



ID Number	Area	Question / Area of Feedback	Response
ID1	Assessment Criteria	You mentioned in the briefing session the possibility of extending the timeline for the legacy report out to 2033 to capture longer term effects. Is this extended timeline something you would want to decide ahead of contract finalisation, and therefore would like to see a case made for this in the bid. Or is this something that would be discussed during the delivery of the project?	The appointed supplier will be asked to assess the merits of extending the evaluation programme in Q3/Q4 of 2026, once under contract. It is something which will be considered during the project.
ID2	Contract Approach	It may be helpful to encourage prime suppliers/consortia to draw on specialist contributors for areas such as inclusion, ethics, community engagement, and learning-focused evaluation, alongside quantitative and economic expertise.	Contracting Authorities will consider this as part of the final preparation of ITT documentation.
ID3	Contract Approach	Beyond delivery of contractual outputs, what criteria will the Contracting Authorities use to define a “successful” evaluation programme at contract close?	Information relating to the Critical and Key Success Factors will be included within the ITT documentation and can be found in the Supplier Briefing slides available on Find a Tender. Further consideration will be given by Contracting Authorities and Hosting Partners to 'what success looks like' in Q2/3 of 2026. Hosting Partners are particularly keen to ensure that a full, comprehensive and robust analysis is completed across all jurisdictions and that the evaluation work undertaken for the tournament can leave residual value and learnings for the major events sector.
ID4	Contract Approach	Will Contracting Authorities facilitate cross-partner data-sharing agreements, or is responsibility for securing access expected to sit with the appointed supplier?	Yes. Contracting Authorities will facilitate data sharing agreements with relevant partners.
ID5	Contract Approach	Are there specific HM Treasury Green Book or other methodological standards that must be applied to economic impact assessment?	This information has been provided in the Supplier Briefing slides available on Find a Tender. As an evaluation HMT's Magenta Book will be the most relevant methodological guide. Principles from HMT's Green Book will also be relevant/consistent with Magenta Book.
ID6	Contract Approach	Are there any constraints on subcontracting to universities, SMEs or specialist consultancies across jurisdictions?	No. However, it will be the responsibility of the principal supplier (where working in partnership) to manage the relationship with subcontractors and coordinate any payment arrangements.
ID7	Contract Approach	What expectations exist regarding continuity of named personnel across the full contract term?	In view of the length of the contract and the need for continuity of relationships/information, Contracting Authorities are keen to ensure that personnel named in the appointed suppliers Tender Response are retained throughout the lifecycle of the contract, particularly those personnel who are in leadership and critical roles. Though, we recognise this is not always possible for a variety of reasons. Where continuity can not be guaranteed, is it expected that any replacement personnel will bring a comparable level of experience and seniority to the personnel they are replacing.
ID8	Contract Approach	Could you please provide more details on the contractual arrangements for the evaluation? Will it be contracted under an existing Government framework (e.g. RM6126)? And could you confirm who the named parties on the contract will be?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation. Information on the Contracting Authorities is set out in the Supplier Briefing slides available on Find a Tender.
ID9	Contract Approach	There was mention at the engagement event of branding of the published reports. Can you please confirm what the expectation is in relation to branding of reports?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID10	Contract Approach	Are you expecting certain data to be sourced from open or publicly available platforms (e.g., Google, Wikipedia, or other open-data organizations), or should all data be derived from primary research and authorized datasets?	This is up to Tenderers to propose as part of their Tender Response. Contracting Authorities are open to suggestions on data innovation and novel data sources.
ID11	Contract Approach	Do you have any pilot datasets, pre-processed data structures, standard reporting templates, or reference evaluation reports from previous EURO tournaments that could be shared as a baseline to inform methodology, comparability, and reporting design for this assessment?	Various datasets, structures, templates and reports do exist and will be made available to the appointed supplier by the Contracting Authorities, though previous studies and evaluation undertaken at previous tournaments may not be relevant/appropriate for use or comparable to the work to be undertaken as part of this contract. These do not provide a full data and document suite which will be required for the contract and the appointed supplier will therefore need to create equivalent documents. We do expect that the appointed supplier will be able to 'borrow' from what has gone before, but this should not be relied upon and the appointed supplier is expected to improve these documents, frameworks and datasets as part of the work to be undertaken.
