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# INTRODUCTION

## The Department for Transport (DfT), Ministry of Defence (MOD) and Sciencewise wish to commission an evaluation of the public dialogue on the use of remotely piloted aircraft systems in the UK. This includes dialogue on issues related to safety, security, privacy and data-protection.

## It is expected that the dialogue project will involve one or more stakeholder engagement events followed by a programme of deliberative workshops with public participants held across the United Kingdom in all devolved administrations.

## In line with Sciencewise practice this will be referred to as a Public Dialogue project throughout and there will be an emphasis on promoting discussion and debate both between participants and between participants and key stakeholders. Irrespective of this it is expected that this work will be conducted in line with best practice for rigorous qualitative research as well as relevant Cabinet Office[[1]](#footnote-2) and Government Social Research (GSR)[[2]](#footnote-3)[[3]](#footnote-4) guidance. It will also be conducted in line with Sciencewise Guiding Principles and quality framework, and will be evaluated against those[[4]](#footnote-5).

# PURPOSE OF THE PUBLIC DIALOGUE PROJECT

## This Public Dialogue project has three main aims:

### To use public dialogue and deliberation to gain insights and understanding of public participants' perceptions, aspirations and concerns on the potential development and use of Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems (RPAS) and small drones in UK airspace, focused on issues of safety, security, privacy, accountability and data protection.

### To explore the current public understanding of the issues around RPAS and small drones, and their views on whether and how to increase wider public awareness and understanding in future.

### To use the results of the work to inform the development of UK Government strategy and ensuing public consultation as well as any other future public engagement and awareness raising on RPAS and small drones in the UK.

# BACKGROUND TO THE AUTHORITY

## The Department for Transport (DfT) are a Government department who work with our agencies and partners to support the transport network that helps the UK’s businesses and gets people and goods travelling around the country. We plan and invest in transport infrastructure to keep the UK on the move. For more information see: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-transport

## The Ministry of Defence (MOD) are a Government Department who protect the security, independence and interests of our country at home and abroad. We work with our allies and partners whenever possible. Our aim is to ensure that the armed forces have the training, equipment and support necessary for their work, and that we keep within budget. For more information see: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-defence

## The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre for Public Dialogue in Science and Innovation (Sciencewise) is funded by the Science and Society team of the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS). Sciencewise aims to improve policy making involving science and technology across Government by increasing the effectiveness with which public dialogue is used, and encouraging its wider use where appropriate. It helps policy-makers commission and use public dialogue to inform policy decisions in emerging areas of science and technology. Sciencewise provides co-funding to Government departments and agencies to develop and commission public dialogue activities. For more information see: http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk

# BACKGROUND TO THE REQUIREMENT

## ‘Unmanned aircraft’ is the umbrella term used for any aircraft which is intended to be flown without a pilot on board. As outlined below there are a wide range of different aircraft types of varying sizes and functionality and all should be considered for the purposes of this research. Despite the fact that the term is not correctly descriptive, it is felt that the public and others will find it easier to refer to “drones”, so that is the descriptor we propose to use as catch-all term for the purposes of this work.

## In most cases, the unmanned aircraft can only be operated as part of a ‘System’ (hence the term unmanned aircraft system ‘UAS’). The UAS consists of an unmanned aircraft, a remote pilot station (RPS), the place where the unmanned aircraft is ‘piloted’ from, and the necessary command and control (C2) links that join them. Remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) are a subset of unmanned aircraft, which in turn gives rise to the term ‘RPAS’ when discussing the system aspects. As a basic principle therefore, ‘unmanned aircraft’ or ‘unmanned aircraft systems’ are used as all-encompassing terms, whereas ‘remotely piloted aircraft’, or similar iterations, refer only to the remotely piloted subset. For now, there are no circumstances where it is likely that a human’s ultimate responsibility for the safe flight of an unmanned aircraft (i.e. as ‘pilot in command’ of an aircraft) will be replaced by ‘autonomous’ technologies, therefore RPA/RPAS will be the terms primarily used for the foreseeable future.

