DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Dear [redacted]

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated 13th July 2021, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Order Number:	PS21043
From:	**Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy**, 1 Victoria St, Westminster, London, SW1H 0ET("Customer")
To:	Ipsos MORI, 3 Thomas More Square, London E1W 1YW ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	**Monday, 26th July 2021**
Expiry Date:	**Thursday, 31st March 2022**

Services required:	Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by: The Customer's Project Specification attached at Appendix A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Appendix B.

Key Individuals:	[redacted], BEIS [redacted], Ipsos MORI

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	As per AW5.2 Price Schedule response highlighted within the RM6018 Contract Terms, section; Annex 1 – Contract Charges. The total value of this contract shall not exceed £174,621.00 Excluding VAT.

Insurance Requirements	Additional public liability insurance to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim. Additional employers' liability insurance with a minimum limit of £5 million indemnity. Additional professional indemnity insurance adequate to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract with a minimum limit of indemnity of £2 million for each individual claim. Product liability insurance cover all risks in the provision of Deliverables under the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim.
Liability Requirements	**Suppliers limitation of Liability** (Clause 18.2 of the Contract Terms);
Special Clause	There will be a break clause in November 2021 on the delivery of the final full draft of the Evaluation Framework Report and the delivery of the first full draft of the Early Findings Report to allow BEIS staff to review BEIS requirements and to ensure the project is being delivered to timelines and quality.
GDPR	As per Contract Terms Schedule 7 (Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects.

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Supplier:

Name and Title: [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Date: 14.07.21

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title: [redacted]

Signature: [redacted]

Date: 20 July 2021

APPENDIX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background
The aim of this first phase of the evaluation is to scope a robust Evaluation Framework and synthesis of early findings to assess BEIS' response to the Covid-19 pandemic, its role in mitigating the economic and health impacts of the virus, monitor equality impacts and to support our response to the expected Covid Public Inquiry. More information on the aims and objectives of the project can be found in section 2. **The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy** The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) is building a stronger, greener future by fighting coronavirus, tackling climate change, unleashing innovation and making the UK a great place to work and do business. • More about BEIS's policy objectives and remit is available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-business-energy-and-industrial-strategy **BEIS and its partner organisations response to COVID-19** In mid-March 2020 as the potential scale of the Covid-19 pandemic became clearer, public health measures designed to combat the pandemic and behaviour change among the population were having a noticeable impact on businesses and the research and innovation sector. BEIS, British Business Bank (BBB) and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) have played a critical role in the UK Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic through launching a variety of policy interventions at pace to address the causes, economic and societal consequences of the pandemic. BEIS' COVID-19 response includes activity across all the departments' priorities. **Interventions in scope** The scope of the overarching evaluation includes interventions developed in direct response to the pandemic and the employment-related aspects of BEIS' Green recovery schemes. To minimise the long-term damage to the UK economy and support businesses to face off the immediate negative economic impact of COVID-19 on otherwise viable businesses: • *Coronavirus Business Interruption Loan Scheme (CBILS)* – April 2020 - March 2021 provided financial support to smaller businesses in the UK affected by coronavirus • *Bounce Back Loan Scheme (BBLS)* – April 2020 - March 2021 enabled smaller businesses in the UK to access finance more quickly during the coronavirus outbreak

- *Coronavirus Large Business Interruption Loan Scheme (CLBILS)* – April 2020 - March 2021 facilitated access to finance for medium-sized and larger businesses in the UK affected by the coronavirus outbreak

  CBILS, BBLS and CLBILS will be covered in one evaluation.
- *Safer workplace guidance:* guidance for businesses and self-employed people in England during coronavirus. Nine of fourteen guides cover a range of different types of work the others are the responsibility of DCMS.
- *Compliance with the safer workplace guidance* - (TBC)

There will be not evaluation as such for safer workplace, but monitoring is in place and stakeholder feedback is regularly sought.

- *Small Business Grant Fund (SBGF)* – supported small and rural businesses in England with their business costs during coronavirus.
- *Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund (RHLGF)* – supported businesses in the retail, hospitality and leisure sectors with their business costs during coronavirus.
- *Discretionary Grant Fund* – supported small and micro businesses that were not eligible for other grant schemes.
- *Local Restrictions Support Grant (for closed businesses* (LRSG (Closed) and LRSG (Closed) Addendum: Tier 4)) – supported businesses in England that had been required to close due to temporary local restrictions.
- *Local Restrictions Support Grant (LRSG (Open))* – supports businesses in England that have been severely impacted due to temporary local restrictions.
- *Local Restrictions Support Grant (LRSG (Sector))* – supports businesses in England that have been closed due to the national restrictions.
- *Additional Restrictions Grant (ARG)* – supports businesses in England that are not covered by other grant schemes or where additional funding is needed.
- *Closed Businesses Lockdown Payment (CBPL) (*closed 31 March 2021)- supported businesses in England that had been required to close due to the national lockdown that began 5 January 2021.

  LA Grants will come under one evaluation.
- *Trade Credit Insurance* – provided guarantees of up to £10 billion to Trade Credit Insurance schemes for business-to-business transactions.

- *Corporate Insolvency and Governance Bill* – to help struggling businesses to continue to trade during the current crisis.

To Support the Research & Innovation community throughout the negative impact of COVID-19 and drive future R&D innovation in the UK:

- *Future Fund* – April 2020 – Jan 2021 issued convertible loans between £125,000 to £5 million to innovative companies which are facing financing difficulties due to the coronavirus outbreak
- *UKRI – Stabilisation portfolio evaluation* - designed to provide targeted support aimed at supporting universities, research organisations, and researchers to stabilise the research and innovation system in light of the disruption and threats to the R&D system caused by the Covid-19 pandemic (Sustaining University Research Expertise (SURE), Grant Extension Allocation (CoA), Doctoral extensions, Covid-19 Institute Support Fund, Support for small, specialist institutions amongst others)
- Innovate UK's *COVID-19 Funding Response programme* to support businesses involved in research and innovation.

To support businesses to recover following the coronavirus pandemic:

- *Restart Grant* – supports businesses in the non-essential retail, hospitality, leisure, personal care and accommodation sections with a one-off grant, to reopen safely as COVID-19 restrictions are lifted
- *Recovery Loan Scheme* – a new loan scheme to support access to finance for UK business as they grow and recover from the disruption of the COVID-19 pandemic
- *Public sector Decarbonisation*, *Green Home Grants*, *Social housing Decarbonisation* - jobs creation

To support the development of a COVID-19 vaccine and fund R&I to understand and tackle the COVID-19 pandemic:

- *Vaccines Taskforce* – established to drive froward, expedite and co-ordinate efforts to ensure that the UK population would have access to a clinically safe and effective vaccine against COVID-19
- *UKRI – R&I portfolio* - supporting research and innovation to help understand or tackle the effects of COVID-19 (Covid-19 open call, DHAS/UKRI rapid response call: Covid 19, Whole genome sequence alliance, GenOMICC consortium, GCRF/Newton Fund Agile Response call to address Covid-19, Global effort on Covid-19 (GECO) Health Research (UKRI/DHSC), Covid-19 Africa Rapid Grant Fund, ventilator Challenge, Vaccines Manufacturing Innovation Centre, Increasing testing capacity, ACCORD Accelerating COVID1 – Research development platform (UKRI/DHSC), RECOVERY (Randomised Evaluation of Covid-19 Therapy trial (UKRI/NIHR), Innovation support Covid-19 Funding response (5 interventions), International Public Policy Observatory)

There are several complementary business support schemes put in place by government that users of BEIS' support might also have drawn upon or considered. These are:

- **The Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme (CJRS)** – this is a scheme where an employer can keep an employee on their payroll even if they are unable to operate or have reduced work for the employee to do due to coronavirus. The employer can apply for a grant to cover part of the employee's regular wages for any time spent on furlough through the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme, up to a monthly cap of £2,500. The monthly cap is reduced in proportion to hours actually worked. From 1 July 2020, the scheme allowed employers to bring furloughed employees back to work for any amount of time and any shift pattern, while still being able to claim a grant for the hours not worked.
- **Statutory Sick Pay Rebate Scheme** – this is a scheme that allows SME employers using a PAYE payroll scheme to claim back up to two weeks of Statutory Sick Pay (SSP) for employees who are eligible for SSP due to coronavirus.
- **The VAT Payments Deferral Scheme** – this was a scheme that allowed UK VAT-registered business to defer VAT payments between 20 March 2020 and 30 June 2020. Businesses that made use of the scheme have the option to pay in smaller payments over a longer period up to the end of March 2022, interest free. Those that can pay their deferred VAT can still do so by 31 March 2021, the original date deferred payments were due.
- **Business Rate Relief Due to Coronavirus** – this is a scheme where businesses in the retail, hospitality and leisure sectors in England do not have to pay business rates for the 2020 to 2021 tax year. The relief is automatically applied by local councils to eligible businesses.

- **Future Fund** – this is a scheme where innovative companies that are facing financing difficulties due to the coronavirus outbreak can access convertible loans of between £125,000 to £5 million subject to at least equal match funding from private investors. These convertible loans are an option for businesses that rely on equity investment and are unable to access other government business support programmes because they are either pre-revenue or pre-profit.

How will the outputs of this first phase of this evaluation be used?
Along with supporting BEIS' response to the expected COVID-19 Public Inquiry:

- They will be presented to the evaluation Steering Group (made up of representatives from each of BEIS' COVID-19 response teams) for scrutiny and dissemination.
- They will inform a decision on the nature and scale of evaluation work and the approach to be taken, including how to and when to commission further phases of evaluation.
- A summary of any learning and findings of the work will be published and shared with potential contractors for any future evaluation project.

There will be a break clause in November 2021 on the delivery of the final full draft of the Evaluation Framework Report and the delivery of the first full draft of the Early Findings Report to allow BEIS staff to review BEIS requirements and to ensure the project is being delivered to timelines and quality.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

Purpose of this first phase of the evaluation
All individual interventions have or will have some form of monitoring, and in most cases evaluation, in place. The purpose of the overarching evaluation will be to build on and compliment individual intervention evaluations to examine combined effects, fill any evidence gaps and propose options to assess combined value for money. It should also provide learning for rapid response in the future.
In FY 2021-22, the focus of this ITT (Invitation To Tender), BEIS are looking to commission to scope a robust Evaluation Framework, Early Findings Report and a Year 1 Report to assess BEIS' response to the Covid-19 pandemic, its role in mitigating the economic and health impacts of the virus, monitor equality impacts and to support the Departments' response to the Covid-19 Public Inquiry.
The intention is to commission further robust evaluation phases based on the Evaluation Framework and the timings of the anticipated outcomes/impacts.

Research questions
Initial questions agreed by the Steering Group are detailed below.
To develop the **Evaluation Framework** (by end 2021) the research questions are:

- What are the key relevant questions to be tested as part of an evaluation of BEIS' response that add value beyond the individual intervention evaluations?
- What research method(s) are most appropriate and deliverable in practice to answer the cross-cutting and theme research questions?
- What are the key challenges for a future contractor(s) in undertaking the proposed evaluation on behalf of BEIS and how would these be overcome?

- What intervention and other data (including administrative data) would be required to address the impact evaluation questions and is this likely to be available?
- How useful would any OECD data/analysis be to answer BEIS' evaluation questions?
- What types of expertise would be required from potential contractors to fulfil the requirement of the overarching evaluation?
- What is the justification for the proposed approaches as compared with other alternatives?
- To what extent is it possible to map businesses and researchers journey through receiving BEIS' support and guidance?
    - who accessed multiple schemes, when and why?
    - At what point was a grant taken up as opposed to a loan, at what point was there a need for both, how did that materialise?
    - Were there displacement effects of combined schemes?
    - To what extent can non-BEIS support for the same groups be included?
- How can an appropriate counterfactual be identified to understand the impact of BEIS' response?

Ultimately, BEIS want the Evaluation Framework to provide a strong recommendation as to the best possible approach for a robust impact evaluation to take place in the future, including the costs involved in delivering the Framework.
For the **Early Findings Report** (by end 2021):

- Have BEIS individual interventions come together to protect different groups, how, and what has this meant for different sizes of business, sectors, ages, regions/geographies, for those in different devolved administrations?

For the **Year 1 Report** (by end FY 2021-22) BEIS is looking for analysis of evidence to date based on individual intervention evaluations reports (debt guarantee schemes process and initial impact evaluation findings, Future Fund early assessment, UKRI R&I process evaluation), any relevant evaluations from other government departments.

- Have BEIS individual interventions come together to protect different groups, how, and what has this meant for different sizes of business, sectors, ages, regions/geographies, for those in different devolved administrations?
- What lessons can be learned from the delivery of the interventions for future rapid responses to economic shocks/crisis'?
- Were there gaps in BEIS' COVID-19 response?
- What were the synergies and tensions between interventions, including those from other departments?

Questions that the longer-term approach outlined in the **Evaluation Framework** would be designed to answer are detailed below.
Cross-cutting process questions:

- Was there any variation in access to support and guidance, or unintended consequences for different groups/those with protected characteristics?
- To what extent were interventions able to address any variations?
- There were multiple channels for accessing the different schemes, how did that work from a business perspective?

- What can BEIS learn from the delivery of these interventions that can be applied to future rapid response schemes and business as usual delivery?
- Was the strategic direction clear?
- Compared to business as usual delivery, how has BEIS done things differently in response to the pandemic?
- How effectively was BEIS able to set up interventions in a short period of time?
- How were businesses, delivery partners, Local Authorities/researchers/universities engaged with intervention design?
    - Did this support delivery, how?
- Are there any lessons on communication and collaboration?
- Did the risk appetite vary across interventions/policy areas?
- How could impacts be enhanced through improvements to implementation?
- What are the implications of the findings for future interventions/delivery or roll out to other settings/policies, how transferable are they?
- Is there learning on the governance of spending approval from the processes for Vaccines Taskforce or the debt guarantee schemes?
- What features of the implementation of the interventions have influenced their success or contribution to a particular outcome?
- Were there synergies and/or tensions between the different BEIS interventions? How did these manifest?
- How, if at all, have the interventions worked together to address the problems BEIS was aiming to alleviate?
- What differences were there in the delivery of interventions in devolved administrations and what did this mean in terms of access, efficiency and outcomes?
- How did multiple channels to access schemes work from a business perspective?
- How did the various delivery partners interact, if at all?
- What can we learn about the timeliness of the response?
- How does BEIS' response compare with other countries? How does this vary across devolved administration?

Cross-cutting impact evaluation questions:

- What impact have BEIS' COVID-19 response interventions had?
- Does this vary by devolved administration, region/geography, size of business, age, sector (including universities), disciplines and types of research, other demographic groups or protected characteristics?
- Does this vary by circumstance?
- What is the range of intervention outcomes? To what extent can they be attributed to BEIS interventions?
- How well do these align with the original objectives of the interventions and the wider context?
- What can we say on business survival, preserving the pipeline of innovative businesses, preserving employment, turnover, growth, workplaces operating safely, relaxing lockdown/tier requirements sooner/avoiding future lockdowns, spin-off benefits, collaboration across researchers, researcher capacity and capability?

- How have BEIS' COVID-19 interventions achieved these impacts? (explore key impact pathways to identify the causal package including interdependencies between schemes and how this sits within the wider context, and aligns with other interventions in the same space)
- In what ways (through which mechanisms) have the BEIS interventions altered (or not) the decision-making, activities or investments of stakeholders to lead to this pattern of contribution and outcomes?
- How have these outcomes been affected by the wider context or particular circumstances?
- What unintended consequences (either positive or negative) of the suite of BEIS interventions have there been?

Value for money questions:

- What were the cost-benefits of the response?
- Did it represent good value for money?
- How could cost effectiveness of BEIS' response be improved?

Specific questions by theme.

Economy - response

- Was finance provided by BEIS made available as needed to businesses across the UK in all regions, sectors, sizes and ages?
- Have businesses increased or decreased their R&D activities alongside BEIS support? In what ways? What do these R&D activities entail?
- Have businesses been able to operate safely? Have workplace outbreaks been an issue? How much can we say this was attributed to the guidance?
- Could more of the economy have operated within the COVID restrictions?
- Is the overall GVA saved and generated by beneficiaries greater than the economic cost of delivering support?
- Was the overall exchequer costs & returns within the expect range?
- What types of support were most effective for which groups? Grants vs. Loans – dependent on types of businesses etc
- Who accessed multiple schemes and why?
- At what point did businesses take up grants vs. loans, at what point did the need for both come up?
- To what extent were there displacements effects of combined schemes?
- Have grants or loans supported more agile ways of trading?
- Grants and loans are more of a composite package in Wales for example, what has the meant in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation or the outcomes?

Economy – innovation

- Have some disciplines and types of research been more affected than others, how e.g. medical vs physical vs social, research in the field or lab as opposed to that which can be done at home?
- The inability to travel will have more impacts in some areas than others. What are likely and potential skills shortages as a result?
- What are the longer-term impacts of the disruption e.g. supply chain impacts, that define the price of grants to Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs)?
- To what extent and how was R&I activity able to continue in universities and businesses?

- To what extent and how were businesses supported in the short term and then able to reach their growth potential?
- Did the Future Fund or innovative business support package preserve the pipeline of innovative businesses?

Economy – recovery
- How do the survival grants and loans tie in with the recovery grants and loans?
- To what extent are BEIS green recovery schemes providing/safeguarding jobs or providing additional jobs?

Health
- How effective was BEIS' response to secure a population wide doses of a COVID-19 vaccine?
- To what extent and how did UKRI funded calls contribute to the immediate COVID-19 pandemic effort (testing, treating, vaccination etc)?
- Is there evidence of Vaccines Taskforces boosting scientific research in the UK 'at risk'?
- Does the current investment in vaccine manufacturing show signs of lasting or Vaccine Taskforce investment building UK vaccines capability more generally (spin-off benefits)?
- To what extent did these interventions enhance collaboration across researchers?

Audience for this evaluation

The audience for this evaluation includes BEIS, DHSC, British Business Bank, UKRI, HM Treasury, and wider government, the research an innovation community and the wider public. It will be used to inform BEIS' response to the anticipated Covid Public Inquiry. Reports delivered as part of this evaluation should be written in the assumption that they will be published for wider consumption and will need to adhere to BEIS style guide requirements.

3. Suggested Methodology

Bidders are invited to set out a proposed methodology to deliver on the aims and objectives of this first phase of the evaluation. In this section we set out our view of (i) key challenges facing the evaluation (that will need to be overcome by the proposed methodology for the Early Findings and the Evaluation Framework); (ii) a discussion on access to datasets; and (iii) potential methodologies. Please note, **bidders are encouraged to think creatively and innovatively about how to meet the objectives and research questions, and to challenge our suggested methodology where necessary.**

Challenges needing to be overcome through the evaluation

This evaluation will face several challenges for which the evaluator will need to recommend and justify methodologies in the Evaluation Framework and look to begin to address in the Early Findings and Year 1 report. These include:

- **Imperfect evidence base** - while management information and other evidence has been collected that will support the evaluation, it is likely there will be gaps or deficiencies in areas of the evidence base relevant for answering the evaluation questions. The evaluator will need to use their judgements to work with and improve this imperfect evidence base. Intervention teams are also working through data access issues in some cases with the aim of giving the successful contractor access to recipient records, for example.

- **Minimising participant burden** – businesses and the research and innovation community have been subject to a large number of surveys since the onset of the pandemic and there is a growing sense of 'fatigue'. The evaluator will therefore need to ensure all evidence-gathering that requires engagement with the research audiences is justified (i.e. that the evidence does not already exist or could be obtained by other means) and that data collection methods are well designed and minimise the burden on participants. BEIS will need to approve any proposed engagement with the various audiences as part of this evaluation.

- **Attributing impacts to the BEIS response** – a number of forms of support, including those beyond the remit of BEIS, have been launched which will have impacted the research sector (e.g. the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme), and the evaluator will need to begin and plan to untangle these impacts to attribute any impacts observed to BEIS or identify the extent of BEIS' contribution. The evaluator will also need to ensure the most appropriate counterfactual - i.e. what would have happened had BEIS not intervened – is chosen and taken into account as part of assessing the deadweight and additionality of impact.

- **Delivering the work at pace** – the Evaluation Framework and Early Findings will need to be delivered in Q4 2021 ahead of the COVID Inquiry and the Year 1 Report will need to be de delivered by the end of 2021-22 FY. The evaluator will therefore need a clear and effective project plan to ensure high quality work, which meets the project brief and addresses comments from the project Steering group, is delivered within the timescales.

    - Few individual intervention evaluation outputs[1] will be available before the Evaluation Framework and Early Findings are required. The Early Findings in particular will need to be generated from analysis of scheme documentation and primary data collection.
- **Proposed timing of future evaluation phases** – the Evaluation Framework will need to recommend and justify the timing of future evaluation phases, weighing up anticipated impacts, the timings of individual intervention deliverables and ensuring the findings are still relevant for stakeholders.

Data and evidence available to support the evaluation

Access to individual intervention data sets may be possible to enhance the conclusions in the three deliverables.

High level envisaged approach and methodologies

To achieve this aim, we envisage the evaluation team will:

- Work closely with the evaluation lead and policy teams to **develop a full set of research questions, prioritised into primary and secondary questions** for BEIS' response.

[1] The debt guarantee and equity scheme early assessment reports should be available in November 2021, other evaluation timescales are not yet finalised.

- Identify and advise on addressing the **evaluation challenges**, setting out methods for assessing the impact of BEIS' response and the timing of the evaluation work.

- Develop an **Evaluation Framework** that sets out how each evaluation question can be robustly addressed and the analytical techniques to be used to answer these questions. This would include work to:

    - Create a sound **Theory of Change** which explains the process by which the response aims to deliver its objectives. This will identify outputs and outcomes and the mechanisms by which the intervention objectives will be achieved; to review and prioritise the data which will need to be collected (and the means of collecting it) to ensure effective evaluation is possible). A high-level draft will be provided as a starting point.

    - Assess and **recommend how and when each evaluation question can be robustly addressed** (including what can be answered in the Early Findings and Year 1 reports and what will need to be answered later) using evidence collected by secondary and primary research, as required (some to be conducted as part of this contract, with the remainder to be commissioned by BEIS at a later date). The commissioned evaluation expert/s should set out how data collected would address the evaluation questions and how it (and existing evidence) should be analysed in order to do so.

    - Identify **risks and issues** to the successful delivery and usefulness of an evaluation and how these could be overcome.

    - **Provide estimated costings for individual elements of the work and provide a costed evaluation plan** that will address the evidence needs for evaluating the impact of BEIS' COVID-19 response.

    - Provide **a clear approach to synthesising the evidence**, including how bias will be minimised, how conclusions will be drawn when faced with contradictory evidence etc.

- **Provide Year 1 findings** in the form of two reports: 1) Early Findings on whether BEIS' support has come together to protect different groups to inform BEIS response to the Covid Public Inquiry 2) learning, outcomes and early impacts to date based on initial impact and process findings from individual interventions, other government department COVID-19 response interventions, devolved administration comparisons.

We envisage this first phase of the evaluation involving the following methods. Bidders are invited to propose an amended and more detailed version of this high-level methodology for this project, including how to respond to the challenges above, as well as any other challenges identified by the bidder.

We encourage bidders to think critically and creatively to set their proposed methodology. The scoping work **to inform the Evaluation Framework** should include consideration of the following key elements:

- 20 familiarisation consultations

- 10 with key stakeholders and delivery partners (where needed following documentation analysis), covering the application processes, demand, procurement processes, consultation and stakeholder engagement activity, and existing evaluation and monitoring functions
- 10 with internal BEIS policy and delivery teams.

- Review the evidence base developed to date, to identify what can be built upon and where gaps exist which could be addressed through evaluation work in FY 2021/2022 and longer-term impact and value for money evaluation, including a desk review of current documentation.

- 5-10 focussed consultations to develop and enhance the draft logic model into a Theory of Change linking the rationale for intervention to the inputs and activities involved, and expected outputs, outcomes and impact, accompanied by an explanatory narrative

    - Followed by a Theory of Change workshop which brings 25-30 key stakeholders together in one 2-3 hour session. Building collective buy-in to the Theory of Change at the centre of this evaluation will be critical in ensuring the evaluation focuses on the right things and generates useful evidence.

- Assessment of possible analytical methods and timing to answer the process evaluation questions, taking into account the approaches outlined in individual intervention plans/methodology papers.

    - BEIS will facilitate access to the individual evaluation documentation for the successful bidder and the contracted evaluator of those schemes will be encouraged to support necessary inputs into the overarching evaluation

- Taking into account the approaches outlined in individual intervention plans/methodology papers provide an assessment of possible methods and timing for an impact and value for money evaluation (including the feasibility of conducting econometric and/or other economic analysis to understand how BEIS' interventions have contributed towards supporting the UK economy through the pandemic and into recovery), including an assessment of the merits and disadvantages of experimental and quasi-experimental as well as theory-based methods.

- Identification of appropriate counterfactual(s). Defining an appropriate counterfactual (or defining multiple counterfactuals) will be a key challenge for the study.

- Develop a detailed data collection plan specifying how existing data will be used (including data linking), what new data will be collected, sample sizes, target audiences, outline discussion guides and survey instruments, statistical power calculations where relevant)

- Develop a detailed analysis plan, explaining the method of analysis of all qualitative and quantitative data, including statistical analysis plans and approaches to synthesis and triangulation, return on investment and value of money assessment and challenges for evaluation and proposed mitigating strategies

- Develop a detailed timeline for evaluation including key activities, milestones and deliverables

- Develop a risk register that should be reviewed throughout the life of the evaluation

- Identification of key outputs and outcomes that should be monitored throughout the evaluation, and the development of appropriate Key Performance Indicators which are linked to the developed Theory of Change.

- How and when data needs to be collected (e.g., through surveys, admin data) and what techniques should be employed (e.g., telephone, online, case studies).

Ultimately, we want the Evaluation Framework Report to provide a strong recommendation as to the best possible approach for a robust evaluation, some of which may take place in FY 2021/22 with the remainder taking place in the future around anticipated impacts.

BEIS would envisage the methodology **to establish the Early Findings** for the anticipated Covid Public Inquiry would include:

- 20-30 interviews/case studies/deep dives with the different types of businesses to explore the extent to which the different interventions came together to protect them (mapping who accessed what, when and why? At what point a grant/loan/both/non-BEIS support was needed, how did those that were not eligible adapt?)
    - A spread of devolved administrations, regions, business size, age and sector, mix of support received, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, and circumstance
- Following a review of the individual interventions Public Sector Equalities Duty impact assessment, filling any appropriate gaps in equalities monitoring, as required through stakeholder engagement (up to 10 further interviews), additional questions on existing surveys

For the **Year 1 Report** we would envisage:

- A review of the individual intervention evaluation reports, including any from other government departments or devolved administrations, and relevant international comparisons available by December 2021
- Any further interviews case studies/deep dives (allow up to 10) or evidence gap filling activity

The full over-arching evaluation outlined in the Evaluation Framework will be heavily reliant on having good quality evaluation findings for each of the individual schemes. This research is not looking to replicate these evaluations, but to look at the combined effects and potential learning and fill any gaps.

4. Deliverables

BEIS expects the supplier to produce quality assured, accessible reports outlining the proposed approach to answer the research questions and the findings from this first phase of the study by the deadlines outlined, these are critical to ensure the usefulness of the findings. The reports should be written for a non-technical audience. The reports or a

summary of the reports will be published following quality assurance and clearance.
BEIS will appoint two external academics from the BEIS Evaluation Peer Review Group to review each of the reports. The evaluator will be expected to make reasonable adjustments to their reports based on the reviewers' feedback

There will be a break clause in November 2021 on the delivery of the final full draft of the Evaluation Framework Report and the delivery of the first full draft of the Early Findings Report to allow BEIS staff to review BEIS requirements and to ensure the project is being delivered to timelines and quality.

As referred to earlier in this ITT the core deliverables for this phase of the evaluation are:

- An **Evaluation Framework Report** (final draft by end 2021) – providing a proposal for the full evaluation of BEIS response to COVID-19, answering the Framework research questions in section 2 and the activities listed in section 3, following a structure agree with BEIS in advance, including an exec summary, introduction, background, proposed methodology, workplan and indicative costs (first full draft to be delivered by mid-November 2021; final report due December 2021)
- An **Early Findings Report** – providing clear evidence-based responses to the research questions (see section 2), including all supporting evidence and analysis, following a structure agreed with BEIS in advance, including an executive summary, introduction and background, methodology, findings, conclusion, annex (first full draft to be delivered by mid-November 2021; final report due December 2021);
- A **Year 1 Report** - providing clear evidence-based responses to the research questions (see section 2), including all supporting evidence and analysis, following a structure agreed with BEIS in advance, including an executive summary, introduction and background, methodology, findings, conclusion, annex (first full draft to be delivered by mid-February 2022; final report due March 2022).

Other deliverables expected during the delivery of the project:

- **Clean data sets and data tables** from any surveys conducted as part of this project. Data sets will include contact details of organisations (for re-contacting) and information about participants, e.g., unique business identifiers to enable data linking.
- **Questionnaires, interview topic guides** or other related research material if alternative methodology is chosen.
  PowerPoint presentation slides summarising the key findings for each report as well as providing information on research methods used in this project. The slides should be easily accessible and understandable to non-researchers.

Project Management and Stakeholder Engagement

We expect the supplier to take a professional approach to managing this project which at minimum would involve the creation and maintenance of a clear project plan. The project plan should set out timelines for activities, contingencies between them and should clearly factor in time for BEIS and the wider Steering Group to input on key decisions.
In addition to maintaining a clear project plan, we would expect at least one member of the project management team to make themselves available for a weekly progress meeting with the BEIS project manager. These progress meetings should also be used to share details of emerging findings in a timely fashion and to identify any early issues that may need resolving.

BEIS has assembled a Steering Group to oversee the project. This group includes policy and analytical representative from the BEIS key COVID-19 response interventions. The evaluation team will be expected to attend 3-4 Steering Group meetings during the contract. The evaluator will be expected to present a written progress and emerging findings report at each Steering Group meeting. The Steering Group will formally sign-off the inception plan, and each of the reports so the evaluator will need to build suitable review periods into their plan.

The contract is to be for a period to the end of FY 2021/22.

APPENDIX B - Supplier Proposal

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Part 2: Contract Terms

Contract Terms v6.0