ID12	Contract Approach	I understood that UK Sport would be the contracting entity, would the terms of the contract also apply to other involved stakeholders e.g. Welsh Government and Scottish Government ?	This information has been provided in the Supplier Briefing slides available on Find a Tender.
ID13	Contract Approach	Could you clarify whether any optional “2033 legacy” extension activities are expected to be contracted as part of the current scope or at a later stage?	See response to ID 1
ID14	Contract Value	How fixed is the estimated £2.25m contract value where suppliers can evidence enhanced delivery or legacy benefit?	Contracting Authorities have set out areas of Added Value within the Evaluation Framework which they expect to be evidenced and delivered within the estimated contract value. Contracting Authorities may consider any proposals from Tenderers where they are able to demonstrate and deliver extra value beyond these previously identified areas (and the cost of doing so), though this would require an agreement from Contracting Authorities to commit further funding, which does not currently exist.
ID15	Contract Value	Is the indicative payment profile prescriptive, or may suppliers propose alternative phasing aligned to delivery risk and workload?	The Contracting Authorities will discuss and agree a final payment schedule with the appointed supplier as part of contract finalisation discussions. This will be aligned to appointed supplier workload, production of outputs and profile of funding provided by the Contracting Authorities.

ID16	Framework	Where trade-offs arise between analytical depth and geographical breadth (e.g. host-city versus national-level reporting), what is the Steering Group’s default preference?	There is no default preference, beyond that acknowledged in the Evaluation Framework - i.e. recognition that less detail is expected for smaller areas and many variables will not be available/considered at city level for example.
ID17	Framework	Which core datasets are secured (e.g. ticketing, transport, volunteering, policing, UEFA data), and which remain subject to negotiation?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID18	Framework	To what extent is the draft Evaluation Framework fixed at ITT stage, versus open to refinement during inception?	See response to ID 56
ID19	Framework	Is the Tier 1 (Gold) prioritisation intended to drive materially greater analytical depth and resource allocation, or primarily to shape reporting emphasis and narrative focus?	Both. We would expect greater depth and resource for Tier 1 AND that the reporting would give more focus to these areas.
ID20	Framework	At Tender Response stage, are you primarily seeking detailed technical responses against the existing Evaluation Framework, or greater emphasis on delivery approach, governance, and risk management, given the scale and duration of the programme (pp.21–22)?	Tender Response Stage requirements - and the requirements of the PSQ and Presentation Stage - will be set out in the ITT documentation. Requirements will include the need for Tenderers to address numerous areas (including, but not limited to): supplier personnel; commercial offering; responses to technical questions related to the Evaluation Framework; provision of case studies; delivery programme; subcontractor management; organisational standards; risk management; EDI.
ID21	Framework	With regard to the prioritisation approach set out in the Evaluation Framework (p.40), should suppliers assume that prioritisation is limited to scoring against the existing categories, or is there scope to propose weightings within categories as part of the evaluation design?	The prioritisation approach to-date is to ensure we are clear with Tenderers where the focus should be in general terms. Tenderers are invited to elaborate on how they would design and conduct the evaluation, but given the level of stakeholder consultation to-date and strong alignment on priorities across stakeholders, we would not envisage major changes to prioritisation.
ID22	Framework	For the additional value themes identified in the Evaluation Framework (e.g. soft power, participation, feelgood factor, sustainability) (p.40), are you expecting these to be evidenced primarily through qualitative insight and narrative, or through bespoke primary research and quantitative metrics within the core programme?	Contracting Authorities are looking for robust quantitative examination of these five value themes, with supporting qualitative evidence.
