

DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment – CCS Reference: CCZZ18A32



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Dear Sirs,

Letter of Appointment - CCZZ18A32 - Voluntary Right to Buy (VRtB) Pilot evaluation

This letter of Appointment is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier dated 13th March 2019.

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

Purchase Order Number:	To be confirmed by Customer.
From:	Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government REDACTED ("Customer")
To:	RSM UK Consulting LLP REDACTED ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	1 st April 2019
Expiry Date:	End date of Initial Period 30 th November 2021. There are no options to extend.

Services required:	Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by:
--------------------	---

	(i) The Customer's Statement of Requirements attached at Annex A, and (ii) The Supplier's Proposal attached at Annex B.
--	---

Key Individuals:	Customer: REDACTED Supplier: REDACTED
Guarantor(s)	N/A

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	£129,655.00.
Insurance Requirements	As detailed in the Terms and Conditions of Contract for Dynamic Purchasing System RM6018 – Research Marketplace.
Customer billing address for invoicing:	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government Invoice Processing team. Finance Shared Services Division REDACTED Email: REDACTED

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 Supplier:

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title:

Name and Title:

REDACTED

REDACTED

Signature:

Signature:

REDACTED

REDACTED

Date:

Date:

ANNEX A

Customer's Statement of Requirements

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) (hereafter referred to as the 'Authority') wishes to commission a research study to assess operational aspects of the regional pilot of the Voluntary Right to Buy Scheme (VRTB) (which aims to extend the right to buy scheme to the housing association sector) in order to inform the design and operational robustness of the main scheme. The Authority will be working closely with the National Housing Federation (NHF) and individual pilot housing associations on this study, and they will be represented on the operational board.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

- 2.1 The Authority is a ministerial department, supported by 12 agencies and public bodies.
- 2.2 The Authority's job is to create great places to work and give more power to local people to shape what happens in their local area. Key responsibilities include driving up housing supply; increasing home ownership; devolving powers and budget to boost local growth in England; and supporting strong communities with excellent public services.
- 2.3 The NHF is the representative body for Housing Associations (HAs) in England.

3. BACKGROUND TO REQUIREMENT/OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENT

- 3.1 The VRTB is a Government commitment to extend the Right to Buy to HA tenants, supporting the Government's key priorities around increasing home ownership, and through the replacement of homes, increasing housing supply. The VRTB policy has been developed in partnership with the HA sector (represented by the NHF) through a voluntary agreement in October 2015. Delivery is through the co-operation of the sector rather than through statute.
- 3.2 In November 2015 a small-scale pilot was launched with five HAs to test the application and sales process, through which 405 homes were sold across 24 local authority areas. An Action Learning study, commissioned by the NHF and the pilot HAs, was carried out by the Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research (CRESR) at Sheffield Hallam University and published in January 2017.
- 3.3 The intention to run a larger-scale regional pilot was announced at the 2017 Autumn Budget, with the Midlands announced as the location, with the aim of delivering around 3,000 sales. A budget profile of £50m in 2018/19 and £150m in 2019/20 was agreed with Her Majesty's Treasury (HMT). The Authority is currently preparing the implementation of this pilot, and, with the NHF, released the guidance for HAs to follow in administering the scheme in May¹; it is currently agreeing the outstanding decisions on the design of the scheme.
- 3.4 The Midlands pilot will test the operability of the VRTB scheme as currently designed with HAs, along with key aspects of the policy not already tested as part of the smaller scale pilot; such as portability of the right to buy discount and one for one replacement of the properties that are sold under the scheme. At the same time it will provide

¹ <https://www.housing.org.uk/resource-library/browse/midlands-voluntary-right-to-buy-pilot-guidance-published/>

invaluable data to inform decisions on how best to manage demand for the national VRTB when it is launched.

- 3.5 As such, the research study is critical to assessing the results of the pilot and the implications for the design of the nationwide implementation of the policy.

4. DEFINITIONS

Expression or Acronym	Definition
CRESR	The Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research at Sheffield Hallam University
HA	Housing Associations
HMT	Her Majesty's Treasury
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
NHF	National Housing Federation
One for One/141	This refers to the replacement of any dwellings disposed of under the scheme being replaced on a one for one basis, in order to avoid the scheme inadvertently reducing the supply of social rented properties.
Portability	This refers to the ability of a tenant to use the VRTB discount to buy an alternative property if the dwelling that they are renting is ineligible for inclusion in the programme.
VRTB	Voluntary Right to Buy Scheme

5. SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT

- 5.1 There are a number of key strands of research which need to be addressed in the study but primarily it is about capturing the lessons which may impact on the operability of the national scheme. This will include the collation and analysis of the data from the pilot study, and to test specific aspects of the voluntary agreement which were not covered by the initial pilot, including the portable discount and one for one replacement of properties sold under the scheme.
- 5.2 As such, the study will comprise elements of process/formative, and impact evaluation, working with a sample of the 45 Midlands HAs, but also an element of qualitative research with potential participants in the scheme, looking at the purchaser and landlord experience of the VRTB process.
- 5.3 Potential Providers may wish to be aware of the work commissioned by NHF and undertaken by Sheffield Hallam University on the initial pilot, but it should be noted that the scope of this study is wider, and will focus more on evaluation than qualitative work with potential VRTB buyers.² It is therefore the intention of the Authority that this study builds on, rather than replicates, the initial pilot study.