## The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) currently regulate the use unmanned aircraft systems and small drones. Just like manned aviation, the avoidance of collisions is the primary concern while an RPA is in flight. With this in mind, RPAS operations are split into two basic categories and are either flown within the ‘visual line of sight’ of the pilot, which is described as ‘VLOS’, or they are flown ‘beyond the visual line of sight’ of the pilot, which is described as ‘BVLOS’.

## For VLOS operations, the pilot discharges his responsibilities to ‘see and avoid’ other aircraft and obstructions by directly observing the RPA and the airspace surrounding it. This is the same way that model aircraft are flown and indeed, the same basic requirements apply. The effectiveness of visual observation is clearly limited by the size and colour of the RPA, the weather conditions and the surrounding landscape; for these reasons, VLOS operations are normally only accepted out to a maximum distance of 500m horizontally, or 400ft vertically, from the Remote Pilot.

## In order to cater for the lack of a pilot in the aircraft ‘looking out’, RPA that are intended to be flown ‘Beyond’ VLOS must be equipped with an alternative method of collision avoidance. This requires a technical solution, generically termed ‘Detect and Avoid’ (DAA). Without such a collision avoidance system, an RPA’s flight must be contained within segregated airspace, to which access for manned aircraft is prevented or closely controlled. The development of an effective DAA system is key to the safe integration of RPAS. While DAA systems are under development worldwide, none have yet been approved for RPAS use in non-segregated airspace.

## Unmanned aircraft come in a range of shapes and sizes with lift technology ranging from rotor and fixed wing to lighter than air. Maximum take-off weights can range from grams to more than ten tons, maximum speeds can range from hovering to more than 1,000 km/h and flight endurance can range from a few minutes to months.

## Unmanned aircraft systems are traditionally and predominately owned and operated by the Military. UK armed forces have extensive experience of using unmanned aircraft of all sizes. In particular the Ministry of Defence has first-hand knowledge of the difficulties of using unmanned aircraft within the UK. Currently, only one (large) system is able operate to in the UK; the Watchkeeper system is has authorization to fly within designated danger areas in West Wales and over Boscombe Down Airfield in Wiltshire.

## Unmanned aircraft systems technology has matured rapidly in past years and, like many other aircraft technologies before it, is ready to make the shift from being purely military equipment to becoming a reliable new technology for civil use

## In the UK there is no doubt that we have seen a big increase in the use of small drones in the UK and across Europe. The Civil Aviation Authority has experienced a big jump in applications for commercial use of small drones, they have issued approximately 670 permissions in 2014. However, we also note that the availability of relatively low-cost small drones over the internet and high street electronic retail outlets has resulted in a dramatic increase in the number being purchased for leisure activities. Small drones continue to be a very popular in 2015. A large number of these systems are bought with an internal camera designed into the platform. It is not easy to separate the commercial and leisure users, because in some instances they are using very similar systems.

## At present, there is a steadily growing ‘community’ of civilian UAS operators within the UK, although all are working at the ‘small drones’ end of the scale and are flown at very short range, within the visual line of sight of the pilot. The majority of the small unmanned aircraft being flown are less than 7kg mass. This type of operation, which has many parallels with recreational model flying, is viewed as being simpler, available and relatively affordable, hence it tends to attract individuals or organisations that have little or no previous aviation experience. As an example of the scale of update the UK high street retailer Maplin is understood to have sold over 10,000 'quadcopters' of varying sizes in 2014 and DJI, the Chinese manufacturer of the 1.5kg Phantom (the most popular mass market product) has shipped over ¾ million units globally.

## Unmanned aircraft are, by and large, aircraft and therefore have to comply with aviation safety rules. International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) standards forbid unmanned aircraft to fly unless the national competent authorities issue a specific individual authorization. Currently the expansion of the unmanned aircraft systems market is inhibited by the absence of an adequate regulatory framework. The Government recognises that this is an important area of growth for the aviation industry. The precise scale of the potential unmanned aircraft systems market is difficult to predict. According to an industry source, the annual global budget forecast in terms of R&D and procurement, including military and Governmental, is expected to grow from currently $5.2bn to about $11.6bn per year in 2023. Beyond manufacturers and system integrators, the unmanned aircraft systems industry also includes a broad supply chain of enabling technologies (flight control, communication, propulsion, energy, sensors, telemetry, etc.), payload developers and operators.

