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# Process evaluation

## Process questions by theme

The following section outlines the process questions for this evaluation, within 6 main thematic areas:

1. Delivery process effectiveness
2. Policy effectiveness
3. LA delivery approach
4. DESNZ delivery model
5. Stakeholder experiences
6. Challenges and dependencies

1. Delivery process effectiveness

1. To what extent did local authorities (LAs) feel effectively engaged by DESNZ prior to participating in the scheme?
2. How effective and efficient were pre-mobilisation and funding allocation processes for LAs?
   1. What were the experiences of LAs with the new expression of interest approach? Did it streamline the funding allocation process?
   2. Were certain LAs/Consortia better suited to progress through the mobilisation period than others? What were the relevant factors?
   3. To what extent did the DAC process support LAs in enabling effective delivery? Did it promote timely procurement and ensure sufficient resourcing in advance of delivery?
   4. To what extent did the mid-mobilisation review support LAs to enable effective delivery?
3. How effective and efficient was the batch process?
4. To what extent was the RISE (Retrofit Information Support and Expertise) function used by LAs across the pre-mobilisation period? What was the value added from RISE at this stage?
5. To what extent did scheme eligibility pathways (income, IMD:ID, low income proxies) influence household recruitment? Did LA prioritise certain routes, and why?
6. How effective were PRS checks at achieving their aims? (i.e. preventing fraud; allocating funds to eligible properties).

2. Policy effectiveness

1. How effective were upfront A&A payments in enabling delivery without exceeding the 15% cap overall?
   1. How did GRs use A&A payments?
   2. Were they sufficient to avoid funding gaps?
2. Did LAs feel they had sufficient funding (A&A, capital funding) to deliver on scheme objectives?
3. **How effective were the following new scheme elements in enhancing grant recipient targeting of eligible properties and households?**
   1. Did policy changes facilitate easier property identification and booking installations?
   2. To what extent have GRs used the low income verification approach (LIVA) and Home Energy Advice Tool (HEAT) to identify eligible households?
   3. To what extent have GRs used the DWP benefits checker, IMD: ID 1-2 and LIVA? Have they promoted delivery efficiencies?
   4. How have the different eligibility criteria (income, IMD:ID, low income proxies) influenced household sign-ups?
4. What factors influenced beneficiaries dropping out of the scheme? (e*.g. links to eligibility pathways, installers, retrofit recommendations*).
5. To what extent were measures which prioritise bill savings installed across the scheme?
   1. Was there a variation in measures across LAs?
   2. What factors influenced this? (*e.g. Governance, local context, procurement*).
6. What effect has the inclusion of measure cost caps had on delivery?
7. Were there differences in delivery outcomes for different eligibility routes? (*e.g. IMD ID 1-2 compared to income, income proxy*)
8. Were there differences in measures installed using different eligibility routes?
   1. Did this influence installers’ ability to deliver more efficiently?
   2. Did this promote economies of scale?
9. How did household experience differ when receiving measures via different eligibility routes?

3. Grant Recipient delivery approach

1. **Household engagement & retention**
   1. What approaches did Grant Recipients employ to identify and engage eligible households to participate in the scheme?
   2. How effective were these?
   3. What engagement barriers did they encounter?
   4. How did Grant Recipients attempt to reduce drop-out rates on the scheme?
   5. Were certain retention approaches more effective than others?
2. **Procurement**
   1. How effectively were Grant Recipients able to procure delivery providers?
   2. What commercial models did they adopt for this?
3. **Governance**
   1. What organisational structures and delivery models did Grant Recipients adopt for delivery?
   2. How did these influence different delivery stages?
4. **Monitoring**
   1. How was delivery monitored by Grant Recipients?
5. **Aftercare**
   1. To what extent was aftercare incorporated into delivery approaches?

