



Crown
Commercial
Service

Bid Pack

Attachment 3 – Statement of Requirements

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones
Research

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 1 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

CONTENTS

1.	PURPOSE.....	2
2.	BACKGROUND TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.....	2
3.	BACKGROUND TO REQUIREMENT.....	3
4.	DEFINITIONS.....	5
5.	SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT	5
6.	THE REQUIREMENT	6
7.	KEY MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES	15
8.	VOLUMES.....	16
9.	CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT	16
10.	SUSTAINABILITY	16
11.	ETHICS.....	16
12.	QUALITY.....	17
13.	PRICE	18
14.	STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE.....	19
15.	SERVICE LEVELS AND PERFORMANCE	19
16.	SECURITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.....	20
17.	PAYMENT AND INVOICING	21
18.	CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	22
19.	LOCATION.....	23

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 1 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The Department for Transport (DfT) is inviting bids for a national evaluation of Future Transport Zones (FTZ)¹.
- 1.2 The Department for Transport may be referred to as 'the Authority' throughout this document.

2. BACKGROUND TO THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

- 2.1 The DfT works with its agencies and partners to support the transport network that helps the UK's businesses, and gets people and goods travelling around the country. The DfT plans and invests in transport infrastructure to keep the UK on the move.
- 2.2 The Government's Industrial Strategy² sets out a long-term plan to put the UK at the forefront of the industries of the future and consists of four Grand Challenges: Artificial Intelligence and Data, Ageing Society, Clean Growth and Future of Transport (FoT, note this was previously referred to as Future of Mobility / FoM).
- 2.3 The FoM Grand Challenge aims to position the UK as a world leader in the way people, goods and services move and has a mission to "Put the UK at the forefront of the design and manufacturing of zero emission vehicles, with all new cars and vans effectively zero emission by 2040". The Future of mobility: urban strategy³ outlines the next steps for the FoM Grand Challenge.
- 2.4 To support the FoM Grand Challenge the Government launched the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF); a £2.5bn public and sustainable transport fund, running across five 5 years from 2018/19 to 2022/23, funding a total of 18 cities⁴. It aims to increase local productivity by improving intra-urban transport links into medium and large city centres, and has a particular focus on supporting new and innovative approaches.
- 2.5 The government has announced £90 million of capital funding as a top up to the TCF to create up to four Future Transport Zones (FTZs). FTZs aim to demonstrate a range of new digitally enabled mobility services, modes and business models with the objective of improving mobility for consumers and providing an exportable template to allow successful initiatives to be replicated in other areas⁵.
- 2.6 In 2018, Transport for West Midlands (TfWM) was allocated £20 million of the FTZ fund to act as 'pathfinder' FTZ. TfWM plans to develop a traveller

¹ Note that prior to their award, Future Transport Zones (FTZs) were referred to as Future Mobility Zones (FMZs)

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/industrial-strategy-building-a-britain-fit-for-the-future>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-of-mobility-urban-strategy>

⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/apply-for-the-transforming-cities-fund>

⁵ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-of-mobility-urban-strategy>

segmentation model to target new transport initiatives, develop a Mobility as a Service (MaaS) platform, exploit transport network data, and showcase innovative mobility services (e.g. mobility credits, autonomous vehicles).

- 2.7 A two-stage competitive process was used to select additional FTZ areas. The competition was open to all TCF cities and 7 areas were shortlisted to complete a final proposal between July 2019 and September 2019⁶.
- 2.8 The FTZ policy team, DfT economists and the Evaluation Centre of Excellence (ECoE) worked with the 7 shortlisted areas to help support the development of their final proposals. The ECoE provided logic mapping support and guidance on the development of initial evaluation plans.
- 2.9 The FTZ final proposals were judged on; the strength of the strategic case, credibility of delivery plans, value for money (economic case), and evaluation plans. The winning FTZ areas were announced in March 2020 and include:
- **Portsmouth and Southampton**⁷ – a range of mobility initiatives across both cities, including MaaS, Dynamic Demand Responsive Transport (DDRT), urban logistics and drone deliveries for medical purposes.
 - **West of England Combined Authority**⁸ – four mobility living labs across the area underpinned by a data hub, MaaS platform, mobility credits, DDRT, mobility hubs and e-scooters trials.
 - **Derby and Nottingham**⁹ – an open access MaaS platform including sustainable travel incentives, a data sharing platform and six e-mobility hubs in neighbourhoods, depots and campuses.
- 2.10 The Department is currently working with the successful FTZ areas to further co-develop and finalise their FTZ projects.