## The Government recognises that an increase in popularity of small drones with cameras and other sensor payloads also raises a number of questions about safety, security, privacy and data protection. Safety and security must always be the overriding priority and both commercial and leisure operators must operate RPAS responsibly and within the rules.

## Recent incidents involving near misses at Heathrow Airport between a small drone and commercial airliner have raised significant media interest in the potential risks posed by remotely piloted aircraft systems and small drones, which in turn has increased public awareness of possible issues. As with the widespread introduction of any new technology, public perception can potentially impact its acceptance and implementation. In the case of RPAS and small drones there is already a strong emerging view form the public about the potential use and the operation of this technology in the UK. The current understanding is that public interest is likely to fall into three key areas: Privacy, Data Protection and Safety.

## The Minister for Aviation at the Department for Transport announced at a House of Lords Committee Inquiry into the civil use of drones in March 2015 that we would conduct a series of public dialogue events to better understand the public perception and their concerns about the use of unmanned aircraft in the UK. He has made it clear that this dialogue will help shape and inform future Government policy, including further consultation as this policy matures. The outcome of the public dialogue will be used to inform Ministers and the European Commission on how aviation policy will take account of this new emerging technology, including how the Information Commissioner will treat RPAS related issues in the future.

## This Public Dialogue will be central to the development of a draft Government strategy which is due to go out to public consultation during 2016.

## Funding from this research comes from DfT, MoD and Sciencewise and the project will be managed from DfT. In order to recognise the wide range of stakeholders with an interest in this work an oversight group has been set up with the current membership detailed below:

**Department for Transport (DfT)**

Head of UK Aviation Operational Safety & Emerging Technologies, International Aviation, Safety & Environment.

**Department for Transport (DfT)**

Policy Adviser on Emerging Technologies in the Aviation. Peter will be the Project Manager on behalf of DfT.

**Sciencewise-ERC Team**

Sciencewise Dialogue and Engagement Specialist and advisor.

**Department for Transport (DfT)**

Senior Research Officer

**Department for Transport (DfT)**

Senior Research Officer

Unmanned Aerial Systems lead for the Civil Aviation Authority

Principal Lecturer in Ethics and Political Theory – **University of Portsmouth**

Director– **Big Brother Watch**

Business Manager for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles at Frazer-Nash Consultancy.

Reporter for Flight Global and its magazine Flight International.

**Flight Safety Officer at the British Airline Pilots Association (BALPA)**

BALPA is the professional association and registered trade union established to represent the interests of all UK pilots.

**ARPAS-UK**

ARPAS-UK is the professional trade association for Remotely Piloted Aircraft and Systems in the UK.

Coordinator and Human Rights Researcher – **All Party Parliamentary Group**

**(APPG) on Drones**

Head of Unmanned Air Systems – **Ministry of Defence**

Lecturer in Human Factors and Accident Investigation – **Cranfield University**

Senior Policy Officer – **Information Commissioners Office**

 Drone Project Manager– **Sussex Police**

Senior Analyst **– Defence Science and Technology Laboratory**

## A number of key questions have already been identified. These may be further developed over the course of the dialogue process:

### What do the public understand so far about drones and what they are used for? How do they feel about their potential use in the future?

### The UK and Europe has seen a dramatic increase in the use of small civil drones for both commercial and leisure activity. It follows that more complex and larger systems with automatic and autonomous characteristics will also populate our skies undertaking a range of roles and activities previously undertaken by manned aviation and some new more innovative applications of their use. Industry argues that this is the next natural evolution of aviation and the UK should be playing a leading role in the development of manufacturing capability and services, which will stimulate new high-tech jobs and promote growth in the economy. What are the public hopes and fears for how the technology develops?