4. DESNZ delivery model

1. **DESNZ Interim Delivery Partner**
   1. How did DESNZ mange the interim delivery period?
   2. How effective was the transition from Interim to the DP2 model?
2. **DESNZ Delivery Partner model**
   1. What role did the DESNZ Delivery Partner have in the delivery of installations, and what value did they add to the process?
   2. How did DESNZ and the appointed Delivery Partner oversee and manage the overall delivery of the scheme?
      1. What were the key enablers of effective management?
      2. What barriers or challenges did they encounter during implementation?
   3. How has the Delivery Partner managed the implementation of the scheme?
      1. What challenges have they faced?
      2. What approaches have been successful in supporting Grant Recipients during delivery?
   4. What were LA experiences of working with DESNZ and the Delivery Partner?
      1. What aspects of the relationship worked well, and what could have been improved?
3. **DESNZ-Grant Recipient Delivery model interactions**
4. How did Grant Recipients’ own delivery approaches interact with the DESNZ delivery model?

5. Stakeholder experience

1. **Households**

*1.1 Arranging installation*

* 1. What was the experience of households at the eligibility stage?
  2. What were the main barriers to household participation?
  3. Were there differences in household experiences across different eligibility routes (*e.g. PRS vs owner occupiers*)?
  4. To what extent were households willing to undertake recommended installations?
     1. Why did households decide *not* to take up certain measures? (*e.g. Heat Pumps*)
  5. Did recruited households receive clear and understandable advice on the expected bill impacts of the installed measure package? How confident were households in the accuracy and usefulness of the advice provided?
  6. Were installations booked in a timely manner? What factors contributed to delays in the installation process?

*1.2 Installation*

1. What were the experiences of households with installations?
2. How satisfied were households with the installation process and measures?

*1.3 Support*

1. What post-installation support was available? To what extent was this taken up and what were the experiences of households?
2. What support was available from booking to completion? What types of support promoted consumer satisfaction and delivery timeliness?
3. **Installers**
   1. What were the experiences of installers with the scheme?
   2. What aspects of scheme design and management were installers satisfied with, and what could be improved?
   3. What were installers experiences working with their Local Authorities?
   4. To what extent are installers willing to participate in other existing/future DESNZ schemes?
4. **Grant Recipients**
   1. Why did Grant Recipients choose to participate in the scheme?
   2. How prepared did Grant Recipients feel at the start of the mobilisation period, and why?
   3. What were Grant Recipients’ experiences with the mobilisation period?
   4. What were Grant Recipients’ experiences during the delivery period, particularly in relation to their interactions with the DESNZ delivery model?

6. Priority installation challenges and dependencies

1. What factors most influenced the ability of LAs to deliver installations to time and standards?
2. What were the primary barriers for installers to deliver installations to time, cost and standards?
3. What wider factors influenced timely delivery of installations? Were there themes in relation to delivery models, governance, eligibility pathways, type of property, tenants, measures etc.
4. Did LAs feel that any policy decisions inhibited delivery and WH:LG objectives (e.g. Income caps, eligibility routes),
5. What barriers did installers encounter to scheme participation and delivery?
6. To what extent are installers paid for their work on time?

*Figure 1. Summary of Warm Homes: Local Grant batching process for scheme delivery*
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## Process questions by scheme delivery stage

The research questions outlined in the table below are **the same as those outlined in the previous section, but** **re-ordered to be in sequence of WH:LG scheme delivery stages**.

This chronological structure should be considered when developing your bid because the evaluation’s reporting requirements address different questions at different stages of delivery.