3. BACKGROUND TO REQUIREMENT

Future Transport Zones funding

- 3.1 FTZs are part of the FoM Grand Challenge's priorities to support industry and local leaders through fostering experimentation and trialling. Therefore, it requires an evaluation that maximises the opportunities for learning to understand how new digitally enabled mobility modes, services and business models can be delivered successfully.
- 3.2 FTZs are linked to the Industrial Strategy and of interest to a range of government stakeholders, including No.10, BEIS and DEFRA. As such, the

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/future-mobility-zones-fund-competition-process>

⁷ http://www.solent-transport.com/images/Bids/future-mobility-zones-fund-application-form-final-proposal_30_09_19_FINAL_redacted.pdf

⁸ <https://www.westofengland-ca.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/WECA-FMZ-Bid-Submission-Redaction-V2.pdf>

⁹ <https://www.transportnottingham.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Derby-Nottingham-FMZ-Stage-2-Bid.pdf>

findings of this evaluation will be of high interest and require an effective plan for dissemination.

- 3.3 The evaluation of FTZs will need to provide both formative evidence, that can be fed back to inform the implementation and maintenance of local plans (allowing for adaptive policymaking), and summative evidence, that can report retrospectively on how effective they have been in meeting their aims.
- 3.4 While the Department currently have no plans to fund further FTZs, we require a flexible approach to evaluation that could be scaled and extended in the event that the programme is expanded.

Local evaluation plans

- 3.5 Some evaluation activity will be delivered locally within each of the FTZs. FTZ areas will ultimately be responsible for conducting evaluation activity related to the schemes they implement.
- 3.6 The DfT's ECoE worked with shortlisted FTZ areas to co-develop initial local evaluation plans and identified three types of learning opportunities:
 - Impact evaluation – the Authority is keen for evaluation activity to generate robust conclusions about the effectiveness of FTZ schemes, where appropriate. As a result, the framework should identify where counterfactual evaluation methods can be applied and where it is proportionate and practical to do so. The Authority expects that this will be feasible for a minority of schemes and outcomes.
 - User insights – the Authority expects that surveys and softer, more qualitative approaches to understand how users respond to new services, modes and models, will form a core part of the evaluation.
 - Implementation lessons – many FTZ activities are more inward looking, or process oriented, where evaluation will focus on ways to log and share lessons.
- 3.7 However, local evaluations in isolation would carry a risk that learning opportunities across FTZs are missed and that common measurements needed to develop a strong evidence base are not adopted.
- 3.8 Based on this, DfT intends to commission a national evaluation to maximise the learning opportunity across FTZs and to synthesise evidence from local evaluations. It is envisaged that this will involve the development of an overarching framework covering both theoretical and practical aspects of the evaluation, the delivery of support to FTZs to develop and deliver local M&E activities to ensure a consistent approach across FTZ areas, and supplementary case study research. These activities are details further in Section 5 & 6 below.

OFFICIAL

4. DEFINITIONS

Expression or Acronym	Definition
BEIS	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs
DfT	The Department for Transport (the Authority)
DDRT	Dynamic Demand Responsive Transport
ECoE	Evaluation Centre of Excellence
FoM	Future of Mobility
FoT	Future of Transport
FMZ	Future Mobility Zone(s), now referred to as Future Transport Zones
FTZ	Future Transport Zone(s)
HMT	Her Majesty's Treasury
LAs	Local Authorities
MaaS	Mobility as a Service
MCA's	Mayoral and Combined Authorities
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
SoR	Statement of Requirements
TCF	Transforming Cities Fund
TfWM	Transport for West Midlands

5. SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT

- 5.1 The Authority seeks to appoint a Supplier to carry out a national evaluation of Future Transport Zones (FTZ).
- 5.2 In summary, the requirement for the national evaluation of FTZ will have five elements. These are discussed in detail in Section 6:
- i. **Development of a M&E framework** for the FTZ programme as a whole, building on the work planned and undertaken by local authorities.
 - ii. **Mapping of common features** and linkages across the FTZs to identify opportunities for additional cross-cutting evaluation work and synthesis of evidence across areas.
 - iii. **Support for local authorities** in the development and delivery of their M&E activities, including steering them towards common measurement

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 5 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

approaches, quality assuring their work and sharing emerging findings to facilitate exchanges of learning across the areas.