### The International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) current definition of an aircraft means that all RPAS and small drones currently are classed as aircraft irrespective or their size. Users of small drones may not be aware of this and their responsibilities whilst using them. How do the public think operators could be best informed of their responsibilities?

### Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems and small drones are capable of flying to unique vantage points that could potentially lead to deliberate and unintentional privacy intrusion, particularly in sensitive area such as private gardens, through windows and playgrounds. What might be the public concerns about this and how do you think they could be mitigated against?

### The UK Armed Forces currently operate RPAS in segregated airspace. However, if there was a need to operate these systems in un-segregated airspace in support of a civil or natural disaster, or for routine training purposes, what would the public's thoughts be on this? Would these change if the systems were armed? If the feeling is that these systems are unsafe, what would the public need to know or see put in place in order to be re-assured about safety?

### Remotely Piloted Aircraft Systems and small drones are capable of capturing a wide range of data, which could on occasion include personal data and imagery. We would like to know how much the public understands about existing legislation to protect personal data and the appetite to know more specifically how it applies to RPAS. If there is a lack of understanding and a need for more thought about how we can best tackle this?

### The UK public currently has little experience of RPAS and small drones or their potential and a new use of this technology could raise concerns about safety and security. What exactly are the public concerns about safety and security? What measures would need to be in place to allow the exploration and use of these technologies?

### If there is to be continued public dialogue on remotely piloted aircraft systems and small drones what form would that take and who with and on which issues of priority?

## A number of key conventions apply across the research:

### All forms of unmanned aircraft are included in the scope of this process. 'Drones' will be our primary shorthand as a descriptor for all of this.

### The dialogue process is limited to use of drones in the UK (including by the military) but **not** their military use overseas. This exclusion extends to drones being used by the military overseas but being piloted remotely from the UK.

## The dialogue process will be UK-wide and include Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland as well as England.

## It is expected that this public dialogue will involve a number of discrete and sometimes concurrent elements. For the purposes of clarity these have been organised in to a possible set of stages:

### Stage 1: Inception meetings

### Stage 2: Short literature review

### Stage 3: Stakeholder workshop

### Stage 4: Oversight Group workshop

### Stage 5a: Deliberative workshops

### Stage 5b: Wider dialogue activities

### Stage 6: Stakeholder summit

## Stage 1 Inception meetings for the dialogue project

## The first of these will be with the core project management team and will occur immediately after the letting of the contract. The second will be with the Oversight Group. The programme of future Oversight Group meetings will also be discussed.

## There will also be discussion of the media strategy surrounding the project, led by Sciencewise.

## Stage 2: Short literature review

## The first stage will be a brief review of any similar research into public attitudes to drones and recent media coverage about drones. This is expected to be very high level and is intended to provide a foundation for the development of draft plans or materials for the later stages.

## Outputs from this stage will be a short summary of the research and media reviewed, the key findings from the review and updated proposals for the structure and content of the workshops.

## Stage 3: Stakeholder workshop

## This will be a workshop where key stakeholders will be brought together to tease out the key issues that may be of interest for the rest of the dialogue and to encourage stakeholder engagement with, and dissemination of the dialogue process and results.

## It is expected that this will be a workshop hosted and arranged by DfT, at a central London venue, probably a government building. DfT will take responsibility for arranging a date and venue for the event and a substantial amount of invitations; the delivery contractor will run the event and produce all of the materials (in collaboration with the DfT project team and Oversight Group.

## Stage 4: Oversight Group workshop

## At this event the findings of the review and stakeholder workshop will be presented, alongside the draft plans for the structure and content of the deliberative workshops. The workshop should be used as an opportunity to seek feedback on these initial plans, encourage Oversight Group engagement with the project and to aid the development of materials for the later workshops.

## Again the workshop will be hosted and arranged by DfT, but the delivery contractor will run the event and produce all materials for it.

