

DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment



Dear Sir/Madam

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated **8th December 2021**, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Contract Number:	Con_19723
Contract Name:	Prison Security Investment Programme Process Evaluation of the three lines of defence
From:	Ministry of Justice HQ, 10 South Colonnade, E14 4PU ("Customer")
To:	National Centre for Social Research (NatCen) 35 Northampton Square London EC1V 0AX ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	8th December 2021
Expiry Date:	<p>End date of Initial Period: 23rd December 2022</p> <p>End date of Maximum Extension Period: 22nd June 2023 (6 months possible extension)</p> <p>Minimum written notice to Supplier in respect of extension: 4 Weeks</p>

Services required:	<p>Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by:</p> <p>the Customer's Project Specification attached at Annex A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Annex B</p>
--------------------	---

Key Individuals:	<p>[REDACTED] DASD / Principal Social Researcher [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Senior Analyst [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Senior Social Researcher [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Senior Policy Manager, [REDACTED]</p> <p>("Customer")</p> <p>And</p> <p>Project Lead / IPE Lead: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Impact Evaluation Lead: [REDACTED]</p> <p>Quality Assurance Lead: [REDACTED]</p> <p>("Supplier")</p>
[Guarantor(s)]	N/A

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	<p>Overall cost for delivery as per quote - £222,314.50</p> <p>These costs are commercially confidential and not to be disclosed for three years from the proposal submission date.</p>
[REDACTED]	
Insurance Requirements	Insurance As per terms (Clause 19 of the Contract Terms)
Liability Requirements	Suppliers limitation of Liability (Clause Error! Reference source not found. of the Contract Terms);

Reimbursable Expenses	<p>Not permitted unless approved in advance by the Customer and in line with MoJ Policy.</p> <div data-bbox="668 347 719 409" data-label="Image"> </div> <p>Travel and subsistence policy and</p>
GDPR	See Contract Terms Schedule 7 (Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects
Alternative and/or additional provisions (including Schedule 8 (Additional clauses)):	N/A

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Customer: **Ministry of Justice**

Name	[REDACTED]
Title	[REDACTED]
Signature	[REDACTED]
Date	[REDACTED]

We accept the terms set out in this letter and its Annexes, including the Conditions.

For and on behalf of the Supplier: **National Centre for Social Research (NatCen)**

Name	[REDACTED]
Title	[REDACTED]
Signature	[REDACTED]
Date	[REDACTED]

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

To be determined by the Customer at Call for Competition stage

1. Introduction

The **Ministry of Justice** is a major government department, at the heart of the justice system. We work to protect and advance the principles of justice. Our vision is to deliver a world-class justice system that works for everyone in society. We are responsible for these parts of the justice system:

- Courts
- Prisons
- Probation services
- Attendance centres

The organisation works together and with other government departments and agencies to bring the principles of justice to life for everyone in society. From our civil courts, tribunals and family law hearings, to criminal justice, prison and probation services. We work to ensure that sentences are served and offenders are encouraged to turn their lives around and become law-abiding citizens. We believe the principles of justice are pivotal and we are steadfast in our shared commitment to uphold them.

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) is an executive agency, sponsored by the Ministry of Justice, supported by 2 agencies and public bodies. HMPPS is here to prevent victims by changing lives. We work with our partners to carry out the sentences given by the courts, either in custody or the community.

We reduce reoffending by rehabilitating the people in our care through education and employment. The agency is made up of Her Majesty's Prison Service, the National Probation Service and a headquarters focused on creating tools and learning.

Within England and Wales, we are responsible for:

- running prison and probation services
- rehabilitation services for people in our care leaving prison
- making sure support is available to stop people reoffending
- contract managing private sector prisons and services such as:
 - o the prisoner escort service
 - o electronic tagging

Through HM Prison Service: we manage public sector prisons and the contract for private prisons in England and Wales.

Through the National Probation Service: we oversee probation delivery in England and Wales including through community rehabilitation companies.

2. Background to the Requirement

The Prison Security Investment Programme (SIP) is a £100m investment with the strategic aim of reducing the crime in prison that disrupts delivery of safe, decent and secure regimes and causes harm in the community.

The programme has the following objectives to support the delivery of the strategic aim:

- 1. First line of defence: Reduce conveyance of illicit items into establishments via the Gate, Reception and Post;**
- 2. Second line of defence: Stop mobile devices working and/ or detect and retrieve devices; and**
- 3. Third line of defence: Strengthen staff resilience to corruption and equip staff to defend against efforts to subvert security regimes.**
4. Increase targeted disruptions against high harm SOC and corrupt staff to frustrate criminal enterprise.

