DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

REDACTED

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated 18/12/19, 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.

Order Number:	CCZZ19A25
From:	The Department for Transport ("Customer")
To:	University of the West of England ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	Monday 23rd day of December 2019
Expiry Date:	End date of Initial Period Monday 23rd day of December 2024 There shall be no option to extend.

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

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

Contract Charges (including any applicable	Day Rates: **REDACTED**

discount(s), but excluding VAT):	Day=8 hours These day rates will remain firm for the life of the contract, and will be used to form any additional work. Total Costs: The total Capped cost for this Contract shall be £797,831.81 excluding VAT. Upon Contract Award, the Customer shall be provided with a profile by the Supplier of how they will be invoiced (also referred to as the payment schedule). This shall include costs for each of the agreed outputs (broken down by staff time and any other costs incurred), including a breakdown of VAT if applicable, and dates when invoices will be submitted linked to key project milestones. The project should be delivered on a capped cost price basis. Government standard practice is to make payment in arrears on satisfactory receipt and acceptance of contracted deliverables. To assist with the payment process, draft invoices shall first be submitted by e-mail to the Customer's Project Manager. Once the draft invoice has been agreed, a DfT 'Goods Received Notice (GRN)' will be produced and the Customer will then confirm that the invoice may be submitted for payment. Payment can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables. Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.
Insurance Requirements	Please refer to Framework RM6018 Research Marketplace Dynamic Purchasing System terms and conditions.
Liability Requirements	**Suppliers limitation of Liability** (Clause **Error! Reference source not found.** of the Contract Terms); Please refer to Framework RM6018 Research Marketplace Dynamic Purchasing System terms and conditions.
Customer billing address for invoicing:	Invoices must quote the Purchase Order (PO) number (issued to the appointed Supplier) and must be submitted as directed in the PO to: **REDACTED**

GDPR	**REDACTED**
Alternative and/or additional provisions (including Schedule 8(Additional	N/A

clauses)):	

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:

Name and Title: **REDACTED**

Signature: **REDACTED**

Date:

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title: **REDACTED**

Signature: **REDACTED**

Date:

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Definitions

Expression or Acronym	Definition
DfT	means; The Department for Transport (the Customer)
TCF	means; Transforming Cities Fund
MCAs	means Mayoral and Combined Authorities
CoP	means Community of Practice

2. Scope of Requirement

2.1 The Supplier shall coordinate the National Evaluation (the “evaluation”) of the TCF, across the 12 competitively funded areas and the 6 funded MCAs.

2.2 In summary the requirement will be for the delivery of:

- **Overarching evaluation:**
  - An **evaluation framework** will need to be developed which will identify the high-level outcome and impact measures that will form part of the overarching evaluation of TCF, and inform and support local areas’ evaluation activities, encouraging consistent data collection that will allow for central collation and analysis. The framework should identify where it will be possible to undertake a counterfactual evaluation approach to arrive at robust quantitative conclusions about the impact of TCF schemes.
  - Alongside, and after, the framework’s development, the Supplier will engage with local areas to **support and coordinate the development of their evaluation plans** and ensure these are aligned with the framework.
  - Because local areas will only be responsible for evaluation activity relating to their own schemes, the national evaluation will be required to **collate and synthesise evidence that addresses questions about the overall impact of TCF**. After the evaluation framework has been agreed and local area evaluation plans established, the overarching evaluation will commence collation and production of reports for DfT on the overall progress of TCF.
- **Targeted evaluation case studies:**
  - To complement the overarching evaluation activity, this contract should also support an adaptive policymaking

approach by providing **rapid-turnaround research covering themes, issues or locations of particular policy interest**. This could involve a variety of research methods, but for simplicity these research projects are referred to in this brief as 'case studies' because the intention is for them to provide in-depth coverage in a targeted way.

- The first case study requirement will consist of **qualitative research exploring the co-development process**. This will be a priority strand of the evaluation for early completion. This research should focus on local areas' experiences of the co-development process through which TCF schemes are being designed, as this is one of the most novel aspects of the TCF, and one that may shape the design and implementation of similar funds in the future.