## Stage 5a: Deliberative workshops

## This will constitute the main body of the primary fieldwork for the project. We envisage workshops being conducted with five groups of 25-30 people around the UK with each group attending three different sessions. An outline suggested structure could be:

### Workshop 1: Evening session introducing drones and the issues around them to glean early views on them and their use.

### Workshop 2: A one-day session where participants are shown a wider range of materials, are able to see and potentially use drones in action and explore their experiences with them.

### Workshop 3: A final session to discuss more considered and reflected views on drones and their use in the UK.

## DfT will liaise between the delivery contractors and industry/stakeholders to help with the provision of key stimulus materials for the workshops. Materials could include demonstrations of drones in action, models for people to see and engage with and videos and presentations to be shown at the events (the successful bidder would be responsible for the production of such videos).

## A key tenet of public dialogue is that stakeholders, scientists, policy makers and other experts are brought together in discussion at the workshops although it is important that this is done in a way which retains methodological rigour. A typical ratio of stakeholders/experts (including OG members) to participants is around 1:6.

## Locations for the workshops are yet to be determined but important criteria include:

* UK wide spread
* A mixture of urban and rural locations
* Differing levels of drone activity

## On this basis a possible list of locations could include, for example:

* Northern Ireland – Newry
* Scotland – Stirling
* Wales – Aberystwyth
* England (North) – Manchester
* England (South) – Salisbury

## The selection, recruitment and retention of participants needs to ensure that the full range and diversity of likely experiences, attitudes and opinions should be captured, ranging from those with no experience or knowledge of drones to those who have used them. The inclusion of other sampling criteria will also be considered and proposals presented in the tender. The dialogue will involve recruiting people who are broadly representative of the population of the United Kingdom in terms of gender, life-stage, social grade/household income, geography, religion and ethnicity.

## Stage 5b: Wider dialogue activities

## Whilst the stages above are the core of the project, DfT and Sciencewise are interested in engaging the public in as wide a way as possible. Wider dialogue activities could also be included alongside the programme of deliberative workshops. These could both be used to complement the activities undertaken as part of the workshops themselves or as an opportunity to allow wider groups to engage with the work. Possible ideas could include:

* Workshop materials being posted online with the facility for participants and/or the general public to engage with them and comment/discuss.
* Webinars or live discussions with experts via a website or social media.
* Downloadable materials for the public or stakeholders to engage with.
* Online forums and social media.

## When and how the outputs from such activities can and should be incorporated into the findings from the other stages of research to make this a truly dialogic process will be considered. Care will be needed to ensure that such activities do not impact on the working of the workshops themselves.

Stage 6: Stakeholder summit

## An event for the discussion of the findings with key stakeholders and decision makers at the end of the project will be run, which could take the form of a workshop (often called a summit) and include a few members of the public who were part of the process.

## The final research report will need to bring together findings from all stages of the research, through thorough analysis of all the data collected and presentation in a highly considered and synthesised way. Outputs should include:

### Short weekly progress reports to the DfT project manager,

### Ongoing but less frequent progress reports for the Oversight Group.

### A full written report of the overall dialogue process, written to a publishable standard. This should include:

#### Top line findings

#### An executive summary

#### Introduction

#### Full details of the approach and methodology including examples of the materials used and produced at the workshop

#### Fully analysed and synthesised findings

#### Conclusions

#### Where consent is given the details of the different stakeholders involved at all stages of the project.

### A presentation of findings to key stakeholders

### A summary of findings to be provided to participants

### Input into a Sciencewise case study[[5]](#footnote-6).

### Participation in a de-briefing meeting to gather the lessons learned about public dialogue processes.

## **Governance**. A nominated DfT project manager will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the contract. He will be supported by colleagues from the DfT Social and Behavioural Research team and a Dialogue and Engagement Specialist from Sciencewise.

## The Oversight Group also has an important role to play in the successful delivery of this project. It is expected that the Oversight Group will comment on the following:

* The overall project plan;
* Composition of events;
* Background/stimulus materials;
* Dialogue questions;
* Outputs from the dialogue exercises.