Evaluation of the SIP is a condition set by Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT) for receiving the £100m investment. This contract will principally include the evaluation of activity implemented under the first three lines of defence. These first three lines of defence are combined in this specification because of the interdependencies between them. Through our scoping work we, for example, identified that increasing the risk of conveyance through the gate may displace this activity and impact the incentives around staff corruption. Specific activity under each strand is as follows:

- **The first line of defence** consists of Physical Security Measures which includes Enhanced Gate Security (EGS), X-ray body scanners (XRBS) and trace detection equipment:

Enhanced Gate Security

EGS is designed to prevent the conveyance of unauthorised items by prison staff and visitors. EGS refers to the installation of equipment such as archway metal detectors and hand-held metal detector wands in 42 prisons in the closed male estate as part of SIP. In addition to the equipment to support the search process, each establishment will benefit from increased Drug Detection Dog Handlers and Passive Drug Dogs. EGS also includes the recruitment of additional staff to implement searches at the Gate. Staff are trained/supported to use the equipment, including through e-learning/remote support due to COVID-19 restrictions. The project is on track to deliver to prisons by November 2021; this includes several private prisons which will be contractually obliged to deliver EGS. There are two tiers being implemented.

EGS Tier 1 investment is the resource package delivered to most public sector prisons. It includes:

- Dual detection archway metal detectors and handheld metal detection wands
- Tactical bag searching. This will consist of a manual check of the contents of a random proportion of staff bags, as to reasonably ensure that they do not contain prohibited articles. To note, all visitor bags are routinely, manually searched as part of BAU.
- Additional dog handlers and drug detection dogs to perform searches at the gate and inside establishments. Dog handlers/dogs are ringfenced for use at particular establishments, but also sit within regional teams. In Wales and the Long Term and High Security Estates (LTHSE), dog handlers are appointed directly to prisons. The investment in dog searching also includes new vehicles for dog handlers and financial support for a technical partnership between the National Dogs Technical Support Group and the Defence Science and Technology Laboratory to ensure that dogs can detect new and emerging drugs.

- Improved visitor ID verification: more rigorous ID checks for visitors following training for staff running visits.
- Recruitment of additional staff to operate all equipment: Operational Support Grades (OSGs), Custodial Managers (CMs), band 3 and 4 Officers and Dog Handlers (as mentioned above).
- Training of staff to operate and manage use of equipment, including:
 - L&D-led OSG national training for new SIP recruits and back-to-basics refresher training (for OSGs and CMs moving into SIP roles). Face-to-face rollout is largely complete.
 - Security Capability Team-led Custodial Manager EGS development package. Remote and face to face delivery complete.
 - Visitor ID verification e-learning for all OSGs and staff running visits. Rolled out from April 2021.

EGS Tier 2 (Flexible Counter Conveyance Package) investment is a less costly, flexibly deployed resource package aimed at preventing illicit conveyance. It is being delivered to 7 prisons which are unsuitable for full EGS equipment/measures. Delivery of most of this equipment will have occurred by February 2021. It includes:

- Archway metal detectors deployed permanently to the highest risk locations
- Metal detection wands
- Mobile phone signal detectors and hardware detection
- Fibre optic search scopes for searching of hard to see places
- Bespoke HMPPS search tool kits
- Staff recruitment per prison of Band 3 Officers, additional dog handlers, passive and active dogs and vehicles, OSGs and a CM to coordinate the additional resource.
- Training of recruited staff as under Tier 1 (detailed above).

X-ray body scanners

Some prisoners attempt to undermine HMPPS's security search methodologies by secreting contraband inside their bodies. X-ray body scanners are used in adult male prisons to detect if prisoners are attempting to conceal contraband internally. XRBS includes the installation of X-ray body scanners as part of SIP and training of existing staff to carry out and manage the scanning process. XRBS is considered as having gone live from the date where the scanner is installed and switched on. The introduction of XRBS as part of SIP covers the delivery and installation of 75 scanners across 74 establishments. This will cover the entire male closed estate. XRBS were installed in staggered waves over the past year, with the first wave beginning in July 2020. 51 sites were completed by March 2021 and a further 23 sites were completed by October 2021.

Trace detection equipment

New trace detection equipment will be delivered into 45 establishments from December 2021.

