UKSBS

Shared Business Services

Commissioning Letter

Technopolis Limited
3 Pavilion Buildings
Brighton
BN1 1EE

Tuesday, 5th March 2019

Dear Sirs

BEIS Research and Evaluation Framework Agreement – Lot 1
BEIS Official Development Assistance (ODA) – Development of KPIs
CR19009

Thank you for your response to the Specification for the above commission by the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) (the Customer) through the BIS Research and Evaluation Framework dated 2 January 2016 between (1) Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills; and (2) Technopolis Limited (the Framework Agreement).

Appendix A: Specification for Enforcing the enhancement of energy efficiency regulations in the English private rented sector
Appendix B: Tender dated 8th February 2019

This contract shall commence on Wednesday, 6th March 2019 and shall end on Friday, 28th June 2019.

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy accepts your Tender (Appendix B), submitted in response to our Specification (Appendix A). Technopolis Limited shall undertake the services in alignment with the specification in Appendix A and their bid submitted in Appendix B.

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 £29,965.00 exclusive of VAT which should be added at the prevailing rate. This contract shall not exceed £29,965.00.00 in alignment with the following commercial breakdown:

OFFICIAL-SENSITIVE (COMMERCIAL)

AW5.2 Price Schedule

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

Please ensure that you DO NOT alter this spreadsheet. Any alterations may result in your Pricing being disqualified.

SOURCING REFERENCE:	CR19009
SOURCING DOCUMENT TITLE:	BEIS Official Development Assistance (ODA) – Development of KPIs
BIDDER NAME	Technopolis Limited

Please complete the shaded yellow sections only.

Please note that the staff costs in section 1 cell D22 should equal the staff costs outlined in section 2. Section 2 provide further detail around the project team and the distribution of staff days.

The figure used for evaluation is the total Cost (ex VAT) provided in Section 1 (cell D22). The total cost is the total staff costs (ex VAT) and the total Travel and Subsistence, Overhead costs, cost of production of materials and any/all costs associated with the delivery of the project (ex VAT).

Section 1: Total Project Costs (Summary)

Objective

Job Title	Standard Rate/Fees excluding VAT (£/Day)	Discounted Rate/Fees excluding VAT (£/Day)	Objective Area (Please Select)	Number of Days	Travel and Subsistence, Overhead costs, cost of production of materials and any/all costs associated with the delivery of the project (ex VAT)	Total Staff Cost (ex VAT)	Total Cost (ex VAT)
			1. Review of DP Data Collection/Compilation				
			4. Analysis and Drafting				
			7. Meetings				
			1. Review of DP Data Collection/Compilation				
			3. Interviews x 10				
			4. Analysis and Drafting				
			5. Consultation with DPs and Newton				
			6. Project management				
			7. Meetings				
			1. Review of DP Data Collection/Compilation				
			3. Interviews x 10				
			4. Analysis and Drafting				
			5. Consultation with DPs and Newton				
			1. Review of DP Data Collection/Compilation				
			2. Review of KPIs in other ODA funds				
			4. Analysis and Drafting				
			1. Review of DP Data Collection/Compilation				
			2. Review of KPIs in other ODA funds				
			4. Analysis and Drafting				
			5. Consultation with DPs and Newton				
			8. Other Costs				
			Please Select				
			Please Select				
			Please Select				
			Please Select				
			Please Select				

TOTAL STAFF COSTS	£	£ 29,325.00	£ 29,965.00

Notes:
Day rate is for 8 hr day
Half day rate is for 4 hrs

The invoice schedule to be agreed at inception meeting.

All invoices should be sent to should be sent to finance@services.uksbs.co.uk or Billingham (UKSBS, Queensway House, West Precinct, Billingham, TS23 2NF). A copy of the invoice should be sent to ███████████

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 6th March 2019.

The Completion date is 28th June 2019.

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: CR19009

The Authorised Representative for this Commission will be ███████████ who can be contacted at ████████████████████████

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.

Yours sincerely

██████████ – Category Manager
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 and Industrial Strategy

Name and Title	
Signature	
Date	6/3/2019.

