DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Dear Sirs

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated Wednesday, 3rd February 2021, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

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

Order Number:	CR20147
From:	The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET (BEIS) ("Customer")
To:	Technopolis Limited, 3 Pavilion Buildings, Brighton, BN1 1EE ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	Friday, 5th February 2021
Expiry Date:	Thursday, 31st March 2022

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

Key Individuals:	[redacted] - BEIS [redacted] - Technopolis Limited

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	The Customer shall pay the Supplier the sum of £233,875.00 for delivery of these Services (Phases 1 and 2). [redacted] For the avoidance of doubt, the Contract Charges shall be inclusive of all third party costs. All charges shall be in alignment with the submitted price schedule located in Annex A to these contract terms.

Insurance Requirements	Additional public liability insurance to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim Additional employers' liability insurance with a minimum limit of £5 million indemnity Additional professional indemnity insurance adequate to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract with a minimum limit of indemnity of £2 million for each individual claim. Product liability insurance cover all risks in the provision of Deliverables under the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim
Liability Requirements	**Suppliers limitation of Liability** (Clause 18 of the Contract Terms);
Special Conditions	There will be a break clause in the contract after Phase 1 to allow a review of future deliverables, allowing BEIS to make a decision on the continuation of thecontract.
Customer billing address for invoicing:	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).
GDPR	As per Contract Terms Schedule 7 Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

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

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

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

For and on behalf of the Supplier:

Name and Title:

[redacted]

Date:

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title: [redacted]

Signature

Date: 4 February 2021

APPENDIX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background

Introduction

This contract is for the delivery of research to evaluate the delivery of Phase II of Modern Energy Partners (MEP) programme.

MEP is a public sector energy innovation programme in collaboration with Energy Systems Catapult (ESC) that was set up to accelerate deployment of integrated energy efficiency solutions on large public estate sites. Its aim is to support the public sector and the supply chain in the realisation of the Clean Growth Strategy objectives to meet carbon emission reductions targets (see here for more information: https://es.catapult.org.uk/service-platforms/modern-energy-partners/)

This is primarily a process evaluation with a cost-effectiveness element.

The evaluation seeks to deliver against the following aims:

1. Determine how well the programme benefits, as described in the MEP Business Case (Phase II), have been delivered, taking into account the agreed rescoping;
2. Identify barriers to delivery of benefits the programme failed to overcome, and/or things that could have been done better in the programme to deliver benefits (in order to understand how benefits in this area can be best realised going forward); and
3. Understand the experience of sites participating in the MEP programme and understand what the facilitators of success are.

The research is expected to be split into two phases of work:

Phase 1 (Feb 2021 - Mar 2021)

It is envisaged that this phase will consist of refining the Theory of Change, scoping cost-effective analysis, qualitative interviews with programme and workstream leads, representatives of government departments involved in the programme, representatives of pathfinder sites and low carbon energy engineering consultancies advising the programme. Also, this phase will include further case study interviews.

The contract will include a break point after completion of Phase 1 to enable the review and agreement of activities for Phase 2. While it is our intention to award Phase 1 and 2 to the winning supplier, at the point of award we will only be able to guarantee Phase 1 and Phase 2 will be determined in accordance with the detail provided in Section 4: Deliverables/Challenges of this specification.

Phase 2 (Apr 2021 to Mar 2022)

Phase 2 will include action research workshops, follow-up interviews with workstream leads, interviews with energy managers on sites with energy monitoring, energy monitoring data providers and senior financial and commercial leaders in government. Cost effectiveness analysis will be conducted to use all available data to provide an understanding of the overall value for money of the programme. The findings will be synthesised into a final report.

Policy Background

Modern Energy Partners (MEP) is a public sector energy innovation programme that was set up in June 2018 to accelerate deployment of integrated energy efficiency solutions on the public estate.

This is expected to develop mechanisms that contribute towards the goal of the public estate to achieve at least 50% non-traded carbon emissions reductions by 2032 against a 2017 baseline.

MEP is focussed on identifying credible decarbonisation pathways for individual campus style public sector sites to deliver their carbon reduction targets in the long term, whilst supporting implementation of the initial phases of their preferred pathway. The objective being to demonstrate the potential of deploying both innovative and established energy efficiency, demand management and low carbon power and heat technologies that are practically deployed to maximise impact and pay back over a sustained time period. The programme's philosophy is to *learn by doing* in order to produce systematic and robust processes that can be deployed at scale.

