

DPS Schedule 6 (Order Form Template and Order Schedules)

Order Form

ORDER REFERENCE: **UKRI-4267**

THE BUYER: **United Kingdom Research & Innovation**

BUYER ADDRESS: Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, England, SN2 1FL

THE SUPPLIER: Technopolis Limited

SUPPLIER ADDRESS: 3 Pavilion Buildings, Brighton, BN1 1EE

REGISTRATION NUMBER: 2354937

DUNS NUMBER: **503302739**

DPS SUPPLIER REGISTRATION SERVICE ID:

APPLICABLE DPS CONTRACT

This Order Form is for the provision of the Deliverables and dated 18th November 2024
It's issued under the DPS Contract with the reference number **RM6126** for the provision of **Evaluation of the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge**

DPS FILTER CATEGORY(IES):
Not applicable

DPS Schedule 6 (Order Form Template and Order Schedules)

Crown Copyright 2021

ORDER INCORPORATED TERMS

The following documents are incorporated into this Order Contract. Where numbers are missing we are not using those schedules. If the documents conflict, the following order of precedence applies:

1. This Order Form including the Order Special Terms and Order Special Schedules.
2. Joint Schedule 1(Definitions and Interpretation) **RM6126**
3. DPS Special Terms NOT USED
4. The following Schedules in equal order of precedence:
 - Joint Schedules for **RM6126**
 - Joint Schedule 2 (Variation Form)
 - Joint Schedule 3 (Insurance Requirements)
 - Joint Schedule 4 (Commercially Sensitive Information)
 - Joint Schedule 10 (Rectification Plan)
 - Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)
 - Order Schedules for **UKRI-4267**
 - Order Schedule 1 (Transparency Reports)
 - Order Schedule 2 (Staff Transfer)
 - Order Schedule 3 (Continuous Improvement)
 - Order Schedule 5 (Pricing)
 - Order Schedule 20 (Specification)
5. CCS Core Terms (DPS version) v1.0.3
6. Joint Schedule 5 (Corporate Social Responsibility) **RM6126**

No other Supplier terms are part of the Order Contract. That includes any terms written on the back of, added to this Order Form, or presented at the time of delivery.

ORDER SPECIAL TERMS

The following Special Terms are incorporated into this Order Contract:

Joint Schedules 3 ANNEX: REQUIRED INSURANCES (Insurance Requirements),

- Professional Indemnity Insurance = £2 Million
- Public Liability Insurance = £5 Million
- Loss, Damage or destruction of any UKRI property under the custody & control of the Supplier = £5 Million

ORDER START DATE: **18th November 2024**

ORDER EXPIRY DATE: **30th June 2025**

ORDER INITIAL PERIOD: **7 Months**

DELIVERABLES

See details in Order Schedule 20 (Order Specification)

RM6126 - Research & Insights DPS
Project Version: v1.0
Model Version: v1.3

DPS Schedule 6 (Order Form Template and Order Schedules)

Crown Copyright 2021

MAXIMUM LIABILITY

The limitation of liability for this Order Contract is stated in Clause 11.2 of the Core Terms.

The Estimated Year 1 Charges used to calculate liability in the first Contract Year is **£282,700**

ORDER CHARGES

Option B: See details in Order Schedule 5 (Pricing Details)

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

None

PAYMENT METHOD

The Supplier shall submit an invoice within 28 days of supplying the Supplies and or performing Services to the satisfaction of the Contracting Authority. The invoice shall show the amount of VAT payable and bear the Purchase Order number. Save where an invoice is disputed, the Contracting Authority shall pay the Contractor within 30 days of receipt of an invoice via BACS payment.

If you have a query regarding an outstanding payment, please contact our accounts payable section either by email to accounts@iuk.ukri.org or by telephone 01793-867004 between 09:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday

The Supplier must facilitate payment by the Buyer of the Charges under a Call-Off Contract under any method agreed with the Buyer in the Order Form.

The Supplier must facilitate a change of payment method during the term of any Call-Off Contract.

The Supplier shall not charge the Buyer for a change in payment method during the term of the Call-off Contract

BUYER'S INVOICE ADDRESS:

UK Research and Innovation
Polaris House,
North Star Avenue,
Swindon,
SN2 1UH

BUYER'S AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE

FOIA Section 40 Personal Data



DPS Schedule 6 (Order Form Template and Order Schedules)

Crown Copyright 2021

Polaris House,
North Star Avenue,
Swindon,
SN2 1UH

BUYER'S ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

<https://www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-standards-and-data/corporate-policies-and-standards/environmental-sustainability/>

BUYER'S SECURITY POLICY

In line with UKRI Data Security checks

SUPPLIER'S AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE

FOIA Section 40 Personal Data



SUPPLIER'S CONTRACT MANAGER

FOIA Section 40 Personal Data



PROGRESS REPORT FREQUENCY

As agreed by the parties

PROGRESS MEETING FREQUENCY

As agreed by the parties

KEY STAFF

FOIA Section 40 Personal Data



KEY SUBCONTRACTOR(S)

FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information



E-AUCTIONS

Not applicable

COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Not applicable

SERVICE CREDITS

Not applicable

ADDITIONAL INSURANCES

Details of Revised Insurances required in accordance with Joint Schedule 3 ANNEX: REQUIRED INSURANCES (Insurance Requirements) are as follows:

- Professional Indemnity Insurance = £2 Million
- Public Liability Insurance = £5 Million

GUARANTEE

Not applicable

SOCIAL VALUE COMMITMENT

The Supplier agrees, in providing the Deliverables and performing its obligations under the Order Contract, that it will comply with the social value commitments in Order Schedule 4 (Order Tender)

For and on behalf of the Supplier:		For and on behalf of the Buyer:	
Signature:	FOIA Section 40 Personal Data	Signature:	FOIA Section 40 Personal Data
Name:		Name:	
Role:	Director	Role:	Procurement Manager
Date:	26 November 2024	Date:	16 th December 2024

FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information

FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Definitions

1. In this Schedule, the following words shall have the following meanings and they shall supplement Joint Schedule 1 (Definitions):

“Processor Personnel” all directors, officers, employees, agents, consultants and suppliers of the Processor and/or of any Sub-processor engaged in the performance of its obligations under a Contract;

Status of the Controller

2. The Parties acknowledge that for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the nature of the activity carried out by each of them in relation to their respective obligations under a Contract dictates the status of each party under the DPA 2018. A Party may act as:

- (a) “Controller” in respect of the other Party who is “Processor”;
- (b) “Processor” in respect of the other Party who is “Controller”;
- (c) “Joint Controller” with the other Party;
- (d) “Independent Controller” of the Personal Data where the other Party is also “Controller”,

in respect of certain Personal Data under a Contract and shall specify in Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*) which scenario they think shall apply in each situation.

Where one Party is Controller and the other Party its Processor

3. Where a Party is a Processor, the only Processing that it is authorised to do is listed in Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*) by the Controller.
4. The Processor shall notify the Controller immediately if it considers that any of the Controller’s instructions infringe the Data Protection Legislation.
5. The Processor shall provide all reasonable assistance to the Controller in the preparation of any Data Protection Impact Assessment prior to commencing any Processing. Such assistance may, at the discretion of the Controller, include:
 - (a) a systematic description of the envisaged Processing and the purpose of the Processing;
 - (b) an assessment of the necessity and proportionality of the Processing in relation to the Deliverables;

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

- (c) an assessment of the risks to the rights and freedoms of Data Subjects; and
 - (d) the measures envisaged to address the risks, including safeguards, security measures and mechanisms to ensure the protection of Personal Data.
6. The Processor shall, in relation to any Personal Data Processed in connection with its obligations under the Contract:
- (a) Process that Personal Data only in accordance with Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*), unless the Processor is required to do otherwise by Law. If it is so required the Processor shall notify the Controller before Processing the Personal Data unless prohibited by Law;
 - (b) ensure that it has in place Protective Measures, including in the case of the Supplier the measures set out in Clause 14.3 of the Core Terms, which the Controller may reasonably reject (but failure to reject shall not amount to approval by the Controller of the adequacy of the Protective Measures) having taken account of the:
 - (i) nature of the data to be protected;
 - (ii) harm that might result from a Personal Data Breach;
 - (iii) state of technological development; and
 - (iv) cost of implementing any measures;
 - (c) ensure that:
 - (i) the Processor Personnel do not Process Personal Data except in accordance with the Contract (and in particular Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*));
 - (ii) it takes all reasonable steps to ensure the reliability and integrity of any Processor Personnel who have access to the Personal Data and ensure that they:
 - (A) are aware of and comply with the Processor's duties under this Joint Schedule 11, Clauses 14 (*Data protection*), 15 (*What you must keep confidential*) and 16 (*When you can share information*);
 - (B) are subject to appropriate confidentiality undertakings with the Processor or any Sub-processor;
 - (C) are informed of the confidential nature of the Personal Data and do not publish, disclose or divulge any of the Personal Data to any third party unless directed in writing to do so by the Controller or as otherwise permitted by the Contract; and
 - (D) have undergone adequate training in the use, care, protection and handling of Personal Data;
 - (d) not transfer Personal Data outside of the UK or EU unless the prior written consent of the Controller has been obtained and the following conditions are fulfilled:

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

- (i) the Controller or the Processor has provided appropriate safeguards in relation to the transfer (whether in accordance with UK GDPR Article 46 or LED Article 37) as determined by the Controller;
 - (ii) the Data Subject has enforceable rights and effective legal remedies;
 - (iii) the Processor complies with its obligations under the Data Protection Legislation by providing an adequate level of protection to any Personal Data that is transferred (or, if it is not so bound, uses its best endeavours to assist the Controller in meeting its obligations); and
 - (iv) the Processor complies with any reasonable instructions notified to it in advance by the Controller with respect to the Processing of the Personal Data; and
 - (e) at the written direction of the Controller, delete or return Personal Data (and any copies of it) to the Controller on termination of the Contract unless the Processor is required by Law to retain the Personal Data.
7. Subject to paragraph 7 of this Joint Schedule 11, the Processor shall notify the Controller immediately if in relation to it Processing Personal Data under or in connection with the Contract it:
- (a) receives a Data Subject Access Request (or purported Data Subject Access Request);
 - (b) receives a request to rectify, block or erase any Personal Data;
 - (c) receives any other request, complaint or communication relating to either Party's obligations under the Data Protection Legislation;
 - (d) receives any communication from the Information Commissioner or any other regulatory authority in connection with Personal Data Processed under the Contract;
 - (e) receives a request from any third Party for disclosure of Personal Data where compliance with such request is required or purported to be required by Law; or
 - (f) becomes aware of a Personal Data Breach.
8. The Processor's obligation to notify under paragraph 6 of this Joint Schedule 11 shall include the provision of further information to the Controller, as details become available.
9. Taking into account the nature of the Processing, the Processor shall provide the Controller with assistance in relation to either Party's obligations under Data Protection Legislation and any complaint, communication or request made under paragraph 6 of this Joint Schedule 11 (and insofar as possible within the timescales reasonably required by the Controller) including by immediately providing:

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

- (a) the Controller with full details and copies of the complaint, communication or request;
 - (b) such assistance as is reasonably requested by the Controller to enable it to comply with a Data Subject Access Request within the relevant timescales set out in the Data Protection Legislation;
 - (c) the Controller, at its request, with any Personal Data it holds in relation to a Data Subject;
 - (d) assistance as requested by the Controller following any Personal Data Breach; and/or
 - (e) assistance as requested by the Controller with respect to any request from the Information Commissioner's Office, or any consultation by the Controller with the Information Commissioner's Office.
10. The Processor shall maintain complete and accurate records and information to demonstrate its compliance with this Joint Schedule 11. This requirement does not apply where the Processor employs fewer than 250 staff, unless:
 - (a) the Controller determines that the Processing is not occasional;
 - (b) the Controller determines the Processing includes special categories of data as referred to in Article 9(1) of the UK GDPR or Personal Data relating to criminal convictions and offences referred to in Article 10 of the UK GDPR; or
 - (c) the Controller determines that the Processing is likely to result in a risk to the rights and freedoms of Data Subjects.
11. The Processor shall allow for audits of its Data Processing activity by the Controller or the Controller's designated auditor.
12. The Parties shall designate a Data Protection Officer if required by the Data Protection Legislation.
13. Before allowing any Sub-processor to Process any Personal Data related to the Contract, the Processor must:
 - (a) notify the Controller in writing of the intended Sub-processor and Processing;
 - (b) obtain the written consent of the Controller;
 - (c) enter into a written agreement with the Sub-processor which give effect to the terms set out in this Joint Schedule 11 such that they apply to the Sub-processor; and
 - (d) provide the Controller with such information regarding the Sub-processor as the Controller may reasonably require.
14. The Processor shall remain fully liable for all acts or omissions of any of its Sub-processors.
15. The Relevant Authority may, at any time on not less than thirty (30) Working Days' notice, revise this Joint Schedule 11 by replacing it with any applicable controller to processor standard clauses or similar terms forming part of an

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

applicable certification scheme (which shall apply when incorporated by attachment to the Contract).

16. The Parties agree to take account of any guidance issued by the Information Commissioner's Office. The Relevant Authority may on not less than thirty (30) Working Days' notice to the Supplier amend the Contract to ensure that it complies with any guidance issued by the Information Commissioner's Office.

Where the Parties are Joint Controllers of Personal Data

17. In the event that the Parties are Joint Controllers in respect of Personal Data under the Contract, the Parties shall implement paragraphs that are necessary to comply with UK GDPR Article 26 based on the terms set out in Annex 2 to this Joint Schedule 11.

Independent Controllers of Personal Data

18. With respect to Personal Data provided by one Party to another Party for which each Party acts as Controller but which is not under the Joint Control of the Parties, each Party undertakes to comply with the applicable Data Protection Legislation in respect of their Processing of such Personal Data as Controller.
19. Each Party shall Process the Personal Data in compliance with its obligations under the Data Protection Legislation and not do anything to cause the other Party to be in breach of it.
20. Where a Party has provided Personal Data to the other Party in accordance with paragraph 8 of this Joint Schedule 11 above, the recipient of the Personal Data will provide all such relevant documents and information relating to its data protection policies and procedures as the other Party may reasonably require.
21. The Parties shall be responsible for their own compliance with Articles 13 and 14 UK GDPR in respect of the Processing of Personal Data for the purposes of the Contract.
22. The Parties shall only provide Personal Data to each other:
 - (a) to the extent necessary to perform their respective obligations under the Contract;
 - (b) in compliance with the Data Protection Legislation (including by ensuring all required data privacy information has been given to affected Data Subjects to meet the requirements of Articles 13 and 14 of the UK GDPR); and
 - (c) where it has recorded it in Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*).
23. Taking into account the state of the art, the costs of implementation and the nature, scope, context and purposes of Processing as well as the risk of varying likelihood and severity for the rights and freedoms of natural persons, each Party shall, with respect to its Processing of Personal Data as Independent Controller, implement and maintain appropriate technical and organisational

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to that risk, including, as appropriate, the measures referred to in Article 32(1)(a), (b), (c) and (d) of the UK GDPR, and the measures shall, at a minimum, comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Legislation, including Article 32 of the UK GDPR.

24. A Party Processing Personal Data for the purposes of the Contract shall maintain a record of its Processing activities in accordance with Article 30 UK GDPR and shall make the record available to the other Party upon reasonable request.
25. Where a Party receives a request by any Data Subject to exercise any of their rights under the Data Protection Legislation in relation to the Personal Data provided to it by the other Party pursuant to the Contract (**“Request Recipient”**):
 - (a) the other Party shall provide any information and/or assistance as reasonably requested by the Request Recipient to help it respond to the request or correspondence, at the cost of the Request Recipient; or
 - (b) where the request or correspondence is directed to the other Party and/or relates to that other Party's Processing of the Personal Data, the Request Recipient will:
 - (i) promptly, and in any event within five (5) Working Days of receipt of the request or correspondence, inform the other Party that it has received the same and shall forward such request or correspondence to the other Party; and
 - (ii) provide any information and/or assistance as reasonably requested by the other Party to help it respond to the request or correspondence in the timeframes specified by Data Protection Legislation.
26. Each Party shall promptly notify the other Party upon it becoming aware of any Personal Data Breach relating to Personal Data provided by the other Party pursuant to the Contract and shall:
 - (a) do all such things as reasonably necessary to assist the other Party in mitigating the effects of the Personal Data Breach;
 - (b) implement any measures necessary to restore the security of any compromised Personal Data;
 - (c) work with the other Party to make any required notifications to the Information Commissioner's Office and affected Data Subjects in accordance with the Data Protection Legislation (including the timeframes set out therein); and
 - (d) not do anything which may damage the reputation of the other Party or that Party's relationship with the relevant Data Subjects, save as required by Law.

Joint Schedule 11 (Processing Data)

Crown Copyright 2021

27. Personal Data provided by one Party to the other Party may be used exclusively to exercise rights and obligations under the Contract as specified in Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*).
28. Personal Data shall not be retained or processed for longer than is necessary to perform each Party's respective obligations under the Contract which is specified in Annex 1 (*Processing Personal Data*).
29. Notwithstanding the general application of paragraphs 2 to 16 of this Joint Schedule 11 to Personal Data, where the Supplier is required to exercise its regulatory and/or legal obligations in respect of Personal Data, it shall act as an Independent Controller of Personal Data in accordance with paragraphs 18 to 27 of this Joint Schedule 11.

