

# **Order Schedule 20 (Order Specification)**



Department for Levelling Up,  
Housing & Communities

## **Bid Pack**

### **Attachment 3 – Statement of Requirements**

Contract Reference: **CPD4124170**

### **Stronger Local Resilience Forum Pilot Programme Evaluation**

---

OFFICIAL

## CONTENTS

1.	PURPOSE.....	3
2.	BACKGROUND TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.....	3
3.	BACKGROUND TO REQUIREMENT/OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENT .....	5
4.	DEFINITIONS .....	6
5.	SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT .....	6
6.	THE REQUIREMENT .....	7
7.	TIMETABLE .....	17
8.	BREAK CLAUSES .....	18
9.	OPTION TO EXTEND .....	18
10.	KEY DELIVERABLES.....	19
11.	MANAGEMENT INFORMATION/REPORTING .....	20
12.	VOLUMES.....	20
13.	CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.....	20
14.	SUSTAINABILITY .....	20
15.	SOCIAL VALUE .....	21
16.	QUALITY .....	23
17.	PRICE .....	23
18.	STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE .....	24
19.	SERVICE LEVELS AND PERFORMANCE .....	24
20.	SECURITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS .....	24
21.	PAYMENT AND INVOICING .....	24
22.	CONTRACT MANAGEMENT .....	26
23.	EXIT MANAGEMENT .....	27
24.	LOCATION.....	27

---

OFFICIAL

# 1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The Department for Levelling up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) wishes to commission a programme of work to design and (if feasible) deliver a full evaluation of the Stronger Local Resilience Forum (LRF) Pilot Programme.
- 1.2 This requirement contains three parts:
  - 1.2.1 **Part 1: Measuring Resilience Outcomes.** To build on foundational work already commissioned by DLUHC to identify and design data-led metrics and measures to measure resilience outcomes. This part of the requirement relates to Deliverables 1, 2 and 3 as set out in section 10 below.
  - 1.2.2 **Part 2: Feasibility Study.** To develop full proposals for the optimal and most efficient methodology for a full impact, process and economic evaluation of the changes being tested through the pilots. This part of the requirement also relates to Deliverables 1, 2 and 3 as set out in section 10 below.
  - 1.2.3
  - 1.2.4 **Part 3: Delivery of a full evaluation of the pilots.** To include evaluation of the process of local implementation and delivery of up to 8 pilot projects, an assessment of outcomes, impact and value for money of the programme. The evaluation will be instrumental in testing and optimising the Stronger LRF proposals as set out in the UKGRF, in advance of full implementation by 2030. This part of the requirement also relates to Deliverables 4, 5 and 6 as set out in section 10 below.

Section 7 below sets out the anticipated timetable for the delivery of these Deliverables under this contract.

## 2. BACKGROUND TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY RESILIENCE AND RECOVERY DIRECTORATE, DEPARTMENT FOR LEVELLING UP, HOUSING AND COMMUNITIES (DLUHC)

- 2.1 DLUHC's Resilience and Recovery Directorate (RED) acts as the primary interlocuter between Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) and His Majesties Government (HMG). RED supports LRFs to discharge the duties placed upon their constituent categorised responders under the Civil Contingencies Act, by:
  - 2.1.1 Ensuring effective dialogue between local and national government to shape, enhance and implement policy relevant to UK civil protection and the role of LRFs.

---

OFFICIAL

- 2.1.2 Providing a cadre of dedicated Resilience Advisers across England to support LRFs to plan and prepare for civil risks, by supporting partners to enhance and develop local plans and capability, to train and exercise in preparation for emergencies and to act as the key strategic liaison point between HMG and the LRF; and
- 2.2 When an emergency happens, DLUHC RED is responsible for:
  - 2.2.1 Acting as government liaison with the local strategic or recovery co-ordinating group during the any associated emergency response. The primary objective of this liaison service is to ensure LRFs receive the support they need from central government during an emergency. This may take the form of technical or policy advice, funding, resources, or coordination of national assets).
  - 2.2.2 Providing local situational awareness to central government, including COBR, and national situational awareness to local responders as appropriate; and
  - 2.2.3 Establishing and maintaining immediate lines of communication between local responders and central government.
- 2.3 Alongside this, within RED's Policy, Strategy and Resilience Division, the Strategy Team is responsible for considering the future of resilience in the UK both at a local and national level and the implications of this for the work of RED, DLUHC and LRFs. This includes leading on HMG's commitment in the UK Government Resilience Framework (UKRG) to significantly strengthen LRFs by 2030, and to pilot this by 2025.