ID23	Framework	Within the economic impact component of the framework (pp.32 and 40), additional GVA and additional jobs are referenced as core metrics. For employment impacts, should suppliers use only the additional jobs metric, or is there a desire to include both job definitions (e.g. fixed positions vs FTEs)?	Precise definitions at this level of detail can be agreed during the evaluation planning phase.
ID24	Framework	Beyond GVA and jobs, a number of standard economic metrics are not explicitly referenced in the framework (e.g. GDP effects, income tax generation, import/export effects, industry-level impacts, and direct/indirect/induced splits). Are these metrics considered intentionally out of scope, or would you expect suppliers to propose their inclusion where appropriate?	The framework is a necessary simplification. We would expect all these examples to be covered with the exception of: -Income tax effects: HMT Green Book is clear that taxes should be treated as transfers and not included in VfM analysis -Induced effects: while these may be presented, again HMT is clear that these should not be included in VfM analysis NB - trade does feature on the framework
ID25	Framework	What are the constraints on data residency and sovereignty across UK nations and Ireland? Any cloud provider restrictions?	We don't envisage any constraints or restrictions on data hosting and/or sharing amongst the Hosting and Contracting Partners. See response to ID 37
ID26	Framework	What SLAs for the unified platform matter during peak periods (ingestion time, query performance, dashboard uptime during the tournament), and what’s acceptable off-peak?	We understand this question to be about the implementation of a real-time dashboard being developed for use at tournament time. We do not foresee a need for such a tool.
ID27	Framework	The draft evaluation framework appears to be approximately 95% complete. Which areas would you be most open to supplier input or challenge, for example: Metric definitions Data sources Prioritization or weighting tiers	In Tender Responses, we would welcome comments on metrics, definitions, data and any omissions. Less so on prioritization given the work conducted to date.
ID28	Framework	What pre-existing data gaps or sensitivities are known to exist within the evaluation framework?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID29	Governance	How will scope changes be governed over the 2026–2030 delivery period, particularly where new policy, political or partner priorities emerge post-contract award?	Scope changes will be determined by the Tournament Evaluation Group. It is envisaged that any required scope changes will be added the contract through a contract variation with the appointed suppliers costs agreed through rate card prices submitted during the Tender Response stage of the Procurement Process.
ID30	Governance	In the event of differing priorities or interpretations between Government Partners, where does final decision-making authority sit?	The Tournament Evaluation Group is the primary decision-making body for matters relating to the evaluation programme. It is expected that decisions will be made by the group based on consensus.
ID31	Governance	What role is the Academic Panel expected to play (e.g. advisory input, peer review, approval gateway)?	The Academic Panel will not be a decision-making body. It will be a voluntary body constituted in Q2/3 of 2026, following contract award to ensure that there is no conflict of interest between its membership and the personnel of the appointed supplier. It will provide constructive and critical challenge and assurance to certain components of the appointed suppliers work, ensuring that the design, methodology and outputs are aligned with the latest research trends and developments. It will review the outputs produced by the appointed supplier. It is not expected that the academic panel will duplicate the work of any academic parties who may be part of appointed supplier's project team.
ID32	Governance	To what extent will the supplier retain academic independence, and what approval or sign-off will apply prior to publication?	The appointed supplier will retain academic independence. Approval processes are still to be finalised but it is envisaged that the Tournament Evaluation Group (composed of Contracting Authorities and Hosting Partners) will have final approval of all outputs (including those which are published).
ID33	Governance	Should the supplier support communications planning around evaluation findings, or is this handled entirely by the Contracting Authorities?	Evaluation-related communication activity will be led by the Hosting Partners. It is expected that the appointed supplier will support comms activity contributing to the development of plans and content, as needed.