BEIS is funding the programme which is being implemented by the Energy Systems Catapult (ESC) providing programme delivery, analytical and technical support. Senior representatives from the estate-owning departments, Cabinet Office, HM Treasury and BEIS are engaged in its governance processes.

Phase 1 ran from June 2018 – March 2019 and involved:

- Site-specific work in order to develop a concept design plans, setting out a pathway to meet 2032 carbon emissions targets at four Pathfinder properties within the UK government estate.
- Develop an early version of a generic Methodology and Toolkit, to enable concept design plans to be developed by key energy decision makers for sites across the government estate in the future

Phase 2, the focus of this evaluation, runs until September 2021, building on the lessons learnt in Phase 1 and initially aimed to:

- Seek to install telemetry[1] and accelerate the deployment of the early phase energy solutions proposed in the concept design plans at Pathfinder sites (MOD Collingwood, NHS Goole & District Hospital, MOJ Sheppey Prison Cluster, Cardiff University which was later swapped to MOD Catterick), to demonstrate what can be achieved at a single site, overcome challenges and generate learning that can inform the wider programme
- Continue to build the Methodology and Toolkit to develop a repeatable approach that creates deliverable concept design plans at campus scale sites in the public sector. A key part of this work will be to address the concerns arising from a lack of clarity about long term objectives, how to prioritise them and inconsistency in key assumptions
- Engage with government and the supply chain to further understand the wider environment for funding, commercial and contractual arrangements, procurement, decision making and the evolving energy system. This is to inform the development of the Methodology and Toolkit and to identify (but not resolve) what will be required to deploy concept design sites, for consideration by the relevant parts of government
- Develop a pipeline of sites beyond the Pathfinder sites, to install telemetry systems in preparation for future development of concept design plans.

The MEP programme underwent a rescoping in December 2019 and combined with the impacts of COVID-19 in 2020, led to some revision of the programme and since April 2020, the programme has focused on:

I) To continue working with the pathfinder sites and ensure that they move forward to delivering an operational data and telemetry system, carbon and energy reductions and associated cost savings and demonstrate that it is possible within the current system to implement initiatives:

[1] A key issue identified in Phase I was the lack of reliable data, benchmarking, and metrics across the four Pathfinder sites. Without access to such data, it is difficult to understand energy consumption patterns to help design energy schemes effectively and to monitor and steer the success of energy solutions going forward therefore the roll-out of data, metering and telemetry was prioritised as a workstream for Phase II.

- Develop & finalise the concept design plans.
- Implement the first phase of activities recommended in concept design plans
- The connection of telemetry to a data collection platform that enable energy consumption to be monitored to establish a baseline and identify/measure savings as implementation of the first phase of activities is completed.

II) To develop a systematic approach to delivering a further 36 "test-bed" sites which will enable us to do, learn and improve in an iterative methodology. The MEP Programme will focus on 'on site' delivery to create, refine and prove a repeatable process to achieve sustainable carbon reductions.

- Capture of data and reporting to a central platform, and when required, connection of telemetry for all 36 sites
- Delivering concept design plans for 24 of the sites
- Completing actionable business cases supporting the development of initial planned interventions for 12 of the 24 sites

All work that is not directly in support of these goals has been deprioritised. The work that was deprioritised consisted of:

- The development of theoretical generic methodologies. However, a revised set of tools and templates has been developed to support in the delivery of the 36 sites.
- Supply chain engagement and future-looking work on procurement and funding
- Detailed work to develop a pipeline of sites.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The Requirement

An evaluation of Phase 2 of the MEP programme is required. The research needs to run alongside the programme, which ends September 2021, to gather insight as it progresses. Insight into how the programme has been delivered and key barriers and facilitators to success are of principal interest.

This is primarily a process evaluation with a cost-effectiveness element.

BEIS has previously commissioned an evaluation scoping exercise of the MEP programme, undertaken by Technopolis Group as part of the Energy Innovation Technical Support Contract. To ensure all bidders have access to the necessary information to prepare an effective bid and enable a fair competition, BEIS has included the Scoping Report, completed in November 2019, as Annex 1. The approach in this ITT differs significantly from the Scoping Report, to reflect the revision of programme scope since completion of the Scoping Report. The tender document therefore should be followed where there are discrepancies.

Aim 1 - Determine how well the programme benefits (as described in the Phase 2 Business Case) have been delivered, taking into account the agreed rescoping

Research to assess how the programme has been delivered and understand the benefits experienced by the sites involved.

