



15 December 2023



Ref: OIA-2023/24-0296

Dear 

Official Information Act request for information relating to strengthening resilience against disinformation.

Thank you for your Official Information Act 1982 (the Act) request received on 16 November 2023. You requested:

“On the DPMC website there is the following page: <https://www.dPMC.govt.nz/our-programmes/national-security/strengthening-resilience-disinformation>. Under the heading "Governments role" three initiatives are mentioned.

The first initiative is: [Convening a civil society-led group to scope longer-term work](#)

1) I would like to know if any of the members receive any payment for being part of the group.

2) I would also like to know what the process was for selecting members of the group.

The second is: [Support for capacity-building and community resilience](#)

in this initiative a "fund" is mentioned. The fund is in 2 phases.

1) I would like to know the total value of the fund.

2) I would like to know from which person or group within DPMC the decision to create this fund came from.

3) I would like to know what governmental oversight exists for this fund.

The third initiative is: [Commissioning public research and analysis into the problem](#)

This involves reports from two different organisations the University of Auckland's HEIA team and the UK company "Logically".

1) I would like to know the cost of these reports.

2) I would also like to see the terms of reference for the two organisations undertaking these reports.”

For ease of response, I have addressed each of your questions in turn.

The first initiative is: [Convening a civil society-led group to scope longer-term work](#)

1) I would like to know if any of the members receive any payment for being part of the group.

Most members of the group receive payment for their work in the Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG). The Cabinet Fees Framework was adopted in determining payments to members of the MSG. Members of the group work for an hourly fee rate of \$65.62 excluding GST, and the Co-Chairs work for an hourly fee rate of \$116.15 excluding GST.

2) I would also like to know what the process was for selecting members of the group.

The MSG acts as an advisory group to the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), and members were therefore selected by DPMC. Members were selected for their experience and expertise, and on the basis that they each bring different perspectives to the discussion.

Members of the MSG were appointed in their individual capacity, not as representatives of an institution, organisation or representative of a group or community.

A Terms of Reference (TOR) was prepared for the MSG, which is publicly available at the following link:

<https://www.dpmc.govt.nz/system/files/2023-11/multi-stakeholder-group-terms-of-reference.pdf>

The second is: Support for capacity-building and community resilience in this initiative a "fund" is mentioned. The fund is in 2 phases.

1) I would like to know the total value of the fund.

The total value of the fund is \$750,000. Applications for this fund are being assessed in two phases. Phase 1 is complete, and the successful projects are named at the following link:

[Successful initiatives of the one-off fund to build resilience to disinformation \(Phase 1\) » InternetNZ](#)

Applications for Phase 2 of the fund are currently being reviewed and the initiatives will be announced in early 2024.

In addition, there is funding for practitioner risk management and for collaboration between organisations and individuals who have been funded. There is also funding for InternetNZ to manage, administer and monitor the grants process.

The total budget for all these activities is \$1 million.

2) I would like to know from which person or group within DPMC the decision to create this fund came from.

In December 2022 Cabinet made the decision to fund three 'interim initiatives' which included the fund in question at the request of the Minister for National Security and Intelligence at the time, Rt Hon Dame Jacinda Ardern. Those decisions were reaffirmed by her successor, Rt Hon Chris Hipkins, in March 2023.

The National Security Group within DPMC has a coordinating role to implement these initiatives.

3) I would like to know what governmental oversight exists for this fund.

The intent of the fund is that decisions on funding should not be made by the government but are made by InternetNZ, as an independent non-governmental organisation. InternetNZ has discretion over funding decisions; DPMC maintains oversight through the contract management process, while remaining at arm's length from the fund and not intervening in funding decisions.

The third initiative is: Commissioning public research and analysis into the problem This involves reports from two different organisations the University of Aucklands HEIA team and the UK company "Logically".

1) I would like to know the cost of these reports.

Following a Requests for Proposal (RFP) process, DPMC concluded contracts with *Logically* and *Hate and Extremism Insights Aotearoa*, up to the value of \$286,500 and \$284,304

respectively for reporting – provided that those suppliers fulfil the terms of their contract and produce all the contracted deliverables.