ID34	Governance	When is the Academic Panel expected to be constituted, and will it provide input on the final Evaluation Plan (Output 1) in Q4 2026?	See response to ID 31
ID35	Governance	What AI standards, if any, do suppliers need to adhere to beyond what's outlined in the recent annex to the Magenta book?	This will be confirmed with the appointed supplier. As a minimum we expect the following to be complied with: - ISO/IEC 42001:2023 - EU AI Act - UK Government AI guidance: (https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-cyber-security-code-of-practice/code-of-practice-for-the-cyber-security-of-ai/ / https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-playbook-for-the-uk-government/artificial-intelligence-playbook-for-the-uk-government-html)
ID36	Governance	Can you provide a list of any industry/governance certificates or standards that are required to meet the PSQ criteria? Please indicate if these need to be held by all parties in a consortium or just the principle supplier.	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID37	Governance	In terms of stakeholder engagement, would the supplier need to coordinate collecting inputs from the host governments, council's host city partners and commercial partners?	UK Sport will support the collation of inputs from Hosting Partners and a range of data sharing agreements will be established to govern the sharing, hosting, management and processing of data.
ID38	Governance	To achieve academic credibility, do you envisage the supplier includes academics, or would this be achieved by the academic panel?	It will be up to Tenderers to determine the make-up of their team based on their interpretation of the specification and scope of services set out in ITT documentation.
ID39	Governance	Could you provide further detail on the role of the Academic Panel, including its remit, level of involvement in methodological decisions, and expectations around challenge, assurance and sign-off? Does it limit the requirement around an academic partner as part of any consortia?	See response to ID 31
ID40	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	In the final specification, would expertise in the area of disorder (fan disruption or incidence of drug use) be of interest?	This could be considered as part of the evaluation planning phase once the contract has been awarded, and we cannot prescribe this at the moment. We do, however, note that this would need to be considered in terms of proportionality relative to all other requirements and stakeholder preferences.
ID41	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	Are you interested in academic publication as an output of this project?	This has not been considered to date but we would consider/ be supportive of it, where sub-elements of the research are relevant. We would not necessarily expect a paper covering the whole body of work in aggregate, given the final evaluation report will do this.
ID42	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	For the 2030 legacy evaluation, are participant or community tracking mechanisms expected to be established by the supplier, or coordinated centrally by Partners?	In the main this is expected to be conducted by the appointed supplier - e.g. for event sentiment over time/pride etc. Individual FAs collect data on participation and may have tracking mechanisms that can be leveraged for participation.
ID43	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	Beyond standard public-sector accessibility requirements, are any specific formats expected (e.g. Easy Read, translations, visual summaries)?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID44	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	Indicator definitions: Are there prescribed definitions for core indicators – if so, could you please provide - or will supplier propose a set of indicators (and descriptors) for evaluation as part of the Evaluation Programme Methodology?	Specific indicators will be decided during evaluation planning with the appointed supplier, and these will be aligned with research questions. For now, there will be a supporting spreadsheet provided in the ITT documentation that gives more detail on each (cross-referenced) framework element covering definitions, data availability etc.
ID45	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	Comms and Engagement: In addition to engaging key stakeholders through a range of research and consultation methods for evaluation purposes. Should suppliers also expect to design and produce communications and engagement materials for the Steering Group, Governance Forums and other key stakeholders that help visualise, translate, and share the insights and outcomes generated by the Evaluation Programme?	Yes. It is expected that the appointed supplier will be required to produce, and readily distil evaluation findings in to easy-to-understand infographics and diagrams which are suitable for public consumption.
ID46	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	The Evaluation Framework refers to impacts being assessed at host city level (p.41). Where data availability allows, would you welcome economic impacts being broken down below the city level (e.g. council-by-council or local authority geographies) to capture intra-city variation? ONS data for economic impact analysis is currently available at this level of granularity.	Precise definitions for Host Cities will be determined during the evaluation planning phase, but will need to trade-off a number of factors including resource available.
ID47	Outputs/Deliverables/KPIs	How would you like us to balance national-level analysis versus host-city and stadium-level granularity across the eight host cities and nine stadia, in order to ensure consistency and comparability without over-extending fieldwork and resources?	This is up to Tenderers to propose as part of their Tender Response.