- iv. **Conduct of supplemental evaluation case studies** activity to generate cross-cutting learnings from the programme through:
 - Rapid cases studies to provide early learning on aspects of the FTZ that are of particular policy interest, for example a mini-study to assess early evidence from initiatives to encourage vehicle sharing.
 - Longitudinal cases studies to provide deeper evidence on new types of scheme that are of particular importance for future policy development, for example mobility credits or mobility hubs.
- v. **Synthesising findings** from authorities and supplemental evaluation activity to produce annual consolidated evaluation reports over the three years of the programme.

5.3 FTZs will also be piloting micromobility interventions in the form of trials of e-scooters. Evaluating these pilots is not in the scope of this requirement. The Supplier will manage the co-ordination of the National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones and any national evaluation of micromobility pilots.

5.4 This requirement is described in detail in the next section.

6. THE REQUIREMENT

Familiarisation

- 6.1 The Authority requires the Supplier to become familiar with the programme and fully understand how the planned schemes are expected to generate benefits. This will require:
- i. Review of programme documentation including:
 - Programme business case / initiation documents setting out programme objectives;
 - Guidance materials issued by the Department to support bidding (publicly available);
 - Bids for funding from successful areas;
 - Programme updates from Transport for the West Midlands;
 - Grant award documentation for all zones; and
 - Any further papers available from zones.

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 6 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

- ii. Face to face interviews with key DfT staff – two sessions would be required to cover both policy and analytical colleagues.
- iii. Initial conversations with key LA contacts in FTZs to understand their objectives, how they intend to develop their evaluation plans, and the areas where they require support – a total of four interviews required.

Mapping and production of a scheme typology

- 6.2 The Authority requires the Supplier to draw on familiarisation activity to map and develop a typology for different types of FTZ investments. The objective of this map and typology is to provide a simplifying structure for the evaluation. The typology should identify commonalities and shared objectives between schemes in individual zones and across all FTZs. The typology should provide a structure for the synthesis and reporting of evaluation findings across FTZs.
- 6.3 This map and typology should be shared with the Authority for discussion in draft form. There may also be value in discussing the emerging approach with individual FTZs as part of familiarisation interviews.

Evaluation framework for FTZs

- 6.4 A critical early task will be to develop an overarching framework setting out both the theories underpinning the FTZ investments and practical aspects of the evaluation. This should be informed by evaluation planning work undertaken by LAs and the scheme typology discussed above.
- 6.5 The framework should include the following elements:
 - i. **An overarching Theory of Change for the programme.** This should set out a theoretical framework describing the mechanisms through which the different types of FTZ schemes are expected to produce benefits. This framework should surface the potential interactions between different schemes as well as with key external factors. A typical structure for this would be to discuss the context, inputs, outputs, outcomes and intending impacts of the programme. The Theory of Change should also surface the key assumptions and risks to these benefits arising that the evaluation should also explore. This Theory of Change should be summarised in the form of a set of logic models or maps.
 - ii. **Measurement of key outcomes.** The evaluation framework should detail the data available to measure the outputs, outcomes and impacts identified in the Theory of Change, covering access and ownership, strengths and likely limitations. It is envisioned that data critical to the evaluation would generally be obtained by local areas and shared with the evaluators. The framework should summarise what data LAs are planning to collect and identify options for additional measures and common measurement approaches.

- iii. **Summary of planned LA FTZ evaluation approaches.** The Authority require a summary of how individual FTZs are approaching evaluation of their schemes, an assessment of the lessons that can be expected from these evaluations, together with an assessment of risks to gaining collective evidence and proposals for how these can be mitigated by the authorities and/or the national evaluation. We anticipate that these approaches will have been influenced by the support provided by the supplier (discussed below).
- iv. **Recommended FTZ evaluation approaches.** The evaluation framework should set out a recommended set of approaches for evaluating FTZ schemes. This should include broad recommendations for LA led approaches to evaluate individual schemes and recommendations for the national evaluation. It should also explain where approaches have been considered and discounted. The framework should summarise the approaches planned by LAs and identify where additional national evaluation activity is recommended to generate and share additional learning from FTZs.

