



UK Government

The Evaluation of Industrial Energy Transformation Fund (IETF)

Annex A - Technical Annex



© Crown copyright 2026

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3 or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Section 1: Evaluation Research Methodology | 4 |
| Section 2: Process Evaluation Research Questions | 8 |
| Section 3: Interview Guides..... | 10 |
| Section 4: Survey text | 55 |

Section 1: Evaluation Research Methodology

Research Methodology

Evaluation design analytical approach

Research was guided by the research questions (RQs) for the evaluation (Section 2, below), which set out to evaluate the programme delivery processes as well as the performance of the programme against the early stages (Inputs > Outputs) of the Theory of Change developed by DESNZ. Given that there was a finite level of resource available for the delivery of the research, DESNZ provided the study team with a prioritisation of research questions to ensure resource was allocated appropriately.

A draft evaluation framework was designed by the study team during the proposal development phase prior to the start of the Final Process Evaluation. During the evaluation inception phase, the study team updated the evaluation framework using information provided by DESNZ. The resultant framework mapped all process evaluation research questions to available data sources and ensured consistency with the ToC Supplement developed by DESNZ, which sets out evidence sources for testing each causal pathway.

Evaluation Fieldwork

The evaluation framework mapped all research questions to research tools that were planned to be used in the evaluation. This allowed all research tools to be designed in a way that clearly and explicitly mapped their questions to the evaluation research questions. During design of the fieldwork research tools, key questions for each tool were highlighted using a prioritisation exercise.

The following primary fieldwork was conducted:

- **Interview programme** - 53 Interviews were conducted – across 6 stakeholder groups – beneficiaries (29), DESNZ delivery team (5), monitoring officers and assessors (10), wider sector stakeholders¹ (6), and dropouts² (3). Interviews were c.45-60min semi structured consultations, using interview guides and conducted via online video calls.
- **A beneficiary survey** was sent to all grant holders. 36 responses were completed. The survey was conducted using an online survey portal, Smart Survey³. DESNZ directly supported engagement by sending reminders.

¹ Wider sector stakeholders were typically representatives with industry trade bodies.

² Dropouts are defined as applicants who were successful in their applications but withdrew their applications prior to grant award.

³ <https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/>

- **Document analysis** – Documents⁴ were reviewed by study team members as part of project mobilisation/ onboarding; to inform research tool design; and as part of project level familiarisation prior to interviews with specific stakeholders.

Interview programme

Table 2 below shows the total number of interviews conducted with IETF stakeholder groups

Table 1 Final Process Evaluation Interview programme

| IETF stakeholder groups | Target | Contacted | Total conducted | % of target |
|-------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Beneficiary | 30 | 63 | 29 | 97% |
| DESNZ delivery team | 5 | 6 | 5 | 100% |
| Assessors and MOs | 10 | 11 | 10 | 100% |
| Dropouts | 5 | 10 | 3 | 60% |
| Wider industry | 5 | 11 | 6 | 120% |
| Total | 55 | 109 | 53 | 96% |

The beneficiary interview programme formed a substantial subset of the overall interview programme. This took a stratified sampling approach, with some over-sampling of projects awarded in earlier phases in order to yield insight on full delivery and monitoring & verification (M&V) processes. Increasingly targeted/ purposive sampling was then used to best fill gaps in the sample frame and achieve as representative a sample as possible.

Beneficiaries were approached for interviews in three tranches, to provide time for responses to rounds of outreach, and ensure the target samples were met:

Tranche 1 – 30 beneficiaries:

- Aimed for a broadly representative sample stratified across the following 7 criteria: Application Window, Company Size, Project Status, Type of Project (Feasibility, Engineering Study, Deployment), Energy efficiency or Decarbonisation, Geographical Region, Grant size.
- This sample was adjusted part way through the process to ensure the study captured experiences of more projects that had closed.

⁴ Documents reviewed include: programme business cases, the IETF programme delivery database, examples of M&V plans, timelines of scheme windows, and applicant guidance documents.

Tranche 2 – 21 beneficiaries:

- Selected to fill Tranche 1 sampling strategy due to target sample not being met in previous tranche.

Tranche 3 – 12 beneficiaries:

- Selected to fill Tranche 1 sampling strategy due to target sample not being met in previous tranche.
- Some minor elements of ‘snowball sampling’ as fieldwork phase closed, to capture additional perspectives such as consultants who were introduced to the study team by interviewed beneficiaries.

Survey engagement

The survey was distributed to all successful applicants. The survey achieved a lower-than-intended response rate (36 full responses versus target census of 103 unique successful applicants), with average n per question of ~32. This low survey response rate was understood to be in part an effect of poor-quality contact details data as well as difficulty engaging beneficiaries.

Decarbonisation deployment projects were the most represented project type (13/36), Phase 2 Autumn 2022 was the most represented competition window (15/36), and large UK and multinational companies were the most represented company size (27/36). As a result, the survey response rate presents a limitation in that it is difficult to make judgements across the full portfolio with a high level of confidence using survey data alone. However, by triangulating survey data with the rich qualitative data received through the 29 high quality interviews, the survey data has proved helpful in confirming or invalidating patterns observed in interview data.

Evaluation Fieldwork Analysis

Qualitative research tools (i.e. interview topic guides) were structured to address the primary research questions and Theory of Change pathways, which formed the basis of a structured qualitative data analysis. Raw data from interviews was uploaded to a master analysis framework which allowed filtering based on research question and topic area, as well as per stakeholder and project characteristic. Cross-sections of data were then analysed thematically to assess patterns, strength of evidence and generate conclusions.

Quantitative survey data structured per research question, and programme database analysis, was then used to triangulate patterns identified in interview data.

A final assessment against each research question was then made, balancing the patterns and strength of evidence observed across the different sources of data.

Limitations

The study in general faced few limitations and was able to generate conclusions based on a strong evidence base. However, some limitations were encountered which limited the scope and strength of conclusions:

- As described above, the survey achieved a lower-than-expected response. The relatively modest survey response rate (33%) presents a limitation in that it is difficult to make judgements across the full portfolio with a high level of confidence using survey data alone. However, by triangulating survey data with the rich qualitative data received through the 29 high quality interviews, the survey data has proved helpful in confirming or invalidating patterns observed in interview data.
- High representation of beneficiaries within sample frame leads to a bias towards beneficiary and successful applicant perspective, as described further below. However, the analysis and strength of conclusions has balanced and triangulated beneficiary perspectives with other stakeholder views. In many cases, the strong representation of beneficiaries was beneficial and essential to understand the “user perspective” of grant processes.
- There was a bias within the beneficiary sample towards large UK based and international companies, representing 71% of respondents.
- The study does not have a significant counterfactual group of companies for comparison beyond the three withdrawn successful applicants who were interviewed. This was due to difficulty securing the engagement of withdrawn and unsuccessful applicants. This would have helped to strengthen conclusions around the ability for companies to adopt EE and DD measures without IETF support, as well as conclusions around the attractiveness of the grant and barriers within the application stage.
- Analysis of spillovers to wider industry, in terms of knowledge transfer and technology adoption, was limited to the perspective attainable via beneficiary interviews and the 6 interviews with wider industry stakeholders. Analysis of wider industry spillovers would have required more resource for more extensive data collection. However, given the relatively early stage of project delivery, the insights generated suggest that the sample frame was proportionate and relevant.
- The fieldwork uncovered the key role that consultants played in supporting applications to the IETF as well as project delivery. Therefore these emerged as a key stakeholder and therefore a limitation of the fieldwork is that it did not interview a significant number of consultancies in the sector, though three consultants were interviewed as part of the beneficiary interview programme. The study generated a reasonable understanding of the role consultants played within IETF Phase 1 and 2. However, further work to develop the understanding of the role of consultants could be undertaken in future testing of the Theory of Change.

Section 2: Process Evaluation Research Questions

Theory of Change

- To what extent, based on evidence available to date, should one have confidence in the causal story as detailed in the Theory of Change (steps 1-19)? What aspects of the Theory of Change, if any, require changing and what are these changes?
- What barriers did applicants face prior to and during their involvement with the IETF, and to what degree did the IETF and IETF processes contribute to overcoming them?

IETF Application

- What were the main motivations and barriers for IETF applicants when applying for IETF funding?
- How was demand for the IETF (volume and scale of applications for EE, DD, studies) influenced by recent market events (including changes to energy prices and/or Covid-19)?
- How was delivery of IETF objectives impacted by inflation and supply chain disruption, and were measures to mitigate the negative effects of these pressures effective?
- To what extent was the "offer" of the IETF interventions (grants, feasibility) attractive to stakeholders?
- How effectively did the IETF leverage private funding to support government funding?
- How did the IETF encourage firms to investigate new projects or studies?
- How did the IETF have an effect on the ambition of firm's decarbonisation or energy efficiency plans?
- Did the guidance, dissemination events and support offered alongside the IETF improve the quality of applications and if so, how?
- How did the IETF's communications, marketing and applicant advice campaigns support the scheme's delivery?
- Did the IETF guidance provide applicants sufficient advice on what they would be tested on and did their perception of the assessment process match with the reality?

IETF Assessment, Due Diligence, Award

- Were the assessment criteria fit for purpose in terms of selecting projects that met the IETF objectives?

- Did IETF assessors apply the scoring guidance consistently?
- What value to the government and applicant was derived from the financial and technical due diligence processes?
- How did the award decision making process (GAP, Ministers, GOLD) support the delivery of the IETF objectives?

IETF Delivery

- Was the performance of the IETF delivery body and technical contractors supportive to the delivery of the intended scheme objectives and if so, how?
- To what extent were the relationships between IETF stakeholders (e.g. beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers, suppliers) supportive of the delivery of the scheme?
- To what extent did projects proceed as expected and how did IETF processes help or hinder this?

IETF Benefits & Benefits Monitoring

- To what extent has information sharing or upskilling (business-to-business and government-to-business) occurred and if so, how effective or ineffective was this in spreading of benefits of EE/DD projects to wider industry?
- How effective was the monitoring & verification (M&V) setup and reporting process in delivering scheme objectives?
- What were users' experiences of the M&V process and to what degree were arrangements proportionate or disproportionate to the project cost/complexity?

Wider questions

- How did the splitting of the scheme between EE and DD projects support the overall delivery of the scheme?
- Were there any material interactions between IETF and other government environmental or economic policies in terms of firms' decisions to invest?
- What lessons, if any, arise from the IETF which could help HMG in determining the pathway to 2050 decarbonisation goals?

Have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF policy and processes?