ID48	Specification Part 1	To what extent are interim findings expected to inform live decision-making during the tournament lifecycle, as opposed to retrospective evaluation?	Given the short-term duration of the tournament, we feel that this is only really relevant for the pre-Tournament report - where tweaks could be made to interventions/approach. For the tournament itself, once underway, there will not be time to inform live decision-making.
ID49	Specification Part 1	Given the four-week turnaround for the Post-Tournament Flash Report (August 2028), what are the minimum required components versus optional elements?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID50	Specification Part 1	Are there any expectations regarding comparability or minimum statistical confidence across nations or host cities for national-level primary research?	This is hard to answer at present. The question is obviously more relevant to elements of the research that require some form of sampling. In general terms, we expect robust sample sizes which provide statistical significance.
ID51	Specification Part 1	What commitments exist to facilitate supplier access to key stakeholders (e.g. UEFA, football associations, volunteers, sponsors) for qualitative research?	This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID52	Specification Part 1	Please could you provide more detail on existing plans for other surveys/research/ analysis that could input to the evaluation (e.g. there was mention of a separate evaluation of the impact on grass roots football and planned research in relation to soft power).	The Grassroots evaluation is currently being overseen by DCMS covering multisport facilities and tennis courts, as well as consideration of separate 'Lioness' funding leveraging recent tournament successes. This will be published before 2028 and so will not run concurrently with UEFA EURO 2028. We are aware of a proposed study to consider Soft Power impacts at UEFA EURO 2028, but do not have further details at present. We would expect some degree of consistency/collaboration for this.

ID53	Specification Part 1	Do the priority themes identified align to and reflect the objectives set out in the original business cases?	Yes, the priority themes align with Hosting Partner objectives. Additionally, there are themes and metrics that go beyond the limited number of objectives captured in business cases.
ID54	Specification Part 1	Have research questions been developed for the evaluation?	No. This will be the responsibility of the appointed supplier.
ID55	Specification Part 1	Data: Access & sharing: Where required, will UK Sport and contracting authorities sponsor data sharing agreements with relevant bodies (i.e. gov, cities, stadia and UEFA) to enable evaluation and analysis?	Yes. This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID56	Specification Part 1	The Evaluation Framework is described as c.95% complete (p.38), with suppliers invited to comment during the tender stage. Are there any elements of the framework that should be considered fully fixed (i.e. locked in and not open to discussion), versus areas where UK Sport would explicitly welcome further supplier input or refinement? Alternatively, should the framework be treated as broadly complete but open to limited improvement and tweaking across all areas?	We view it as broadly complete given the significant level of stakeholder input to date, but still welcome comments.
ID57	Specification Part 1	Is the evaluation primarily summative (i.e. focusing on impact analysis), or is there an expectation that it will also play a formative role in shaping the legacy programme and activities? (e.g. through supporting the development of project specific theories of change and ongoing feedback)	Please see response to ID 48
ID58	Specification Part 1	Does the evaluation scope require assessment of both positive and negative effects of the tournament on social cohesion, including any unintended or uneven impacts across communities?	Yes, we would expect both positive and negative effects to be considered here on cohesion, perception, feelgood, pride etc.
ID59	Specification Part 1	When are community and social interventions expected to be confirmed, and to what extent should the evaluation approach remain flexible to incorporate programmes that are designed or adapted later in the lifecycle?	These will be confirmed in Q3 of 2026. We do not envisage any further programmes being developed after this date, though the evaluation programme will need to remain agile, should this position change.
ID60	Specification Part 1	Is the appointed supplier expected to support broader dissemination of findings beyond formal written reports, such as through designed assets or multimedia outputs, or will communications activity be led separately by partners?	See response to ID 33 & 45. Evaluation-related communication activity will be led by the Hosting Partners. It is expected that the appointed supplier will support comms activity contributing to the development of plans and content, as needed.
ID61	Specification Part 1	Is there an expectation that a ‘Big 4’ will be required to be the lead consultancy in order to have a ‘name’ attached to the evaluation?	No. The Contracting Authorities will seek to award the contract to the most advantageous Tenderer based on the assessment criteria set out in the ITT.
