



Department  
for Transport

Department for Transport  
Great Minster House  
33 Horseferry Road  
London  
SW1P 4DR

STEER Group  
14-21 Rushworth St,  
London,  
SE1 0RB

Website: [www.gov.uk/dft](http://www.gov.uk/dft)

Date: 31 August 2023

Dear Supplier,

**Procurement Reference: TROO0396 – Thameslink Evaluation**

Further to your submission of a bid for the above Procurement, on behalf of Department for Transport (the “Authority”), I am pleased to inform you that you ranked first in our evaluation. Therefore, it is our intention to award the contract to you.

The contract shall commence on 11 September 2023 and will expire on 10 September 2024. The total contract value is up to £199,536.25 with DfT under no obligations to utilise the full amount.

The order form with the terms and conditions of the contract will be forwarded to you in due course to review, sign and return.

The appendix below provides detailed feedback on your submission.

By authority of the Secretary of State for Transport

## APPENDIX

Number	Question	Score (out of 100)	Evaluators' Feedback
<b>QUALITY ENVELOPE</b>			
<b>OVERALL WEIGHTING 70%</b>			
<b>QUESTION 4 – TECHNICAL – QUALITY OF SERVICE</b>			<b>WEIGHTING 70%</b>
4.1	<p>Please outline your understanding of the requirement to undertake a summative evaluation of the Thameslink Programme.</p> <p>This should outline your understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The context and intended objectives of this evaluation</li> <li>• Existing literature and evidence from similar evaluations</li> <li>• The intended audience for the findings from this project and how evidence from this evaluation is intended to be used"</li> </ul>	75	<p>A good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response providing a clear articulation of the requirement in terms of both the context of the Thameslink Programme, as well as the need for evaluation.</p> <p>The intended objectives of the evaluation are well understood and an appropriate list of stakeholders/audiences for the evaluation is provided, including internally within DfT, as well as externally among other government departments and industry partners. Reference to evidence standards and the need for robust research is also well considered.</p> <p>The response would have benefited from more detail on how the evidence from the evaluation is intended to be used. It was referenced how the evaluation is critical to ensure public investment has delivered planned objectives, outcomes and impacts and lessons learnt. However, more detail could have been provided here by giving some examples of where this has worked before or through an explanation of the strategic importance of this evaluation in terms of strengthening the evidence base for rail.</p>
4.2	<p>Please outline your proposed approach to the evaluation of transport impacts of the Thameslink Programme. Responses MUST include your suggested methodological and analytical approach, and the rationale. This should include, but is not limited to, details of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What secondary data sources will you be accessing? (Including measures and how these relate to the programme's intended outcomes)</li> <li>• Are there any data gaps for which primary data collection will be required? If yes, please outline</li> </ul>	75	<p>A good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response outlining a comprehensive approach to the evaluation of transport impacts of the Thameslink Programme. The 3-step mixed methods approach represents an effective and proportionate way to scoping and designing the evaluation before executing the analysis and write up. A relevant and comprehensive list of secondary data sources is provided.</p> <p>The response would have benefited from detailed reasoning behind the choice of replicating the baseline survey, explanation around the practicalities of completing this fieldwork, and how it will</p>