Following this RFP, the suppliers were selected by an independent evaluation panel. DPMC carried out extensive reviews and legal assessments to ensure it complies with public sector standards, best practice and the Privacy Act 2020:

- Only publicly available data will be collected.
- No data from private messages will be collected.
- All collected data will be anonymised so that individuals cannot be identified, and reports will focus on high-level trends.
- Under no circumstances shall the supplier send or disclose raw data to DPMC, including any containing personal information.
- Both suppliers were required to undertake privacy impact assessments and must comply with the relevant public sector codes and standards.

2) I would also like to see the terms of reference for the two organisations undertaking these reports.

No TOR were prepared for *Logically* or *Hate and Extremism Insights Aotearoa* in the context of this work, because they were engaged through a procurement process which does not involve TOR. Therefore, this part of your request is refused under section 18(e) of the Act, as the documents requested do not exist.

Those services were procured through a thorough RFP process. An RFP was prepared, and a copy is attached for you.

You have the right to ask the Ombudsman to investigate and review my decision under section 28(3) of the Act.

This response will be published on the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet's website during our regular publication cycle. Typically, information is released monthly, or as otherwise determined. Your personal information including name and contact details will be removed for publication.

Yours sincerely



Julian Grey
Acting Executive Director
National Security Group



DEPARTMENT OF THE
PRIME MINISTER AND CABINET
TE TARI O TE PIRIMIA ME TE KOMITI MATUA

Request for Proposal (RFP)

by: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet

for: Insights to build an empirical picture of the disinformation landscape

GETS Reference: 27388193

RFP released:	15 05 2023
Deadline for Questions:	5pm 31 05 2023
Deadline for Proposals:	5pm 08 06 2023

Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet
Parliament Buildings
Wellington 6011

The opportunity

This RFP is issued by The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC), referred to below as “the Buyer” or “we” or “us”.

What we need

Disinformation is not a new issue. But the way that people around the world access and consume information has changed radically in the last few decades. In Aotearoa there is growing concern about the effects of disinformation, but there is also awareness that intervention against disinformation can create privacy and human rights risks. The government is seeking to support a “whole-of-society” approach to build understanding and resilience against the harms of disinformation, that can be led primarily by those outside government. This approach includes commissioning reporting to build a transparent empirical foundation for any policy response; enhancing community capacity and capability outside of government; and promoting civil society leadership.

This RFP seeks insights services on a temporary short-term basis (contract terms can range from a few months up to one year) with a view to promoting good practice and a diversity of contributions to a holistic, accurate, and trustworthy picture of the online information environment in New Zealand, in ways that are rigorous and capable of robust testing. The reporting produced as a result of this RFP is intended to be released publicly. DPMC is aware that this kind of work is a matter of evolving best practice, and while we will scrutinise proposed solutions carefully, we are realistic about the need to support a developing community of local practitioners.

For the purposes of this RFP:

Disinformation is false or modified information knowingly and deliberately shared to cause harm or achieve a broader aim.

Misinformation is information that is false or misleading, though not created or shared with the direct intention of causing harm.

This RFP is primarily focused on disinformation, but acknowledges that reporting may cover a wider spectrum of false and misleading information.

What we don't want

The protection and promotion of human rights, including freedom of expression, a diverse range of views, and rights to privacy, are critical to this work programme. Any solutions must proactively incorporate structures and safeguards designed to build public trust and confidence and enable robust testing of data collection, analysis, and conclusions. We are reluctant to procure solutions that rely on proprietary systems or commercial secrets, while understanding the limitations faced by providers in terms of transparency and disclosure. We do not want solutions oriented toward intervention in disinformation, reporting particular instances of disinformation to platforms or governments, or censorship. We also do not want broad collection of communications in ways that are not rationally connected to the outcomes sought in this RFP. All providers are expected to have assessed their solution for compliance with legal and privacy risks, and short-listed providers are likely to have their solutions tested for legal and privacy compliance as part of this procurement process.

What's important to us?

The Annex includes a list of key questions that we will consider when reviewing providers' proposed solutions, capability, capacity, and track record. The Buyer is looking for providers who have the capability, experience, and infrastructure to deliver the services. They need to have a good track record in delivering similar services in the context of the unique New Zealand environment. Delivery in full, on time, as per specifications (DIFOTIS) is important to us.

Successful providers will act with integrity and use data collection methods that align with the model standards for information gathering published by the Public Service Commission, and produce reporting suitable for public release and consumption.