In particular, the initial process evaluation report in 2026 centres on ‘pre-delivery processes and early delivery’ - the workstreams for this report will have a greater emphasis on funding, mobilisation and pre-delivery stages.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage** | **Evaluation questions** | **Data source(s)** |
| **Funding & mobilisation**    (Expression of interest / challenge fund model) | **Delivery Process effectiveness**: What were the experiences of LAs with the new expression of interest approach? Did it streamline the funding allocation process? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** What was the value added from RISE (Retrofit Information Support and Expertise) at this stage? How? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** How effective and efficient were pre-mobilisation and funding allocation process for LAs? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness**: Were certain LAs/Consortia better suited to progress through the mobilisation period than others? What were the relevant factors? | LA survey & interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Pre-delivery**    (Household Recruitment) | **Stakeholder experience (households):** To what extent were households willing to undertake recommended installations? | LA survey and interviews  Household surveys and/or interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience (LA perspective):** What were the main barriers to household participation? | LA survey and interviews  Household surveys and/or interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience (households):** Why do households decide not to take up certain measures? | LA survey and interviews  Household surveys and/or interviews |
| **Household engagement**: What approaches did LAs employ to identify and engage eligible household to participate in the scheme, and how effective were these? What barriers were encountered? | LA surveys and interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Household engagement:** What approaches did LAs adopt to reduce drop-out rates on the scheme? Were certain approaches more effective than others? | LA surveys and interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness**: How did eligibility pathways (income, IMD:ID, low income proxies) affect recruitment? Were certain routes prioritised and why? | LA & DP survey & interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Policy effectiveness**: To what extent have GRs used the low income verification approach (LIVA) and Home Energy Advice Tool (HEAT) to identify eligible households? | Scheme delivery data    LA surveys and interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** To what extent was the RISE function used by LAs across the pre-mobilisation period? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** How effective were the PRS checks at achieving their aims? I.e. Preventing fraud and allocation of funds to ineligible properties. | LA survey & interviews |
| **Policy effectiveness:**  How effective were upfront A&A payments?   * How did GRs use A&A payments? * Were they sufficient to avoid funding gaps? | LA surveys and interviews |
| **Targeting:** How have the different eligibility criteria (income, IMD:ID, low income proxies) influenced household sign ups? | LA surveys and interviews    Scheme delivery data |
|  | **LA delivery approach:** How was delivery monitored by LAs? | LA surveys and interviews |
| **Delivery process effectiveness**: To what extent did the DAC process support LAs to promote effective delivery? E.g. Adequate to promote timely procurement and sufficient resourcing in advance of delivery. | LA survey |
|  | **Delivery process effectiveness:** To what extent have the DWP benefits checker, IMD: ID 1-2 and LIVA been used and have they promoted efficiencies? | LA survey |
|  | **Delivery process effectiveness** : To what extent did the mid-mobilisation review support LAs to promote effective delivery? | LA survey |
| **Pre-delivery**    (LA funding to installation booking) | **Delivery process effectiveness:** To what extent did LAs have the expertise and capacity to deliver targets? | LA survey & interviews    DESNZ Delivery Partner interview |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** How effective and efficient was the batch process? What improvements could be implemented for future schemes? | LA survey & interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Delivery process effectiveness:** To what extent was the RISE function used by LAs across the delivery period? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Challenges and dependencies:** What factors most influenced the ability of LAs to deliver installations to time and quality? | LA survey & interviews |
| **DESNZ delivery model:** What role did the DESNZ Delivery Partner have in the delivery of installations? What value have they added? | DESNZ Delivery Partner interview,    LA survey & interviews |
| **LA delivery approach:** What organisational structures and delivery models did LAs adopt for delivery? How did these influence different delivery stages? | LA interviews    Scheme data analysis |
| **LA delivery approach:** How effectively were LAs able to procure delivery providers? What commercial models did they adopt to do this? | LA interviews |
| **Delivery Mechanism**    (LA funding to installation booking) | **Stakeholder experience (households):** Did recruited households receive clear advice on measures and their bill impacts? | LA survey & interviews,    Household survey and/or interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience (households / installers):** Were installations booked in a timely way? What factors disrupted or delayed installation bookings? | Installer, household and LA interviews  Household surveys |
| **Policy effectiveness:** Were new policy changes (relative to previous schemes) facilitatory towards booking installations? | Installer and LA interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Delivery Mechanism**    (Installation booking to completion) | **Challenges and dependencies**: What were the primary barriers for installers delivering installations to time, cost and quality? | LA survey & interviews,    Installer survey & interviews |