As noted above (para 3.5), LAs have been encouraged to draw a distinction between three types of learning, and it may be helpful to separately consider these in the evaluation framework:

- Impact evaluation – the Authority is keen to identify the minority of schemes and outcomes where robust impact evaluation is feasible to ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to these opportunities.
 - User insights – the evaluation framework should include recommendations for approaches to ‘user’ or ‘behavioural insights’ research that enable comparisons and learning across different schemes and FTZs.
 - Implementation lessons – the framework should set out specific recommendations for how evaluation can learn from the process of delivering FTZ schemes. The Authority is particularly interested in how this can be undertaken in a structured and objective manner.
- v. **Specification of national evaluation approach.** The Authority requires a detailed specification for the next stage of the evaluation covering:
- Monitoring requirements for FTZs – specification of the common information that should be captured by all areas and additional scheme specific data collection. The Authority will take responsibility for incorporating this into guidance for LAs.
 - Detailed recommendations for where national-level evaluation activity can build on LA led approaches for individual FTZs. This

OFFICIAL

should include consideration of centrally managed rapid and longitudinal case studies, an approach to the central synthesis of evaluation evidence and around dissemination (see detailed requirements below).

M&E support for local authorities

- 6.6 The supplier for the national evaluation is intended to be a resource for both the commissioning Authority and also for LAs to help them deliver their evaluation plans more effectively.
- 6.7 LAs have overall responsibility for planning and delivering M&E activity for their zones. Areas were encouraged to develop initial evaluation plans at bid stage, a process that the Department supported. All successful bids identified areas that the evaluation of their schemes could inform, set out an initial evaluation plan and demonstrated some evaluation capability (either in house or through partnering). Nevertheless, there are limits to the experience of designing and delivery proportionate evaluations in some LAs. The Authority requires the Supplier to work with FTZs and their evaluation partners to help them maximise the opportunity to learn from the programme.
- 6.8 The Authority anticipates that the relationship between LAs and the supplier will be especially important for identifying and implementing approaches to mitigate the baselining challenge created by disruption associated with COVID-19. This disruption may limit the extent to which historical data is of use in the evaluation, as well as the contribution of simple 'before vs. after' comparisons of change over time.
- 6.9 While the specific support requirements of individual zones will likely vary, the Authority envisions that the following overall levels of support activities will be required. Bidders may suggest greater or lesser levels of engagement, with justification of how this level of engagement would meet the requirements of the evaluation satisfactorily.
- 6.10 The Authority envision that LAs will benefit from having the greatest level of engagement with FTZs soon after contract award to:
- Review evaluation plans prepared at bid stage and any updates for each of the four FTZs.
 - Facilitate a face-to-face workshop with staff in each local area responsible for designing and delivering M&E plans to help them develop their local evaluation plans. This could include support with the development of local theories of change and logic mapping, identifying metrics to monitor scheme delivery or outcomes of interest as well as designing proportionate evaluation approaches and offering advice on where counterfactual designs for impact evaluation could support new learning.
 - Provide a write-up of the workshop and detailed feedback and guidance for each area to help them refine their approach.

OFFICIAL

- Be available on two further instances to provide follow-up guidance or input either via email or over the phone for each FTZ.
 - Provide peer review of evaluation plans, commenting on the extent to which they maximise the opportunity to learn from FTZ funding and feasibility.
- 6.11 Once evaluation plans have been agreed, there should be regular discussions on progress to help local evaluations remain on track and respond to any changes in FTZ activities. This should be arranged on an ad-hoc basis, as required. The Authority envisions that the Supplier should plan on the basis of one face-to-face meeting in each zone in each subsequent year and ongoing telephone support of about one call every two months for the duration of the contract.
- 6.12 The Authority also requires the Supplier to provide a peer review of evaluation outputs prepared by FTZs to offer quality assurance. Suppliers should plan on the basis of reviewing a baseline and two annual reports from each FTZ.
- 6.13 Potential Suppliers shall set out a detailed plan for engagement with local areas. This should indicate both how and when Suppliers would plan to engage, how these relationships would be managed, and how much resource they anticipate providing across both structured (e.g. workshops) and ad hoc support. In costing this element of the requirement. Suppliers shall provide an indication of both the total cost of supporting four FTZs in this way.

Rapid case studies

- 6.14 The Authority requires the Supplier to complement local evaluation activity with rapid case studies to explore specific topics in depth and provide early learning on aspects of the FTZ that are of particular policy interest. For example, this might involve:
- Taking stock on progress across the zones with a particular type of scheme, such as the establishment of ‘mobility hubs’;
 - Bringing together and sharing the lessons that individual zones have learnt from initial work to improve the availability of public transport data;
 - Comparing evidence emerging on schemes targeting a particular type of benefit (such as increased public transport patronage); or
 - Exploring why certain groups of users have responded in a particular way to a specific type of intervention (such as how older people have responded to DDRT).
- 6.15 The identification of these rapid case studies will depend on the requirements of DfT’s FTZ policy team. The successful Supplier will therefore need to allow time for consultation with this team when considering the selection of case studies.