Signed on behalf of Technopolis Limited

Name and Title	
Signature	
Date	5 March 2019

- Appendix A Specification

1. Background

Official Development Assistance (ODA) is provided by official agencies (including state and local governments) with the promotion of economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective. ODA is monitored by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). ODA funded activity focuses on promoting the long-term sustainable growth of countries on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list.

BEIS research and innovation ODA is delivered through the already established Newton Fund, through the new Global Challenges Research fund (GCRF) and ODA spend from the core science and research budget. The ODA Governance Board chaired by the Minister for Universities and Science provides oversight of all BEIS ODA funds.

BEIS is committed to undertaking a robust and thorough monitoring and evaluation of GCRF and Newton. Given the size of the GCRF and Newton contribution to overall ODA activity (circa £2bn over the Spending Review period), the funds will come under significant external scrutiny, from within the UK from HMT, NAO and DfID, but also from ICAI and OECD.

It is essential that BEIS can provide robust evidence that the Funds are on course to deliver significant impact. The Department is now developing key performance indicators (KPIs) which can operate across all the ODA spend to improve its monitoring of outcomes and impact of the spend. The study will provide guidance on the most appropriate and practical KPIs to be rolled out across our delivery partners. This will allow for more transparent reporting of the spend and contribute to ongoing and proposed evaluations.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

BEIS is wishing to appoint contractors with expertise in both ODA monitoring and evaluation, and understanding of the research base environment, to work with the in-house team to develop key performance indicators for its ODA spend. The aim of this project is to determine the most effective measures of performance across the BEIS research and innovation ODA funds. It is anticipated that these indicators will consist of a core set of cross-fund KPIs but could also include some fund specific KPIs where necessary. Its objectives are to answer the following key questions:

- What is the full extent of information delivery partners regularly collect on the outputs, outcomes and impact of their ODA spend?

- Can this information be used to form a comprehensive set of performance indicators?

- What are the gaps in the available data and can these be filled with adjustments to existing data collection systems?

- What approaches are used by other ODA programmes and funds and could these be translated across to BEIS Research ODA?

3. Suggested Methodology

The focus of this project is the development of key performance indicators and it is expected that contractors will conduct a review of delivery partners grant records and other databases and review of approaches adopted by other programmes. This will be supplemented by qualitative interviews with delivery partners to better understand how data is collected and any caveats around quality and accuracy. We also expect interviews will take place with other fund managers to understand how their KPIs operate. This work will build on work already underway for the Newton Evaluation and the foundation stage GCRF Evaluation. In detail the project will:

- Review existing indicator data collected by Delivery Partners
- Review academic databases (eg ResearchFish)
- Review what other funds and research initiative are doing for KPIs (inc. ICF, Prosperity, Fleming, Innovate UK, UKRI, etc)
- Provide summary of review findings
- Consult with BEIS and DPs

4. Deliverables

Key deliverables will be:

- A final report which contains:
  - a review of the current data collection surrounding ODA activities and what related data is currently held by delivery partners
  - a brief review of the KPIs for similar other ODA programmes
  - recommendations on the most appropriate and practical KPIs to roll out for regular reporting.
- A presentation will likely be made to summarise the key findings and explain our approach.

- **Appendix B – Tender Response**

technopolis   itad

PROJ1.1 Approach

- Aims and objectives

BEIS spends Official Development Assistance (ODA) on research and innovation through the Newton Fund, the Global Challenges Research fund (GCRF), and ODA spend from the core science and research budget.

The Global Challenge Research Fund (GCRF) is a £1.5 billion fund to ensure that the UK's world-leading research takes a major role in pioneering new ways to tackle global problems faced by low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The Fund achieves this through supporting challenge-led disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, strengthening capacity, partnerships and networks for research and innovation within LMICs, as well as providing an agile response to emergencies where there is an urgent research need. The primary delivery partners (DPs) for the GCRF are UKRI, including the Research Councils and Innovate UK, the National Academies, the devolved higher education funding councils, and the UK Space Agency (UKSA).

The aim of this assignment is to work with the BEIS in-house team develop a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The KPIs are to be used to determine the most effective measures of performance across BEIS' ODA-funded research and innovation by answering the following key questions (paraphrased from the tender specification): (1) What is the full extent of information collected by DPs? (2) Can this information be used to create a set of KPIs? (3) If so, what are the gaps and how might these be filled? (4) And, what approaches by other similar ODA programmes or funds can be drawn upon?