Why should you bid?

This is a unique opportunity to support and inform an evidence-based, whole-of-society response to disinformation. The analysis and insights that you provide will contribute to building and maintaining a strategic picture of the disinformation context and inform a whole-of-society strategy to build resilience to the potential harms of disinformation.

A bit about us

DPMC's work is all about ensuring New Zealanders live in a country that is ambitious, resilient, and well-governed. DPMC's overall area of responsibility is in helping to provide, at an administrative level, the 'constitutional and institutional glue' that underlies our system of parliamentary democracy. DPMC is a mid-sized agency of eight business units, with approximately 275 staff in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch. We have a unique role as the trusted advisor, leader, and steward of our system of executive government.

The National Security Group is a business unit within DPMC that provides leadership, advice, support and coordination of the Government's national security priorities and risks. This includes leadership to strengthen national resilience, develop situational understanding, and improve coordination and collaboration on nationally significant issues.

SECTION 1: Key Information

1.1 Context

- a. This Request for Proposals (RFP) is an invitation to submit a proposal for insights into the disinformation landscape in Aotearoa.
- b. This RFP is a single-step procurement process.

1.2 Our timeline

Here is our timeline for this RFP (all are New Zealand times and dates):

Deadline for Questions	5pm 31 May 2023
Deadline for us to answer questions	6 June 2023
Deadline for Proposals	5pm 8 June 2023
Presentations by shortlisted Respondents (indicative and if required)	15 - 22 June 2023
Successful Respondent(s) notified (indicative)	23 June 2023
Expected Contract agreed and signed (indicative)	28 June 2023
Expected start date of Contract (indicative)	30 July 2023

1.3 How to contact us

- a. Contact us through the Government Electronic Tenders System (GETS).

1.4 Developing and submitting your Proposal

- a. This is an open competitive tender process.
- b. Take time to read and understand the RFP.
- c. Take time to understand our Requirements. These are in SECTION 2: of this document.
- d. Take time to understand how your Proposal will be evaluated. See SECTION 3: of this document.
- e. For resources on tendering visit <https://www.procurement.govt.nz/suppliers-2/>
- f. If you have questions, please direct them through GETS before the Deadline for Questions (see Section 1.2 above).
- g. Use the Response Form available to download at GETS to submit your Proposal. Please note that price will not be a weighted criterion. Instead, price will be taken into account in determining overall value for money over the whole-of-life of the contract.
- h. Complete and sign the declaration at the end of the Response Form.
- i. Check you have provided all the necessary information in the correct format and order.
- j. Submit your Proposal before the Deadline for Proposals.

1.5 Address for submitting your Proposal

Submit your Proposal using the GETS platform. If you have technical problems in uploading your proposal on GETS, please send your Proposal to procurement@dpmc.govt.nz

We will not accept Proposals sent by post or delivered to our office.

Make sure you include all attachments and reference material. Make sure all pricing information is in a separate file.

1.6 Our RFP Terms

a. Offer Validity Period

By submitting a Proposal, the Respondent agrees that their offer will remain open for 6 calendar months from the Deadline for Proposals.

b. RFP Terms

By submitting a proposal, the Respondent agrees to the RFP-Terms described in SECTION 6: .

Remember, if a Respondent commits a non-trivial breach of the RFP-Terms, we may exclude them from further participation in the RFP process, whether or not that requirement is contractually binding.

1.7 Later changes to the RFP or RFP process

- a. After publishing the RFP, if we need to change anything or provide additional information, we will let all Respondents know by placing a notice on GETS or contacting Respondents by email.
- b. If you downloaded the RFP from GETS you will automatically receive notifications of any changes through GETS.

1.8 Defined terms

These are shown using capitals. You can find all definitions at the back of the RFP-Terms.

SECTION 2: Our Requirements

2.1 Background

This request for trustworthy and transparent insights reporting will complement a greater programme of work to strengthen our national capacity to identify and address disinformation. The government is seeking to support a “whole-of-society” approach to build understanding and resilience against the harms of disinformation, that can be led primarily by those outside government. This approach recognises the need to maintain an open internet and uphold the right to freedom of expression.