## The Oversight Group will also provide help and advice on:

* Shaping the overall dialogue process and topics to be discussed;
* Selecting and developing materials to be used at the dialogue events;
* Where appropriate, contributing scientific or other expertise in dialogue sessions.

## The project is expected to start immediately after an inception meeting during the week of 5th October 2015.

## Below is a possible outline project timetable:

| **Milestone** | **Date** |
| --- | --- |
| Inception Meetings | Early October |
| Literature review report | Mid October |
| Stakeholder workshop | End October |
| Oversight Group workshop | Mid November |
| First set of deliberative workshops begin | Late November |
| Remaining deliberative workshops begin  | Early January |
| Remaining deliberative workshops end | Mid to late February  |
| Stakeholder summit | Mid-March |
| Final report | End of April |

# SCOPE OF REQUIREMENTS

5.1 All public dialogue projects co-funded by Sciencewise require an independent evaluation, for which this specification invites tenders. The aims of the evaluation are:

• to provide an independent assessment of the impacts and quality of the dialogue project, covering the outputs and impacts of the project as a whole as well as the design, delivery, reporting and governance of the dialogue activities

• to contribute to the wider effectiveness and use of public dialogue.

5.2 The objectives of the evaluation are:

• to gather and present objective and robust evidence of the nature and quality of the impacts, outputs and activities of the project in order to come to conclusions

• to identify lessons from the project to support capacity building across Government, and the wider development of good practice in public dialogue.

5.3 There will need to be some audit elements to the evaluation but it is not intended to assess the personal performance of those involved. It should rather focus on **identifying the impacts of and lessons from the design, delivery, outputs and outcomes of the dialogue project overall**. This requires analysis based on detailed evidence using the quantitative and qualitative data that will need to be collected by the evaluation.

5.4 **The evaluation should include consideration of six key questions:**

• **Objectives**. Has the dialogue met its objectives? Were the objectives set the right ones?

• **Credibility**. Were the dialogue design, delivery and reporting fit for purpose (appropriate to the context and objectives), and credible with those expected to use the results?

• **Quality**. Has the dialogue met standards of good practice (according to the Sciencewise quality framework and guiding principles[[6]](#footnote-7)? What took place, how, when, where, who with and why? How successful has the governance of the project been, including the role of stakeholders, oversight groups, the commissioning body and Sciencewise?

• **Impacts**. Has the dialogue achieved the expected (and any unexpected) impacts on policy and decisions, on organisational change and learning, and on all those involved? What new insights have been obtained (including on tackling potential social and ethical risks)? Who has seen the results and how have the results been used? What has been the value of the project to those involved, including the extent to which those involved were satisfied with the dialogue outcomes and process?

• **Costs and benefits**. What was the balance overall of the costs and benefits of the dialogue (basic costs compared to benefits, including potential future costs saved)?

• **Lessons**. What are the lessons for future public dialogue projects (including from what worked well and less well)?

5.5 The evaluation must adhere to the following principles:

**a) Starting early**: and continuing throughout the detailed design and delivery of the project.

**b) Clarity**: of the purpose, scope, approach, levels of participation in and limits of the evaluation.

**c) Rigorous and fit for purpose**: using appropriate methodologies.

**d) Constructively critical**: seeking understanding and learning rather than apportioning blame.

**e) Confidential**: respecting the sensitivity of data collected, and avoiding personal or reputational harm

**f) Avoiding conflicts of interest**: including privileged access to information not being used for future competitive advantage.

**g) Proportionate**: with sufficient resources and in sufficient depth to meet evaluation objectives.

**h) Transparent**: the evaluation should be explained to all participants and stakeholders, and evaluation findings published.

**i) Practical**: evaluation data sought can be collected, assessed and reported within timescale and budget.

**j) Useful**: evaluation findings should be reported in accessible language and in a form that is useful for learning and to provide evidence of impacts, what works, and lessons for the future.

