
Appendix 3: Terms of reference

Public Deliberation on Trade Policy, Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy

Bid Pack

Document 3 – Statement of Requirements

Contract Reference: US_22138

**Contract Reference: Public Deliberation on Trade Policy,
Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy**

Contents

1.	Sussex Background Information	3
2.	Working Arrangements	5
3.	Project Scope and Requirements	5
4.	Milestones	10
5.	Performance Review	11
6.	Contract	11

Statement of Requirements for the provision of: PUBLIC DELIBERATION ON UK TRADE POLICY

- PLEASE TREAT THE CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT AS CONFIDENTIAL, AND UTILISE IT ONLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING A TENDER SUBMISSION TO THE UNIVERSITY.

-

1.0 Sussex Background Information

The University of Sussex is a leading higher education and research institution near Brighton, in the south of England. Sussex was the first of the new wave of UK universities founded in the 1960s, receiving its Royal Charter in 1961. Sussex is a leading research University, as reflected in the 2021 Research Excellence Framework (REF). 89 per cent of research activity at Sussex is categorised as world leading (4*) or internationally excellent (3*) in terms of originality, significance and rigour. In addition, 93 per cent of research impact at Sussex is assessed to be ‘outstanding’ or ‘very considerable’.

The University of Sussex has over 18,000 students, of which over a third are postgraduates. Creative thinking, pedagogic diversity, intellectual challenge and inter-disciplinarily have always been fundamental to a Sussex education.

Our goal is to deliver teaching and learning programmes that are informed by current research, are attractive to students from all socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, and which deliver skills for life.

Our 12 schools of studies, Doctoral School and research groups form the academic heart of the University, driving forward academic development in research and teaching and fostering an interdisciplinary approach to study.

Please go to the link below to find out more information about the University.

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/aboutus/>

1.1 Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy background information.

The Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy (CITP) is a major new research centre, which started in April 2022 and aims to be a centre of excellence for innovative trade policy research. It is the first Centre dedicated to trade policy to be funded by the Economic and Social Research Council. The CITP is built on the precept that trade policy should be inclusive in both policy formulation and outcome.

Having left the EU, the UK is now in the position for the first time in more than 45 years of being able to devise and implement its own trade policy. At the same time, international trade is changing rapidly and becoming more complex with the world trading system facing major challenges such as COVID-19, trade wars and the use of economic sanctions, transformational digital technology and climate change.

UK policy decisions made now will shape social, economic and welfare outcomes for generations across the United Kingdom. Formulating an effective trade policy that delivers for all parts of society in such circumstances requires an evidence-based interdisciplinary approach, founded on consolidated and independent research expertise. It needs the CITP.

The Centre will build permanent capacity by developing a community of scholars and practitioners with the knowledge, skills and mutual understanding to develop robust trade policy in a changing world.

The Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy aims to equip the UK with the capability to formulate and implement a trade policy tailored to the needs of the whole of the UK while recognising the importance of the multilateral trading system and the UK's role within it.

With a commitment to hearing the voices of all parts of UK society, the Centre's activities will include:

- Conducting innovative disciplinary and interdisciplinary research into international trade and policy
- Creating a body of data and frontier empirical methods
- Applying research skills to pressing practical trade problems
- Working extensively to inform public debate and understanding of trade policy issues
- Engaging with a wide range of policymakers and stakeholders.

The CITP has three research themes:

- **People, Firms and Places** studies the differential impact of trade across locations, firms and individuals in the four nations of the UK, and how external factors such as Brexit, Covid-19 and the rise of China affect the UK economy.
- **Digitisation and Technical Change** considers how governments wrestle with huge platform companies, and how digital trade affects labour markets, business models and value chains, and their regulation.
- **Negotiating a Turbulent World** asks how to formulate UK trade policy given the obstacles to trading across the UK's internal borders, international regulatory challenges, the need for environmental sustainability and the interaction between trade and investment.