[The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet has a coordinating role to support the development of this whole-of-society approach](#), with three key initiatives:

Convening a civil society-led group to scope longer-term work

This group will advise the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet on options for future institution-building in civil society to strengthen resilience to disinformation. This includes exploring the design for a non-government entity to lead long term work on disinformation.

The group will be made up from members of civil society with expertise in disinformation and its impacts, including academia, media, and the legal community. Te Ao Māori perspectives and participation will be important to the group’s work.

The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet will convene the group and provide its secretariat, but will not participate as a member of the group.

Support for capacity-building and community resilience

The Government is working with civil society on the design of a one-off fund to support community projects and organisations in helping to build New Zealand’s resilience and capacity to respond to disinformation.

Commissioning public research and analysis into the problem (this RFP)

A set of reports will be commissioned to monitor and analyse Aotearoa’s online information ecosystem, and the impacts of disinformation.

These reports will be made publicly available, to help all New Zealanders to better understand the challenges of disinformation in Aotearoa, and to inform the other two workstreams.

2.2 Key outcomes

The objectives of this RFP include to:

1. Improve understanding of the problem of disinformation in Aotearoa through publicly available and robust best-practice reporting, in ways that build public trust and confidence.
2. Create the basis for enduring capability, collaboration and networks to understand disinformation outside government, based on shared evidential foundations.
3. Encourage future reporting to incorporate features that make it transparent, contestable, and rigorous, including through potential engagement with other providers, peer review, or a broader community of practice.

4. To maintain independence of reporting from government, and to maintain the basis for public trust in this reporting.
5. To confine the scope of this work to monitoring of the problem and insights into it. The public should be reassured that the purpose of this reporting is to provide information, not to inhibit or censor communications.

2.3 Reporting focus and themes

The intent of this RFP is to commission a number of reports which provide empirical and data driven insights into different dimensions of the disinformation landscape in New Zealand. We are open to commissioning overview reports, and thematic reports which cover a particular aspect of the issue; reports by single providers or by collaboration between providers; point in time snapshots or reports which illustrate change over time (within the contract term). Potential focus areas could include:

- Analysis of disinformation networks and narratives affecting New Zealand, drawing on open networks and/or, to the extent ethical and lawful, closed networks
- Reporting which explores the development of disinformation networks and narratives over time, including growth trends
- Reporting which takes an empirical, data driven approach to assessing the impact of foreign and foreign state sourced disinformation narratives on New Zealand's information networks
- Reporting which provides insights into disinformation narratives affecting the integrity and conduct of New Zealand's local and general elections
- Reporting which provides insights into the extent and impact of disinformation narratives on Māori
- Reporting which provides insights into the extent and impact of disinformation on minority communities
- Reporting which analyses the role of technology, algorithmic amplification, monetisation, media, and social media, in relation to disinformation narratives affecting New Zealand
- Reporting which provides insights into the nature and impact of disinformation narratives in non-English language media and social media in Aotearoa.

2.4 What we require from a Respondent:

a. Solution

We are seeking Respondents that:

- can provide services that meet or exceed our requirements
- can demonstrate clearly how well they understand our requirements
- provides the level of quality we require
- can articulate and mitigate risk

- can give assurance that they will keep the information they collect secure and in accordance with the Privacy Act 2020.

b. Capability

We are seeking Respondents that can

- allocate the right people to deliver the services
- demonstrate how key personnel (and subcontractors) develop and maintain a high skill set in the delivery of the requirements
- provide a description of their understanding of likely challenges and key success factors in providing these services.
- demonstrate strong awareness and experience of the unique local context for understanding disinformation in Aotearoa
- demonstrate commitment to Te Tiriti principles.

c. Capacity

We are seeking Respondents that can:

- deliver in Full on Time in Spec (DIFOTIS) in New Zealand – as per our Requirements.
- support their delivery with appropriate infrastructure (operational and financial systems to manage delivery).

d. Track record

We are interested in seeing evidence of:

- A track record of delivering similar services to the services we currently seek
- A strength in collaborating with others in the sector and community to work towards achieving the objective
- How challenges were addressed and key success factors in providing these services.