## LOCAL RESILIENCE FORUMS

- 2.4 Local Resilience Forums (LRFs) are non-statutory multi-agency partnerships that comprise senior representatives of local responder organisations that prepare for and respond to emergencies. These responder organisations and the duties on them are defined in the Civil Contingencies Act 2004. There are 38 LRFs in England, with separate arrangements for the Devolved Administrations. This programme is specific to the 38 English LRFs.
- 2.5 Further guidance about how the government prepares and plans for emergencies, working nationally, locally and co-operatively to ensure civil protection in the UK, [can be found on gov.uk](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/preparation-and-planning-for-emergencies-responsibilities-of-responder-agencies-and-others)<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/preparation-and-planning-for-emergencies-responsibilities-of-responder-agencies-and-others>

### 3. BACKGROUND TO REQUIREMENT/OVERVIEW OF REQUIREMENT

- 3.1 In recognition of the enhanced expectations of LRFs in recent years, and following the unprecedented demands placed upon them during the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2021 Integrated Review committed the UK Government to “consider strengthening the roles and responsibilities of LRFs in England”.
- 3.2 DLUHC has subsequently developed a range of proposals for the strengthening of LRFs, with these detailed in the December 2022 [UK Government Resilience Framework \(UKGRF\)](#)<sup>2</sup>. The UKGRF which commits the Government to delivering piloting of the reforms with LRFs in England by 2025, before a wider roll-out of the reforms by 2030. DLUHC RED is leading this work.
- 3.3 There are three pillars to the Stronger LRFs (SLRF) proposals: Leadership, Accountability and Integration of resilience into the UK’s levelling up mission and wider local policy and placemaking. Taken together, these significant changes seek to empower LRFs, local government and local leadership drive and improve resilience across the places for which they are responsible. LRFs will be given a clear mandate build resilient communities that are able to adapt, respond to, and recover from, new and emerging risks, emergencies and disruptive events, and to take full advantage of the opportunities of levelling up.
- 3.4 DLUHC intends to establish a series of pilots with up to 8 LRFs in England, alongside appropriate counterfactuals. The pilots will test and refine these proposals, learning from what works in a range of different contexts and to understand the benefits, risks, and challenges of implementing them throughout England. The pilots will start in January 2023 and conclude in December 2025.
- 3.5 DLUHC has undertaken work to engage and mobilise the LRF sector to participate in the pilots and have set out their pilot proposals in a prospectus in March 2023. This prospectus has been made available at Annex B.
- 3.6 In May 2023 DLUHC ran a scoping exercise inviting all 38 English LRFs to register an interest in taking part in the pilot programme. The responses gathered during this exercise were combined with other relevant data to compile a longlist of LRF areas that represent the range and diversity of the LRF sector and provide the DLUHC with the opportunity to test a range of different delivery approaches.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-uk-government-resilience-framework>

- 3.7 DLUHC is currently undertaking a programme of work to finalise a purposive sample for the pilots and will lead the work to negotiate and establish pilot projects in each of the chosen LRFs. This work is likely to still be underway when the Contract commences. The Supplier is not expected to lead this work but will have the opportunity to shape and influence the design of each pilot programme in parallel with the design of the evaluation approach and methods. DLUHC has also asked LRFs to indicate their willingness to be part of any counterfactual group(s), and this information will be shared with the Supplier to support the development of the evaluation design.

## 4. DEFINITIONS

Expression or Acronym	Definition
DLUHC	Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities
HMG	His Majesty's Government
LRF	Local Resilience Forum
RED	Resilience and Recovery Directorate
SLRF	Stronger Local Resilience Forum
UKGRF	UK Government Resilience Framework
CCA	Civil Contingencies Act
CRO	Chief Resilience Officer

## 5. SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT

- 5.1 The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact, outcomes and value for money of the stronger LRF pilot programme, identify lessons DLUHC can learn from their delivery, and to understand the effectiveness of a range of different delivery approaches across the 8 pilot participants, including as compared to appropriate counterfactuals. This is to enable DLUHC to finesse and refine their proposals ahead of a national roll out by 2030 and to demonstrate their potential value for money.
- 5.2 This is a novel and complex evaluation in a policy area where there are a range of key evidence gaps. Previous evaluations on LRFs have tended to be qualitative in nature, focussing only on process and implementation (see specifically a recent evaluation of the [2021/22 LRF Funding pilot](#)) For this evaluation the supplier will develop robust outcome measures to assess impact and value for money, as well as assessing process and implementation.
- 5.3 To achieve this, the DLUHC is commissioning a three-part requirement:

---

OFFICIAL

- 5.3.1 **Part 1: Developing Resilience Outcome Measures.** To build on draft foundational work already undertaken by the DLUHC which has identified a set of potential outcomes. The Supplier will have the opportunity to review and suggest potential changes and then will design a set of proposed quantitative metrics and measures for the finalised and agreed outcomes. The Supplier will design measures and indicators so they can be used to measure, where possible, the outcomes and impact of the pilot programme in participating pilot areas. The Supplier shall be guided by work DLUHC has already undertaken in this area in their approach. The outcomes identified through this initial work have been made available at Annex A.
- 5.3.2 **Part 2: Feasibility Study.** To develop full proposals for the optimal and most efficient methodology to undertake an impact, process and economic evaluation of the changes being tested through the pilots. This must include full value for money (VfM) assessment, and capture the differences in outcomes, process and VfM between different pilot LRFs as appropriate. It will need to draw out how data will be collected across the up to 8 pilot LRFs and proposed counterfactual(s), including how to make use of the resilience outcomes metrics developed in part 1 of this requirement.
- 5.3.3 **Part 3: Delivery of a full evaluation of the pilots.** The full evaluation will then take forward the methodology from the feasibility study, once signed off by DLUHC. This will measure implementation and delivery effectiveness, value for money, the impact our interventions have on local resilience outcomes and provide clear learning and recommendations for wider implementation of the policy. The detailed quantitative and qualitative methodologies must be designed by the Supplier. The day-to-day management of the pilots themselves will be led by DLUHC and participating LRFs.
- 5.4 Given the complex and wide-ranging nature of the pilots, and the potential value of a range of methodological and subject-matter expertise the Supplier may form a consortia.