OFFICIAL

- 6.16 The Authority's initial conclusion is that four rapid case studies will be required and these will be evenly spaced through the life of the Contract. The exact number of rapid case studies will be dependent on the FTZ policy team, and as such there could be a requirement for more (or fewer) case studies. However, the Authority expects to require a minimum of two and a maximum of six rapid case studies. The Authority will assess the need for additional rapid case studies (above the minimum four) on a call-off basis during the evaluation.
- 6.17 To ensure comparability, tenderers should set out the specification, timing of activities and cost for four rapid case studies in their core submissions. Suppliers shall also specify the resources (e.g. staff costs, consumables, equipment, etc.) required for this task.
- 6.18 The specific design of these rapid 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. Suppliers are encouraged to propose a solution that can accommodate a range of potential case study designs. The Authority recognises that there will necessarily be a trade-off between depth and breadth of coverage in these case studies to ensure that the chosen topics can be thoroughly explored while also being sufficiently responsive to policy needs.
- 6.19 To illustrate the scale of the requirement, the scope of a single rapid case study could include:
- Desk review – review of FTZ planning documents, monitoring data already collected by the Department, and LA evaluation research conducted to date. Review of three relevant international studies to provide context for the case study.
 - Engagement with FTZs – qualitative interviews with four LA officers to learn lessons for any wider roll-out of their schemes (process evaluation) and engagement to access additional data on the deployment of specific schemes from four FTZs.
 - User research – qualitative interviews with 20 users and two focus groups across four different FTZs to explore specific issues not covered by LA research.
 - Reporting – a short (20-30 page) case study report, drafted in an accessible style for non-technical audiences.
 - Rapid turnaround – an initial scoping and planning phase of three weeks, and a six-week research phase.
- 6.20 The following activities would be OUT of scope:
- Large scale primary research, either quantitative or qualitative.

OFFICIAL

- Planning for follow-up research.
 - Counterfactual impact evaluation designs unlikely to be feasible for this strand of work due to short timescales and limited budget.
- 6.21 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. Further guidance on this is given in Attachment 2.

Longitudinal cases studies

- 6.22 The Authority also requires a set of longitudinal case studies to learn from instances where multiple FTZs are trialling related interventions. The objective is to better link up evaluation activity in different areas to create opportunities to pool data for analysis or more effectively compare and contrast the effectiveness of different approaches. Examples of potential schemes being trailed in multiple areas include the introduction of mobility market places or platforms, offering mobility credits to encourage behaviour change and testing some form of 'mobility hubs'.
- 6.23 The Authority's initial conclusion is that three longitudinal case studies will be required. The Authority requires the Supplier to bring forwards recommendations for where longitudinal case studies can add the most value as part of the evaluation framework. The Authority will then agree the exact number of longitudinal case studies with the Supplier. The Authority expects to require a minimum of two longitudinal case studies and a maximum of four longitudinal case studies.
- 6.24 To ensure comparability, tenderers should set out the specification, timing of activities and cost for three longitudinal case studies in their core submissions. Suppliers shall also specify the resources (e.g. staff costs, consumables, equipment, etc.) required for this task.
- 6.25 The specific design of these longitudinal case studies will be tailored to the opportunities for learning presented by different FTZ schemes. As for rapid case studies, the range of evidence required will vary depending on the specific objectives of each case study.
- 6.26 The Authority's initial conclusion is that three will be required encouraged to propose a solution that can accommodate a range of potential case study designs. The Authority recognises that there will necessarily be a trade-off between depth and breadth of coverage in these case studies to ensure that the chosen topics can be thoroughly explored while also being sufficiently responsive to policy needs.
- 6.27 To illustrate the scale of the requirement, the scope of a single longitudinal case study could include:

- Initial scoping and outline evaluation design – this will form part of the evaluation framework discussed above and would aim to assess the broad value that a longitudinal case study could offer and judge its feasibility.
- Joint detailed planning with FTZs – engagement with FTZs to understand relevant schemes in detail, their initial thinking on evaluation approaches and to discuss the scope to align these evaluations (for example, by agreeing a common script for user surveys across all four areas).
- Ongoing engagement with FTZs – to access data and understand how schemes have evolved and to ensure their evaluation approaches remain aligned. One telephone discussion every four months.
- Consolidation of emerging evidence – synthesis of monitoring data and evaluation evidence available from individual FTZs. Repeated annually.
- Annual light-touch research activity to complement LA-led research – interviews with 4 LA officers and 2 other stakeholders (such key suppliers) as to capture progress and gather any implementation lessons not captured in LA evaluation outputs. In addition either a small-scale survey or qualitative interviews with 20 users will be required.
- Reporting – production of a brief baseline report (20-pages), two annual reports and one final report (30-pages). These should be drafted in an accessible style for non-technical audiences.

