



Women Pivoting to Digital Taskforce – Policy Recommendations, Cost-benefit Analysis

1. Recommendation under appraisal

By 2027, the AI and Future of Work Unit should publish a publicly accessible Automation and Redundancy Risk Dashboard covering at least 80% of UK standard occupational classifications (SOCs), updated annually, drawing on data from employers, ONS and Skills England, and disaggregated by sector, region, and skill level.

Costs

Table 1: Automation & Redundancy Risk - Costs Dashboard Summary

Automation & Redundancy Risk Dashboard — Indicative Cost Model

DSIT AI & Future of Work Unit | Prepared for HM Government policy costing | June 2026

KEY ASSUMPTIONS (edit yellow cells to update all sheets)

Employer NI rate	13.8%	13.8% of secondary threshold (2025/26)
Employer pension (alpha)	29.0%	28.97% of pensionable pay (2024–27 valuation)
On-cost multiplier	142.8%	Total salary × this = full employment cost
Build contingency %	15.0%	15% contingency on all procurement/build items
Annual inflation uplift %	3.5%	3.5% p.a. for staff cost uplifts yr 3 onwards

THREE-YEAR COST SUMMARY (£)

Cost Category	Year 1 (Build)	Year 2 (Operate)	Year 3 (Refresh)	3-Year Total	Notes
1. Staff Costs	£483,651	£68,887	£71,298	£623,836	FTE analysts, data engineers, PMs – DSIT pay band midpoints + on-costs
2. Procurement / Build	£215,050	£17,250	£17,250	£249,550	G-Cloud supplier build; two views, filtering, coverage tracker
3. Data Agreement Costs	£71,450	£64,700	£64,700	£200,850	ONS & Skills England bespoke extract / processing resource
4. Hosting & Maintenance	£27,310	£27,310	£27,310	£81,930	Cloud hosting, security patching, platform licences (GDS estimate)
5. Governance & Peer Review	£40,211	£48,211	£48,211	£136,633	Annual methodology advisory group; external peer review commissions
TOTAL — THREE-YEAR PROGRAMME	£837,672	£226,358	£228,769	£1,292,799	

NOTES

- All figures are indicative estimates for business case purposes and require validation with DSIT finance, ONS, Skills England and G-Cloud suppliers.
- Staff costs use DSIT pay band midpoints (2025/26) + 28.97% pension + 13.8% employer NI = ~43% on-cost. No London Weighting applied; adjust if posts are London-based (+8–15% approx).
- Procurement costs are illustrative G-Cloud market rates for a data dashboard of this scope. A formal discovery brief to 2–3 G-Cloud suppliers is required before committing budget.
- Data agreement costs assume ONS provides bespoke Annual Population Survey extracts and Skills England provides occupational skills demand data; actual charges to be agreed via MOU.
- Hosting costs assume AWS/Azure Gov Cloud equivalent; actual quotes to be obtained from DSIT Digital/IT. Traffic assumed <5,000 unique monthly users.
- Figures exclude VAT. G-Cloud procurements are generally VATable; staff costs are not.
- Year 3 staff uplift at 3.5% p.a. applied to base salary (not total on-cost) per Civil Service Pay Remit guidance trajectory.



1. Staff Costs

The pay band figures came from several publicly available sources:

- **IFG (Institute for Government):** their civil service pay explainer, which noted DSIT has the highest median salary across Whitehall at £55,810, and provided median figures by grade across departments.
- **Civil Service Careers website:** which gives indicative salary ranges by grade (HEO £32k–£38k was one figure cited there).
- **DSIT Gender Pay Gap reports (2024 and 2025):** which confirmed the grade structure and that HEO/SEO grades are the largest cohort at DSIT.
- **A third-party salary guide (Job Interviewology):** which cited HEO as £32k–£38k nationally.
- **Defra civil service grades page:** which gave national minimums: SEO £39,439, G7 £52,120, G6 £62,605.