ID62	Specification Part 1	How central is the environmental and sustainability element within the overall evaluation, relative to economic and social priorities, and where should depth of analysis/expertise be concentrated in practice?	As one of the five value added areas, it should be considered as central, but there is some degree of prioritisation within the theme, given the breadth of it. This can be seen in the framework and will be expanded upon in the ITT documentation.
ID63	Specification Part 1	Can a brief description of the documents that cannot be shared from the initial evaluation framework development be provided to potential suppliers?	Not at present - these reports are internal working documents. These documents will be shared with the appointed supplier.
ID64	Specification Part 1	Could you please confirm whether Spec Part 1 covers a cross-national evaluation spanning 2026–2030, including the six defined outputs (ranging from the Evaluation Plan through to the Post-Tournament Legacy Report)?	Yes, it does.
ID65	Specification Part 1	Are there any further differences in objectives or delivery models across host locations in addition to what we know about Scotland (Specification 2)?	Hosting Partners have both common and different objectives for the tournament, but have agreed common objectives for the evaluation programme. These will be included in the spreadsheet supporting the framework in the ITT. Each nation is able to invest in different themes to the degree they wish.
ID66	Specification Part 1	With collaboration highlighted as a key priority – what can we expect from UK Sport (and/or secondary partners) in terms of facilitating access to a) fans for primary data collection; and b) fan data for existing data sources and knowledge?	The Contracting Authorities and Hosting Partners will provide access to fans and existing fan data to the appointed supplier.
ID67	Specification Part 1	What, if any, UEFA or deliver-partner data sources will be made available to the successful evaluation supplier?	A significant amount. This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID68	Specification Part 1	Are you looking for the to incorporate value calculations beyond calculation methodologies permitted by HM Treasury’s Green Book?	Yes, for example Type 2 multipliers are not permitted by HMT Green Book and so will not be included in the value for money analysis in the post-tournament evaluation but will be included in the Flash Report.
ID69	Specification Part 1	For specification 1, are there separate budgets envisaged for each of the four deliverables across 2026 to 2030? Would there be separate payment gateways for each report? (I am not sure I understand the contract value page)	See response to ID 15
ID70	Specification Part 1	For the evaluation framework, have specific metrics already been identified for the event outcomes, legacy outcomes and impact, or would the definition of these form part of the finalisation of the evaluation framework?	Hosting Partners have defined metrics to assess tournament outcomes; metrics to define legacy and impact outcomes are still in development and will be finalised in Q2/3 of 2026
ID71	Specification Part 1	Where metrics needs to be collected or collated, particularly through primary research, would the contractor provide volunteer resource to support this (surveys)?	Yes, it expected that the appointed supplier will secure any volunteer resources needed to undertake primary research, where is used or where pertinent to the evaluation.

ID72	Specification Part 1	On environmental impact - would the supplier be required to do primary data collection - e.g. on carbon footprint, water usage, recycling rates etc	Some Primary research on environmental impacts will be undertaken by Hosting Partners. There may be a requirement for the appointed supplier to supplement this, if it is deemed necessary and pertinent to the evaluation.
ID73	Specification Part 1	To enable the most accurate proposal for the Event Impact Analysis, a clear breakdown of which data required for the analysis will be provided by which party, and which data is expected to be collected by the service provider and incorporated into the analysis, would be helpful.	Yes. This information will be set out in the ITT documentation.