² http://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/pub.housing.org.uk/Voluntary_Right_to_Buy_for_housing_associations_-_an_action_learning_approach.pdf and http://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/pub.housing.org.uk/Voluntary_Right_to_Buy_pilot_-_additional_analysis_of_completions.pdf

6. THE REQUIREMENT

- 6.1 The Authority will require a series of outputs that directly address the research objectives outlined in section 6.3.
- 6.2 The Authority is looking for a mixed approach that will build upon and enrich existing understanding of the topic and facilitate the successful implementation of the policy through the incorporation of the lessons from the regional pilot scheme. The research findings and report will also be used as key evidence to inform the final design and rollout of any future national scheme.
- 6.3 Objectives that will need to be addressed include the following:
- I. (Overarching objective) Assess the deliverability of the scheme for Government, HAs, and tenants, including value for money and operational robustness, with a view to informing the final design of a national VRTB scheme.
 - II. Identification of key inputs into the final design of the national VRTB scheme with regard to determining eligibility criteria in order to effectively manage demand within the funding envelope, and to better understand the characteristics of tenants who apply, as well as those who apply but do not complete a purchase. This will require measuring demand under the pilot, and making an assessment of the level of demand the Authority can expect for a national VRTB.
 - III. Assess the operational implementation of the 'portable discount' policy offer which will allow tenants the opportunity to 'port' their discount to an alternative property if their HA uses their discretion not to sell them the property they are living in. This will require an appraisal of the policy's implementation from both from a tenant and a landlord perspective, including barriers, constraints, and success indicators, and - given that HAs will be implementing different portability policies - a recommendation on the preferred approach.
 - IV. An interim assessment of the operation of the one for one replacement policy, which requires the HA sector to deliver at least one replacement home for each one sold under the VRTB on a national basis. Given that the time allowed for the replacement of properties is up to 3 years, it is acknowledged that a final assessment will not be possible within the scope of this study, but Potential Providers should consider what interim measures could be developed, and how the assessment could be taken forward in further commissioned or in-house Authority studies.
 - V. How the process works for potential purchasers and how this could be improved, including the customer experience (particularly around the operation of a ballot system for allocating places on the scheme, and around portability), and the best prevention and identification of fraud and unfair sales claims. The Authority is also interested in the affordability issue for potential purchasers.

- VI. A “pilot within a pilot” of sales of extra care housing is being undertaken by one HA and the Potential Provider will need to set out how they will evaluate this.
- 6.4 Potential Providers will need to consider the implications of undertaking work with a sample of Midlands HAs that are participating in the scheme (45 in total) and may wish to consider how to structure their samples in order to produce robust findings. This is particularly important as the providers involved cover a wide range of operating areas (both urban and rural) and have a range of client groups and tenant characteristics.
- 6.5 The Authority does not have a set in stone view on the approach that the study should take, and would encourage tenderers to outline what they think is the best approach to produce robust findings in relation to the issues outlined in paragraph 6.3. However some possible routes are suggested below, based on early conversations between the Authority, the pilot HAs and the NHF, which the Potential Provider may wish to consider.
- 6.6 Throughout the research we expect the Potential Provider to draw direct comparisons with the outcomes from the previous pilot Action Learning Study, but only in cases where the methodology used was the same. A period of initial familiarisation with this pilot and its analysis (e.g. through desk research) will likely be required to facilitate this.
- 6.7 Some administrative data will be supplied by the Authority, and by HAs (see 6.10, 6.11 and 6.12). The Authority will work with the Supplier so that they are fully appraised of any available data that they may wish to analyse as part of the project. Whilst the majority of the data that will be supplied is administrative data of a quantitative nature, a mixed approach is required, and should cover both quantitative and qualitative analysis.
- 6.8 In terms of qualitative aspects, the Supplier may consider that a case study approach, whereby the Supplier spends time with a selection of different HAs to build a fuller picture of the landlord and purchaser experiences, may also meet a number of the specified objectives, and may bring out points of comparison between different associations (e.g. urban and rural, developing and non-developing). This could be supplemented by structured and semi-structured interviews with HA managers and/or operational staff, to allow for an understanding of the application process over a period of time. In addition, the Supplier may consider that techniques such as structured individual or group interviews with prospective or actual purchasers, and with those who drop out, are appropriate in helping to provide an indication of tenants’ underlying reasons and motivations for applying and their experience of the pilot (Objective V), including around portability (Objective III).
- 6.9 In terms of quantitative aspects, the Supplier may consider analysis of administrative data to meet Objectives II (measuring demand and informing the scheme’s eligibility criteria) and IV (measuring one for one replacement).
- 6.10 It should be noted that some such data can be supplied by the Authority on an on-going basis throughout the course of the pilot’s duration, as required. This data will comprise quantitative data on the planned for replacement of homes under the pilot, some headline budgetary data, and numbers and detailed characteristics of applicants (to include both purchasers and applicants who have dropped out). It is therefore recommended that any proposed methodology should beneficially incorporate some analysis of this data, though the Supplier may choose to collect additional quantitative data to meet the objectives, as outlined in 6.3 above. Some administrative data will be supplied by the Authority, and by HAs.

