



INVITATION TO TENDER (ITT) FOR:

*CONTRACT FOR SERVICE]: **PSB Social Value Research***

Ref. No: 104456
Issue Date: 17th June 2025

CONTENTS

SECTION 1

INFORMATION FOR TENDERERS

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 INSTRUCTIONS TO TENDERERS
- 3 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES
- 4 FORM OF AGREEMENT
- 5 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
- 6 DATA PROTECTION ACT 2018
- 7 ELIGIBILITY OF TENDERERS (JOINT VENTURES OR CONSORTIA)
- 8 NO MARKETING RIGHTS
- 9 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS
- 10 DRAFT TIMETABLE
- 11 RESPONSE CHECKLIST

SECTION 2

SPECIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS

- ANNEX A: SOCIAL VALUE

SECTION 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- PART 1: SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE
- PART 2: TECHNICAL SUBMISSION
- PART 3: SOCIAL VALUE
- PART 4: PRICING SCHEDULE

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE
- APPENDIX B: PRICING SCHEDULE
- APPENDIX C: TENDER SUBMISSION STATEMENT
- APPENDIX D: COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION
- APPENDIX E: KEY PERSONNEL, PRIMARY SUPPLIERS & PRIMARY SUBCONTRACTORS
- APPENDIX F: CONTRACT FOR SERVICES

SECTION 1

INFORMATION FOR TENDERERS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) ('the Department') is inviting Tenders for a contract for PSB Social Value Research. The detailed requirements are set out in the Specification of Requirements at Section 2 ('the Specification').
- 1.2 Tenders are being invited under the Crown Commercial Service (CCS) Framework RM6126, Research and Insights DPS.

2. INSTRUCTIONS TO TENDERERS

- 2.1 This ITT is being carried out in accordance with the open procedure as set out in the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (as amended) which implement Directive 2004/18/EC.
- 2.2 In submitting a Tender Response, a Tenderer (i.e. a party submitting a response to this ITT) undertakes that in the event of their Tender Response (i.e. their response to this ITT) being accepted by the Department and the Department confirming in writing such acceptance to the Tenderer, the Tenderer will, upon being called to do so by the Department execute the Contract in the form set out in Appendix F of this ITT or in such amended form as may subsequently be agreed.
- 2.3 The Department reserves the right to cancel the procurement exercise at any point. The Department will accept no liability for any losses caused by any cancellation of this procurement exercise nor any decision not to award a Contract as a result of the procurement exercise.
- 2.4 Tenderers are responsible for ensuring that they have submitted a complete and accurate Tender Response and that prices quoted are arithmetically correct for the units stated. Prices provided must be submitted in £ Sterling (GBP), exclusive of VAT.
- 2.5 The Department reserves the right to discuss, for the purpose of clarification, any aspect of a Tender Response with the relevant Tenderer prior to the award of the Contract.
- 2.6 At any time prior to the deadline for receipt of Tender Responses, the Department reserves the right to amend, add to or withdraw all or any part of this ITT at any time during the procurement exercise. Any such amendments, additions, or removals will be notified in writing to all prospective Tenderers.

- 2.7 The contents of this ITT and of any other documentation sent to any Tenderer in respect of this procurement exercise are provided on the basis that they remain the property of the Department and/or any relevant body. Tenderers shall treat the contents of the ITT and any related documents (together called the 'Information') as confidential (save in so far as they are already in the public domain) and shall take all necessary precautions to ensure that all information is treated as such and not disclosed (save as described above) or used other than for the purpose of this procurement exercise by the Tenderer.

Submission of Tenders

- 2.8 Tenders must be submitted via the Atamis e-sourcing portal (see 2.20 below) to be received no later than **10:00hrs BST, 11th July 2025** (the deadline for receipt of Tender Responses – see 10.1 below). Please ensure that you allow yourself plenty of time when responding to this invite prior to the closing date and time, especially if you have been asked to upload documents.
- 2.9 Tender Responses not received by the deadline may not be considered unless there is clear evidence that the delay in receipt was beyond the control of the Tenderer.
- 2.10 Any questions concerning aspects of the ITT should be submitted via the e-sourcing portal (see 2.20 below).
- 2.11 Prospective Tenderers are reminded that the entire contents of this invitation belong to the Department. It must only be used for the purpose for which it was issued.
- 2.12 Your Tender Response should remain valid for a period of 90 days from the tender closing date. A tender valid for a shorter period may be rejected.
- 2.13 Tenderers must not inform anyone else, even approximately, what their Tender prices are, or will be. Furthermore, Tenderers must not try to obtain any information about anyone else's tender or proposed tender.
- 2.14 Page limits are provided for each question in the Technical Submission (Part 2 of the Tender Response – refer to Section 3 of this ITT). All written responses should be in a minimum font size of Arial 12 point. Only the information within the set page limit will be evaluated. Additional information will not be evaluated and therefore should not be supplied. The Department will only take account of information which is specifically asked for in the ITT.
- 2.15 Failure to provide the information required or particulars for the relevant question(s) or supply documentation referred to in the Tender Response within the deadline for submission of Tender Response may result in elimination from the procurement exercise.

- 2.16 Answers must be in English. Tenderers should note that where any supplementary documents are not published in English, certified translations into English must be provided with the Tender Response (if applicable).
- 2.17 No representation, warranty or undertaking, express or implied, is or will be given by the Department or any of its agents or advisers with respect to the information contained in this ITT document, including with respect to its accuracy, adequacy or completeness.
- 2.18 All Tenderers are responsible for all their costs and expenses incurred in connection with this procurement process at all stages. Under no circumstances will the Department be liable for any costs or expenses borne by or on behalf of the Tenderer or any party associated with this procurement process.
- 2.19 If you do not wish to submit a tender, please notify us to that effect. It would be appreciated if the reasons for not submitting a tender are given, although there is no obligation to do so.
- 2.20 The information and/or documents for this opportunity are available on the Atamis e-sourcing portal: <https://dcms.my.site.com/login> . You must register on this site to respond. If you are already registered you will not need to register again, simply use your existing username and password. Please note there is a password reminder link on the homepage.

Please ensure you review all communications and follow any instruction provided to you.

If you experience any technical difficulties please contact the Atamis eSourcing Helpdesk at: Support@atamis.co.uk

Selection of Successful Tender

- 2.21 Tender Responses will be checked for completeness and compliance with this ITT and only compliant Tender Responses will be evaluated. Non-compliant Tender Responses may be eliminated from the procurement exercise.
- 2.22 The Department will award the Contract(s) to the Tenderer submitting the most economically advantageous tender based on the combined responses submitted in relation to the technical and commercial requirements. Section 3 (Evaluation Criteria) sets out the full range of criteria for assessing Tender Responses.
- 2.23 The Department reserves the right to undertake a detailed financial and technical appraisal of each Tenderer and for this process to continue up to the award of the Contract(s). Further appraisal may continue if required through the duration of the Contract. This may result in the Department requiring

assurances from the Tenderer/Supplier, such as Parent or Ultimate Holding Company Guarantees, if required.

- 2.24 The Department shall be under no obligation to accept the lowest or any tender and, unless the Tenderer expressly stipulates to the contrary at the time of tendering, reserves the right to accept such portion of a tender as it decides. All Tenderers will be notified of the Contract award decision.
- 2.25 The Department may require Tenderers to present details or aspects of their tender submission to the Department and its advisors for the purposes of clarification. No marketing material should be included in the presentation. No information other than that specifically requested in writing by the Department should be included in the presentation. Tenderers are responsible for all costs or expenses incurred by tenderers associated with any presentation.

3 DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

- 3.1 The Specification (as at Section 2 of this ITT document) sets out the various services that may be required.
- 3.2 The Specification will form part of the eventual Contract(s).
- 3.3 Tenderers should formulate their Tender Responses based on the Specification. Any changes in the Department's requirements would be the subject of post tender discussions.
- 3.4 The Supplier (i.e. the successful Tenderer) should comply with all requirements of the Framework for Sustainable Development on the Government Estate. Environmentally friendly products where applicable should be used.
- 3.5 Your attention is drawn to the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE). It is the responsibility of Tenderers to determine whether or not TUPE applies to this procurement exercise. Notwithstanding this, Tenderers will note that it is DCMS' view that TUPE is not likely to be applicable if this procurement exercise results in a contract being placed, although DCMS is not liable for the opinion expressed. In these circumstances DCMS will wish to satisfy itself that Tender Responses are responsibly based and take full account of your likely TUPE obligations.
- 3.6 If Tenderers have a contrary view to that of DCMS on the applicability of TUPE, it would be helpful if Tenderers would advise us, giving reasons, prior to the deadline for receipt of Tender Response.

4 FORM OF CONTRACT

- 4.1 The Contract between the Department and the Supplier will be based as closely as possible on the Contract for services provided (refer to Appendix F) including its annexes and any schedules.
- 4.2 Information presently left out of the Contract will be derived from the Supplier's Tender Response and, if appropriate, post tender clarification.
- 4.3 Please note that no material changes to the Contract will be accepted and by submitting a tender response Tenderers are confirming they unreservedly accept the terms and conditions as set out in the Contract and related annexes. Should any changes be requested these must be supplied together with your tender submission and the Department may consider these at their discretion. If the Department rejects any such requested changes, the Tenderer will be required to accept the Departments terms and conditions or their response will be assessed as Non-compliant and eliminated from the procurement exercise. The Department reserves the right to withdraw our acceptance of your tender offer at any point until signature of Contract by all Parties.

5 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

- 5.1 Any information submitted to the Department may need to be disclosed and/or published by the Department. Without prejudice to the foregoing generality, the Department may disclose information in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, any other law, or, as a consequence of judicial order, or order by any court or tribunal with the Department to order disclosure.
- 5.2 If the Tenderer considers that any of the information included in their completed ITT is commercially confidential then the Tenderer shall identify it and explain (in broad terms) what harm might result from disclosure and/or publication. If required, this should be provided using the template at Appendix D. It should be noted though, that even where the Tenderer has indicated that information is commercially sensitive, the Department may disclose this information where it sees fit.
- 5.3 Receipt by the Department of any material marked 'confidential' or equivalent should not be taken to mean that the Department accept any duty of confidence by virtue of that marking.
- 5.4 The UK Government is committed to greater data transparency in the public sector. Accordingly the Department reserves the right to publish its tender documents, contracts and data from invoices received and may at its discretion redact all or part of such information prior to publication. In doing so the Department may at its absolute discretion take account of the exemptions that would be available under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

6 DATA PROTECTION ACT 2018

- 6.1 The awarded Contract will be subject to UK Data Protection legislation which came into force from the 25th May 2018. Tenderers should ensure they are both familiar with the legislation and of their obligations as the Data Processor. Guidance from the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) is available [here](#). The Department reserve the right to request additional evidence to undertake sufficient due diligence of any Tenderer and/or Supplier to ensure they can implement the appropriate technical and organisational measures to comply with the act (i.e. provide guarantees of their ability to comply with the regulations).
- 6.2 Where applicable to the services outlined within this ITT the draft contract for services, attached at Appendix F, details the specific roles and responsibilities of the Controller, the Processor and any Sub-processors.
- 6.3 In circumstances where personal data will be processed either by DCMS (the Controller) or a third party on our behalf, DCMS is required to complete a Data Protection Impact Assessment ("DPIA") prior to any processing. A DPIA may be undertaken after contract award but prior to any processing with input from the Tenderer or Supplier (the Data Processor), factoring in time to consult the ICO if the DPIA relates to high risk processing. This may also require updating as processes evolve or more information becomes available throughout the contract term.