Annex 1 - Processing Personal Data

This Annex shall be completed by the Controller, who may take account of the view of the Processors, however the final decision as to the content of this Annex shall be with the Relevant Authority at its absolute discretion.

1.1 **FOIA Section 40 Personal Data**
 1.2 [Redacted]

- 1.3 The Processor shall comply with any further written instructions with respect to Processing by the Controller.
- 1.4 Any such further instructions shall be incorporated into this Annex.

Description	Details
Identity of Controller for each Category of Personal Data	<p>The Relevant Authority is Controller and the Supplier is Processor</p> <p>The Parties acknowledge that in accordance with paragraph 2 to paragraph 15 and for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the Relevant Authority is the Controller and the Supplier is the Processor of the following Personal Data:</p> <p>FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information</p>
Duration of the Processing	From 1 st November 2024 to 30 th June 2025.
Nature and purposes of the Processing	FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information
Type of Personal Data	[Redacted]

Categories of Data Subject	FOIA Section 43 Commercial Information
Plan for return and destruction of the data once the Processing is complete UNLESS requirement under Union or Member State law to preserve that type of data	Evaluators will delete all personal data at the end of the study and provide UKRI with written confirmation of this.

Order Schedule 20 (Order Specification)
Order Ref:
Crown Copyright 2021

Order Schedule 20 (Order Specification)

This Schedule sets out the characteristics of the Deliverables that the Supplier will be required to make to the Buyers under this Order Contract

Specification for

The Provision of Evaluation of the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge

Title of Request:	Evaluation of the ISCF Commercialising Quantum Technology Challenge
Duration of Engagement:	9 months without extension
Required Commencement Date:	1st November 2024

1. Introduction

As the ISCF Commercialising Quantum Technology Challenge approaches its March 2025 completion, Innovate UK – UKRI seek the services of independent evaluators to deliver an impact evaluation for the Commercialising Quantum Technologies Challenge. UKRI and the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund (ISCF) is committed to collecting evidence to understand the impacts and effectiveness of the ISCF Commercialising Quantum Technology Challenge.

The purpose of this exercise are: (i) to gain quantitative and qualitative insight into the outcomes and impacts of the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge programme, i.e. (ii) to demonstrate what the Challenge has delivered for taxpayers, and (iii) to help UKRI build the evidence base on “what works” in such programmes, to inform ongoing and future improvements in order to maximise the value of public funding.

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme is delivering or has delivered its outcomes and impacts considering its original aims. Innovate UK – UKRI wishes to gain both quantitative and qualitative insight into these outcomes and impacts of the programme, testing the extent to which the programme delivers the outcomes and impact for industry and the extent to which these are attributable to ISCF funding.

Achieving this will involve the development and outcomes of final impact and process evaluation reports over the remaining duration of the programme (ie: to 2025) by the evaluators. The reports will be suitable to form part of an evidence base with which to judge the success of the ISCF, and will make recommendations which inform best practice and decisions on future potential funding streams.

To deliver a suitably rigorous evaluation, Innovate UK - UKRI needs to procure evaluation specialists with specific expertise in the quantum technologies field in addition to research evaluation to produce a robust impact evaluation and process evaluation, hence this specification document.

The primary intended audience for these recommendations is decision-makers within UKRI and Innovate UK management structures who may be involved in the design and implementation of future Challenge-led funds. The reports will form part of an evidence base with which to judge the success and overall impact of the ISCF, and will make recommendations which inform best practice and decisions on future potential funding streams.

There also needs to be an evidence record that Innovate UK has carried out sufficient due diligence and review of activities, reviewing the success of the Challenge in meeting its objectives.

Analysis of the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge baseline report.

Review of prior examples of evaluation procurement documents, e.g. CR20076 - Mini Competition (Quantum Technology Programme Evaluation); Procurement Specification for Interim/Final Evaluation: Low Cost Nuclear ISCF Challenge.

Review of prior examples of evaluation reports, e.g. UKRI-18102023-ISCF-Audience-of-the-Future-Interim-report-210226_final; UKRI-041023-ISCF-ProcessEvaluationReport.

Review of prior relevant documents, e.g. ISCF QT Evaluation Baseline 2.2 Report Final 210618

November 2021 ISCF Quantum Technology Programme Evaluation [D4] Phase 3: Process Evaluation

2. Aims & Objectives

Impact Evaluation

The ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge (ISCF QTC) impact evaluation should look to comprehensively explore the outcomes, outputs and impacts defined in the original logic model set up at the programme creation (Appendix 1). While the interim targets are essential, the longer term targets should also be considered.

In particular, the evaluation should explore:

Outputs (of the ISCF projects)

Improved Capabilities of QT Organisations

- To what extent and how did the programme generate new knowledge and insights?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to improved capabilities and skills?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new and enhanced partnerships and collaborations (business / academia / government / SMEs)?
- To what extent and how did the programme increase the private and public funding leveraged (UK and from overseas)?

New QT Technologies, Products and Services

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new QT technologies, and lift the TRL of existing ones?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new working commercially viable QT components, prototypes, products and services?
- To what extent and how did the programme de-risk R&D investment opportunities

Stimulating a UK QT supply chain

- To what extent and how did the programme improve the UK QT supply chain?

Outcomes (ISCF QT beneficiaries)

Capable and Innovative QT Companies

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new product lines and services?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased R&D investment?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased skills and knowledge?

Commercially successful business (revenue / potential revenue)

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased investment in QT businesses?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased revenue and employment growth?

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to growth in export opportunities?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to improved profitability and productivity?

QT Supply Chain

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased SME involvement in the quantum sector?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased awareness of QT among a range of stakeholders?