Aim 2 - Identify barriers to delivery of benefits the programme failed to overcome and/or things that could have been done better in the programme to deliver benefits (in order to understand how benefits in this area can be best realised going forward)

Research to identify the barriers to the programme is needed to support future programmes in this sector to avoid the same pitfalls.

Aim 3 - Understand the experience of sites participating in the MEP programme and understand what the facilitators of success are

Research to provide evidence of the utility of both the processes developed as a result of the programme and the technologies applied to understand areas that should be targeted going forward.

Specific research questions

To address the aims set out above, the following high-level and detailed research questions have been developed by BEIS.

EQ1: To what extent and how has the programme created sustainable processes, tools and templates to support sites to design, implement and prove integrated energy system business models at adequate scale in the real world? (Aim 1)

- How have the tools and templates been used for and by sites?
- To what extent has the programme furthered the ambitions of the sites to decarbonise their buildings?
- How are the concept design plans fit for purpose in public sector sites?
- What energy systems are being considered or have been employed on the sites?
- How have the sites experienced the programme in terms of cost-effectiveness?

EQ2: To what extent, and how, is the programme on track to deliver intended future impacts, considering the assumptions, current situation, market barriers and failures as set out in the Theory of Change[2]? (Aim 1,3)

- What behaviours have sites engaged in that could lead to long-term decarbonisation?
- How does the programme address specific market barriers faced by the public sector sites?
- How have the sites experienced the outcomes of the programme to date?
- Have different types of sites (i.e., departments or building types) had different experiences of the programme?
- How effective and efficient were deployment processes?
- Has the use of pathfinder and testbed sites generated interest in the wider public sector?
- Have the sites with concept design plans secured follow-on funding from other government schemes such as Salix or Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme?
- Does the MEP programme represent value for money?
- Does the present value of expected future benefits outweigh the costs?

EQ3: To what extent and how have the programme's governance and processes enabled it to deliver its objectives? (Aim 1,2)

- How efficient and effective have the established processes been in delivering objectives?
- How have sites been supported during development and deployment?
- How have arising issues been addressed (both at site and programme level)?

EQ4: How effectively has telemetry and data (T&D) been deployed and how are sites and users engaging with the data? (Aim 1,2,3)

- How efficient was the installation/conversion process for sites?
- How are sites using the data and have they taken any actions as a result of it?

EQ5: What were the barriers to delivery of the programme, what has been learned about how these might be overcome going forward, and/or what could have been done better throughout the programme to deliver benefits? (Aim 2)

- Have there been any unintended outcomes of the programme?
- What learning from programme implementation can tell us about how to address barriers?

EQ6: What are the wider learnings for effective investments, policies and regulations to enhance integrated energy solutions and carbon reduction across the public sector? (Aim 2, 3)

- How has MEP interacted with other Public Sector Energy Efficiency schemes?

[2] Theory of Change to be revised in line with current scope of the programme. Annex 1 shows Theory of Change correct as of August 2019. This will be updated prior to the start of the contract by the programme leads.

- What strategies deployed as part of this programme were successful in engaging public sector sites in decarbonisation?
- What are the wider learnings for future policy development?

3. Suggested Methodology

Approach

There are several ways in which key features of MEP and its programme monitoring requirements influence the choice of evaluation methods and the extent of primary data collection required. These include:

- Findings from the evaluation will be used to feed into future decisions on the roll-out of innovative energy solutions across the wider public estate, so it will be important for the evaluation to provide findings as soon as possible after the programme ends (expected 30th September 2021). This means we cannot push back this evaluation to wait for potential impacts or data availability. Therefore, a final evaluation report is assumed to be required as soon as possible after completion of MEP e.g., within three to six months.
- Interim quarterly findings will be needed throughout to feed into ongoing adaptive management decisions, e.g., to review how public sector estate managers are responding to energy plans developed through MEP and feed into decisions on its refinement before MEP ends.
- The programme has monitoring arrangements with ESC; including a telemetry system to disaggregate energy usage and track changes in consumption patterns over time, as well as progress reports to update against relevant BEIS Energy Innovation Portfolio KPIs. The evaluator is not required to track change on these key indicators. The focus of the evaluation is understanding the process of implementing the monitoring systems and the early impacts this has had. For example, with the installation of data and telemetry systems specifically, we want to observe any measurable benefits (e.g. anecdotally it has been reported that access to this type of data often leads to quick wins) and to understand the relationships between these benefits and the interaction between technological factors (e.g., quality and suitability of technology, quality of installation and upkeep) and human factors (e.g., user skill level, desire for new systems, level of engagement, avoidant behaviours to bypass or disable new systems etc.).