## 6. THE REQUIREMENT

### Part 1: Measuring Resilience Outcomes

- 6.1 Whilst a range of definitions exist there are currently no universally recognised definitions or measures for the concept of resilience or wider key concepts related to resilience (e.g., resilience 'places' or 'communities', or 'vulnerability' to resilience-related risks). This includes across the prevention, preparation, response, and recovery from emergencies and building the overall resilience of communities.
- 6.2 A key challenge to achieving this is identifying clear evidence that interventions have lessened the likelihood a crisis from occurring, or evidence that interventions have helped to mitigate or ameliorate the impact or potential

---

OFFICIAL

impact of an emergency or disruptive event on a community, and therefore have made a community more resilient. This is especially challenging considering the highly unpredictable and unique nature of emergencies, and the potential for them to play out in a variety of ways depending on a wide range of social, economic and political factors. DLUHC also wants to consider, if possible, how we might capture the wider benefits increasing the resilience of an area, beyond the immediate impact on risks, emergencies as this may be an important consideration in assessing value for money. Another challenge will be securing data at a local-enough level, that can be used consistently to measure impact in different parts of the England.

6.3 In response to this DLUHC has already commissioned and delivered foundational work to develop an outcomes framework and logic models for the work of both Local Resilience Forums and RED on the basis of what we will want to achieve following the implementation of the Stronger LRFs Programme. This foundational work has been made available at Annex A.

6.4 For LRFs the identified strategic outcomes are:

- LRFs effectively manage risk, respond, and recover, and actively build resilience in their communities, and operate on a substantiable financial footing.
- Places in England have greater community, social and economic resilience.
- Local leaders, communities and the UKG have confidence in local resilience systems and have confidence that those systems are effective in improving local resilience
- The local tier and UKG have information required within necessary timescales to make timely and evidence-based decisions, with local resilience integrated across local decision making at all stages of the resilience cycles
- Communities have greater awareness of, and engagement in local resilience, and the systems by which they can hold local leaders to account

For RED the identified strategic outcomes are:

- LRFs in England have been significantly strengthened, effectively manage risk and actively build resilience in their communities and operate on a sustainable financial footing.
- Places in England have greater community, social and economic resilience.
- The UKG has confidence in local resilience systems and that these systems are effective in improving local resilience.

---

OFFICIAL



- DLUHC Ministers, COBR, UKG departments and the local tier have information required within necessary timescales to make timely and evidence-based decisions, with local resilience integrated across all relevant policy decisions at all stages of the resilience cycles.
  - The public and stakeholders are engaged with and can implement the UKG vision and strategy to build local resilience.
  - DLUHC is prepared to mitigate for and manage the direct consequences of emergencies and major events on its estate, people, policies and delivery priorities, has robust and tested plans for its LGD responsibilities, and is able to respond effectively to emergencies.
- 6.5 The Supplier will have the opportunity to fully review and recommend any changes to these logic models, although there are not expected to be any significant changes at this stage. Building on these logic models and outcomes, the Supplier must develop a full proposal on how they would define and measure a full set of appropriate indicators, metrics and KPIs to measure these resilience outcomes, and how these could be deployed in the full evaluation of the stronger LRFs programme. The Supplier must also consider and develop intermediate outcome measures as proxies for longer term impact. These logic models will be made available at Annex A.
- 6.6 The Supplier will draw upon examples of innovative and leading practice internationally and from academia in addition to wide engagement with RED and LRFs.
- 6.7 The Supplier will need to provide details on how they would address this requirement and what will be possible to deliver within the timelines
- 6.8 The supplier will be required present the suggested resilience outcomes measures framework to the Stronger LRFs Evaluation Advisory Panel.
- 6.9 This element part of the requirement may be delivered in parallel with the feasibility study (detailed below).
- 6.10 The recommendations from part 1 and part 2 of the requirement must be approved by DLUHC via the Resilience Communities Board, before DLUHC agrees to take forward part 3 of the contract.

## **Part 2: Feasibility study**

- 6.11 This stage of the contract will be to undertake a feasibility study to develop a clear set of proposals for the optimal and most efficient methodologies to allow the most robust possible impact, process and economic evaluation of the proposals being tested through the pilots.
- 6.12 The SLRF pilot programme seeks to capitalise on the heterogeneous nature of the LRF sector and test strengthening proposals in a range of different settings,

---

OFFICIAL

and to allow the adoption of a range of different delivery approaches to achieve the set outcomes and spirit of the proposed reforms.