- 6.11 The Authority will be able to provide data on planned for and actual replacement, including number, location, tenure, and size (see the VRTB Pilot Guidance for more detail on HAs' reporting requirements on one for one replacement). The Authority will be able to provide data on the progress of applications, including timings, level of discount, numbers of portable discounts, and the level of customer dropout.
- 6.12 HAs will also be able to provide some administrative data (primarily quantitative but some qualitative) directly to the Supplier, particularly around the contents of tenants' application form, which includes sections on Property and Tenancy Details, Source of Funding for Purchase, and Applicants Details (i.e. characteristics of purchasers/other occupants). It should be possible to link data provided by the Authority and by HAs using a Unique Reference Number. Further to this, HAs will be publishing policies on portability, and developing internal policies (not for publication) on one for one replacement, which some HAs may also provide for analysis.
- 6.13 Undertaking the necessary research within the Midlands pilot will provide the Authority with the results required to improve on any issues found from the scheme, and inform the development of a national scheme (Objective I). In line with this addition to the methodology suggested above, a process evaluation and an impact evaluation with Value for Money analysis will help the Authority analyse the results and offer solutions to any potential issues.

7. KEY MILESTONES

- 7.1 The Potential Providers should note the following project milestones that the Authority will measure the quality of delivery against:

Milestone	Description	Timeframe
1	Inception meeting	Within week 1 of Contract Award
2	Fieldwork	April 2019 onwards.
3	Presentation of draft interim report to project board	November 2019
4	Present draft final report to project board	August 2020
5	Publication of final report	October 2020
6	Publication of supplementary annex	October 2021

- 7.2 Following fieldwork that will begin in April, the Supplier will be expected to present a draft interim report to the project board in November 2019, analysing and summarising early findings across each of the objectives as set out in the strategic case. A presentation of the draft final report is due to be presented to the project board in August 2020. This will build on the interim report and provide a more detailed analysis of the investigation. A supplementary annex is due to be published by October 2021, capturing any additional data analysis. This will mainly cover 141 replacements due to HAs having up to three years to replace stock that has been sold. These reports will be of publishable quality and will be publicly available to communicate its findings and therefore be open to peer review and public scrutiny.

8. AUTHORITY'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 8.1 The Authority will ensure all contractual obligations are adhered to and managed accordingly. A key contact will be identified within the Authority as the Contract Manager to oversee the project. Any Supplier queries will be addressed and responded to within 3 working days by the Contract Manager. The Authority will provide suitably qualified persons to attend and chair meetings when required to do so.

9. REPORTING

- 9.1 The Supplier will be required to provide all outputs in Microsoft Word, in plain language and with all outputs to be quality assured and proof read by the Supplier before submission to the Authority. Reporting is to be delivered in a format agreed by the Authority. The project will be overseen by the sub-group of the pilot operational board, and will consist of representatives from the Authority and the NHF, including analysts; 3-4 pilot HA representatives; and the Supplier. In the initial period, meetings will take place every 6 weeks, and then at regular intervals to be agreed thereafter with the Authority. It is expected that the Supplier will supply and present regular progress reports at these boards, with regular updates of a risk register, these may be conducted via teleconference where attendance at the meeting is not possible. Informal updates may be required via email as necessary on an ad-hoc basis.

- 9.2 The Supplier will provide:

- a. On-going access to any additional quantitative data that is collected (regularity to be agreed)
- b. A draft interim report, analysing and summarising early findings across each of the objectives. The report will be required by November 2019.
- c. A presentation of the draft final report to the project board, to be held in August 2020.
- d. The final report itself, building on the draft report and providing a more detailed analysis of the investigation into objectives (this will be required for publication by October 2020).
- e. Provision of a supplementary annex, capturing any additional data analysis on objective iii) (where the time lag means this data analysis on one for one replacement can only take place after the pilot's conclusion), by October 2021.

10. VOLUMES

- 10.1 N/A

11. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

- 11.1 The Supplier will be expected to continually improve the way in which the required Services are to be delivered throughout the Contract duration.

11.2 The Supplier should present new ways of working to the Authority during Contract review meetings (monthly, in the early stages, or quarterly when the project is underway).

11.3 Changes to the way in which the Services are to be delivered must be brought to the Authority's attention and agreed prior to any changes being implemented.

12. SUSTAINABILITY

12.1 N/A

13. QUALITY

13.1 n/a

14. PRICE

14.1 Prices are to be submitted via the Appendix E excluding VAT.

15. STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE

The Authority will work with the Supplier to produce a full risk register following award. The risk register will be updated throughout the life of the project and will be included along with regular progress updates.

15.1 The Authority will measure the quality of the Supplier's delivery by:

KPI/SLA	Service Area	KPI/SLA description	Target
1	Communication	Brief progress reports by email against agreed work milestones circulated by the Supplier no later than 3 full working days before progress meetings. Regular discussions via telephone as required.	100%
2	Project management	All action points from progress meetings circulated and agreed within 2 working days of the meeting.	100%
3	Completion of objectives	Draft Interim Report to be submitted to the Authority by the agreed deadline. Final Report to be submitted to the Authority by the agreed deadline Supplementary Annex to be submitted to the Authority by the agreed deadline	100%

15.2 The Authority will maintain a record of Supplier adherence to the agreed service level and performance timelines. Any non-adherence will result in performance review meetings between the Authority and the Supplier, to provide a full debrief and explanation as to why the service level agreement was not met. Improvement plans will be established along with clear timescales for improvement Performance

Management will be in accordance with Terms and Conditions as set out in Appendix C – Terms and Conditions.

- 15.3 Where the Supplier fails to provide a Service Improvement Plan or fails to deliver the agreed Service Improvement Plan to the required standard or within the agreed timescale, the Authority reserves the right to seek early termination of the contract in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C - Terms and Conditions.

16. SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

- 16.1 The Supplier will be required to securely collect and store data, which may include personal data, in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. The Supplier must follow the appropriate requirements for this. Further, where Authority data is used this data sharing will be subject to the Authority's data sharing agreements and data protection policy. Where data has been provided by HA's, data sharing agreements will be agreed with the individual HA and the Supplier.
- 16.2 The Supplier will be required to provide assurance to the Authority that all data will be destroyed within a reasonable timeframe from completion of the project, in line with the Authority Pilot Privacy Notice.

17. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS (IPR)

- 17.1 The Authority will retain full Intellectual Property Rights for the work completed. This is in accordance with Appendix C – Terms and Conditions.

18. PAYMENT

- 18.1 Payment can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables. Products must meet the Authorities quality standards and expectations before payment is authorised.
- 18.2 Invoices must be sent to the following address:
- 18.3 Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
REDACTED
- Email: **REDACTED**
- 18.4 Payment milestones will be agreed with the Supplier based on the schedule of work proposed.
- 18.5 Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.
- 18.6 Please note that the budget range for this contract is £110,000-130,000 (Ex VAT).

ANNEX B

Supplier's Proposal

The Customer also entered into Post Tender Clarification with the Supplier on Friday 8th March 2019. The following points were agreed during the discussion and form part of this Contract:

1. RSM have acknowledged that the CCS invitation to tender, sub-section 1.3 incorrectly states a contract length of 12 months, but are prepared to work according to the project milestones laid out in the Statement of Requirements (Appendix B), as shown in their indicative timeline to August 2020.
2. RSM have indicated that they will be able to produce the report within their indicative timeline, in order to publish by Autumn 2020, despite the later than anticipated start to the project.
3. RSM expanded in greater detail how they plan to fulfil the quantitative aspects of the bid if awarded the contract. RSM have stated that they are able to dedicate more time and resource from economists as needed in order to meet the quantitative aspects of the requirement, and that this would carry no additional cost beyond what is already stated in their bid.

QUESTIONNAIRE 4 – SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE		
Question Number	Question	Supplier's Response
4.1	<p>Potential Providers must provide two case studies to demonstrate their experience of delivering similar services as those set out in Appendix B. Potential Providers must clearly link these examples of previous experience to this current requirement.</p> <p>Potential Providers should also consider stating how their previous experience</p>	<p>4.1: CASE STUDIES OF OUR EXPERIENCE</p> <p>Case study 1: Deep Dive study into the Shared Ownership and Affordable Homes Programme 201621</p> <p>Lead researcher: REDACTED (with REDACTED, whilst at the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research)</p> <p>Dates: November 2017 to February 2018</p> <p>Client: Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).</p>

	<p>will be deployed to benefit this requirement.</p> <p>Responses to this question must take up no more than 2 sides of A4 and must be formatted in line with the requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	<p>Context: RSM was commissioned with support from the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research to deliver a review of the Shared Ownership & Affordable Homes Programme (AHP) 2016-21 using a deep dive case study research approach. The AHP has operated as the government's flagship housing programme in England under successive governments since the 1990s and is the main means by which the government provides funding for new Affordable Housing development. The objective was to assess the programme's effectiveness in delivering the UK Government's affordable housing objectives and achieving value for money.</p> <p>Methods: The study methodology involved four components:</p> <p>A desk-based policy review of the AHP was undertaken. This explored how the AHP had operated previously, how the current programme was operating and the objectives behind it.</p> <p>Data from the 2016-21 AHP was analysed to explore spend and outputs across different areas. This investigated whether affordable housing was being built in the areas where it was most needed (i.e. where affordability of market housing was worse).</p> <p>10 case studies of housing associations were undertaken to understand their interaction with the programme. This involved face to face interviews with the chief executives and development managers within each housing association. Housing associations were identified via existing contacts in the sector, recommendations from stakeholders and analysis of data on the profile of the sector, to ensure a range of types of association. Interviewees were recruited via emails followed up by phone calls. Information about the project was supplied and anonymity offered to ensure a full and frank discussion.</p> <p>Strategic stakeholders in the sector were interviewed. These comprised 30 individuals, including representatives of 16 housing associations in England, the Homes and Communities Agency, staff within MHCLG, the Greater London Authority). These were identified by the client, our own contacts and those of our partner organisation, the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research.</p> <p>Findings and recommendations: The findings explored the cyclical variation in AHP delivery; the</p>
--	---	--

		<p>relationship between affordability pressure and affordable housing delivery; data and monitoring requirements of the AHP; whether the AHP was delivering where affordable housing was most needed and the impact of wider changes to housing, planning and welfare policy on Affordable Housing delivery. The findings and recommendations were presented to MHCLG and Homes England for discussion and will inform policy development.</p> <p>Relevance to proposed study on the Voluntary Right to Buy: This study involved substantial engagement with the housing association sector across England. Case study interviews with those in charge of asset management and development of new housing gave us an in depth understanding of the ways in which new affordable housing is funded and developed. This will be particularly relevant for exploring the challenges and opportunities for developing replacement housing for that sold under the VRTB. The study also demonstrates our ability to engage with wider sector experts, who were interviewed as strategic stakeholders. The study was commissioned by MHCLG, with involvement from the HCA (now Homes England). This has given us a good understanding of the objectives of both organisations, and of the requirements MHCLG have for research in this field.</p> <p>Case Study 2: Interim Evaluation of Help to Buy Wales</p> <p>Lead researcher: REDACTED (with REDACTED)</p> <p>Dates: June 2015 to March 2016</p> <p>Client: Welsh Government</p> <p>Context: 1.1 The Help to Buy – Wales scheme was introduced in January 2014 in order to boost the house building sector in Wales and support home ownership. This interim evaluation measured the impact of Help to Buy - Wales on buyers and developers, considering how the existence of the scheme influenced buyer and developer behaviour.</p> <p>Methods: The project comprised both a process and an interim impact evaluation. The process evaluation aimed to establish how well the scheme had been implemented and was operating, whilst the impact evaluation analysed wider economic and industry-</p>
--	--	---