Section 3: Interview Guides

Delivery team interview guide

Interview context [Interviewer to read this section in advance of interview]

These interviews are intended to:

- Develop an interim process evaluation, assessing the performance and impact of delivery processes on the scheme intended objectives
- Assess the Programme level Theory of Change (from inputs and activities through to early outcomes, i.e. boxes and arrows 1-19 of the ToC) annexed to the interview guide.

All interviewees will be subject to optimism bias and other biases.

Reading available documentation will provide context of delivery experience so far, including any changes that have been made. It will also allow you to (politely) challenge the interviewee if required.

Consider:

- Competition guides
- Process mapping documents
- Previous Steer Evaluation Report

Acronyms:

EE: Energy Efficiency

DD: Deep Decarbonisation

Key for notes on interview questions:

- KEY SOURCE – the Interview is the primary source of evidence for collecting this information. If time allows, try to make sure this question is asked to beneficiary.
- HIGH PRIORITY. During project kick off, DESNZ were asked to prioritise RQs. This question was flagged as HIGH PRIORITY.
- PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION – this question maps to a RQ in the ITT which was marked with an asterisk (*) and therefore is of interest to DESNZ. If time allows, try to ask this question.

Note, if not logged as KEY SOURCE or logged as COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE, there may be other sources of evidence to answer this question.

- TOC BOX. This question tests a causal pathway in the TOC, e.g. the linkage that exists between ToC BOX 11 and ToC BOX 15

Introduction [5 min] [To be read out by interviewer at start of all interviews]

Thank you for speaking to me as part of the evaluation of the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund Programme. ("IETF")

Technopolis are an independent research and evaluation consultancy providing robust programme evaluation to DESNZ. We are currently undergoing the last phase of the process evaluation.

A previous process evaluation was published in 2021 and was delivered by Steer and focused on Phase 1 processes. This phase of evaluation focuses on the delivery of the programme and the monitoring and verification processes that have been implemented. We have tried to avoid overlap between the scope of the 2 evaluation activities.

We aim to speak with approximately 5 more people from the delivery team, as well as other stakeholder groups to help us to develop a holistic assessment of the IETF programme to date.

Your feedback will inform the development of the IETF programme and other future DESNZ programmes.

The output of this phase of the work will be a published research report that presents anonymised and aggregated views on the delivery of IETF.

1.1.1 Data protection:

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

- For this report, we will not attribute any quotes to individuals without prior permission. However, given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect interviewees' personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.

- Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

The interview is expected to last 1 hour.

- If you consent, we would like to record the interview for analysis purposes, as it will help us accurately collect findings for the research. The recording will be securely stored on

Microsoft Teams and Microsoft OneDrive, retained by us and destroyed after the completion of the evaluation (currently estimated to be December 2025), under UK GDPR.

- Only members of the Technopolis research team will have access to the recording, DESNZ's research team will have access to interview transcripts, therefore complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Are you happy to:

- a. Take part in the interview?
- b. For the interview to be recorded?

For the recording, please can you indicate that you agree to take part in this interview on the basis described.

Do you have any questions before we continue?

A. Opening [1 min]

1. Please can you begin by confirming what your role has been within the IETF?

B. Applications to IETF (Time allocation 10 mins / accumulative time 15 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My first few questions seek to understand your view on the applications received to the IETF, applicant motivations, the quality of applications received, as well as the influence of recent market events such as energy price rises and Covid-19 on the amount and scope of applications.

1) KEY SOURCE

To what extent did the IETF receive good-quality applications from businesses, given the assessment criteria and IETF objectives? (ToC BOX 3 > ToC BOX 5)

Probe:

- Did businesses appear to face any challenges in terms of their capacity to submit good quality applications?
- (ToC BOX 4 > ToC BOX 5): To what extent did DESNZ's resources and expertise impacted the quality of the applications submitted?

2) KEY SOURCE

Was the pre application and application process well designed and implemented? How did the process support or hinder good quality applications?

Probe:

- What challenges did the delivery team encounter during application stage?
- What challenges did businesses appear to face (e.g. eligibility or capacity to submit good quality applications)?

3) HIGH PRIORITY/ COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

In your view, what were the primary motivations of applicants? [RQ#2]

Probe:

- What barriers did firms face in relation to studies, EE and DD deployment, which made the IETF appealing?
- Do you think firms had other commercial, strategic or policy motivations beyond overcoming financial and capability barriers?

4) KEY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

In your view, how was demand for the IETF (in terms of volume and scale of applications for EE, DD, studies) influenced by recent market events (including changes to energy prices and/or Covid-19)? [RQ#4]

5) COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

How effective do you think the IETF's communications, marketing and applicant advice campaigns in generating demand (for applications) and supporting applicants? [RQ#11]

C. Assessment and award process (Time allocation 10 mins / accumulative time 25 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My next few questions focus on your views of the assessment and award process, and how well you think the assessment, due diligence and final awards processes led to a portfolio of good grants across the three pillars of studies, EE and DD.

6) KEY SOURCE PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

In practice, how suitable were the assessment criteria for selecting projects that met the IETF objectives, and was the scoring guidance applied consistently by the assessors? [RQ#13, RQ#14]

Probe:

- Were there differences across the three streams?
- What worked well?
- What worked less well?

7) HIGH PRIORITY / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

From your perspective, how effective was the award decision making process (i.e. the Grant Award Panel, Ministers and Grant Offer Letter Decision) in awarding grants to good quality projects? [RQ#16] (ToC BOX 5 > ToC BOX 6)

Probe:

- Effect of structure and governance
- Difference across studies vs EE vs DD.

8) COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

From your perspective, how valuable (both to the government and applicant) was the financial and technical due diligence processes? [RQ#15]

Probe:

- Did it enable better projects?
- Was it well implemented?
- Were there differences between the three streams?

9) Are you aware of ineligible projects being signposted to other potential sources of funding? If so, please expand on what kinds of projects were rejected and the sources of alternative funding they were signposted to.

10) What could the UK Government do differently in the delivery of a similar scheme in the future?

D. Realisation of IETF objectives: Financial barriers (Time allocation 5 mins/ accumulative time 30 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My next few questions focus on how well you think the IETF helped firms overcome financial barriers.

11) KEY SOURCE

In your experience, how effective was the IETF in leveraging matched private funding? [RQ#7]

Probe:

- Were provisional grant holders able to leverage matched private funding? Were any clear reasons as to why they could/could not?
- Did any provisional grant holders have issues securing match funding?
- Was there any difference across the three pillars of Studies, EE and DD?

12) Reflecting on each of the three streams (studies, EE and DD deployment), to what extent did the IETF help firms overcome financial barriers? (ToC BOX 13 > ToC BOX 17)

Probe:

- For studies, has it reduced the risk of financial loss by identifying unviable projects?
- For EE, has it reduced the payback period? (ToC BOX 13 > ToC BOX 17)
- For DD, has it enabled first movers to choose lower carbon options? (ToC BOX 14 > ToC BOX 18)
- Could projects have progressed without IETF funding? Which projects / types of projects, and with what sources of funding?

E. Realisation of IETF objectives: Capability barriers (Time allocation 5 mins/ accumulative time 35 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My next few questions focus on how well you think IETF support helped firms overcome capacity barriers.

13) To what extent did IETF support help firms to overcome capability barriers (including knowledge and skills as well as other capabilities) for DD deployment? (ToC BOX 11 > ToC BOX 15)

Probe:

- In what way did the IETF support projects to build knowledge and skills for DD deployment? (ToC BOX 19 > ToC BOX 15)
- (ToC BOX 18 > ToC BOX 19) Could you describe how the learning from fully installed and operational projects have been shared across project beneficiaries?
- Could firms have developed this without the IETF?

14) HIGH PRIORITY / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

From your perspective, how effective has DESNZ and the IETF programme been in facilitating knowledge sharing with and between IETF projects, as well as broader industry? [RQ#20]

Probe:

- (ToC BOX 4 > ToC BOX 11) To what extent did DESNZ's resources and expertise facilitate knowledge-sharing?
- The design of the programme in promoting and facilitating knowledge sharing
- The role of projects themselves in knowledge sharing.
- The extent to which there has been positive spillovers into wider industry, in terms of knowledge and skills around DD technology deployment.

F. Delivery of IETF: general delivery functions (Time allocation 10 mins /accumulative time 45 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My next few questions focus on some of the general delivery functions within the IETF such as the effectiveness of the delivery body and technical contractors, the performance of the Monitoring and Validation (M&V) setup, IETF communications, as well as the impact of relationships between the various IETF stakeholders which the scheme facilitated.

15) How did splitting the scheme between EE and DD projects support the overall delivery of the scheme? For instance, did it encourage more focused or ambitious, higher quality projects? Were there any negative effects of this separation? [RQ#23]

Probe:

- How might this design be improved in future?

16) How effective have the IETF delivery body and technical contractors been in supporting firms and delivering the programme more broadly? [RQ#17]

Probe:

- Issues around team collaboration and governance
- Issues around capacity
- What has worked well?
- What challenges have arisen? What could be changed in future?

17) The IETF enables, and to an extent, relies on relationships between various stakeholders such as between beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers, suppliers.

18) To what extent were the relationships between IETF stakeholders supportive of the delivery of the scheme? [RQ#18]

Probe:

- Which relationships did the IETF facilitate that were especially beneficial for project delivery?
- Were there any challenges? If so, how could relationships between stakeholders be improved?

Monitoring and verification (M&V) and reporting

19) In your opinion, how effective was the monitoring & verification (M&V) setup and reporting process in delivering scheme objectives? [RQ#21]

Probe:

- Was it helpful for planning and project management?

- Was it helpful for tracking and understanding beneficiary?

20) From your perspective, what were users' experiences of the M&V process and to what degree were arrangements proportionate or disproportionate to the project cost/complexity? [RQ#22]

Probe:

- Did beneficiaries express issues with the M&V and reporting process?
- Did programme staff have issues implementing the M&V process?

21) HIGH PRIORITY / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

Do you have any further reflections on how well projects have progressed, and the effect of IETF processes on their progress? [RQ#19]

Processes such as:

- Post application: DESNZ queries/ application clarification question process
- Contracting processes
- Post notification: Developing M&V plans (Phase 3 only)
- Milestone Payment claims process / project milestone and compliance information
- Quarterly progress reviews
- Site visits
- Project change request process

22) Reflecting on the IETF design and processes more generally, have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative)? [RQ#27]

G. Broader questions (Time allocation 10 mins / accumulative time 55 mins)

[Interviewer to read out load] My final few questions cover broader considerations including unintended consequences of the IETF policy, the effect of inflation and supply chain disruption, and your reflections on the overall programme Theory of Change.

23) HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

Have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF programme delivery and IETF policy and if so, what are they and why did they arise? [RQ#26]

24) HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

From your knowledge, how was delivery of the IETF objectives impacted by inflation and supply chain disruption? What measures were taken to mitigate these impacts, and were those measures effective? [RQ#5]

25) HIGH PRIORITY COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

Are you familiar with the IETF Theory of Change? If so, to what extent do you think the programme causal theory is correct? In other words, do you think the policy design is suitable for its intended impact? What aspects, if any, require changing and how? [RQ#1]

Closing remarks (4 mins /accumulate time 60 min)

Q: Is there anything you'd like to add that we haven't already covered, or something you'd like to emphasise as of particular importance?

- Are you happy with all the information you've provided to be included in the evaluation?
- If there is anything I need to clarify when I go back over the interview, would it be ok to contact you again about this?

If you have any questions about how the data provided as part of the study will be used by DESNZ or Technopolis or wish to exercise your rights under UK GDPR you can contact: xxxxx@technopolis-group.com

Thanks for your time.

[Close Interview]

Beneficiary interview guide

Interview context [Interviewer to read this section in advance of interview]

These interviews are intended to:

- Assess interim process evaluation, delivery processes, etc
- Assessment of Programme level ToC boxes 1-19 (annexed to the interview guide)

All interviewees will be subject to optimism bias and other biases.

Reading available documentation will provide context of delivery experience so far, including any changes that have been made. Please review the Change Request excel [Snapshot June 2024] Change Request Log.xlsx (see Q4.1) and summarise the key changes in the field provided on Question 4.1 as this is essential context for the question.

Key for notes on interview questions:

- KEY SOURCE – the Interview is the primary source of evidence for collecting this information. If time allows, try to make sure this question is asked to beneficiary.
- HIGH PRIORITY. During project kick off, DESNZ were asked to prioritise RQs. This question was flagged as HIGH PRIORITY.
- PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION – this question maps to a RQ in the ITT which was marked with an asterisk (*) and therefore is of interest to DESNZ. If time allows, try to ask this question.

Note, if not logged as KEY SOURCE, there may be other sources of evidence to answer this question.

- TOC BOX. This question tests a causal pathway in the TOC, e.g. the linkage that exists between ToC BOX 11 and ToC BOX 15

Introduction [5 min] [To be read out by interviewer at start of all interviews]

Thank you for speaking to me as part of the evaluation of the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund Programme (“IETF”). Technopolis are an independent research and evaluation consultancy providing robust programme evaluation to DESNZ. We are currently undergoing the last phase of the process evaluation.

A previous process evaluation was published in 2021 and was delivered by Steer and focused on Phase 1 processes. This phase of evaluation focuses on the delivery of the programme, including the application, contracting, reporting, payment claims, and the monitoring and

verification processes that have been implemented. We have tried to avoid overlap between the scope of the 2 evaluation activities.

We aim to speak with approximately 30 beneficiaries as well as other stakeholder groups to help us to develop a holistic assessment of the IETF programme to date. Your feedback will inform the development of the IETF programme and other future DESNZ programmes.

The output of this phase of the work will be a published research report that presents anonymised and aggregated views on the delivery of IETF.

1.1.1 Data protection:

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

- For this report, we will not attribute any quotes to individuals without prior permission. However, given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect interviewees' personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.
- Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

The interview is expected to last 1 hour.

- If you consent, we would like to record the interview for analysis purposes, as it will help us accurately collect findings for the research. The recording will be securely stored on Microsoft Teams and Microsoft OneDrive, retained by us and destroyed after the completion of the evaluation (currently estimated to be December 2025), under UK GDPR.
- Only members of the Technopolis research team will have access to the recording, DESNZ's research team will have access to interview transcripts, therefore complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Are you happy to:

- a. Take part in the interview?
- b. For the interview to be recorded?

For the recording, please can you indicate that you agree to take part in this interview on the basis described.

Do you have any questions before we continue?

A. Opening [1 min] [Skip this question if respondent is known to researcher/ interviewer and information can be provided]

Please can you begin by confirming what your role has been on the project? [max 1 min]

Probe if needed:

Project management only or day to day delivery?

Involvement in IETF application, delivery, M&V?

B. IETF demand (up to 10 mins/accumulative 15 mins)

[Interviewer to read] My first few questions focus on what motivated your firm to apply to the IETF, whether your firm had any reservations about applying, and the extent to which the IETF influenced you to investigate new studies or projects.

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

1) What were your primary motivations for applying to the IETF? [RQ#3, RQ#2]

- Doing the project anyway – part of the DD pathway of the IETF.
- This is a pathway to emissions reductions – not directly emissions reductions
- Other two projects were EE -

Prompt:

- Emissions reductions
- Short term Cost reductions
- R&D development
- Long term financial sustainability

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

2) Were there any barriers or reasons that made you consider not applying to the IETF? How were these overcome? [RQ#3]

- Not really

Prompts:

- Scope not fit for purpose
- Grant level not appropriate
- Timelines for project not appropriate
- Matched funded requirements too high

KEY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

3) Was your participation in the IETF influenced by recent market events (including changes to energy prices and/or Covid-19)?

- CO2 price had a big impact – UK ETS had just started – the CO2 prices were rising very steeply, but then market was rationalised
- How did these events affect your decision to apply, or the scale or type of project you applied for? [RQ#4]

KEY SOURCE / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

4) To what extent did the IETF encourage your firm to investigate new projects or studies? [RQ#8] (ToC BOX 2> ToC BOX 6)

- To what extent was the offer of the programme attractive to your company? [RQ#6]
- Planning on doing this anyway, regardless of IETF.
- Energy saving potential for the project

KEY SOURCE / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

5) Did the IETF influence the ambition of your firm's decarbonisation or energy efficiency plans? In what way? [RQ#9]

- Yes – it enabled them to get an energy transition strategy

KEY SOURCE

6) How did you become aware of / interested in the scheme? Was IETF communication and marketing influential in your decision to apply? [RQ#11]

- Consultant helped them gain initial awareness – but subsequent were

C. Application Processes (up to 10 mins/accumulative 25 mins)

[Interviewer to read out loud] My next few questions focus on your experiences of the IETF application process, for instance whether the process, assessment criteria and due diligence was clear and well designed, and if sufficient information and support was provided.

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

7) Within the application process, did you face any capacity barriers in terms of the experience or knowledge of your staff or contractors? [RQ#2] (ToC BOX 3 > ToC BOX 5)

Probe: Did you need external support?

KEY SOURCE /PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

8) When developing your application, did you find IETF support helpful? In what way was it beneficial for the quality of your application [RQ#10] (ToC BOX 4 > ToC BOX 5) [RQ#11]

- Which aspects of their support and broader communication, guidance, etc, did you engage with?

Probe:

- Pre-launch engagement
- Application guidance documents
- Stakeholder briefing event (Phase 3 only)
- Applicant support (raising queries to IETF during bid prep window)
- Applicant workshops
- Applicant Development Service (Phase 2 only)

[Note to interviewers] Q#15 later in document also asks about this topic, but during delivery]

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY / RESEARCH QUESTION

9) Do you feel you had sufficient and accurate guidance from IETF on the application process and assessment criteria? Did this guidance match the reality of what you experienced in the application process? [RQ#12] (ToC BOX 4> ToC BOX 5)

KEY SOURCE PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

10) From your perspective, were the assessment criteria clear and consistently applied? [RQ#13, RQ#14]

KEY SOURCE

11) To what extent was the financial and technical due diligence process valuable to you as an applicant? In what way did it affect your application and participation in the IETF? [RQ#15]

D. Delivery processes and delivery of IETF objectives (up to 15 mins/accumulative 40 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next few questions focus on the progress of your project and the reasons why it may or may not have progressed as expected. This includes questions about the role of support you received from the IETF, as well as questions about spillover effects into wider industry.

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

12) Has your project progressed as expected? In what way has or has it not progressed as expected? [RQ#2, RQ#19].

[Pre-interview preparation]

I understand that your project has requested the following changes:

Interviewer to check Project Change Request list - [Snapshot June 2024] Change Request Log.xlsx ahead of the interview:

Beneficiary's change request summary:

KEY SOURCE

13) During the delivery of your project, did you find the IETF's broader communications, guidance and advice campaigns useful for delivering your project? If so, In what way? [RQ#11]

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

14) How have IETF processes helped or hindered your project's progress? [RQ#2, RQ#19]

Processes such as:

- Post application: DESNZ queries/ application clarification question process
- Application award process (Grant Agreed in Principle > Grant Offer Letter)
- Contracting processes
- Post notification: Developing M&V plans (Phase 3 only)
- Milestone Payment claims process / project milestone and compliance information
- Quarterly progress reviews
- Site visits
- Project change request process

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

15) To what extent has participation in IETF helped you overcome financial or capacity barriers to deploying energy efficiency or decarbonisation projects? (RQ#1) (ToC BOX 9> ToC BOX 13) (ToC BOX 10> ToC BOX 14)

Probe:

- [If the project has finished/operational] (ToC BOX 13> ToC BOX 17) To what extent the payback period of EE projects has been reduced to an acceptable level (financial barrier is overcome) now that the project is operational?
- [If the project has finished/operational] (ToC BOX 14> ToC BOX 18): To what extend the grant makes riskier carbon projects more financially applicable to first movers now that DD tech has been installed and became operational?
- To what extent do you think these projects would have progressed without the IETF?

KEY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY/ PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

16) What has been the impact of inflation and supply chain disruption during project delivery, and how have these impacts been mitigated? [RQ#5]

KEY SOURCE

17) How effectively did the IETF enable you to leverage additional private funding? [RQ#7] (ToC BOX 5> ToC BOX 6)

KEY SOURCE

18) Did you find the IETF delivery body and technical contractors valuable for the delivery of your project and if so, how? [RQ#17]

Probes:

- for engineering vs non-engineering contractors
- [if not valuable] How could the process be improved?

KEY SOURCE

19) To what extent has your project benefited from relationships with IETF stakeholders (e.g. other beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers, suppliers)? [RQ#18]

Probe: Which relationships or interactions have you benefited from and why?

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

20) To what extent has the IETF supported the development of knowledge or skills related to energy efficiency or decarbonisation projects in your company? [RQ#20] (ToC BOX 18> ToC BOX 19)

Prompt:

- Knowledge around best practices, costs or benefits
- To what extent has the IETF supported knowledge, and skills transfer to wider industry?
- To what extent did you rely on external support?