X-ray baggage scanners

Some x-ray baggage scanners have been rolled out in private prisons.

- **The second line of defence** consists of mobile phones activity.

Detection

- The provision of hardware detection and signal detectors, together with other relevant supporting equipment to aid searches;

- The development of central Learning and Development training packages to cover the range of mobile phone detection equipment available in prisons;
 - The introduction of staff to act as SPOCs and subject matter experts in this field and to support and advise prison staff with any local issues relating to the equipment;
 - The production of comprehensive operational guidance documents so that equipment can be used effectively.
- **The third line of defence** consists of the Counter Corruption Unit (CCU)

Corruption facilitates the flow of drugs, mobile phones and other illicit items into prisons. These, in turn, fuel violence, debt and the illicit economy. Corruption puts the safety of offenders, staff and visitors to prisons at risk, damages the reputation of the organisation, reduces workforce morale and performance and compromises confidence in HMPPS' ability to run safe and secure prison and probation services that protect the public and rehabilitate offenders.

The SIP-funded Counter Corruption Unit has a clear strategy for tackling corruption and a plan to continually improve their approach over time. The ambition is to create an organisation that is resilient to the threat of corruption, can protect its hard-working staff, prevent any who might be manipulated into corruption and target those engaging in corrupt behaviour through four strategic approaches:

- **PROTECT** against corruption by understanding threats, having robust policies, processes and procedures in place and holding ourselves to account
- **PREVENT** staff from engaging in corruption by recruiting a resilient workforce, strengthening capability and professional integrity and managing corruption risks
- **PURSUE** and punish those involved in corruption through disciplinary and criminal justice outcomes
- **PREPARE** for the consequences of corrupt behaviour and support teams where corruption has occurred

Activities carried out under Protect and Prepare include the design and rollout of a communications package around corruption and corruption reporting for prisons and probation and the roll-out of a system to locally assess the threat posed by corrupt staff. Under Pursue, prisons and probation are advised on disciplinary proceedings in relation to corruption cases by Pursue regional teams and supported to make decisions at key stages. Monthly case management meetings in establishments are attended by Pursue regional staff as part of this. Key activities under Prevent include the identification of offenders who seek to corrupt staff, training on corruption and early intervention and diversion processes for staff. Implementation of these activities has been ongoing during the late Spring and Summer and will be embedded within an updated policy framework in April 2022.

The CCU National Team includes the Head of CCU, the Head of Pursue, Head of Prevent, Head of Performance/Strategy and a range of other roles. The Pursue function is formed of five regional teams led by the Head of Pursue, as well as embedded corruption specialists and police investigator roles to support investigations. The Prevent function is also comprised of five regional teams led by the Head of Prevent.

Additional activities linked to the three lines of defence

A strand within SIP that runs alongside these first three lines of defence is Security Capability. The key deliverable for this strand was setting up a Security Capability team, with the eventual aim that this function would enhance the capability of staff undertaking security tasks through tailored upskilling interventions. Some of the training/up-skilling delivered by the team directly impacts on the ability of prison staff to carry out other SIP-funded processes (i.e. EGS) and so will be considered in more detail, while other activities are less strongly tied to the rest of SIP.

3. Requirement

Mandatory

A process evaluation and an outcome and economic study is being conducted for the three lines of defence in the Security Investment Programme. We require a contractor to deliver the process evaluation element. The process evaluation will have two key aims:

1. Answer the key process evaluation questions as outlined in section 4 below.
2. Inform how and when the outcome study will be conducted

The majority of the outcome and economic study will be carried out within the MoJ by the internal evaluation team.

However, the data and findings from the process evaluation will heavily inform when the outcome study should begin i.e. providing information on whether the programme has been fully delivered and bedded in sufficiently to assess outcomes. This is essential given the number of new initiatives that have been introduced under SIP and the dynamic nature of prison environments. The chosen contractor will be required to work with the internal evaluation team to help draw out the implications of the process evaluation findings for the design of the outcome study, including timings and methodology.

Collaboration between the internal evaluation team and chosen contractor is essential for this evaluation. The internal evaluation team have gathered detailed insight and understanding on the programme delivery, data sources and other evidence sources which are available to use within this evaluation. However, expertise in conducting a process evaluation within the prison context and additional resource from a contractor will be crucial to oversee and deliver this evaluation. The methodology below illustrates how the internal team would expect the collaboration to work and details the potential different phases for the process evaluation and outcome study.