Where relevant to the provider's track record, we ask that Respondents:

- provide information that demonstrates their track record i.e. examples/case studies of previous or current contracts demonstrating their ability to meet our requirements including:
 - the contract / name of client (including contact details for reference purposes), location of contract, and dates of when the services were provided
 - a brief description of the scope of services performed (including the key service areas, and any ancillary services that were provided)
 - a brief description of how they managed the delivery of the services to the client
 - a brief commentary of the quality and timeliness of the services

- commentary on how they managed health and safety.

2.5 Other information

- The supplier may be handling sensitive information. This will be covered by the contract and consistent with the broader intent of this work to operate transparently and build public trust and confidence.
- Unless requested otherwise by the applicant, payment will be monthly on invoice.

2.6 Contract term

We anticipate that the Contract will commence 30 July 2023. There may be a range of Contract terms for a range of contract awards, from several months up to one year.

2.7 Contract value

DPMC intends to procure services from multiple suppliers, where multiple suppliers can meet our requirements. As an indication of contract value, we would anticipate a period of regular reporting for up to one year may entail a contract value of \$200 to \$450k, and for a shorter period (for example a one-off or series of thematic reports) a contract value of \$20 to \$60k. These ranges are indicative only and intended to help suppliers to scope their proposals. We will consider proposals with costings that both fall below and exceed these values.

Suppliers are expected to take responsibility for their own legal and privacy risks, including a privacy impact assessment, however the Buyer may undertake further privacy and legal risk assessment where relevant following a short-listing process.

2.8 Key deliverables

Description	Indicative date for delivery
Reports	Frequency to be agreed with successful RFP respondent (eg. regular weekly/monthly reports, one-off thematic reports etc.)

2.9 Other tender documents

These documents have been uploaded on GETS and are available to Respondents – they form part of this RFP. These include:

- RFP Response form.
- Proposed contract

SECTION 3: Our Evaluation Approach

This section sets out the Evaluation Approach that will be used to assess Proposals.

3.1 Pre-conditions

Each Proposal must meet the following pre-conditions. We will not consider Proposals which fail to meet these conditions.

#	Pre-conditions
1.	<p>Supplier must read and understand the New Zealand Government Supplier Code of Conduct, and ensure their nominated subcontractors are aware of the Code.</p> <p>Note: This code of conduct, under Labour and Human Rights – states ‘Suppliers must adhere to international human rights standards in their workplace and monitor and address these standards within their supply chain’.</p> <p>DPMC may ask respondents for evidence of compliance with this supplier code of conduct.</p>

3.2 Evaluation model

The evaluation model is **weighted attribute**. Price is not a weighted criterion. This means that each of the four criteria under section 3.3 below will be given a score between zero and 10 (as per Section 3.4) where this score will be multiplied with the weighting percentage (also section 3.3). The weighted scores for each of the four criteria will then be summarised to a final score. The price you provide will not be subject to this scoring method.

Proposals that are capable of full delivery on time will be shortlisted by score, and the Successful Respondent(s) will then be selected from the shortlist based on an overall assessment of best public value over the whole-of-life of the Contract.

3.3 Evaluation criteria

We will evaluate Proposals - which meet all pre-conditions - according to the following criteria and weightings:

Criteria	Weighting
----------	-----------

<p>1. Proposed solution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Describe how the services you offer will meet or exceed our requirements. b) Describe the level of quality of the services you offer. c) Describe your understanding of why we are seeking these services. d) Describe how you propose to work collaboratively across a number of public agencies and stakeholders. 	<p>(30%)</p>
--	---------------------

<p>2. Capability of the Respondent to deliver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Describe the capability you have in supplying the services we are seeking. b) Describe the capability of key people who will deliver the services, and their qualifications and experience (including any Biographies). Describe how many personnel will be allocated to perform the Contract (include any subcontractors), and describe how this may change and be managed throughout the delivery of the requirements. Provide your organisational chart, demonstrating how it links to the Contract. c) Describe how you ensure personnel (and subcontractors) develop and maintain a high skill set in the delivery of the required services (describe whether you provide training etc). d) If relevant, describe your subcontractor network (i.e. those services available to you with respect to the services being delivered to us). e) Describe any relevant likely challenges and key success factors in providing the services to us. Describe all significant risks associated with your solution and how you propose to mitigate them (prevent them from happening) and manage them (in the event that they do happen). 	<p>30%</p>
--	-------------------