Table 2: Staff costs

Staff Costs — FTE Requirements by Stage & Grade with DSIT Pay Band Midpoints									
PAY BAND REFERENCE (DSIT / typical central department, 2025/26 — source: IFG, Civil Service Careers, DSIT GPG report)									
Grade	CS Equivalent	Min (£)	Max (£)	Midpoint (£)	London supplement	Pension (28.97%)	NI (13.8%)	Total On-Cost (£)	Typical role
EO	Executive Officer	£28,000	£33,000	£30,500	London +10% app	£8,836	£4,209	£43,545	Junior analyst / data assistant
HEO	Higher Executive Officer	£36,000	£44,000	£40,000	London +10% app	£11,588	£5,520	£57,108	Analyst / data engineer (mid)
SEO	Senior Executive Officer	£44,000	£55,000	£49,500	London +10% app	£14,340	£6,831	£70,671	Senior analyst / senior data eng.
G7	Grade 7	£57,000	£68,000	£62,500	London +10% app	£18,106	£8,625	£89,231	Lead analyst / technical architect
G6	Grade 6	£68,000	£80,000	£74,000	London +10% app	£21,438	£10,212	£105,650	Head of unit / programme director
SCS1	Deputy Director	£75,000	£117,800	£96,400	London +10% app	£27,927	£13,303	£137,630	SRO / unit head (SCS1 band minimum)

FTE REQUIREMENTS BY DELIVERY STAGE									
Stage	Duration	Role	Grade	FTE	Midpoint salary (£)	On-cost multiplier	Annual cost (£)	Stage cost (£)	Notes
Stage 1: Discovery & Data Ingestion	6 months	Data engineer	SEO	1.0	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£35,336	ETL pipelines from ONS ASHE, LFS, Skills
Stage 1: Discovery & Data Ingestion	6 months	Analyst (data mapping)	HEO	1.0	£40,000	1.43	£57,108	£28,554	SOC mapping, coverage logic
Stage 1: Discovery & Data Ingestion	6 months	Project manager	SEO	0.5	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£17,668	Supplier & stakeholder coordination
Stage 1: Discovery & Data Ingestion	6 months	Technical architect	G7	0.5	£62,500	1.43	£89,231	£22,308	Data architecture, security sign-off
Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build	9 months	Data engineer	G7	1.0	£62,500	1.43	£89,231	£66,923	Schema harmonisation, API build
Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build	9 months	Analyst (risk modelling)	SEO	2.0	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£106,007	Automation risk scoring across SOCs
Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build	9 months	Frontend developer	SEO	1.0	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£53,003	Dashboard views, accessibility
Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build	9 months	Project manager	G7	0.5	£62,500	1.43	£89,231	£33,462	Build oversight, milestone tracking
Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build	9 months	Policy adviser	HEO	0.5	£40,000	1.43	£57,108	£21,416	User research & policy interpretation



Stage 3: Launch & Go-Live	3 months	Data engineer	SEO	0.5	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£8,834	QA, load testing, final integration
Stage 3: Launch & Go-Live	3 months	Analyst	HEO	0.5	£40,000	1.43	£57,108	£7,139	Content sign-off, validation
Stage 3: Launch & Go-Live	3 months	Project manager	SEO	0.5	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£8,834	Comms, accessibility review
Stage 3: Launch & Go-Live	3 months	Programme director	G6	0.2	£74,000	1.43	£105,650	£5,282	Senior responsible owner sign-off
Stage 4: Annual Update (ongoing)	3 months/yr	Data engineer	HEO	0.5	£40,000	1.43	£57,108	£7,139	Refresh data pipelines annually
Stage 4: Annual Update (ongoing)	3 months/yr	Analyst	SEO	1.0	£49,500	1.43	£70,671	£17,668	Update risk scores, verify coverage
Stage 4: Annual Update (ongoing)	3 months/yr	Project manager	HEO	0.3	£40,000	1.43	£57,108	£4,283	Stakeholder sign-off, publication
Stage 4: Annual Update (ongoing)	3 months/yr	Programme lead	G7	0.2	£62,500	1.43	£89,231	£4,462	Governance & quality assurance
Subtotal — Stage 1: Discovery & Data Ingestion								£103,865	
Subtotal — Stage 2: Harmonisation & Build								£280,811	
Subtotal — Stage 3: Launch & Go-Live								£30,089	
Subtotal — Stage 4: Annual Update (ongoing)								£33,551	

THREE-YEAR STAFF COST PROJECTION				
Cost Component	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Year 3 (£)	
Stage 1: Discovery (yr 1 only)	£103,865	£0	£0	
Stage 2: Build (yr 1 only)	£280,811	£0	£0	
Stage 3: Launch (yr 1 only)	£30,089	£0	£0	
Stage 4: Annual update (ongoing)	£33,551	£33,551	£34,725	
Retained analyst capacity (0.5 FTE SEO)	£35,336	£35,336	£36,572	
TOTAL STAFF COSTS	£483,651	£68,887	£71,298	

