

Science, Trust and Public Engagement – exploring future pathways to good governance

Questions and answers arising from information session on 7 September 2010

Project Governance	
1.1 Who is the steering group and how will it be formed?	<p>A small (4-5 person) management team will be formed, to which the provider will report, formed of representatives of Sciencewise-ERC, BIS and other key interests. Task and finish groups may also be convened around key questions of inquiry, or activities.</p> <p>The project will also seek wider involvement of key stakeholders and experts (on functions such as: identifying issues, framing the debates, encouraging wider engagement within sectors, contributing ideas, having oversight of quality etc). We would be interested to hear ideas from potential providers for how the project might substantively include a broader range of stakeholders, and how the principles of participatory, inclusive and creative decision making can be designed into the project governance itself.</p>
1.2 Will decision making be devolved to the steering group?	Decision making will be with the management team mentioned in 1.1. However, in the spirit of a project looking at participative decision making, we will be interested to explore internal mechanisms for keeping wider interests engaged and some initial ideas have been listed in the Tech Spec.
Phases 1 and 2	
2.1 Should proposals for Phase 1 include ideas for Phase 2?	<p>Due to time restrictions Phase 1 and 2 processes are likely to have to run in parallel, rather than consecutively (NB including the synthesis of Phase 2 activities by possible extension, Phase 1 activities may run to the end of March 2011). Therefore Sciencewise-ERC is already exploring possible policy champions who are willing to lead relevant, short lifetime experiments / action research projects and some may be brought on stream from November onwards.</p> <p>This contract covers Phase 1 alone, however we will expect the Phase 1 process to help identify policy champions, sponsors and ideas for Phase 2 funding, take advantage of any ideas and issues emerging from Phase 2 pilots and (through a potential £10k extension), manage the cross cutting synthesis of learning from the Phase 2 projects, should these go ahead.</p> <p>Phase 2 projects will be procured separately, though it is not impossible that a Phase 1 provider might be contracted by a policy sponsor to support an element of the Phase 2 work.</p>
2.2 What will be the nature of Phase 2 projects?	Relevant, short lifetime experiments / action research projects, maybe 4 or 5 in total, ideally with government body sponsors / champions.

2.3 How will Phase 2 projects be decided?	A transparent process will be designed to assess and select the best projects for Phase 2 funding.
Timing	
3.1 Does Phase One end in January or March 2011?	Potential providers may propose activities after January 2011. Including the synthesis of Phase 2 activities by possible extension, Phase 1 activities may run to the end of March 2011. One possible indicative timetable is given at the end of this document.
3.2 Can the project be stretched beyond March 2011?	There is currently no commitment to funding Sciencewise-ERC or this project beyond 31st March 2011. All costs supported by Sciencewise-ERC will have to be incurred and defrayed by the end of March 2011. Organisations that are working on related issues, and who are likely to be able to provide a longer term home for this process and the debates and ideas generated, should make this clear in their bid as this will offer extra value to the process outputs.
3.3 How might funds be disbursed / managed given the tight time tables?	See answer to 2.3. We would expect any out sourced components to be small enough in contract size to be activated quickly.
Process	
4.1 How can broad based participation by thinkers and experts be incentivised / paid – what if they have been put off by not winning in the competitive tendering process?	The Technical Specification suggests a portion of the funds for the project might be set aside to fund smaller projects or pieces of work. They might also be used to incentivise attendance in key work streams, so that a wider group of stakeholders can be engaged. We welcome ideas from potential providers on how a broad based, inclusive, engaging process can be designed.
4.2 Should the public be involved?	Phase 1 is conceived of as a stakeholder engagement process. However we do want this phase to take into account the public's views, if possible. We therefore don't discount but welcome ideas for bringing the public's views into Phase 1, including use of already documented views, involving interested publics as stakeholders and or where and how it might be useful to engage the wider public in certain Phase 2 activities. Phase 2 projects / trials may include greater public involvement.
4.3 Will being on a tender from a consortium preclude involvement in other ways in the project if that consortium is not successful?	No