<p>3. Capacity of the Respondent to deliver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) We are seeking proposals that can demonstrate delivery in Full on Time in Spec (DIFOTIS). Please describe how you can deliver this to us and to meet our requirements. b) Describe your capacity when it comes to interaction with public agencies and stakeholders in the delivery of the services. Describe how you manage work outside of scope, i.e. additional minor works. Include how you may engage additional adequate staff or subcontractors, balance priorities, and work with stakeholders to ensure the delivery. c) Describe how you would manage potential conflict of interests should they emerge during delivery of the services to us. 	<p>20%</p>
--	-------------------

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

4. Track record

20%

- a) We are interested in seeing evidence of:
- A track record of delivering similar services to the services we currently seek
 - A strength in collaborating with others in the sector and community to work towards achieving the objective
 - Challenges (and how these were addressed) and key success factors in providing these services.
- b) Where relevant to the provider's track record, we ask that Respondents provide information that demonstrates their track record i.e. examples/case studies of previous or current contracts demonstrating their ability to meet our requirements, including:
- the contract / name of client (including contact details for reference purposes), location of contract, and dates of when the services were provided
 - a brief description of the scope of services performed (including the key service areas, and any ancillary services that were provided)
 - a brief description of how they managed the delivery of the services to the client
 - a brief commentary of the quality and timeliness of the services
 - commentary on how they managed health and safety.

Total weightings	100%
-------------------------	-------------

3.4 Scoring

In scoring responses, the evaluation panel will use the following scoring scale:

Rating	Definition	Score
EXCELLENT	Respondent demonstrates exceptional ability, understanding, experience and skills. The Proposal identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.	9-10
GOOD	Respondent demonstrates above average ability, understanding, experience and skills. The Proposal identifies minor additional benefits, with supporting evidence.	7-8
ACCEPTABLE	Respondent demonstrates the ability to meet the criteria, with supporting evidence.	5-6

RESERVATIONS	Satisfies only a minimum of the criteria but not all. Reservations about the Respondent to adequately meet the criteria. Little supporting evidence.	3-4
SERIOUS RESERVATIONS	Extremely limited or no supporting evidence to meet the criteria. Minimum effort made to meet the criteria.	1-2
UNACCEPTABLE	Does not comply or meet the criteria at all. Insufficient information to demonstrate the criteria.	0

3.5 Price

We wish to obtain the best value-for-money over the whole-of-life of the Contract. This means achieving the right combination of solution, capability, capacity and price.

If a Respondent offers a substantially lower price than other Proposals, we may make enquiries or require additional evidence to verify that the Respondent can meet all the Requirements and conditions of the Proposed Contract for the price quoted. Note: Any claims made about price must be clear, accurate and unambiguous. Prices must include or be clear about Goods and Services Tax (GST).

3.6 Due diligence

For shortlisted Respondents, we may:

- a. reference check the Respondent and any named personnel
- b. make other checks against the Respondent e.g. a search of the Companies Office or NZBN
- c. interview Respondents
- d. request Respondents make a presentation
- e. request Respondents to brief on their intended Privacy Impact Assessment
- f. undertake a credit check
- g. undertake a Police check for all named personnel
- h. undertake further legal and privacy assessments.

SECTION 4: Pricing information

4.1 Pricing information provided by Respondents

- a. Respondents should provide a pricing schedule with a breakdown of all costs, fees, expenses and charges.
- b. where the price is based on fee rates, specify all rates, either hourly or daily or both as required.
- c. Respondents must show how they will manage risks and contingencies related to the delivery of the Requirements.
- d. Respondents must document all assumptions and dependencies that affect its pricing and/or the total cost to us. In other words, if the Respondent would expect us to pay more than the quoted price or estimate if particular assumptions or dependencies are not satisfied, the Respondent must call out those assumptions and dependencies.
- e. Respondents must tender prices in NZ\$. Unless otherwise agreed, we will arrange contractual payments in NZ\$. If there are foreign exchange implications explain how risk in foreign exchange will be dealt with.
- f. any anticipated expenses (such as travel costs for resources) should be clearly identified; and
- g. all pricing is to be exclusive of GST and other local taxes and duties. If other taxes or duties apply these should be indicated.
- h. If two or more Respondents intend to submit a joint Proposal the Pricing Schedule must include all costs, fees, expenses and charges chargeable by all Respondents. If this is the case, only the lead in the consortium will issue invoices.
- i. DPMC will expect respondents to offer a cost-effective bid. Pricing is not, though, the decisive consideration.