Short term IMPACTS (UK QT Sector)

A thriving QT sector creating products to meet user needs

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to growth of Existing UK QT businesses capturing UK and international markets?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to creation of new UK QT companies?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to a world-leading UK QT sector that spans the supply chain?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new jobs created in the UK QT sector?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to Increased engagement and adoption of new QT-enabled products in end-user (non-QT) sectors?

Process Evaluation

The ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge (ISCF QTC) process evaluation should look to comprehensively explore the programme's processes and methodologies and how successful these were in delivering the required outcomes. In particular, the evaluation should consider:

Process Evaluation:

1. Did the intervention meet its targets for inputs, outputs, and short-term outcomes (within the challenge timeframe) efficiently and effectively?
2. How effective were risk management strategies in anticipating and mitigating risks?
3. Did the policy meet budgetary expectations when rolled out, or were there unforeseen issues and hidden costs?
4. Did the design and delivery of the programme enable QT Challenge projects to deliver on their proposals and align with the challenge objectives?
5. To what extent has the makeup of the grant award process enabled the programme to achieve its objectives?
6. To what extent has the programme enabled outputs from activity strands to be shared throughout the programme's portfolio?
7. To what extent has the programme enabled, facilitated, or continued collaboration across industry and academia/ research communities?
8. To what extent did the governance, monitoring, events, and communications surrounding the fund add value and contribute to the intended impacts?
9. Was the challenge team correctly structured and empowered to deliver the programme effectively?
10. Did the engagement across UKRI and other government organisations add value and maximise progress?

Both Evaluations

It should be considered that there are three groups of organisations: (i) the programme participants; (ii) unsuccessful applicants (that will form the counterfactual for the evaluation); and (iii) non-applicant organisations that make up (along with groups (i) and (ii)) the wider, emerging quantum technologies sector in the UK.

While objectives for regional impacts and ED&I aspects were not included at the outset of the challenge, it would be helpful for the evaluations to record any notable local / regional / ED&I outcomes.

The Procurement

This procurement is for the delivery of **two** evaluation deliverables, as briefly described below:

1. Impact Evaluation

Indicates if the challenge is on track to deliver the expected impacts. It will seek to review and adjust the evaluation approach to date as necessary in order to deliver an appropriate impact evaluation report. The successful supplier is required to capture and analyse data against the challenge identified benefit measures and evaluation indicators see Appendix 1.

2. Process Evaluation

Assesses how the specific approach(es) adopted by the Challenge have enabled the delivery of expected benefits, outcomes and impacts. A prior process evaluation was conducted in 2021 and will be included in the documents supplied to evaluators.

The successful provider will be encouraged to include visual elements across all report areas (charts, tables, graphs etc) where appropriate, and include the supporting data for any visual or written evidence. As part of their bid submissions, bidders are encouraged to propose any additional areas of study/research that they believe will support the overarching objectives of the evaluation set out in all sections of the specification

All evaluation activity undertaken at the challenge level must provide evidence of the impact of the challenge, contribute to the fund-level evaluation, which will allow industry and UKRI to assess the value for money of the ISCF and ensure public money is being spent in accordance with the fund's stated aims, and to understand the impact of its activity on the UK's knowledge, the economy and society. The evaluation will also need to inform ongoing and future improvements of programme design and delivery.

3. Background to the Requirement

Evaluation activities to date

The ISCF Quantum Technology Programme Evaluation phase 2.2 baseline report was completed by Technopolis with in June 2021. The baseline aimed to provide a reference point from which to measure the programme's contributions and progress against its objectives, using the evaluation framework developed in the first phase of the study. Additionally, it provided an initial mapping of the emerging quantum technology sector in the UK at the point

of the programme launch. This baseline was part of a wider programme of work, comprising an evaluation framework developed in February 2021 and a process evaluation that will be conducted in the period leading up to August 2021.

The baseline was based on the outcome of the following data collection and analysis activities:

- Analysis of programme data and data linking from secondary sources including FAME, Pitchbook and LinkedIn
- Stakeholder survey of programme participants and unsuccessful applicants
- Bibliometric and patent analysis
- A programme of 7 high-level interviews: These have informed our sector analysis and complemented our understanding of adoption and barriers in the emerging sector.
- Six case studies of programme grants across four programme strands (Pioneer, Collaborative R&D, Technology Projects and the Investment Accelerator)

In determining whether the objectives of the programme and therefore the intervention of the Commercialising QT Challenge has been successful, the programme has identified intermediate and long-term benefits that have the potential to be realised as a result of this investment. The team have developed a logic model (Appendix 1), which support the management and monitoring of the challenge.

The ISCF Quantum Technology Programme process Evaluation report was completed by Technopolis with in November 2021. This report presented the process evaluation for the Commercialising Quantum Technology Challenge of the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund (ISCF CQT). The process evaluation sought to determine how the programme design and processes enabled and/or hindered the achievement of the programme's objectives and identify learning and potential improvements to existing processes. The assessment was based on analysis of programme documentation and data as well as a primary data gather from participants and stakeholders via a survey and series of semi-structured interviews.

A report is in the final review stages (as of July 2025) commissioned for DSIT by Anchored In Ltd to answer the question: "What can the quantum sector, investment community, and UK Government do to support increased private investment into UK quantum companies, particularly at later rounds?"

The Royal Academy of Engineering was commissioned by the UK government's Department for Science Innovation and Technology to conduct an independent review of the UK's quantum sector's infrastructure requirements for the next decade, including for fabrication facilities, to help identify opportunities where there is a rationale for government to invest in infrastructure for the future.

The successful bidder will be required to work with the Innovate UK Quantum Technologies team, and may be required to engage with the Innovate UK Finance, Projects, Competitions, and Operations teams.

The Innovate UK Quantum Technologies Team

The first point of contact, with overall responsibility for managing the QT Challenge.