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

21) In what ways has IETF supported the development of knowledge or skills in wider industry? Related to energy efficiency or decarbonisation projects? [RQ#20] (ToC BOX 4> ToC BOX 11) (ToC BOX 19> ToC BOX 15)

Prompt:

- Directly from government
- By supporting business to business collaboration
- Other channels

E. Monitoring and Verification (up to 5 mins/accumulative 45 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next few questions focus on your experience of the monitoring, verification (M&V) and reporting setup, to understand how useful or un-useful you found it.

KEY SOURCE

22) To what extent did you find the monitoring and verification (M&V) and reporting set up was valuable for the implementation of your project? [RQ#21]

Prompt:

- Was it helpful for planning and project management? Including budget management?
- Was it helpful for goal setting and tracking milestones?

KEY SOURCE

23) Did you find the M&V arrangements proportionate or disproportionate compared to your project cost and complexity? In what way? [RQ#22]

F. Wider questions (up to 10 mins/accumulative 55 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next few questions cover some broader issues relating to your experience of the IETF.

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

24) Do you think there have been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF policy or processes? (i.e. the way the programme was designed and implemented) [RQ#26, RQ#27]

KEY SOURCE

25) In what way [if at all] did the separation of the scheme into two pillars of EE and DD cause you to think differently about your application (e.g. how this affected scope, technology, type or ambition, etc), and how did it affect project delivery? [RQ#23]

26) Where there any material interactions between IETF and other governmental policies?
RQ#24

27) What could Government do to improve the delivery of similar schemes in the future?

G. Closing remarks [4 mins]

28) Is there anything you'd like to add that we haven't already covered, or something you'd like to emphasise as of particular importance?

- Are you happy with all the information you've provided to be included in the evaluation?
- If there is anything I need to clarify when I go back over the interview, would it be ok to contact you again about this?

If you have any questions about how the data provided as part of the study will be used by DESNZ or Technopolis or wish to exercise your rights under UK GDPR you can contact:
xxxxxx@technopolis-group.com

Thanks for your time.

Assessors and Monitoring Officers interview guide

Interview context

[Interviewer to read this section in advance of interview]

These interviews are intended to:

- Develop an interim process evaluation, assessing the performance and impact of delivery processes on the scheme intended objectives
- Assess the Programme level Theory of Change from inputs and activities through to early outcomes (i.e. boxes 1-19 of the ToC) annexed to the interview guide.

All interviewees will be subject to optimism bias and other biases.

Reading available documentation will provide context of delivery experience so far, including any changes that have been made. It will also allow you to (politely) challenge the interviewee if required.

This interview guide has been designed for both assessors of applications and monitoring officers. Throughout the guide, there are indications about areas where questions focus on either stakeholder group.

Prior to beginning your interview, identify the questions which are most relevant to the interviewee from the list provided.

 Some of the shortlisted participants have been involved in both assessment and monitoring

Acronyms:

- EE – Energy Efficiency (often used as short-hand to refer to Energy Efficiency technology deployment)
- DD – Deep Decarbonisation (often used as short-hand to refer to Deep Decarbonisation technology deployment) – now referred to within the programme simply as Decarbonisation
- GAP – Grant Assessment Panel
- GOLD – Grant Offer Letter Decision

Key for notes on interview questions:

- KEY SOURCE – the Interview is the primary source of evidence for collecting this information. If time allows, try to make sure this question is asked to beneficiary.
- HIGH PRIORITY. During project kick off, DESNZ were asked to prioritise RQs. This question was flagged as HIGH PRIORITY.
- PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION – this question maps to a RQ in the ITT which was marked with an asterisk (*) and therefore is of interest to DESNZ. If time allows, try to ask this question.

Note, if not logged as KEY SOURCE, there may be other sources of evidence to answer this question.

- TOC BOX. This question tests a causal pathway in the TOC, e.g. the linkage that exists between ToC BOX 11 and ToC BOX 15

Introduction [5 min] [To be read out by interviewer at start of all interviews]

Thank you for speaking to me as part of the evaluation of the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund Programme. ("IETF")

Technopolis are an independent research and evaluation consultancy providing robust programme evaluation to DESNZ. We are currently undergoing the last phase of the process evaluation.

A previous process evaluation was published in 2021 and was delivered by Steer and focused on Phase 1 processes. This phase of evaluation focuses on the delivery of the programme and the monitoring and verification processes that have been implemented. We have tried to avoid overlap between the scope of the 2 evaluation activities.

We aim to speak with approximately 10 assessors and monitoring officers, as well as other stakeholder groups to help us to develop a holistic assessment of the IETF programme to date. Your feedback will inform the development of the IETF programme and other future DESNZ programmes.

The output of this phase of the work will be a published research report that presents anonymised and aggregated views on the delivery of IETF.

Data protection:

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

- For this report, we will not attribute any quotes to individuals without prior permission. However, given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect interviewees' personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.
- Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

The interview is expected to last 1 hour.

- If you consent, we would like to record the interview for analysis purposes, as it will help us accurately collect findings for the research. The recording will be securely stored on Microsoft Teams and Microsoft OneDrive, retained by us and destroyed after the completion of the evaluation (currently estimated to be December 2025), under UK GDPR.
- Only members of the Technopolis research team will have access to the recording, DESNZ's research team will have access to interview transcripts, therefore complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Are you happy to:

- a. Take part in the interview?
- b. For the interview to be recorded?

For the recording, please can you indicate that you agree to take part in this interview on the basis described.

A. Opening [1 min]

1. Please can you begin by confirming what your role has been within the IETF?

B. Applications to IETF (Time allocation 10 mins/ accumulative time 16 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My first few questions seek to understand your view on the applications received to the IETF, applicant motivations, the quality of applications received, as well as the influence of recent market events such as energy price rises and Covid-19 on the amount and scope of applications.

KEY SOURCE

1) To what extent did the IETF receive good-quality applications from businesses, compared to the assessment criteria and IETF objectives? (ToC BOX 3> ToC BOX 5)

Probe:

2) In what way do you think the DESNZ expertise in the design of the pre application and application process supported or hindered businesses submitting good quality applications? (ToC BOX 4> ToC BOX 5)

- Did businesses appear to face any challenges in terms of their capacity and capability to submit good quality applications?

TOC Box 5. Businesses submit good-quality applications to the scheme

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

3) What do you think were the primary motivations of applicants? In your view, were applicant's motivations well aligned with the IETF policy objectives? [RQ#2, RQ#3]

Probe:

- What motivated firms to participate in the IETF for studies, Energy Efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) technology deployment?
- Did firms have other commercial, strategic or policy motivations to participate in the IETF beyond overcoming financial and capability barriers?

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY

4) What barriers did firms face in terms of eligibility or preparing quality applications? [RQ#2, RQ#3]

Probe:

- Key challenges in terms of eligibility
- Key challenges in terms of capacity and quality of applications
- How did applicants mitigate these challenges?

5) Did you identify any support offered by IETF that helped to mitigate challenges that applicants encountered? (ToC BOX 4> ToC BOX 11)

6) Were there any specific challenges that arose during application that should have caused challenges in project delivery.

7) Could the design of the assessment or monitoring process have mitigated these challenges?

C. Assessment and award process (Time 10 mins/ accumulative 26 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next few questions focus on your views of the assessment and award process, and how well you think the assessment, due diligence and final awards led to a portfolio of good grants across the three pillars of studies, studies, Energy Efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) .

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION/ PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

8) In practice, how suitable were the assessment criteria for selecting projects that met the IETF objectives? [RQ#13]

Prompt:

- What worked well? What didn't?
- In what way would alternative assessment criteria/ approaches to assessment have worked better?

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

9) In your view, did the assessors apply the scoring guidance consistently? [RQ#14]

Probe:

- Were there any good practices that were used to ensure that scoring guidance was applied consistently?
- Did any challenges arise in applying the scoring guidance?

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE/ HIGH PRIORITY

10) From your perspective, how effective was the award decision making process (i.e. reflecting on the GAP, Ministers and GOLD) in awarding grants to good quality projects aligned to the IETF objectives? [RQ#16] (ToC BOX 5> ToC BOX 6)

Probe:

- What aspects of the design and governance of the award process worked well?
- Were there any challenges?

KEY SOURCE

11) Are you aware of ineligible projects being signposted to other potential sources of funding?

Prompt:

- The kinds of projects that were rejected and the sources of alternative funding they were signposted to.

TOC Box 7. Ineligible projects are signposted to other potential sources of funding

D. Delivery of IETF: general delivery functions (10 mins/ accumulative time 35 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next few questions focus on some of the general delivery functions within the IETF such as the role of the delivery body and technical contractors, the performance of the Monitoring and Validation (M&V) setup, the effect of IETF communications, as well as the impact of relationships between the various IETF stakeholders which the scheme facilitated.

Monitoring and verification (M&V) and reporting

KEY SOURCE

12) In your opinion, how effective was the monitoring & verification (M&V) setup and reporting process in delivering scheme objectives? [RQ#21]

Prompt:

- Was it helpful for programme and grant management?
- Was it helpful for planning and project management?

- Was it helpful for tracking and understanding beneficiary progress?

TOC Boxes 12 – 15: role of M&V in overcoming barriers and overall project progress

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

13) From your perspective, what were users' experiences of the M&V process and to what degree were arrangements proportionate or disproportionate to the project cost/complexity? [RQ#22]

Probe:

- Did beneficiaries express issues with the M&V and reporting process?
- Did the programme team have issues implementing the M&V process?

TOC Boxes 12 – 15: role of M&V in overcoming barriers and overall project progress

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

14) How effective have the IETF delivery body and technical contractors been in supporting the delivery of the intended scheme objectives? [RQ#17]

Probe:

- In what way has their support helped progress projects? (E.g. programme management, knowledge and skills)
- What has worked well?

What challenges have arisen?

-

E. Realisation of IETF objectives: Financial barriers (Time 5 mins/ accumulative 40 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next question focuses on how well you think the IETF helped firms overcome financial barriers.

KEY SOURCE

15) Reflecting on each of the three streams of projects - studies, EE and DD deployment - to what extent do you think the IETF is effective in helping firms overcome financial barriers?

Probe for each stream:

- Studies > avoid financial loss by identifying unviable projects?
- Energy Efficiency: in helping reduce the payback period because of EE tech projects were installed and became operational? (ToC BOX 13> ToC BOX 17)
- Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation): in making the project less financially risky for first movers? (ToC BOX 13> ToC BOX 18)
- Could projects have progressed without IETF funding? Which projects / types of projects, and with what sources of funding?