| **Challenges and dependencies:** What wider factors influenced timely delivery of installations? Were there links delivery models, governance, eligibility pathways, type of property, tenants, measures etc. | LA, DP and Household interviews    Scheme delivery data |
| **Policy effectiveness:** What factors were related to higher rates of beneficiary drop-offs? Were there links to eligibility pathways, installers, retrofit recommendations etc | Installer and LA interviews    Landlord declaration data    Scheme delivery data |
| **Stakeholder experience (households / LAs)** What support was available from booking to completion? What promoted consumer satisfaction and delivery timeliness? | LA & household interviews, |
| **Stakeholder experience (households / LAs):** What post-installation support was available (e.g. follow-up appointments)? To what extent was this taken up? | Installer & household interviews |
| **Delivery Mechanism**    (Overarching delivery management) | **Policy effectiveness:** To what extent were priority measures installed across the scheme? Was there a variation in measures across LAs and what factors influenced this? E.g. Governance, local context, procurement etc | Scheme delivery data    LA and DP interviews |
|
| **DESNZ Delivery Model:** How did DESNZ and the appointed Delivery Partner (DP) managescheme delivery overall? What were the key successes or barriers to effective management encountered during delivery | DESNZ delivery team interview  DESNZ Delivery Partner interview,  LA survey & interviews |
| **DESNZ Delivery Model**: How has the Delivery partner managed scheme delivery? Exploration of challenges and successful approaches to LAs | DP and LA interviews |
| **LA Delivery Approaches:** To what extent was aftercare incorporated into delivery approaches? | LA survey and interviews |
| **Policy effectiveness:** What effect has the inclusion of measure cost caps been on delivery? | LA, DP and DESNZ interviews |
| **DESNZ Delivery Model:** How was the interim delivery period managed by DESNZ and how successful was the transition to the DP model? | DESNZ and DP interviews    LA interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience**    (LAs) | **Delivery process effectiveness:** To what extent did local authorities (LAs) feel effectively engaged by DESNZ prior to participating in the scheme? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** Why did LAs choose to participate in the scheme? Why did some LAs (if any) choose not to? | LA survey & interviews |
| **DESNZ Delivery model:** What were the experiences of LAs working with DESNZ and the Delivery Partner on scheme delivery? | LA survey & interviews |
| **Challenges and dependencies:** Did LAs feel that any policy decisions inhibited delivery and WH:LG objectives (e.g. Income caps, eligibility routes), | LA interviews |
| **Policy effectiveness:** Did LAs feel they had sufficient funding (A&A, capital funding) to deliver on scheme objectives? | LA interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** What was the LA experience of the mobilisation period? | LA and DESNZ interviews |
| **DESNZ Delivery Model:** What were LA experiences with their delivery approaches and interactions with the DESNZ delivery model? | LA & DP interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience**    (Installers, LA Delivery partners, Retrofit coordinators, etc) | **DESNZ Delivery model:** What were the experiences of installers working with LAs on-scheme delivery? | Installer, DP and LA interviews |
| **Challenges and dependencies:** What barriers did the installers face in meeting demand generated by the scheme, and related schemes? How do they feel these barriers could be overcome in future? | Installer, DP and LA interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience**    (Installers) | **Stakeholder experience (Installers):** What aspects of scheme design and management were installers satisfied with? | Installer interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience (Installers):**What improvements could be made to the scheme? | Installer interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience (Installers):** What was the installer experience working with their Local Authorities? | Installer interviews |
| **Challenges and dependencies:** To what extent are installers paid for their work on time? | Installer interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** What were the experiences of installers with the scheme? | Installer interviews |
| **Policy effectiveness:** Was there a difference in measures installed based on IMD:ID eligibility vs. Income (and low-income proxies)? Did this influence installer’s ability to deliver more efficiently or promote economies of scale? | Installer interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** To what extent are installers willing to participate in other existing/future DESNZ schemes? | Installer interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience**    (Households ) | **Stakeholder experience:** What was the experience of households at the eligibility stage? | Household interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** What was the experience of households with the installation itself? | Household interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** What was the experience of households with the measure after installation, including aftercare? | Household  interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** How satisfied were households with the installation process and measures? | Household interviews |
| **Stakeholder experience:** Were there differences in experiences of households on the scheme through different routes e.g. PRS vs owner occupier? | Household interviews |
| **Policy effectiveness**: What were the experiences of households receiving measures via different channels i.e. income, IMD:ID and income proxies’ routes? | Household interviews |