Project content	
5.1 Reference is made to governance, what exactly is meant by governance in this context?	<p>The 'questions for inquiry' in 1.5 of the extract from the Proposed Technical Specification , together with the context sections (1.2) aim to give a sense of what the project means by governance, however we would welcome views of potential providers as to other key questions / areas of inquiry that they feel are relevant and should be included.</p> <p>Areas of inquiry should be relevant to policy and governance of decisions involving science and technology over the next ten years. It is likely the project will need to begin by commissioning a number of short reviews / horizon scanning processes, and interviewing key civil servants and thought leaders to identify exactly where there is specific need and demand.</p>
5.2 Can the contractor have opinions on the issues raised, or should they be neutral?	<p>The contractor (or consortia) should have process skills for convening thought leadership and development processes, but would also be expected to have content knowledge on the key governance issues related to science, technology and complexity. We would expect the contractor to manage these dual roles without the latter dominating the former. This will include playing an active role in developing the agenda on the content of the project, and to help refine the project questions and lines of inquiry (in partnership with the management team, and any other advisory structures and processes).</p>
5.3 Is there an interest in international aspects?	<p>It may be useful to inform the project with international best practice or international experience, but there is unlikely to be time to commission any primary research or process work in other countries. This project must be primarily relevant to the UK governance context, and where appropriate and feasible within the budget constraints the EU governance process where relevant policies, regulations and guidelines are devolved.</p>
5.4 Should the project focus on very practical solutions and ideas for policy makers to help create change in the way government works, or more blue sky 'whizzy' concepts that may have less realistic application?	<p>The aim is to build on the learning of the last (10) years in order to generate and (begin to) test ideas that can be used by government, potentially leading to institutional and cultural change and development. A part of this process might be a creative process to identify the latest thinking or ideas about both the needs and issues to be addressed and potential solutions to those.</p>
5.5 The brief is very open. Are you open to the suggestion of a particular focus or foci for the inquiry?	<p>Yes, the brief is deliberately left open and potential providers can suggest both a mode of working and a particular focus or foci for inquiry, provided that they are within the remit of the technical specification.</p>

<p>5.6 What kind of knowledge should emerge from Phase 1? For example, would the various sponsors be more interested in quantities (e.g. what are the numbers of different interest groups that might be interested in getting involved, and in which issues)? Or more interested in qualitative stories, helping understand attitudes and desires to science, (dis)trust and participation?</p>	<p>We want the evidence to be presented in the most appropriate and useful way as judged by the contractor. All potential bidders are aware of the requirements of the technical specification, and it will be up to them in the bidding process to assure of the quality of their suggested solution.</p> <p>Sections 2.4 and 2.6 of the Technical Specification give some indication of the expected outputs from the project. This project should not overly focus on generating primary research findings from the views and opinions of the public. However, some degree of public engagement may be appropriate, as indicated in the answer to Q4.2 above, to ensure that new policy ideas or experiments are grounded in reality and take on a wide range of views. Given the early, exploratory nature of the project, and the existence of other opinion poll type research, it is likely that qualitative rather than quantitative results would be more useful.</p>
<p>5.7 What stakeholder groups, or kinds of people, should be involved in Phase 1?</p>	<p>Some indications are given in Section 1.4 of the Technical Specification.</p>
<p>Consortia</p>	
<p>6.1 Should a bidding organization have all partners and competencies identified in the PQQ?</p>	<p>(see also question 9.1) This is not essential. Potential providers can indicate at A8 in the PQQ that they are Type A (supply chain in place) or Type B (unable to confirm all subcontractors, but methodology for procuring the supply chain identified in A10. As in the note to question A9 of the PQQ, this does not have to include sub-contractors who may be identified through the course of the work to provide materials or contributions.</p>
<p>6.2 Can organizations be on more than one bid?</p>	<p>Organisations can be a sub-contractor on more than one bid.</p>
<p>Pricing</p>	
<p>7.1 How should staff costs be presented in the full tenders?</p>	<p>Those invited to submit a full bid will be asked to submit their day rates. Value for money will be an element of the scoring process.</p>

Information on Pre Qualification Questionnaire	
8.1 Questions in section C and E require detailed information on both the main contractor and the sub-contractors. What percentage of the work would the sub-contractor have to be doing on the project to have to include that information on the PPQ?	Subcontractors that are included in table A8 should be included in Sections C and E. (see also answer to question 6.1 As an absolute minimum, sections C and E should include information about the lead provider. If selected to tender, information about sub-contractors would then be required to demonstrate that they are suitably qualified.
8.2 If work is being undertaken with a university, do the questions relate to the university a whole?	The questions should be applied to the University Department or Unit that will be undertaking the work.

An indicative timetable for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Science, Trust and Public Engagement activity

	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
Phase 1							
Procurement							
Activities							
Synthesis and conclusions							
Potential extension for Phase 2							
Phase 2 – initial examples being identified by Sciencewise-ERC							
Identification							
Approval by management team and BIS							
Procurement							
Activities							
Phase 2 – examples identified in conjunction with Phase 1							
Identification							
Approval by management team and BIS							
Procurement							
Activities							
Evaluation							
Procurement							
Phase 1							
Phase 2 “mini-projects”							

Potential initial input from Phase 1