Led by the University of Sussex, the Centre itself is inclusive. It comprises researchers in all four UK nations - and several overseas universities - in five disciplines and at all stages of their careers to create the UK's first interdisciplinary and international research centre in international trade.

In addition to the universities, the Centre will work with nine partners including Ernst & Young LLP (EY), Fieldfisher LLP, the International Trade Group of the Professional and Business Services Council, the British Chambers of Commerce, the Trade Justice Movement and trade officials in all four UK administrations.

2.0 Working Arrangements

The Supplier will complete the work captured in this document to an agreed schedule of dates. It is expected that the works identified will be rationalised into works packages with delivery dates agreed with the University for their completion. The supplier will be expected to liaise with different departments and stakeholders as required in order to gather any relevant information to deliver the works packages.

Employment Status - The Supplier is required to confirm that any resources that are allocated to this work are employed directly and included on Payroll with deduction of PAYE and NIC on all earnings. The University has no liability for payment of tax or national insurance in respect of these individuals.

Location of work – This will be a combination of physical meetings and remote working. The University expects that the Supplier will ensure this balance is effectively managed by the Supplier based on requirements and demand. Visits to and working from University site(s) are not anticipated to be required; however, should budget constraints dictate, the Universities of Sussex, Cardiff and Belfast will be considered as possible venues.

Equipment – The supplier will be expected to provide all IT and telephony equipment necessary to complete the works packages. Any compatibility issues are to be resolved by the supplier with the support of the appropriate University department.

3.0 Project Scope and Requirements

The Centre for Inclusive Trade Policy (CITP) is looking to commission a package of qualitative deliberative research on public attitudes towards UK trade policy. Our interest is in attitudes towards the basic structure of trade/trade policy and, in particular, the unavoidable choices and trade-offs it requires.

Topic:

Our project is framed as decisively ‘post-Brexit’. While understanding how participants voted in the referendum will remain significant, we do not want to frame the discussion and deliberation in terms of Brexit positions (although, of course, participants may raise them spontaneously). Thus, for example, in terms of the background information we provide, in contrast to some past deliberative research projects, we do not anticipate engaging ‘pro’ and ‘anti’ Brexit advocates in the name of impartiality. Aiming to tap into basic attitudes to trade and trade policy should allow us both to avoid priming the discussion for attitudes towards the EU and the UK’s relationship with it and becoming embroiled in whatever trade negotiations may be current at the time the research is conducted.

We do want to explore attitudes across the four nations/jurisdictions that make up the UK, to look for patterns of similarity and difference. Although it should not be a primary framing concern, we are also interested in attitudes to who should provide input to or participate in trade negotiations processes (UK and devolved governments, legislatures, businesses, trade unions, civil society organisations).

Format:

We are open to considering a range of possible modes (in-person or on-line) and formats (deliberative workshops, citizen juries, citizen assemblies) for this qualitative work. Each has its own strengths and weaknesses. They range from a single large-scale Citizens' Assembly-type in person event (which might make it difficult to cover the 4 nations/jurisdictions) to 5 parallel workshops or streams of workshops or juries (one workshop/jury or stream each in Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and two in England). Multiple meetings of the same jury would probably mean meeting on-line. It will also raise questions about attrition of membership, which we would expect contractors to address.

Purpose:

The CITP is a multi-year ESRC-funded research centre – this project is an important early element in its work. The project will help to set the tone for the Centre, for which 'inclusiveness' is a keyword. Digging in to public understanding of trade policy and orientations towards trade and trade policy, this project aims to provide an initial set of qualitative insights into what people understand about the policy area and the choices and trade-offs it entails. We are guided by two research questions – (a) what choices do people make when faced with complex trade policy trade-offs? (b) who do they trust to inform or make these choices?