- For further case studies, the exact specification will depend on the research objectives that need to be addressed. These will be identified over the course of the evaluation, depending on evidence gaps and policy team requirements, and will be decided between the Supplier and the Customer. The Customer expects to prioritise studies of types of schemes that are representative or novel, and of interest in informing future policymaking. Methods should be selected based on the most appropriate approaches for answering key research questions. Case studies could include mixed method approaches and will generate new data beyond that which is collected as part of the local evaluation.

2.3 The following activities will be out of scope of this requirement:

- **Evaluation of TCF Tranche 1 schemes:** schemes funded through Tranche 1 of the TCF will be evaluated by local areas and will not be included in this evaluation requirement.

- **Delivery of local area evaluations:** although this requirement will deliver overarching evaluation activity, and coordinate and support local areas in designing their evaluations for schemes funded through Tranche 2 of the TCF, local areas will ultimately remain responsible for the delivery of the evaluation activity relating to their funded schemes. (Local evaluation activity will be funded through existing funding streams, and not through this requirement.) However, the Supplier will be responsible for supporting local areas in adhering to the requirements of the evaluation framework and producing overall reporting based on what is set out above.

2.4 There will be considerable read across and influence between local evaluation activities and the national evaluation. The Supplier will be expected to take account of local work in the design and analysis of the evaluation, while local areas will be instructed to follow some consistent features in their local work to align with the evaluation framework produced through the national evaluation.

2.5 The Customer believes that national evaluation activity which builds on local evaluation provides the optimum basis for collecting good evidence about the effectiveness of the TCF because:

- Guidance and support through this contract should **improve consistency and quality of evaluation activity** across areas, reducing duplication of effort.

- The Supplier shall **specify standard monitoring metrics** and collect data from different local areas that can then be aggregated and analysed in a consistent way, improving the learning from the evaluation.

- Thematic case studies undertaken as part of the overarching evaluation contract will be able to **draw together evidence from different areas** in a rich and insightful way.

- A consolidated programme of reporting will **provide insight about the effectiveness of different types of schemes**, generating actionable findings both at the whole programme level and for local areas.

3. The Requirement

<u>Evaluation Framework:</u>

3.1 A core task for the evaluation will be the development of an overarching national evaluation framework. Due to each local area's schemes being unique, it will be necessary to **establish a typology of schemes** by identifying at a high level the commonalities and shared priorities of TCF schemes (or groups of schemes) that will facilitate comparison and meaningful analysis.

3.2 The Supplier will collate and digest information about local areas' plans, including but not limited to: the schemes, appraisal information, deliverable and intended outputs. The Supplier will be supported by the Customer and local areas in obtaining the relevant information. The Supplier will be expected to draw on this information in delivering the overarching evaluation and case studies.

3.3 The first stage in producing the evaluation framework will be to review the scheme plans available from local areas, to establish a typology of schemes and identify the key commonalities and differences between local areas' packages of schemes. This will build on the detail set out in Section 2 covering the potential range of schemes. The framework should then **identify a set of consistent evaluation designs and metrics** that can be collected to inform overarching evaluation reports about the outcomes and impacts of the TCF. These will be agreed with the Customer, and must meet the standards for transport evaluation as set out in the Customer's published evaluation guidance.

3.4 The Customer welcomes the Supplier recommending and sourcing, or encouraging local areas to source, additional data that will inform the evaluation.

3.5 The Customer is keen for this framework to facilitate robust conclusions about the outcomes of TCF. As a result, the framework should **identify where counterfactual evaluation methods can be applied** (where it is proportionate and practical to do so) – the Customer is keen for this to be done where it is possible. For example, identifying measures where it is likely to be possible to compare against suitable areas, to provide evidence for what would have happened in the absence of the plans.

3.6 However, the Customer recognises that the scope and range of the TCF means a counterfactual evaluation approach is not likely to be viable across all schemes. Packages of schemes within local areas may be designed to complement one another, or share common objectives, making it difficult to isolate the effects of individual schemes. Equally, it may not be feasible to identify locations within local areas where certain schemes do not operate and which are suitable for use as a comparison. The framework should therefore also **consider how theory-based evaluation methods, drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data sources, could be used** to draw conclusions about schemes' relative contribution to achieving impacts.