**k) Independent**: from commissioners, funders, delivery team and participants.

**l) Credible**: status and reputation of evaluator, and use of effective evaluation frameworks and methodology.

5.6 The evaluation contractor is expected to have a strong track record and expertise of evaluation of public dialogue and/or other public engagement processes, and of using best practice techniques to evaluate dialogue processes involving the general public, experts and policy-makers.

5.7 The evaluator will develop the evaluation process, and provide a detailed methodology, including success criteria and metrics as appropriate.

5.8 The evaluator must undertake all aspects of the evaluation, including data collection, collation and analysis. The evaluator may wish to outline the support they would require from the delivery contractor in aspects of the process (e.g. data collection).

5.9 All evaluation plans, materials (e.g. questionnaires and interview schedules) and all reports need to be discussed in draft with Sciencewise, and formally signed off before use.

**Stages of the evaluation**

5.10 The evaluator will be expected to attend an inception meeting at the beginning of the project, and a final wash-up meeting at the end of the project. Formative evaluation will also be important, and the evaluator should be prepared to provide on-going feedback, based on evidence from evaluation research and emerging evaluation findings, to support project development.

5.11 It is expected that there will be three main stages of the evaluation, with brief reports on the first two stages that feed into the final evaluation report which will be expected to cover all three stages:

• **Baseline assessment**. An early review of the specific policy context within which the project is operating, and the expectations of the commissioning body and other key stakeholders about the likely achievements and impacts of the project on policy decisions. A very brief report on this stage may be required but essentially this will provide a basis for the final evaluation assessment.

• **Interim assessment of design and delivery**. As soon as possible after the completion of the dialogue events, a review of the quality of the design and delivery of the dialogue activities based on the evidence from evaluation research, including observation of events and feedback from public and other participants (e.g. experts and other stakeholders). Again, a very brief report on this stage may be required but essentially this will also feed into the final evaluation report.

• **Final assessment of the project overall**. Final research and analysis following the publication and dissemination of the dialogue project reports to gain further feedback from those involved (e.g. the oversight group, commissioning body, delivery contractors and others). This new data, together with data from the earlier stages of evaluation research, should be used to produce an overall evaluation report providing an assessment of the impacts of the project and of the quality of the design, delivery and reporting of the dialogue project overall.

5.12 The final evaluation report should be produced in draft and circulated internally to the project team, Innovate UK and Sciencewise at least one week prior to the wash-up meeting.

5.13 The final evaluation report should explicitly address all six key questions outlined above and cover all dialogue project activities, including:

• Preliminary activities (e.g. desk research)

• Governance (e.g. oversight groups) and stakeholder engagement

• Public dialogue activities (e.g. sampling, recruitment and number of participants; number, location and design of events; the main questions addressed by the public; quality of information provided; specialists involved)

• Any other related public engagement activities (e.g. polls or online surveys), and any other activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results

• Reports from the project, including to public participants

• All impacts (achieved and expected), and all dissemination and use of dialogue results.

5.14 The final report should be written in accessible language and provided in a form that is useful for learning and demonstrating impacts, including an Executive Summary (which can stand alone and which provides a brief description of the project, a very brief summary of the evaluation methodology, and the main evaluation findings particularly on impacts and lessons for the future); with detailed evaluation data provided in annexes.

**Deliverables**

5.15 In summary, the deliverables from the evaluation will be:

• Formative evaluation input throughout the project

• Brief baseline evaluation report for internal circulation only

• Brief interim evaluation report for internal circulation only

• Draft final evaluation report for internal circulation only, circulated at least one week prior to the wash-up meeting

• Attendance at final wash-up meeting to input evaluation findings to date

• Detailed final evaluation report covering previous evaluation reports and all aspects of the work as outlined above agreed with Innovate UK and Sciencewise.

**Deadlines**

5.16 The dialogue project overall is scheduled to begin in October 2015. It is expected that the evaluator will be appointed so that the evaluation can start at the same time as the rest of the project to ensure that a full understanding of the whole project can be gained.

5.17 The timetable for the dialogue project is provided in section 4.41 above. The final stages of the evaluation will need to be completed after the final report is completed; it is expected that the final evaluation report will therefore be published in June 2016.