7 ELIGIBILITY OF TENDERERS (JOINT VENTURES OR CONSORTIA)

- 7.1 Tenderers may take the form of sole legal entities or may wish to combine to form consortia, joint ventures (JVs), unincorporated associations or partnerships. This may, for example, apply to entities who feel that alone they do not have the capacity or capability to address the size and scale of the Department's requirement. Tenderers are responsible for determining the most appropriate approach to delivering their proposal, should consider the instructions below and also consider whether sub-contracting alone may be sufficient.
- 7.2 The following additional instructions apply to Tenderers who put forward a joint approach:
- (i) A Lead Party must be identified that shall submit a ITT response on behalf of all Parties to the JV/consortium;
 - (ii) The Lead Party shall be responsible for all communication with the Department during the procurement process;
 - (iv) As part of their ITT response, the Tenderer must submit a structure diagram identifying the roles and relationships between the Parties including all relevant companies, their respective parent or ultimate

holding companies. The structure should make clear who will be contractually responsible for delivery of the contract and ensure that, as a minimum, the legal obligations and liabilities of the Tenderer are borne by an entity or entities which satisfy the financial and economic requirements set out in the ITT. Where the group is proposing to create a separate legal entity, such as a special purpose vehicle (SPV) or consortium, they should provide details of the actual or proposed percentage shareholding of the constituent members within the new entity and details of its legal and operational structure. An SPV is a legal entity that is formed to perform a specific contract;

- (v) Appendix C (Tender Submission Statement) should be completed and signed by all Parties together with written confirmation from each Party that they authorise the Lead Party organisation to act on their behalf in relation to this procurement exercise;
- (vi) If awarded a Contract, unless otherwise stated in your submission, each of the Parties shall be jointly and severally responsible for the due performance of any contract with the Department.

7.3 Tenderers must advise the Department if there is any change to their legal status and/or composition during or after the procurement process, and the Department reserves the right to disqualify Tenderers where significant or material changes occur.

8 NO MARKETING RIGHTS

8.1 Tenderers shall not and shall procure that their subcontractors, representatives, agents and/or advisors do not do any of the following without obtaining the prior written consent of the Department:

- (i) make a public statement or communicate in any form with the media in connection with this procurement process;
- (ii) use any trademarks, logos or other intellectual property rights associated with the Department and/or its stakeholders;
- (iii) represent that the Tenderer is directly or indirectly associated in any way with the Department and/or its stakeholders or that its or their respective products and/or services are in any way endorsed by the Department and/or its stakeholders; or
- (iv) do anything or refrain from doing anything which would have an adverse effect on or embarrass the Department and/or its stakeholders.

9 ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

9.1 Information Sharing Across Government

All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, the Department may disclose within Government any of the Tenderer's documentation/information (including any that the Tenderer considers to be confidential and/or commercially sensitive such as specific bid information) submitted by the Tenderer to the Department during this procurement. The information will not be disclosed outside Government. Tenderers taking part in this competition consent to these terms as part of the competition process.

9.2 **Government Security Classifications**

The Government has introduced its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme to replace the current Government Protective Marking System (GPMS). A key aspect of this is the reduction in the number of security classifications used. All potential Tenderers are encouraged to make themselves aware of the changes and identify any potential impacts in their tender, as the protective marking and applicable protection of any material passed to, or generated by, you during the tender process or pursuant to any contract awarded to you as a result of this tender process will be subject to the new GSC. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

<https://www.gov.uk/Government/publications/Government-security-classifications>

The Department reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITT to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC.

9.3 **Cyber Essentials Scheme**

It is mandatory for Suppliers to demonstrate that they meet the technical requirements prescribed by Cyber Essentials for those contracts featuring any of the characteristics set out below.

The requirements can be found at:

<https://www.cyberaware.gov.uk/cyberessentials/>

Any of the following characteristics will necessitate the requirements prescribed by Cyber Essentials:

- i) Where personal information of citizens, such as home addresses, bank details, or payment information is handled by a Supplier.

ii) Where personal information of HMG employees, Ministers and Special Advisors such as payroll, travel booking or expenses information is handled by a Supplier.

iii) Where ICT systems and services are supplied which are designed to store, or process, data at the OFFICIAL level of the Government Protective Marking scheme

Where any of the above apply, assurance will be required that Suppliers themselves exercise good cyber security practice, holding Cyber Essentials as a minimum by contract commencement.

Potential Suppliers are required to implement appropriate arrangements for data security at all times, particularly relating to the transmission and storage of personal data. Such procedures must meet the standards outlined in the Data Protection Act.

9.3 **CE marking**

Any applicable product provided as part of your response must comply with EU safety, health and environmental requirements and bear CE marking in line with the following guidance: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ce-marking>.

9.4 **Armed Forces Covenant**

The Armed Forces Covenant is a public sector pledge from Government, businesses, charities and organisations to demonstrate their support for the armed forces community. The Covenant was brought in under the Armed Forces Act 2011 to recognise that the whole nation has a moral obligation to redress the disadvantages the armed forces community face in comparison to other citizens, and recognise sacrifices made.

The Covenant's 2 principles are that:

- the armed forces community should not face disadvantages when compared to other citizens in the provision of public and commercial services
- special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given most such as the injured and the bereaved.

DCMS encourages all Tenderers, and their suppliers, to sign the Corporate Covenant, declaring their support for the Armed Forces community by displaying the values and behaviours set out therein.

Guidance on the various ways you can demonstrate your support through the Corporate Covenant is at [The Corporate Covenant](#).

If you wish to register your support you can provide a point of contact for your company on this issue to the Armed Forces Covenant Team at the address

below, so that the MOD can alert you to any events or initiatives in which you may wish to participate. The Covenant Team can also provide any information you require in addition to that included on the website.

Email address: covenant-mailbox@mod.uk

Address: Armed Forces Covenant Team, Zone D, 6th Floor, Ministry of Defence, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

The Armed Forces Covenant is not a condition of working with DCMS now or in the future, nor will this issue form any part of the tender evaluation, contract award procedure or any resulting contract. However, DCMS very much hopes you will want to provide your support.

10 DRAFT TIMETABLE

10.1 This timetable is provided as a guideline only and is subject to change.

Description	Date
ITT issue	17th June 2025
Deadline for clarification questions to be issued to the Department	10:00hrs BST, 1st July 2025
Deadline for receipt of Tender Responses	10:00hrs BST, 11th July 2025
Contract award	28th July 2025
Contract commencement	13th August 2025
Start up meeting	13th August 2025
Contract end date	13th February 2026

10.2 The Department reserves the right to extend the contract for a further 2 months.

11 RESPONSE CHECKLIST

Please ensure you have provided all the relevant documents in the table below when submitting your Tender Response. The following documentation will form your Tender Response and should be provided via the e-sourcing portal by the deadline for receipt of Tender Responses stated at 10.1(above) of this ITT document:

Document description	Mandatory to provide?	Format	File name (please name your documents as below)
Part 1			

Technical Submission	Mandatory	Word/PDF (single document containing responses to Questions 1-5 and the social value question)	"Tenderer name_Technical Submission"
Part 2			
Appendix B: Pricing Schedule	Mandatory	Word/PDF/Excel spreadsheet (template at Appendix B)	"Tenderer name_Pricing Schedule"
Other Appendices			
Appendix A: Selection Questionnaire	Mandatory	Word/PDF (template at Appendix A)	"Tenderer name_Appendix A"
Appendix C: Tender Submission Statement	Mandatory	Word/PDF (signed) (template at Appendix C)	"Tenderer name_Appendix C"
Appendix D: Commercially Sensitive Information	Only if desired	Word/PDF (template at Appendix D)	"Tenderer name_Appendix D"
Appendix E: Key Personnel, Primary Suppliers and Primary Subcontractors	Mandatory	Word/PDF (template at Appendix E)	"Tenderer name_Appendix E"

SECTION 2

SPECIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS ('Specification')

1. INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

This research project aims to develop a robust, evidence-led understanding of the social value generated by public service broadcasters (PSBs) in the UK, using the BBC as the primary case study. The purpose is twofold: first, to build a clear and communicable theoretical model of how PSBs create public value across different content types and services; and second, to develop practical methods for measuring and, where possible, monetising that value. These insights will help to supplement other pre-established evidence on the economic value of PSBs to build a more holistic picture of how PSBs contribute to broader societal welfare in a contemporary context.

The work is structured to deliver a theory of change, applied analytical research into methods for evaluating social value, and a series of applied case studies that test the framework in practice. It will support DCMS's broader Charter Review programme by generating research findings that are usable in policy, regulatory, and funding discussions - helping to answer the central question of why PSBs matter in a rapidly evolving media landscape dominated by commercial providers of significant scale.

2. SCOPE OF REQUIREMENT

2.1. RESEARCH CONTEXT

Public service broadcasters (PSBs) in the UK, and particularly the BBC as the most prominent example, are widely understood to deliver social value. But the case for how they do so, and why that value is distinctive or essential in a rapidly changing media ecosystem, could be developed further.

Anecdotal and case-based evidence have been widely cited: BBC Bitesize's role during the pandemic, or the community cohesion offered by local radio services, are commonly cited as examples of public value in action. At the intervention level, both internal BBC evaluations and external reviews (e.g. Ofcom's content assessments) have attempted to measure impacts. Similarly, discrete academic contributions such as the Institute of Innovation and Public Purpose (IIPP) [framework](#) on cultural and creative value have helped identify broad domains in which PSBs contribute such as civic engagement, representation, and education.

The drive of this work is underlined by two major trends::

1. **The shifting media environment:** in which commercial platforms (e.g. Netflix, YouTube, Spotify) increasingly dominate viewing and listening habits - particularly among younger demographics. This shift has prompted debate among some commentators about the continued role and necessity of publicly funded content in an increasingly on-demand media environment.
2. **Increasing public scrutiny of PSB funding:** questions have also emerged around the perceived fairness and value for money of the current licence fee model. While not necessarily challenging the existence of publicly funded content, these concerns

focus on whether the model remains equitable and widely supported. For example, recent figures show a decline in the number of people paying the licence fee and a rise in enforcement concerns, particularly among younger and lower-income audiences.

