, and everyone is reminded of their commitment to the Seven Principles of Public Life. Anyone present during an application discussion must make it clear if they have any indirect interest (e.g. an interest in a direct competitor), and any comments offered must be objective and evidence based.

|  |
| --- |
| To protect the objectivity, integrity and reputation of the funds and the assessment of applications, everyone is strongly encouraged to raise concerns about their own interests and the interests of anyone present. |

Where a co-chair has a Conflict of Interest, then they will nominate the other co-chair to lead the discussions while they are out of the (virtual) room.

A record will be kept, with the potential to be published, where members have withdrawn from a discussion due to a Conflict of Interest.

If an individual is considered to have too many high-risk interests that it significantly limits their ability to contribute equitably, then discussions may be held to consider their ongoing role.

Handling Conflicts of Interest

Given the range of projects and partners involved in each proposal, an interest may only be identified once the assessment of the proposals begin or during the discussions at a meeting.

If this occurs, it is the responsibility of the individual to declare the interest quickly so that the application can be reallocated and assessed by a different member, or they can leave the room and cease to play a role in the consideration of the proposal.

During Allocation meetings, all members will be expected to be present unless there is a Conflict of Interest that requires their absence.

The co-chairs are responsible, with support from the Tier 1 Programme Team for managing the Conflicts of Interest during the meetings, requiring members with conflicts to leave the room while proposals are discussed.

If a co-chair has a Conflict of Interest, then the other co-chair will lead the discussions while they are out of the (virtual) room.

A record will be kept, with the potential to be published, where members have withdrawn from a discussion due to a Conflict of Interest.

Other matters

All discussions and all written comments on applications are to be treated as confidential; any requests under the Freedom of Information Act will be handled by the Tier 1 Programme Team or FCDO.

If discussing the application process and/or assessment process, individuals should seek not provide any unpublished advice or details that they have as a result of their membership of the DAP or access to information that would give one applicant an unfair advantage over another.

# Annex C: Payment Information

Appointed members shall be responsible for compliance with any applicable tax rules regarding any payments or benefits provided in relation to your appointment. Please consult your tax office if you have queries.

Appointed members can claim £350 a day and the Chair can claim £400 a day. Appointed members are required to submit a claim for payment in a timely manner.

Where a member deputises for the Chair for at least a full day, in agreement with Cefas, the member can claim the Chair rate of £400 per day.

Details of expected time commitment for Members is detailed in **3.5. Time commitment and frequency of meetings.**

Based on the above average level of effort rate, members will be advised of the maximum number of days / half days we expect you to claim for when you are allocated your applications. We may seek to clarify any claims under the expected amounts. Claims in excess of the advised amount will be capped at the advised amount unless there is a clear justification for exceeding this level.

# Annex D: Privacy Notice

This privacy statement sets out what you can expect from Cefas when we process your personal information. This is complemented by our [personal information charter](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-environment-food-rural-affairs/about/personal-information-charter), which broadly sets out our standards for requesting or storing personal information.

Who are we?

Cefas are the government’s marine and freshwater science experts, working for healthy and productive oceans, seas and rivers and safe and sustainable seafood. Innovative, world-class science is central to our mission. We work to safeguard human and animal health, enable food security and support marine economies.

What data do we collect?

The information that we collect from you may include:

* Name
* Email address
* Organisation
* Telephone number
* Occupation
* Gender (for equality & diversity metrics)
* Country of residence/Nationality
* Photograph/Video (e.g. passport details)
* Some elements of the project will record location data

Why are we processing your personal data?

Details of individuals will be collected in order to process their applications for the DAP, and to enable operation of the DAP and to contact them about future work plans, and for keeping in touch on progress. Passport details will be needed if travel is to be arranged by the programme for individuals to attend events and work in areas not their home or office base. Gender information will be collected (not attributed to individuals) to provide gender equality metrics for the programme. Where surveys are conducted personal data will be required to link individuals to their responses.

What is the legal basis for processing your personal data?