- 6.13 As such, the programme is likely to lead to localised interventions and LRF specific variations on the core proposals being developed by pilot LRFs, which may make the evaluation of the programme challenging.
- 6.14 A key challenge will be designing a pilot, including identifying appropriate counterfactuals to enable the study to find reliable causal impact evidence whilst controlling for this level of heterogeneity. Resilience is also an innately highly unpredictable environment where the presence of a crisis cannot be predicted, and when the ability of communities to be more resilient to the impacts of emergencies is impacted by a wide range of factors, with this government intervention being just one.
- 6.15 The feasibility study will need to draw out how an evaluation can be effectively designed to allow the most robust evidence possible, with reference to appropriate HMG guidance (e.g. the Magenta Book) and appropriate benchmarks (e.g. the Maryland Scale). It will need to set out how data will be collected both for the measures defined in part 1 and for any other data required for wider evaluation, across the up to eight (8) pilot areas and counterfactual(s) and explore the use of metrics and indicators to measure the outcomes DLUHC has identified in previous work. The feasibility study should look to understand the following:
  - 6.15.1 How to integrate the outcomes framework and proposed measures from part 1; outlining what these metrics are and what data is available or needs to be collected, and how data will be collected across all pilot areas and analysed.
  - 6.15.2 How DLUHC can construct robust counterfactuals for the pilot programme and which areas should be used as counterfactuals.
  - 6.15.3 Develop proposals for how best and most robustly to establish causal evidence on the impact of this intervention at the LRF level, controlling for any other factors and intervention that might be happening in the same area at the same time.
  - 6.15.4 The approaches and methods that should be applied to deliver a process, impact, and value for money evaluation of the pilots and how should they be delivered.
- 6.16 Through the delivery of the feasibility study, the Supplier must provide a range of options for how to evaluate the pilots and set out a full rationale of benefits and risks of each approach. The Supplier will need to provide details on how they would answer the above questions and what will be possible to deliver within the timelines and overall budget.
- 6.17 The Supplier must consider how they can make use of our network of Resilience Advisors (all LRFs assigned Resilience Advisors) to support key

---

OFFICIAL

activities such as recruiting research participants and facilitating data collection activities. This may allow more budget to undertake key 'value add' activities including consideration of the complex design challenges and more sophisticated analysis. The Supplier will also be able to make use of DLUHC's Delta system to aid quantitative data collection with key partners, supported by its internal analysts, to keep the overall costs of data collection down where possible.

- 6.18 The feasibility study must be completed by the timelines specified in Section 7 below. The Supplier must present the findings of the feasibility study to the Stronger LRFs Evaluation Advisory Panel.
- 6.19 The recommendations from part 1 and part 2 of the requirement must be approved by DLUHC via the Resilience Communities Board, before the DLUHC agrees to take forward part 3 of the contract. If approval is not secured the contract will cease at this point.

### **Part 3: Delivery of a full evaluation of the pilots**

- 6.20 If approved the full evaluation will then take forward the agreed methodology from the feasibility study, when and if DLUHC agrees to proposals and to take forward part 3 of the contract.
- 6.21 The evaluation of the pilots must include:
  - 6.21.1 **A process evaluation** – This must focus on the different delivery approaches in each pilot areas to understand how and why LRFs implemented Stronger LRFs in their area as they did, how this may have contributed to the outcomes seen and lessons DLUHC can learn for the future roll out of the SLRF proposals.
  - 6.21.2 **An impact Evaluation** – To measure the impact of the pilot activities and outputs on the LRFs, wider local partners, locally elected leaders, communities, other relevant stakeholders (e.g. potentially VCS partners and businesses) and the overall resilience of each pilot area. This will be the core evidence used to demonstrate a causal impact of the strengthening proposals and inform a national roll-out of Stronger LRF policy on local resilience. This needs to clearly follow a Theory of Change (linked to the foundational work already commissioned to design and LRF logic model mentioned earlier): evidencing how and whether the pilot programme is meeting the objectives and delivering the outcomes we are seeking to deliver – we expect this may also require an analysis of 'relative improvement' or progression towards an outcome. The evaluation must also provide clear learning and recommendations for wider implementation of the policy
  - 6.21.3 **Value for money assessment** – This must be delivered as per the Green Book principles and seek to understand whether the pilot activities and pilot funding represented good value for money.

Suppliers must demonstrate an appropriate and robust methodology to measure the cost-effectiveness of the programme. This must include a cost effectiveness analysis and cost benefit analysis, and be informed by the evidence from the process evaluation and impact evaluation

- 6.22 DLUHC is not prescribing the specific methods the evaluation design should include, but it is expected that the evaluation could involve a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collected directly with pilot participants and stakeholders, relevant data from other programmes, and wider national and local data sets where it is available.
- 6.23 Similarly, DLUHC welcomes innovative thinking on the evaluation methods that may be most appropriate, although the emphasis will be on achieving the most robust evidence possible, including consideration of experimental and quasi-experimental approaches and theory-based evaluation as appropriate.

### **Research Questions**

- 6.24 DLUHC has developed an initial long list of potential research questions to guide the evaluation, that will be shared with the supplier. The supplier will be invited to work with DLUHC and participating LRFs to refine and develop a final set of research questions for the evaluation. The expected overarching research questions are expected to include:

### **Overarching questions**

- 6.24.1 Did the pilot programme work as intended, and why?
- 6.24.2 What were the key impacts in terms of the core themes of leadership, accountability and integration?
- 6.24.3 What worked well, less well and why?
- 6.24.4 Did Stronger LRFs policy work differently in different areas and why?
- 6.24.5 How did places implement Stronger LRFs in their area and why did they choose that approach?
- 6.24.6 What was the overall impact of Stronger LRFs pilot programme?
- 6.24.7 What is the observed and potential value-for-money of the proposed reforms included in the SLRF proposals?
- 6.24.8 How should Stronger LRFs policy, its current form, be rolled out nationally, and what are the implications for scaling up and moving this to a national scale and a national roll out?