	<p>your methodology for conducting the primary research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What limitations are there of the use of these data sources for this study</li> <li>• How will you use this data to establish an accurate picture of the use of the network?</li> <li>• How will you use this data to assess the extent to which the intended transport impacts related objectives of the Thameslink Programme were delivered, and the intended outcomes observed?</li> <li>• What analytical methods will you use to assess the extent to which the observed transport outcomes can be attributed to the Thameslink Programme?</li> <li>• How will you use this data to assess the extent to which the Thameslink Programme has been cost effective?</li> </ul>		<p>fill gaps in data available, particularly those that have arisen since the baseline was completed.</p> <p>Overall, the approach to secondary data analysis is strong, and the proposed primary data collection and analysis is weaker.</p>
4.3	<p>Please outline your proposed approach to the evaluation of wider social and economic impacts of the Thameslink Programme. Responses MUST include your suggested methodological and analytical approach, and the rationale. This should include, but is not limited to, details of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will you define areas surrounding a selection of stations served by Thameslink for analysis of social and economic impacts?</li> <li>• What administrative data sources will you access to use in conducting analysis of social and economic effects? How will these be accessed?</li> <li>• What methods of analysis will be used to capture what would have happened without the investment into the Thameslink Programme?</li> <li>• What technical steps are necessary to ensure robust analysis? How will methodological challenges of the analysis be overcome?</li> </ul>	75	<p>A good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response outlining a clear rationale for the selection of study areas and comparators including suitable suggestions defined using appropriate criteria.</p> <p>There is a clear list of potential outcomes matched to data sources with scale and timing of data publication considered.</p> <p>The bid would have been improved by adding more detail on how the analysis of socio-economic outcomes will be done. There is reference to the description of analytical methods in the previous, transport impacts evaluation section, however, there is not an explanation to describe how these will be applied to socio-economic outcomes for which the data sources and study areas will vary considerably.</p> <p>Please be mindful for future reference, the referencing in the PDF submission was broken.</p>
4.4	<p>Please outline your proposed approach for carrying out the evidence synthesis and reporting, as outlined in attachment 3 – Statement of Requirements. Responses MUST include your suggested analytical approach, and the rationale. This should include details of:</p>	50	<p>The response generally meets the requirements but lacked sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response including a detailed discussion of the importance of the scoping stage, of evaluation planning and mitigating risk early in the project. There is good consideration of the audience and setting expectations early to ensure high</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How you will deliver high standard evaluation evidence and reporting</li> <li>• How you will synthesise the evaluation evidence to answer the key evaluation questions as set out in attachment 3 – Statement of Requirements</li> <li>• Details of how the report will be drafted and quality assured to provide clear and relevant findings for the programme’s stakeholders</li> <li>• How you will ensure that publishable outputs meet accessibility requirements (WCAG 2.1) for publication on GOV.UK</li> <li>• Consideration of any ethical issues including measures that will be taken to ensure respondent confidentiality where relevant.</li> </ul>		<p>quality outputs. The bid highlights many opportunities for DfT and external review throughout the project and a proposal to have meetings at the end of each project stage to finalise the work.</p> <p>The response would have benefited from providing more implicit reference to ethical considerations and mitigation measures that will be taken. Moreover, the bid would also have benefited from more detail on how the findings from different data sources and on both the transport and socioeconomic would be brought together in reporting to form a strong narrative.</p> <p>Also, while accessibility standards were mentioned, more detail on how they would be met would have provided added assurance.</p>
Total Questionnaire Weighted Score		49	Winning Supplier's Weighted Score 49
QUESTION 5 - TECHNICAL – EXPERIENCE			WEIGHTING 15%
5.1	<p>Potential Providers MUST provide full details and experience of the proposed team who will be delivering the project (including any consortia partners or subcontractors). This should also include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear project roles and responsibilities for each member of the proposed team</li> <li>• An organogram showing clear reporting lines and accountability structure, including between the main contractor and subcontractors or consortia partners if applicable.</li> </ul>	100	<p>An excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements with detailed supporting evidence with no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response clearly identifying project roles, including project managers, evaluation experts, peer reviewers, economic evaluations and experts in rail.</p> <p>The bid also included the number of days each person would work and noted under each person what their roles would be, for example the PM role would be management of the project, liaising with DfT leads and others, ensuring project meets deadline proving great assurance.</p>
5.2	<p>Potential Providers MUST provide pull details and experience of the proposed team who will be delivering the project (including any consortia partners or subcontractors). This should also include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relevant skills and expertise of individuals who will be undertaking the project to evidence their ability to deliver it, particularly social research experience.</li> <li>• CVs and specialist biographies for key members of your proposed project team(s)</li> </ul>	100	<p>An excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements with detailed supporting evidence with no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response setting out all project team members have experience in transport. For example, the Project director is an expert in transport strategy and public policy with experience of impact evaluations. The WEI lead has an economics degree and led on the HS1 evaluation. Market research lead - worked on quant and qual studies and gave examples of designing questionnaire, interview guides, and has experience of the transport industry</p>