The Innovate UK Competitions Team

The contact points for successful and unsuccessful applicants

4. Scope

The scope of this exercise are: (i) to gain quantitative and qualitative insight into the outcomes and impacts of the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge programme, i.e. (ii) to demonstrate what the Challenge has delivered for taxpayers, and (iii) to help UKRI build the evidence base on "what works" in such programmes, to inform ongoing and future improvements in order to maximise the value of public funding.

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme is delivering or has delivered its outcomes and impacts considering its original aims. Innovate UK – UKRI wishes to gain both quantitative and qualitative insight into these outcomes and impacts of the programme, testing the extent to which the programme delivers the outcomes and impact for industry and the extent to which these are attributable to ISCF funding.

Achieving this will involve the development and outcomes of final impact and process evaluation reports over the remaining duration of the programme (ie: to 2025) by the evaluators. The reports will be suitable to form part of an evidence base with which to judge the success of the ISCF, and will make recommendations which inform best practice and decisions on future potential funding streams.

Management of the Evaluation content will be through the programme evaluation working group, also reporting to the SRO through the QT Challenge Programme board and the wider ISCF Governance structures (Executive Team and Programme Board) and a central UKRI (NPIF) Evaluation Oversight Board. The successful bidder may need to

attend periodic meetings to update the programme evaluation group (and occasionally the QT Challenge Programme Board), present results, and agree outputs as fit for purpose.

The contract would be managed directly by one of the team at Innovate UKI - UKRI, but access to the relevant stakeholders at DSIT and other organisations will be granted, after discussion at an early stage, as required to complete the works. The expectation would be to have at least 8 formal delivery meetings across the duration of programme. This is on top of virtual weekly progress meetings and any other ad-hoc meetings as required in the course of the work. However, the number and frequency will be mutually agreed with the successful supplier taking consideration of the situation at the time and will be reviewed as required.

The scope of the services is fixed at the outset.

The Period of the Agreement

1st November 2024, for 9 months.

Security needs both physical / IT related re Cyber essentials

GDPR implications

The evaluator will be handling official sensitive and commercially sensitive information. Personal data will be limited to contact information. The evaluator is responsible for taking appropriate data protection steps.

Data to be provided to the successful bidder:

- (i) **Contact data:** Innovate UK, EPSRC, ESRC and any funded investments hold the contact data for all individuals or organisations who have submitted an application for funding to the Programme, both successful and unsuccessful.
- (ii) **Management information about applicants:** Innovate UK collects management information on each applicant to the competitions. This includes;
 - Company name, address, Companies House number
 - Contact details for project lead
 - Total project cost, requested grant size, project overview

- Current turnover, employment, profits, R&D expenditure. Note: this data may not be complete as it depends on information shared by applicants.

- (iii) Activity monitoring data: Such as quarterly updates from the programme activities and the CR&D monitoring officer reports
- (iv) Project Start & Completion reports
- (v) Programme Benefits Baseline report
- (vi) Economic Analysis data & Quantum Start-up Survey conducted by the Programme in 2019
- (vii) Quantum Wave 2 & Wave 3 Business Cases and Delivery Plans

5. Requirement

Impact Evaluation

We require the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge (ISCF QTC) impact evaluation to comprehensively explore the outcomes, outputs and impacts defined in the original logic model set up at the programme creation (Appendix 1). While the interim targets are essential, the longer term targets should also be considered.

In particular, we require the evaluation to explore:

Outputs (of the ISCF projects)

Improved Capabilities of QT Organisations

- To what extent and how did the programme generate new knowledge and insights?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to improved capabilities and skills?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new and enhanced partnerships and collaborations (business / academia / government / SMEs)?
- To what extent and how did the programme increase the private and public funding leveraged (UK and from overseas)?

New QT Technologies, Products and Services

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new QT technologies, and lift the TRL of existing ones?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new working commercially viable QT components, prototypes, products and services?

- To what extent and how did the programme de-risk R&D investment opportunities

Commercially successful business (revenue / potential revenue)

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased investment in QT businesses?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased revenue and employment growth?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to growth in export opportunities?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to improved profitability and productivity?

QT Supply Chain

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased SME involvement in the quantum sector?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to increased awareness of QT among a range of stakeholders?

Short term IMPACTS (UK QT Sector)

A thriving QT sector creating products to meet user needs

- To what extent and how did the programme lead to growth of Existing UK QT businesses capturing UK and international markets?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to creation of new UK QT companies?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to a world-leading UK QT sector that spans the supply chain?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to new jobs created in the UK QT sector?
- To what extent and how did the programme lead to Increased engagement and adoption of new QT-enabled products in end-user (non-QT) sectors?

Process Evaluation

We require the ISCF Quantum Technology Challenge (ISCF QTC) process evaluation to comprehensively explore the programme's processes and methodologies and how successful these were in delivering the required outcomes. In particular, the evaluation should consider:

Process Evaluation:

1. Did the intervention meet its targets for inputs, outputs, and short-term outcomes (within the challenge timeframe) efficiently and effectively?
2. How effective were risk management strategies in anticipating and mitigating risks?
3. Did the policy meet budgetary expectations when rolled out, or were there unforeseen issues and hidden costs?
4. Did the design and delivery of the programme enable QT Challenge projects to deliver on their proposals and align with the challenge objectives?
5. To what extent has the makeup of the grant award process enabled the programme to achieve its objectives?
6. To what extent has the programme enabled outputs from activity strands to be shared throughout the programme's portfolio?
7. To what extent has the programme enabled, facilitated, or continued collaboration across industry and academia/ research communities?

8. To what extent did the governance, monitoring, events, and communications surrounding the fund add value and contribute to the intended impacts?
9. Was the challenge team correctly structured and empowered to deliver the programme effectively?
10. Did the engagement across UKRI and other government organisations add value and maximise progress?