3.7 To achieve this, the creation of the framework will require the further development and **refinement of an overarching logic model setting out the 'theory of change'** underpinning the whole TCF and the individual local area packages that will sit within it. An initial logic model (Annex 1 – Transforming Cities Fund Draft Logic Model) has already been developed by the DfT, but will require refinement in light of more detailed information about local areas' schemes.

3.8 The resulting evaluation framework should set out:

- What information should be stored from local area appraisals and business cases for individual projects for use both at the individual project level and centrally.
- How this information should be processed to provide baselines and targets in terms of timing and outcomes against which progress can subsequently be monitored during and after the implementation of projects.
- What datasets will be available either publicly or by arrangement with stakeholder organisations to enable the outcomes of the programme to be tracked. The lags in the availability of the data and any limitations on accessibility should be flagged.
- Taking account of the issues in collecting such data, what forms of monitoring for the TCF should be conducted centrally, for example by the Customer and its agencies or as part of the overarching evaluation conducted as part of this requirement.
- What forms of data collection would be more efficiently collected at a local level, by local areas responsible for TCF projects.
- For measures collected locally, a consistent format for reporting that can facilitate central analysis and comparison between areas.

Support and guidance for local areas developing evaluation plans:

3.9 Local areas will already have made progress developing their evaluation plans. Drafts of these were submitted as part of their draft Strategic Outline Business Cases in June 2019, drawing on existing guidance such as DfT's Monitoring & Evaluation guidance for Local Major schemes.

3.10 Alongside, and after, the development of the framework, the Supplier will need to provide advice and guidance to the 12 competitively funded areas and 6 MCAs to bring their evaluation plans in line with the TCF evaluation framework produced through the first stage of the overarching evaluation.

3.11 Engagement with the competitively funded areas and the MCAs will require a different approach. Throughout the co-development process, there is already an established channel for interaction with the 12 competitively funded local areas to help shape their bids and plans. The Supplier will be responsible for working with the Customer to sign off local area evaluation plans for these 12 areas.

3.12 With the 6 MCAs, there is not a formal co-development process, although DfT will have sight of MCA delivery plans. The Supplier shall need to engage with those 6 organisations to support their evaluation plans. The overarching evaluation will need to be able to draw conclusions about both competitively funded areas and the MCAs, with a view to enabling comparison and learning across all areas.

3.13 Although the specific support provided will need to be tailored to each of the local areas engaged with, support and guidance is likely to cover the following points:

- Support with development of local logic models and theories of change;
- Identification of metrics, and guidance on how business case and appraisal information can be used to profile project outcomes and provide targets for subsequent progress monitoring;
- Identification of schemes where counterfactual evaluation designs will be possible, and guidance on designing these;
- Developing consistent format for evaluation reports to facilitate comparison with other areas.

3.14 Guidance will also help to ensure that local area evaluations are pragmatic – seeking to make effective and proportionate use of local areas' resources while maximising potential learnings and comparability across areas. It will probably be necessary to prioritise local areas' evaluation activities, identifying the elements of their schemes, which can be most effectively evaluated and focusing efforts on these.

3.15 Local areas may have limited experience of designing and delivering evaluations with robust counterfactual designs. However, these (where they are realistic and achievable) will be important to providing high quality evidence on the impact of the TCF. As such, a key part of this support will be able to help local areas identify where and how counterfactual designs can strengthen their evaluation activity.

3.16 The ambition and scale of local areas' proposals vary, as will their evaluation capacity and expertise. These factors will influence the level of support required.

3.17 The Supplier will need to have the greatest level of engagement with local areas soon after Contract award, in early 2020, and in any case study work in their areas. Thereafter, there should be regular discussions on progress to ensure local evaluations remain on track.

3.18 It is anticipated that early support will include **a minimum of one face-to-face workshop with each local area**, bringing together staff responsible for designing and delivering evaluation plans. As well as structured workshops, the Customer anticipates that local areas will require more informal support with developing their evaluation designs in 2020 in the early months of the contract.

3.19 An average level of support for a local area may be a face-to-face workshop early in the first year followed by further face-to-face meetings in each subsequent year and ongoing telephone support at the rate of about one call per month for the duration of the Contract. However, Suppliers may suggest greater or lesser levels of engagement, with justification of how this level of engagement would meet the requirements of the evaluation satisfactorily.