			<p>working on evaluations including the e-cycle intervention.</p> <p>It gave further demonstration of experience working with rail industry datasets, working on impact evaluations including a new rail service. Experience of counterfactuals e.g., creating a counterfactual scenario to code into MOIRA.</p>
5.3	<p>Potential Providers are required to provide details of their experience relevant to this requirement, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous research and/or evaluations delivered with relevance to the rail and/or transport sector and any experience delivering evaluation support to infrastructure investment programmes"</li> </ul>	100	<p>An excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements with detailed supporting evidence with no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response giving reference to other projects which they have led that involved counterfactual analysis, and detail on an example building a rail timetable.</p> <p>A summary table listed all the previous projects they've been involved in and the type of experience including impact eval, design and delivery of surveys, they then provided additional details including HS1 evaluation. Also provide experience of reporting writing that is suitable for publication and also conducting verbal presentations to stakeholders, for example in the Kings Cross Impact eval and e-cycle interventions.</p>
Total Questionnaire Weighted Score		15	<p>Winning Supplier's Weighted Score</p> <p>15</p>
QUESTION 6 - TECHNICAL – PROJECT MANAGEMENT			WEIGHTING 15%
6.1	<p>6.1 Please provide details of how you will ensure a sufficient level of resource is available throughout the duration of the research project and how you will project manage the contract in order to meet the required milestones and ensure successful delivery of the contract. Your response MUST include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed project plan including all principal tasks and milestones</li> <li>• How you will ensure staff availability</li> <li>• How you will project manage the requirement to ensure the milestones are met and work with the Authority to update on progress</li> <li>• A resource plan that clearly articulates your proposed team breakdown of responsibilities by grades and number of days reflecting any dependencies on the Contracting Authority.</li> <li>• Identification of individuals who will have overall management responsibility for day-to-day</li> </ul>	75	<p>A good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response providing a clear visualisation of the project plan with key milestones and meetings included.</p> <p>It presents a plan for weekly update meetings to keep DfT informed on progress, upcoming tasks, and any risks arising.</p> <p>The bid would have benefited from detail on how they would engage and manage subcontractors along with more detail on risk register which would have provided added assurance.</p>

	<p>contact with the Authority's Project Officer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The processes which will be implemented for engaging with and managing any subcontractors and for resolving any issues arising</li> </ul> <p>Your resource plan should reflect the resources costed in the pricing schedule.</p>			
6.2	<p>Please outline how your organisation will implement a robust quality assurance process throughout this project to ensure that outputs are in line with the Contracting Authority's high standards, and recognised industry standards for research. Your response MUST include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details of a quality plan which explains the quality assurance process to assure the analytical quality of inputs, method, and outputs (to include any peer review and sign-off processes) of the report.</li> <li>Detail of what you perceive to be the risks to this project and detail how you will mitigate them throughout the project.</li> <li>Details of how you will ensure the report meets the DfT's accessibility requirement for publication.</li> <li>Your ability to follow the Government Social Research (GSR) Professional Guidance on 'Ethical Assurance for Social and Behavioural Research in Government' as a minimum</li> </ul>	75	<p>A good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response outlining a good quality assurance process with good discussions of risks, mitigation measures to put in place, and risk ownership and of the responsible reviewer for each project stage.</p> <p>However, the panel felt there was some gaps in risk consideration, for example, there is no discussion of the possibility of lack of comparability of new primary data with that collected for the baseline study.</p>	
Total Questionnaire Weighted Score		11.25	Winning Supplier's Weighted Score	11.25
Total score out of 100		75.25	Winning Suppliers total score out of 100 score	75.25
Total score weighted		52.68	Winning Suppliers total score weighted	52.68
QUESTION 7: TECHNICAL – SOCIAL VALUE (10%)				WEIGHTING 100%
7.1	<p>Potential Providers are to describe how they intend to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, within their organisation. Your response should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Your 'Method Statement', stating how you will achieve this</li> <li>A Statement on how you will implement your commitments and by when</li> </ul>	100	<p>An excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements with detailed supporting evidence with no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.</p> <p>This is demonstrated by the response which outlines a comprehensive plan to support and prioritise health and wellbeing and how these factors will be monitored and managed. For example, a 6 monthly report to the board on progress, provided a table which clearly</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments</li> <li>• How the Authority can contribute to the health and wellbeing of staff working on the project</li> </ul> <p>The response should align with the Government's social value priorities for procurement as can be found in the Social Value Model (Theme 5: Wellbeing).</p>		<p>laid out the theme of commitments, the proposed activities and timings and the metrics to monitor progress.</p> <p>The core social value activities were relevant to the project, as opposed to listing commitments more generally.</p>	
Total Questionnaire Weighted Score		10	Winning Supplier's Weighted Score	10
Evaluation Summary				
Technical Overall Score Weighted (Q4+Q5+Q6) + Q7		62.28	Winning Supplier's Technical Overall Score	62.68
<b>PRICE ENVELOPE</b>				
<b>OVERALL WEIGHTING 20%</b>				
QUESTION 8 – PRICE EVALUATION (20%)				WEIGHTING 100%
8.1	Price schedule			
Total Questionnaire Weighted Score		19.45	Winning Supplier's Weighted Score	19.45
Evaluation Summary				
Overall Bid Score		82.12	Winning Supplier's Overall Bid Score	82.12
Overall Ranking		1st	Winning Supplier's Overall Ranking	1st