# service levels and performance

## DfT will measure the quality of the successful bidder’s delivery against the deliverables set out below:

### Delivery of brief monthly progress reports which summarise progress in achieving objectives and the projected programme of work, identify problems encountered and any proposed revisions to the work programme, as well as updating the overall position. These should be made in writing to the appointed DfT Project Manager in a format to be agreed at the outset of the project. The evaluators should also be available for regular telephone conversations where required.

### The other deliverables specified in section 6 and any others that may be agreed by the successful bidder and DfT project manager.

## All outputs must be clearly written, and written in such a way that it makes them easily accessible to a non-technical audience. All technical jargon and terminology must be fully explained and plain English used throughout the reports. Organisations contracted to produce reports for the Department must follow the guidelines available here: http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/dft-formatting-reports/. This will help the Department meet its online accessibility, usability and transparency obligations.

## Circulated drafts and final versions of all outputs should be thoroughly proof-read prior to submission. There is a need to build sufficient time (minimum 2 weeks) in to your timetable for DfT to comment on any draft and final outputs.

## If so required by DfT, the successful bidder shall produce a further version of a project plan for conducting the research in such further detail as DfT may reasonably require. The successful bidder shall ensure that each version of the project plan for this project, as agreed by both parties at project inception is subject to DfT approval. The successful bidder shall ensure that this plan is maintained and updated on a regular basis as may be necessary to reflect the then current state of the implementation.

## DfT shall have the right to require the successful bidder to include any reasonable changes or provisions in each version of the project plan.

## The Successful bidder shall perform its obligations so as to achieve each milestone by the dates agreed in each project plan.

## Changes to any agreed milestones, as agreed at project inception shall only be made in accordance with the variation procedure and provided that the successful bidder shall not attempt to postpone any of the milestones using the variation procedure or otherwise (except in the event of a DfT default which affects the successful bidder's ability to achieve a milestone by the relevant date).

## Payment can only be made following satisfactory delivery of pre-agreed certified products and deliverables.

## Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.

## The Authority requires a dedicated account management structure including a single point of contact for day-to-day enquiries, with a nominated deputy to act in their absence.

## A detailed escalation procedure should be outlined with named individuals outlined on an organogram provided by the Potential Provider outlining their escalation policy and associated service level agreements.

## Potential successful bidders are required to provide a copy of their Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity plans to ensure that on-going service will be provided as part of this contract.

# Ethics

## DfT is committed to promoting high ethical standards in the conduct of the social research it funds and commissions. Tenderers are asked to complete the appended ethical assurance checklist and submit it alongside their proposal to undertake this research. The checklist asks you to identify any ethically sensitive issues associated with the research and describe what remedial action you propose to undertake to address these. The checklist also requires you to make a preliminary judgement about the level of sensitivity of each issue that is identified.

## Consideration given to ethical issues will be assessed as part of the tender evaluation process and count towards the selection of a contractor.

# DATA Security requirements

## Bidders must have an adequate data protection policy in place and these should be detailed in the tender documentation and appropriately referenced in the attached ethics checklist.

## Sciencewise and DfT may wish to follow up with participants after the project is complete. At an appropriate point in the project participants will need to be asked for their consent for Sciencewise or DfT to do this. The final details of this will be agreed with the successful bidder.

# Additional Requirements

## Invoices

### A purchase order will be provided following award of this contract. Invoices should be sent to:

Accounts Payable

DfT Shared Services Centre

5 Sandringham Park

Swansea Vale

Swansea

SA7 0EA

### The purchase order number must be shown prominently on your invoice. Invoices should also include a brief description of the tasks completed. To ensure swift payment, invoices should only be submitted to the Shared Services Centre once the invoice amount has been agreed with the Department’s Project Officer. A copy of the invoice should also be sent to the Project Officer.

### Unauthorised spending above the contracted limit will not be covered by the Department for Transport under any circumstances. The contractor should contact the Project Officer as soon as possible if there is any concern with the timescales or budget to identify what remedial action can be taken.
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