We understand that the intention is that this assignment will link to work on BEIS ODA-funded KPIs for the Newton Fund. The resultant set of KPIs will include some that are specific to each fund (Newton and GCRF) and some that are common to both.

The resultant set of KPIs (both cross-fund and fund-specific) will have a number of uses:

- To **continuously monitor and assess the results** of research programmes / funds, including the efficiency of their management
- To **inform decisions,** on-going learning, and support appropriate, timely action
- To **provide effective and relevant departmental reporting** on ODA-funded research and innovation
- To ensure that the information gathered will **effectively support an evaluation**

The use of the KPIs in these different ways will help support BEIS in its robust monitoring and evaluation of the GCRF and the Newton Fund; both to *improve* its performance and *prove* its achievements. This is especially important as ODA funding for research and innovation is subject to significant scrutiny from within the UK, including from HM Treasury, the National Audit Office (NAO), the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI), and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) – as well as the attention of non-governmental organisations and the public.

- Our approach and methodology

A common challenge with developing KPIs is creating indicators that are both straightforward to collect and use while simultaneously capturing the essence of good performance (itself often more complex). KPIs can be deceptively simple and yet be underpinned by significant data collection and methodological challenges. For example the International Climate Finance (ICF) indicators on *'people with access to clean energy'* or *'hectares of deforestation and degradation avoided'* have several pages of definitions and methodologies that require a relatively high level of effort to process the data. As such, there is often a trade-off between *what is possible* to collect data on (e.g. numbers of LMIC research partners, number of training events, etc), with *what is desirable* to know (e.g. meaningful engagement between UK and LMIC partners, building challenge-orientated capabilities, etc.). It is easy to fall into common traps like 'measuring everything that is easy to measure' or assuming that 'lots of information is better than no information'.

challenge funds); the Fleming Fund in Department of Health; and other international development

grants (crowdsourced by the particip

tor

PROJ1.4 Staff to Deliver

* Delivery team – overview

Itad and Technopolis have partnered to pull together an in-house team to support BEIS in developing the key performance indicators (KPIs) for its ODA spend. Itad and Technopolis are presently collaborating on the delivery of the evaluation foundation stage for the Global Challenge Research Fund (GGRF), delivering support for development of the Theory of Change, a process evaluation and development of an evaluation strategy. To deliver this assignment, our team will build on our knowledge of BEIS and its use of ODA for research and innovation. Our proposed core team is able to respond to the critical conditions for the success of this assignment through a combination of: in-depth expertise of implementing and evaluating research initiatives; a deep understanding of research systems in the UK, amongst DAC member countries, and in low to middle income countries; as well as a thorough knowledge of the context, including current thinking within BEIS around the GCRF.

* Team members

* ███████████████████ ███ is the Partner for Technical Excellence at Itad with expertise in impact evaluation and   ⟨   methodologies, particularly in the fields of social investments, livelihoods, civil society, and governance. As a member of Itad's senior leadership, he   technical delivery, including quality assurance, learning and knowledge sharing. ███ is an Honorary Associate at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and was fo   Director (now Board member) of the Centre for Development Impact (CDI), a joint initiative between IDS, Itad and the University of East Anglia. His current research interests include innovative   evaluate impact and causality, power imbalances, and the ethics of evaluation. ███ is an experienced team leader and project director of several high-profile evaluations, such as the 10-year study of CDC's mobilisation, and the Millennium Villages Project in Ghana. He directs the M&E component of DFID's Ideas to Impact programme, which awards innovation prizes that seek solutions to poverty in areas of climate change, energy and water. He has previously worked on the Mid-Term Review of DFID's Research Into Use programme, value for money (VFM) and governance indicators for DFID,[1] and VFM studies for the NAO.

* ████████████████████████ ███ is Managing Director of Technopolis UK. He has been involved in science, technology and   (STI) policy consulting since the late 1980s, having carried out multiple studies and evaluations for most of the GCRF partners. He is currently leading evaluations of the Diamond Light Source and UK involvement in CERN, both for the Science and Technologies Facilities Council (STFC) and has carried out various other evaluations of collaborative research programmes and international fellowship schemes for each of the other UK research councils. He recently completed a review of the drivers and barriers of international cooperation in research and innovation for BEIS and was centrally involved with the GCRF Foundation Stage Evaluation. He is undertaking a strategic review for the Rwanda national research and innovation strategy.