		<p>related impacts. A range of methods were used to meet the needs of these two approaches:</p> <p>A review of the policy context and programme management information was undertaken at the start to ensure the research built upon what was already available.</p> <p>Comprehensive surveys were undertaken with both buyers and developers. Response rates of 23 per cent (n=682) and 39 per cent (n=49) were achieved. Analysis was undertaken to check that the respondents were typical of the overall populations.</p> <p>Follow up interviews were carried out with 20 applicants (comprising 10 who had gone on to purchase and a further 10 who had dropped out) and 10 developers.</p> <p>A consultation exercise was held with key stakeholders including the Home Builders Federation, Chartered Institute of Housing, Welsh Government officials, Chair of the Housing Supply Task Force and Council of Mortgage Lenders.</p> <p>Benchmarking was undertaken involving a comparative analysis of the scheme across Wales vis-à-vis the similar Help to Buy scheme in England. This compared data on applicants, purchase prices, loan to value ratios and housing market indicators between the two schemes in order to inform understanding of the counterfactual.</p> <p>Findings and recommendations: The research concluded that the Help to Buy - Wales scheme has had a positive impact on the Welsh housing market with 75 per cent of buyers being first time buyers. This evidence showed additionality in terms of the purchasing of a greater quantity of new properties than would have occurred without the scheme. A cumulative analysis of survey responses suggest at least 126 jobs were created by developers directly because of the scheme (additional) with a further 34 jobs being partially additional (may have been created without the Scheme). The evidence suggested some displacement impact on buyer activity, with some buyers suggesting they altered their behaviour due to the scheme – such as purchasing a bigger house or bringing forward their timeframe. There was some evidence, although limited, that it became difficult to sell smaller properties that could be marketed as</p>
--	--	---

		<p>'starter homes' as first time buyers were diverted to the Help to Buy scheme.</p> <p>Recommendations were made to improve marketing strategy promoting the scheme to buyers, solicitors and financial institutions, offering training to solicitors and Independent Financial Advisors to improve the efficiency of the scheme's operation. The Welsh Government was recommended to consider further analysis of the possible impact of the scheme on those seeking to sell a property</p> <p>Relevance to proposed study on the Voluntary Right to Buy: This study involved analysis of a government scheme with very similar objectives to the VRTB – to increase home ownership rates. It involved consideration of housing market conditions and the ways in which home-buyers decide to make use of a scheme, or not. This is a very similar approach to the one we have proposed here – including interviews with people who have decided not to proceed with VRTB purchases. The study also involved two surveys, using our Smart Survey technology, developing expertise that will be applied to the housing association survey in the work proposed here.</p>
4.2	<p>Potential Providers must include a list of the Key Personnel they will use when delivering this requirement. Each Key Person should have 5 critical and relevant details of their skills and experience listed.</p> <p>Potential Providers should ensure that any experience or skills listed are relevant to this requirement and should state how they will deploy these experiences and skills to the benefit of the services outline in Appendix B.</p> <p>Responses to this question must take up no more than 2 sides of A4 and must be formatted in line with the</p>	<p>RSM Economic Consulting is a team within the RSM tax and consulting global network. We have a large team of 25 consultants working across the UK and have the capacity, skills and resources to undertake this specialised and fast-paced project. The proposed team comprise:</p> <p>REDACTED (BSc Economics and Business, MBA, Cert Diploma in Accounts and Finance) is an RSM Partner with over 20 years' research and evaluation experience in the housing and health sectors, including an evaluation of Rent Smart Wales (landlord registration and licensing scheme).</p> <p>Skills and experience:</p> <p>Research / evaluation in support of legislative developments - clients have included Government Departments; County Councils; Housing Associations as well as Health Trusts. REDACTED has presented to Government Departments on the effectiveness of several publicly funded programmes and the evidence has been used to inform funding / policy decisions.</p>

	<p>requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	<p>Knowledge of the housing sector across the UK as well as the work of local authorities. REDACTED has led and managed assessments of the design, implementation and operation of several housing schemes, including cost benefit analysis and outcomes for stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Contract management – skilled in managing process and impact evaluations to tight timescales and with multi sub-contractors and team members.</p> <p>Managing risk, ensuring IG and data protection requirements are adhered to and reporting to Steering Groups (with multi stakeholders).</p> <p>Highly proficient in the following areas: project management; policy and economic analysis; quantitative and qualitative research; presentation and reporting.</p> <p>REDACTED (MSc in Social Research Methods) is an Associate Director and a leading housing policy expert. Prior to joining RSM in March 2018, has 14 years' experience at the Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research</p> <p>Skills and experience</p> <p>Leading expert on social housing in England. Research she has led has included:</p> <p>Analysis for the JRF on the impact of the voluntary RTB and proposed sales of higher value homes on access to social housing, and poverty. This included estimating update of the RTB</p> <p>A review of Birmingham City Council's housing allocation policy o A review of shared ownership for UK Finance</p> <p>The evaluation, commissioned by the DWP, of the housing benefit cuts for social tenants with spare bedrooms, which included close engagement with the housing association sector</p> <p>Highly experienced research manager who las led teams of researchers and fieldwork across multiple case study sites</p> <p>Skilled at researching controversial issues, dealing with conflicting views of lobby groups and producing robust independent analysis. For instance, REDACTED led work for the Welsh Government</p>
--	--	---