6.28 The following activities would be OUT of scope:

- Large scale primary research, either qualitative or quantitative.

Synthesis of FTZ M&E findings and production of annual reports

6.29 Initially we expect lessons emerging from FTZs to be predominantly formative and focused around how schemes are implemented. As schemes complete we expect more summative evidence to be available from user insight and impact evaluation research. Section 7 below sets out a timetable for the national evaluation that completes six months after the end of the FTZ funding.

6.30 The Authority requires reports that bring together lessons from across the programme. This will necessitate the synthesis and triangulation of the following evidence on an annual basis:

- Monitoring records supplied in synthesised form by the Authority.
- Annual evaluation reports from four FTZs.
- Reports from longitudinal case studies and any rapid case studies completed in the previous year.

OFFICIAL

- The supplier may be required to add value to the content by comparing evaluation findings to specific international evidence.
- 6.31 The Authority expects the Supplier to engage with it to propose and then agree the focus for individual reports. Reports should be drafted to be accessible to a non-technical audience, should be of a publishable standard and meet cross-government accessibility criteria¹⁰.

Dissemination of evaluation and trial findings to local and national stakeholders.

- 6.32 Alongside the Authority, the primary audience for evaluation findings will be the FTZs themselves and other LAs interested in investing in new modes, models and transport services. The Authority requires the Supplier to undertake the following activities to support dissemination of findings to ensure these groups can learn as much as possible from the evaluation:
- Preparation of high level, two-page, summaries of key findings – six required through the life of the contract.
 - Presentation of progress and findings to key DfT stakeholders – one presentation each year.
 - Presentation at annual workshop of FTZs and key stakeholders arranged by DfT – one presentation each year.

Potential increase in contract scale

- 6.33 As noted above, the Department does not currently have plans to fund further FTZs. However, we require a flexible approach to evaluation that could be scaled and extended in the event that the programme is expanded.
- 6.34 The Authority anticipates that if additional FTZs were funded this would create a requirement for additional activity for the Supplier in two areas. There would be a need to engage with and provide support to the additional area. The inclusion of an additional zone would also likely give rise to a broader range of activities within the programme and potentially new areas of overlapping activities between zones. To learn from this the Authority would require one additional rapid case study and one additional longitudinal case study.

The price assessment for this contract will be made on the total cost of the current requirement plus the Supplier's estimated cost of the inclusion of one additional future FTZ (see Attachment 4).

¹⁰ For further detail see here: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-publish-on-gov-uk/accessible-pdfs>

7. KEY MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES

7.1 The following Contract milestones/deliverables are expected to apply:

Milestone/ Deliverable	Description	Timeframe or Delivery Date
A - National Evaluation of FTZ		
1. Evaluation framework document	A confirmation of an evaluation workplan, drawing on engagement with local authorities and the Authority, to meet the agreed research objectives and provide evidence of the effectiveness of new mobility approaches in FTZs. This will set out a typology of schemes across the areas, how M&E activity by local areas will be used, how baseline measures will be established*, what supplemental case study evaluation activity will be undertaken, and how findings will be drawn together in summative reports.	December 2020
2. Baseline report	Describes the baseline positions in FTZ and explains how outcomes of the programme will be assessed against these* (not for publication). Following the delivery of the Baseline report the Authority will review and confirm the requirement for the remaining stages of the research.	March 2021
3. Case study reports	Provides findings from the rapid and longitudinal case studies (for publication).	To be discussed with the Contracting Authority at inception meeting
4. First report	Provides early evidence from FTZ activities (not for publication).	September 2021
5. Second report	Provides interim evidence from FTZ activities (not for publication).	September 2022
6. Third report	Provides interim evidence from FTZ activities (not for publication)	September 2023
7. Final summative report	Provides final evidence of outcomes from FTZ after the end of the funding period (for publication).	September 2024

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 15 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

*Baseline measures are likely to be affected by COVID-19 due to changes in travel behaviour during lockdown and recovery. It is anticipated that the evaluation framework and baseline report should consider what appropriate baseline measures are feasible given this context.