Targeted Evaluation Case Studies:

3.20 These targeted research projects will focus on schemes, areas, or topics identified as being of particular interest or of high potential for informing policy decisions. For example, this might involve a focus on a particular type of scheme across different local areas (e.g. smart ticketing programmes); the realisation of a particular type of benefit (e.g. employment benefits) or schemes delivered by a particular local area. The identification of these case studies will depend on the requirements of DfT’s TCF policy team. The successful Supplier will therefore need to allow time for consultation with the policy team when considering the selection of case studies.

3.21 The Customer recognises that there is a trade-off between breadth and depth of coverage in these case studies to ensure that the chosen topics can be thoroughly explored while also being sufficiently responsive to policy needs. The Customer’s initial conclusion is that six detailed case studies should be undertaken across the course of the evaluation, with these being focused on specific learning priorities identified by TCF policy colleagues. The first case study requirement has already been identified (research into the co-development process) and is detailed in the following sub-section, to provide a sense of what the case study requirements may look like.

3.22 Other examples of potential future case studies (although not yet confirmed) include: in-depth research with potential beneficiaries of schemes (e.g. bus network operators); and process evaluation exploring how local areas devised interlinked packages of schemes that target strategic goals.

3.23 The following table sets out an indication of how the case studies are intended to be distributed across the course of the evaluation. The Customer anticipates a need for four case studies each concentrated at a single point in time (such as with the co-development research), and which would each fall within a single year of the Contract. A further two case studies are expected to be longitudinal, having multiple research points across the course of the evaluation. These would suit case studies covering interventions that take some time to reveal their impacts (e.g. mobility credit schemes or zonal controls on traffic and parking).

	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Targeted case studies				
1 (Co-development process)				
2				
3				
4				
Longitudinal case studies				
5				
6				

3.24 The exact number of deep-dive case studies will be dependent on the TCF policy team, and as such there could be a requirement for more (or fewer) case studies. However, the Customer expects to undertake a minimum of six deep-dive case studies and a maximum of eight. The Customer will assess the need for additional case studies (above the expected six) on a call-off basis during the evaluation.

3.25 The specific design of these case studies is expected to be flexible. The range of evidence required (e.g. balance between qualitative and quantitative evidence) will vary depending on the specific objectives that each case study is designed to address..

3.26 In setting out the potential methods they would intend to use to deliver these case studies, Suppliers should detail their approach to applying these, including development of research tools, data collection, data analysis, reporting and quality assurance.

Case Study 1 – Co-Development process evaluation:

3.27 The first case study will focus on local areas' and the Customer's experiences of the co-development process. This is one of the key novel elements of the TCF, and evidence on how effectively it is working will be valuable for policy colleagues.

3.28 To deliver this case study, it is envisaged that a series of qualitative interviews be undertaken with representatives from a purposively selected sub-sample of local areas, as well as staff in the Customer, to explore their perceptions of the co-development process. This case study should draw on the principles of process evaluation – exploring how the principles of co-development were implemented in practice within the different local area contexts to surface lessons about how effectively the process was delivered.

3.29 The outputs of this research should consider both the strengths and weaknesses of the co-development process, as well as exploring the differences in how experiences have varied between local areas. The emphasis of the process evaluation report should be on how these findings can directly inform the delivery and implementation of co-development throughout the remainder of the TCF process, as well as for future programmes.