		<p>exploring the likely impact of banning letting agency fees to tenants</p> <p>Experienced mixed methods researcher, with a thorough understanding of the synergies between qualitative and quantitative methods</p> <p>Skilled at presenting findings to government clients, local authorities, housing practitioners and government ministers.</p> <p>Responsibilities: Director of research and responsibility for all deliverables. Progress reports and phone calls, design research tools and produce report</p> <p>REDACTED (BSc Economics and International Development) is an experienced evaluator in mixed methods research and developing evaluation / performance measurement frameworks.</p> <p>Skills and expertise</p> <p>Track record in undertaking housing research including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Managing the MHCLG case study team and ensuring that the case studies were completed to the tight schedule required for the public land build-out analysis o Leading the MHCLG-commissioned review of the HCA's Affordable Homes Programme <p>Housing association Non-Executive Director for seven years, overseeing new development</p> <p>Over ten years' experience of designing Magenta Book compliant evaluation frameworks and theory of change, for a variety of public funded programmes including:</p> <p>Education, health, community and economic development programmes</p> <p>For clients such as NHS England, Department for Education, Department for Health, Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, local authorities and third sector organisations.</p> <p>Responsibilities: Deputy project director</p> <p>REDACTED (BA and MA Modern History) is a Senior Consultant with over seven years research /</p>
--	--	---

		<p>evaluation experience, including completing an evaluation of the landlord registration and licensing scheme Rent Smart Wales.</p> <p>Skills and experience</p> <p>Strong understanding of housing policy and particularly how housing schemes / legislation is implemented at a local level</p> <p>Experience in conducting qualitative interviews with a range of stakeholder groups, including local authorities to obtain meaningful and relevant insight on key issues</p> <p>Experience in developing case studies and writing robust research and evaluation reports</p> <p>Expertise in conducting impact analysis of government programmes / schemes including the development of logic models and theories of change and is skilled at understanding / measuring the intended and unintended impacts for a range of different groups</p> <p>Skilled at developing data collection processes to obtain quantitative information on projects and programmes (resourcing, costs, time audits etc.)</p> <p>Responsibilities: Development of case studies and sections of the report</p> <p>REDACTED (MA in International Relations and Development Studies / BA in Anthropology) is a Senior Consultant with a focus on housing research and evaluation.</p> <p>Skills and experience • In depth understanding of local authorities, with over 10 years' experience and as a local authority Senior Research Officer with responsibility for producing the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for a sub-regional group of local authorities</p> <p>Experience of data collection and analysis regarding housing issues, including the development of surveys and liaising with district council / local authorities to collect data</p> <p>Completed numerous research assignments relating to housing and of producing briefing papers for sub-regional housing board and other audiences</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Experience as a Senior Land Use and Transport Interaction Analyst developing extensive data analysis skills</p> <p>Experience with a range of technical programmes including CSS, FUNDRAISING, HTML, JAVASCRIPT, MAPINFO, QGIS, MS Excel, Social Media Marketing, SNAP surveys. Able to run models, analyse results and reporting results to clients</p> <p>Responsibilities: Case studies, secondary data collection and data analysis</p> <p>REDACTED (BA and MA Modern History) a consultant with expertise in community impact, will support the fieldwork</p> <p>Undertook an equality impact assessment on behalf of Southwark Council for the regeneration of Aylesbury Estate, analysing the equality impacts of relocation on homeowners</p> <p>Extensive experience undertaking stakeholder engagement including focus groups, face-to-face and telephone interviews to explore topics such as service configuration</p> <p>Experienced in engagement with vulnerable groups, such as disabled people and older people</p> <p>Designed and delivered online surveys with high response rates for clients such as NHS England, HS2 and Merseytravel</p> <p>Part of the core team which delivered a large scale evaluation of impacts (including social and community impacts) of Heritage Lottery Funding on heritage sites across the UK. This involved conducting 50 face-to-face interviews, as well as an online survey, of grant recipients.</p>
--	--	--

QUESTIONNAIRE 5 – APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Question Number	Question	Supplier's Response
-----------------	----------	---------------------