Within this context, the question is no longer just what PSBs should do, but why their existence matters and how we can measure the value they create, not only economically, but in terms of their broader social and cultural impact.

Current frameworks, including those developed by the BBC and academic partners, offer useful typologies and high-level mapping. However, in many cases, they do not fully provide:

- A rigorous, monetised approach to capturing the individual or societal-level value of PSB content.
- A comparative understanding of why consuming PSB content enriches life differently than commercial media (e.g. in terms of trust, learning, civic identity, or democratic participation).
- A narrative that is authoritative, grounded in evidence, and accessible to non-specialist audiences.

This research will seek to fill that gap. It will combine existing evidence with a new methodological framework to provide a robust account of the social value of PSBs, informed by audience experience, democratic context, and the evolving media landscape. The BBC will be used as a case study, and the aim will be to support the articulation of the public rationale for PSB models more broadly, setting out the risks of relying solely on the market for culturally, educationally, and civically-important content.

2.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Module 1: Theory of Change

Research Questions:

- What forms of social value are delivered by PSBs, and how do these vary by service type, audience, and platform?
- What are the distinct pathways through which PSBs generate social value - and how do these manifest in practice using the BBC as a case study?
- To what extent can the social value pathways be delivered by commercial providers, and what potential government incentives might enable or encourage this?
- How can these pathways be systematically mapped using a theory of change model applicable to PSBs?

Module 2: Evaluation Framework and applied analytical research into methods for evaluating social value

Research Questions:

- What are the most credible and practical methods for measuring or monetising the different types of social value associated with PSB content and services as identified in module 1?
- How can these methods be systematically mapped to value domains (e.g. civic trust, emotional wellbeing, education, representation)?
- What are the data requirements and barriers to applying these methods in real-world PSB contexts?
- To what extent is the social value delivered by PSB services unique to public provision, and how does it differ from outcomes potentially achievable through commercial media?
- What guidance or applied analytical methods for evaluating social value can support analysts and decision-makers in evaluating PSB impact?

Module 3: Case Studies

Research Questions:

- What is the social value generated by specific BBC services or activities, and how can this value be robustly evidenced by applying the Theory of Change and applied analytical methods for evaluating social value
- What is the estimated monetised or quantifiable value of selected BBC service-level case studies - such as content that reflects UK audiences, regional production, or educational programming?
- To what extent do the social value outcomes of these BBC services differ from those offered by commercial alternatives, and what makes them distinctive as public service content?
- How can insights from these service-level case studies be aggregated or extrapolated to inform wider public value arguments for Charter Review?

2.3. SCOPE

This research project is structured into three modules, each designed to build towards a clear, evidence-based, and communicable articulation of the social value of public service broadcasting (PSB) in the UK. The BBC will be used throughout as a primary case study given that it is the UK's most prominent public service broadcaster and the recipient of public funding via the licence fee in the PSB ecosystem.

The supplier should deliver each module in sequence, with the outputs of earlier modules informing the later stages.

Module 1: Landscape Review and PSB Theory of Change

Purpose: Establish a rigorous, evidence-based foundation for understanding the different types of social value PSBs are understood to deliver, and map this into a detailed theory of change model.

The supplier will:

- Conduct a targeted literature review of existing frameworks and typologies, including academic, regulatory, and grey literature (e.g. IIPP/[Policy and Evidence Centre \(PEC\) framework](#), Ofcom assessments).
- Identify and synthesise the types of value PSBs create (e.g. informational, democratic, cultural, educational), including audience-facing and societal impacts.
- Develop a theory of change framework that visually and narratively sets out:
 - Inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and longer-term value pathways for PSB content.
 - The role of public funding and regulation in enabling these effects.
 - Where these value pathways are potentially underprovided by commercial providers.
- Apply this framework to a mapping of BBC services and outputs, identifying where different forms of value are most likely to be delivered.

Output: A detailed theory of change for PSBs, illustrated with BBC examples, supported by references and explanatory narrative. This output should be visually engaging, analytically grounded, and usable across government.

Module 2: Applied Analytical Methods for Evaluating Social Value

Purpose: Develop a set of practical, robust methods and decision-making frameworks that can be used to strengthen the analytical evidence base on the social value of public service content. These frameworks should support PSBs in demonstrating their broader societal contributions and help inform ongoing policy and funding debates around the value of publicly funded media.

The supplier will:

Review and assess existing non-market valuation approaches, including:

- **Willingness to pay (WTP) and contingent valuation surveys:** Asking people directly how much they would be willing to pay for a service they currently receive for free, to estimate its perceived value.
- **Discrete choice modelling:** Presenting people with a set of hypothetical choices between different versions of a service (e.g. with and without certain features) to see which attributes they value most and how they trade them off. This helps estimate value based on preference structures.
- **Audience diaries or ethnographic/immersive methods:** Asking participants to keep journals or participate in longer-term observation or interviews to capture detailed, qualitative insights into how they use and experience PSB content.

- **Comparative exposure or experimental methods:** Using before/after surveys or experimental comparisons (e.g. exposing one group to PSB content and another to commercial content) to measure changes in trust, knowledge, civic attitudes, or wellbeing.
- **Qualitative or narrative case studies:** Developing rich, story-led evidence of how particular services or content have impacted people's lives, which may not be measurable in numbers but still illustrate public value.
- **Content tagging and representation analysis:** Analysing the themes, settings, and representation in PSB content to understand whose stories are being told, which communities are being represented, and whether this reflects diverse audiences across the UK.

This list is not exhaustive; the supplier will be expected to draw on their expertise and work with DCMS to identify the most appropriate methods for different value domains.

For each method, assess:

- What kind of value it can capture (e.g. trust, civic connection, learning outcomes).
- What services or contexts it is most suitable for.
- Limitations, feasibility, and required data.
- Where monetised outputs are possible and where robust qualitative proxies are more appropriate.

Output: A well-documented set of methods and evidence-based options for evaluating and, where appropriate, monetising the social value of PSB provision. This should provide practical evidence based guidance for analysts and policymakers and be flexible enough to apply across different services and future evaluations.

Module 3: BBC Case Studies - Applying the Framework

Purpose: Demonstrate how the theory of change and proposed evaluation methods can be applied to real-world PSB services and activities - and generate specific findings for the BBC Charter Review and broader PSB debate.

To ensure robust and policy-relevant findings, the supplier will deliver four in-depth case studies that explore the social value generated by specific BBC services or activities. The first case study, on Regional Commissioning, has been pre-identified and is detailed in the methodology section below.

The remaining three case studies will be selected collaboratively with DCMS, drawing on insights from Modules 1 and 2. The supplier will be expected to propose and justify the final selection, using a clear set of criteria. These criteria should include:

- Analytical tractability - the feasibility of assessing social value through the methods identified in modules 1 and 2;
- Data availability - the accessibility of data that can support meaningful analysis;

- Distinctiveness - whether the activity reflects features unique to public service broadcasting, or would be underprovided in a purely commercial environment;
- Audience relevance - whether the service or activity contributes to outcomes that matter to the public (e.g. trust, wellbeing, civic participation);
- Policy utility - the potential of findings to inform future PSB policy or contribute to wider Charter Review priorities.

DCMS has identified a number of areas of interest that it would be interested to explore through case studies, but these are intended as indicative rather than prescriptive. It will be for the supplier to propose final case studies based on the criteria set above..

1. Educational Content - a strong candidate for a second case study, focused on the public value generated through services like Bitesize, BBC Teach, and early-years programming. This case study will only be taken forward if the findings from earlier modules demonstrate that educational content delivers distinctive and measurable forms of social value that can feasibly be assessed within the project's scope.
2. Events of National Significance - focused on coverage of events such as the coronation, Olympics, VE Day commemorations, or pandemic-related broadcasts. These moments are frequently referenced as examples where the BBC is widely trusted and plays a unifying national role. This case study would explore how such coverage contributes to civic trust, national cohesion, and shared identity. Given the nature of these impacts, the case study is likely to draw primarily on qualitative approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or narrative case studies, potentially complemented by survey-based evidence. It may not lend itself easily to monetisation but can offer rich insights into symbolic and emotional forms of public value.
3. On-Screen Representation - focused on the public value created through increased visibility of underrepresented groups on screen. This case study would explore whether content that reflects a broader range of identities and communities contributes to individual outcomes (such as aspiration, belonging, or wellbeing) and to societal outcomes (such as social cohesion, cultural recognition, or attitudinal shifts). While Ofcom regularly reviews how public service broadcasters (BBC, ITV, STV, Channel 4, Channel 5, and S4C) reflect UK diversity as part of their statutory duties, and reports on this through its [Small Screen: Big Debate programme](#), there is limited evidence linking on-screen representation to measurable social value. This case study would aim to bridge that gap, potentially through qualitative methods, sentiment analysis, or survey-based approaches to capture audience responses and perceived impacts.

The supplier must provide a clear rationale for the final selection of these three additional case studies, including the research questions addressed, proposed methods for valuation, and the data sources required. Where BBC data is not available, fallback options should be set out, drawing on desk research, sector expertise, or proxy datasets. This approach ensures that all case studies are rooted in methodological rigour and aligned with the project's overarching goal of evidencing the social value of PSB provision.

For each case, the supplier will:

- Map the activity against the theory of change;
- Apply or test at least one method from Module 2;
- Identify available evidence and potential gaps;
- Generate findings suitable for public policy use and application.

Output: Well-documented case studies demonstrating how the value framework and methods work in practice. Each should include visual and narrative elements and be clearly aligned with the project's wider objectives.

2.4. METHODOLOGY

Module 1: Developing a Theory of Change for PSB Social Value

For this research module, the Supplier shall develop a full theory of change (ToC) model that articulates the mechanisms through which PSBs, using the BBC as a case study, deliver different forms of social value to individuals and to UK society. The ToC should aim to be as comprehensive as possible in capturing all the routes through which PSBs deliver social value to ensure the breadth of PSB impact is covered at this initial stage. The Supplier must be able to complete this work independently, drawing on a combination of desk research, published studies, and sector knowledge. DCMS will aim to facilitate light-touch engagement with the BBC where feasible, but bidders must set out clearly in their proposals how they intend to deliver this work without assuming significant BBC input. Where BBC input is considered essential, the supplier must propose fallback options for obtaining the necessary information through other means (e.g. analogous PSB data, expert consultation, third-party data suppliers).

The Supplier must work with DCMS to clarify and agree a shared definition of “social value” for the purposes of this project. This should be grounded in existing academic and policy literature, drawing in particular on the Public Value framework developed by the BBC and the Institute for Innovation and Public Purpose (IIPP). That framework distinguishes between three dimensions of public value: individual (audience) value, industry value, and societal value.