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) Article 6 establishes the legal basis for processing your data as this is necessary for the performance of a task in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority vested in the controller. This is due to our joint responsibility with the Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office for delivering the SBE Technical Assistance Platform.

Who will we share your personal data with?

To ensure the effective delivery, functioning and governance the SBE Technical Assistance Platform we may share your data with our partners only when deemed necessary to support the programme. Currently this includes bodies in the UK such as the Marine Management Organisation (MMO), Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), the National Oceanography Centre (NOC), the UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO), The Met Office and the Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), as well as bodies in SBE partner countries.

To support transparency and trust in the work of the programme, the SBE Tier 1 Programme Team will publish details of the names of members of the DAP and brief biographic information on the SBE Platform website and in associated materials. Any biographic information shared on the SBE Platform website will be confirmed with DAP members in advance.

We may also be required to share your information with suppliers in order to arrange travel on your behalf. The supplier used will depend on the travel booking and details can be supplied if requested.

Will your data be processed in a country outside of the United Kingdom or European Economic Area (EEA)?

There are no plans to transfer personal data to 3rd countries or international organisations. Personal data may however be processed in 3rd countries under their applicable legal regimes.

Will your data be processed using automated decision making or profiling?

Your information will not be processed using automated decision making or profiling.

How long will we keep your data for?

The SBE Technical Assistance Platform is currently scheduled to run until 31st March 2028. Information will be retained by Cefas for the lifetime of project and an additional 12 months for administrative purposes before deletion.

What are the consequences if I do not supply the requested data?

If you do not supply the requested personal data, it is more than likely that we will not be able to arrange your participation in the planned activities.

What are my rights to my personal data?

Your rights and our commitments to your personal data are described in the [Cefas Personal Information Charter](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-environment-food-rural-affairs/about/personal-information-charter) as well as on the [ICO website](https://ico.org.uk/).

Where processing of your personal data is necessary for the performance of a task in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority vested in the controller, you have the right to:

* Be Informed when we are processing your information
* To access and request a copy of the information we hold about you
* To correct inaccurate or complete incomplete personal data we hold about you
* To request that we restrict how widely we process your personal data
* To object to the processing of your personal data
* To request human intervention where automated decision making or profiling

How to get in contact

For day to day use, please look to contact the team you are already communicating with or our [Data Protection Team](mailto:cefassecurityteam@cefas.gov.uk) They are best placed to manage general enquiries or to update the accuracy of your data, or provide you with information. However, if they cannot help you, or you have a complaint about how your data is being handled, please use following contacts, making clear which right you wish to exercise:

Contact form: [Contact - Cefas (Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science)](https://www.cefas.co.uk/contact/)

Complaints

If you are unhappy with the service you have received in relation to your request and wish to make a complaint, you should write to Tim Green (Senior Information Risk Owner) at the address below, who will arrange for an internal review of your case.

Cefas

Pakefield Road

Lowestoft

Suffolk

NR33 OHT

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner’s Office

Wycliffe House

Water Lane

Wilmslow

Cheshire SK9 5AF

0303 123 1113

[casework@ico.org.uk](mailto:casework@ico.org.uk)

Any complaint to the Information Commissioner is without prejudice to your right to seek redress through the courts. Should you wish to exercise that right full details are available [on the Information Commissioner’s website](https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/individual-rights/).

# Annex E: Safeguarding and Cefas’ Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (SEAH) Policy within International Development

**Purpose**

Cefas expects the highest moral and ethical standards from those we employ, and from those we work with through our international programmes which provide support and services to people and their communities. When working overseas SEAH must be regarded as one of the most important pillars of Safeguarding to be abided by and vigilant for. Where we work with partners we will ensure, through our procurement / engagement practices, that beneficiaries and delivery partners are aware of their expectations in the Safeguarding space, and in particular to SEAH. Beneficiaries must always be put first, by Cefas and by its partners.