<p>5.1</p>	<p>Please outline your approach and methodology for collecting the required data for objectives I-VI in Section 6.3 of Appendix B.</p> <p>Your response should include details of how you will make use of existing data, the method and techniques for collecting additional data and how this will be beneficial in conducting research for the Authority under this contract.</p> <p>Responses should take up no more than 3 sides of A4 and must be formatted in line with the requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	<p>We proposed a mixed methods approach, building on what is already known, as set out below. We have indicated (in brackets) which of the objectives set out in the brief these relate to. Objective I is the overarching objective, so will be addressed largely through the analysis, see 5.2 Data Analysis for details.</p> <p>Engagement with sector experts (Objective I)</p> <p>The evaluation project board comprises a sub-group of the pilot operational board, consisting of representatives from the Authority, NHF and 3-4 pilot HA representatives. Regular board meetings, and updates by email will allow us to engage them in emerging issues as the evaluation progresses. In addition, we propose to undertake a series of interviews with key individuals within Government involved in overseeing the pilot, at the start of the evaluation, in mid-2019 and towards the end of the study. This will allow us to understand the operational challenges and – in the later interviews – to gain their insight into emerging findings and how they relate to the running of the scheme. We will also include the NHF in these interviews, as the representative of the HA sector who may be aware of issues facing its members.</p> <p>Understanding and measuring demand (Objective II)</p> <p>After commencing with an inception meeting we will run a workshop, analyse policy and survey HAs.</p> <p>Workshop for HAs</p> <p>We will run a workshop for the 45 HAs involved in the pilot in order to introduce them to our team and explain the purpose of the evaluation and what input we will seek from them. This enable us to identify key inputs. We have offices throughout England, and would suggest hosting this from our Birmingham office, to facilitate access from across the Midlands. The Authority and NHF would also be welcome to attend this workshop.</p> <p>Policy and data review</p> <p>We will review the monitoring data being collected as part of the pilot, to identify potential for analysis and gaps, to be filled through the survey and case studies. We will also review the Action Learning Study already undertaken. We have read the report already and would supplement this by speaking to the NHF, and to the lead authors at CRESR. We are familiar with</p>
------------	--	---

		<p>the CRESR team and would value their views on the implications of their study for this wider pilot evaluation. We will also analyse policy documents including guidance already issued to HAs involved in the pilot and analysis in which our staff were involved modelling the likely update of RTB update. The House of Commons Library briefing from August this year also provides a useful and up to date overview. We will also analyse administrative data supplied by the Authority and by the 45 HAs involved. After this we will discuss with the Authority what gaps remain and how we can fill these through the survey and interviews.</p> <p>Surveys of HAs</p> <p>We propose to a series of online surveys of HAs in order to fill any gaps in quantitative data already being collected, and also to collect qualitative information about how the pilot is being implemented, challenges to implementation, promotion and demand management. These will include details of eligibility criteria and how HAs are managing demand. We think that the breadth of coverage achieved by a survey is necessary in order to bring out any points of comparison between different types of HAs (developing/non-developing, rural/urban, high/low priced housing market). The first survey will cover the design of the scheme and implementation plans whilst later ones will collect up to date information on uptake. We will discuss with the board the optimal frequency of this exercise to minimise burden on HAs, whilst providing timely data. We would suggest not more than quarterly. As only 45 HAs are involved in the pilot, we will engage closely with them to aim for close to a 100% response rate. This will involve sending email reminders, chasing by phone, and working with the NHF and if necessary the Authority in order to encourage slow responders. Our survey software allows us to monitor responses in real time and to pick up any situations where respondents appear to have got stuck part-way though and contact them to ask if we can help them to complete the survey, completing it for them whilst on the phone to them if necessary. We will also offer a phone number and email contact for respondents for queries.</p> <p>Portability of discounts will be covered here (contributing to Objective III) to establish the extent to which HAs are offering portability of discounts, and how they are identifying appropriate alternative housing for affected applicants. The surveys will ask for the names of the HAs and factual information</p>
--	--	---

		<p>provided will be attributable to that organisation and used to supplement existing quantitative information. Views and opinions, however, will be anonymised in order to encourage full and frank responses.</p> <p>Assessing operational implementation (Objective III)</p> <p>The extent to which HAs are offering portability will be explored in the monitoring data (if recorded) or survey (if not). Policies will be explored in more detail via 10 in depth case studies with HAs. These will involve a visit and face to face interviews with the Chief Executive (or similar), to explore the strategic aims of the RTB within their organisation, and interviews with operational staff who handle enquires from potential applicants. This can be either a series of individual interviews or a group interview, depending on what each HA thinks will work best for them. We will discuss how they have prepared for the launch of the pilot, systems for identifying properties that cannot be sold (e.g. due to S106 restrictions), compliance with the Capital Funding Guide, stock transfer agreements, and other legal constraints and how they have promoted the scheme and are dealing with enquires. The checklist on pages 13-14 of the guidance provides a useful checklist³. We will also ask for plans around building replacement stock – numbers they are expecting to build, what types of stock they will be building, where, how, and how they will ensure that this is additional to existing plans and funded from the receipts from the sale of the RTB homes.</p> <p>We envisage making first contact with the case study HAs in early 2019, and then re-interviewing at least one person from each case study at six monthly intervals to for an update on emerging issues. This will include systems for identifying fraud and dealing with managing portability. We will also ask respondents about the potential impact of ways in which the pilot differs from the planned rollout – such as withholding some of the payment of the discount until the replacement home has been completed.</p> <p>The case studies will also contribute to meeting Objective IV exploring policies around one for one replacement, and Objective V by exploring systems for identifying fraud and unfair sales. It is likely that some customer enquiries never get as far as resulting in a formal application, so we will ask HA staff of their</p>
--	--	---

³ http://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/pub.housing.org.uk/Midlands_Pilot_Voluntary_Right_To_Buy_Guidance.pdf