For this study, social value should be interpreted as referring primarily to the individual and societal dimensions - that is, the benefits to people and communities that are not fully captured through market mechanisms or profit-based incentives. While the Green Book also uses the term “social value”, it encompasses a wider range of impacts, including some economic or industry outcomes. In contrast, the focus here is on non-industry-related public value, even where those impacts may be indirectly connected to BBC or PSB operations.

Indicative examples include:

- Individual value: learning, cultural participation, emotional and psychological engagement
- Societal value: democratic trust, civic cohesion, shared identity, inclusion and representation

- Non-market international value: UK soft power, global perception, support for international development goals

Suppliers should take this definitional framing as the reference point when designing the theory of change, selecting indicators, or proposing valuation methods. Industry value (e.g. sector growth or job creation) may be relevant contextually but is not a primary focus of this work.

The Supplier should critically assess how these different categories intersect and manifest across different services, recognising that some types of value (e.g. soft power, civic engagement) operate at a macro level and are harder to link directly to individual content or usage metrics.

The Supplier's theory of change must be developed at a functional service level. In the BBC case study context, this includes, but is not limited to, live broadcast BBC TV content, BBC News (TV, radio, and online), BBC iPlayer (on-demand TV), BBC Sounds and Radio, Children's and Educational services (e.g. Bitesize), the BBC World Service, Nations and Local output, and BBC Online. The aim is to articulate, for each of these services, the causal chains through which BBC content, platforms, and delivery mechanisms create short, medium, and long-term outcomes of public value. These should include informational, civic, cultural, educational, and social outcomes. The Supplier should clearly set out the value pathways associated with each service and how these interact at a service-portfolio level.

Each value pathway should describe both the causal logic and the type(s) of social value produced, including any evidence of reach, intensity, and durability. Where appropriate, these pathways should be supported by plausible or measurable indicators and reflect both service-specific and cross-service effects. The supplier may also identify and describe cross-cutting themes (e.g. civic trust, democratic engagement) that span multiple services or genres.

Each logic chain or sub-model must clearly set out standard ToC elements: inputs, activities, outputs, short-term outcomes, and longer-term impacts. Assumptions about causality and contextual dependencies should be made explicit. The Supplier should also highlight any enabling conditions that underpin impact delivery (e.g. digital access, public trust in media, availability of local infrastructure).

Methodology: The theory of change shall be constructed through a combination of evidence review, stakeholder engagement, and structured mapping. The Supplier will be expected to:

1. Conduct a literature and evidence review covering existing PSB value frameworks, cultural value literature, the UCL public value framework, the PEC layered value model, and international comparators where relevant. This review should highlight where types of social value are already well-evidenced, and where gaps remain. The starting point for theory development should be the existing external frameworks, including UCL IIPP, PEC research, and the Green Book.

2. Develop a modular theory of change, with individual logic chains or sub-models created for each of the core BBC services listed above. These sub-models should each link BBC inputs (e.g. investment, editorial policy, regulatory obligations) to measurable or inferable public outcomes. The modular design should allow for both individual and aggregate analysis across the portfolio. Where possible, suppliers should identify audience segmentation effects (e.g. by geography, socio-economic status, or age) and reflect these in the mapping of value pathways. The Supplier should also consider how different user needs and preferences shape the nature and value of engagement with PSB content.
4. Iteratively test and refine the model. The Supplier shall hold review sessions with DCMS and the BBC to test assumptions, visualise the model, and ensure accuracy and usability.
5. The supplier should identify and assess credible ways to evaluate the social value of PSB services, drawing primarily on the BBC/IIPP framework definition of social value - which includes individual and societal-level impacts, and excludes industry-level or economic returns. Suppliers should propose specific indicators or metrics, assess which are supported by available data, and explain how they would handle any uncertainty or data gaps, particularly for outcomes that are difficult to quantify. Where appropriate, suppliers should draw on methodological frameworks and valuation techniques recommended by HM Treasury's Green Book, for example, the use of WELLBYs, stated preference techniques, or avoided cost models to help assess non-market social outcomes. However, the Green Book's broader framing of 'public value' should not be used to redefine the scope of this research. To support decision-making, suppliers may also present a maturity matrix or similar framework to show which outcomes are most evaluable and where further development may be needed. Indicators should be grouped according to strength of evidence, feasibility, and relevance to the aims of this study.

The Supplier must also outline how the final ToC can be used in practice. This includes its application in:

- Strategic communication (e.g. to illustrate PSB public value in ministerial briefings)
- Policy development (e.g. to assess or justify the case for intervention)
- Future government impact assessments across the PSB and media sector more broadly.

Outputs must be designed to be both analytically robust and accessible to non-technical policy audiences. While analytical independence must be maintained, the Supplier is expected to work collaboratively and DCMS teams throughout.

The Supplier's methodology and proposed process should be set out in a scoping report during the first phase of the contract. This should include a clear breakdown of steps, assumptions, evidence sources, data gaps, and planned outputs. A draft theory of change should be shared mid-project, with a final version submitted alongside a summary report and presentation materials.

Output:

- A complete, modular theory of change for BBC public value, including a logic model and supporting value typology;
- A report detailing the methodology, assumptions, evidence base, and areas of uncertainty;
- A visual, service-level schematic showing how value is generated by different BBC services, and how these services interact at a portfolio level;
- A short practical guide on how the ToC can be used in future policy, evaluation, and strategy work;
- A technical annex listing indicators, assumptions, and evidence ratings;
- A slide deck and editable visual materials suitable for internal and ministerial communication.

Module 2: Developing an Evaluation Framework for PSB Social Value

This module is intended to operationalise the theory of change developed in Module 1 by establishing a robust evaluation framework that can be used to assess, estimate, and, where appropriate, monetise the social value created by public service broadcasters. The framework must be usable by PSBs and regulators alike - both to evidence impact and to potentially inform strategic decisions, funding structures, and possible future reforms.

The framework must ultimately help articulate and distinguish the types of value generated by PSBs in comparison to commercial media providers. It must go beyond the narrow use-value models or programme-specific appraisals that some operators already carry out. Instead, the intention is to provide a coherent, intellectually sound, and publicly defensible model of PSB value generation that is applicable across different content genres, delivery platforms, and audience segments.

A crucial element of the framework must include not just articulation of PSB value in isolation, but consideration of the counterfactual: to what extent can commercial providers generate similar types of social value? For each value domain, the supplier should include analysis or structured judgement on whether the value created is:

- wholly distinctive to PSBs (e.g. trust in institutions through impartial news);
- enhanced by PSBs due to public interest mission (e.g. cultural representation);
- potentially replicable by commercial platforms (e.g. entertainment-led wellbeing effects), and what is lost in terms of accessibility, universality or public accountability.

This comparative aspect is essential in underpinning a compelling justification for PSB-specific provision and funding.

The Supplier shall begin with a scoping phase to define and test the conceptual basis of the framework, drawing first and foremost on UCL IIPP's layered public value model, PEC's research on PSB value, and previous DCMS-commissioned work including the [Frontier Economics](#) wellbeing valuation of cultural and heritage activities. This scoping should also consider relevant guidance from HM Treasury's Green Book and Magenta Book, particularly where these support practical application or monetisation of societal and individual-level value.

The primary focus should be on frameworks that are externally validated and analytically transferable. The framework must be deliverable without assuming access to internal BBC teams or data. However, DCMS will facilitate engagement with relevant BBC policy or analytical teams where helpful to identify existing internal evidence or align with parallel work. This engagement will be light-touch and coordinated by DCMS.

Data requirements and dependencies: The supplier should not collect data at this stage, but must define the expected types of data that would be required to operationalise the evaluation framework. This includes specifying where appropriate data is likely to exist, what proxies may be acceptable, and where PSBs would face critical gaps or high collection burdens. The framework should be developed with consideration of realistic access to data within PSBs and the wider public evidence ecosystem.

The preferred methodology for this module is the development of an integrated, multi-method evaluation model.

Methodology: The Supplier shall construct a modular evaluation framework that defines a core set of PSB value domains - such as civic trust, wellbeing, cultural identity, learning and education, and global soft power - and maps them to appropriate outcomes, indicators, and valuation methods. Each domain should include both short and long-term outcomes, and consider where the value is realised (individual, or societal level).

For each domain, the Supplier shall identify:

- Primary public outcomes and how they relate to BBC or PSB-specific interventions;
- Appropriate indicators - quantitative, qualitative, or proxy-based - with metadata (e.g. source, frequency, reliability, data gaps);
- The most appropriate evaluation technique (e.g. wellbeing valuation, contribution analysis, case-based evaluation, avoided cost modelling, Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALYs), or Wellbeing Adjusted Life Years (WELLBYs));
- The feasibility of monetisation, including what assumptions would be needed to apply contingent valuation, willingness-to-pay methods, or revealed preference approaches;

- A structured comparative assessment of whether the identified value could credibly be delivered by non-PSBs and what trade-offs would be entailed.

Suppliers should also consider how to represent and manage interdependencies between domains - for example, how a service like BBC News may simultaneously impact civic trust, democratic participation, and national cohesion. The framework should avoid double-counting while still acknowledging overlapping pathways.

A key focus should also be on clarity of audience - i.e. who benefits from the value: individuals, families, communities, or society as a whole, and how this influences appropriate methods and data.

The Supplier must specify the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of each method, and provide guidance on which approach to use under which conditions. The supplier must develop a clear decision framework that helps future users choose between different evaluation approaches, based on things like data availability, analytical capacity, and how robust the assessment needs to be.

The outputs of Module 2 will inform Module 3. Suppliers should not undertake any service-specific worked examples within this module. Instead, they should focus on designing a generalisable and methodologically rigorous evaluation structure, with decision rules and practical templates that can be later applied to BBC services or those of other PSBs.

Module 3: Application to BBC Case Studies

The purpose of this module is to test and demonstrate the theory and evaluation framework through focused case studies that estimate the social value of specific BBC services. Rather than attempting to estimate the aggregated total value of the BBC, this module aims to explore whether and how certain BBC activities can be monetised using robust valuation methods with the goal of providing a clear, aggregated illustration of value across a subset of core services.

Strategically, this allows us to show the framework in action and generate findings that are intelligible to policymakers. One possible output of this module would be a combined estimate of social value across a number of BBC services/activities, scaled to reflect per-user or per-household value.

To avoid duplication with existing work (e.g. the BBC's research on news and journalism), this module will begin with one agreed case study: Regional Commissioning, which will examine the economic and cultural value of geographically distributed production. The supplier will then deliver three additional case studies, to be selected during delivery in collaboration with DCMS. Selection will be informed by findings from Modules 1 and 2, and based on criteria such as analytical tractability, distinctiveness, data availability, and relevance to public value. Possible candidate areas include (indicative only):

- Children and Young People's Educational Content: focusing on services like Bitesize, BBC Teach, and early-years programming;

- Events of National Significance: such as the Olympics, royal events, or emergency broadcasts;
- On-Screen Representation: exploring the impact of increased visibility of underrepresented groups;
- Informational content: exploring the impact of BBC content (across services) on civic awareness, engagement in local and national democratic processes, environmental sustainability etc;
- Community and Participation: how the BBC facilitates community cohesion and/or impacts loneliness.