#### 6.24.9 Where can the policy be improved?

The full long list of questions for each theme are below for information, but the Supplier must focus on the above for the purposes of developing a proposal.

## **Accountability**

- 6.24.10 What challenges have been identified by the LRF and the elected leader about implementing this new line of accountability?
- 6.24.11 Were there any unintended consequences of making the LRF accountable to an elected leader?
- 6.24.12 How did the new role for democratically elected leaders affect the work of the LRF?
- 6.24.13 What mechanisms were effective for providing elected leaders with oversight and the ability to influence to the work of the LRF?
- 6.24.14 How did the local government structures of pilot areas affect their ability to implement this line of accountability?
- 6.24.15 Did new role for local democratic leaders improve the local resilience outcomes in the region and how?
- 6.24.16 What impact have new assurance mechanisms had on the democratic leader and CRO in taking on their roles of accountability and strategic leadership, and how?
- 6.24.17 How and to what extent did piloted assurance mechanisms provide assurance of multi-agency LRF responsibilities in addition to that provided by existing processes?
- 6.24.18 To what extent are new piloted mechanisms under the assurance framework useful to CCA agencies and CROs in identifying and rolling out specific, actionable improvements?
- 6.24.19 To what extent did compliance with piloted assurance mechanisms present an added resource burden for the LRF?
- 6.24.20 To what extent did the different assurance mechanisms piloted effectively complement each other, and together provide more rounded and useful assurance than a single mechanism used alone?
- 6.24.21 To what extent and in what ways may LRFs have become is accountable or visible to the communities they serve, if so, how is this measured or demonstrated and what impacts has this had?
- 6.24.22 What were the impacts of this on wider LRF delivery and on LRF and local resilience outcomes.

## Integration

- 6.24.23 To what extent and in what ways have the activities of the LRF to integrate resilience into local place making improved or enhanced the effectiveness of the LRF to plan, prepare for and respond to emergencies, and how?
- 6.24.24 What challenges did the LRF and Chief Resilience Officer face when trying to integrate resilience into wider placemaking and why?
- 6.24.25 Where there any unintended consequences of integrating resilience into wider placemaking?
- 6.24.26 Did the LRF's activities to integrate resilience into local place making improve the local resilience outcomes in the area and how?
- 6.24.27 To what extent did the LRF bring in new people/partners for new activity adding to the outputs of the LRF?
- 6.24.28 To what extent did the LRF reach other people/partners/forums outside the LRF to influence and integrate policies better outcomes
- 6.24.29 In terms of additionality was this viewed as new (or existing unmet) work done by extra people? Or additional work or exiting people?
- 6.24.30 To what extent as the LRF seen better or more integrated relationship with the local VCS organisations? If so, how is this measured and what impacts has this had?
- 6.24.31 To what extent and how were the needs of the community including those most vulnerable to risk considered in:
  - Risk assessment and communication
  - Planning including community involvement in planning
  - Response and recovery arrangements
- 6.24.32 What were the impacts of this on wider LRF delivery and on LRF and local resilience outcomes.

## Leadership

- 6.24.33 To what extent and how has oversight of an elected leader improved or enhanced the effectiveness of the LRF to plan, prepare for and respond to emergencies, and how?
- 6.24.34 Has the oversight of an elected leader led to a greater level of integration of resilience into wider placemaking policy, and how?
- 6.24.35 To what extent and how did the Chief Resilience Officer role provide effective and improved leadership to the LRF?

---

OFFICIAL

- 6.24.36 Has the Chief Resilience Officer contributed to improved resilience outcomes for their LRF area, and how have they achieved this?
- 6.24.37 To what extent and how did the Chief Resilience Officer provide effective leadership across multiple local authority boundaries?
- 6.24.38 To what extent and how did a dedicated Office of the Chief Resilience Officer improve resilience outcomes in the LRF area?
- 6.24.39 What challenges did the LRF experience when establishing the Chief Resilience Officer role and additional permanent resource, and why?
- 6.24.40 Did the Chief Resilience Officer and additional permanent resource structure have any unintended consequences and why?
- 6.24.41 What challenges did the Chief Resilience Officer face when trying to carry out their role to build a more resilient community?
- 6.24.42 How did the introduction of the Chief Resilience Officer / Office of the Chief Resilience Officer structure effect the relationships between 'the LRF' and Category 1 and 2 responders in the area and why?
- 6.24.43 Did the CRO attend and influence any other boards, forums or policy outside of the LRF?
- 6.25 The Supplier must deliver an interim report by October 2024 which reports on the progress (including progress towards outcomes and an indication of value for money where possible) LRFs have made during the pilots, in line with the research questions.
- 6.26 The findings and interim conclusions made in this report will inform any funding bid for LRFs that DLUHC makes at future fiscal events. The analysis and findings therefore need to be of sufficient robustness so that the evidence can be incorporated by the Department into its overall submissions to HM Treasury.
- 6.27 In February 2026, the Supplier must deliver a final evaluation report, which fully answers the research questions of the evaluation. This report must include an impact and scalability assessment of rolling out Stronger LRFs policy at a national scale to all 38 LRFs.