**Policy**

Safeguarding means preventing harm abuse and neglect to people and the environment. The risks of harm from a particular type of exploitation to beneficiaries of Official Development Assistance (ODA) also known as International Aid were highlighted by the Aid Sector scandal in early 2018 and has resulted in an increased focus on Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH), a major subset of Safeguarding policy which is particularly important when engaging with people and communities worldwide. This Policy highlights the Cefas approach to SEAH for our international development programmes.

Cefas believes that everyone involved in programmes and projects, regardless of age, gender identity, disability, sexual orientation, religion, ethnic origin or any other protected characteristic has the right to be protected from all forms of harm, abuse, neglect and exploitation. Cefas will not tolerate abuse and/or exploitation by staff or associated personnel involved in any international programmes or projects Cefas or its commissioned partners are involved in.

It is a mandatory responsibility of delivery partners or organisations that are delivering component of a programme or projects, to have appropriate and proportionate safeguarding policies and procedures and it is the responsibility of the senior project leader within Cefas to seek assurance that these are in place.

All delivery partner/organisation’s safeguarding policy should clearly set out policies that seek to prevent and address SEAH and have clear behavioural expectations of all staff and associated personnel that apply in all countries in which work is being delivered. This should include the requirement that “staff must not engage in sexual activity with anyone under the age of 18, CPP037 Page 2 of 3 regardless of the legal age of consent in the country in which aid is being delivered.” as a minimum.

Cefas expects all partners and organisations delivering projects to commit to addressing SEAH throughout their work, through the safeguarding cycle of identify, prevent, report, respond and learn. Our zero tolerant position extends to Cefas staff / delivery partner staff who find themselves, through their work on programmes and projects, exposed to SEAH and direct these cases to our policy CP010-06 on harassment in the workplace (available upon request). SEAH is an organisational risk and therefore measures are required to span all organisational activity where there is direct or indirect contact with people. This activity includes general operations, procurement, programmers, activities, communication, recruitment, management, policies and procedures, culture, mission and values.

**Sexual Abuse, Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Harassment (SEAH)**

Cefas are committed to a culture of zero tolerance to sexual exploitation and abuse in all that we do. Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH) is made of the following terms;

* Sexual exploitation: any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust for sexual purposes. Includes profiting momentarily, socially, or politically from sexual exploitation of another. Under UN regulations it includes transactional sex, solicitation of transactional sex and exploitative relationship;
* Sexual abuse: the actual or threatened physical intrusion of a sexual nature, whether by force or under unequal or coercive conditions. It should cover sexual assault (attempted rape, kissing / touching, forcing someone to perform oral sex / touching) as well as rape. Under UN regulations, all sexual activity with someone under the age of 18 is considered to be sexual abuse;
* Sexual harassment: a continuum of unacceptable and unwelcome behaviours and practices of a sexual nature that may include, but are not limited to, sexual suggestions or demands, requests for sexual favours and sexual, verbal or physical conduct or gestures, that are or might reasonably be perceived as offensive or humiliating.

There are strong links between power and safeguarding from SEAH. If a person has more power, they have more opportunity to exploit, abuse and harass others. If a person has less power, they are more likely to be targeted for exploitation, abuse, and harassment. These people tend to include children, women, and other marginalised groups, for example indigenous groups.

**Application**

This policy applies to all Cefas staff and our partners.

**Monitoring**

As UK government policy develops in this area from guidance issued by the FCDO in November 2022, this policy will be updated as required to ensure Cefas’ is compliant

**Reporting**

If you become aware of suspicions or complaints of safeguarding / SEAH, you will take swift and appropriate action to stop harm occurring, investigate and report to relevant authorities (for criminal matters) when safe to do so and after considering the wishes of the survivor. You will also promptly contact Cefas at [cefas.safeguarding@cefas.gov.uk](mailto:cefas.safeguarding@cefas.gov.uk) to report any allegation credible enough to warrant an investigation of SEAH related to this arrangement as well as any allegation credible enough to warrant an investigation of SEAH that are not directly related to this arrangement but would be of significant impact to the partnership with FCDO. It is understood and accepted that your arrangement to report on SEAH is subject to not compromising the safety, security, privacy and due process rights of any concerned person.