# Impact evaluation

## Fuel poverty impacts

1. Is the scheme effectively reaching those at risk of Fuel Poverty?
   1. How could the scheme be improved to reach them more effectively?
2. Did fuel poverty hit rates vary across IMD:ID, income, low-income proxy pathways?
3. What is the income distribution of households receiving heat pumps?
4. To what extent is the scheme helping lift the target population out of Fuel Poverty?
   1. Are there differences across various eligibility pathways?
5. To what extent have the homes of the target population become warmer and more comfortable as a result of the scheme?
6. To what extent has the scheme influenced change in energy behaviours among customers who benefitted from WH:LG?

## Beneficiary outcomes

The following areas are focused on the “so what” — identifying best practices and evaluating the impact of scheme outcomes. The bullet points below outline key thematic areas of research, which will inform the development of survey questions. The supplier will collect data through a two-wave survey, which will also capture information on fuel poverty, beneficiary experiences, and outcomes within the private rented sector.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Satisfaction with the support provided by local authorities (LAs) and delivery partners (DPs) 2. Household satisfaction with the installed measures 3. Impacts on household well-being 4. Understanding the reasons behind the adoption or non-adoption of specific measures (e.g., air source heat pumps) 5. Impacts on energy bills and indoor comfort 6. Challenges encountered and key dependencies affecting outcomes |

## Private rented sector impacts

1. Market distortion
   1. To what extent did the WH:LG affect rent price for participating Private Rental Sector (PRS) households?
   2. To what extent did the WH:LG affect churn for participating Private Rental Sector (PRS) households?
2. Landlord and tenant experience
   1. To what extent were applications driven by tenants or landlords?
   2. How engaged did tenants feel during the scheme? Why?
   3. How satisfied were tenants with scheme measures? Why?

*Figure 2. High level Theory of Change for Warm Homes: Local Grant impacts to Private Rental Sector*

A diagram of benefits and benefits

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

# Delivery model Case studies

**Sample:** 6-10 GRs

The delivery model case studies will provide detailed insights into the experiences and delivery models of 6-10 GRs.

The successful bidder will sample LAs, households and installers to triangulate findings and provide a more rounded picture of how the different approaches were delivered in practice.

Each case study will explore the following themes, and address the evaluation questions within each theme:

1. LA delivery approach
   1. Provide an overview of the delivery model adopted by the LA.
   2. What is the division of roles between LAs, delivery partners and installers?
   3. To what extent does the model align with previous scheme approaches? What changes has the LA made, and why?
   4. Were any changes in delivery approaches driven by the WH:LG policy?
2. LA knowledge and capability
   1. What are the skills and experience are held within the LA, including experience with previous DESNZ retrofit schemes.
   2. What is the capability and capacity of LAs within the consortia?
3. Pre-delivery processes
   1. What was your experience with the pre-delivery period?
   2. To what extent was your delivery approach determined at the expression of interest (EOI) stage?
   3. Did you or your delivery partner (DP) engage with RISE to inform your delivery approach?
   4. Did your delivery approach change during the pre-delivery period? If so, why?
4. Early delivery
   1. How quickly did your delivery model mobilise after passing the DAC?
   2. How did your delivery model interact with the batch process?
   3. What barriers to delivery have you encountered?
   4. What aspects of delivery were LAs involved in, and why?
   5. How have the LA/DP approached local engagement and promoted WH:LG to households?
5. Initial delivery lessons
   1. Were any changes in delivery approaches made due to early delivery experiences?
   2. What were the pros and cons of the delivery approach?

# Devolution Case studies

The following provide an overview of the thematic areas the case studies should examine. These will differ between each round, addressing emerging evidence gaps as authorities move through the devolution process.

**Neither round has a set of research questions currently developed**, as the successful bidder will scope these with DESNZ prior to finalising the research design.

**Sample:**  3-4 Mayoral Combined Authority MCAs

## Round 1 (2026)

Three to four case studies will examine the context of LAs/MSAs in 2026. This will involve gathering insights into their current delivery approaches and exploring their perspectives on the future of retrofit delivery and devolution. These case studies will be purposively selected based on internal interest and anticipated policy directions. The questions will be informed by pre-delivery survey analysis and a brief consultation with DESNZ stakeholders, with particular consideration given to devolution.

## Round 2 (2028)

The second round of case studies will revisit the same four MSAs/LAs. These studies will explore the extent of devolution transitions undertaken by each MSA/LA and examine their experiences to inform future devolution policy development. Research questions will be scoped in collaboration with DESNZ prior to fieldwork, as the devolution context and outcomes will be more established by then. The central research question will focus on understanding the advantages, disadvantages, and practicalities of devolution transitions, and how best to support retrofit delivery for fuel-poor households.