The methodology should be used as an example of the type of activities which, for the specified budget, can deliver the evidence required for this piece of research. Bidders are encouraged to consider the appropriateness of these methods and, if felt necessary, propose alternative approaches which are felt to provide more robust, timely or cost-effective evidence.

The overall approach most appropriate to evaluate this programme is a theory-based process evaluation with a cost effectiveness element.

The proposed methodology below is split into two phases and comprises of three main work strands[3]:

1. **Process evaluation** to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes deployed to deliver each key MEP workstream. The process evaluation should be underpinned by a clear framework that defines the key aims of each workstream, their intended contribution to the achievement of MEP and indicators that could be deployed to measure their success. The aim is to understand whether each key output of MEP achieved its objectives and under if not, why not and share lessons on ways in which processes for delivery be improved to inform future implementation. It is expected that the process evaluation will be

[3] The QCA as proposed in the Scoping Report has been removed due to lack of sites to be able to build a comparison group who declined to participate in the programme.

primarily based on qualitative interviews with stakeholders including programme managers, central government delivery partners etc.

2. **Action Research** working collaboratively with sites and MEP programme workstream leads through qualitative workshops with site representatives to gather and share insights on lessons learned and produce reports to inform future programmes.
3. **Cost effectiveness analysis**[4].

Phase 1 (Feb 2021 to Mar 2021)

Process Evaluation

Scoping phase to review existing Theory of Change and indicators & assess data availability for CEA.

Qualitative interviews

Requesting participation in interviews is likely to be relatively straightforward among stakeholder groups who are directly involved in MEP. BEIS/ESC will provide contacts to the evaluator and we can assume that engagement will be high given they have a direct interest in the evaluation. We anticipate most fieldwork will be conducted via telephone or teleconferencing interviews, which will also help us mitigate any delays caused by COVID-19 going forward.

- Six MEP programme managers (BEIS & ESC) and six MEP workstream leads (ESC) to explore whether/why not outcomes were delivered in line with the Theory of Change.
- Seven interviews with one representative from each central government organisation involved in the collaborative partnership to manage and deliver MEP (BEIS, Cabinet Office, NHS, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Defence, the Office of Government Property, Crown Commercial Service) to explore whether MEP has met expectations, lessons learned and views of future rollout and governance arrangements.
- Eight interviews with the site manager from each of the four Pathfinder sites, to cover decision makers with different roles (e.g., energy management and financial management) to cover various process evaluation questions, including progress to date with implementing measures, outcomes observed, views on process deployed and implementing telemetry, etc.
- 5 interviews with low carbon energy engineering consultancy firms who have provided advice and quality assurance as part of programme delivery during the discovery phases, concept design workshops and engineering assessments to gain insight into their views of the programme processes. We should also be able to gain insight from their expert knowledge of the low carbon energy market.
- Two interviews (drawing on the evidence from related interviews & data sources), per 14 sites (four Pathfinders and sample of 10 test bed sites) for key site stakeholders to develop in-depth case studies to give an understanding of the complexity of each site, their motivations to participate in the MEP and plans for implementing the concept design plans in the future. We are open to suggestion from bidders on the design and approach to the case studies. We will provide additional sources of evidence for the case studies (such as documentation) where possible and appropriate.

Phase 2 (Apr 2021 to Mar 2022)

Process Evaluation

[4] This is more appropriate Cost-Benefit Analysis proposed in the Scoping Report due to data limitations and given many of the anticipated benefits of the programme are learnings and processes that are not necessarily monetisable.

Qualitative interviews

- Six follow-up interviews with MEP workstream leads (ESC) to consider the progress of the programme and whether the Theory of Change still stands.
- c. 30 interviews with public sector estate staff responsible for energy management (Energy mangers) in all 36 sites using telemetry systems to gain insight into ways in which system has changed energy management, influenced decision making and feedback on usability of telemetry tools, data analysis etc.
- 1 or 2 interviews with senior leaders from the three government departments involved in work on financing and commercial as part of MEP. These are work streams that were paused/suspended during the refocusing of MEP. These interviews would be an opportunity to explore thinking that was done on how to transfer the MEP model to the private sector.
- 1 or 2 interviews with the telemetry data platform provider, who will be able to give insight into usage of the data collection platform. They may also be able to provide views on the challenges to linking datasets, installing telemetry, and getting stakeholder buy in.