16) KEY SOURCE

To what extent do you think projects could have overcome their financial barriers without IETF funding?

Probe:

- Which projects / types of projects, and with what sources of funding?

F. Realisation of IETF objectives: Capacity barriers and knowledge (Time 5 mins/ accumulative 46 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next two questions focus on how well you think the IETF helped firms overcome capacity barriers.

17) To what extent did IETF support help firms to overcome capability barriers (in terms of knowledge and skills) for Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation) deployment? (ToC BOX 11> ToC BOX 15)

Probe:

- In what way did the IETF support the development of knowledge and skills for DD deployment?
- In your opinion, could firms have developed this without the IETF?
- To what extent has this capability spread to wider industry?

18) To what extent has overcoming capability barriers (in terms of knowledge and skills) to deliver Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation) technologies impacted the perceived cost of the technologies? (ToC BOX 15> ToC BOX 29)

HIGH PRIORITY / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

19) From your perspective, how effective has DESNZ and the IETF programme been in facilitating knowledge sharing with and between IETF projects, as well as broader industry? [RQ#20] (ToC BOX 4> ToC BOX 11)

Probe:

- How have IETF staff and the programme design supported knowledge sharing.
- Has been positive spillovers into wider industry, in terms of knowledge and skills around Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation) technology deployment?

20) To what extent do you think installed and operational IETF projects contribute to knowledge sharing regarding best practices in deploying Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation) technologies? (ToC BOX 18> ToC BOX 19)

Probe:

- How have projects themselves been involved in knowledge sharing (i.e. within the project, with other projects or broader industry)? (ToC BOX 11> ToC BOX 15)

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

The IETF enables, and to an extent, relies on relationships between various stakeholders such as between beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers, suppliers.

21) To what extent were the relationships between IETF stakeholders supportive of the delivery of the scheme? [RQ#18]

Probe:

- What relationships did the IETF facilitate that were especially beneficial for project delivery?
- Were there any challenges? If so, how could relationships between stakeholders be improved?

CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

22) In your view, have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF processes? [RQ#27]

G. Broader questions [Time allocation [5 mins] (accumulative time [51 mins])

[Interviewer to read aloud] My final few questions cover broader issues including unintended consequences of the IETF policy, the effect of inflation and supply chain disruption, and your reflections on the overall programme Theory of Change.

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

23) How did splitting the scheme between Energy Efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly Deep Decarbonisation) projects support the overall delivery of the scheme? For instance, did it encourage more focused or ambitious, higher quality projects? Were there any negative effects of this separation? [RQ#23]

Probe:

- How might this design be changed in future?

24) What could the UK Government do differently to improve the delivery of a similar scheme in the future?

HIGH PRIORITY / COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

25) Do you have any further reflections on how well projects have progressed as expected, and the effect of IETF processes on their progress? [RQ#19]

Probe:

Influence of processes such as:

- Post application: DESNZ queries/ application clarification question process
- Contracting processes
- Post notification: Developing M&V plans (Phase 3 only)

- Milestone Payment claims process / project milestone and compliance information
- Quarterly progress reviews
- Site visits
- Project change request process

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY

26) Are you familiar with the IETF Theory of Change? If so, do you think the policy design is suitable for its intended impact?

- What aspects, if any, require changing and how? [RQ#1]

COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY/ PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

27) In your view, have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF policy and if so, what are they and why did they arise? [RQ#26]

H. Closing remarks (4 mins/ accumulative time 55 mins)

Is there anything you'd like to add that we haven't already covered, or something you'd like to emphasise as of particular importance?

- Are you happy with all the information you've provided to be included in the evaluation?
- If there is anything I need to clarify when I go back over the interview, would it be ok to contact you again about this?

If you have any questions about how the data provided as part of the study will be used by DESNZ or Technopolis or wish to exercise your rights under UK GDPR you can contact:
xxxxx@technopolis-group.com

Thanks for your time.

Dropouts interview guide

Interview context [Interviewer to read this section in advance of interview]

These interviews are intended to:

- Assess interim process evaluation, delivery processes, etc
- Assessment of Programme level ToC boxes and arrows 1-19 (annexed to the interview guide)

All interviewees will be subject to optimism bias and other biases.

Reading available documentation will provide context of delivery experience so far, including any changes that have been made.

For Withdrawals, review their reason for withdrawing on this database (See Tab: Withdrawal, Column I): IETF_Delivery_Database_sampleframe.xlsx

Key for notes on interview questions:

- KEY SOURCE – the Interview is the primary source of evidence for collecting this information. If time allows, try to make sure this question is asked to beneficiary.
- HIGH PRIORITY. During project kick off, DESNZ were asked to prioritise RQs. This question was flagged as HIGH PRIORITY.
- PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION – this question maps to a RQ in the ITT which was marked with an asterisk (*) and therefore is of interest to DESNZ. If time allows, try to ask this question.

Note, if not logged as KEY SOURCE, there may be other sources of evidence to answer this question.

- TOC BOX. This question tests a causal pathway in the TOC, e.g. the linkage that exists between ToC BOX 11 and ToC BOX 15

Introduction [5 min] [To be read out by interviewer at start of all interviews]

Thank you for speaking to me as part of the evaluation of the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund Programme. (“IETF”)

Technopolis are an independent research and evaluation consultancy providing robust programme evaluation to DESNZ. We are currently undergoing the last phase of the process evaluation.

A previous process evaluation was published in 2021 and was delivered by Steer and focused on Phase 1 processes. This phase of evaluation focuses on the delivery of the programme and the monitoring and verification processes that have been implemented. We have tried to avoid overlap between the scope of the 2 evaluation activities.

We aim to speak with approximately 5 representatives of trade bodies and wider industry, as well as other stakeholder groups to help us to develop a holistic assessment of the IETF programme to date. Your feedback will inform the development of the IETF programme and other future DESNZ programmes. We will conduct an additional round of interviews during 2025 as part of the impact evaluation of the IETF programme. We hope that we can count on you with participating.

The output of this phase of the work will be a published research report that presents anonymised and aggregated views on the delivery of IETF.

Data protection:

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

- For this report, we will not attribute any quotes to individuals without prior permission. However, given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect interviewees' personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.
- Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

The interview is expected to last 45 minutes.

- If you consent, we would like to record the interview for analysis purposes, as it will help us accurately collect findings for the research. The recording will be securely stored on Microsoft Teams and Microsoft OneDrive, retained by us and destroyed after the completion of the evaluation (currently estimated to be December 2025), under UK GDPR.
- Only members of the Technopolis research team will have access to the recording, DESNZ's research team will have access to interview transcripts, therefore complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Are you happy to:

- a. Take part in the interview?

b. For the interview to be recorded?

For the recording, please can you indicate that you agree to take part in this interview on the basis described.

Do you have any questions before we continue?

A. Opening [1 min]

1. Please can you begin by confirming what your role is within your organisation and what input you had to the IETF project application? [max 1 min]

B. IETF demand [up to 5 mins/accumulative 10 mins]

[Interviewer to read out load] My first few questions focus on what motivated your firm to apply to the IETF, whether your firm had any reservations about applying, and the extent to which the IETF influenced you to investigate new studies or projects.

HIGH PRIORITY

1) What were your primary motivations for applying to the IETF? [RQ#3, RQ#6]

Probe:

- Overcoming financial barriers
- Overcoming capability barriers

HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

2) Did recent market events such as energy price rises and Covid-19 influence your project design? (i.e. in terms or scale and scope) If yes, In what way? [RQ#4]

KEY SOURCE PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

3) To what extent did the IETF encourage your firm to investigate new projects or studies? [RQ#8]

KEY SOURCE PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

4) Did the IETF influence the ambition of your firm's decarbonisation or energy efficiency plans? In what way? [RQ#9]

KEY SOURCE

5) How did you become aware of / interested in the scheme? Was IETF communication and marketing influential in your decision to apply? [RQ#11]

KEY SOURCE HIGH PRIORITY

6) Were there any barriers or reasons that made you consider not applying to the IETF? How were these overcome? [RQ#3]

Prompts:

- Scope not fit for purpose
- Grant level not appropriate
- Timelines for project not appropriate
- Matched funded requirements too high
- Industrial eligibility not relevant

C. Application Processes [up to 5 mins/accumulative 15 mins]

[Interviewer to read out loud] My next few questions focus on your experiences of the IETF application process, for instance whether the process, assessment criteria and due diligence was clear and well designed, and if sufficient information and support was provided.

KEY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

7) From your experience, was the application process well designed and did you feel you had sufficient information and guidance? [RQ#12]

Probe:

- What barriers did you encounter?
- What worked well?

8) Were the assessment criteria clear and do you feel they were consistently applied? [RQ#13, RQ#14]

D. Delivery processes/ delivery of IETF objectives [up to 15 mins/accumulative 30 mins]

[Interviewer to read out load] My next few questions focus on the progress of your project and the reasons why it may or may not have progressed as expected. This includes questions about the role of support you received from the IETF, as well as questions about spillover effects into wider industry.

KEY SOURCE / HIGH PRIORITY

9) Why did your project not progress? [RQ#19]

(ToC BOX 6> ToC BOX 8); (ToC BOX 6> ToC BOX 9); (ToC BOX 6> ToC BOX 10)

Probe:

[Interviewer] Describe what you understand about their reasons for withdrawing, based on the database information: confirm whether this is accurate / fair

- Understand influence of IETF design factors vs external factors
- What would have prevented them from withdrawing.

10) Did your project go ahead despite withdrawal from the IETF funding? (ToC BOX 5> ToC BOX 6)

11) Could you describe your experience with the M&V process? In your opinion, were the requirements proportionate to the project cost/complexity? [RQ#22]

12) How did splitting the scheme between EE and DD projects affect your project? [RQ#23]

Probe:

- How did it affect your project design and application?
- How did it affect your project delivery?

HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

13) From your perspective, were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF programme or processes? [RQ#26, RQ#27]

14) What could the UK Government do differently in the delivery of a similar scheme in the future?

E. Closing remarks [4 mins]

Is there anything you'd like to add that we haven't already covered, or something you'd like to emphasise as of particular importance?

- Are you happy with all the information you've provided to be included in the evaluation?
- If there is anything I need to clarify when I go back over the interview, would it be ok to contact you again about this?

If you have any questions about how the data provided as part of the study will be used by DESNZ or Technopolis or wish to exercise your rights under UK GDPR you can contact:
xxxx@technopolis-group.com

Thanks for your time.