* ███████████ █████████████ combines over 30 years of academic and solid field- level
    programme   with I   positions in organisations, including Director and Co-

Chair of Itad. He is currently President of the UK Evaluation Society (UKES). Julian's technical skills span strategy, monitoring and evaluation using both qualitative and quantitative approaches, research and value for money audit, across a wide range of development sectors including governance and policy uptake, private sector/market-led development, agriculture and rural poverty, climate change, gender and social norms. He also has a substantial track record reviewing and evaluating i   concerned with research, knowledge management and communications: ███ was team leader for the GCRF Evaluation Foundation stage; Quality Assurer for the   of DFID's Building Capacity for the Use of Research Evidence (BCURE), and led the formulation of the 2010-2015 Strategy for Global Development Net (GDNet), a public International Organization that builds research capacity in development globally. He was team leader for the GDNet Output to Purpose Review; the Mid-Term Review of the Research Into Use programme; and, co-lead for the evaluation of Eldis and Mobilising Knowledge for Development (MK4D).

- ███████ ██████████ is a Senior Consultant at Technopolis Group and has extensive   as project   report author and analyst on a broad range of evaluations, policy and impact studies. He specialises foremost in studies relating to research funding and research impact, notably including the social sciences, and ranging from small scheme evaluations to organisational and international systemic perspectives. He has further expertise in innovation systems, evidence use for policymaking, research collaboration for   development, social policy and design-driven innovation. Most recently, ███ has carried out a major impact study of the European Social Survey (ESS) ERIC, as well   several evaluations for the Royal Society (UK) and the Swiss National Science Foundation and is involved in the currently ongoing Foundation Evaluation of GCRF. Peter has over 5 years of consulting experience with Technopolis, and holds a doctorate in Sociology, awarded by the University of Sussex. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts (RSA), an Associate Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.

- ███████ ██████████ is an Itad staff consultant with 9 years' experience, specialising in qualitative research methods, social development, and evidence-informed policy. ███ designs, manages and conducts research across a number of themes, and has   of   range of innovative qualitative and mixed-methods approaches to impact evaluation. She has applied contribution analysis, realist evaluation and process tracing in several multi-year impact evaluations – including the evaluations of DFID-   ɛ BCURE programmes. Previously employed in DFID's Research and Evidence Division, ███ was responsible for research uptake, impact and communications projects to improve   ce informed policy for DFID.

- ███████ ██████████ is a consultant at Technopolis-Group. His main areas of

He is the project managing the process evaluation element for the foundation evaluation of the Global Challenges Research Fund that is in the last stages of completion. This has involved four surveys, over 60 interviews and extensive secondary data analysis across 13 delivery partners. He is also project manager on the deep dive study of the British Council's Newton Fund programmes in Latin America that uses process tracing to showcase the Council's added value ure monitoring and evaluation. Prior to ███ in Medical Education at Sheffield Medical School.

- ████████████ ███ is a highly accomplished researcher with 5 years of experience in international deve and strengthened grantee monitoring and evaluation systems for a Zanzibar Government/ European Union civil society strengthening programme. She is currently, conducting doctoral research on the employment of innovative, context-driven, 'politically smart, locally led' foreign aid models by DFID and its partners, in Uganda and Mozambique.

1.3 Maintaining the ability to successfully deliver throughout the life of the programme

We are fully committed to delivering a high-quality product and believe that work of this quality is best guaranteed by prioritising use of staff members in our evaluation team in whose capacity and expertise we are fully versed. All but one of the team are employees of Itad or Technopolis, providing us an exceptionally high level of resource control, continuity and prioritisation of inputs – locking the scheduled days into internal workplans. The external ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ is a member of Itad's Research Analyst Roster, and ha project management systems and procedures which will be used to ensure a smoothly running project and that the expectations for each team member are clearly communicated, both verbally and contractually.