Action Research

Action Research may be considered an 'approach' which consists of a family of various research methodologies which share the same broad aim of seeking transformative change through the simultaneous process of undertaking research and taking planned actions, then reflecting on outcomes. Action Research practitioners will actively participate in a change situation, whilst simultaneously conducting research. For example, through leading a series of iterative workshops with energy managers from test bed sites to gather insights on the challenges faced in developing a concept design plan within their organisation, they can share examples of good practice, brainstorm and co-produce a series of actions to overcome their barriers and then feedback on lessons learned. Action Research generally consists of undertaking the following self-reflective iterative cycles; Planning, Implementing, Observing and Reflecting. For example, planning workshops with energy managers to identify ways in which they can report insights from telemetry data to their senior site managers in order to drive decision making; reporting these insights and recommendations to the Steering Board and agreeing them to be implemented; observing the outcomes through follow-up interviews or self-reporting from participants.

The research may involve the practitioner[5] carrying out: reviews of programme documentation (e.g. concept design plans), in-depth interviews with a series of test bed site representatives to understand their needs and intended outcomes, and 'action learning group' style workshops to facilitate information sharing between sites and co-production of learnings with them. Ethnographic observations (either via site visits or remotely) of energy managers using MEP tools could further deepen their understanding of ways in which they influence energy management practices and decisions.

Examples of ways in which this insight may support adaptive programme management include:

- Gathering feedback from energy managers on their experiences of using telemetry data to understand what additional support they would find useful to improve their capability to analyse, interpret and communicate the data and then testing the use of new guidance to address any challenges.
- Gathering insights on ways in which energy managers have used their draft concept design plans to communicate the benefits internally and seek to secure funding.

[5] Action Research involves the practitioner becoming embedded in the process to identify and propose a new course of action, and therefore may require subject-specific skill sets and must act separately to the independent evaluator. To incorporate Action Research, the MEP evaluation project may therefore require a consortium of partners to delivery on specific roles.

- Gathering insights on the steps followed by energy managers to use the tools and templates to explore whether the recommended options produced were feasible and appropriate for implementation in the sites.

The Action Research should be used as one strand of evidence to address EQ1, which is focused on assessing whether programme outputs are delivering their intended benefits.

We welcome creative proposals on how to implement an Action Research element to provide insights and feedback in this project.

Cost effectiveness analysis (CEA)

We think a cost effectiveness analysis (as covered in HMT Green Book[6]) is most appropriate to help us understand whether the MEP programme represents a value-for-money approach to decarbonising the public sector estate[7].

We plan to work alongside the contractor at the start of Phase 1 of the evaluation to scope whether there is sufficient data available for a CEA. To scope the CEA, the contractor will be asked to look at the costs of the programme against non-monetised benefits. Costs data could include: the telemetry workstream and the concept design plans for sites, and the costs associated with programme management and implementation and stakeholder engagement. The outputs could include energy consumption from a small number of sites, air quality, productivity, growth energy solution start-ups and improved procurement routes.

Bidders should note that the exact approach will be refined once a contractor has been appointed.

This aspect of the evaluation is expected to require close working between the contractors and the BEIS analytical and policy colleagues. We would expect early engagement with this strand so that primary research work strands can consider the needs of this analysis. As the evaluation will be running alongside the programme, data will become available gradually throughout the project (telemetry data is expected from July 2021). As such, we suggest the CEA is an iterative process of triangulation of the evidence that refines our understanding as it becomes available.

Examples of information that could be used in conducting a cost-effectiveness analysis, include:

- Telemetry data from the sites with the technology installed.
- Programme documents and records (where available).
- Qualitative data from the other strands of this evaluation.

Analysis and synthesis

Analysis and synthesis will be required for delivery of the case studies, process evaluation and cost effectiveness analysis. BEIS expects bidders to submit suitable proposals for analysing the qualitative data, for example how the main themes will be identified and developed, whether analysis will be undertaken within and/or across cases, and how the analysis will be managed across sub-groups and individuals.

Bids should also specify the proposed method for synthesising the evidence from the multiple work streams into an overall, coherent and accessible final report, which could include using workshops with BEIS and the research team to help bring out key findings.