The supplier will need to define a clear and policy-relevant research question for each case study that has been agreed with DCMS, aligned to the theory of change developed in Module 1. For each case, they must identify the core value pathway being tested and draw on the evaluation options mapped out in Module 2. The research should aim to test whether and how the activity delivers value that is distinctive to PSBs, and whether this can be meaningfully described, measured, or monetised.

They should assess the feasibility of applying valuation techniques (e.g. WELLBYs, contingent valuation, avoided cost, or qualitative proxy methods), and where quantification is appropriate, estimate population-level impact using BBC audience or service reach data. Where direct measurement is not feasible, the supplier should offer a robust narrative-based valuation supported by audience or stakeholder evidence.

DCMS will coordinate a data request to the BBC at the appropriate stage of the project, but access is not guaranteed. The supplier will be expected to clearly specify the data they require - including format, granularity, and purpose, to enable timely and proportionate engagement. While we will aim to facilitate access where feasible, the supplier must also outline robust fallback strategies. These may include the use of desk-based research, industry benchmarks, expert elicitation, or sector-specific knowledge networks, as suggested by multiple suppliers during pre-market engagement.

Where appropriate, the supplier is encouraged to draw on media sentiment analysis, social media listening, or content engagement metrics to evaluate more abstract outcomes such as civic identity, community cohesion, or emotional resonance. These approaches may complement more structured methods and help capture non-use or symbolic value.

The supplier should also consider applying a Total Economic Value (TEV) framework to structure their approach, helping to distinguish between use value (e.g. direct consumption, engagement) and non-use value (e.g. existence, option, and symbolic value). All assumptions, methods, limitations, and risks must be clearly stated. Each case study will apply the methodology developed in Modules 1 and 2 and must:

- Draw from the theory of change and map outcomes to a clear value pathway;
- Set out a research question or hypothesis;
- Identify relevant BBC data or reasonable proxies;
- Apply a mix of quantitative and/or qualitative valuation approaches;
- Test whether outcomes are distinctive to PSBs.

Case Study 1 Methodology: Regional Commissioning

The BBC has committed to shifting more of its commissioning and production spend outside of London, aiming to spend an additional £700 million in the nations and regions between March 2021 and March 2028. This case study seeks to understand the *non-economic public value* that may result from that shift - with a focus on social, cultural, and representational outcomes that are often underprovided in commercial markets.

Research objective:

To test whether geographically distributed commissioning leads to distinctive public value outcomes that would not have occurred under a more centralised model - particularly in relation to regional representation, audience experience, and cultural relevance.

Research questions may include:

- Does regional commissioning lead to content that better reflects the experiences, identities, or priorities of audiences in different parts of the UK?
- Are there observable differences in engagement, sentiment, or perceived relevance for regionally commissioned content compared to centrally commissioned content?
- How do audiences, producers, and other stakeholders perceive the impact of regional commissioning on public service outcomes?

While this case study may touch on economic context - such as local production trends or regional spend - it is not intended to quantify economic returns or employment outcomes. Instead, the focus is on *how regional commissioning might enhance the distinctiveness and social value of PSB content*.

The methodology should include:

1. Quantitative analysis of commissioning trends

Suppliers should analyse commissioning spend and production activity by geography and genre over time. This should help identify shifts in regional commissioning and isolate changes in the location and type of content produced. The analysis should be contextualised using broader market trends - e.g. activity by Channel 4, ITV, or streaming platforms - to situate the BBC's commissioning patterns within the wider UK production landscape.

Suppliers must set out what BBC data they would need to conduct this analysis and propose fallback sources (such as Ofcom PSB data or industry databases) in case BBC data is unavailable. DCMS will coordinate a data access request to the BBC, but bidders are responsible for ensuring they have a viable plan for securing or substituting the necessary data.

2. Content and audience analysis

To assess whether regional commissioning leads to more distinctive or representative content, suppliers should examine programme metadata (genre, themes, format, representation) and audience engagement metrics (reach, uptake, qualitative feedback). Where possible, this should include regional breakdowns.

This analysis should be complemented by qualitative insights. Suppliers may conduct interviews or focus groups with audiences, producers, and commissioners to explore whether regionally commissioned content is perceived as more relevant or locally resonant. Suppliers are expected to draw on their own sector networks to identify participants.

3. Testing valuation methods

Finally, the supplier should explore options for valuing the social outcomes associated with regional commissioning. This may include:

- WELLBYs linked to representation, recognition, or cultural identity
- Willingness-to-pay or contingent valuation studies with audiences
- Avoided cost models estimating what comparable outcomes might cost through other interventions

Where feasible, these approaches should be scaled using audience reach or geographic exposure data. All assumptions must be clearly stated.

Case studies 2 - 4

The project will begin with one pre-identified case study: Regional Commissioning. This has been selected due to a clear evidence gap and its relevance to wider PSB policy work across DCMS. Regional commissioning represents a strong hypothesis-led example of a BBC activity that may create public value both economically and socially, and the research will explore whether this is the case and how such value might be monetised. The case study is detailed in full in the methodology. Alongside the agreed case study on Regional Commissioning, the supplier will deliver three additional case studies. These will be selected during delivery, based on findings from Modules 1 and 2, and in collaboration with DCMS.

Final selection should ensure analytical tractability, data availability, and coverage of diverse PSB value domains.

For each case study, the supplier must set out a clear rationale, research questions, proposed methods, and data needs. Where BBC data is unavailable, fallback options such as desk research or proxy datasets must be provided to ensure delivery remains feasible and robust.

2.5. DELIVERABLES

This section sets out the expected deliverables for each of the three research modules. These outputs must be analytically robust, clearly presented, and suitable for public policy use. The supplier must ensure that deliverables are accessible to both technical and non-technical audiences and that all materials are submitted in editable formats.

Module 1: Theory of Change

The supplier must produce a modular theory of change model that captures the causal relationships between BBC activities and the social value outcomes they are understood to generate. This will involve constructing logic chains for each core BBC service area (such as iPlayer, Bitesize, Sounds, News, and Nations and Regions) and synthesising these into a full portfolio-level framework. Deliverables will include a full-length narrative report, a modular logic model, and accompanying schematic diagrams. These visuals must be editable and suitable for reuse by DCMS and partner organisations.

The narrative report should explain the logic chains in detail, mapping inputs, outputs, short-term outcomes, and longer-term impacts. It should also articulate underlying assumptions and reference existing data sources and gaps. The theory of change should be designed to support both communication (e.g. slide decks for ministers) and future impact evaluation. A user guide must accompany the report to support reusability and interpretability, including instructions on how to interpret the model, key assumptions, and a summary of service-specific findings. A technical annex should detail indicators, assumptions, data gaps, and dependencies. Slide decks should also be created for non-technical audiences.

Module 2: Module 2: Evaluation Methods and Practical Guidance

The supplier must create a comprehensive framework for assessing the social value of PSBs, mapping evaluation methods to types of social value and providing clear guidance on which approaches are suitable for different services and outcomes. This should result in a method-value matrix, a library of indicators with associated metadata, and a full methodological report that explains how to apply the framework.

Deliverables will include a written framework document outlining the conceptual and methodological basis of the evaluation structure, a tool for selecting appropriate techniques such as contingent valuation, QALYs, or WELLBYs, and a maturity matrix that classifies evaluation-readiness by domain. The supplier must provide a set of template documents such as blank ToC logic chains or indicator specification tables and decision support frameworks such as flow charts or logic trees to aid uptake by non-technical teams. A slide deck explaining the evaluation framework and approaches should be designed for senior policymakers and programme leads.

The evaluation framework must also include a dedicated section on counterfactual reasoning, setting out how to assess the uniqueness of PSB value relative to commercial provision and providing guidance on selecting appropriate comparators and both qualitative and quantitative controls. The final package should be generalisable but piloted using BBC examples, with an emphasis on reusability and sector-wide learning.

Module 3: Case Studies

This module applies the theory of change and evaluation framework to four case studies. Each case study must be delivered as a standalone report, with clearly defined research questions, logic chain mapping, methodological details, and results. If valuation techniques

are used such as contingent valuation or WELLBYs, the supplier should provide a cleaned and anonymised dataset in CSV format, along with user documentation.

The reports must include both technical and policy-facing content. Each should contain a methodological appendix, a summary of assumptions, detailed analysis of outputs and outcomes, and, where applicable, monetisation estimates. A slide deck suitable for senior stakeholders must also be included for each case study. The supplier should provide fallback methodological approaches in the event of limited BBC data access and clearly explain any data substitutions or proxies used.

All assumptions and limitations should be clearly documented. If alternative case studies are proposed, these must be evidenced and justified as per the criteria set out earlier in the document.

Cross-Cutting and Reporting Deliverables

At project initiation, the supplier must produce a detailed scoping report that outlines refined research questions, methodological proposals, a high-level workplan, and a summary of risks, dependencies, and mitigation strategies. This report must be suitable for internal and external audiences and serve as a baseline for measuring progress.

At the midpoint of the project, the supplier will provide an interim report summarising emerging findings, data access updates, methodology refinements, and anticipated next steps. This document must flag risks, slippage, or budgetary concerns.

A final overarching report will be produced that draws together findings across all three modules. This must be suitable for publication and structured using the 1:3:25 format consisting of a one-page summary, a three-page executive summary, and a 30-page main body. The report must include methodological overviews, evidence summaries, technical annexes such as data tables or model documentation.

A final slide pack should be produced for senior decision-makers, supported by module-specific decks to brief internal stakeholders and communicate findings externally.

At project close, the supplier will submit a formal handover note listing deliverables, summarising unfinished tasks or future opportunities, and offering short background briefings on each product. The note must be accompanied by editable source files, data dictionaries, and any additional frameworks or models created.

The supplier will deliver at least one knowledge-sharing session or teach-in for DCMS staff, focused on methodology, model use, or framework application. This can be virtual or in person.

Project Governance and Quality Assurance

To support continuous quality assurance and effective project management, the supplier will participate in a 90-minute kick-off workshop to finalise scope and expectations, a mid-project

workshop to review emerging outputs and refine direction, and a final close-out workshop to present findings and discuss future dissemination.

In addition, fortnightly check-in meetings of 30 minutes and monthly written progress reports of one to two pages per module will be expected. Suppliers should flag any risks, delays, or changes to scope promptly and work with the DCMS team to resolve them.

Suppliers will be expected to engage with DCMS at key governance points, including but not limited to: finalisation of methodology for each module, confirmation of selected case studies for Module 3, agreement on fallback approaches where BBC data or input is not available, and prior to finalising any public-facing deliverables. DCMS retains the right to review, request revisions, and sign off on key milestones and outputs.