SECTION 5: Our Proposed Contract

5.1 Proposed Contract

The Government Model Contract for Services will be the proposed contract. This contract can be viewed at the New Zealand Government Procurement pages [HERE](#) (contract) and [HERE](#) (terms and conditions).

If the successful respondent is member of the All of Government Consultancy Supplier Panel, a Consultancy Service Order will be the proposed contract.

DPMC is conscious that some terms may require negotiation given the subject matter of this work. In submitting your tender response, you must let us know if you wish to question and/or negotiate any of the terms or conditions in the Proposed Contract, or wish to negotiate new terms and/or conditions. The Response Form contains a section for you to state your position. If you do not state your position, you will be deemed to have accepted the terms and conditions in the Proposed Contract in full.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

SECTION 6: RFP Terms

View the [RFP Terms](#) dated RFP Terms V.2. June 2021.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

ANNEX: Illustrative panel evaluation questions

Our evaluation approach will assess proposals' proposed solution, capability, capacity, and track record using these detailed panel evaluation questions where applicable. **Note that we do not expect all suppliers to address all of these questions in their proposals:** we intend to promote a diversity of suppliers in order to build quality bodies of practice and contestability among providers. These questions are not requirements and may not be engaged for every proposal.

Purpose of reporting

We want to hear about how respondents propose to provide analysis and reporting on disinformation sources, narratives, and networks in Aotearoa. This work sits within a broader procurement programme that recognises both public concern about disinformation and the need to uphold the rights to privacy, freedom of expression, and other human rights. As a result, the purpose of this reporting includes:

1. Improve understanding of the problem of disinformation in Aotearoa through robust best-practice reporting, in ways that build public trust and confidence.
2. Create the basis for enduring capability, collaboration and networks to understand disinformation outside government, based on shared evidential foundations.
3. Encourage future reporting to incorporate features that make it transparent, contestable, and rigorous, including through potential engagement with other providers, peer review, or a broader community of practice.
4. To maintain independence of reporting from government, and to maintain the basis for public trust in this reporting.
5. To confine the scope of this work to monitoring and insights. The public should be reassured that the purpose of this reporting is to provide information, not to inhibit or censor communications.

Illustrative questions

In order to assess the suitability of proposals against the goals of this work, and providers' solutions, capability, capacity, and track record, we will be considering the following questions as we evaluate your proposal. **You should not feel the need to explicitly address all of these questions, but we recommend you keep them in mind as you write your response.**

Data sources and data collection

1. What sources of data will this proposal analyse? Will any analysis or investigations be conducted that do not rely solely on online communications (i.e. surveys, focus groups, other qualitative methods)? Is this work focused only on fringe communities, or will it analyse communications from more mainstream sources (government, news media etc.)?
2. What the proposed collection criteria? How will respondents decide which communications to collect and analyse?
3. What data collection procedures are outlined?

4. Research activities collect large volumes of communications. Not all of those communications will be false, and not all of those communications will cause harm. What measures are proposed to mitigate risks of over-collection of communications that do not fit your collection criteria?
5. Are providers proposing to capture or analyse communications and content in any closed, private, or publicly unavailable groups? If so, what safeguards are proposed to ensure that activities are safe, lawful, meet reasonable expectations of privacy, and commonly accepted standards of research ethics?
6. Does the provider propose to collect and analyse any data in non-English languages? If so, which languages?
7. Does the proposal outline methods for distinguishing between communications originating in New Zealand and communications originating from outside New Zealand? If so, what are they?
8. How will the provider store collected data? Is their data storage subject to any security or oversight mechanisms? What assurance, security and integrity processes do they have in place?
9. Does the provider have with social media platforms for collecting data, or any intent to explore these kinds of arrangements with such platforms? This could include selective access programmes, data for good programmes, or bespoke arrangements.