4. Deliverables

[6]https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/685903/The_Green_Book.pdf

[7] Due to data limitations, a CEA is a more appropriate methodology, than the cost-benefit analysis as proposed in the Scoping Report (Annex 1), as it allows us to consider the costs against all the outputs coming out of the programme at site level; this could include the modest amount of telemetry data available to be used in the round with other sources to support wider evidence synthesis of cost-effectiveness. We would want to use a more qualitative approach to account for these benefits within a theory-based context. This would also allow for a qualitative assessment of the additionality of the programme.

Expected Outputs

The following outputs are required within the duration of the project, irrespective of whether the proposed methodologies are used or whether alternatives are proposed. Alternative reporting approaches or timing may be proposed so long as they exceed the needs set out below and the reasons are fully justified.

The outputs of this research project are expected to include:

Phase 1 research outputs & early indicative findings report

By end of March 2021 - Delivery of phase 1 qualitative interview transcripts and an early indicative finding report

Phase 2 research outputs

By December 2021 - Delivery of reports of action research workshop findings and recommendations for further action phase 2 qualitative interview transcripts, and case study write-ups.

In June 2021, September 2021, and December 2021 - *Quarterly progress reports*

Final report

By March 2022 - Delivery of final reports and annexes (including synthesis, a final Theory of Change, cost effectiveness analysis and technical method). The research team should provide a face-to-face presentation of the final findings for policy and analytical colleagues at BEIS at the end of Phase 2.

Other reporting requirements or deliverables

Where relevant, outputs should include suitable technical annexes and datasets. We would welcome suggestions as to any further outputs and would expect to agree a final set of deliverables at the inception stage.

It is desirable for BEIS to also have access to transcripts of qualitative interviews or other records of discussions with stakeholders, for QA purposes by analysts. Bidders are asked to specify how they will record, analyse, and QA their qualitative research, and to propose alternative outputs which could be used by BEIS.

It is assumed that key reports will be published to ensure a transparent evidence base is available to support ongoing policy making decisions. To demonstrate relevant experience in producing high quality reporting, bids must:

- specify who in the project team will be responsible for drafting the report;
- specify who will be responsible for quality assurance before it comes to BEIS.

Quality Assurance

Bidders must set out their approach to quality assurance (QA) in their response to this ITT with a QA plan.

Sign-off for quality assurance must be conducted by someone of sufficient seniority within the contractor organisation to be able to take responsibility for the work done. Acceptance of the work by BEIS will take this into consideration. BEIS reserves the right to refuse to sign off outputs which do not meet the required standard specified in this invitation to tender and/or the contractor's QA plan. QA should cover all aspects of the project undertaken by the contractors, including data collection, data analysis and reporting.

To demonstrate an effective process to produce high quality reporting, the contactor/s must ensure that quality assurance is done by individuals who were not directly involved in that research or analysis.

Bidders should note that BEIS may appoint its own peer reviewer(s) to QA publishable outputs. Consideration should be given to how the external peer reviewer(s) will be included in the QA process.

Where complex or innovative methods are proposed, bidders should specify how additional quality assurance will be provided. Where necessary, this should include the use of external experts. A BEIS appointed peer reviewer will not be expected to provide detailed quality assurance, their role will be focused on higher level peer review.

Outputs will be subject to BEIS internal approvals, the more substantive the output the longer the approval time required. Published reports will require three rounds of comments, which should be factored into the timelines.

The successful bidder will be responsible for any work supplied by sub-contractors. For primary research, contractors should be willing to facilitate BEIS research staff to attend interviews or listen in to telephone surveys as part of the quality assurance process.

Other useful sources of guidance and advice that will help bids and the resulting work be of the highest quality include:

- The Government Social Research Code, in particular those that relate to GSR Products:
- UK Statistics Authority Code of Practice or an equivalent standard.
- Supplementary Guidance on the Quality in Policy Impact Research
- Quality in Qualitative Research: A Framework for assessing research evidence provides a framework for appraising the quality of qualitative research.

Working Arrangements

The successful contractor will be expected to identify one named point of contract through whom all enquiries can be filtered. A BEIS project manager will be assigned to the project and will be the central point of contact. Where a consortium or sub-contractors are in place, BEIS expect that they are included in relevant meetings, workshops, and review points to ensure their full engagement in the project. All contractors and sub-contractors are responsible for the delivery of outputs to the appropriate time and quality. It is expected that the lead contractor takes an active role in oversight of all workstreams and bears the overall responsibility for the delivery of the evaluation activities and outputs.