		<p>overview on the reasons why people may choose not to apply, enhancing our understanding of the customer experience (Objective V) and underlying demand (Objective II).</p> <p>Sampling of case studies</p> <p>We propose a stratified sampling approach to ensure a broad coverage of HAs based on size, location, degree of focus on new development, tenant-type and origin (stock transfer/traditional). We will discuss our proposed approach with the Authority and can also accommodate any other factors considered relevant.</p> <p>Assessment of operation of one for one replacement (Objective IV)</p> <p>As noted in the brief, replacement properties are required to be built within three years, so are unlikely to be built in large numbers within the timespan of this evaluation. We will have discussed HAs' plans for replacement in the case studies (see above), and will at this stage explore any data that is available on replacement stock by July 2020, as well as drawing on the analysis of the HAs' plans for replacement to make recommendations for how best the Authority can undertake further work to monitor and evaluate the success in building replacement stock at a later date.</p> <p>Customer experience: Interviews with VRTB applicants (Objective V)</p> <p>We will also undertake 60 telephone interviews with people who have applied to purchase under the RTB – including both those who go on to purchase and those who fail to progress their applications. We think that individual interviews will be more practical than a group discussion with this client group, because they may not live near to any one location, and also because the content of the interviews may include discussions around sensitive financial issues that they may feel less comfortable discussing publicly. We will ask the participating HAs to contact their applicants, to ask them whether they would be willing to speak to us (using text that we can supply, to ensure compliance with GDPR), and to pass on their contact details to our team if they consent. The interviews will explore affordability and applicants' motivations and customer experience, including the ballot process. We will ask applicants their reasons for applying,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>experience of the process, and (if applicable) the reasons they failed to progress their application.</p> <p>We have not proposed large-scale surveying of tenants because the questions posed in the brief are more qualitative than quantitative and we expect the monitoring data and HA survey to provide the more comprehensive data on applicants and uptake.</p> <p>Sampling of applicants for interviews</p> <p>The sample will be drawn in two halves – half to be interviewed in spring 2019, and the other half in spring 2020. This will allow us to have some findings in time for the interim report, but to have a fuller sample include more people who have completed their purchases in time for the final report.</p> <p>We will also stratify the sample to include an even mixture of tenants who have completed (or are in the process of progressing) their RTB application, and those who have withdrawn from the process. This will enable us to find out about the tenant experience of the process, and also to learn why some tenants decide not to progress their applications (including exploring issues of affordability). For the remainder of the sample, we will ask our case study HAs to provide a random sample of those who have applied to purchase within the first few months of the pilot going live. The cut-off date will be determined after discussions with the case study HAs and the Authority in order to provide the best balance between the need to speak to tenants who are sufficiently advanced with their applications to be able to provide views on the entire process, and the need to ensure that the evaluation can meet its own deadline.</p> <p>We propose to work closely with the case study HAs to obtain the sample of applicants to interview. Within this, we propose a stratified random sampling method. The sample will be stratified to include up to 15 tenants offered portability (which will contribute to meeting Objective III) – this is because we think the number of tenants offered portability is likely to be quite small, so if we draw the sample randomly we may have insufficient numbers to be able to say anything meaningful around tenants’ views on portability of discounts. We will therefore work closely with any of the case studies who are offering portability to prioritise these tenants for interviews, up to a maximum of 15 obtained interviews - if this many</p>
--	--	---

		<p>can be identified who are sufficiently advanced in the application process (or have withdrawn voluntarily).</p> <p>Evaluation of “Pilot within a pilot” sales of extra care housing (Objective VI)</p> <p>The methods for evaluating this pilot scheme will be confirmed in more detail in the PID, once we know more about it (for instance, are the extra care housing units sold to current residents, or is portability used in some manner? What is the scale and timetable? Who is eligible?). We can include the HA who is undertaking this pilot as one of our case studies and also analyse data on applications, sales, etc, and speak to a range of other local agencies involved in the pilot or in supporting residents.</p> <p>If possible, we will include up to 15 interviews with customers purchasing under this scheme.</p>
5.2	<p>Potential Providers should describe their proposed method for analysing the data gathered/provided for objectives I-VI in Section 6.3 of Appendix B. Response should consider the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How this analysis will address the objectives of the research as detailed in the Appendix B. - How analysis and reporting of the data would be conducted to provide meaningful and relevant conclusions. <p>Responses should take up no more than 3 sides of A4 and must be formatted in line with the requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	 <p>5.2 Data analysis.pdf</p>

QUESTIONNAIRE 6 – QUALITY ASSURANCE AND DELIVERY

Question Number	Question	Supplier's Response
6.1	<p>Potential Providers should describe the quality assurance processes they will use to ensure that any outputs are accurate and understandable. Potential Providers should consider government requirements around research ethics and data security when detailing these processes.</p> <p>Potential Providers should also provide an example of a risk register detailing risks relevant to the delivery of the services outlined in Appendix B.</p> <p>Responses to this question should take up no more than 2 sides of A4 and should be formatted in line with the requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	 <p>6.1 Quality assurance and delivery (1).pdf</p>
6.2	<p>Potential Providers should provide a project timeline detailing how they will deliver the project within the timescale stated within Appendix B. This timeline should detail any particular bottleneck areas and describe ways in which the Potential Provider will manage these.</p> <p>Potential Provider may also wish to consider any other contingency plans they would utilise to ensure effective and timely</p>	 <p>6.2 Timeline.pdf</p>

	<p>delivery of the requirement.</p> <p>Responses to this question should take up no more than 2 sides of A4 and should be formatted in line with the requirements set out in section 3.13.</p>	
--	--	--

Part 2: Contract Terms

Please see document provided separately

Annex C – Price Schedule

REDACTED