4. Key milestones and Deliverables

4.1 The following Contract milestones/deliverables shall apply:

Milestone/ Deliverable	Description	Timeframe or Delivery Date
1 – Evaluation framework document	A confirmation of the project work plan based on the tender specification, the Supplier’s proposals and matters subsequently agreed in set up/initiation meetings; a document setting out a framework for monitoring delivery of the TCF that will enable the coordination of evaluation activity across local areas. This will set out how business case information, datasets and fresh data collection should be used and what roles national and local bodies should contribute.	Well-developed initial draft within two months of Contract Award; to be finalised after local area engagement completed
2 – Report on Case Study 1 – Process evaluation of co-development	As detailed in Section 2 ‘The Requirement’, a report to examine local areas’ experiences of the co-development process that draws conclusions about its strengths and weaknesses to inform the future delivery of such processes.	To be confirmed but expected to be within six months of Contract Award
3 – Completion of local area business cases (including evaluation plans)	As detailed in Section 2 ‘The Requirement’, local areas will require support and guidance through this Contract to deliver their evaluation plans in their TCF business cases.	To be confirmed but expected to be within four months of Contract Award
4 – First annual interim report	As detailed in Section 2 ‘The Requirement’, these reports should combine the latest outputs from all the elements of the evaluation, to form an evidence-based narrative on the performance of the local plans. The outputs of each annual report should be presented to the Customer, in person, upon completion.	Within year 1 of Contract Award
5 – Second annual interim report		Within year 2 of Contract Award
6 – Third annual interim report		Within year 3 of Contract Award
7 – Fourth annual interim report		Within year 4 of Contract Award
8 – Evaluation summary report		Within year 5 of Contract Award

5. Management Information/Reporting

Overarching Evaluation Reports:

5.1 Overarching evaluation outputs will need to follow the structure set out in the evaluation framework, drawing together the available evidence (including evidence gathered by local areas and any additional evidence required to be collected centrally) to present an overarching narrative about the progress and impacts of TCF. This should bring together the available qualitative and quantitative evidence, and will probably involve some meta-analysis of evaluation outputs from across the local areas. Where possible, the Customer is keen for this reporting to synthesise local counterfactuals to arrive at conclusions about impacts on key measures across the TCF as a whole.

5.2 It is envisaged that over the course of the Contract between 2019/20 and 2023/24 there will be annual reporting points for the overarching evaluation. Interim reports should be provided at the end of each of the first four years of the Contract. While evidence of impacts may be limited in the early stages of implementation, it will still be useful to set out the available evidence in a structured way which can be built on in further interim reports. For example, these reports could present evidence on early indicators identified through the overarching theory of change (or local area theories of change) even if long-term impacts are not yet observable.

5.3 At the end of the Contract's fifth year (in 2023/24), a summary report should be provided that summarises the available evidence on the impacts of the TCF at the close of the evaluation, synthesising the previous interim reports. This should also incorporate findings from process evaluation work and case studies (detailed further in the sections below) to provide an overview of what has been learned through the TCF programme by that stage. This report will then act as a starting point for any further ex-post evaluation of TCF.

Additional Reporting Activities:

5.4 These activities could be delivered through effective learning and dissemination mechanisms, including but not limited to the following examples:

- **Community of Practice (CoP):** the CoP is run by the TCF policy team with the aim of providing support to the 12 shortlisted cities as part of the co-development process. It commenced with a workshop in March 2019 which brought together the 12 cities, six MCAs, DfT's Transport Research and Innovation Board, policy teams from DfT and other Departments, Innovate UK and the UK Collaboratorium for Research on Infrastructure and Cities. This was intended as an opportunity to share knowledge and build relationships. The CoP now mostly involves the TCF policy team commissioning specialist guidance from across government as part of the monthly TCF newsletter to shortlisted cities, and encouraging participation in regular catch-ups with the Customer. There are no expectations that the Supplier will run the CoP, but as a pre-existing platform it may have some value (e.g. to disseminate findings via online groups, email groups or topic-specific group meetings).

- **Quarterly newsletters or briefings from the evaluation team:** these would include progress with the evaluation, top tips to improve data gathering locally, a summary of relevant national level policies, and any emerging learning from the national evaluation of local plans.

- **Webinar forums:** live (and recorded) webinars on specific topics of interest, covering for example: specific measures which are being implemented across numerous sites, LAs presenting what they are doing/have done and sharing learning with others, to discuss data monitoring challenges that are being faced, or to verbally communicate the emerging learning from the evaluation.

- **National events:** the evaluation team could host a small number of 'learning and sharing' events where all local areas are brought together to network, share knowledge, solutions they have embedded to overcome challenges, and to receive information on national level policy and the evaluation.

5.5 The Supplier shall provide a Project Manager who will work collaboratively with the Customer's Project Manager and provide regular updates on the progress. The method and regularity for providing updates and progress meetings will be agreed following the start of the commission.

