

DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Nous Group (UK) Ltd

Nicon House
Level 5
21 Worship Street
London
United Kingdom
EC2A 2DX

Dear [REDACTED],

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated Friday, 11th February 2022, 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:	PS21293
From:	Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy , 1 Victoria St, Westminster, London, SW1H 0ET ("Customer")
To:	Nous Group (UK) Ltd , Nicon House, Level 5, 21 Worship Street, London, United Kingdom, EC2A 2DX ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	Monday, 14 th February 2022
Expiry Date:	Friday, 10 th June 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:	Supplier Contact – [REDACTED] Project Manager – [REDACTED] (cover - [REDACTED])
------------------	--

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 £94,511.04 Excluding VAT. Milestone Payments as per the Special Condition's section of this Contract.
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.
Liability Requirements	Suppliers' limitation of Liability (Clause 18.2 of the Contract Terms);
Special Condition(s):	As per the Special Conditions section in the PS21293 – RM6018-Contract-terms-v8
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:

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title:

[REDACTED]
Principal

Name and Title:

[REDACTED]
Principal Research Officer

Signature:

[REDACTED]

Signature:

[REDACTED]

Date:

14 February 2022

Date:

14 February 2022

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background

Scope of the tender

BEIS is seeking to commission an evaluation of the Provision of Services Regulations (PoSRs) 2009 in order to understand its impact, assess the extent to which it is fit for purpose in an EU Exit context, and identify areas for improvement of the PoSRs.

This is likely to include a combination of surveys and stakeholder interviews of two of the three major stakeholder groups (competent authorities¹ and service providers, who operate under the scope of the [Provision of Service Regulations²](#)). Service users receive some benefits from the PoSRs and there may be some scope to explore the impact on service users as well.

BEIS is seeking interim outputs by the end of March 2022 and final outputs by the end of May 2022.

Background to the PoSRs

The PoSRs transposed the 2006 EU Services Directive into UK law and were amended in 2014 and 2018 (with the 2018 amendment being further amended in 2020) through separate legislation. Amendments did not substantially change the nature of the PoSRs and thus the legislation is retained EU law. The PoSRs protect UK businesses and consumer rights by maintaining obligations on UK competent authorities to ensure that their regulation of service activity is proportionate and justified in the public interest. They also contain obligations for service providers, and for HMG. The regulations:

- prevent competent authorities from imposing disproportionate or unnecessary requirements on businesses who seek to provide services in the UK;
- require competent authorities to, under certain circumstances, notify the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) of new requirements affecting access to, or the exercise of, a service activity;
- require the UK Government to maintain an online facility for information dissemination and the processing of authorisation applications;
- set out the duties of businesses, detailing the requirements for contact details and other information to be made available for service recipients.

These requirements are expected to have significant impacts on the stakeholders it affects (discussed further in section 2 below), which BEIS is interested in evaluating through this

¹ In these Regulations “competent authority” means a body or authority having supervisory or regulatory functions in the United Kingdom in relation to service activities (and includes in particular a professional body, professional association or other professional organisation, that regulates access to, or the exercise of, a service activity).

² Please note that the most current version of the PoSRs available online does not incorporate amendments made in the Provision of Services (Amendment etc.) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018 (the latter was, in turn amended by the Professional Qualifications and Services (Amendments and Miscellaneous Provisions) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020). The 2018 and 2020 amendments were to bring the original Regulations in line with the UK’s then pending exit from the EU.

research. A key benefit of ensuring the above is that UK businesses and consumers do not face excessive administrative burdens. A summary table taken from the PoSRs [guidance](#) can be seen below. It should be noted that this is an overview and is not exhaustive. Further detail can be found in the PoSRs guidance document as well as through reviewing the legislation itself.

Parts of the Regulations	Brief description of the provisions
Part 1	Details on the definitions of 'service' and 'competent authority'.
Part 2	Service providers have a duty to provide their contact details and other information to service recipients, along with processes for submitting complaints.
Part 3	Competent authorities are required to provide a clear process for their authorisation scheme. Businesses cannot be prohibited from delivering a services activity due to an economic test, involvement of competing operators or other requirements such as quantitative or territorial restrictions, minimum number of employees etc.
Part 4 (Previously Part 6 in the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (as amended in 2014))	Competent authorities must clearly outline details of all documentation required from a service provider as part of the application. They must also ensure the availability of information and acceptance of applications through an electronic facility. Competent authorities cannot impose a total prohibition on the use of commercial communications by providers of a service who are carrying on a regulated profession, or oblige the provider to exercise a specific service activity exclusively and restrict the exercise, jointly or in partnership, of different activities.
Part 5 (Previously Part 7 in the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (as amended in 2014))	Competent authorities must provide information which is clear, unambiguous and shared via electronic means to providers and recipients on request. They must also ensure that the Secretary of State is updated with the most current information on the authorisation scheme they administer, and the requirements that are applicable to providers of the service.
Part 6 (Previously Part 8 in the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (as amended in 2014))	The Secretary of State is responsible for providing an electronic assistance facility for users.

Further information on recent statutory instruments

- The [Provision of Services \(Amendment etc.\) \(EU Exit\) Regulations 2018](#) amended the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 using powers under section 8 of the EU (Withdrawal) Act 2018 to deal with deficiencies arising from the UK's departure from the EU. The 2018 Regulations amended the 2009 Regulations to ensure that their deregulatory principles applied for the benefit of UK nationals, and businesses established in the UK and formed under UK law only, whereas previously they

applied for the benefit of EEA nationals and businesses. Although in practice many authorisation schemes will not distinguish between UK or EEA applicants, the UK's departure from the EU necessitated a change in the law. The 2018 Regulations did not otherwise engineer substantive policy changes in relation to the UK's own Internal Market.

- The Provision of Services (Amendment etc.) (EU Exit) Regulations 2018 were in turn amended by the Professional Qualifications and Services (Amendments and [Miscellaneous Provisions](#)) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020). The 2018 and 2020 amendments were to bring the original Regulations in line with the UK's then pending exit from the EU.

Businesses supported by the PoSRs

The Directive applies to services supplied by providers established in a Member State, with the following exemptions:

- Non-economic services of general interest;
- Financial services;
- Electronic communications services and networks;
- Services in the field of transport;
- Services of temporary work agencies;
- Healthcare services whether or not they are provided via healthcare facilities;
- Audiovisual services;
- Gambling activities;
- Activities which are connected with the exercise of official authority as set out in Article 45 of the Treaty;
- Social services;
- Private security services; and
- Services provided by notaries and bailiffs.

There are approximately 500 Competent Authorities in scope.

Previous research and evaluation

Prior engagement with competent authorities took place in 2020, with focus on the extent to which competent authorities were compliant with the PoSRs in practice, in light of how PoSRs obligations related to commitments made in the UK-EU Trade and Cooperation Agreement. In this instance 31 face to face interviews were conducted with competent authorities and service providers were not engaged.

An impact assessment was produced when developing the initial 2009 legislation which can be found in the [explanatory memorandum](#).

Associated legislation

Some sectors sit outside of the PoSRs.

The PoSRs apply horizontally to a large number of services sectors. Sectors that are excluded from the scope of the PoSRs (for example, financial services and transport

services) are governed by their own, sector specific legislation. This exercise will not be examining the impact of this sector specific legislation.

UK Internal Market Act 2020

The PoSRs and the UK Internal Market Act 2020 (UKIMA) are complementary pieces of legislation. Part 2 of UKIMA aims to restrict barriers to the flow of services within the different parts of the UK through applying the market access principles of mutual recognition³ and non-discrimination⁴. The PoSRs continue to provide an administrative framework for the regulation of all services within scope, alongside UKIMA.

The PoSRs previously contained non-discrimination provisions aimed at ensuring non-discrimination against EEA service providers. These provisions were repealed with effect from Implementation Period Completion Day (IPCD). With effect from IPCD, UKIMA introduced a new non-discrimination principle, replacing the relevant provisions of the PoSRs and applying solely for the benefit of UK service providers.

The PoSRs also contain mutual recognition provisions, which are similar to the mutual recognition principle of UKIMA. The mutual recognition provisions set out in the PoSRs continue to apply to authorisation requirements created prior to IPCD that remain substantively unchanged post-IPCD. Authorisation requirements created or substantively changed after IPCD would then be subject to the mutual recognition principle of the UKIMA instead.

The Regulators Code

Competent authorities will also be influenced by the [Regulator's Code](#). The code is principle-based, providing shorter and less prescriptive guidance than the PoSRs. Regulators are required to have regard to the code but if a regulator concludes, on the basis of material evidence, that a specific provision of the Code is either not applicable or is outweighed by another relevant consideration, the regulator is not bound to follow that provision, but should record that decision and the reasons for it. The [Enterprise Act 2016](#) requires regulators other than local authorities to formally report on the effect that the Regulators' Code has on the way they exercise their regulatory functions and the impacts of this on business. While

³ Mutual recognition ensures that an authorisation issued by a competent authority/regulator whose functions only extend to part of the UK (i.e. England, Wales, Northern Ireland or Scotland) will, subject to certain exceptions, allow that service provider to provide its services throughout the whole of the UK.

For example, the mutual recognition principle means that if a service provider is issued a licence which permits it to provide that service in Wales, then assuming that none of the exceptions apply, it will also be permitted to provide that service without the need for further authorisation in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

⁴ The principle of non-discrimination means that a regulatory requirement will have no effect on a service provider if it directly or indirectly discriminates against that service provider. Direct discrimination is where a regulator discriminates against a service provider based on their connection to a part of the UK (e.g., being based in one part of the UK). Indirect discrimination is where a regulatory requirement does not directly discriminate, but still puts an incoming service provider at a disadvantage compared to local service providers, or it has a significant adverse effect on competition in the market for that service.

the PoSRs apply UK-wide, the Regulator's code does not apply to all Devolved Administrations, for example with Scotland having its [own code](#).

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

Overall aim

This research project will evaluate the impact of the Provision of Services Regulations 2009 (PoSRs), and assess stakeholder views of the PoSRs.

The project will assess the effectiveness of the PoSRs in a post EU Exit context, and identify areas for improvement of the PoSRs.

Key research question

The legislation covers several aspects of service provision relating to authorisation processes, including, information requirements, complaints procedures, and transparency. This research project will seek to answer the following key research question:

- What are the impacts of the PoSRs, and to what extent are the PoSRs delivering on key objectives?

The impacts and outcomes for consideration are those listed in Table 1 below.

This includes impact on key stakeholders including competent authorities, service providers, and service recipients; and the extent the PoSRs serve the interests of these key stakeholders; as well as whether the obligations remain proportionate and relevant in a post EU Exit context.

When the initial legislation was developed in 2009, an [impact assessment](#) was developed, which identified the following key initial intended objectives:⁵

- Liberalise the EEA service sector, facilitating trade and further opening the market to competition;
- Reduce the uncertainty and administrative costs that service exporters currently face, thereby increasing the level of output, productivity, and the welfare of individuals in the UK;
- Create employment opportunities across different service sectors;
- Increase the choice and quality of services available to consumers whilst maintaining levels of consumer protection.

BEIS is interested in understanding the extent to which the PoSRs is delivering on the key objectives which remain relevant in a post EU Exit context. Bids should include proposals on how objectives that map onto quantitative measures (e.g. admin costs in terms of time saved and value of time, output, productivity etc.) could be evaluated using economic analysis, or other appropriate methods.

⁵ Please refer to the Explanatory Memorandum to the PoSRs (2009) No.2999 for further detail on the initial intended objectives of the 2006 EU Services Directive and the 2009 UK PoSRs.

Understanding the activities of stakeholders

The PoSRs place obligations on **competent authorities (CAs)** (bodies which regulate specific activities related to service provision) to provide clear processes and relevant information for obtaining authorisation to provide a service in the UK. They also place some requirements on **service providers**, and **BEIS Secretary of State**. Another key stakeholder group of the PoSRs is **service recipients**, who benefit from some of the requirements placed on CAs and service providers.

Each part of the PoSRs outlines specific requirements on each stakeholder group. To comply with these requirements, stakeholders engage in associated activities. BEIS expects this research to understand further the extent to which stakeholders undergo each of these activities.

Note, this is not a compliance exercise. However, understanding the nature of activities that stakeholders are undertaking will help inform the evaluation of associated outcomes and impacts that derive from these activities, and could help identify potential areas for improvement to the PoSRs.

Evaluating the direct and indirect impacts of the PoSRs on key stakeholders

BEIS is interested in better understanding how the PoSRs, in their current form, impact key stakeholder groups, in particular competent authorities and service providers. The below themes could be explored further through this research. This is not an exhaustive list of all possible outcomes/impacts and there may be ways in which the PoSRs impacts these stakeholders beyond those listed below.

Table 1: Impacts on key stakeholder groups (not an exhaustive list):

Section of the PoSRs	Potential outcomes and impacts on key stakeholder groups ⁶		
	Competent authorities	Service providers	Service recipients
Part 1	+ Clarity on regulations covering their sector	+ Clarity on regulations covering their sector	+ All sectors covered by some form of legislation
Part 2		- Resources needed to provide information, quotes, and complaints procedures - Costs resulting from consumers seeking redress from service providers	+ Able to assess best value for money and plan spending + Increased competition between service providers could result in services that are of a higher quality, more

⁶ Note, (+) indicates a potential positive impact and (-) indicates a potential negative impact.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Using feedback from complaints to improve service - Increased price competition from other service providers + Increased consumer confidence from accurate information, quotes and transparent processes is good for business 	<p>innovative, and lower in price</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Consumers being made aware of their rights and channels of redress available to them will incentivise providers to provide services of a higher quality and deter them from engaging in non-compliant behaviour + Increase in confidence in service providers due to accurate information + Being able to voice dissatisfaction more easily and receive response to complaints - Price increases of services due to resource implications of quotes etc. for service providers
Part 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resources needed to provide information and ensure criteria is met → increased cost + Being able to assess and improve service through established criteria (e.g. proportionality) → fulfilling the regulatory role of ensuring high quality service provision + Reduced bureaucracy from removal of the option to receive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Increased ease of market entry for potential entrants + Resources needed to apply for authorisations/renewal of authorisations → reduced costs + Improved access to obtaining authorisations + reduced regulatory burden on service providers → increased ease of market entry → 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Increased number of providers competing in the market can lead to reduced prices, more choice, better quality of service + Public interest criteria ensures that the interests of service recipients (e.g. safety, high quality services) is met

	<p>recurring applications following expiry (excluding exempt instances)</p> <p>- Reduced flexibility on rule-setting</p>	increased competition for existing service providers	
Part 4	<p>- Increased resources required to set up and maintain electronic processes for displaying information transparently</p> <p>+ Increased efficiencies due to electronic processes → reduced admin burden and costs</p> <p>- Reduced flexibility on rule-setting</p>	<p>+ Due to being able to make commercial communications → improves ease of service provision</p> <p>+ Being able to perform an unrestricted range of activities → reduced barriers to entry into other service sectors</p> <p>+ Easier documentation requirements lead to reduced costs/barriers to entry</p> <p>- Increased ease of entry resulting in increased competition for existing providers</p> <p>+ Increased clarity and access to updated information from CA's → reduced admin burden and costs</p>	<p>+ Being able to contact CA about any concerns</p> <p>+ Benefitting from increased competition which may reduce prices and increase quality</p> <p>+ Increased information and choice through commercial communication</p> <p>- Limited restriction on communication may lead to negative impact (overwhelmed, being convinced to spend more than able to etc.)</p>
Part 5	<p>- Increased resources needed to provide information of any changes to HMG and following any requests by service providers/recipients → increased cost</p>	+ Increased assurance readily available access to information	+ Increased assurance readily available access to information
Part 6	+ Increased awareness of where CAs exist →	+ Being able to more easily identify which authorisations are	+ Being able to more easily identify which authorizations

	Increased compliance on CA requirements + Some admin burden shifted from CAs to government → coordination benefits as a one-stop shop exists	needed (in cases where multiple are needed they can easily access all in one place) → (+) reduction in search costs and (+) reduced risk of non-compliance	are needed → Increased assurance
--	---	--	----------------------------------

Improving the evidence base on stakeholder sentiment toward the PoSRs

BEIS' evidence base is currently very limited on how key stakeholders view PoSRs.

The OECD Services Trade Restrictiveness Index (STRI) indicates that treatment of intra-UK services trade is relatively free from overt discrimination, and regulatory inconsistency is quite limited.

However, BEIS is interested in views of stakeholders regarding the extent to which objectives are being met and whether any improvements to the PoSRs could be beneficial.

Identifying areas for improvement of the PoSRs

Minister of State at the Cabinet Office, Lord Frost, recently announced a [full review](#) of all retained EU Law (REUL). This includes the Provision of Services Regulations. BEIS is interested in strengthening the evidence base in advance of this review, in order to better understand the scope for any potential improvement of the PoSRs.

3. Suggested Methodology

Scoping the research

1. Theory of Change

An initial scoping study should be conducted for BEIS and contractors to agree on a Theory of Change for the PoSRs, identifying key outcomes and impacts to evaluate in this research. BEIS will provide a draft theory of change for review.

2. Develop research methodology

A clear methodology for evaluating these outcomes and impacts should be developed, setting out key analytical challenges to overcome, as well as the feasibility and limitations of the chosen approach. This approach should be agreed between BEIS and contractors.

Key challenges and potential approach

A key challenge with this research project is a lack of existing monitoring and enforcement data to establish a baseline/counterfactual.

As such, we anticipate that the main research methods for this project will be a combination of surveys and/or stakeholder interviews of the main stakeholder groups (Competent

Authorities, Service Providers). There is a potential to extend the research further to explore impacts of the PoSRs on service recipients if a suitable approach can be agreed between BEIS and contractors.

The methods used may vary between stakeholder group, due to large differences across the three groups in terms of a) sample size, and b) pre-existing awareness and knowledge of the PoSRs and how these regulations impact them. There are a number of risks that will need to be managed, including on response rates.

Whilst the methodology outlined below is likely most feasible given the existing evidence base, BEIS welcomes bidders to consider other evaluation tools that could be used to evaluate outcomes and impacts of the PoSRs on Competent Authorities, Service Providers, and Service Recipients. This includes thinking on scope to conduct quasi-experimental analysis.

Competent Authority survey or interviews

A survey approach, in-depth interviews, or a mixed approach could be used to establish outcomes and impacts of the regulation. A mixed approach could include in-depth interviews, in order to support design of a survey or explore survey findings in more depth and utilise both quantitative and qualitative evidence to support policy conclusions.

The chosen research approach will ensure that evidence is collected either from the whole population or a reliable and representative sample of competent authorities, which may require stratification of the population (using characteristics such as different sectors, types of competent authorities, geographic location etc.). The approach will consider the most appropriate method and mode (e.g. in the case of a survey, this could be an online survey or telephone interviews) to gather robust evidence from competent authorities and data processing will be GDPR compliant.

Where applicable consideration will need to be given to a) expected response rate, b) awareness of the PoSRs, c) defining the sample and ensuring it is representative (e.g. competent authorities across different sectors, different type of competent authorities etc.), d) non-response bias (and systemic biases in respondents), e) unbiased responses (achieved through careful question design and order etc.), f) coverage error (e.g. through not being able to contact certain competent authorities), g) demand bias (this may be especially the case if competent authorities interpret the engagement as a compliance check), and h) interviewer bias.

BEIS will aim to provide the contractor details of competent authorities to support development of a sampling frame for the chosen survey, in-depth interviews, or mixed approach.

Service provider survey or interviews

The total population of service providers is much larger, with less awareness of how the PoSRs affect them as stakeholders. Again, in-depth interviews, surveys or a mixed approach could be used here.

The chosen research approach will ensure that evidence is collected from a reliable and representative sample of service providers, which will require stratification of the population (using characteristics such as sector, size of business, geographic location etc.). The approach will consider the most appropriate method and mode (e.g. in the case of a survey, this could be an online survey or telephone interviews) to gather robust evidence from service providers and data processing will be GDPR compliant.

Where applicable consideration will need to be given to a) expected response rate, b) awareness of the PoSRs, c) defining the sample and ensuring it is representative (e.g. service providers across different sectors, business size, geographic location, etc.), d) non-response bias (and systemic biases in respondents), e) unbiased responses (achieved through careful question design and order etc.), f) coverage error (e.g. through not being able to contact certain service providers), g) demand bias (this may be especially the case if service providers interpret the engagement as a compliance check), and h) interviewer bias.

If required, BEIS will aim to provide the contractor with a relevant sampling frame for services providers (e.g. [Inter-Departmental Business Register](#)).

Consideration of the outcomes and impacts on service recipients

BEIS is interested in finding out more about the specific ways in which the PoSRs impacts service recipients as a key stakeholder, particularly the extent to which their interests are protected effectively by the PoSRs requirements. Unlike with competent authorities and service providers, a survey and/or interview approach may not be the most effective way to assess this. Bids should suggest proposals for how this research will capture the impacts on recipients.

Identifying ideas for improvement of the PoSRs

Depending on findings from the evaluation and wider evidence, recommendations on how to improve policy interventions/legislation should be put forward.

Monitoring and enforcement of compliance with the PoSRs

BEIS is also interested in improving its understanding of the extent to which there is compliance and whether there is any scope for improvements to the monitoring and enforcement of the regulations. One approach to this could be to web-scrape where appropriate, to understand the extent to which service provider comply with reporting requirements.

Collation and review of additional evidence useful for evaluation of impacts

The evaluators are responsible for collecting or collating additional evidence that would add value to the process of evaluation and outcomes evidence. This is not expected to require primary data collection, but instead would draw on relevant data in the public domain sourced via desk research, or additional data that stakeholders, in particular Competent Authorities, may be able to provide.

4. Deliverables

Initial scoping documents

Timing of the delivery of these initial scoping documents should be outlined in bids. Suggested timelines below.

1. Theory of Change for the PoSRs

An outline of the intended scope of the evaluation, including a detailed Theory of Change for the PoSRs, out of which clear themes and impacts to be evaluated through the research are drawn.

2. Scope, methodology and feasibility assessment

This is expected to outline key stakeholders that will be covered, and the extent to which each stakeholder will be focussed on in each stage of the research. It will further outline details on sample sizes anticipated for each of the stakeholder group populations where surveys or interviews are being undertaken.

Use of any other evaluation tools in the social science field, including quasi-experimental programme evaluation methods to evaluate specific outcomes and impacts of the PoSRs is favourable. Bids should specify where they intend to draw upon evidence gathered using these alternative evaluation approaches in the final evaluation report.

This document will also outline a clear methodology intended to be carried out. Feasibility of this intended methodology, outlining any anticipated challenges with the chosen approach should be detailed in bids.

Final evaluation report

Bids should be clear about associated timelines for the delivery of the impact evaluation report, including any interim drafts, but to meet the need for identifying ideas for improvement of the PoSRs, it is expected that this report (and associated outputs) is delivered by the end of May 2022. It is expected that bids are clear about what content will be included in the report.

The research should tell us the extent to which the PoSRs have contributed to the outcomes and impacts set out in the Theory of Change developed during the scoping phase of the project.

Raw data outputs

In addition to the feasibility assessment and evaluation reports, BEIS expects all underlying raw datasets to be provided so these can be used in any further analysis. This includes:

- Dataset of the quantitative research; any additional data sources used to evaluate the impacts of the PoSRs; and
- any data from other sources which supports analysis in the final report.

Quality assurance documentation

All bids should describe the quality assurance processes that will be applied to different activities and outputs associated with this evaluation project. A summary outlining these processes is expected. Where the bidder intends to provide additional outputs relating to quality assurance, they should detail these in their bid.

Ethics arrangements and documentation

BEIS requires all bids to identify and propose arrangements for initial scrutiny and on-going monitoring of ethical issues. The appropriate handling of ethical issues is part of the tender assessment exercise and proposals will be evaluated on this as part of the 'addressing challenges and risks' criterion.

We expect contractors to adhere to the following ethical principles for Government Social Research:

1. clear and defined public benefit;
2. sound application, conduct and interpretation;
3. data protection regulations;
4. specific and informed consent;
5. enabling participation; and
6. minimising personal and social harm.

Expected working arrangements with the contractor

Given the short timelines for the project, we would like to have regular weekly catch-ups with contractors.

Timetable

Timelines	Activities/ Deliverables
W1 – W2	Scoping assessment (2 weeks)
W3	Agree on methodological approach with BEIS (1 week)
W4 – W9	Develop and conduct primary and secondary research (7 weeks)
W10	Share data from primary and secondary research and outputs with BEIS (1 week)
W11 – 13	Write up results (3 weeks)
W14 – W15	Share report with BEIS for comment (2 weeks)
W16-17	Review and finalise report (2 weeks)
W18	Deliver final report and presentation (1 week)

Provide a detailed timetable for carrying out the work based on your proposed approach and method, following the approximate timings outlined above.

This should highlight key milestones and deadlines, including suggested meetings and progress reports.

Staff

Provide a list of the staff that will be involved in the project at all levels from director, project manager and all other levels involved. The list should briefly highlight relevant experience, their role in the project; their estimated time to be spent on the project and the length of time they have spent working with your organisation. State the name of the project manager and a designated deputy.

Understanding the environment

Demonstrate your understanding of the project environment, detailing your team's experience and knowledge relevant to the project and policy/programme area, including any data sources or research relevant to the project.

Contract break points

There will be a break clause at the end of Week 3, after the scoping stage has been completed. This break point allows BEIS staff to review BEIS requirements and to ensure the project will be delivered to timelines and quality.

There will be a second break clause at the end of Financial Year 2021/22, after the delivery of data and outputs from the primary and secondary research. This break point allows BEIS to manage the spend which extends into the next Financial Year.