PROJ1.3 Understanding the Project Environment

1.1 Our understanding of the project context and what is required

The UK is already a **world leader in international development** and its **research is world class**. Both the Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) and the Newton Fund aim to further strengthen this position and, "*ensure UK science takes the lead in addressing the problems faced by developing countries, whilst developing our ability to deliver cutting-edge research*". This is consistent with the guiding principle of the UK's Aid Strategy, "*that the UK's development spending will meet our moral obligation to the world's poorest and also support our national interest*".

The GCRF (a £1.5 billion fund, running from 2016-2021) was announced in 2015 to harness the expertise of the UK's research base to pioneer new ways of tackling global challenges. Its way of working stress interdisciplinarity and building partnerships in developing countries. These principles signal an ambition "*to achieve a positive transformational impact on development research and on sustainable global development*". The aim is to deploy UK research excellence in a strategic way to "*generate solutions to the most significant and complex problems faced by developing countries while at the same time strengthening their research capability*".

The overarching rationale behind GCRF is that **complex development challenges require new kinds of research and innovation.** The Fund uses a set of challenge areas, based on the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) , to provide an overarching framework for these two domains (research and development) to come together in a new way by increasing the scope and depth of research activities. The assumption is that new kinds of research and innovation are needed to tackle these challenges, including work that is interdisciplinary, mobilises multi-stakeholder partnerships across the global North and South, and across sectoral boundaries, to build lasting research and innovation capabilities and infrastructures in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs). As a secondary objective, GCRF aims to build the reputation of UK research and innovation as global leaders in addressing global challenges.

Using 'aid money' in this way also brings **a high degree of scrutiny.** Since 2015, the UK government has made a legal commitment to invest 0.7 per cent of GNI on Official Development Assistance (ODA), and for each subsequent calendar year. Recently, ODA spending has begun to shift from DFID to other government departments: five years ago, DFID accounted for 88.6% of UK ODA, falling to 71.9% by 2017, while other government departments almost doubled their proportion over the period, from 9.4% (2013) to 18.3% (2017). Of this contribution, the largest non-DFID 'departmental' share of ODA was from BEIS, at 5.4 per cent.[7] To meet BEIS' legal requirements for the use of ODA, it is necessary comply with internationally agreed definitions, most notably the need for it to directly address poverty and gender inequality.

In addition to the regular lines of scrutiny (such as departmental reporting to HM Treasury, and the National Audit Office studies), the **International Commission for Aid Impact** (ICAI) provides

specific scrutiny for the aid spend. ICAI reports to Parliament through the House of Commons International Development Committee. In September 2017, ICAI published a review of GCRF recommending that (amongst other things): *"BEIS should develop a results framework for assessing the overall performance, impact and value for money of the GCRF portfolio, drawing on DFID's guidelines on value for money in research and evidence programming"*. ICAI is also undertaking a performance review of the Newton Fund, due out in April 2019, and each year, ICAI conducts a follow-up review on the government's response to the recommendations it made in previous reviews. As such, there will be follow- up reviews of both the ICAI studies of GCRF and the Newton Fund.

As part of addressing the ICAI recommendation for GCRF to 'develop a results framework...', Itad has been working in collaboration with Technopolis and Kings College London to undertake the Foundation stage for the evaluation for the GCRF. This includes a theory of change, a process evaluation and an evaluation strategy. We therefore understand that this assignment - **to develop Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for ODA spend** - fits within this overall context. Specifically, we understand that these KPIs will support:

- Addressing **ICAI's recommendations** to improve the monitoring and evaluation of performance, impacts and value for money for GCRF; which at its core is ensuring that ODA is correctly used to promote, *"the economic development and welfare of developing countries"* (with research considered legitimate as far as it is, *"directly and primarily relevant to the problems of developing countries"*).[13]

- BEIS with **reporting to key stakeholders**, such as departmental reporting to HM Treasury, or to the Research and Innovation ODA Board (which also oversees the Newton Fund).

- Providing a **timely and credible source of learning and evidence** for BEIS and its Delivery Partners (DPs) to support course corrections and adapt its research and innovation programmes. Performance data (like KPIs) may also be used to support future bids to HM Treasury for further funding and continuation.