## 7. TIMETABLE

Milestone	Description	Delivery Date
1	Inception meeting	Within 1 week of Contract Award
2	Research proposal report submitted to DLUHC.	Within week 3 of Contract Award
3	Research design finalised with the DLUHC	w/c 18 December 2023
4	Part 1 – Resilience outcomes presentation to advisory panel and report submitted to DLUHC	w/c 5 February 2024
5	Part 1 – Resilience outcomes report finalised with the DLUHC	w/c 12 February 2024
6	Part 2 - Feasibility study begins	w/c 12 February 2024
7	Part 2 – Feasibility study presentation to advisory panel and report submitted to DLUHC	w/c 11 March 2024
8	Part 2 – Feasibility study report finalised with DLUHC	w/c 25 March 2024
9	Project board meeting with contractor	w/c 4 March 2024
10	Evaluation approach and design for part 3 finalised with DLUHC	w/c 25 March 2024
11	<b>BREAK CLAUSE</b>	29 April 2024
12	Part 3 - Full evaluation contract begins	May 2024
13	Part 3 – Interim report (1) presentation to advisory panel and submitted to DLUHC	w/c 20 January 2025
14	Part 3 – Interim report (1) finalised with DLUHC ( <b>to be published on gov.uk</b> )	w/c 17 February 2025
15	<b>BREAK CLAUSE</b>	No later than March 2025
16	Part 3 – Interim report (2) presentation to advisory panel and report submitted to DLUHC	November 2025
17	Project board meeting with contractor	December 2025
18	Part 3 – Interim report (2) finalised with DLUHC	No later than January 2026
19	Final Report presentation to advisory panel and final report submitted to DLUHC	February 2026

OFFICIAL

20	Final report finalised with DLUHC (to be published on gov.uk)	No later than February 2026
21	Disseminate findings with key stakeholder, including Ministers	March 2026

## 8. BREAK CLAUSES

8.1 The Contract will be for an initial term up to March 2026 but will be subject to two break clauses:

8.2 **1<sup>st</sup> Break Clause:** The contract will be subject to a break clause following the completion of Part 1: Measuring Resilience Outcomes and Part 2: Feasibility Study.

8.2.1 The decision to proceed will be dependent upon the performance of the Supplier as well as the outcome of Part 2: Feasibility Study and assessing the feasibility of conducting Part 3: Delivery of a full evaluation of the pilots.

8.2.2 The Supplier will be notified about this decision no more than one month after the submission of the feasibility report.

8.2.3 The contract will continue with Part 3 (no later than May 2024), only if the DLUHC evaluation proposed under Part 2 would be feasible and robust enough to be carried out and are convinced that the Supplier would be able to complete the work at the highest standards.

8.3 **2<sup>nd</sup> Break Clause:** The contract will be subject to a break clause dependent on the availability of funding beyond March 2025, meaning that if funding is not available the contract will come to an end in March 2025.

8.3.1 The Authority will give a minimum of one months' notice before invoking this.

## 9. OPTION TO EXTEND

9.1 Separately we reserve the right to extend the contract for up to 12 months (until March 2027), in the case of delays to the implementation of the programme, delays to administrative data linking, or other events beyond the control of the Supplier. DLUHC will give a minimum of 1 months' notice before invoking this and any such changes shall be formally agreed via the Contract Variation process.

## 10. KEY DELIVERABLES

10.1 The following Contract deliverables shall apply:

Deliverable	Description	Timeframe or Delivery Date
1	<b>Research proposal report</b> - The Supplier will provide a final written proposal on the scope and method for achieving the requirements set out in this document. This proposal should include a project timeline and the Supplier's approach to quality assuring the work. This report will not be published.	As per the milestones above
2	<b>Presentations to the Stronger LRFs Evaluation Advisory Panel</b> - Before submission of the Feasibility and resilience outcomes report, the Supplier will present their findings to the Stronger LRFs Evaluation Advisory Panel for feedback and comment.	As per the milestones above
3	<b>Feasibility study and outcomes framework report</b> - The Supplier will provide a report which answers part 1 (resilience outcomes) and part 2(feasibility) of the requirement. This will include delivery of a finalised logic model / theory of change and indicators to measure the finalised resilience outcomes and full proposals for the optimal and most efficient methodology to measure the full impact of the pilot programme. As part of this, the Supplier will also provide a workplan for the evaluation period, including a timeline.	As per the milestones above
<b>BREAK CLAUSE</b>		
4	<b>Interim evaluation report (1)</b> - The Supplier will provide an interim report on the outcome, impact and value for money of the pilots to date. This report will be published on gov.uk.	As per the milestones above
<b>BREAK CLAUSE</b>		
5	<b>Interim evaluation report (2)</b> - The Supplier will provide an interim report on the outcome, impact and value for money of the pilots to date. This report will be published on gov.uk. The supplier	As per the milestones above

OFFICIAL

	will present the findings of this report to the DLUHC advisory panel.	
6	<b>Final evaluation report</b> - The Supplier will provide a final report on the outcomes, impact and value for money of the pilots to date. This report should also include a scalability assessment of a national roll-out. This report will be published on gov.uk. The supplier will present the findings of this report to the DLUHC advisory panel.	As per the milestones above

- 10.2 The Contracting Authority reserves the right to terminate the contract on failure to deliver milestones and deliverables.