Themes and questions:

We are interested in how people think their way through trade-offs, but we also believe that many of the trade-offs we seek to explore are essentially quantitative – what we might accept to create 2,000 new jobs we would not accept for 20 new jobs. We would welcome proposals about how these two perspectives might be combined in a deliberative process

We are tentatively planning a set of five workstreams (set out below) for each jury of the 4 nations in the United Kingdom around the following themes and questions, with each workstream covering the following areas:

1. Balancing trade between territory and sectors of the economy
 2. UK trade policy's impact on the wider world
 3. Food and Environmental Standards
 4. Privacy and data [or anything else that touches on the service side of things]
 5. Who should make the trade-offs that trade policy forces upon us
-
1. Balancing trade between territory and sectors of the economy
 - If increasing trade stimulates innovation and gives access to more innovations from abroad, are we willing to bear the adjustment costs that increased trade entails?
 - Loss of some jobs (wages) in return for lower prices for consumers and/or more jobs (wages) **in another sector of the economy** [e.g. fewer farmers, but more service trade...]

-
- Loss of some jobs (wages) in return for lower prices for consumers and/or more jobs (wages) **in another part of the UK** [e.g. fewer farmers in rural areas, but more service trade...]
 - And how can/should government(s) respond to these trade-offs (compensation, helping with adjustment costs, general support for those falling on hard times, etc. ?)
2. UK trade policy's impact on the wider world
 - To what extent should trading with a nation depend on its human rights performance?
 - If enforcing net-zero for carbon emissions cuts imports from poor countries, is that OK? Do we need to offer some form of compensation to those countries?
 - What are the limits of our willingness to accept international (or simply foreign) arbitration/settlements of trade disputes? What if without this, trade fails to grow significantly?
 - Governments sometimes constrain exports of essential goods (foods, components for vaccines, vaccines). Would we support an international agreement that made doing so significantly more difficult?
 3. Food and Environmental Standards
 - Erosion of food standards/environmental standards/animal welfare in return for lower prices for consumers and/or more jobs (wages) elsewhere.
 - If other countries are willing to endure lower standards of, say, air pollution, than we accept in order to make their goods cheaper, should we be willing to accept their goods? What if they are very poor countries?
 - If food is cheaper if we import it (for a given quality), are we willing to see self-sufficiency eroded and some farms going out of business (or switching to providing environmental benefits rather than food)?
 4. Privacy and data [or anything else that touches on the service side of things]
 - Business almost universally wants to see easier regulations for the transfer of data abroad; Privacy advocates want to see tougher regulations. Where does our jury come out?
 - To what extent should exchanging data with a nation depend on its human rights performance in the areas that might be affected by data transfer?
 - Trading services with another country often entails recognising their standards or qualifications as equivalent to our own. Should we be willing to accept this if those standards are not clearly as demanding as ours? Or if they are clearly a bit below ours?
 5. Who should make the trade-offs that trade policy forces upon us:
 - Whose voices (business, local government, trade unions, civil society org etc.) should be consulted/listened to in deciding trade policy?
 - How should the views of the potential losers from a piece of trade policy be considered?
 - Should trade policy be up to government or parliament?
 - Should each UK nation have veto power over any trade policy or any trade agreement?

Requirements:

The CITP is looking for a contractor to take responsibility for all aspects of the full set of meetings, including selecting and maintaining the sample, making any arrangements necessary for the meetings,

providing facilitators and note-takers (recorders), producing a thorough final report and giving access to raw results as far as is consistent with the protection of personal data. It is possible that a contractor may need to subcontract for one region, but we would expect a strong degree of commonality across all regions.

The CITP will provide the trade expertise, the nature of which will be determined jointly between the contractor and the CITP. CITP will also interpret the results and produce its own academic outputs based on them. We anticipate that each regional jury will be drawn from a restricted area, in order that participants have some common understandings about their circumstances, but they are expected to be reasonably broad based. While we accept that this exercise will not be nationally representative, it must be informative and illustrative of regional differences and of differences across between different economics and social circumstances.

Deliverables:

- A. Organise, facilitate and document deliberative workshops/meetings or Citizen Juries/assemblies in
 - a. Northern Ireland (1),
 - b. Scotland (1)
 - c. Wales (1)
 - d. England (2).