ID74	Specification Part 2	How distinct are governance, reporting and sign-off arrangements for Specification Part 2 relative to Part 1 in practice?	Following feedback from prospective Suppliers and discussions amongst Hosting Partners, Specification Part 2 has been removed from the Evaluation Services Procurement Process. Scottish Government are considering running a separate competition for this area of work. Should it do so, information will be published via traditional channels including the Public Contracts Scotland website (https://www.publiccontractsscotland.gov.uk/)
ID75	Specification Part 2	Is there a preferred framework or precedent for assessing human rights impacts associated with enforcement of the Scottish legislation?	See response to ID 74
ID76	Specification Part 2	How should suppliers manage findings from the legislative evaluation that may carry legal, political or reputational sensitivity?	See response to ID 74
ID77	Specification Part 2	For the Scottish legislation evaluation, are there confirmed commitments from enforcement agencies and affected businesses to participate, or will securing stakeholder access be the supplier’s responsibility?	See response to ID 74
ID78	Specification Part 2	For the Scottish legislation evaluation, are there confirmed commitments from enforcement agencies and affected businesses to participate, or will securing stakeholder access be the supplier’s responsibility?	See response to ID 74
ID79	Specification Part 2	For Specification Part 2, we note the relatively small share of the budget allocated to this work. Will the expectation in terms of level of analysis be proportionate to the budget allocated? And is a full magenta book compliant evaluation required or is the requirement more akin to a post-implementation review?	See response to ID 74
ID80	Specification Part 2	For Specification Part 2, please can you provide details of the work required between draft final report and final published report? Will additional research and analysis between the two be required?	See response to ID 74
ID81	Specification Part 2	Specification Part 2 focuses on evaluation of the Scottish Government’s legislative provisions and explicitly excludes broader economic and social impacts (pp.26–27). Should suppliers assume this workstream will be entirely standalone, or is there an expectation of methodological alignment or shared evidence where appropriate with the wider tournament evaluation?	See response to ID 74
ID82	Specification Part 2	Including the content outlined under Part 2 as part of an Event Impact Analysis represents an extension beyond standard Event Impact Analyses. Therefore, it would be helpful to provide as much information as possible on the intended scope, content, and process of the analysis under Part 2. In addition, further clarification on the following points would be helpful: - Which qualifications are required or preferred for conducting the analysis? - Which data is required for the analysis and which data will be made available to the service provider? - Which access rights will be granted to the service provider for the collection of relevant data, for example for stakeholder interviews and surveys?	See response to ID 74
ID83	Specification Part 2	Would it make sense to split the specification part 2 as a separate tender, noting that this is quite a different requirement?	See response to ID 74
ID84	Tooling	Could you clarify your expectations regarding the digital tools, platforms, and analytical systems the supplier should use to deliver the evaluation? In particular: Are there preferred or mandated tools for: - data collection - data management - data analysis - visualisation and reporting?	No, there are no mandated tools. Suppliers are invited to demonstrate how they would deliver and add value as part of their Tender Response.
ID85	Tooling	Are there minimum security, data protection, or interoperability requirements that any tooling solution must meet - especially given the potential for multi nation, multi partner data sharing?	There will be minimum security, protection and interoperability requirements agreed with the appointed supplier, in consultation with the relevant owners of any data. As a minimum, we expect the appointed supplier to comply with ISO/IEC 27001, ISO/IEC 27017, ISO/IEC 27018, NIST CSF 2.0 and GDPR 2018 and follow the Secure by Design Principles of UK Government (https://www.security.gov.uk/policy-and-guidance/secure-by-design/) In general terms, we expect the appointed supplier to provide a solution which ensures confidence around data transfer, hosting and security and which enables Contracting Authorities and Hosting Partners to readily access contract outputs and materials in a user-friendly way.
ID86	Tooling	Will any tooling be provided by UK Sport, or should suppliers assume responsibility for proposing and hosting a full end to end tooling environment?	No tooling will be provided by the Contracting Authorities.
ID87	Tooling	Do you expect a centralised evaluation platform or portal to be created to support collaboration with the Evaluation Steering Group and Academic Panel?	Suppliers should determine the best way to foster collaboration and leave partners with functioning data throughout and at the end of the contract.

ID88	Tooling	Are there preferences regarding open source vs. commercial software for transparency, replicability, and auditability of analysis?	No. Supplier should propose their preferred software solutions as part of their Tender Responses.
ID89	Tooling	Should suppliers propose innovation in tooling?	See response to ID 84