Bidders should assume that BEIS take an active role in review and quality assurance of research materials, analysis, and outputs, beyond external peer review. It should be expected that research materials and outputs go through at least four iterations (i.e., three rounds of comments from BEIS), dependent on the complexity of the product. Additional amendments may be required for published outputs.

The appointment offer will be confirmed by 3rd February. Note that bidders must be available to attend an inception meeting in the week commencing 8th February 2021.

We envisage the need for close interaction between the BEIS Project Manager and contractor throughout the process, to ensure that emerging issues are dealt with promptly and that BEIS fully understand the assumptions and approach taken. Bidders should assume that engagement with BEIS will include weekly project management phone calls, weekly progress update reports, steering group meetings (frequency to be confirmed), and face to face meetings as required to design, and deliver the chosen methods. Throughout the research, BEIS will be required to review and sign off all final data collection instruments, analytical approaches (including key assumptions) and outputs.

Skills and experience

BEIS require you to demonstrate that you have the experience and capabilities to undertake the project. Your tender response should include a summary of each proposed team member's experience and capabilities.

The following skills and experience are considered particularly important for this work:

- Designing and undertaking theory of change development, action research, case studies and qualitative interviewing
- Delivery of high-quality synthesis, reporting and communication of complex programme evaluation
- Understanding of UK energy and climate change policy landscape.

Contractors should propose named members of the project team and include the tasks and responsibilities of each team member. This should be clearly linked to the work programme, indicating the grade/ seniority of staff and number of days allocated to specific tasks.

Contractors should identify the individual(s) who will be responsible for managing the project.

Challenges

There may be several challenges in conducting this research; some are given in the following section. Bidders must consider how these, and any other challenges will be addressed through the research design and delivery.

Timescales of the MEP programme

The evaluation will be running alongside the programme, with sites at different stages of the process. Therefore, it is important to ensure the evaluation approach aligns with the programme plan, so we are asking the right questions at the right time (i.e., asking about technologies after they have been installed). This also means being agile to potential programme delays.

Retention of the MEP programme

Some sites have already left the MEP programme for various reasons. If further sites were to leave the scheme, we could potentially lose learning about how the programme played out on their site, if they were no longer engaged.

Primary research and COVID-19 impacts

There is a risk that we may not be able to complete some aspects of the research, such as workshops and action research, if a scenario arose where the UK needs to go back into lockdown again due to COVID-19. The successful contactor will need to work flexibility and plan for alternative modes of research if required.

We have built in a review point to the contract where spend can be reallocated as needed if the methodology needs to be altered mid-contract. The contract will also include a break clause at this stage; in case the remainder of the research cannot be delivered due to external circumstances. Contract amendments/extensions may also be considered. MEP have already worked up risk assessments and methodologies to allow them to continue working with sites, including site visits, so this can be considered.

Ethics

All applicants will need 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 'consideration of challenges' criterion.
We expect contractors to adhere to the following Government Social Research (GSR) Principles:

1. Sound application and conduct of social research methods and appropriate dissemination and utilisation of findings
2. Participation based on valid consent
3. Enabling participation
4. Avoidance of personal harm
5. Non-disclosure of identity and personal information

Data security
The successful tenderer must comply with the General Data Protection Regulation 2016 (GDPR) and any information collected, processed, and transferred on behalf of the Department, and in particular personal information, must be held and transferred securely. Contractors must provide assurances of compliance with the GDPR and set out in their proposals details of the practices and systems they have in place for handling data securely including transmission between the field and head office and then to the Department. Contractors will have responsibility for ensuring that they and any subcontractor who processes or handles information on behalf of the Department is conducted securely. The sorts of issues which must be addressed satisfactorily and described in contractors' submissions include:

- Procedures for storing both physical and system data;
- Data back-up procedures;
- Procedures for the destruction of physical and system data;
- How data is protected;
- Data encryption software used;
- Use of laptops and electronic removable media;
- Details of person/s responsible for data security;
- Policies for unauthorised staff access or misuse of confidential/personal data;
- Policies for staff awareness and training of DPA;
- Physical security of premises; and
- How research respondents will be made aware of all potential uses of their data.

Price and payments

The budget for this project is £242,600 excluding VAT. Cost will be a criterion against which bids which will be assessed.

Contractors should provide a full and detailed breakdown of costs. This should include staff (and day rate) allocated to specific tasks.

Bids should at a minimum include costs for the below activities, including design and analysis:

- Review and refinement of the Theory of Change
- Qualitative telephone interviews with
    - 7 MEP programme managers and 12 ESC workstream leads of 30 mins length (6 in Phase 1, 6 in phase 2)
    - Seven representatives of central government organisations involved in the collaborative partnership to manage and deliver MEP of 30 mins length.
    - 8 interviews with representatives from each pathfinder sites of 30 mins length.
    - 30 estate staff responsible for energy management in sites using telemetry systems of 30 mins length
    - Five low carbon energy engineering consultancies who have contributed to programme processes of 30 mins length.
    - Two interviews with senior leaders in finance and commercial
    - Two interviews with telemetry data platform providers
- Case study interviews
    - 28 interviews with key site stakeholders for case studies (2 per sites, 4 pathfinder sites and a sample of 10 test bed sites).
- Action research
    - Three action learning group style workshops between representatives of test bed sites
    - Ethnographic observation work
- Cost effectiveness analysis
    - The scoping, iterative analysis, and synthesis of a cost-effectiveness analysis of the programme.

Bids should also include the unit cost for the following:

A single qualitative telephone interview with one energy manager of 30 minutes length.

In submitting full tenders, suppliers confirm in writing that the price offered will be held for a minimum of 60 calendar days from the date of submission. Any payment conditions applicable to the prime contractor must also be replicated with sub-contractors.

The Department aims to pay all correctly submitted invoices as soon as possible, within 30 days from the date of receipt, in line with standard terms and conditions of contract.

Timetable

Contractors must demonstrate that they can meet the following provisional timetable for the research:

Kick-off meeting to agree and finalise approach to the study	w/c 8th Feb 2021
Phase 1	
Interviews with MEP programme managers & refinement of Theory of Change	Feb 2021
Cost-effectiveness analysis scoping	Feb 2021
Material design and recruitment	Feb 2021
Interviews with ESC MEP workstream leads	Feb 2021
Interviews with Pathfinder site managers	Feb - Mar 2021
Interviews with government organisations	Feb - Mar 2021
Interviews with low carbon energy engineering consultancies	Feb – Mar 2021

Case study interviews with site representatives	Feb - Mar 2021
Early indicative findings report	End of March 2021
Contract review and break point	April 2021
Phase 2	
Cost effectiveness analysis	May 2021 – Feb 2022
Material design & recruitment	May 2021
Case study write-up	Jul - Aug 2021
Quarterly Report 1	June 2021
Follow up interviews with ESC MEP workstream leads	June - Oct 2021
Action Research workshops	June – Dec 2021
Interviews with energy managers	May – Dec 2021
Interview with telemetry data platform provider	Aug – Oct 2021
Quarterly Report 2	Sep 2021
Interviews with senior leaders in finance and commercial	Sep – Dec 2021
Quarterly Report 3	Dec 2021
Analysis & synthesis	Jan - Mar 2022
Final report	Mar 2022
Final Presentation	Mar 2022

Payment milestones

The indicative milestones and phasing of payments will be agreed at the project inception meeting. A provisional phasing is detailed below; however, BEIS welcome alternative suggestions at the inception meeting.

Milestone	Date	Payment
Completion of interviews with MEP workstream leads, pathfinder site managers and low carbon energy engineer consultancies. Completion of case study interviews with site representatives. Analysis of qualitative data, and delivery of transcripts and notes from the action research workshops. Delivery of an early indicative findings report.	March 2021	Up to £89,000
Completion of follow-up interviews with MEP workstream leads, interviews with energy managers from telemetry sites, senior leaders in finance and commercial and telemetry data platform providers. Completion of action research workshops and case-study write up. Analysis of qualitative data, and delivery of transcripts and quarterly reports 1,2 & 3.	December 2021	Up to £108,000
Delivery of final reports (including synthesis and technical reports), final findings presentation to BEIS and cost effectiveness analysis.	March 2022	Up to £45,600

Evaluation of tenders

Please refer to the Mini Competition Questions for details of the evaluation criteria.

5. Timescales	
Date of Issue to all Bidders	16th December 2020
Deadline for receipt of queries about ITT	8th January 2021
Responses circulated to queries	15th January 2021
Deadline for submission	22nd January 2021
Evaluation of written bids	w/c 25th January 2021

Selection of preferred supplier and contract award	w/c 1st February 2021
Contract start date	5th February 2021
Kick-off meeting to agree and finalise approach to the study	w/c 8th February 2021
End of Phase 1	March 2021
Contract Review Point	April 2021
Delivery of final outputs and end of contract	March 2022

Part 2: Contract Terms

Contract Terms v6.0