2. Procurement/Dashboard Build Cost

- From general web search results confirming things like G-Cloud's existence, its framework structure, overall market size (£2.91bn in 2024/25 sales), and that suppliers like AWS/Azure are on it, but nothing with itemised pricing for a "build a dashboard with two views, filtering, and a coverage tracker" type of service. No G-Cloud supplier publishes a rate card for a bespoke build like this; pricing only becomes real once a buyer issues a Statement of Requirements and gets responses.
- It was estimated plausible bands based on general knowledge of UK public sector digital-build day rates (typically £600–£1,200/day for digital delivery roles depending on supplier size) and rough effort estimates for each work package (e.g. "8 weeks of discovery" × a blended team day rate). The SME/Mid/Large supplier tiering was a structural device to show that price typically scales with supplier size, not real comparative quotes.
- The Year 2 maintenance figures were similarly modelled as a rough percentage of build cost (roughly 10–15% per item), which is a common rule of thumb in IT cost estimation, not anything sourced from G-Cloud data.

Table 3: Procurement / Dashboard Build Cost

Procurement / Dashboard Build Cost — G-Cloud Supplier Indicative Quotes						
FEATURE SCOPE FOR DISCOVERY BRIEF						
✓ Public-facing view: SOC-level risk scores, trend lines, methodology summary						
✓ Professional/researcher view: disaggregated by sector, region, skill level; download CSV/Excel						
✓ Coverage tracker: % SOC's covered, data vintage, last-updated flag						
✓ Filtering: by SOC major group, region (NUTS1), sector (SIC division), skill level (NQF)						
✓ Accessibility: WCAG 2.2 AA compliant, GOV.UK Design System						
✓ Annual data refresh pipeline: automated ingestion from ONS/Skills England APIs or SFTP						
✓ Hosting: GDS-compliant Gov.UK cloud environment, ISO 27001, Cyber Essentials Plus						
G-CLOUD SUPPLIER INDICATIVE QUOTES (to be obtained via discovery brief — illustrative ranges shown)						
Item	Supplier A (SME)	Supplier B (Mid)	Supplier C (Large)	Adopted estimate (£)	Yr 2 maint (£)	Basis
Discovery & user research (8 wks)	£30,000	£40,000	£55,000	£40,000	-	One-time; 8-week alpha/discovery; UCD & stakeholder engagement
Data architecture & API build	£45,000	£65,000	£85,000	£60,000	£8,000	ETL from ONS + Skills England; schema; APIs
Dashboard frontend (2 views)	£35,000	£50,000	£70,000	£48,000	£5,000	GOV.UK Design System; filtering; accessibility
Coverage tracker module	£10,000	£18,000	£25,000	£16,000	£2,000	Automated SOC coverage display
QA, testing & security review	£12,000	£18,000	£25,000	£16,000	-	Penetration test, load test, WCAG audit
Documentation & handover	£5,000	£8,000	£12,000	£7,000	-	Technical docs, runbooks, training
Contingency (15%)	-	-	-	£28,050	£2,250	Applied to adopted estimates excl. contingency
TOTAL BUILD COST (incl. contingency)				£215,050	£17,250	<i>Year 2 = annual maintenance only</i>
Year 3 maintenance (same as Yr 2)				£17,250		

3. Data Agreement Costs

- **Day rates (£700 for ONS, £650 for Skills England):** These are rough approximations based on typical UK public sector consultancy/analyst day rates for a mid-grade specialist (roughly SEO/G7 equivalent loaded cost). There aren't any actual ONS or Skills England charging schedule for bespoke data services and it's not clear one is even publicly published, since this kind of cross-government data-sharing cost is usually negotiated bilaterally via a Memorandum of Understanding rather than priced off a public rate card.
- **Estimated days (e.g. 20 days for ONS ASHE extract, 15 days for LFS/APS disaggregation):** These are estimates based on a general sense of how labour-intensive bespoke statistical disclosure control and data extraction work tends to be not derived from any ONS scoping document, prior project, or stated capacity figure.