Wider industry interview guide

Interview context

These interviews are intended to:

- Develop an interim process evaluation, assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery processes on the scheme's intended objectives.
- Understand the impact of contextual factors.
- Assess the Programme level Theory of Change (from inputs and activities through to early outcomes (i.e. boxes and arrows 1-19 of the ToC) annexed to the interview guide.

All interviewees will be subject to optimism bias and other biases.

Acronyms:

EE: Energy Efficiency

DD: Deep Decarbonisation

Key for notes on interview questions:

- KEY SOURCE – the Interview is the primary source of evidence for collecting this information. If time allows, try to make sure this question is asked to beneficiary.
- HIGH PRIORITY. During project kick off, DESNZ were asked to prioritise RQs. This question was flagged as HIGH PRIORITY.
- PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION – this question maps to a RQ in the ITT which was marked with an asterisk (*) and therefore is of interest to DESNZ. If time allows, try to ask this question.

Note, if not logged as KEY SOURCE or logged as COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE, there may be other sources of evidence to answer this question.

- TOC BOX. This question tests a causal pathway in the TOC, e.g. the linkage that exists between ToC BOX 11 and ToC BOX 15

Introduction [5 min] [To be read out by interviewer at start of all interviews]

Thank you for speaking to me as part of the evaluation of the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund Programme. (“IETF”)

Technopolis are an independent research and evaluation consultancy providing robust programme evaluation to DESNZ. We are currently undergoing the last phase of the process evaluation.

A previous process evaluation was published in 2021 and was delivered by Steer and focused on Phase 1 processes. This phase of evaluation focuses on the delivery of the programme and the monitoring and verification processes that have been implemented. We have tried to avoid overlap between the scope of the 2 evaluation activities.

We aim to speak with approximately 5 representatives of trade bodies and wider industry, as well as other stakeholder groups to help us to develop a holistic assessment of the IETF programme to date. Your feedback will inform the development of the IETF programme and other future DESNZ programmes.

The output of this phase of the work will be a published research report that presents anonymised and aggregated views on the delivery of IETF.

1.1.1 Data protection:

Your participation in this interview is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

- For this report, we will not attribute any quotes to individuals without prior permission. However, given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect interviewees' personal information and follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.
- Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

The interview is expected to last 45-minutes.

- If you consent, we would like to record the interview for analysis purposes, as it will help us accurately collect findings for the research. The recording will be securely stored on Microsoft Teams and Microsoft OneDrive, retained by us and destroyed after the completion of the evaluation (currently estimated to be December 2025), under UK GDPR.

- Only members of the Technopolis research team will have access to the recording, DESNZ's research team will have access to interview transcripts, therefore complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Are you happy to:

- a. Take part in the interview?
- b. For the interview to be recorded?

For the recording, please can you indicate that you agree to take part in this interview on the basis described.

Do you have any questions before we continue?

- A. Opening (5 min)

Please can you begin by telling me about your organisation, your role and your experience with the IETF programme?

[Interviewer to read if participant is not familiar with programme] The IETF is designed to support energy intensive industries overcome financial and capability barriers to energy efficiency and deep decarbonisation. IETF provides matched grant funding and support to undertake feasibility studies and energy efficiency and deep decarbonisation technology deployment.

- B. Demand for the IETF (Time allocation 10 mins / accumulative time 20 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My first few questions seek to understand your views as a wider industry stakeholder on the motivations of firms to participate in the IETF and any barriers that firms may have faced in applying to or participating in the IETF.

1) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION / HIGH PRIORITY

In your view, what support do energy intensive industries need from government in order to deploy EE and DD tech? What financial and capability barriers does industry face? [RQ#2, RQ#3]

2) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION HIGH PRIORITY

In your view, what were the primary motivations for applicants to apply to the IETF? [RQ#3]

3) COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE

In your view, to what extent was the IETF offer (grants, feasibility) attractive to industry? [RQ#6]

Probe:

- Is it sufficient given industry's needs, and the net zero targets?

2) Delivery of benefits (Time allocation 30 mins / accumulative time 50 mins)

[Interviewer to read aloud] My next questions cover aspects of IETF performance such as the ability of participating firms to leverage matched finance, the role of the IETF in developing capabilities (within funded projects and broader industry), relationships between IETF stakeholders, and the influence of inflation and supply chain disruptions.

4) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION HIGH PRIORITY

In your view, to what extent does the IETF enable firms to overcome financial barriers to EE and DD deployment? [RQ#2, RQ#3, RQ#7]

Prompt:

- How effectively did the IETF leverage private funding to support government funding? [RQ#7]
- How significant is the amount of support (to enable progress for participating firms and broader industry)?
- What are the limitations of the programme?

5) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION HIGH PRIORITY

In your view, to what extent does the IETF enable firms to overcome capability barriers to energy efficiency deployment? [RQ#2, RQ#3]

- Are you aware of any (positive) spillover effects from the IETF into broader industry, in terms of increased EE capability / expertise?

Prompt:

- How significant is the amount of support, (to enable progress for participating firms and broader industry)?
- What are the limitations of the programme?

6) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION HIGH PRIORITY

- In your view, to what extent does the IETF enable firms to overcome capability barriers to deep decarbonisation deployment? [RQ#2, RQ#3] (ToC BOX 11 > ToC BOX 15)
- Does this increased capability help to reduce the perceived risk of DD technology deployment, by participating firms and broader industry? (ToC BOX 15 > ToC BOX 29)
- Are you aware of any (positive) spillover effects from the IETF into broader industry, in terms of increased DD capability / expertise?

Prompt:

- How significant is the amount of support (to enable progress for participating firms and broader industry)?
- What are the limitations of the programme?

7) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION/ HIGH PRIORITY

To your knowledge, to what extent has information sharing or upskilling (business-to-business and government-to-business) occurred as a result of the IETF? [RQ#20]

Prompt: How effective or ineffective was the IETF in spreading these benefits to wider industry?

8) COMPLIMENTARY INFORMATION/ PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

How important do you think it is that the IETF provides financial support to firms to investigate new projects or studies? To your knowledge, how effective has the IETF been in providing this support? [RQ#8]

9) KEY SOURCE

The IETF facilitates, and to an extent relies on, relationships between multiple stakeholders such as beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers and suppliers.

[If respondent has been directly engaged / highly knowledgeable about IETF]: In your view, how effective and beneficial have these relationships been? [RQ#18]

Probe if knowledgeable:

- What relationships (i.e relationships with which stakeholders) did the IETF facilitate that were especially beneficial either for project delivery or other stakeholders

[If respondent has not been directly engaged / limited knowledge about IETF]: Which relationships are important to strengthen in order to overcome financial and capability barriers? [RQ#18]

Probe if not knowledgeable:

- Which relationships (i.e relationships with which stakeholders) do firms rely most on to overcome financial and capability barriers?

10) COMPLIMENTARY SOURCE/ HIGH PRIORITY

How has inflation and supply chain disruption affected firms' efforts to deploy energy efficiency and deep decarbonisation technologies? How might this have affected progress made by the IETF? [RQ#5]

Probe:

- How might the IETF have protected beneficiaries from inflation and supply chain disruptions?

11) CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION / HIGH PRIORITY / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

In your view, have there been any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the IETF programme delivery as a whole or its specific processes / aspects of its design? [RQ#26, RQ#27]

Probe:

- Has it performed as expected?
- Has it had knock on effects on broader industry or participating firms?

12) COMPLIMENTARY INFORMATION / PRIORITY RESEARCH QUESTION

To your knowledge, how does IETF interact with other government environmental or economic policies? [RQ#24]

Probe:

- Is the IETF complimentary to these other policies?
- Is it necessary and providing additional value

13) COMPLIMENTARY INFORMATION

In your view, what lessons for the decarbonisation of energy intensive industries should be learnt by government, to reach the net zero 2050 goal? [RQ#25]

Probe:

- Is the IETF the right kind of support for industry?

14) Do you have any further comments or reflections that might support the improvement of the IETF and similar policies in the future?

E. Closing remarks (2 mins)

Is there anything you'd like to add that we haven't already covered, or something you'd like to emphasise as of particular importance?

- Are you happy with all the information you've provided to be included in the evaluation?
- If there is anything I need to clarify when I go back over the interview, would it be ok to contact you again about this?

If you have any questions about how the data provided as part of the study will be used by DESNZ or Technopolis or wish to exercise your rights under UK GDPR you can contact: xxxxx@technopolis-group.com

Thanks for your time.

[Close Interview]

Section 4: Survey text

Landing page/ Introduction (1 min)

This survey is part of the current evaluation of DESNZ research award programmes. Technopolis has been commissioned by DESNZ to conduct this evaluation.

The purpose of the survey is to collect feedback from applicants to the IETF programme to better understand the experiences of applicants.

We welcome all feedback, both positive and negative. Your response to this survey will significantly contribute so DESNZ can improve the way the programme is delivered.

DESNZ will use the results of the evaluation to improve the programmes for the future.

Survey privacy and confidentiality

Is the survey anonymous? The analysis of the survey will be presented as aggregate statistics and will not be linked to individuals or individual organisations.

By completing the questions in “Your project and organisation”, you may provide information that allows you to be identifiable.

We will ask you to share your contact details at the end of the survey only if you are interested in participating in further qualitative research for this evaluation. However, this data will not be analysed and will be detached from the rest of your responses.

There are a small number of open text box responses. Given that you may describe specific issues or technologies, and the relatively small number of projects involved, complete anonymity cannot be guaranteed. We take steps to protect respondents’ personal information, and we follow procedures designed to minimise its authorised access or disclosure.

What happens with your response? Your anonymous responses may be used in the future for research purposes and in publications.

Who will your data be shared with? This data will be used by the evaluator at Technopolis and DESNZ.

How long will we keep the data? The data will be retained for the full length of the evaluation contract (March 2026), plus one year (i.e. March 2027).

What can I do if I wish to withdraw my participation? Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you can withdraw your participation and information at any time. Participation is entirely voluntary and will have no impact on any current or future dealings with DESNZ in any way.