Analysis methods

10. What awareness, expertise, competence, and experience in analysing topics commonly associated with “disinformation” does the proposal demonstrate, including awareness of coded language or concepts?
11. What methods does the provider propose to follow in applying quantitative or qualitative approaches to data analysis? How detailed and reliable are these methods?
12. Does the provider present a methodological approach to accounting for the impact of their own positions and biases in data collection, qualitative coding, and analysis, including these into their findings and communications?
13. Will the provider use any machine learning techniques in their analysis of data? If so, how?
14. How will the provider assess the truth or falsehood of communications they analyse? Do they intend to assess the intent of the ‘speaker’? If so, how?
15. To what extent does the proposal account for any relevant factors such as algorithmic bias, bias in datasets, limitations of datasets, and privacy, ethics and human rights considerations?
16. If the proposal entails the collection and analysis of communications in non-English languages, how will the provider ensure their analyses are accurate, grounded in community cultures, and account for nuance?
17. If the proposal focuses on specific subcultures, communities, or ecologies, will this analysis be explicitly situated within a broader landscape? If so, how? Does this analysis reflect an understanding of the impacts of disinformation on vulnerable groups?
18. Does this proposal demonstrate deep knowledge of the New Zealand socio-political and cultural context? Does it reflect awareness of Te Ao Māori? Depending on the focus of the work proposed,

this may include, for example, knowledge of disinformation issues in different communities, or capability to analyse foreign language media.

19. What are the qualifications and disciplinary background of primary team members?

Quality and contestability of analysis

20. Are there any barriers or key restrictions on the provider's ability to engage with researchers or providers conducting similar work to their own?
21. Does the provider have connections with relevant peers in their community? Have they engaged in any wānanga, meetings, or discussions aimed at building best practice, or inviting peer review of their work?
22. Does the provider pursue continuous improvement, quality assurance, or reflective practices?
23. What is the provider's approach to sharing your data with other researchers?
24. Does the proposal involve the use of any open-source analysis products, or proprietary commercial products for data analysis?
25. Does the provider have any connections with international communities of practice or scholarship they intend to draw upon?

Content of reports

26. How will the supplier substantiate their key findings by reference to their data collection and analysis methods? How much qualitative and quantitative supporting evidence will they provide?
27. What is the proposed approach to analysing or predicting the link between online communications and associated behaviour? To what extent does the proposal account for distinctions between what people say online, what they believe, and how they act?
28. Does this proposal focus in particular on: (i) sources, (ii) narratives, (iii) networks, or (iv) all three?

Communication about findings

29. Does the provider intend to produce specific reports for specific audiences, and how will reports be made useful and clear for specific audiences (ie, academic communities, media, government, community groups)?
30. What approach does the proposal take to declaring and acknowledging the limitations of its work, whether methodologically or otherwise?
31. Is there thought given to communicating distinctions between descriptive and/or empirical claims, predictions, theoretical claims, and/or professional or personal observations about your data?
32. What types of data visualisations has the provider adopted in the past, and what can they provide for audiences to understand their insights?
33. In what circumstances does the provider make recommendations to various audiences about actions they believe should be taken in response to their findings?

Risk, safety, escalation

34. Does the proposal outline escalation processes for any situation where the provider identifies a risk of imminent harm?
35. What processes does the provider have in place – or propose to put in place - for mitigating health and safety risk to staff (noting that some information may need to be withheld to ensure the effectiveness of these processes)?

Public perception, trust, transparency

36. Does the supplier make reports to platform companies, government agencies, or law enforcement about data they collect or their findings? What methods do they have for recording situations where they have made such disclosures and the outcome of those disclosures? Do they have trusted flagger status or equivalent with any platforms?
37. What funding sources does this supplier have available to them, and how might funding arrangements raise perceived, potential or actual conflicts of interest?
38. Do any points in the proposed contract raise issues of conflict, independence, or transparency for the supplier's data collection or analysis?
39. What steps does the supplier have in place (or plan to put in place) for identifying and managing perceived, potential, or actual conflicts in their organisation, research, or findings?
40. What is the supplier's organisational structure?
41. What policies will be in place for mitigating breaches of legal or ethical standards in the proposed work? How will the supplier ensure their data collection, analysis and disclosure is lawful and ethical?
42. Does the supplier also conduct work in disinformation response, intervention, and mitigation, or is their work limited to monitoring and insights? If so, how do they propose to manage any tension or conflict between these roles?
43. What policies or processes will the supplier have in place that would support DPMC to demonstrate its commitment to its obligations under [the Public Service Commission's model standards in relation to information gathering and public trust](#)?