Both Evaluations

It should be considered that there are three groups of organisations: (i) the programme participants; (ii) unsuccessful applicants (that will form the counterfactual for the evaluation); and (iii) non-applicant organisations that make up (along with groups (i) and (ii)) the wider, emerging quantum technologies sector in the UK.

While objectives for regional impacts and ED&I aspects were not included at the outset of the challenge, it would be helpful for the evaluations to record any notable local / regional / ED&I outcomes.

We require the delivery of two evaluation deliverables, as briefly described below:

1. Impact Evaluation

Indicates if the challenge is on track to deliver the expected impacts. It will seek to review and adjust the evaluation approach to date as necessary in order to deliver an appropriate impact evaluation report. The successful supplier is required to capture and analyse data against the challenge identified benefit measures and evaluation indicators see Appendix 1.

2. Process Evaluation

Assesses how the specific approach(es) adopted by the Challenge have enabled the delivery of expected benefits, outcomes and impacts. A prior process evaluation was conducted in 2021 and will be included in the documents supplied to evaluators.

The successful provider will be encouraged to include visual elements across all report areas (charts, tables, graphs etc) where appropriate, and include the supporting data for any visual or written evidence. As part of their bid submissions, bidders are encouraged to propose any additional areas of study/research that they believe will support the overarching objectives of the evaluation set out in all sections of the specification

We require all evaluation activity undertaken at the challenge level to provide evidence of the impact of the challenge, contribute to the fund-level evaluation, which will allow industry and UKRI to assess the value for money of the ISCF and ensure public money is being spent in accordance with the fund's stated aims, and to understand the impact of its activity on the UK's knowledge, the economy and society. The evaluation will also need to inform ongoing and future improvements of programme design and delivery.

For clarity, the list below describes the skills and expertise which are considered to be essential for the performance of this scope of works.

Required Supplier Expertise:

- Research Evaluation – extensive expertise in programme and research evaluation relevant to the programme (i.e: in quantum technologies and allied technologies such as photonics)

- The quantum technologies sector including policy, technology landscape and implementation activity - general understanding of the quantum technologies field and evidence of past engagements
- Environmental, Social and Regio-economic Impact of Quantum Technologies – an understanding of the environmental and social benefits/challenges of the sector including the resilient infrastructure agenda, regional economic and EDI aspects
- Equity Investments in Industrial Ventures – Ability to provide independent third-party verification of the equity investment position in quantum technologies businesses, as a result of the programme.

Data collection and analysis method

Bidders may wish to consider a combination of data collection and analysis methods using multiple data sources as set out in the Evaluation Framework document. Bidders are encouraged to propose any additional or alternative methods in their proposals, provided that these can be justified in the context of their contribution to the analysis and can be delivered within time and budget. It is recognised that not all methods are appropriate, but it is unlikely that any one source/method alone will be sufficient. Proposals should set out how different data collection and analysis method will be deployed and will be combined to produce the final findings. Further, the proposal should set out how the particular data collection and analysis methods will address the evaluation questions in a robust manner.

Data and Evidence

Bidders should consider the following broad principles when providing their submissions:

- The QT Challenge will require a description of all caveats and assumptions surrounding the evidence that forms part of all reports (incl. definitions, sample size, response rate, collection method, specific caveats of data)

Quantitative evidence

- Will include relevant statistics capturing the state of the industry and thematic areas of focus during the Challenge, including where appropriate, trends over the preceding few years.
- Will include an assessment of how the industry and research area is likely to evolve during, and at the end of, the delivery of the Challenge.
- For all indicators of impact/success selected to be used in the evaluation, evidence capturing the interim and final position against these indicators will be required.
- Details of any sample frameworks are to be agreed with the QT Challenge team and any lessons learned or observations from the baseline survey are to be considered with regard to the minimum achievable sample to provide a robust view.

Qualitative evidence

- Where qualitative indicators (e.g. views, opinions) will be used as part of the evaluations, evidence capturing the position for these indicators will be required. The successful supplier is also expected to provide evidence from key stakeholders and participants.

With regard to the metrics and their characterisation against baseline data, all methodologies and approaches identified must seek to evidence attribution, and the QT Challenge's contribution to the sector concerned. The methods are expected to provide insights to the existing evidence and sector baselines.

Bidders are encouraged to think innovatively in terms of how they propose to address the evaluation aims, although innovation should not be to the detriment of robustness. The funding partners are keen to push boundaries in their evaluations, to improve the quality of their evidence base.

Evaluation Audience and Governance

We require that the whole evaluation programme should enable lessons learnt and accurate conclusions to be drawn on the impacts (forecast and actual) of the programme, in meeting the Challenge. This will improve programme management, communicating the progress and benefits of the programme, and enable lessons to be learnt for subsequent initiatives. The suggested audience for the evaluation therefore includes:

- The programme SRO within DSIT
- The Challenge Director, UKRI Delivery Team, and the Quantum Challenge Programme Board.
- ISCF and Quantum Technology stakeholders in UKRI, DSIT, HM Treasury and the wider public sector.
- Quantum Technology stakeholders in industry, local authorities and regional LEPs, NGOs, and the research community.
- Other challenges across the ISCF portfolio who may have use for our findings.

The successful bidder will be required to engage with relevant stakeholders and subject experts to develop appropriate approaches to monitoring and evaluation within the context of the objectives of the programme.