A robust quality assurance (QA) plan must be submitted as part of the scoping phase. This should outline how the supplier will ensure analytical rigour, manage risks, and maintain high standards throughout the project lifecycle. The QA plan must include details of internal review processes, validation checks for data and modelling outputs, and a QA log to record identified issues and resolutions. Suppliers are expected to follow best practice in line with the principles of the Aqua Book, including clear audit trails for all methodological decisions and transparent documentation of assumptions.

All datasets must be submitted in CSV format, anonymised and cleaned, with codebooks and user notes. Reports must be in Word and PDF. Slide packs must be editable PowerPoint files. All outputs must be suitable for publication and reuse, adhering to accessibility and government branding standards. Suppliers must ensure that any proprietary models or frameworks are documented for internal reuse.

This project must meet the milestone and payment schedule set out in Appendix B. Progress and quality will be assessed by the Buyer using a Milestone Acceptance Process to ensure research objectives are met on time and to standard.

The supplier will be expected to attend regular check-ins with DCMS. This will include:

- A project kick-off workshop (w/c 11 August 2025)
- Mid-Project Review Workshop: w/c 13 October 2025)
- A final close-out and findings workshop w/c 2 February 2026)
- Fortnightly written progress updates
- Monthly 1-2 page progress reports
- Ad hoc workshops and technical meetings where appropriate

All deliverables must adhere to relevant accessibility and publication standards. Content must be clear, legible, and free from technical jargon unless otherwise specified.

Delivery Milestones

Deliverable	W/c	Description
Kick-Off Workshop	11/08/2025	Initial project alignment meeting to finalise scope and expectations
Scoping Report (Payment Milestone 1)	01/09/2025	Detailed scoping report with refined research questions, methodology, workplan, and risk summary
Interim Report	29/09/2025	Summary of emerging findings, data access updates, and methodology refinements
Mid-Project Review Workshop	20/10/2025	Workshop to review outputs to date and refine direction
Module 1 Deliverables (Payment Milestone 2)	10/11/2025	Full narrative report and modular logic model for BBC theory of change, with schematic diagrams and user guide
Module 2 Deliverables	15/12/2025	Evaluation framework with method-value matrix, indicators library, and framework templates
Module 3 Deliverables	02/02/2026	Four case study reports including regional commissioning, educational content, and a third selected with DCMS
Final Report and Final Presentation	09/02/2026	Final overarching report (1:3:25 format), final slide pack, and synthesis of all module findings
Handover Note and Teach-Ins (Payment Milestone 3)	09/02/2026	Handover note, editable source files, teach-in session, and any remaining tool documentation

All progress will be reviewed against these milestones. Payment will be conditional upon satisfactory delivery of outputs in line with the Milestone Acceptance Process.

Milestone Acceptance Process

Upon completion of the milestones set out in Table A the Supplier shall submit the relevant deliverables to the Buyer for review; such review is to include quality assurance by the Buyer regarding the extent to which the deliverables have met the relevant milestone acceptance criteria. The Buyer shall, within 10 days of receipt of deliverables, either confirm to the Supplier that such deliverables are satisfactory or notify the Supplier regarding any requirement for amendments or adjustments. The Supplier shall, within 10 days of notification by the Buyer undertake any remedial action reasonably required and re-submit to the Buyer for approval. Should the deliverables remain unsatisfactory to the Buyer the matter shall be resolved in accordance with the Dispute Resolution Process.

4. TIMETABLE

- A project kick-off workshop (w/c 11 August 2025)
- Mid-Project Review Workshop: w/c 20 October 2025)
- A final close-out and findings workshop w/c 9 February 2026)
- Fortnightly written progress updates
- Monthly 1-2 page progress reports
- Ad hoc workshops and technical meetings where appropriate

5. SERVICE LEVELS & PERFORMANCE

- Deliverables defined in the tender delivered on time and to sufficient standard, measured relative to project timescales and feedback from relevant colleagues
- Regular progress checks, including any Contract Management requirements
- Social Value KPIs - these include:
 - Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employment opportunities created under the contract, by UK region
 - Number of apprenticeship opportunities (Level 2, 3, and 4+) created or retained under the contract, by UK region.
 - Number of training opportunities (Level 2, 3, and 4+) created or retained under the contract, other than apprentices, by UK region.
 - Number of people-hours of learning interventions delivered under the contract, by UK region.

6. LOCATION

The location of the Services will be carried out at 'the Supplier's premises'

7. BUDGET

The estimated value of this requirement is in the range of £300,000 - £350,000. Prices must be inclusive of all fees, costs and expenses, and exclusive of VAT. Please note that, while not the only criteria, pricing is a key element of our evaluation criteria.

ANNEX A SOCIAL VALUE

Social Value Overview

For the avoidance of doubt, this section (Annex A) refers to the social value that will be evaluated with the tender competition, and not the social value that the contents of the research is looking to investigate.

Social Value ([PPN 06/20](#)) is a framework utilised in government procurement to prioritise and assess the broader societal benefits of contracts beyond just cost-effectiveness. It emphasises the consideration of environmental, social, and economic impacts, aiming to maximise positive outcomes for communities.

By incorporating factors like environmental sustainability, job creation, and support for marginalised groups into procurement decisions, the model ensures that public spending generates lasting value beyond immediate deliverables. This approach fosters a more holistic and responsible allocation of resources, promoting long-term societal well-being and fostering a more equitable and sustainable economy, making it vital for effective governance.

As a result, the Social Value Model (SVM) has been created which details 5 Themes, 8 Policy Outcomes and 24 Model Award Criteria (MACs). Each policy outcome within the SVM has been designed so that users can easily assess and evaluate the relevant social value offered in tenders and manage the social value delivered in contracts. The SVM provides detailed information relating to each policy outcome, including:

- Model Evaluation Questions
- Model Response Guidance for tenderers
- Model Award Criteria and Sub-Criteria
- Reporting Metrics

Social Value Policy Outcome and Evaluation

This tender will be focusing on the following priority MAC 2.2 Employment and training opportunities.

An overview of the chosen policy outcome and award criteria has been shared below, which is deemed to be relevant and proportionate to the subject matter of the contract:

Priority Theme	Policy Outcome	Model Award Criteria
MAC 2.2 Employment and training	Create new businesses, new jobs and new skills	MAC2.2 Effective measures to create employment and training opportunities particularly for those who face barriers to employment and/or who are located in deprived areas, and for people in industries with known skills shortages or in high growth sectors.

For each policy outcome outlined above the corresponding evaluation question and model sub-criteria can be found under **PART 3: Social Value of the ITT**. The detailed sub-criteria provide a guide of options and illustrative examples for bidders, however please note these examples are not mandatory.

When providing your response, we ask that you describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver outcomes in respect of the MAC 2.2. Employment and Training described under Part 3: Social Value.

Evaluators will qualitatively assess your tender response based on the provided information. Please ensure you address the specified SVM MACs. Any additional information which is not specific to the contract being procured will not be considered.

Please ensure your responses set out the additional Social Value benefits that they will deliver against the Policy Outcomes for this procurement, i.e. **commitments that are over and above the core deliverables of the contract**. It is not sufficient to only reference or use Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and or Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) documents.

The scoring matrix can be found detailed under **Section 3, PART 3: Social Value**.

Social Value Contract monitoring and reporting

Social value commitments will be recorded, monitored and measured using the following standard reporting metrics:

1. Number of full-time equivalent (FTE) employment opportunities created under the contract, by UK region
2. Number of apprenticeship opportunities (Level 2, 3, and 4+) created or retained under the contract, by UK region.
3. Number of training opportunities (Level 2, 3, and 4+) created or retained under the contract, other than apprentices, by UK region.
4. Number of people-hours of learning interventions delivered under the contract, by UK region.

Alongside the Standard Reporting Metrics (SRM), Social Value Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be used within this contract. KPIs will be generated from the Potential Provider's social value response; it is therefore important that measurable commits are included in the response (both commitments against the SRMs and other metrics as may be appropriate). KPIs will be agreed between the parties and included in the contract at Contract Award.

It is crucial that all social value commitments offered are Specific, Measurable, Achievable,

Relevant and Timed (SMART). The Contractor shall work with the DCMS Contract Manager to deliver the social value commitments outlined within their response and will be required to report on contractual commitments during the contract term.

Further Social Value Guidance can be found:

- . Social Value Model (SVM), Government Commercial Function,
Edition 1.1 – 3 Dec 20
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/940827/Guide-to-using-the-Social-Value-Model-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf
- b. Guide to Using the Social Value Model, Government Commercial Function,
Edition 1.1 – 3 Dec 20
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/940826/Social-Value-Model-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf
- c. Social Value Model Quick Reference Table, Government Commercial Function,
Edition 1.1 – 3 Dec 20
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/940828/Social-Value-Model-Quick-Reference-Table-Edn-1.1-3-Dec-20.pdf

SECTION 3

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Questionnaire and Evaluation Criteria

The elements of the Tender Response to be evaluated will be made up of four parts as shown below:

Part	Description	Weighting
PART 1:	Technical Submission	60%
PART 2:	Social Value	10%
PART 3:	Pricing Schedule	30%
Total:		100%

These are described in more detail below, together with information on how they will be assessed.

PART 1: TECHNICAL SUBMISSION

The questions in Part 1 are weighted, showing the relative importance of each criteria (expressed as a percentage). The total weighting for this section is **60%**. This is made up of 5 questions as shown below:

Question	Weighting
1: Conflict of Interest	Pass/Fail
2: Data Protection	Pass/Fail
3: Skills, expertise and capacity	20%
4: Methodology	20%
5: Understanding of the sector	20%

TOTAL FOR TECHNICAL SUBMISSION:	60%
--	------------

Each technical question response will be evaluated and marked on a scale of 0-4 where:

Evaluation Score		Technical Scoring Methodology
0	Fail	<p>The response fails to meet the requirements, standards and/or raises serious concerns because of one or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Information is omitted or insufficient making the proposal incomprehensible. ❖ The proposal represents an unacceptably high risk to the business.
1	Poor <i>(meets some of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response meets some of the requirements but contains significant gaps and/or concerns in several areas. There are reservations because of one or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There is at least one significant issue needing considerable attention. ❖ Limited evidence and assurance to support and demonstrate that the Tenderer will be able to provide the services. ❖ Considerable reservations in a number of areas in respect of relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to deliver the requirements. ❖ The proposal represents a moderate risk solution to the business.
2	Good <i>(meets all of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response meets most of the requirements. There are no significant areas of concern, although some areas lack detail that require further exploration or attention. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Sufficient evidence and assurance to support and demonstrate that the Tenderer will be able to provide the services. ❖ Minor reservations in a few areas in respect of relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to deliver the requirements. ❖ The proposal represents a low risk to the business.