At all points during processing Technopolis will store your responses to the survey in a secure online system. Further details are available in our privacy policy on our website at <https://www.technopolis-group.com/privacy-policy>

Your project and organisation (2 mins)

Please provide information about the project funding you received. [If you have received multiple grants from IETF, please consider your MOST RECENT grant]

Q. Which Phase of the IETF programme were you successful in?

Select one

- IETF Phase 1, Summer 2020
- IETF Phase 1, Spring 2021
- IETF Phase 2, Autumn 2021
- IETF Phase 2, Spring 2022
- IETF Phase 2, Summer 2022
- IETF Phase 2, Autumn 2022
- Don't know

Q Was your project funding Decarbonisation or Energy Efficiency

Select one

- Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation): Feasibility Study
- Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation): Engineering Study (FEED)
- Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation): Deployment
- Energy Efficiency: Feasibility Study
- Energy Efficiency: Engineering Study (FEED)
- Energy Efficiency: Deployment

Q How would you describe the main technology associated with your project?

Select all that apply

- Carbon capture (storage)
- Carbon capture (usage)
- Electrification
- Fuel switch (hydrogen)
- Fuel switch (CNG/LNG)
- Fuel switch (biomass)
- Fuel switch (biogas)
- Geothermal
- Heat recovery/reuse (incl. cooling)
- Heat pumps
- Improved equipment electrical efficiency
- Process optimisation
- Other (please specify) [text box]

Q What was the size of your grant?

Select one

- £0 - £100,000
- £100,000 - £500,000
- £500,000 - £1,000,000
- £1,000,000 - £4,000,000
- £4,000,000 - £7,500,000
- £7,500,000+

Q What is the 3 digit SIC code that applies to your business?

Select one from dropdown list

[Dropdown list, using all 3 digit SIC codes in Ph1 and Ph2 applicants database, including descriptors]

Q What is the size of your business?

The factors determining your business size are:

| Company Category | Staff headcount | Turnover or Balances sheet total |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Medium Sized | <250 | £ £44m £ £38m |
| Small | <50 | £ £9m £ £9m |
| Micro | <10 | £ £2m £ 28m |

Source: IETF Phase 2 guidance for applicants

Select one

Micro

Small

Medium: UK based

Medium: Multinational (Headquartered outside UK)

Large: UK based

Large: Multinational (Headquartered outside UK)

Q. Where is your business located?

Select one

East Midlands

East of England

London

North East

North West

Northern Ireland

South East

South West

Wales

West Midlands

Yorkshire and The Humber

Application to the IETF (3 mins)

RQ #2 What barriers did applicants face prior to and during their involvement with the IETF and to what degree did the IETF and IETF processes contribute to overcoming the barriers?

Q What barriers to project development did you face prior to your involvement with the IETF?

[Matrix of choices]

Significant barrier to project development, Moderate barrier to project development, Not a barrier to project development, Don't know/ not sure

| | Significant barrier to project development | Moderate barrier to project development | Not a barrier to project development | Don't know/ not sure |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| ...did not have knowledge of technology costs | | | | |
| ...did not have knowledge of technology risks | | | | |
| ...did not have knowledge of technology benefits | | | | |
| ...did not have time to allocate to project development | | | | |
| did not have funds to allocate to project development | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| ...payback for projects was not in investible range for company decision makers | | | | |
| ...high technical risks associated with insufficient track-record for demonstration of potential project technologies | | | | |
| ...carbon intensive investments were more financially attractive than low-carbon investment | | | | |

(RQ #3 What were the primary motivations and barriers for IETF applicants when applying for IETF funding?

Q To what extent did the following factors affect your application to IETF?

[Matrix of choices]

Significant barrier to application, Moderate barrier to application, neither a barrier nor an enabler, A moderate enabler for application, A significant barrier for application, Don't know/not sure

How appropriate was the scope of IETF

How appropriate was the cost incurred to apply to the IETF

How appropriate was the application window timelines

How appropriate was the timing of the funding vs your business cycle

How appropriate was the size of the IETF grant available

How appropriate were the IETF matched funded requirements

| How appropriate was the... | Significant barrier to application | Moderate barrier to application | Neither a barrier nor an enabler | A moderate enabler for application | A significant barrier for application | Don't know/not sure |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| ...scope of IETF | | | | | | |
| ... cost incurred to apply to IETF | | | | | | |
| ...the amount of information required for the application | | | | | | |
| ... the application window timelines | | | | | | |
|the timing of funding vs your business cycle | | | | | | |
| ...size of the IETF grant available | | | | | | |
| ...matched funded requirements | | | | | | |

Q Thinking about the IETF application processes, to what extent did they support you to produce an application that allowed you to overcome the barriers? deliver your project as expected:

[Matrix of choices]

Supported, Neither supported nor did not support, Did not support, Did not experience process, Not sure

| The IETF application process supported me to submit an application... | Supported | Neither supported nor did not support | Did not support | Did not experience process | Not sure |
|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------|
| Pre-launch engagement | | | | | |
| Application guidance documents | | | | | |
| Stakeholder briefing event (Phase 3 only) | | | | | |
| Applicant support (raising queries to IETF during bid prep window) | | | | | |
| Applicant workshops | | | | | |
| Applicant Development Service (Phase 2 only) | | | | | |
| Post application: DESNZ queries/ application clarification question process | | | | | |
| Contracting processes | | | | | |
| Post notification: Developing M&V plans (Phase 3 only) | | | | | |

RQ#4 How was demand for the IETF (volume and scale of applications for EE, DD, studies) influenced by recent market events (including changes to energy prices and/or Covid-19)?*

Q - Was your decision to apply for IETF funding affected by...

A – Covid-19

B – energy price rises in Winter 2022/23

C – decision to apply affected by another major other external factor

D – decision to apply not affected by Covid-19, energy price rises in Winter 2022/23 or other external factors

Tick all that apply

If A ticked,

Q Did Covid-19 affect the likelihood of your decision to apply?

more likely to apply

no effect on likeliness to apply

less likely to apply

Q Did Covid-19 affect the scale of the ambition of your application?

Project was more ambitious than without Covid-19

Covid-19 had no effect on project ambition

Project was less ambitious than without Covid-19

If B ticked,

Q How did energy price rises in Winter 22/23 affect the likelihood of your decision to apply?

more likely to apply

no effect on likeliness to apply

less likely to apply

Q How did energy price rises in Winter 22/23 affect the scale of the ambition of your application?

Project was more ambitious than without energy price rises

Energy price rises had no effect on project ambition

Project was less ambitious than without energy price rises

If C ticked,

Q What external factor affected your decision to apply?

[Open text box]

Q Did that external factor affect the likelihood of your decision to apply?

more likely to apply

no effect on likeliness to apply

less likely to apply

Q Did that external factor affect the scale of the ambition of your application?

Project was more ambitious than without the external factor

The external factor had no effect on project ambition

Project was less ambitious than without the external factor

If D ticked, routing to next question

RQ#23 How did the splitting of the scheme between EE and DD projects support the overall delivery of the scheme?

Q The IETF programme provides grant funding to deploy energy efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation) technologies.

How far do you agree that the separation of the programme into separate strands delivering Energy Efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation) ...

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know,

...encouraged us to apply

...increased the ambition of our project

...encouraged us to focus on the deliverability of our project

...required us to adjust our proposed project to meet the scope of the strand we applied to

... encouraged us to adjust our organisation priorities to meet the scope of the strand we applied to

| | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
|---|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| The separation of the programme into energy efficiency and Decarbonisation (formerly known as Deep Decarbonisation) strands affected... | | | | | | |
| ...encouraged us to apply | | | | | | |
| ...increased the ambition of our project | | | | | | |
| ...encouraged us to focus on the deliverability of our project | | | | | | |
| ...required us to adjust our proposed project to meet the scope of the strand we applied to | | | | | | |
| ... encouraged us to adjust our organisation priorities to meet the scope of the strand we applied to | | | | | | |

Page break

Knowledge sharing events and other applicant support (2 mins)

RQ#10 Did the guidance, dissemination events and support offered alongside the IETF improve the quality of applications and if so, how?*

Q Did you attend any IETF support/ knowledge sharing events?

Yes, I attended one or more events related to applying to the IETF programme

No, I did not attend any events related to applying to the IETF programme

If Yes

Q Did you participate in any of the knowledge sharing events provided by the IETF

Tick all that apply

Events:

Briefing/Launch event of IETF

Technology Showcase

Trade Association events

None of the above

Other (please specify) [text box]

Q Did you participate in any of the following applicant activities provided by the IETF?

Tick all that apply

Applicant support

Contacted the IETF inbox with your queries

Did an eligibility test of your project before applying

Attended stakeholder clinic

Virtual Technology Marketplace

Networking Mojo

None of the above

Other (please specify) [text box]

Q How useful did you find the following resources for helping you write your application for IETF

[Matrix of choices]

Very useful, useful, somewhat useful, not at all useful, did not use, don't know

Guidance documents

Questions with Responses (FAQ)

IETF capacity support via the inbox and eligibility checks

Knowledge sharing events

Email support

Consultants (please specify) [text box]

Other third-party support (please specify) [text box]

Other (please specify) [text box]

| The resource was... | Extremely useful | Very useful | Useful | Somewhat useful | Not at all useful | Did not use resource /NA | Don't know |
|--|------------------|-------------|--------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Guidance documents | | | | | | | |
| Questions with Responses (FAQ) | | | | | | | |
| IETF capacity support via the inbox and eligibility checks | | | | | | | |
| Knowledge sharing events | | | | | | | |
| External third-party support (if used) | | | | | | | |
| Email support | | | | | | | |
| Consultants (please specify) [text box] | | | | | | | |
| Other third-party support (please specify) [text box] | | | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) [text box] | | | | | | | |

Application Assessment (1 min)

RQ#12 Did the IETF guidance provide applicants sufficient advice on what they would be tested on and did their perception of the assessment process match with the reality?*

Q To what extent do you agree that guidance documents provided you with sufficient advice on the assessment criteria

Strongly agree,

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree,

Disagree,

Strongly disagree,

Don't know

Delivery of IETF project (3 mins)

RQ #2 What barriers did applicants face prior to and during their involvement with the IETF and to what degree did the IETF and IETF processes contribute to overcoming the barriers?

Q As you deliver your project with IETF funding support, what barriers remain to project development?

[Matrix of choices]

Significant barrier to project development, Moderate barrier to project development, Not a barrier to project development, Don't know/ not sure

| | Significant barrier to project development | Moderate barrier to project development | Not a barrier to project development | Don't know/ not sure |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| ...did not have knowledge of technology costs | | | | |
| ...did not have knowledge of technology risks | | | | |
| ...did not have knowledge of technology benefits | | | | |
| ...did not have time to allocate to project development | | | | |
| did not have funds to allocate to project development | | | | |
| ...payback for projects were not in investible range for company decision makers | | | | |
| ...high technical risks associated with insufficient track-record for demonstration of potential project technologies | | | | |
| ...carbon intensive investments were more financially attractive than low-carbon investment | | | | |

RQ#17 Was the performance of the IETF delivery body and technical contractors supportive to the delivery of the intended scheme objectives and if so, how?