5.6 The Supplier shall provide delivery of progress updates summarising progress in achieving objectives and the projected programme of work. These shall be made in writing to the appointed Project Manager, with format to be agreed at the outset of the project.

6. Continuous Improvement

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

6.2 The Supplier should present new ways of working to the Customer during annual Contract review meetings.

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

7. Ethics

7.1 The Customer is committed to promoting high ethical standards in the conduct of the social research it funds and commissions. We expect potential Suppliers to conduct research to appropriate ethical standards. This would include following the General Data Protection Regulation of 2018, and the principles outlined in the Government Social Research (GSR) Unit Professional Guidance 'Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government':

- Principle 1: Sound application and conduct of social research methods, and interpretation of the findings
- Principle 2: Participation based on informed consent
- Principle 3: Enabling participation
- Principle 4: Avoidance of personal and social harm
- Principle 5: Non-disclosure of identity

7.2 For further details of these principles see the GSR guidance here: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethical-assurance-guidance-for-social-research-in-government.

8. Quality

8.1 These guidelines are intended to ensure that the reporting process is efficient and produces outputs of good quality that will be acceptable for the Customer.

- All reports and other outputs of the Contract should use language that a non-analyst would understand and have clear policy-relevant messages. Sentences, headings and paragraphs should be short and concise. Slang and jargon should be avoided. Where technical terms must be used, a glossary should be provided.

- Reports should be written in the third person and should refer to analytical findings in the past tense. The Supplier should ensure the style and tense used does not change throughout the report. Drafts must be consistent in language and acronyms, use of footnotes and use of references throughout.

- Research methods should be described succinctly in the main text. Further detail that would allow a technical peer reviewer to understand the research methods and ascertain their quality should be provided in a technical annex.

- Reports should begin with an Executive Summary of 3-5 pages in length. This should be suitable for use as a stand-alone summary of the research findings. It should clearly identify the main points arising of policy relevance.

- Reports which are intended for publication should be drafted using the DfT report template which will be provided by the Customer. We expect that this will apply to two reports – one approximately halfway through the Contract (for example, the third annual interim report), and one at its conclusion (the evaluation summary report). In the case of these reports the Supplier shall follow guidance provided for external partners on creating accessible documents so must be aware of the requirements[1].

- The Supplier should schedule a report planning meeting with the Customer. This should take place when data collection and analysis has been conducted and before drafting of the report begins. For this meeting, the Supplier should provide a suggested outline of the report contents and a narrative of the main points that will be covered and the emerging conclusions. Discussion and agreement on these points in advance should make the report writing process more efficient and minimise wasted effort by the Supplier and Customer.

- The Supplier should build in time for thorough quality assurance of reporting outputs to ensure they have been thoroughly checked before submission and so are free from spelling and grammatical errors. The schedule should build in time for this process.

- The Supplier should allow adequate time for the Customer to review draft reports and return comments. The suggested allowances are 2 weeks for case study reports and 3 weeks for annual reports. Any comments provided by the Customer must be fully addressed.

8.2 In addition to meeting these quality guidelines, research findings must be sufficiently robust to guide future policy decisions. This means that the research needs to be defensible in design and that the collection, analysis and interpretation of qualitative data is transparent and systematic. Methodological decisions and any implications of such decisions must be explained.

[1] https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-publish-on-gov-uk/accessible-pdfs

9. Staff and Customer Service

9.1 The following types of expertise will be essential for successful delivery of this requirement:

- Understanding and experience of contributing to or delivering similar evaluations – especially where these have involved the coordination of an overarching evaluation where implementation is delivered at a local level.
- Understanding and experience of counterfactual evaluation methods (including quasi-experimental methods or similarly robust techniques).
- Understanding and experience of theory-based evaluation methods (including the development and application of logic models).
- Capacity to undertake and deliver this research requirement within the timetable.

9.2 The Supplier shall provide a sufficient level of resource throughout the duration of the Contract to consistently deliver a quality service.

9.3 The Supplier's staff assigned to the Contract shall have the relevant qualifications and experience to deliver the Contract to the required standard.