- Desk based review

The first phase is currently being undertaken by the internal evaluation team. This includes a literature review, a project documentation review, consultation with key stakeholders, a review of feedback from specialist trainings and development of the Theory of Change and assumptions to be tested within this evaluation. We anticipate that this phase will be largely completed by the time the contractor is on board, at which point this information will be shared; however, we would expect the contractor to review, challenge and further scope where required.

- Primary research phase

We expect this phase to be largely led by the contractor but with the internal evaluation team involved in developing research materials and quality assuring analysis. Given the wide range of activity in the three lines of defence, different methods may be applicable per strand. Contractors are asked to design their own methodology, but the following is envisaged as a suggestion:

Physical Security Measures (PSM) – given the different levels of physical security measures being implemented across establishments, a case study methodology is envisaged with approximately 10-12 establishments being sampled. Perceptions will be gathered from two angles 1). those involved in delivering XRBS and EGS processes i.e. prison staff and 2). those who are scanned/searched using the equipment i.e. staff, visitors and prisoners. A range of qualitative methods, including interviews, focus groups, researcher-administered questionnaires and participant observation could be used as part of the case study methodology. There will also need to be a focus on the Security Capability strand as part of this fieldwork to understand how prison staff were prepared and trained to carry out SIP roles (see details at the end of Section

2). Given the different context of private sector prisons, who have more latitude to decide how to implement EGS and XRBS to fulfil their contractual obligation, it is anticipated that a separate piece of light-touch qualitative research will be undertaken to understand how roll-out has occurred in these establishments. This will include their experience using x-ray baggage scanners, which have already been rolled out in some of the private sector estate.

Counter Corruption Unit (CCU) - we anticipate that it may be appropriate to sample two to three of the five regions where activities are being carried out. Relevant participants will likely include: the core CCU team including heads of Prevent and Pursue; regional Pursue and Prevent staff; staff working in regional teams doing implementation in probation settings; managers using tools designed for early intervention on corruption and staff who have experienced the latter interventions; staff in receipt of communications and training about counter corruption; and senior staff in establishments who would be able to comment on perceptions of outcomes associated with Prevent and Pursue interventions. A range of qualitative methods including focus groups and interviews will likely be appropriate. A survey which goes out to a broader sample of staff at two points in time may also be useful for gauging how staff knowledge, awareness and attitudes towards corruption have changed during the course of implementation.

Mobile phones – where possible it would be ideal to include mobile phone detection in the same fieldwork that is undertaken for the PSM strand mentioned above. However, additional fieldwork will need to be carried out to capture any mobile phone strand implementation activity that takes place outside of PSM establishments.

- Quantitative analysis utilising MoJ data

This phase will be largely led by the internal evaluation team and will run concurrently with primary research to feed into the process evaluation and outcome study. We envisage the internal team and the contractor working collaboratively to make best use of available prison data – qualitative work may be able to further explore observed data trends and quantitative metrics may provide context for the reporting of primary research findings. The quantitative analysis plan will be shared with the chosen contractor at the set-up stage. We would expect the contractor to help finalise this plan and provide technical advice on how to best utilise metrics and other quantitative data within the process evaluation and outcome study throughout the duration of the contract. The available data will include greater granularity than published metrics which can be found online [here](#). In summary, we will be considering the following metrics for the evaluation:

- X-ray body scanner scans
- Finds of drugs, memory cards, SIMs, phones and hooch
- Drones and throwovers
- Workforce data

- MoJ intelligence data

As with the phase above, collating this data will largely be led by the internal evaluation team and the National Intelligence Unit (NIU). Where intelligence can help inform key areas of the evaluation and subject to NIU approval, redacted and collated reports will be shared with the chosen contractor.

Responsibilities

Internal evaluation team:

- Undertake the majority of the desk review phase and produce the draft Theory of Change, including assumptions to be tested.

- Facilitate approval of the Theory of Change and assumptions with contractor and key MoJ/HMPPS stakeholders.
- Feed into the development of research materials and sampling and sign off on final products.
- Provide contractor with contacts for research.
- Produce quantitative plan and conduct internal analysis on MoJ metrics.
- Produce intelligence data plan with NIU and share approved, collated versions with the contractor where possible.
- Work with the chosen contractor to draw out the implications of the process evaluation findings for the design of the outcome study, including timings and methodology.
- Draw together the final report for SIP

Contractor:

- Provide regular updates about their work and meet agreed dates for delivery of outputs.
- Provide expertise and general oversight on the delivery of the evaluation
- At set up, the chosen supplier may need to revise their methodology in line with information available in desk review documents which can only be shared after the supplier is appointed.
- Provide expertise and advice on the quantitative analytical plan and how to incorporate findings into the process evaluation
- Design and conduct the primary research phase including producing research materials, developing sampling considerations, suggesting ideas to increase response rates and conducting fieldwork and analysis.
- Ensure that the primary research is compliant with any COVID restrictions in prisons and adapt in response to changing restrictions.
- Use findings from the other phases to inform the primary research phase.
- Work with the internal evaluation team to help draw out the implications of the process evaluation findings for the design of the outcome study, including timings and methodology.
- Work with the internal evaluation team to produce a process evaluation report which can be incorporated into a wider, publishable report on SIP.
- It would be highly desirable if the chosen supplier had experience of delivering evaluations in prisons.

Mandatory: in their bids, contractors must include the following elements:

- A clear and transparent framework on how they will deliver a process evaluation of SIP.
- Details of the project team that will be involved in working on the project, outlining their roles and responsibilities and the number of days on the project broken down by key areas of work
- Details of the skills and experience of the project team
- How the contract will be delivered in the event of staff changes during the project
- How the contract team will keep the MoJ evaluation team updated on the progress of the project
- Details on how they will manage this project to ensure that it runs smoothly, specifying the project management techniques that will be used
- Identification of risks associated with the successful completion of the project and how they plan to mitigate them. Contractors must provide a full risk register for all elements of the project.
- Details of planned quality assurance procedures.

Mandatory: costings as part of bids

Contractors should fill in the blank Excel Pricing Schedule; each part of this project should be costed separately. In addition, staff rates must be specified and a detailed breakdown of the proportion of time spent by key staff on the different elements of the research provided. Costs should be exclusive of taxes and VAT. The proposed costs should be submitted as a separate document from the rest of the bid. You should include details of the data collection and data analysis costs, which activities each member of the research team will conduct, time allocated and their daily rate. Any costs associated with the design of the published materials should also be included.

4. Aims

A process evaluation and outcome study are required to answer the following questions for the first three lines of defence in SIP.

- **Have technological infrastructure, associated policy and training been rolled-out as intended?**
- **To what extent is new equipment being used as intended? What is the user experience of the new equipment (both for those staffing it and those it is used on)?**
- **How have the contexts of the different establishments (i.e. prison types, public/private etc.) where this strand was rolled out affected implementation and user experience?**
- **What is working well and what could be improved going forward?**
- **What factors may have helped or hindered SIP's effectiveness?**
- **What are the perceptions of outcomes and impacts among those who manage and carry out SIP processes, as well as those who are affected by them?**
- What outcomes occurred (both intended and unintended)?
- What outcomes were associated with different versions of the programme which were implemented?
- In what ways did the contexts of different establishments contribute to different outcomes?

The chosen contractor will be asked to help refine these questions further. The first six questions in bold will need to be answered by the contractor. The remaining three questions will be answered by the internal evaluation team but the design for answering these questions will be informed by the process evaluation.

5. Objectives (Measurable Outputs)

Key deliverables for the evaluation include the following:

- Weekly progress updates (via email) for MoJ contract-manager
- Project plan detailing proposed methodology and timetable
- Attendance at set-up meeting at the project's outset where key stakeholders are brought together and requirements are discussed.
- Research tools for each stage of the evaluation i.e. topic guides for focus groups and interviews, survey instruments etc.

- Presentations on interim findings (April 2022 and June 2022 virtual meetings) and final findings (December 2022 virtual meeting)
- Attendance at virtual quarterly and 6-monthly stakeholder boards in December 2021 and September 2022, three in total.
- Regular delivery of findings to help inform outcome study design.
- Final report bringing together findings and recommendations.

We will look to publish process and outcome evaluation findings in Spring 2023. However, where appropriate we will deliver on-going results throughout the year at the boards mentioned above. In terms of the impact of this work, findings and associated recommendations are likely to inform decisions about the continued rollout of the programme across the estate as the transition to Business As Usual (BAU) occurs.

6. In Scope, Out of Scope

Included

- A process evaluation for the first three lines of defence for SIP.
- The chosen contractor making targeted, impartial recommendations about the programme's delivery.
- Informing the design of the outcome study using the process evaluation findings.