Q To what extent do you agree that the performance of the various stakeholder groups supported you to deliver your project:

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know, Did not work with this stakeholder group

| The performance of this stakeholder group supported me to deliver my project: | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know | Did not work with this stakeholder group |
|---|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|--|
| IETF programme delivery team/portfolio manager | | | | | | | |
| IETF communications | | | | | | | |
| (IETF) technical contractors: engineering | | | | | | | |
| (IETF) technical contractors: non-engineering | | | | | | | |

RQ#18 To what extent were the relationships between IETF stakeholders (e.g. beneficiaries, trade bodies, consultants, delivery bodies, academics, engineers, suppliers) supportive of the delivery of the scheme?

Q To what extent do you agree that your relationships with various stakeholder groups supported you to deliver your project:

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know, Did not work with this stakeholder group

| Relationships with this stakeholder group supported me to deliver my project: | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know | Did not work with this stakeholder group |
|--|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|--|
| IETF delivery bodies (e.g. Innovate UK (IUK), Knowledge Transfer Network (KTN), DESNZ Central Grants and Loans Team, Ricardo and ICF Consulting) | | | | | | | |
| Non- engineering Consultants | | | | | | | |
| Engineers, | | | | | | | |
| Trade bodies, | | | | | | | |
| Academics | | | | | | | |
| Suppliers | | | | | | | |
| Other (please specify) [text box] | | | | | | | |

RQ#19: To what extent did projects proceed as expected and how did IETF processes help or hinder this?

RQ#1 To what extent, based on evidence available to date, should one have confidence in the causal story as detailed in the Theory of Change (steps 1-19)? What aspects of the Theory of Change, if any, require changing and what are these changes?

Box 12 : The risk of financial loss is abated if the study shows the project is unfeasible (financial barrier is overcome) –

Box 13: The payback period of EE projects are reduced to an acceptable level (financial barrier is overcome)

Box 14: The grant makes the (riskier) lower carbon project more financially applicable to first movers (financial barriers is overcome)

Q Thinking about the IETF processes, to what extent did they support you to deliver your project as expected:

[Matrix of choices]

Supported, Neither supported nor did not support, Did not support, Did not experience process, Not sure

| The IETF process supported me to deliver my project as expected: | Supported | Neither supported nor did not support | Did not support | Did not experience process | Not sure |
|---|-----------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------|
| Post application: DESNZ queries/ application clarification question process | | | | | |
| Contracting processes | | | | | |
| Post notification: Developing M&V plans (Phase 3 only) | | | | | |
| Milestone Payment claims process / project milestone and compliance information | | | | | |
| Quarterly progress reviews | | | | | |
| Site visits | | | | | |
| Project change request process | | | | | |

RQ#5 How was delivery of IETF objectives impacted by inflation and supply chain disruption, and were measures to mitigate the negative effects of these pressures effective?

IETF Benefits & Benefits Monitoring (3 mins)

RQ#1 To what extent, based on evidence available to date, should one have confidence in the causal story as detailed in the Theory of Change (steps 1-19)? What aspects of the Theory of Change, if any, require changing and what are these changes?

Box 15: There is a lack of knowledge and skills to deliver Deep Decarbonisation deployment technologies (capability barrier is overcome)

Box 19: New knowledge or insights around DD technology deployment 'best practices' and/or costs and benefits

RQ – Impact question: To what extent has the IETF generated evidence on the costs and benefits of EE and DD tech and how has that evidence been shared with, or otherwise influenced wider industry?*

If project is EE project:

Q My knowledge of energy efficiency deployment technologies has ...

Select one response

A... has increased, only in relation to the energy efficiency technologies used in my project

B... has increased, both in relation the energy efficiency technology used in my project and wider energy efficiency technologies not used in my project

C... not increased

If A or B ticked

Q My knowledge of energy efficiency deployment technologies has increased in the area of ...

Tick all that apply

A... best practices of energy efficiency deployment (please specify) [text box]

B... costs of energy efficiency deployment (please specify) [text box]

C... benefits of energy efficiency deployment (please specify) [text box]

If project is DD project:

Q My knowledge of decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) deployment technologies has ...

Select one response

A... has increased, only in relation to the decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) technologies used in my project

B... has increased, both in relation the decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) technology used in my project and wider DD technologies not used in my project

C... not increased

If A or B ticked

Q My knowledge of decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) deployment technologies has increased in the area of ...

Tick all that apply

A... best practices of decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) deployment (please specify) [text box]

B... costs of decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) deployment (please specify) [text box]

C... benefits of decarbonisation (formerly deep decarbonisation) deployment (please specify) [text box]

RQ#20 To what extent has information sharing or upskilling (business-to-business and government-to-business) occurred and if so, how effective or ineffective was this in spreading of benefits of EE/DD projects to wider industry?

Q Thinking about sharing the benefits / learning of your project business to business, to what extent would you agree that...

Information or learnings have been shared....

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know

| Information or learnings have been shared.... | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
|--|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| ... within your organisation | | | | | | |
| ... with other businesses receiving IETF funds | | | | | | |
| ... with other businesses – not receiving IETF funds | | | | | | |
| ...with other businesses – across sectors | | | | | | |

Q Thinking about the role that DESNZ has played in sharing the benefits / learning of your project with business, to what extent would you agree that...

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know,

Government has...

...shared information and learning from my project with other businesses receiving IETF funds

... shared information and learning from my project with other businesses not receiving IETF fund.

... facilitated information sharing and upskilling about the benefits of industrial energy efficiency and decarbonisation (formerly known as deep decarbonisation) with wider industry

| Government has... | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
|---|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| ...shared information and learning from my project with other businesses receiving IETF funds | | | | | | |
| ... shared information and learning from my project with | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| other businesses not receiving IETF fund. | | | | | | |
| ... facilitated information sharing and upskilling about the benefits of industrial energy efficiency and decarbonisation (formerly known as deep decarbonisation) with wider industry | | | | | | |

TOC supplement causal linkage for Box 15 states:

“11 with 19 causes 15 because knowledge about DD tech, including deployment best practices and costs and benefits is gained and shared across organisational boundaries, through DESNZ stakeholder engagement events, published case studies of successful deployment projects and organically from the movement of consultants and engineers involved with IETF projects to non-IETF-funded firms”

(ToC BOX 11 + ToC BOX 19 > ToC BOX 15)

Q Think about the ways in which knowledge and learning about has been shared across organisation boundaries, to what extent do you agree that....

Select one response

Knowledge and learning from my project have been shared...

...through DESNZ, or other government stakeholder engagement events

... non-government stakeholder engagement events (e.g. third-party conferences)

... published case studies of successful deployment projects

... business-to-business knowledge sharing (outside of IETF)

... movement of engineers involved with my projects to non-IETF-funded firms

... through consultants involved with my projects sharing lessons learned with non-IETF-funded firms

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Not applicable
Don't know

| Knowledge and learning from my project has been shared... | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Not applicable | Don't know |
|--|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|------------|
| ...through DESNZ, or other government stakeholder engagement events | | | | | | | |
| ... non-government stakeholder engagement events (e.g. third-party conferences) | | | | | | | |
| ... published case studies of successful deployment projects | | | | | | | |
| ... business-to-business knowledge sharing (outside of IETF) | | | | | | | |
| ... movement of engineers involved with my projects to non-IETF-funded firms | | | | | | | |
| ... through consultants involved with my projects sharing lessons learned with non-IETF-funded firms | | | | | | | |

Benefits Monitoring (2 mins)

RQ#22 What were users' experiences of the M&V process and to what degree were arrangements proportionate or disproportionate to the project cost/complexity?

Q Think about the monitoring and verification (M&V) processes, to what extent do you agree that monitoring and verification processes ...

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know,

| Monitoring and verification processes... | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know |
|--|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| ...have supported the delivery of my project by providing technical support and advice | | | | | | |
| ...have supported the delivery of my project by ensuring focus on project milestone deliverables | | | | | | |
| ...are proportionate to the size of the project cost | | | | | | |
| ...are proportionate to the complexity of the project delivery | | | | | | |

RQ#21 How effective was the monitoring & verification (M&V) setup and reporting process in delivering scheme objectives?

Q How much additional monitoring and verification activity have you undertaken due to participation in IETF than you would have done if you had not received IETF funding?.

As a result of participation in IETF, we have undertaken...

Select one response

Significantly more monitoring and verification activity

More monitoring and verification activity

The same level of monitoring and verification activity

Less monitoring and verification activity

Significantly less monitoring and verification activity

Don't know

Q To what extent do you agree that the monitoring & verification (M&V) setup and reporting process supported you...

[Matrix of choices]

Strongly agree, Agree Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Don't know/not sure

| To what extent did the monitoring and verification (M&V) setup and reporting process support you in | Strongly agree | Agree | Neither disagree nor agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Don't know/not sure |
|---|----------------|-------|----------------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| ...in delivering your project as set out in the project plan | | | | | | |
| ...in adapting your project to meet the original objectives set out in the project plan | | | | | | |
| ...in adapting your project to meet your organisational objectives | | | | | | |

Expected fuel and emissions savings (1 min)

Impact RQ-

How has the scheme reduced energy intensity, energy costs and carbon emissions for industry (EE objective)?*

- How has the scheme reduced energy intensity and carbon emissions for industry? (DD objective)*

Q. What percentage (%) of the expected annual fuel and/or emissions savings in your application project benefit calculator do you expect to achieve by project end?

Select one response

Less than 50%

50% - 75%

75% - 90%

90%- 100%

More than 100%

Q. Are there any reasons for expected savings that are more than or less than 100%: [text box, 240-character limit]

Closing (1 min)

Q. Do you have any other comments about the IETF or any suggestions for the DESNZ to improve the design and/ or delivery of the programme?

[text box, 240 character limit]

Thank you for responding to this survey. Your response to this survey will significantly contribute so DESNZ can improve the way the programme is delivered.

Q. We may want to follow up on some of your answers in more detail. Are you happy for us to contact you for clarifications or a short follow-up interview?

Select one response

Yes

No

Q. If you answered yes to one of the above, please provide your email address:

Email address [text box]

This publication is available from: www.gov.uk/government/publications/evaluation-of-the-industrial-energy-transformation-fund-ietf

If you need a version of this document in a more accessible format, please email alt.formats@energysecurity.gov.uk. Please tell us what format you need. It will help us if you say what assistive technology you use.