3	Very good <i>(exceeds some of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response fully addresses and meets all requirements and standards. There are no significant areas of concern. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Full details and evidence provided to support the solution and demonstrate that the Tenderer will be able to provide the services. ❖ Full confidence as to the relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to deliver the requirements with some areas exceeding expectations. ❖ The proposal represents a minimal risk to the business.
4	Excellent <i>(exceeds all of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response exceeds expectations. Leaves no doubt as to the capability and commitment to deliver over and above the full set of requirements and standards. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Identified factors that will offer additional value / innovation. ❖ Demonstrates a considerably strong understanding of the requirements and/or in-depth market experience. ❖ Full confidence as to the relevant ability, understanding, expertise, skills and/or resources to deliver the requirements, but also exceeds it as described. ❖ The proposal represents minimal risk to the business.

Your score will be determined by the marks awarded for each question (out of 4), in accordance with the applicable weighting.

For example, if the weighting for a question is 10%, a mark of 4 for that question would lead to a score of 10%. A mark of 3 would lead to a score of 7.5%, a mark of 2 would lead to a score of 5%, a mark of 1 would lead to a score of 2.5%, and mark of 0 would lead to a score of 0%.

The questions for Part 1: Technical Submission along with the evaluation criteria for each, are shown below:

Question	Response Requirements	Weighting
Question 1: Conflict of Interest	<p>Please advise if there is any actual or perceived conflict of interest with regards to this contract and your organisation including members of staff.</p> <p>Pass/Fail scoring criteria as follows:</p> <p>The Department's opening panel will meet with the Department's legal department and representatives from the technical evaluation panel to discuss any</p>	Pass/Fail

	<p>actual or potential conflict of interest issues that have been disclosed by a Tenderer. The attendees at this meeting will decide whether the Tenderer's internal management processes and controls are satisfactory to safeguard against the actual or potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>If the team agrees that a Tenderer's internal management processes and controls are insufficient to safeguard against any conflict of interest issues. The team will make a recommendation to the Commercial Director to exclude that Tenderer from the procurement exercise.</p> <p>Page limit: 1 A4 side</p>	
Question 2: Data Protection	<p>Please set out the processes and procedures you have in place for ensuring your GDPR obligations are met with regards to the specific data held for this contract. Please include details of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will you ensure an adequate level of protection for any personal data processed by others on your behalf? (e.g. HR / Payroll / IT) - How will you ensure GDPR obligations are met by sub-contractors? - Relevant security measures - How will you seek assurances about the origins and accuracy of any personal data sourced for the purpose of this contract e.g. bought-in contact lists? - How you will deal with data breaches and subject access requests - Safeguarding processes for high risk data (e.g. children, vulnerable adults, sensitive data such as gender, race, etc.) <p>Evaluation criteria:</p> <p>The Tenderer should demonstrate a sound understanding of their GDPR obligations in relation to this specific Contract. They should demonstrate that they have sufficient processes and procedures in place to ensure they meet their GDPR obligations, or</p>	Pass Fail

	<p>that they will do so before data is processed. Security measures and relevant data protection procedures should be appropriate to the nature of the data being processed and adequate safeguarding processes should be in place for high risk data.</p> <p>Page limit: 2 A4 sides</p>	
<p>Question 3: Skills, expertise and capacity</p>	<p>Please demonstrate the relevant skills and expertise of your organisation and staff, to undertake this work. Relevant skills should include econometric modelling and primary data collection capabilities. Please provide CV details (key information, not full CVs) for up to 3 Key Persons who will be responsible for delivering this work. In particular, we are looking for individuals who have experience in econometric modelling.</p> <p>Please include an organogram showing a summary of roles and responsibilities, and the amount of each person's time to be dedicated to this project.</p> <p>Please also demonstrate that you have sufficient capacity to carry out this work. If the team includes any staff who are not permanently employed by your organisation please include details and advise how they will be secured and managed for the duration of the Contract. If you intend to outsource any of this research through a sub-contract, please explain how you envision doing so and why you believe this to be necessary.</p> <p>If applicable, please provide examples of similar research projects you have previously undertaken.</p> <p>Evaluation criteria:</p> <p>Your response should provide evidence that the Tenderer and Tenderer's team has excellent and relevant skills, expertise and experience to enable successful delivery of the project, with appropriate knowledge of the subject matter area. The response should demonstrate appropriate allocation of senior/junior resource and give confidence that appropriate Key Persons will dedicate sufficient time to the Contract. The response should demonstrate there is sufficient capacity to carry out this work, and manage</p>	20%

	<p>this project as a priority alongside any other current work.</p> <p>Page limit: 5 A4 sides (including CV details and organogram)</p>	
Question 4: Methodology	<p>Please provide details of your methodology for the project, from contract commencement to contract completion.</p> <p>This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed methodology for how you will carry out the work including key tasks and activities - Rationale for your proposed approach for each research module - High level project plan of how you will carry out each module and form the proposed deliverables - How you will meet the timescales required, and ensure the timings and contract price are not exceeded - Key risks you feel may arise and how you will overcome these <p>Evaluation Criteria:</p> <p>Your response should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demonstrate effective processes for acquiring data needed for the research - Demonstrate a clear and appropriate methodology for delivering the contract requirements, with clear rationale - Provide confidence in your approach and ability to deliver the scope of the project, in an appropriate manner - Provide confidence that the timescales and price will not be exceeded - Identify key risks and propose appropriate mitigation strategies - Approach to delivering lessons learned and teach-ins 	20%

	Page limit: 5 A4 sides	
Question 5: Understanding of the Sector	<p>Please demonstrate your understanding of the media sector and subject matter area for this contract, potential challenges that may be faced within this industry, and how you intend to mitigate these challenges for the purpose of this research.</p> <p>Evaluation criteria:</p> <p>Your response should demonstrate that the Tenderer has a sound understanding and knowledge of the relevant sector and subject matter area, to enable successful delivery of the Contract. This should include awareness of relevant current issues. The Tenderer should identify key potential challenges that may be faced in the industry, with an appropriate approach to managing and resolving these effectively.</p> <p>Page limit: 3 A4 sides</p>	20%
TOTAL FOR PART 1:		60%

Note: Please do not include any financial or pricing information in your Technical Submission.

The Department reserves the right to reject any Tenderer who scores '0' in any of the questions in Part 1, and/or achieves an overall score of less than 30% in Part 1.

PART 2: SOCIAL VALUE

The question(s) in Part 2 is weighted, showing the relative importance of the criteria (expressed as a percentage). The total weighting for this section is a minimum of **10%**. This is made up of **the** question(s) as shown below:

Question	Weighting
Social Value	10%
TOTAL FOR PART 3: SOCIAL VALUE	10%

Each question response will be evaluated and marked on a scale of 0-4 where:

Evaluation Score		Social Value Scoring Methodology
0	Fail	The response completely fails to meet the required standard or does not provide a proposal.
1	Poor <i>(meets some of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response meets elements of the requirement but gives concern in a number of significant areas. There are reservations because of one or all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ There is at least one significant issue needing considerable attention. ❖ Proposals do not demonstrate competence or understanding. ❖ The response is light on detail and unconvincing. ❖ The response makes no reference to the applicable sector but shows some general market experience. ❖ The response makes limited reference (naming only) to the social value policy outcome set out within the invitation.
2	Good <i>(meets all of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response broadly meets what is expected for the criteria. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues that need further exploration or attention later in the procurement process. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Good understanding of the requirements. ❖ Sufficient competence demonstrated through relevant evidence. ❖ Some insight demonstrated into the relevant issues. ❖ The response addresses most of the social value policy outcome and also shows general market experience.

3	Very good <i>(exceeds some of the award criteria)</i>	<p>The response meets the required standard in all material respects. There are no significant areas of concern, although there may be limited minor issues that need further exploration or attention later in the procurement process. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Good understanding of the requirements. ❖ Sufficient competence demonstrated through relevant evidence. ❖ Some insight demonstrated into the relevant issues. ❖ The response addresses the social value policy outcome and also shows good market experience.
4	Excellent <i>(exceeds all of the model award criteria)</i>	<p>The response exceeds what is expected for the criteria. Leaves no doubt as to the capability and commitment to deliver what is required. The response therefore shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Very good understanding of the requirements. ❖ Excellent proposals demonstrated through relevant evidence. ❖ Considerable insight into the relevant issues. ❖ The response is also likely to propose additional value in several respects above that expected. ❖ The response addresses the social value policy outcome and also shows in-depth market experience.

Your score will be determined by the marks awarded for each question (out of 4), in accordance with the applicable weighting.

For example, if the weighting for a question is 10%, a mark of 4 for that question would lead to a score of 10%. A mark of 3 would lead to a score of 7.5%, a mark of 2 would lead to a score of 5%, a mark of 1 would lead to a score of 2.5%, and mark of 0 would lead to a score of 0%.

The question(s) for Part 2: SOCIAL VALUE along with the evaluation criteria for each, are shown below:

Policy Outcome and Model Award Criteria	Model Evaluation Question and Model Award Sub-Criteria	Question Weighting
Employment Opportunity MAC 2.2: Create employment	<p>Model Evaluation Question - 1:</p> <p>Using a maximum of 2 A4 sides to describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver the Policy Outcome and Award Criteria. Please include:</p>	10%

<p>and training opportunities particularly for those who face barriers to employment and/or who are located in deprived areas, and for people in industries with known skills shortages or in high growth sectors.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • your 'Method Statement', stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria, and • a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when. Also, how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. You should include but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ timed action plan ○ use of metrics ○ tools/processes used to gather data ○ reporting ○ feedback and improvement ○ transparency • how you will influence staff, suppliers, customers and communities through the delivery of the contract to support the Policy Outcome, e.g. engagement, co-design/creation, training and education, partnering/collaborating, volunteering <p>Model Award Sub-Criteria:</p> <p>Activities that demonstrate and describe the tenderer's existing or planned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of employment and skills issues, and of the skills and employment shortages of high growth sectors relating to the contract. <p>Illustrative Examples for how to implement MAC 6.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics, skills shortages, new opportunities in high growth sectors, groups under-represented in the workforce (e.g. prison leavers, disabled people), geographic/local community and skills/employment challenges. • Implementation of recruitment practices and employment conditions, such as the five foundational principles of quality work set out in the Good Work Plan (e.g. fair pay, participation and progression, voice and autonomy), in relation to the • contract that will attract good candidates from all backgrounds, minimise turnover of staff and improve productivity. • Creation of employment opportunities particularly for those who face barriers to employment, such as prison leavers, and/or who are located in deprived areas, and 	
--	--	--

	<p>for people in industries with known skills shortages or in high growth sectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of awareness of careers and recruitment opportunities relating to known skills shortages or in high growth sectors relating to the subject matter of the contract. • Support for the contract workforce by providing career advice, and providing opportunities for staff working on the contract with in-work progression career development into known skills shortages or high growth areas. Illustrative examples: mentoring; mock interviews; CV advice and careers guidance; learning and development; volunteering; influencing staff, suppliers, customers and communities through the delivery of the contract to support employment and skills opportunities in high growth sectors. • Offer of opportunities for work experience or similar activities under the contract. Illustrative examples: work placements, pre-employment courses, paid/unpaid student placements, or paid internships of 6 weeks or more • Support for educational attainment relevant to the contract, including training schemes that address skills gaps and result in recognised qualifications. • Delivery of training schemes and programmes to address any identified skills gaps and under-representation in the workforce for the contract (e.g. prison leavers, disabled people). • Other activities to support relevant sector related skills growth and sustainability such as delivering the following, in relation to the contract. Illustrative examples: careers talks, curriculum support, literacy support and safety talks. • Delivery of apprenticeships, traineeships and T Level industry placement opportunities (Level 2, 3, and 4+) in relation to the contract. • Measures to ensure equality and accessibility, without discrimination, to employment and workforce related opportunities on the contract, and promote them so as to be fully accessible. 	
--	--	--

TOTAL FOR PART 3: SOCIAL VALUE		10%

The Department reserves the right to reject any Tenderer who scores '0' in any of the questions under Part 2: Social Value.