- 7.2 Please note that in light of the exception pressure Local Authorities are facing in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, we may ask the supplier to delay the start of their engagement with individual FTZs. At this point, we do not expect that the end date of the programme or evaluation will change.

8. VOLUMES

- 8.1 The volumes for this procurement have been identified in Section 6 covering 'The Requirement'.

9. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

- 9.1 The Supplier will be expected to continually improve the way in which the required Services are to be delivered throughout the Contract duration.
- 9.2 The Supplier should present new ways of working to the Authority during annual Contract review meetings.
- 9.3 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.

10. SUSTAINABILITY

- 10.1 Not Applicable.

11. ETHICS

- 11.1 DfT 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

- 11.2 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>.

OFFICIAL

Bid pack for Provision of National Evaluation of Future Transport Zones Research

Contract Reference: CCZZ20A56

Page 16 of 24

V1.0 15/07/2020

© Crown Copyright 2018

- 11.3 Suppliers should address any identified ethical sensitivities or risks in their application, as well as any others they consider might arise. Appropriate handling of ethical sensitivities is part of the tender assessment exercise and proposals will be evaluated against how they identify and address ethical sensitivities.

12. QUALITY

- 12.1 Potential Suppliers' proposals must be able to offer an appropriate level of expertise and experience and be able to deliver the outputs within the desired timeframe.
- 12.2 As part of the proposals, Potential Suppliers shall also provide a quality control plan that demonstrates their organisation's quality control procedures.
- 12.3 Suppliers should take note of the following guidelines for producing research outputs. These are intended to ensure that the reporting process is efficient and produces outputs of good quality that will be acceptable for the Authority.
- 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 2-5 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 that are intended for publication should be drafted using the DfT report template which will be provided by the Authority. We expect that this will apply to the FTZ Evaluation Framework, case studies and final summative 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 requirements¹¹.

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-publish-on-gov-uk/accessible-pdfs>

- The Supplier should schedule a report planning meeting with the Authority. 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 Authority.
 - 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 Authority 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 Authority must be fully addressed.
- 12.4 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.

13. PRICE

- 13.1 We are not specifying a budget for this contract. We have taken account of the evaluation requirements when setting our budget, and expect tenderers to use their judgement to assemble proposals that best meet the stated requirements while also providing good value for money.
- 13.2 Prices are to be submitted via the e-Sourcing Suite at Attachment 4 – Price Schedule excluding VAT and including all other expenses relating to Contract delivery.
- 13.3 Potential Suppliers are required to submit a full price schedule of each work package as outlined in Attachment 4 – Pricing Schedule. A clear price breakdown will enable any future prioritisation decisions (see Attachment 4 for details required).
- 13.4 Where a sub-contractor arrangement is used, a separate breakdown for each partner should be provided in addition to the overall project costs.

Call-off/ad-hoc days:

- 13.5 Day rates for all staff should be provided along with a general description of duties; and Potential Suppliers shall also provide day rates to provide ad-hoc response to review questions or urgent policy issues. These should be specified as a separate milestone and detailed in Attachment 4 – Price Schedule.
- 13.6 The 30-day call-off element will be used for such activities as detailed below:

OFFICIAL

- 13.6.1 Answering technical questions;
 - 13.6.2 Conducting ad-hoc analysis of data and;
 - 13.6.3 Attending ad-hoc meetings and presentations.
- 13.7 The clear majority of the activities outlined above should be led and completed at a working level, with senior engagement where necessary. This should be reflected within the staff day rates and costings provided for this element.

14. STAFF AND CUSTOMER SERVICE

- 14.1 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.
- 14.2 The Supplier shall provide a sufficient level of resource throughout the duration of the Contract to consistently deliver a quality service.
- 14.3 The Supplier's staff assigned to the Contract shall have the relevant qualifications and experience to deliver the Contract to the required standard.
- 14.4 The Supplier shall ensure that staff understand the Authority's vision and objectives and will provide excellent customer service to the Authority throughout the duration of the Contract.

15. SERVICE LEVELS AND PERFORMANCE

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

KPI/SLA	Service Area	KPI/SLA description	Target
1	Delivery	Deliverables presented to the Authority according to the timescales outlined in Section 7 'Key Milestones and Deliverables' (unless otherwise agreed) and are in the agreed format;	100%

OFFICIAL

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 Authority 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%

- 15.2 The quality of the service provided by the Successful Supplier will be regularly monitored by the Authority against the elements outlined above throughout the duration of the Contract.
- 15.3 The Supplier shall participate in quarterly and annual review meetings with the Authority 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.
- 15.4 Following annual review meetings, the Authority 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.

16. SECURITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS

- 16.1 The Authority is committed to maintaining high standards of data security and confidentiality.

OFFICIAL

- 16.2 The Potential Suppliers must fully comply with General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and the Freedom of Information (FOI) legislation and the Mandatory Minimum Measures set out by the Cabinet Office.
- 16.3 Suppliers shall address any Data Protection or Information Security issues that they anticipate encountering in relation to the Contract and their approach to mitigate them. Any information security accreditations held by the Supplier or sub-contracted organisations must be clearly outlined.
- 16.4 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 Authority.
- 16.5 The Successful Supplier shall seek approval in advance from the Authority'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 Authority's Project Manager informed of any further use of data and/or findings from the project.
- 16.6 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.
- 16.7 Any outputs must not be published or shared with any third parties without the written permission of the Authority.

Conflicts of interest:

- 16.8 Previous engagement with local areas does not preclude organisations from bidding for the national evaluation. However, we ask that any potential Supplier that has already been commissioned to undertake a local FTZ evaluation refrain from bidding for the national evaluation.
- 16.9 To minimise the risk of conflicts of future interest – perceived or actual – we require that the Supplier appointed to carry out the national FTZ evaluation, and any participating sub-contractors, refrain from undertaking local FTZ evaluation work. Neither should they advise local areas on how to prepare future bids for further FTZ funding should it become available. 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).
- 16.10 We do not require the Supplier or sub-contractors to refrain from carrying out evaluation work for local areas that are not participating in the FTZs, nor to refrain from conducting the evaluation of other programmes.

17. PAYMENT AND INVOICING

- 17.1 Upon Contract Award, the Authority shall be provided with a profile 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

OFFICIAL

any other costs incurred), including a breakdown of VAT if applicable, and dates when invoices will be submitted linked to key project milestones.

- 17.2 To assist with the payment process, draft invoices shall first be submitted by e-mail to the Authority's Project Manager. Once the draft invoice has been agreed, a DfT 'Goods Received Notice (GRN)' will be produced and the Authority will then confirm that the invoice may be submitted for payment.
- 17.3 Invoices must quote the Purchase Order (PO) number and must be submitted as directed in the PO to: Arvato, Shared Service Centre, 5 Sandringham Park, Llansamlet, Swansea Vale, Swansea, SA7 0E (support@sharedservicesarvato.co.uk).
- 17.4 Payment can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables.
- 17.5 Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.

18. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

- 18.1 The identity of the Authority's Project Manager shall be disclosed upon Contract Award. They shall be the main point of contact throughout the duration of the Contract.
- 18.2 A FTZ 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 Authority's offices to provide advice on interim and draft final outputs. Suppliers should assume that they will be invited to attend these meetings on a quarterly basis for the duration of the contract.
- 18.3 Papers for steering group must be provided at least 5 working days before each meeting.

Project Management:

- 18.4 Potential Suppliers must set out their project team identifying the following:
 - 18.4.1 The Project Director(s) who will provide senior leadership and oversight for delivery of the project;
 - 18.4.2 The Project Manager(s) who will provide day-to-day management of the project and will be the main point of contact for the Authority's Project Manager and;
 - 18.4.3 Project team members, stating their role in the delivery of the study.
- 18.5 Arrangements for management of the project team shall be set out, explaining how these will ensure timely delivery of high quality outputs. An organogram should be provided to show the proposed relationships within the project team for delivery of the Contract.

OFFICIAL

- 18.6 Where the Potential Suppliers propose the use of sub-contractors to deliver part of the Contract, a clear explanation shall be provided to outline how their work will be managed. Potential Suppliers shall explain any prior track record of successful collaboration for similar Contracts.
- 18.7 Arrangements for quality assurance shall be set out including how draft outputs for this Contract will be checked prior to submission. Details of any existing quality systems and quality accreditations must also be provided.
- 18.8 Potential Suppliers shall address any Data Protection or Information Security issues that they anticipate encountering in relation to the Contract and their approach to mitigate them. Any information security accreditations held by the Potential Supplier or sub-contractor organisations must be clearly outlined.

19. LOCATION

- 19.1 The Authority is located at Greater Minster House, London SW1P 4DR. It is expected that Contract Review meetings, presentations and workshops relating to the overarching evaluation will be held either at these offices or online.
- 19.2 As detailed in Section 6 'The Requirement', the Successful 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.