Each jury can be either as singular one event or as a set of 5 workstreams but we would anticipate the same approach across all four nations.

- B. Provide a full set of raw results consistent with the protection of personal data
- C. Produce a thorough quality final report

Criteria:

Quality/Technical Criteria	Weighting	Minimum Score Required (60%)
Team – qualifications, experience	15%	9%
Quality of proposal		
(a) Originality, feasibility, analytical thoroughness, coverage of CITP objectives	50%	30%
(b) Effectiveness of delivery plans	20%	12%

The overall Quality/Technical pass mark to be considered for the commercial portion of the tender is 51% (which represents 60% of the total score available for this section).

Price, relative to nature of the project	15%	N/A
--	-----	-----

Team (15%):

At a minimum,

- the experience and qualifications of the Team Leader and the group leaders
- internal arrangements for quality control and

- the organisation’s previous experience in conducting this kind of research with universities. Please quote at least two examples from recent years.

Further details of the internal support for the Team in terms specialist advice would be welcome.

Quality (a) Originality, feasibility, analytical thoroughness, coverage of CITP objectives (50%)

We will be assessing the ability of bidders to

- understand this Statement of Works and the objectives of this research
- provide engaging ways of providing information to participants, including working with CITP on what to provide,
- organise sessions such that participants remain engaged
- elicit answers to the questions we have posed, including any necessary re-expression of the questions
- monitor the progress of the exercise and propose any necessary adjustments
- produce a quality report on the exercise

Quality (b) Effectiveness of delivery plans (20%)

Do bidders have credible plans to

- Deliver sessions to multiple juries
- Deal with potential attrition of the samples
- Produce final materials on time
- Process personal data in a compliant way (this is a pass/fail question)

Price and Value for Money (15%):

- Price will be marked using proportionate pricing. The lowest priced bid will receive the full 15 marks, all other bids will then be marked as:

-

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Compliant Bid}}{\text{Other Supplier's Compliant Bid}} \times 15\%$$

- Proportionate Pricing example

Supplier	Price	Formula	Marks %
1 (lowest bid)	£120,000	15 * 120/120	15.0
2	£130,000	15 * 120/130	13.8
3	£150,000	15 * 120/150	12.0

-

Provided the highest scoring submission on the Quality/Technical section is no more than £10,000 more expensive than the lowest compliant bid, the University reserves the right to select that submission.

4.0 Milestones

Fees are payable upon the delivery of fixed milestones. The University shall pay certain milestone payments following the occurrence of milestone events, as set forth in the table below.

Milestones	Proportion of Payment	Description	Acceptance Criteria	Completion Date
Milestone 1	20%	All materials finally approved, prepared and ready for sessions (Draft documentation should be submitted prior to this date)	Written approval by a University Officer	16 th December 2022
Milestone 2	20%	Session 1 completed across all juries	Written approval by a University Officer	31 st January 2023
Milestone 3	20%	All sessions completed	Written approval by a University Officer	15 th March 2023
Milestone 4	40%	Final report and raw results delivered	Written approval by a University Officer	31 st March 2023

If, due to unforeseen circumstances, Milestone 2 is missed, the Supplier will be allowed to receive this payment in combination with the payment for Milestone 3, provided that all sessions are completed by the deadline for Milestone 3.

5.0 Performance Review

The Supplier shall ensure effective and proactive management and control of project activities and perform quality control reviews for the works packages being delivered. During the engagement period, the Supplier must provide regular updates to the University to report on the status and progress of the project against planned deliverables.

The Supplier is required to provide the University with a formal procedure for dealing with complaints and underperformance, to include timescales for responses and resolution. The procedure should have clearly indicated amounts of time to be owned by increasingly more senior officers in the supplier's company for attempts at resolution.

6.0 Contract

University of Sussex General Conditions of Purchase of Consultancy Services will be in place for this work package. If there is a conflict between anything included within your response and the contract terms, then the latter shall prevail.