## 11. MANAGEMENT INFORMATION/REPORTING

- 11.1 The annual reports and the final reports (including drafts) to be delivered using Microsoft Office products.
- 11.2 Reports to be delivered using Microsoft Office products and must be fully accessible. All written reports provided to the Authority must be of a high quality using the DLUHC reporting template and style guide. (See Section 16, Quality).

## 12. VOLUMES

- 12.1 The contract will run from December 2023 to March 2026, with the option to extend for up to 12 months (as set out in section 9, above).

## 13. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

- 13.1 The Supplier will continually improve the way in which the required Services are to be delivered throughout the Contract duration.
- 13.2 The Supplier must present new ways of working to DLUHC during monthly contract review meetings.
- 13.3 Changes to the way in which the Services are to be delivered must be brought to DLUHC's attention and agreed prior to any changes being implemented.

## 14. SUSTAINABILITY

- 14.1 Not applicable

## 15. SOCIAL VALUE

- 15.1 DLUHC will apply the 'Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012' to secure wider social, economic and environmental benefits from the Contract. Of the social value policy themes set out the Quick Reference Table<sup>3</sup>, DLUHC considers the following policy areas as the most relevant to the Delivery of LRFs Pilot Programme Evaluation.
- 15.2 The Supplier will be required to describe the commitment their organisation will make to ensure that opportunities specifically in the delivery of this Contract deliver the Policy Outcome and Award Criteria deliver social benefits related to them under the Contract:
- 15.2.1 **Theme 5 Wellbeing**
- 15.2.1.1 **MAC 7.1:** Demonstrate action to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce.
- 15.2.2 **Theme 4 Equal opportunity**
- 15.2.2.1 **MAC 6.1:** Demonstrate action to identify and tackle inequality in employment, skills and pay in the contract workforce
- 15.3 The Supplier must include a timed project plan and process, including how the commitment will be implemented and by when. The Supplier will monitor, measure and report on the commitments/the impact of their proposals. The Supplier should include but not be limited to: a timed action plan; metrics tools/processes used to gather data; reporting feedback; and improvement transparency.
- 15.4 In addition to delivering Social Value, the Supplier must demonstrate the action to be taken to identify and manage the risks of modern slavery in the delivery of the Contract, including within the supply chain. This must be maintained throughout the duration of the Contract term.
- 15.5 Social Value performance will be measured against the below, with specific target thresholds being established at contract implementation.
- 15.6 The Supplier must report quarterly on performance with evidence in relation to delivering on their Social Value commitments as set out in Order Schedule 4.

---

<sup>3</sup>[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/940828/Social-Value-Model-Quick-Reference-Table-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/940828/Social-Value-Model-Quick-Reference-Table-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf)

KPI's SV	Social Value MAC's and supplier metrics			
Model Award Criteria and the Reporting Metrics set out in the ITT documentation and in the Call-Off Schedule 4 (Call Off Tender). Targets should be established for each metric at contract implementation.				
Good	Approaching Target	Requires Improvement	Inadequate	Recorded elsewhere
The supplier is meeting or exceeding the SV KPI targets that are set out within the contract.	The supplier is close to meeting the SV KPI targets that are set out within the contract.	The performance of the supplier is below that of the SV KPIs targets that are set out within the contract	The performance of the supplier is significantly below that of the SV KPIs targets that are set out within the contract.	Data that is published by the department separately (a link should be provided).

## 16. QUALITY

- 16.1 All written reports provided to DLUHC should be of a high quality and presented on Supplier stationary (letter-headed).
- 16.2 The interim and final reports created during the contract to be shared with DLUHC and other interested internal and external stakeholders must be of publishable quality. Further information on Government Social Research publication protocols can be found in this link: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1078983/2022-GSR\\_Publication\\_protocol\\_v4\\_Final.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1078983/2022-GSR_Publication_protocol_v4_Final.pdf)
- 16.3 All research will be conducted in line with the Government Social Research code and should follow all required ethical guidelines. See checklist and guidance: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/515296/ethics\\_guidance\\_tcm6-5782.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/515296/ethics_guidance_tcm6-5782.pdf)
- 16.4 Quality assurance controls will be in place for both quantitative and qualitative primary research.
- 16.5 All deliverables as part of the contract must be of publishable quality under the Authority's name. Reports, papers and datasets are expected to have been proofread and quality assured by a senior official/director before submission to DLUHC.

## 17. PRICE

- 17.1 Prices are set out in the Price Schedule. These prices exclude VAT but include all other expenses relating to Contract delivery.
- 17.2 The maximum budget for this project is £500,000 excluding VAT
- 17.3 Contract Part 3 – Deliverables 4, 5 and 6 (see Section 10 of this Statement of Requirements) are subject to funding approval in line with section 8.3 of this Statement of Requirements.

## **18. STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE**

- 18.1 The Supplier must provide a sufficient level of resource throughout the duration of the Contract in order to consistently deliver a quality service.
- 18.2 The Supplier's staff assigned to the Contract shall have the relevant qualifications and experience to deliver the Contract to the required standard.
- 18.3 The Supplier shall ensure that staff understand the Authority's vision and objectives and will provide excellent customer service to DLUHC throughout the duration of the Contract.