Data to be provided to the successful bidder:

- (i) **Contact data:** Innovate UK, EPSRC, ESRC and any funded investments hold the contact data for all individuals or organisations who have submitted an application for funding to the Programme, both successful and unsuccessful.
- (ii) **Management information about applicants:** Innovate UK collects management information on each applicant to the competitions. This includes;
 - Company name, address, Companies House number
 - Contact details for project lead
 - Total project cost, requested grant size, project overview
 - Current turnover, employment, profits, R&D expenditure. Note: this data may not be complete as it depends on information shared by applicants.
- (iii) **Activity monitoring data:** Such as quarterly updates from the programme activities and the CR&D monitoring officer reports
- (iv) **Project Start & Completion reports**
- (v) **Programme Benefits Baseline report**
- (vi) **Economic Analysis data & Quantum Start-up Survey** conducted by the Programme in 2019
- (vii) **Quantum Wave 2 & Wave 3 Business Cases and Delivery Plans**

KPI's

Contract Key Performance Indicators

Contract Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be used to align the Supplier's performance with the requirements of UKRI. KPIs will be realistic and achievable. KPIs must be maintain a green rating in order to demonstrate that the service is being delivered to an adequate quality. UKRI reserves the right to amend the existing KPIs detailed in the table below or add any new KPIs throughout delivery with agreement of the supplier. Any changes to the KPIs will be agreed with the Supplier and be confirmed in writing.

Performance against KPIs will need to be monitored on a quarterly basis by the Supplier. UKRI will reserve the right to request reporting of KPIs on a more frequent basis if performance levels suggest increased monitoring is required. Performance of each KPI will be recorded against a red, amber, green “score”, as described below. Performance against each KPI should be submitted every three months from the start of the contract for the duration of the contract and will be discussed in the succeeding weekly project management phone call. The scoring methodology for KPI criteria is as follows:

- **Green score:** If a green score has been awarded to a KPI then no further action is required from the Supplier, except for continuing activities to maintain this score for the next reporting period.
- **Amber score:** If an amber score is awarded, the Supplier should examine and implement measures to prevent this KPI being scored an amber or below in subsequent reporting periods. UKRI will not expect formal improvement measures at that stage. If a single KPI is awarded amber in two consecutive invoice periods, or twice in four consecutive invoicing periods then the Supplier should create a Rectification Plan at their own cost. This should detail how they will change their practices to prevent another amber score being awarded for this KPI. The timeline for producing this Rectification Plan should be agreed between the Authority and the Supplier and should only be implemented following approval by UKRI. UKRI reserves the right to terminate the Contract if a satisfactory Rectification Plan cannot be agreed, reference Core Terms Clause 10.4.3(a).
- **Red score:** If a red score is awarded, the Supplier should create a Rectification Plan at their own cost. This Rectification Plan should detail how they will change practices to prevent another red score being awarded for this KPI. As above, UKRI must agree to the timelines and contents of the Rectification Plan prior to implementation and reserves the right to terminate the Contract if a satisfactory plan cannot be agreed, reference Core Terms Clause 10.4.3(a). If, following implementation of a Rectification Plan, the Supplier scores a red in the same KPI in any subsequent period throughout the duration of the Contract, UKRI reserves the right to terminate the Contract, reference Core Terms Clause 10.4.1(b). UKRI also reserves the right to terminate this Contract based on a red score without requesting a Rectification Plan, if it is of UKRI’s view that a material default has occurred. reference Core Terms Clause 10.4.1(d). UKRI reserves the right to suspend, or partially terminate this Contract, while a Rectification Plan is being developed and agreed, where there is justification to do so, reference Core Terms Clause 10.7.3.

The below table sets out the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) which will be used throughout the duration of the contract.

KPI Ref	KPI Criteria	KPI measure	KPI Rating		
			Red	Amber	Green
1	Deadlines	Work delivered on the timescale agreed with the Authority.	Four or more deadlines included in the project Gantt chart missed by	Up to three deadlines included in the project Gantt chart missed	Meets expectations - All work is carried out and

			3 working days or more in a 3-month period.	by 3 working days or more in a 3-month period.	delivered on time
2	Responding to UKRI comments	Comments and feedback provided by UKRI on outputs are addressed	Output drafts are submitted to UKRI that have not addressed all feedback and comments from UKRI on three or more occasions in a 3-month period.	Output drafts are submitted to UKRI that have not addressed all feedback and comments from UKRI on up to two occasions in a 3-month period.	Meets expectations – All output drafts submitted to UKRI address all comments and feedback from UKRI.
3	Attendance	Attendance of appropriate representatives at project management meetings and presentations.	Attendance target is not met on more than three occasions.	Attendance target is not met on more than one occasion.	100% attendance is achieved

In addition to the above KPIs, the QT Challenge team with support from policy, sector, legal, internal economists, and evaluation specialists will monitor the quality of the work outputs. The assessment of quality will revolve around the following questions although not exhaustive and will be in raised through discussions with the successful applicant before reaching the deadline date(s) for the work.

6. Timetable

It should be noted that as the Challenge progresses, the evaluation questions or scope or nature of the programme may evolve and/or change. Evaluation should adapt to these changes as necessary to ensure it appropriately provides evaluation at the end of the programme

Should bidders consider the tender timeline outlined unachievable or consider the quality to be impacted, please explain why it is unachievable and propose an alternative timeframe for the evaluation team to consider.

Indicative key milestone breakdown:

PHASE	Milestones	Indicative Date
	Process and Impact Evaluation Report	
	Contract Start Date	1 st November 2024
1	Introductory meeting	On or around 1 st November 2024
	Detailed planning and familiarisation	1 st November to 30 th November
	Impact Evaluation Kick off meeting	1 st December 2024
	Process Evaluation Kick off meeting	1 st December 2024
	Formal Progress update (to include presentation of the framework re-validation report considering revised objectives)	6 th January 2025
2	First draft of the Impact Evaluation work package	End March 2025
	First draft of the Process Evaluation work package	End March 2025
	Formal Progress update	End March 2025
3	Second draft of the Impact Evaluation work package	End April 2025
	Second draft of the Process Evaluation work package	End April 2025
	Final version of the Impact Evaluation report	End May 2025

Order Schedule 20 (Order Specification)
Order Ref:
Crown Copyright 2021

	Final version of the Process Evaluation report	End May 2025
--	--	--------------