PART 3: Pricing Schedule

Part 3 is weighted, with a total weighting of 30% for this section.

Please complete the template provided (Appendix B Pricing Schedule) and ensure all relevant sections are completed. Please also provide a redacted version of Appendix B Pricing Schedule which provides all the information requested except any pricing e.g. fixed prices or day rates.

1. Completion of the Pricing Schedule

Please pay careful attention to all the information and instructions contained in this ITT document when preparing your Pricing Schedule as part of your Tender Response.

Pricing shall be a Fixed Price for delivering the full scope of work set out in Section 2 above "Specification", including all associated fees, costs and expenses. This shall include incorporating comments and feedback from the Department and its stakeholders into deliverables, where appropriate.

Payment will be in arrears, on completion of all deliverables to the satisfaction of the Department.

2. Final evaluation of the Pricing Schedule

The commercial evaluation will be carried out by establishing the assessed price of each Tender, taken from each completed Pricing Schedule. The assessment will be conducted against the fixed prices tendered in the Pricing Schedule.

Should there be any clarifications with the Tenderer during the evaluation process which, as a result of the clarification, results in any price adjustment to the Tenderers original submission the adjusted price (where accepted) will be taken as the final fixed Tender Price for evaluation.

The maximum marks available for this part of the Tender Response will be 30% and will be awarded to the Tenderer submitting the lowest price. The remaining Tenderers will receive marks on a pro-rata basis from the lowest to the highest price.

The calculation used is the following:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Tender Price}}{\text{Lowest Tender Price}} \times 30 \text{ (Maximum available marks)}$$

Tender Price

For example, if three Tender Responses are received and Tenderer A has quoted £3,000 as their total price, Tenderer B has quoted £5,000 and Tenderer C has quoted £6,000 then the calculation will be as follows:

Tenderer A Score = $(£3000/£3000) \times 30$ (Maximum available marks) = 30%

Tenderer B Score = $(£3000/£5000) \times 30$ (Maximum available marks) = 18%

Tenderer C Score = $(£3000/£6000) \times 30$ (Maximum available marks) = 15%

3. Abnormally low tenders

Tenders with abnormally low prices may be rejected by the Department. Prices that are suspiciously low in the opinion of the Department will be considered further before a decision is taken as to whether the price is abnormally low. This may include clarification with the relevant Tenderer.

4. Total Scores and Award decision

The Department will award the Contract to the Tenderer submitting the most economically advantageous offer from the point of view of the Department. If the Department decide to use its right to reject a Tender on the basis of the Technical Submission score (as described in Part 2), any such Tender will not be awarded a Price score.

The most economically advantageous offer will be the Tender that achieves the highest combined final score (out of 100%), made up from the Technical Submission score (max score = 60), Social Value score (max score = 10) and the Pricing score (max score = 30).

The Department will notify all Tenderers of its contract award decision. In accordance with the Regulations, a ten day standstill period will be observed between notification of the award decision, and contract award.

APPENDIX A SELECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete and upload as part of your Tender Response.

Tender reference:	104456 - PSB Social Value Research
Tenderer organisation name (company name).	
Company registration number (as listed with Companies House).	
Company registered address (as listed with Companies House) or official legal address.	
Postal / trading address, if different.	
Contact details of lead member of staff responsible for organisations tender submission (main point of contact) – please provide contact name, role in organisation, phone number, e-mail address.	
DUNS number if applicable.	
Date the organisation was established / incorporated?	
If your organisation is a subsidiary of another organisation, please provide the name and address or registered office and company registration number of the holding or parent organisation and the ultimate parent (if applicable). Please provide a diagrammatic illustration of the ownership structure of the Tenderer including relations to any parent or other group or holding companies. Please name the file "Tenderer name_Parent Co".	

<p>If you are tendering as a Joint Venture or Consortium, please provide details here and submit a structure diagram identifying the roles and relationships between the Parties including all relevant companies, their respective parent or ultimate holding companies. The structure should ensure that, as a minimum, the legal obligations and liabilities of the Tenderer are borne by an entity or entities which satisfy the financial and economic requirements set out in the ITT. Please name the file "Tenderer name_JV".</p>	
<p><i>The below information will not be used in any way to affect the selection process. It is collected to enable DCMS to monitor its procurement processes and ensure they are fair and non-discriminatory.</i></p>	
<p>Does the Tenderer's business (including parent company if relevant) fall under the European definition of a Small or Medium sized enterprise (SME)? Criteria can be found here: http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/sme/facts-figures-analysis/sme-definition/index_en.htm</p>	
<p>If yes, please state which one: Medium enterprise / Small enterprise / Micro enterprise</p>	
<p>Is the Tenderer a voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisation?</p>	
<p>Is the Tenderer a business which has a majority (51% or more) ownership by individuals who are from Black, Asian or other non-white minority ethnic (BAME) groups?</p>	
<p>Is the Tenderer a business which has a majority (51% or more) ownership by women?</p>	
<p>Is the Tenderer a business which has a majority (51% or more) ownership by disabled people?</p>	

UNCLASSIFIED

APPENDIX B PRICING SCHEDULE

(Please complete and upload as part of your Tender Response. Please also provide a redacted version of Appendix B Pricing Schedule which provides all the information requested except any pricing e.g. fixed prices or day rates.)

Tenderer Name: _____

Delivery / Payment Milestone Description	Price (Excl VAT):
1: Scoping Report	£
2: Module 1 Deliverables	£
3: Final Report and Final Presentation as well as handover notes and teach ins	£
Total Fixed Tender Price (total of the above)	£

All pricing shall be exclusive of VAT.

Pricing shall be a Fixed Price for delivering the full scope of work, including all fees, costs and expenses. This shall include incorporating comments and feedback from the Department and its stakeholders into the deliverables, where appropriate.

Payment will be in arrears, on completion of all relevant deliverables to the satisfaction of the Department.

APPENDIX C
TENDER SUBMISSION STATEMENT

(Please print, sign, scan and upload as part of your Tender Response)

TENDERER NAME: _____

MAIN ADDRESS: _____

ITT ISSUE DATE: 16/06/2025

RETURN TO BE RECEIVED - 10:00 11/07/2025

INVITATION TO TENDER - Ref. 104456 PSB Social Value Research

- 1 We the undersigned, having read the Invitation to Tender, which includes the contract terms and conditions, hereby offer to supply the services specified therein (to the extent that the Department may decide on considering our bid) at the price(s) stated in our tender and unreservedly accept the terms and conditions as set out in the contract and related annexes.
- 2 We agree that any other terms and conditions of contract or any general reservations which may be printed on any correspondence emanating from the tenderer in connection with this bid or with any contract resulting from the bid shall not be applicable to this bid or the contract.
- 3 We certify this is a Bona Fide submission and that we have not fixed or adjusted the amount of the tender by, or under or in accordance with any agreement or arrangement with any other person. We also certify that we have not at any time before the specified date and time for the return of the tender undertaken any of the following acts:
 - communicated to any person other than the person calling for the tender the amount or approximate amount of the proposed tender other than for the purpose of obtaining a quotation of an insurance premium required for the purpose of the tender;
 - entered into any agreement or arrangement with any other person so that he shall refrain from tendering or as to the amount of any tender to be submitted;
 - offered, paid, given or agreed to pay or give consideration directly or indirectly to any person for having done or for doing, in relation to another tender or proposed tender for the paid work or any act or forbearance of the sort described above.
- 4 The word "person" includes any person, body or association corporate or otherwise. The phrase "any agreement or arrangement" includes any such transaction, formal or informal, and whether legally binding or otherwise.

- 5 We understand that if we wish to advance reasons why the provisions of regulation 50 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 (SI 2015/102) should not apply to the information contained in our tender, these shall be enclosed in our tender response.

Signature

Date

Name

Position

Telephone No

Fax No

E-mail

Note: In the case of JV/Consortium responses this statement should be completed and signed by all Parties together with written confirmation from each Party that they authorise the Lead Party organisation to act on their behalf in relation to this procurement exercise.

APPENDIX D
COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

(Only if desired: please complete and upload as part of your Tender Response)

Please refer to Paragraph 5 of Section 1 of the ITT (Freedom of Information).

Page Number (in your tender)	Clause/paragraph numbered (or other identification)	Explanation of harm which may result from disclosure and time period applicable to any sensitivity

APPENDIX E
KEY PERSONNEL, PRIMARY SUPPLIERS AND PRIMARY SUBCONTRACTORS
(Please complete and upload as part of your Tender Response)

1. Key Personnel

The Key Personnel as referred to in the contract are:

Role	Person
[Project Director]	[Name]
[Senior Project Manager]	[Name]
[Project Manager]	[Name]

Any changes to the Key Personnel shall be made in accordance with the provisions of clause 9 of the Contract.

2. Primary Suppliers

The Primary Suppliers as referred to in the contract are;

[list suppliers who are subject to the provisions of clause 9]

3. Primary Sub-contractors

The Primary Subcontractors as referred to in the contract are;

[list sub-contractors who are subject to the provisions of clause 10]

4. Lists

A list of the above Key Persons, Primary Suppliers and Primary Sub-Suppliers shall be maintained by the Supplier throughout the provision of the Services and the list(s) will be submitted to the Department on a regular basis or otherwise following any substantial changes.

APPENDIX F
CONTRACT FOR SERVICES

(This is provided as a separate attachment. **For information**)

The services shall be commissioned in accordance with the terms of the Crown Commercial Services Research and Insights DPS (Reference RM6126). Please refer to Attachment A (DPS Schedule 6 Order Form and Order Schedules) for additional detail.