9.4 The Supplier shall ensure that staff understand the Customer's vision and objectives and will provide excellent customer service to the Customer throughout the duration of the Contract.

10. Service levels and performance

10.1 The Customer will measure the quality of the Supplier's delivery by:

KPI/SLA	Service Area	KPI/SLA description	Target
1	Delivery	Deliverables presented to the Customer according to the timescales outlined in Section 3 ‘Key Milestones and Deliverables’ (unless otherwise agreed) and are in the agreed format;	100%
2	Research Quality	When agreed, deliverables are quality assured, clear, accurate and of a publishable standard;	100%
3	Response Time	The Supplier is flexible and i) adapts work plans quickly in light of changing situations to ensure planned outcomes are achieved, for e.g. revising recruitment approach or methodology; ii) responds positively to requests and queries from the Customer and other stakeholders; and iii) supports data quality by proactive and collaborative working with sub-contractors and ensuring that roles and responsibilities are clear;	100%
4	Risk Management	High quality, detailed and up to date project risk assessments in place. Appropriate mitigations are adopted/ mitigation action is taken.	100%

10.2 The quality of the service provided by the Supplier will be regularly monitored by the Customer against the elements outlined above throughout the duration of the Contract.

10.3 The Supplier shall participate in quarterly and annual review meetings with the Customer to review the quality and performance of the services provided. The Supplier shall be appropriately represented at the review meetings that will usually be conducted via teleconference or facilitated face to face in where this can coincide with other meetings.

10.4 Following annual review meetings, the Customer may choose to discontinue the contract if it judges any of the following criteria are not met:

- A robust and appropriate evaluation design has been demonstrated to be feasible;
- A sufficiently robust data collection method has been identified and;
- The research outputs are of sufficient quality and are providing robust evidence to guide future policy decisions; and;
- The proposed study represents value for money.

11. Security and Confidentiality Requirements

11.1 The Customer is committed to maintaining high standards of data security and confidentiality.

11.2 The Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of all products created during this commission (including, without limitation, all data, findings and outputs) will be vested with the Customer.

11.3 The Supplier shall seek approval in advance from the Customer's Project Manager for any press release, presentation or publication related to this project until the final report is published; sufficient time should be allowed for this. After publication of the final report, the Supplier shall keep the Customer's Project Manager informed of any further use of data and/or findings from the project.

11.4 All copyright, know-how and other property rights generated from this project remain property of the Crown. The Supplier shall ensure that all documentation and wherever possible all computer media are clearly marked accordingly.

11.5 Any outputs, including the final evaluation framework, must not be published or shared with any third parties without the written permission of the Customer.

Conflicts of Interest:

11.6 To minimise the risk of conflicts of future interest – perceived or actual – the Supplier shall carry out the national evaluation, and any participating sub-contractors, refrain from undertaking local TCF evaluation work. Neither should they advise local areas on how to prepare future bids for funding through TCF. The potential for conflict of interest could arise in such cases (for example, through access to privileged information from either the local or national studies).

11.7 The Customer does not require the Supplier or sub-contractors to refrain from carrying out evaluation work for local areas that are not participating in the Transforming Cities Fund, nor to refrain from conducting the evaluation of other programmes.

12. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

12.1 A TCF evaluation steering group has been established comprising of policy officials and analysts from across DfT. The group will meet across the course of the evaluation at the Customer's offices to provide advice on interim and draft final outputs. The Supplier shall attend these meetings on a quarterly basis for the duration of the contract. This includes the annual presentations of findings specified.

12.2 Papers for steering group must be provided at least 5 working days before each meeting.

Project Management:

12.3 Attendances at Contract Review meetings shall be at the Supplier's own expense.

13. Location

13.1 The Customer is located at **REDACTED**. It is expected that Contract Review meetings, presentations and workshops relating to the overarching evaluation will be held at these offices.

13.2 As detailed in Section 2 ‘The Requirement’, the Supplier will also be required to visit local areas to provide in-person support and guidance. Some fieldwork and data collection (e.g. case studies) may also require visits to local areas.

ANNEX B

Supplier Proposal
REDACTED

Part 2: Contract Terms

Please see CCZZ19A25 Attachment 5

Contract Terms v6.0