- **Cross-fund and cross-Whitehall initiatives**, such as the cross-Whitehall Strategic Coordination of Research (SCOR) Board (supported by UK Collaborative on Development Research, UKCDR). The UKCDR has for instance, recently produced a new strategy (2018-2022) and is presently refreshing its own theory of change, monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

1.2 Ensuring successful delivery

Although we do not anticipate that they will be needed here, we also have procedures to deal with poor performance of team members, subcontractors or project components, For example, substandard or non-delivery of agreed deliverables will be addressed as follows: (1) a review meeting with the project team and client to identify the causes of the poor performance; (2) assessment of the implications for the assignment, including what may need to be adjusted – particularly if there have been unforeseen events or delays caused by external factors beyond our control; (3) if significant problems remain, an agreement on an improvement plan to

highlight key milestones and delivery dates; and (4) increased monitoring from the Partner at Itad on key deliverables.

Itad is a strongly values-driven organization committed to making international development more effective. Our **Code of Ethics** sets out specific guidance for the behaviour of our staff. It is underpinned by our company values and sets out the minimum standards of behaviour and compliance. Where appropriate, the Code refers to any legal requirements, other regulations, and company policy. The code of conduct cuts across the full range of potential ethical issues that might arise in our work in including professional conduct; good governance and anti-bribery,

equality and anti-discrimination; responsibilities to staff and environmental impact. With regard to the ethical focus needed for this assignment – the need in particular for data protection and confidentiality, throughout the data collection and review process.

1.3 Using relevant knowledge to enable successful delivery

We will apply our existing knowledge of BEIS, previous consultations with the DPs, and our knowledge of the GCRF, to enable the successful delivery this assignment. In particular, Itad and Technopolis have been delivering the Foundation stage for the evaluation of the GCRF, and this provides us with **a number of insights that will enhance our successful delivery**:

- **Knowledge of ways of working for BEIS and its DP's.** We will work collaboratively with BEIS to ensure the KPIs meet their requirements, but we also understand that BEIS staff have limited time to apply specifically to this assignment. Rather than proceed with lengthy consultations throughout, we will use our knowledge to selectively engage BEIS (and other DPs) at key points: (1) the kick-off / expectations meeting; (2) when sharing the draft set of KPIs; and, (3) the presentation and feedback on finalisation of the KPIs,

- As part of the previous Foundation stage assignment, we have already undertaken **a process evaluation of the first years of GCRF calls**. This provides our team with a thorough understanding of the existing datasets (e.g. ResearchFish, Gateway to Research), the gaps, and any limits in using this data for new KPIs. It also means that we can deploy quickly and don't need a lot of time to get up to speed. For the process evaluation we have undertaken: (1) Documentary analysis of GCRF programmes; (2) Composition analysis. Collection and analysis of metadata on programmes, projects, applicants and Panel Members collected by each Delivery Partner (DP) for their GCRF activities; (3) Online surveys of GCRF grant holders, co-applicants and partners; (4) An online survey of unsuccessful applicants and GCRF panel members.

- **GCRF theory of change** (ToC). In developing the ToC, we have a thorough understanding of GCRF's aims and the expected pathway to impact. This will help us identify indicators that best capture outputs-to-outcome processes, and where appropriate, from short-term to longer-term outcomes and impacts.

In addition, **Itad and Technopolis are able to draw on our expertise gained over decades in both UK research and international development.** Itad has focused on monitoring, evaluation, and learning for more than 30 years, primarily within international development where we have gained an international reputation for our innovative and rigorous approaches to evaluation. This includes relevant work on 'research-into-use' (GNet, IDSi, Eldis, MK4D, BCURE, etc). Technopolis, founded in in 1989, works at regional, national and international levels in the areas of evaluation and research, particularly of innovation, university and research institutes, new technologies, and clusters and branches of industry. See Staff Profiles for more details.

PROJ1.4 Project Plan and Timescales

In this section we outline our proposed plan and timescales. Figure 1 (overleaf) sets out the 6 steps of our approach and the tasks required to complete each step. The six steps are (as detailed in our 'PROJ1.1 Approach' section):

- Step 1: Agree principles and quality criteria
- Step 2: Review data sources and KPIs in other funds

- Step 3: Consult with the Newton Fund
- Step 4. Draft KPIs
- Step 5: Consult with DPs
- Step 6: Finalise KPIs

1.1 Timetable, and consultations

We are cognisant of the limited availability of BEIS staff and DPs for extensive consultations, and have therefore identified 'key moments' for engagement. These are:

- Firstly, an **initial call with BEIS staff to re-check expectations**, plus any matters arising from this proposal that may require adjustment. Chris Barnett (co-team leader) and Julian Barr (who led the GCRF Foundation stage) will take part in this call (detailed under Step 1).

- Secondly, once we have conducted the review of available data, existing KPIs and information from other Funds, **we will consult with the Newton Fund**. By doing the review first, this will enable us to be focused in our engagement with the Newton Fund stakeholders (Step 3).

- Thirdly, **we will consult with BEIS and respective DPs later on in the study**; once we have reviewed all datasets and conducted an in-house (Itad, Technopolis) workshop to develop the draft set of KPIs. The reason for holding this consultation later on in the assignment is so that we can engage around a draft set of KPIs, and be more focused on their refinement (than initial creation). This should provide a more efficient means of engagement for all. (Step 5).

- And lastly, **we will present the final report** (review and KPIs) to BEIS and DPs. As part of this finalisation stage, we will take on feedback and agree a set of KPIs. (Step 6).

1.2 Key milestones and deliverables

While there are a number of internal, intermediate write-ups that will occur throughout, our main deliverables are (as marked in Figure 1):

- **Deliverable 1A: Draft paper of KPIs.** This is our draft set of indicators around which we will consult with BEIS and the DPs (as part of Step 5).

- **Deliverable 1B: Revised KPIs and final report.** The report will include the earlier review of datasets, KPIs and other funds, and will provide an update of the set of KPIs (Step 6).

- **Deliverable 2: Presentation.** As mentioned above, we will present our report to BEIS (Step 6).

1.3 Preventing slippage, delivering on time

Both Itad and Technopolis have robust project management systems, clearly setting out responsibilities for tasks, planning these in advance, with regular communication to check that progress is on-track. The Co-team leader, Chris Barnett, will be ultimately accountable for delivery (on time, within budget, and of the right quality). He will work closely with Paul Simmonds, particularly for Step 2 (the review) which will be led and largely undertaken by Technopolis as a discrete piece of work (building on their Process Evaluation as part of the previous Foundation stage). The timing of this work has been designed to be completed before Easter (21st April), although in the timetable we have allowed an extra week afterwards to accommodate any leave / slippage. For a similar reason, we have scheduled the consultations with the Newton Fund (Step 3) for the week commencing 29th April to avoid potential clashes with the Easter holiday period. This, plus the main consultations with BEIS and DPs on the KPIs (Step 5) are scheduled in the latter part of the assignment, so that we can agree dates as soon as possible to avoid slippage. We have also scheduled the main deliverables (Step 6) for two weeks before the contract end-date, to allow for consultations and iterations as needed.

Figure 1: Workplan showing activities, timescale and responsibilities

Activity	Total Fee days
Step 1: Agree Principles and quality criteria	
1.1 Kick-off meetings, call with BEIS, clarify expectations	1
1.2 Refine quality criteria for assessing KPIs	0.5
Step 2: Review data sources and KPIs of other funds	
2.1 Review of existing indicator data collected by GCRF Delivery Partners	5
2.2 Review of academic databases (Research UK, etc)	2.75
2.3 Review of what other funds and research initiative are doing for KPIs (inc. ICF, Newton, Prosperity, Fleming, Innovate UK, UKRI etc, etc)	4
2.4 Summary of review findings	6
Step 3: Consult with the Newton Fund	
3.1 Meetings and exchanges with the Newton Fund	2
3.2 Document review and extraction of relevant Newton / cross-fund KPIs	1
Step 4: Draft KPIs	
4.1 In-house (Itad, Technopolis) workshop to collate a first cut of KPIs	6
4.2 Draft paper on KPIs. Deliverable 1A.	6.25
Step 5: Consult with DPs	
5.1 Consultation with BEIS	1
5.2 Visit / consultations with UKRI and other DPs	2
Step 6: Finalise KPIs	
5.3 Revised KPIs and draft report (summary of review, proposed KPIs, rec's). Deliverable 1B.	2.5
5.4 Presentation with BEIS. Deliverable 2.	1
5.5 Revised final report and submission	0.5
Total	**41.5**