Excluded

- The fourth line of defence is not included in this contract. This consists of two strands: MARSOC and the digital projects. MARSOC (Multi Agency Response to Serious and Organised Crime) is being implemented as a pilot early adopter phase; a process evaluation is currently being conducted by Ipsos Mori. With regards to digital projects, delivery plans are still being determined by the SIP programme. The internal evaluation team will stay abreast of developments in this area and potential links to the activity in this project. Any relevant further information will be shared with the preferred bidder.
- Experimental/ quasi-experimental and Theory Based Impact evaluation has been found to not be feasible for this programme.

7. Location of Assignment

Where possible, we ask that research fieldwork would take place remotely. This will be more possible with prison staff in senior positions. With frontline staff it is likely that the research will need to take place at prison sites and will require flexibility around times/dates; this will certainly be the case for offenders.

8. Regulatory requirements

Contractors should as a minimum be able to comply with:

- The Government's Social Research Code and publications protocol
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-government-social-research-code-people-and-products>
- Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethical-assurance-guidance-for-social-research-in-government>
- [Publishing Research and Analysis in Government](#)

9. Service Levels

This contract has several key deliverables set out under section 5.

Once the contract has been awarded, the MoJ SIP evaluation team will work with the contractor to confirm the delivery dates for each phase of the project. Initial dates have been provided below. At the project inception stage, the MoJ SIP evaluation team will agree the process for signing off each phase of the work and who will be involved in that decision-making process.

The MoJ SIP evaluation team will hold regular meetings with the Contractor to review progress, to ensure that milestones are met and to quality assure the final product to ensure it is of a high standard, meets the specification and is publishable. A payment schedule will be drawn up to reflect milestones and final sign off.

10. Security arrangements for Consultants

- Baseline Personnel Security Standards (of which Disclosure Scotland is a part) are a default requirement in any Research contract.

Security Check (SC) clearance may be required due to the sensitive content involved in this programme. The chosen supplier may need to review documentation which contains sensitive information and discuss sensitive information which requires this level of clearance. This can be applied for when the contractor has been appointed if deemed necessary.

11. Timetable

For the process evaluation element:

- Set-up meeting: w/c 6th December 2021
- Attendance at the stakeholder quarterly board: 9th December 2021
- Fieldwork: January 2022 onwards
- Initial findings (at quarterly board): April 2022
- Interim findings (at quarterly board): June 2022
- Stakeholder quarterly meeting and 6-monthly meeting (attendance required): September 2022
- Final findings (at quarterly board): December 2022

To note - the outcome study will rely on the process evaluation findings to identify the most suitable time for exploring outcomes. However, as can be seen below the internal evaluation team will need to deliver final findings in Spring 2023. Therefore, the outcome study will need to start being considered from March 2022

For information, here are the timescales for the overall evaluation and reporting, including the outcome and economic study:

- Phase 1: Desk-based document review (January 2021 – January 2022)
- Phase 2: Primary research (January 2022 onwards)
- Phase 3: Data analysis of quantitative metrics (March 2021 – March 2023)
- Phase 4: Analysis of intelligence data (March 2021 – March 2023)
- Interim findings: Spring 2022
- Final findings: Spring 2023

12. Any other Key features

It is important for the contractor to reduce burden on prison staff and other participants wherever possible.

13. Outcome

Expected Outcomes

- A robust process evaluation which stands up to external scrutiny.
- An outcome study methodology, informed by the chosen supplier's input, which will subsequently be delivered by the internal evaluation team.

Escalation process

Milestones will be agreed with the Contractor for the delivery of each stage of the project to ensure that each of the project's components and identified work in each of the phases are delivered on time and are of sufficient quality, using the timeline above as an initial guide. The project will have two identified MoJ analyst project managers who will be responsible for liaising with the Contractor and managing the project according to project management principles e.g. monitoring progress, managing risks and escalating risks and issues. The MoJ project managers will actively manage risks, seek to mitigate them and develop contingency plans if necessary. The Contractor will be expected to nominate a lead person with overall responsibility for delivery and with the same expectations around project and risk management.

As a first stage, if any difficulties arise, it is anticipated they would be resolved through the respective project managers. If concerns persist or become more serious, the MoJ project managers will escalate concerns to senior leaders in the analytical directorate and seek guidance on the next steps.

Exit Strategy

This is a time limited piece of work. Findings will be communicated at several points throughout the evaluation and this will culminate in a final report. Findings will be published.

ANNEX B

Supplier Proposal

To be determined at Call for Competition stage

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Part 2: Contract Terms

Copy of completed T&C's to be included here

[REDACTED]