## **19. SERVICE LEVELS AND PERFORMANCE**

- 19.1 DLUHC will measure the quality of the Supplier's delivery, in accordance with the key performance indicators set out in the table at Annex A: Part A (Services Levels and Service Credits Table) in DPS Order Schedule 14 (Service Levels). DLUHC shall manage the Supplier's performance according to the provisions of Order Schedule 14 (Service Levels).

## **20. SECURITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS**

- 20.1 Should the Supplier be required to attend meetings at 2 Marsham Street, photo ID is required and bags and people are scanned.
- 20.2 The Supplier must employ the appropriate organisational, operational and technological processes and procedures to keep research participants data safe from unauthorised use or access, loss, destruction, theft or disclosure. The organisational, operational and technological processes and procedures adopted are required to comply with the requirements of ISO/IEC 27001 or equivalent; and Cyber Essentials: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cyber-essentials-scheme-overview>
- 20.3 DLUHC will remain as data controller and will own the Intellectual Property and Publishing Rights for the analysis findings. At the end of the project, and when requested throughout its duration, any additional project materials must be shared with the DLUHC, including anonymised transcripts from the interviews and focus groups. All processes and procedures put in place by data controllers (the Department) and data processors (the Supplier) will be compliant with the principles of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
- 20.4 The collection, analysis and reporting of personal data, and protocols for storage and destruction is set out in the DPS Joint Schedule 11.

## **21. PAYMENT AND INVOICING**

- 21.1 DLUHC will pay the Supplier within 30 days of receipt of a valid invoice.

---

OFFICIAL



- 21.2 DLUHC will retain 10% of the total sum until satisfactory delivery of the final report.
- 21.3 Payments shall be made in accordance with the following schedule. The Supplier is permitted to request an alternative payment schedule to assist with their cashflow. Payments must be linked to specific deliverables.
- 21.4 Any alternative Payment Schedule shall be discussed and agreed between DLUHC and the Supplier prior to the commencement of the Contract.

Milestone Payment 1 – following production of deliverable 1 and 3, para 10.1 above	March 2024
Milestone Payment 2 – following production of deliverable 4, para 10.1 above	February 2025
Milestone Payment 3 – following production of deliverable 5, para 10.1 above	January 2026
Final Milestone Payment 4 – following production of deliverable 6, para 10.1 above	March 2026

21.5

- 21.6 Payments can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables.
- 21.7 Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.
- 21.8 Invoices must be submitted to: Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, Invoice Processing Team, Finance Shared Services Division, High Trees, Hillfield Road, Hemel Hempstead, Herts, HP2 4XN, Email: [CLGInvoices@levellingup.gov.uk](mailto:CLGInvoices@levellingup.gov.uk). Invoices must be cc'd to the relevant contract manager
- 21.9 All invoices must be specific to charges agreed at the end of each milestone. Other information such as: Purchase Order number, project reference, period of work, and number of days worked, invoiced amount, VAT shall also be included on each invoice.

---

OFFICIAL

## **22. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT**

- 22.1 The Supplier will attend fortnightly online review/progress calls via Microsoft Teams to ensure that the programme is progressing well.
- 22.2 The Supplier will attend meetings at each agreed review point, or if there are particular issues that need to be addressed.
- 22.3 At each review point, DLUHC will assess whether outputs meet satisfactory standards before the work can proceed to the next stage. The dates of these review points will be set and agreed between DLUHC and the Supplier once in post.
- 22.4 There will be formal contract and progress review meetings every 4 weeks between the Supplier and DLUHC Analytical Lead and DLUHC Contract Manager. These will take place online via Microsoft Teams.
- 22.5 The majority of meetings are expected to be taken online however where these are delivered in person, attendance at meetings shall be at the Supplier's own expense.
- 22.6 Throughout the Contract, regular progress meetings will be required between the Supplier and DLUHC, and other meetings as necessary (e.g. with the Stronger LRF Evaluation Advisory Panel). The Supplier must take on board feedback from DLUHC.
- 22.7 The Supplier and DLUHC will also meet regularly (weekly/fortnightly during the project) for progress updates. There may also be a requirement for ad hoc meetings or calls throughout the project. Meetings will take place online via Microsoft Teams.
- 22.8 The Supplier must highlight any key risks or actions, including any potential time or delivery risks and propose mitigation as and when it materialises. The Supplier must also advise DLUHC on managing and mitigating risks owned by DLUHC and anything the Supplier believes that DLUHC should be made aware of.
- 22.9 The contract will be considered completed upon the satisfactory completion of all deliverables, reports, and milestones.

## **23. EXIT MANAGEMENT**

- 23.1 The Supplier must provide an Exit Plan and comply with the provisions for Exit Management as set out in DPS Order Schedule 10 (Exit Management).
- 23.2 The Supplier's Exit Plan must set out a detailed strategy for exiting the Contract, including an exit which is brought about by poor performance or the need to break the Contract in due to the circumstances set out in Paragraph 9.1).

## **24. LOCATION**

- 24.1 The location of the Services will be carried out remotely, with the possibility of occasionally attending one of the DLUHCs offices (main office 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF).