

Commissioning Letter

URSUS Consulting Ltd
Newbold Terrace
Leamington Spa
CV32 4EA

Thursday, 12th March 2019

Dear Bidder,

**BEIS Sciencewise Framework Agreement – Lot 3
Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation Public Dialogue Exploring and Understanding
Public Perceptions & Responses to Online Targeting (Evaluator)
CR19012**

Thank you for your response to the Specification for the above commission by the UK Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) (the Customer) through the BEIS Sciencewise Framework dated 20th February 2017 between (1) Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills; and (2) URSUS Consulting Ltd (the Framework Agreement).

Appendix A. Specification for Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation Public Dialogue Exploring and Understanding Public Perceptions & Responses to Online Targeting (Evaluator)

Appendix B. Tender dated 24th February 2019

Annex A GDPR

This contract shall commence on Monday, 18th March 2019 and shall end on Friday 31st January 2020

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) accepts your Tender (Annex A), submitted in response to our Specification (Annex B). URSUS Consulting Ltd shall undertake the services in alignment with the specification in annex B and their bid submitted in annex A.

The Call-Off Terms and Conditions for this Contract are those set out in Schedule 5 to the Framework.

The agreed total charges for this assignment are £19,998.00 exclusive of VAT which should be added at the prevailing rate. This contract shall not exceed £19,998.00 in alignment with the following commercial breakdown:

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

The invoice schedule will be agreed at inception meeting.

Inception meeting details to be agreed

All invoices should be sent to should be sent to [REDACTED], UK Research and Innovation, 4th Floor, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET [REDACTED]

You are reminded that any Customer Intellectual Property Rights provided in order to perform the Services will remain the property of the Customer. The following deliverables have been agreed:

The Services Commencement Date is Monday, 18th March 2019

The Completion date is Friday, 31st January 2020.

The Contract may be terminated for convenience by giving 30 days' notice in accordance with clause 38 of the Call-off Terms and Conditions.

Your invoice(s) for this work must include the following information:
Commission number: CR19012

The Authorised Representative for this Commission will [REDACTED], who can be contacted at [REDACTED].

Until the date of publication, findings from all Project outputs shall be treated as confidential. Findings shall not be released to the press or disseminated in any way or at any time prior to publication without approval of the Department.

This clause applies at all times prior to publication of the final report. Where the Contractor wishes to issue a Press Notice or other publicity material containing findings from the Project, notification of plans, including timing and drafts of planned releases shall be submitted by the Contractor to the Project Manager at least one week before the intended date of release and before any agreement is made with press or other external audiences, to allow the Department time to comment on factual accuracy. All Press Notices released by the Department or the Contractor shall state the full title of the research report, and include a hyperlink to the Department's research web pages, and any other web pages as relevant, to access the publication/s.

This clause applies at all times prior to publication of the final report and within one month from the date of publication. Where the Contractor wishes to present findings from the Project in the public domain, for example at conferences, seminars, or in journal articles, the Contractor shall notify the Project Manager before any agreement is made with external audiences, to allow the Department time to consider the request. The Contractor shall only present findings that will already be in the public domain at the time of presentation, unless otherwise agreed with the Department.

Congratulations on your success in being selected to undertake this Commission.

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

Yours sincerely


UK Shared Business Services Ltd

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS COMMISSIONING LETTER THE SERVICE PROVIDER AGREES to enter a legally binding contract with the Customer to provide to the Customer the Services specified in this Commissioning Letter and Annexes incorporating the rights and obligations in the Call-off Terms and Conditions set out in the Framework Agreement.

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy

Name and Title	
Signature	
Date	19 March 2019

Signed on behalf of URSUS Consulting Ltd

Name and Title	
Signature	
Date	15/03/2019

- **Appendix A**

Specification

Background

The Sciencewise programme, led by BEIS, aims to improve UK public sector policy-making around areas of science, technology and innovation through the use of public dialogue. BEIS works with departments and bodies across the public sector to engage the public on new and emerging technology. The programme provides financial support (through a co-funding model) and specialist advice in all aspects of best practice in dialogue with the public to help Government departments and public sector bodies develop and commission public dialogue. For this project, BEIS will be working with the Department for Digital Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS).

Strategic Context

The ambition of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) is for the UK to be at the forefront of global efforts to harness data and artificial intelligence as a force for good. The Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation (CDEI) has been established in support of this. It was set up to undertake major projects focused on the ethical implications of particular data uses and fully explore them through reviewing existing research, conversations with sector stakeholder and experts, and engaging with the public, before reaching conclusions and making recommendations to Government. It has an explicit and unique mandate to advise the government on the measures which are needed to ensure the safe, ethical and innovative use of data and AI. The Centre has committed to embedding public engagement into its work.

The purpose of this public dialogue will be to support the Centre's first project. The Centre has been commissioned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to undertake a project on online targeting, looking at how this practice affects people's online experiences, and develop advice and recommendations for the Government by spring 2020.

Overview of wider online Targeting project

In the 2018 Budget, the Centre was commissioned by the Chancellor to complete a project on targeting. Targeting (also called micro-targeting) is the use of personal data (including consumer data) and demographics (for example, by service providers and/or retailers) to identify the interests of specific individuals or very small groups of like-minded individuals and influence their thoughts or actions. While this project will focus on targeting carried out by commercial organisations for a variety of reasons and in different contexts, it may also consider the use of targeting by the public sector.

This topic was decided upon after engagement with a range of stakeholders including advocacy and consumer groups, who highlighted the topic as a priority for the Centre. Targeting can improve public services and enhance the experience of citizens if done well – this can range from selling specific products to suit people's preferences, but may also include nudging people to change their behaviour. However, such practices can become intrusive or even manipulative – and can rely on opaque uses of data. The Centre's work is aimed at understanding this tension and its implications. The Centre needs to

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

explore how data is used to shape people's experiences online and consider what steps can be taken to ensure such techniques are used responsibly so they support business and society.

The Centre's online targeting project will culminate with the publication of clear recommendations and advice for Government by Spring 2020. This is likely to include identifying action needed to improve regulation or governance frameworks, and possibly developing best practice or proposing a code of conduct.

There are 3 key elements to the Centre's online targeting project as a whole:

- 1) The Centre is undertaking its own desk based literature research and conversations with industry and experts to understand how online targeting works, techniques used, and the scale of its use (identifying potential harms and benefits). The Centre will also work with regulators and other key stakeholders to understand the current regulatory framework and to identify areas which could be improved to address risks and support innovation.
- 2) Understanding what is technically possible in terms of innovations that could be introduced to address people's concerns. The Centre will also consider wider policy solutions that are relevant.
- 3) A public dialogue to understand how people balance potential benefits with harms in relation to online targeting.

The Online Targeting Dialogue

The purpose of the public dialogue is to understand and explore public understanding, perceptions and attitudes towards online targeting in order to inform the advice and recommendations the Centre will give to Government. It is envisaged that the dialogue will involve a minimum of 105 workshop participants in at least 3 nationwide locations, each workshop to be reconvened once.

- The Centre is particularly keen to understand how public attitudes may differ across different demographics of the population as well as in different contexts (through the use of case studies).
- The public dialogue work will explore the wider cultural/societal impact of online targeting as well as the potential for direct harm. But it may also consider the wider cultural effects of people being recommended music or books because of their previous purchase history (or assumptions made about the preferences from other data sources), as well as the impact of targeting on social cohesion.
- In addition to understanding the context-specific concerns of people, the Centre also wishes to understand and explore generic concerns that emerge across different uses of online targeting.
- The dialogue will need to explore how people feel about data about them being used to target goods or services (or possibly political messages), as well as how they feel about the different online targeting techniques.
- It is anticipated that the dialogue will include topics such as transparency, control and a consideration of different power balances.

Project Oversight and Management

The Centre's Board, will have oversight of the wider project. The CDEI will have a dedicated project manager who will hold the day-to-day relationship with the provider of the dialogue project. An Oversight Group (which the CDEI will administer) will provide challenge to the development of the case studies and the design of the workshops. It will be engaged closely with the development of the project and the design of the deliberative approach. It is envisaged that the oversight group will include stakeholders such as a representative from a

consumer body as well as people from business and other advocacy groups. There will also be input from academic experts with knowledge of particular online targeting methods. This Group will play a key role, together with the contractor, in developing the case studies used in the deliberative exercises.

Impact

The final report will be published as the Centre is committed to transparency.

The results of the public engagement activity will be reflected in the Centre's recommendations to Government and therefore make them particularly compelling. For example, the recommendations may outline ways in which regulation/governance should be strengthened to meet people's expectations and address the concerns expressed during the public dialogue.

Aims of the public dialogue

The Chancellor has commissioned the Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation to research and advise upon online targeting using personal and/or demographic data, a practice that has potential to be beneficial but may also be intrusive or even manipulative. The topic was decided upon after engagement with a wide range of stakeholders.

The purpose of the public dialogue is to understand and explore public understanding, perceptions and attitudes towards online targeting in order to inform the advice and recommendations the Centre will give to Government.

Objectives of the dialogue

- To engage a diverse and inclusive sample of publics to explore attitudes to the use of data in targeting public services
- To understand the values and principles underlying public attitudes towards the use of data for targeting products and services
- To understand if and how attitudes vary in different contexts (through a range of case studies) across different sub-groups of participants
- To explore participants' views on the trade-offs involved in the use of data for targeting (in different contexts through a range of case studies).
- To ensure that the Centre's outputs are informed by the public's views and expectations.

Questions for the dialogue to explore with the public

1. What needs to be in place for people to feel comfortable about the way data is used?
2. Is it possible to identify common ground across people with different experiences and attitudes?
3. How do the views of people from different backgrounds differ (e.g. age, socio-economic and ethnicity – the literature review will inform the identification of these groups).
4. Why do people's views differ across the different case studies, what values experiences and perspectives inform such differences? What principles do people apply/use and how do they apply these to different use cases?
5. How do people perceive and respond to potential risks/harms and benefits?
6. How do people balance the trade-offs between perceived (or real) harms and perceived (or real) benefits of targeting? What influences these attitudes?

7. What measures/innovations, governance and regulation, would the public like to see in place to give them increased comfort around the use of targeting?
8. What levels of transparency do the public expect in the ways organisations are using data?
9. How much personal control do people want over how and when they are targeted online?

Recruitment

In order to understand different people's attitudes and perceptions, the Centre envisages that the demographically representative public dialogue will be enhanced by weighting the sample to allow an additional focus on 3 relatively broad demographics, these include age, socio-economic background and ethnicity. These will be chosen based on the extent to which there are questions relating to whether specific groups might have different attitudes and perceptions compared to the general population. The literature review will be used to define the additional broad demographics in consultation with the contractor. It is also important that workshops take place across the country in order to demonstrate a commitment to nationwide engagement.

In order to demonstrate balance, no more than one of the sets of reconvened workshops should take place in the SE of England, and at least one set in one of the devolved nations. Our analysis of the literature review will guide our preferences for further locations (e.g. north/south, urban/rural etc.).

Methodology of the public dialogue

CDEI expects the dialogue provider to propose the structure of the public dialogue, but anticipates the core of the process will involve dialogue workshops designed to meet the Sciencewise principles, reconvened once, in at least 3 locations to demonstrate a nationwide reach. In order to demonstrate balance, no more than one of the sets of reconvened workshops should take place in the SE of England, and at least one set in one of the devolved nations. The Centre's analysis of its own literature review will guide our preferences for further locations (e.g. north/south, urban/rural etc.), and will be decided in collaboration with the contractor.

The Centre envisages a total minimum participation level of 105 people. It expects the provider to recruit a minimum of 75 participants to reflect the demographic make-up of the country with an additional set of at least 30 participants recruited from the 3 key demographics to be decided after the literature review in order to weight the sample for these groups and explore the specific perspectives of those demographics.

We are looking to the dialogue contractors to propose the most effective way to structure the workshop programme to ensure participants from these demographics are able to participate and contribute effectively while meeting the Centre's objectives. We would be happy to consider a process which:

The Centre envisages a total minimum participation level of 105 people. It expects the provider to recruit a minimum of 75 participants to reflect the demographic make-up of the country with an additional set of at least 30 participants recruited from the 3 key demographics to be decided after the literature review in order to weight the sample for these groups and explore the specific perspectives of those demographics.

We are looking to the dialogue contractors to propose the most effective way to structure the workshop programme to ensure participants from these demographics are able to participate and contribute effectively while meeting the Centre's objectives. We would be happy to consider a process which:

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

- includes the additional 30 participants in the core reconvened workshops;
- holds core reconvened workshops with 75 participants and runs three additional, shorter workshops involving a total of 30 people, one for each of the demographics recruited; or
- an alternative proposed approach that meets the Centre's objectives.

To understand how people's attitudes change in different contexts, the public dialogue will need to explore up to 3 different case studies which cover different methods and/or contexts of targeting – the Centre will provide the raw materials (using the research from the literature review) for the case studies which will include a description of the use case, details of the sorts of organisations using the particular targeting techniques and different ways consumers/clients receive information. The Centre will expect to work with the provider to develop these case studies which will cover different uses of online targeting, and may include:

- direct marketing of products or services
- the targeting of political messages
- the targeting of media and entertainment content

In addition to understanding the context specific concerns of people, the Centre also wishes to understand and explore generic concerns that emerge across different uses of online targeting.

We are inviting contractors to develop and provide a rationale for a process that meets these minimum requirements and to explain any associated challenges.

Deliverables

Project Timeline

January – February = CDEI commission literature review and begins to collate potential case studies.

February = CDEI extract raw materials for case studies, from literature review development of case studies (raw materials drafted by CDEI and passed to dialogue contractor).

March = Clarification interviews (11th March) and dialogue and evaluation contract award (w/c 11th March)

March = Inception meeting (14th March) with dialogue and evaluation contractors. Participant recruitment plans and workshop locations agreed. CDEI provides contractor with background materials, including raw material for case studies development

Late March/early April = first meeting of the Oversight Group (organised by CDEI on 26 March)

April - May = specialists and participant recruitment and development of dialogue materials, venue booking (by contractor)

May, April - July = Deliberative workshops underway (designed and facilitated by contractor provider who will also book locations and recruit participants)

Mid-August – September = Oversight Group review drafts of final dialogue report

September - October = final dialogue report

November = draft evaluation report

December = wash-up meeting

January 2020 = final evaluation report

Final report from dialogue

- The Centre understands that the numbers involved from these three additional demographics may not be enough to draw robust conclusions about the perspectives of these demographics.

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

- It is expected therefore that the final report of the public dialogue should include recommendations for further research if appropriate, particularly in relation to the different demographic groups recruited.
- The final report will need to identify areas of consensus across different groups as well as areas of difference.
- The final report will be published as the Centre is committed to transparency.
- Regular updates on emerging findings and project progress
- Interim report of findings
- Quality assured final report
- Slides summarising key findings

Vox pops from participants.

Aims and Objectives of the Project

The aim of evaluating the dialogue projects co-funded through the Sciencewise programme is to contribute to the programme's overall aim by providing an independent assessment of the impacts and quality of the dialogue project as a whole, including the design, delivery, reporting and governance of the dialogue activities.

The objectives of Sciencewise programme evaluations are to:

- Gather and present objective and robust evidence of the nature and quality of the impacts, achievements and activities of the project in order to come to conclusions.
- Identify lessons from the project to support the design and delivery of future public dialogue projects.

Evaluations will consider a project as a whole, covering all the activities described in the dialogue specification, including:

- any preliminary activities (e.g. desk research, literature review)
- governance (e.g. steering or oversight groups; other decision making processes)
- stakeholder engagement
- public dialogue activities (e.g. number, location and design of events; sampling, recruitment and number of participants; quality of information provided; specialists involved)
- any other related public engagement activities (e.g. polls or online surveys)
- the key questions addressed by the public
- methods of recording and analysis of public discussions
- reports from the project including to public participants
- activities to disseminate and use the dialogue results
- any other relevant activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results.

Evaluations must be conducted independently of the dialogue project, and in accordance with the Sciencewise programme note, *Guidance on Evaluating Projects*. This can be found on the UK SBS portal. They should also should be undertaken against the quality standards identified in the Sciencewise Quality Framework¹, and in the broader context of the Sciencewise guiding principles².

Focus of Sciencewise programme evaluations

Sciencewise evaluations should include formative and summative elements.

- **Formative:** The evaluator will be expected to use evidence gathered throughout the project to support the delivery of a high quality project.
- **Summative:** Identifying the impacts of and lessons from the governance, management, 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. The focus should be on identifying the impacts of the project and how the design, delivery, governance and outputs contributed to these.

The evaluation is not intended to assess the personal performance of those involved.

The following six key questions must be answered when evaluating a Sciencewise dialogue project:

- **Lessons.** Based on the results of the public dialogue how can the centre build on this for future projects? What are the lessons for future public dialogue projects (including from what worked well and less well)?
- **Objectives.** Has the dialogue met its objectives? Were the objectives set the right ones?
- **Credibility.** How and why were the dialogue design, delivery and reporting 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)? 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 the Sciencewise programme?
- **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

¹ Sciencewise (2017) *Quality in Public Dialogue. A framework for assessing the quality of public dialogue*. This is available on the UK SBS portal.

² Sciencewise (2017) *The Government's Approach to Public Dialogue on Science and Technology*. This is available on the UK SBS portal.

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 have been 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)?

Methodology

Overall approach to the evaluation

6.1 It is expected that there will be three main stages of dialogue project evaluation:

- **Baseline assessment.** Early review of the specific policy context for the project, governance and management arrangements and the expectations of those involved about the likely achievements and impacts of the project on policy decisions.
- **Interim assessment of design and delivery.** Review of the quality of the design and delivery of dialogue activities, based on evidence from the evaluation research, including observation of events and feedback from public and other participants (e.g. specialists and other stakeholders), and the role of governance and management arrangements. This will feed into the final assessment of the project, and final evaluation reporting.
- **Final assessment of the project overall and reporting.** Final research and analysis following the dissemination of the dialogue project reports to gain further feedback from those involved (e.g. the oversight group, commissioning body and others). These new data, together with data from earlier stages, should be used to produce the final evaluation report.

Has the dialogue achieved its objectives?

6.2 The evaluator will be expected to determine if and how the dialogue has achieved the objectives specified, providing credible evidence in support of their conclusions. The dialogue objectives are:

1. To explore with participants their current understanding of, and engagement with, the different terms used to describe the technology/practice (e.g. profiling, targeting, personalisation etc.).
2. To explore with participants their current knowledge levels of the practice and the technology involved.

To gain understanding of participants' perceptions, aspirations and concerns on the development and use of targeting their reactions to Overall approach to the evaluation

6.1 It is expected that there will be three main stages of dialogue project evaluation:

- Baseline assessment. Early review of the specific policy context for the project, governance and management arrangements and the expectations of those involved about the likely achievements and impacts of the project on policy decisions.
- Interim assessment of design and delivery. Review of the quality of the design and delivery of dialogue activities, based on evidence from the evaluation research, including observation of events and feedback from public and other participants (e.g. specialists and other stakeholders), and the role of governance and management arrangements. This will feed into the final assessment of the project, and final evaluation reporting.
- Final assessment of the project overall and reporting. Final research and analysis following the dissemination of the dialogue project reports to gain further feedback from those involved (e.g. the oversight group, commissioning body and others). These new data, together with data from earlier stages, should be used to produce the final evaluation report.

Has the dialogue achieved its objectives?

6.2 The evaluator will be expected to determine if and how the dialogue has achieved the objectives specified, providing credible evidence in support of their conclusions. The dialogue objectives are:

1. To explore with participants their current understanding of, and engagement with, the different terms used to describe the technology/practice (e.g. profiling, targeting, personalisation etc.).
2. To explore with participants their current knowledge levels of the practice and the technology involved.
3. To gain understanding of participants' perceptions, aspirations and concerns on the development and use of targeting their reactions to different potential scenarios of how the technology could be deployed in various ways.
4. To develop understanding of how and in what circumstances public aspirations and concerns regarding online targeting might be addressed.
5. To explore what the public sees as the role of government and regulators in the regulation of the technology (compared with industry) and who they think is responsible for raising awareness and engagement.

Dialogue success factors

6.3 At this stage, it is expected that success of the Targeting dialogue will be assessed by a range of factors including:

- The use of the results of the dialogue to influence national policy making involving targeting;
- The high quality of the design and delivery of the public dialogue project (good practice, value and effectiveness);
- The greater willingness and ability of the commissioning body to undertake public dialogue in future (learning about the place, value and practice of public dialogue in policy and decision making);
- Government and stakeholders will understand more on the risks associated with the use of targeting and will be in a better place to mitigate them;

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

- The ability of the project to put across issues and possibilities of targeting to non-participants if found;
- The ability of the project to touch a wide range of stakeholders who then go on to use what they have learned in their own policy and practice;
- The robustness of data analysis and quality of reporting;
- Evidence of the distribution and use of the dialogue results among policy makers and industry;
- Evidence of the satisfaction of public and stakeholder participants with the quality and outcomes of the dialogue; and
- Statements from policy makers on the impacts, value and benefits of public dialogue.

6.4 Bidders should indicate how they propose to assess if and how the dialogue has achieved its objectives, drawing on these success factors, and any others they propose.

Design and delivery

7.1 The evaluator will develop the evaluation process, and provide a detailed methodology, including an evaluation framework, success criteria and metrics as appropriate. The evaluator will be required to take part in an initial inception meeting with CDEDI and Sciencewise, prior to the full inception meeting with all parties.

7.2 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).

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

Formative Evaluation

7.4 The evaluator should be prepared to provide on-going feedback, based on evidence from evaluation research and emerging evaluation findings, to support project development and the delivery of a high quality dialogue. They must be aware, however, of their role as an evaluator and of the need to draw on evidence during any formative evaluation activities and be aware of the risks of “marking their own work”.

Meetings

7.5 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. They will also be required to attend Oversight Group meetings and take part in other meetings as required by the CDEI project lead.

Other considerations:

8.1 Final communication, sign-off and reporting requirements and protocols will be agreed between CDEI and the evaluation contractor at the Inception Meeting.

8.2 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.

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

8.4 If so required by the CDEI, the contractor shall produce a further version of a project plan for conducting the evaluation in such further detail as CDEI may reasonably require. The contractor shall ensure that the project plan is subject to CDEI approval. The contractor 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.

8.5 CDEI shall have the right to require the contractor to include any reasonable changes or provisions in each version of the project plan.

8.6 The contractor shall perform its obligations so as to achieve each milestone by the milestone dates agreed in each project plan and changes to any agreed milestones, as agreed at project inception shall only be made in accordance with discussion with CDEI.

8.7 Payment terms will be agreed between CDEI and the contractor, at the Inception meeting.

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

Requirements of contractor

9.1 Bidders should demonstrate a sound understanding of the brief, and should have experience 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.

9.2 Applicants should demonstrate how they would be prepared to adapt to developments or changes in the dialogue project. These are likely in this project, as noted in the full dialogue specification.

9.3. A single contract will be let for the evaluation. Applicants should provide details of any sub-contractors, or support staff, which the evaluator intends to use. Details of oversight procedures should be provided.

9.4 Without compromising the independence of the evaluation process, the evaluator must be prepared to grant access to CDEI and Sciencewise to allow inspection of the work at any time. The evaluator must also be prepared to provide further information to these parties should it be requested.

9.5 Data security arrangements for this project should accord with those specified in the Sciencewise programme framework contract.

9.6 The evaluator will be required to inform CDEI and Sciencewise promptly, in writing, of any cessation of work and of any event or circumstance likely to affect significantly affect the satisfactory completion of the evaluation.

Deliverables

The evaluator will be required to produce the following written reports:

- Brief monthly progress updates (as required);
- Interim report, likely to be required two weeks after the final fieldwork events
- Final evaluation report:
 - draft to be shared with the CDEI project team and Sciencewise lead evaluator prior to the wash-up meeting. They will comment on any initial changes
 - improved draft circulated to attendees at the wash-up meeting, one week in advance of meeting
 - final version in a form that can be published.

Reporting

The final evaluation report should include:

- an executive summary that will work as a stand-alone document: this should include a brief description of the purpose of the project, timing and activities; a brief summary of the evaluation methodology, and the main evaluation *findings* particularly on impacts, lessons for the future and conclusions.
- a description of the project objectives, timescale and activities (including reports), so that readers will know what the purpose of the project was, what took place and when.
- a summary of the evaluation methodology, any metrics, and data collection sources and tools
- detailed analysis and evidenced conclusions from the evaluation research across all three stages.

The report should 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
- Project management (both commissioning body and dialogue delivery contractor)
- 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; role and value of scientists and other specialists involved)
- Any other related public engagement activities and any other activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results
- Report and reporting (including methods of analysis / recording) from the project, including to public participants
- All impacts (achieved and expected), and all dissemination and use of dialogue results

- Reflective learning, drawing out the main lessons of the evaluation and how these might inform future dialogues.

Detailed evaluation data (e.g. questionnaire responses, frameworks, use of Sciencewise Quality Framework, etc) should be provided in annexes.

The report must be written in coherent and accessible language and provided in a form that is useful for learning and demonstrating impacts.

- Appendix B

Bidder Response – PROJ1.1

PROJ1.1 Expertise and knowledge Evidence of Skills and expertise

URSUS Consulting Ltd is a small consulting company, established in 2004, and committed to promoting sustainable development through working with government, business, academia and NGOs in technology, science, environmental, social and wellbeing. We have previously worked with Sciencewise in evaluating seven public dialogues (see below) and other dialogue processes funded by Royal Society and BEIS. We are also experienced in running dialogue processes ourselves, recently having co-designed and facilitated [RSA's Citizens Economic Council](#) and in facilitating sessions for multi-stakeholder audiences (such as a short consultation process and workshop on soils policy and science for Royal Society). Almost all our work outside of Monitoring and Evaluation also includes design and delivery of workshops with multiple stakeholders and all URSUS consultants are experienced facilitators.

URSUS has broad experience of supporting clients on studies around complex, emerging, 'disruptive' technologies and applications and UK and EU level policy making. We are quick to grasp the key technical and commercial aspects, likely societal, ethical and regulatory issues. We also have broad experience in helping decision makers understand the factors which underly public understanding, aspirations, concerns and trust that the benefits of technology can be delivered safely and securely for all, while the concerns can be managed through appropriate regulatory, governance arrangements or codes of conduct.

In the data field we are currently working with Genomics England (GE) on a Sciencewise co-funded dialogue evaluation about sharing of whole genome sequencing data. A key theme running through this dialogue has been addressing the public's limited existing understanding of what data is currently collected, how it is stored and how it is used (both for personalised targeting and as anonymised data sets for research). The dialogues have sought to understand what underlies people's hopes and fears about data sharing and security and their red lines in relation to privacy, confidentiality and risks of hacking or data misuse. Almost all the other public dialogues we have been involved with have also raised issues about data sharing and security, and often the role of AI. For instance, a major dialogue process on future smart cities with Innovate UK (now UKRI) and BEIS included cross-cutting themes of open data, and use of personal data to shape consumption habits, guide personalised service delivery and nudge citizens towards more sustainable behaviours in the areas of transport, food, health, energy and environmental behaviour.

The major challenges in evaluating deliberative dialogue processes have proved to be: in working closely with, but independently from the commissioners and the delivery consultants; providing formative, constructive, timely advice which reflects emerging evidence and our experience from other dialogue processes, without affecting the design of the process to the extent that we are 'marking our own work'; and being flexible in allocating a fixed budget across a dialogue delivery design that has sometimes changed dramatically over the course of the process. Our small senior team of proposed evaluators have experience of talking to senior policy makers and to members of the public. Our transparent and friendly working style means that we have always been able to establish a constructive 'critical friend' role to support dialogue processes. Our quality systems and long experience of evaluating such projects has meant that we are able to adapt easily and deliver outputs of a high quality that meet the overall evaluation objectives. Two projects highlighted below illustrate how we have adapted to specific challenges and maintained capacity over the course of long projects.

URSUS recent experience of evaluating public dialogues and stakeholder events ranges from one off large events to series of reconvened smaller groups, and from online forums to nationally representative opinion surveys include:

- Design, framing and facilitation of policy/science/NGO workshop, [Royal Society, 2019](#) to identify key policy questions and framing of a scientific evidence synthesis.
- Evaluation of public participation initiatives in European Grid Design, [Renewables Grid Initiative and Mercator Foundation, 2019](#), evaluation of projects to involve the public and stakeholders in grid planning and implementation exercises using a range of novel participative techniques (role play scenarios, argumentation mapping). Surfacing the need for data collection.
- Genetic technologies, public dialogue and national opinion survey, [Royal Society/BBSRC, 2017-March18](#). Three parallel dialogue processes (human, plant and animal GT) plus national online survey.
- Theory of Change workshop – [NORAD and Aidenvironment, 2018](#), workshop with policy and practitioner stakeholders to explore ToC for a financial data and risk management advocacy project focused on increasing sustainability of palm oil and soya production in tropical countries (Indonesia and Brazil).
- Stakeholder consultation process on GDF, NPS and Working with Communities BEIS 2017-18. Covered formative inputs (compliance with Aarhus regulations and Cabinet Office consultation principles) and summative evaluation of 7 multi-stakeholder workshops.

Recent experience with Sciencewise co-funded projects includes:

- [GenomicMedicine time for a new social contract?Genomics England/Sciencewise, 2018-19](#), lit review, stakeholder workshop, 90+ public participants in 4 venues each reconvened once, culminating in joint public/stakeholder summit in London.
- [Integrated City System DialogueInnovate UK/Sciencewise, 2015/6](#) evaluation of 3 workshops (100 participants) a reconvened event (60+), online forum and 7 stakeholder workshops.
- [Community involvement in siting a GDF, DECC, 2016](#), 3 locations, reconvened once contributing to DECC open-policy process.
- [Wellbeing public dialogues, PHE/WWCW/Sciencewise, 2015](#), three dialogue strands 3 locations (including Scotland and N Ireland), 100 participants, 2 days each.
- [Nanotechnologies public dialogue, Defra/Sciencewise, 2014/5](#) 1 large group reconvened 3 times involving many experts, a stakeholder workshop and steering group comprising government, academic, industry and NGOs.

- [Food Supply Chain Innovation public dialogue process, GO-Science and Which?, 2014/5](#). 3 locations each reconvened once and working with cross-governmental steering group and external stakeholder advisory group (academics, businesses & NGOs).
- [Flood risk communication, Sciencewise, Environment Agency, Met Office and Cabinet Office, 2014-5](#).

The proposed team

We understand CDEI plan a formal Oversight Group which we expect would include commercial and government technical and regulatory data specialists, open data NGOs and ethicists, to complement the CDEI Board representation. We have not included such specialisms in our team but would be happy to do so from amongst our network if a need emerges during Phase 1. Our team comprises:

██████████ and main contact with CDEI/Sciencewise, contractors and Oversight Group. She will attend start up and OG meetings, design the detailed evaluation plan, observe stakeholder and a sample of public dialogue events (at least pilots), interview stakeholders and quality assess outputs.

██████████ is a social scientist and URSUS Co-founder with 25 years' experience of sustainable development and policy making across a range of fields including environment, technology, science and social and economic policy. She leads URSUS's evaluation work, most recently working with Genomics England on Whole Genome Sequencing, data sharing and a new Social Contract for the NHS and with Royal Society to evaluate their public dialogue and national survey on genetic technologies covering genomic medicine and other animal and plant applications to human health. She has led 7 Sciencewise co-funded dialogue evaluations on behalf of: Genomics England, PHE, EA, Defra, GO-Science/Which?, Innovate UK and BEIS (including a follow up project without Sciencewise support). She has also provides formative and summative evaluation support to complex programmes in the climate and humanitarian fields. For each evaluation she designs the process, attends OG meetings, offers constructive independent advice during design and pilot events, and incisive analysis of findings and lessons learnt on the basis of quantitative data and interviews with senior stakeholders. She is herself an experienced facilitator, recently co-designing and facilitating RSA's 2017-8 Citizens Economic Council deliberative dialogue process. She was previously a Technical Director at ERM for 10 years.

██████████ – Senior Evaluator responsible for reviewing desk research, observing a sample of dialogue events, analysing quantitative data and carrying out participant and post-event stakeholder interviews.

██████████ is an URSUS evaluator with an MSc in Environmental Science and 20 years' experience of advising public sector clients across sustainability issues. Her experience covers a wide range of scientific/technical areas including smart cities, health, wellbeing, energy and waste. ██████████ has been involved in recent Sciencewise-supported dialogue evaluations include: Royal Society (Gentech), Defra (nanotech), BEIS (GDF) and Future Food Systems (including GM foods). Prior to URSUS ██████████ was a senior consultant at ERM Ltd and before that worked in the medical research sector?

██████████ – Senior Evaluator responsible for observing dialogue workshops and events in the North of England, data analysis and carrying out some post dialogue evaluation interviews.

Based in the North West, ██████████ is an economist with almost 40 years' experience in public policy and implementation. He has previously evaluated Sciencewise co-funding public dialogues run by BEIS (on GDF siting) and Innovate UK (future city systems) and by the Royal Society funded dialogues on Genetic technologies. He has worked extensively with public and private sectors and is a long-time named member on Homes England's (previously HCA, EP) select Economics evaluation Panel. Previously he was a Technical Director at ERM Ltd.

Maintaining capability of expertise

Our proposed team have all worked with URSUS continuously for at least 10 years. We maintain team capability through our planning and project management systems. URSUS operates an ISO 9001:2015 Quality System (certificate number GB200268p), to help ensure successful delivery of our projects. This includes procedures for project planning, weekly or fortnightly internal project progress reviews, and regular client liaison (e.g. through schedule weekly catch up calls during the most intense periods of project activity), maintenance of project records and director review and authorization of project outputs. We anticipate that for this project we would take part in weekly/fortnightly catch up meetings with CDEI/delivery contractors and Sciencewise by telephone or email. We will ensure our capability is unaffected in the event of the unexpected unavailability of a team member (e.g. due to accident or personal circumstances) through:

- close working between all three team members, who have interchangeable skills, with frequent catch-ups and access to all files and working documents via our secure share site;
- the ability to call on other URSUS evaluators during intense periods (e.g. multiple events scheduled on the same day) or to bring in expert associates where necessary.

We are currently in the Phase 3 stage of a Sciencewise co-funded project with Genomics England (GE) which has run from May 2018 to May 2019 (with a no-cost contract variation to extend the contract). This variation has been necessary due to slippages and changes in scope in the dialogue delivery which involved a literature review and initial stakeholder workshop as inputs to the detailed design of the dialogue process in terms of demographics, number and location of events. Slippage in these two elements led to several months delay in delivery of workshops. Last minute interest from the devolved administration in Scotland also resulted in adding two additional workshops in Edinburgh to the programme. The project has also involved a very large Oversight Group which has met 5 times during the project. By working closely with the Sciencewise and GE team we have been able to adapt our evaluation plan, incorporate the additional events and meetings and remain fully involved throughout the process with no additional costs to the agreed budget (except reimbursement of travel costs for the Scottish workshops). Reference: [REDACTED], Genomics England Project Manager.

Our work with BEIS on stakeholder dialogues around deep disposal of high-level radioactive waste (2016) is an example of a non-Sciencewise funded evaluation which encountered lengthy delays due to unforeseen events (e.g. a snap election, departmental staff reallocation to Brexit-related tasks, delays to ministerial sign-off processes and extreme weather events). Again, we were able to adapt to such delays and retain capacity by working closely and flexibly with the commissioners, rescheduling inputs, attending extra events and delivering the evaluation objectives at no additional cost. (Reference: [REDACTED])

[REDACTED] Civil Nuclear and Resilience team BEIS [REDACTED]

PROJ1.2 Evaluation Approach and Quality of Outputs

Reasoning behind our approach

In the 2017 budget the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced the intention to set up the Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation (CDEI) as an advisory body working with DCMS and others to promote best practice and offer advice to Government on how best to reap the potential benefits associated with the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and data-enabled technologies, while managing the risks associated with big data and responding to the concerns of the public and wider stakeholders.

CDEI has been established with an independent board of very senior experts who bring a range of technical, commercial, policy and ethical perspectives and knowledge. CDEI has a very specific brief to advise government on measures to ensure safe, ethical and innovative use of data and AI. It is committed to embedding public engagement in its work.

We understand that as part of a formal consultation process between June and September 2018, which included formal written responses and a series of roundtables, it was agreed that CDEI has been tasked with providing government with advice and recommendations on online targeting (also known as micro-targeting) by Spring 2020. As one strand of the activity for this work CDEI and Sciencewise are co-funding a public dialogue exercise to understand how people balance potential benefits with harms with relation to online targeting. Although CDEI has made some suggestions of the scale and scope of the dialogues to include about 105 people in three locations, each reconvened once, the actual design will be informed by a literature review that CDEI is leading, which may point to the need to recruit specific groups to reflect views of specific demographic groups (e.g. younger people, older people, ethnic groups, urban/rural). Given the number of dialogues on other topics which have also touched on data related issues (such as fears around cyber security, data misuse, equity, transparency, lack of understanding of regulatory regimes and lack of trust in commercial involvement in big data) this will also be an important input to shaping the narrative of the dialogue sessions. We understand three or more case studies of data uses in different settings are likely to be a core strand of the dialogues and that these will be designed by the delivery consultants based on CDEI's work and the inputs of the Oversight Group. We also understand that the dialogues will involve reconvened groups in three locations, of which at least one will be in a devolved administration, and one in a city/rural area outside the South East. There is also a likelihood that some smaller one-off events with specific demographic groups may also be included. The Dialogue has five key objectives:

- 1) To explore with participants their current understanding of, and engagement with, the different terms used to describe the technology/practice (e.g. profiling, targeting, personalisation);
- 2) To explore with participants their current knowledge levels of the practice and the technology involved;
- 3) To gain understanding of participants' perceptions, aspirations and concerns on the development and use of targeting, their reactions to different potential scenarios of how the technology could be deployed in various ways;
- 4) To develop understanding of how and in what circumstances public aspirations and concerns regarding online targeting might be addressed;
- 5) To explore what the public sees as the role of government and regulators in the regulation of the technology (compared with industry) and who they think is responsible for raising awareness and engagement.

Based on our understanding of the brief, our overall approach will involve:

- **Formative evaluation.** Working closely with CDEI and contractor teams to feed in constructive, independent advice and formative insights through planning meetings, regular progress updates and wash-up meetings after events and at the end of the project, while respecting the need to avoid the risks of 'marking our own work' or overlapping with the role of the Sciencewise engagement specialists. Timely inputs will help to inform design and delivery of a high-quality process.
- **Summative evaluation** data collection across all three phases will be analysed to provide summative findings on the projects' objectives, credibility, quality (design, delivery, governance, project management) and impacts which will be presented in a well-crafted report suitable for publication, including an executive summary suitable for wide circulation.
- **Participation in OG meetings** to hear the views of commercial and public sector data experts, policy makers, academics, NGOs and ethicists. This will form the basis of our understanding of the policy context and how different stakeholders might wish to use the outcomes of the dialogue (and how this evolves) and to ensure OG expectations are reflected in framing, design and stimulus materials developed. We will also review how

effectively governance arrangements contribute to project objectives and that the OG group is representative, enabled to contribute meaningfully to design and delivery while minimising time requirements for individual members. Some OG members will be interviewed during Phase 3.

- **Observation of as many dialogue elements as possible.** As noted above we have assumed this will include: overview of CDEI's literature review; a stakeholder event or a sample of meeting(s); six dialogue workshops (2 England and 1 devolved administration meetings each reconvened once). Additional elements may include: a survey/ interviews to explore differences in views between specific demographic groups; launch/ dissemination event(s). We will agree with the CDEI project manager and Sciencewise head evaluator which events to attend (depending on whether all dialogue groups cover all three case studies or whether they are stratified by location/case study theme in which case we would need to attend both Days 1 and 2 in each location). In the event we do not attend all events we will work closely with the delivery contractors to ensure that quantitative feedback from participants and specialists is captured through evaluation questionnaires (e.g. by asking them to only hand out incentives in exchange for a completed feedback questionnaire).
- **Meeting best practice standards**– the evaluation will meet Evaluating Sciencewise Projects and we will evaluate how far the dialogue has met its objectives against the Sciencewise (2017) Quality in Public Dialogue Framework and the illustrative dialogue success factors listed in the tender.

Detailed Methodology

Phase 1: Baseline Assessment

Phase 1 will involve working alongside the delivery team to ensure that research framing and overall process design reflects what is already known about public understanding and attitudes to data and how it can be used for online targeting, so that the process adds value and richness to CDEI's advice and recommendations to government.

- **Inception Discussion** – URSUS's project director will attend the 14th March inception meeting. This will be a chance to understand the drivers and context behind the project; progress made on other modules such as literature review, identifying case studies etc; agree methodological approach; discuss/refine dialogue objectives to ensure they are measurable and review success criteria/metrics for the evaluation framework; agree progress reporting (e.g. regular catch up meetings); and finalise contractual matters. In total we have allowed two-person days to take part in key project planning/progressing meetings between CDEI and the delivery contractors.
- **Baseline research.** Review of CDEI's literature review and how it is used to inform the framing of the research, decisions on sampling and recruitment and the overall shape of the dialogues, including whether there is a need for shorter smaller sessions with specific demographic groups.
- **Attend OG meetings.** We will attend the first OG meeting on 26th March and would be happy to present briefly on the evaluator role and plan. Also, through observation and side discussions with individuals we will identify the specific policy or other decision-making processes that members expect the work to feed into and therefore how the dialogue needs to be designed and delivered to meet expectations of different stakeholders. We have allowed for attending a total of three OG meetings over the course of the project.
- **Attend/review stakeholder meeting(s).** We will observe any 'stakeholder consultation' workshop during the scoping phase or review contractor notes of 1-2-1 meeting with key stakeholders to help ensure that stakeholder views are reflected in designing the process, feeding into the design of the three case studies, ensuring that any materials developed are

balanced, accurate and accessible and that the full range of views is represented by specialists in the room or through other means (e.g. talking heads videos, materials, role plays etc).

- **Detailed design of evaluation framework and evaluation materials** – reflecting the above and lines of enquiry in the TOR we will develop detailed protocols for reviewing the design of stakeholder and public dialogue events (see illustrative table below), getting participant and specialist feedback through evaluation questionnaires, and post-event interviews and metrics for measuring the success of the project.

Output: Detailed design of evaluation framework and evaluation materials and plan for attending events, reflecting detailed process design

Phase 2 will focus on evidence collection through observation, feedback questionnaires and analysis. Key tasks will include:

- **Review of project process, activities and dialogue materials** – we will assess the planning of events (locations, timing, venues), recruitment of public and specialists (sampling characteristics, recruitment process and questions, incentives offered), stimulus materials and pre- or between-event comms and tasks (e.g. any homework tasks). Materials will be assessed for balance, accessibility, clarity, variety and whether they will enable informed and engaged dialogue amongst a non-technical audience. Our findings will be fed directly to the delivery partners to help inform design.

- **Observe public dialogue events and activities.** We will observe a representative sample of round one and two events across the three locations and any smaller one-off events for specific groups of participants. Based on expert observation, informal conversations with participants and evaluation feedback questionnaires (or less formal evaluation techniques where appropriate) our evaluators will assess for each meeting: the mix and engagement of participants and 'specialists'; effectiveness of stimulus materials; design flow and timing; quality of facilitation; and logistics (see Table below).

- **Data collection and analysis.** Data will be collected through feedback questionnaires tailored to:

- **105 Participants** covering: satisfaction (recruitment, location, delivery style, timing, information provided, chances to be heard, and to hear from specialists) and what they took away (e.g. increased interest and understanding by the end of Day 2 of the issues, and their aspirations and concerns regarding online targeting and views on the role of government and regulators). Questions will also cover their confidence in the process (whether their inputs will be useful and used by CDEI and government to get the most out of the technology while managing the concerns, and their interest in being involved in future dialogue processes). Questions for each round will explore the participant journey in understanding (and attitudes towards) online targeting in the three-case study over the process.

- **Specialist/observers** covering views on the credibility of the design, participant mix and engagement, stimulus materials and delivery; whether they heard anything new, surprising or particularly useful to their own work; whether they consider public dialogue processes useful and whether they would use them in their own work in future.

Personal data collected (e.g. contact details) will be held, processed and disposed of subject to GDPR requirements. Data will be coded to ensure anonymity and, where participants are happy for their details to be shared with CDEI (e.g. for any ongoing participant panel or follow up activities) transferred securely in password-protected encrypted spreadsheets. If the intention is to share any data with the National Archive

then we would be happy to use the evaluation questionnaires to confirm whether participants are happy for their anonymised data to be shared. Immediate reflections on each meeting will be shared with the team at post-event wash up meetings or the next project progress meeting: summary data from questionnaires will be shared immediately following the pilot for each round.

Output: Interim report presenting data (participants and specialists/observers) and commentary on all Round 1 and 2 events and final event and outlining key questions for Phase 3 evaluation interviews and analysis.

Illustrative Evaluation Plan for dialogue events	How evaluated	
	Pre-events	During and after (pp= public participant; Q? = Questionnaire)
<p>Participants – Numbers, mix, engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the mix reflect the literature review recommendations and recruitment brief (e.g. socio-economic, ethnicity, age, knowledge of online targeting etc.)? Is it broadly representative of each location (and of UK across all locations?) • Are attrition rates acceptable? 	Review recruitment brief and compare to ONS data	Observe #s, mix. Informal discussions with pp and specialist
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were recruitment practices appropriate and as agreed? (i.e. no snowballing or recruitment from databases if specified - do any participants already know each other? have they recently taken part in other qualitative research?) 	Review recruitment brief	Informal discussion with pp
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do group dynamics work? Are participants interested and actively engaged and enjoying the process? Do they stay engaged and work constructively together? 	Review group size (pp: facilitator ratio 10:1 or less)	Observe group dynamics and engagement Day 1 & 2 pp Questionnaire
<p>Dialogue event design and flow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are overall objectives clear – do commissioners explain how outcomes will be used and what they have heard • Does design maintain momentum between Day 1 and 2 events (e.g. homework task or communication with pps) • Does design include a good mix of techniques with enough time, opportunities for Q+A, and for 'pause and hear' in smaller and plenary groups? • Do any sessions/techniques need tweaking before future events? 	Review design, sessions and that scope and timings are realistic	Observation Pp and specialist Q? on timings Post-pilot Wash-up meeting

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

<p>Role of specialists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do number and mix of specialists provide for a balance of views? Do all locations have similar access to specialists? Are other methods used for hearing other voices (e.g. Talking Heads) if necessary? • Is the specialist: participant ratio appropriate (e.g. enough but not over-powering?) • Are specialists well-briefed and able to fulfil their roles? Are they able to answer questions in a balanced, accessible, open manner? • Have opportunities been built in for feedback on what they've heard and how they might use it? 	<p>Review recruitment and pre-briefings</p>	<p>Observe how specialists interact with pps. Pp Q?s on whether specialists were helpful in getting questions answered Specialist Q?s on benefits and challenges of taking part</p>
<p>Stimulus materials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there an engaging mix of video, animation, presentations, posters, handouts etc. allowing participants to learn in different ways and to the depth they want? • Does information present a full range of views? Is it balanced and unbiased? • Do materials such as the case studies allow discussions to get into enough depth to understand the terms (Obj 1), current knowledge levels (Obj 2), perceptions, aspirations and concerns (Obj 3), how to 	<p>Review design and stimulus materials – balance, accessibility, variety</p>	<p>Observation Pp Q? Days 1 & 2 whether enough, balanced, accessible information and whether pp have learnt about online targeting and issues around it Post-event wash-up on what worked well and what needs amending</p>

address them (Obj 4) and the role of government and regulators (Obj 5).		
<p>Facilitation and data capture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the mix of data capture techniques (aural, written, creative, video etc.) effective? • Does the team have continuity and the skills/ experience to build trust, treat everyone respectfully, manage individuals who tend to dominate and to really probe the reasoning behind views expressed • Will data be captured in a format suitable for sharing with the National Archive? 	Review facilitation plans	Observation of group dynamics, Pp and specialist Q? on independence, professionalism and style of facilitation. Did pp feel heard, were individuals allowed to dominate?
<p>Organisation and logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Are venues accessible, welcoming and conducive to dialogues (plenary and break out space, AV equipment). <input type="checkbox"/> Are refreshments enough and appropriate to dietary needs? <input type="checkbox"/> Are administration arrangements well handled (recruitment, communications between events, incentive payments, travel arrangements, filming permissions, feedback forms etc.) 	Review of planned venues, room set ups, incentive arrangements etc.	Observation of how venue and logistics work. Feedback after pilot sessions.

Phase 3: Final assessment of the project overall

The final stage will focus on summative evaluation of the project based on data collated from phases one and two and qualitative data collected during phase three. This work will take place after the dialogue report is shared with participants, the oversight group and CDEI Board and has been reviewed by Sciencewise and the evaluator.

Stakeholder interviews. We will carry out about 12-15 semi-structured interviews with stakeholders who have been involved with the process (as members of the OG, specialists at events) or who will be main users of the outcomes including: core CDEI team and a few Board members. Interviews will explore the big evaluation questions including:

- whether the research **met its objectives**(and whether those were the right ones);
- whether the **process was credible and robust** was the design, delivery and reporting appropriate to the context and objectives? Do end users of the findings find them credible? What other means might have been considered for collecting the same breadth and depth of understanding of the public's views?;
- Whether the delivery of the **process was of high quality**; design, delivery, facilitation, data capture and analysis, reporting and sharing of key messages;
- The likely **impacts of the process**– how results have been disseminated and fed into CDEI's overall deliberations on how to ensure techniques are used responsibly so they support business and society including actions: to improve regulation or governance; develop best practice; develop a code of conduct. We will also identify any other unexpected or potential impacts (e.g. government responses to emerging advice, inputs to international or other relevant policy processes).
- the **relative costs and benefits** of different approaches;
- **lessons learnt**- what worked well, what less so, what they would do differently in any future process.

Dialogue participant interviews. We may also carry out a handful of interviews by telephone with a representative range of participants who have indicated that they are happy to be contacted again. Interviews will focus on the lasting impressions of taking part in the process and any final reflections on online targeting and the issues around it. The need for such interviews will be confirmed with the Sciencewise head of evaluation and CDEI project officer and if this seems likely to add significant value then resources will be reallocated to other tasks.

Data Collation and Analysis. Data from all three phases will be collated, validated and analysed to address evaluation questions and to draw broad conclusions on relative costs (monetary and in-kind contributions from CDEI, OG members and specialists) and benefits (through changes in policy, approach, delays avoided etc.)

Final reporting. We will prepare a draft final report (about 30 pages) to an outline agreed in advice with Sciencewise. This will be circulated in November and will be discussed with CDEI, Sciencewise and the delivery contractors at a wash up meeting in December at which we will present the key findings, lessons and recommendations and collect comments to finalise the report. The final quality assessed evaluation report in a format ready for publications will be submitted in January 2020.

Output: Final Evaluation Report

- Executive summary (3 pages – objectives, context, dialogue description, methodology, key findings, lessons learnt)
- Introduction: Dialogue objectives, policy context, description of key elements of dialogue; evaluation objectives and methodology
- Evaluation findings: meeting the objectives, dialogue quality against Sciencewise Quality framework and project governance (OG, stakeholders, project management), credibility, impacts, costs and benefits
- Key Lessons and recommendations for CDEI and Sciencewise
- Appendices: OG members, summary analysis of participant questionnaire results

The table below summarises potential risks which might arise for the delivery of this project and how we would mitigate them.

Potential Risk	How we will address it
<p>Major slippage in timing or project scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal project delays (e.g. in recruiting contractors, convening OG, scheduling a stakeholder workshop/meeting, preparing stimulus materials, scheduling dialogue sessions, drafting or sign-off of final dialogue report) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify potential crunch points and slippage risks during Stage 1 and reflect in detailed evaluation plan (URSUS) • Feed in best practice lessons on governance arrangements, project design, materials development etc. where necessary (URSUS). • Flexibility in extending contract end date to allow enough time for evaluation interviews (URSUS/CDEI/Sciencewise) • Early discussions around any budget implications of major changes to scope (number, format or location of events) (URSUS/CDEI/Sciencewise)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External delays beyond the control of the project (e.g. Brexit process, snap elections, departmental restructuring or personnel) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure delivery design includes contingencies/flexibility (e.g. for cancellations, additional meetings, or achieving project objectives in other ways) (All)

turnover, extreme weather events etc.).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early discussions around any budget or timing implications of major changes (URSUS/CDEI/Sciencewise)
Unexpected unavailability of URSUS team member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small senior team with interchangeable skills, able to step into different roles. • Regular team updates on project progress. • All project documents held in secure share sites accessible to the whole team.

- **Annex A**

Data Protection

The Supplier will be compliant with the Data Protection Legislation, as defined in the terms and conditions applying to this opportunity. A guide to The General Data Protection Regulation published by the Information Commissioner's Office can be found [here](#).

The only processing that the Supplier is authorised to do is listed in Annex 1 by the Contracting Authority and may not be determined by the Supplier.

Annex 1: Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

(1) The contact details of the Contracting Authority Data Protection Officer are:

The Contracting Authority Data Protection Officer
 Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy
 1 Victoria Street
 London
 SW1H 0ET

Email: dataprotection@beis.gov.uk

(2) The contact details of the Supplier Data Protection Officer (or if not applicable, details of the person responsible for data protection in the organisation) are: [REDACTED]

(3) The Supplier shall comply with any further written instructions with respect to processing by the Contracting Authority.

(4) Any such further instructions shall be incorporated into this Annex 1.

(5)

Description	Details
Subject matter of the processing	The processing is needed in order to ensure that the Supplier can effectively deliver the contract to provide effective evaluation of the delivery of

	<p>a public dialogue</p> <p>The processing of names and business contact details of staff of both the Contracting Authority and Supplier will be necessary to deliver the Services exchanged during the course of the Contract, and to undertake Contract and performance management.</p> <p>The Contract itself will include the names and business contact details of staff of both the Contracting Authority and the Supplier involved in managing the Contract.</p>
Duration of the processing	<p>Processing will take place from 11 March 2019 for the Commencement of the Contract. The contract will end on 31 January 2020 but may be extended until 31 March 2020.</p>
Nature and purposes of the processing	<p>The nature of the processing will include collection, recording, retrieval, use, erasure or destruction of data. Erasure or destruction of the data will be by automated means or other re 3rd party secure destruction.</p> <p>Processing takes place for the purposes of research.</p> <p>The nature of processing will include the storage and use of names and business contact details of staff of both the Contracting Authority and the Supplier as necessary to deliver the Services and to undertake Contract and performance management. The Contract itself will include the names and business contact details of staff of both the Contracting Authority and the Supplier involved in managing the Contract.</p>
Type of Personal Data	<p>Name, address, telephone number, email address, images.</p> <p>Names, business telephone numbers and email addresses, office location and position of staff of both the Contracting Authority and the Supplier as necessary to deliver the Services and to undertake Contract and performance management. The Contract itself will include the names and business contact details of staff of both the Contracting Authority and the Supplier involved in managing the Contract.</p>

Categories of Data Subject	Members of the public Staff of the Contracting Authority and the Supplier, including where those employees are named within the Contract itself or involved within Contract management.
Plan for return and destruction of the data once the processing is complete UNLESS requirement under European Union or European member state law to preserve that type of data	Where Personal Data is contained within the Contract documentation, this will be retained in line with the Department's privacy notice found within the Procurement Documents.

The nature of the service will require the Supplier to collect personal data directly from data subjects. The Supplier will use the agreed Contracting Authority privacy notice as instructed by the Contracting Authority

The Contracting Authority will be relying on consent as the relevant legal basis of processing. The Supplier will ensure that all communications requesting the provision on personal data allow for the data subject to provide clear, affirmative, informed, freely given and unambiguous consent, which requires a positive 'opt-in.' the Supplier will have mechanisms in place to ensure that consent is recorded and shown through an audit trail.

1. Cyber Security

In line with HM Government's Cyber Essentials Scheme, the Supplier will hold valid Cyber Essentials certification by the time of contract award. Evidence of the certification must be provided to the Contracting Authority in order for the contract to be awarded.

Evidence of renewal of certification must then be provided to the Contracting Authority on each anniversary of the first applicable certificate obtained by the Supplier for the duration of the Contract. In the event the Supplier fails to comply, the Contracting Authority reserves the right to terminate the Contract for material breach in line with the Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract.

If the Supplier already holds ISO27001 accreditation (or equivalent), no further Cyber Essentials certification will be necessary provided that the certification body carrying out this verification is approved to issue a Cyber Essentials certificate by one of the accreditation bodies.

GDPR Questionnaire

The Supplier shall complete and return the questionnaire to the contact named in the Contract on the anniversary of the commencement of the Contract.

The Supplier agrees that any financial burden associated with the completion and submission of this questionnaire at any time, shall be at the Suppliers cost to do so and will not be reimbursable.



GDPR Assurance
Questionnaire May1