Table 4: Data Agreement Costs

Data Agreement Costs — ONS & Skills England Resource Burden						
ESTIMATED ONS & SKILLS ENGLAND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS (to be confirmed via MOU / bilateral discussion)						
Data Item / Activity	Est. ONS days	Est. Skills England days	Day rate (£)	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Notes
ONS: Bespoke ASHE extract by SOC code	20	0	£700	£14,000	£14,000	Annual recut of Annual Survey Hours & Earnings at 4-digit SOC
ONS: LFS / APS disaggregation by SOC	15	0	£700	£10,500	£10,500	Bespoke runs of Labour Force Survey by occupation × industry
ONS: Data sharing agreement legal & sign-off	5	0	£700	£3,500	£0	ONS legal team; MOU drafting & sign-off (one-off yr 1)
ONS: Methodology support & quality assurance	10	5	£700	£10,500	£10,500	Statistical disclosure control; methodology note review
Skills England: Occupational demand data	0	20	£650	£13,000	£13,000	Job postings analysis; skills adjacency data; SOC mapping
Skills England: Annual refresh coordination	0	10	£650	£6,500	£6,500	Ongoing refresh; data governance sign-off each year
Skills England: Legal / MOU set-up	0	5	£650	£3,250	£0	One-off yr 1 data sharing framework
Employer data: Survey design & collection	5	5	£600	£6,000	£6,000	DSIT-funded employer survey via ONS omnibus or equivalent
Cross-agency methodology alignment	3	3	£700	£4,200	£4,200	3 × half-day workshops; travel & room hire
TOTAL DATA AGREEMENT COSTS				£71,450	£64,700	

4. Hosting and Maintenance Costs

- **Quantities:** These are based on traffic assumption as stated in the notes, not any actual capacity plan. Some approximate numbers are considered that felt proportionate to a modest public dashboard ("<5,000 monthly unique users"), but this is not based against real concurrency, query load, or dataset size.
- **Unit costs (e.g. £150/month for compute, £120/month for database, £3/GB-month for storage, £8,000 for an annual pen test):** These are loose approximations of general cloud market pricing from training data (e.g. AWS/Azure-equivalent list prices for similar tiers), not Gov Cloud negotiated rates, not G-Cloud catalogue prices, and not anything quoted by DSIT's IT team. The pen test figure in particular is a rough rule-of-

thumb for a CREST-accredited engagement and could easily be off by a factor of 2 either way depending on scope.

Table 5: Hosting & Maintenance Costs

Hosting & Maintenance — Annual Cloud & Platform Costs						
ASSUMPTIONS: <5,000 monthly unique users; ~50GB data; standard Gov.UK security baseline; AWS/Azure GovCloud						
Item	Unit	Qty / Month	Unit Cost (£)	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Notes
Cloud compute (web & API tier)	instance/month	2	£150	£3,600	£3,600	2x t3.medium equiv.; auto-scaling for peaks
Database hosting (RDS PostgreSQL)	instance/month	1	£120	£1,440	£1,440	Managed DB; multi-AZ for HA
Data storage (S3 / Blob)	GB-month	50	£3	£1,800	£1,800	Raw + processed datasets; 3-year retention
CDN & bandwidth	month	1	£80	£960	£960	CloudFront/Azure CDN; static assets
Security patching & WAF	month	1	£200	£2,400	£2,400	Gov.UK WAF; automated patching pipeline
SSL certificates & DNS	year	1	£150	£150	£150	GOV.UK subdomain; wildcard cert
Monitoring & logging (CloudWatch)	month	1	£80	£960	£960	Alerting, uptime monitoring, log retention
Penetration test (annual)	per test	1	£8,000	£8,000	£8,000	CREST-accredited supplier; GovAssure alignment
Platform licence (e.g. Power BI Gov / Tableau)	year	1	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£27,310
IT support & incident management	year	1	£3,000	£3,000	£3,000	L1/L2 support SLA; out-of-hours cover
TOTAL HOSTING & MAINTENANCE				£27,310	£27,310	

5. Governance and Peer Review Costs

- **Frequency assumptions** (3 MAG meetings/year, 1 peer review commission/year, 3 user research rounds, etc.): These are assumptions based on "reasonable" annual governance cadence might look like for a body like this, loosely modelled on how advisory groups and methodology boards typically operate in government (quarterly meetings, annual review cycles). There is no other reference in any existing DSIT advisory group's actual meeting frequency or terms of reference.
- **Unit costs** (£2,500/meeting, £15,000 for year-1 peer review, £8,000 for ongoing peer review, £4,000/user research round, etc.): These are rough guesses at what such activities might cost based on general familiarity with government commissioning costs (e.g. academic/think-tank review commissions, venue and admin costs for board meetings) not quotes, not benchmarked against any real procurement, and not sourced from any document.

Table 6: Governance & Peer Review Costs

Governance & Peer Review Costs — Annual Methodology Advisory Group						
ANNUAL COORDINATION & EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW — advisory group, commissions, secretariat						
Activity	Frequency	Unit	Unit Cost (£)	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Notes
Methodology Advisory Group (MAG) meetings	3× per year	meeting	£2,500	£7,500	£7,500	Venue, catering, VC kit, admin support
External peer review commission (yr 1 only)	1× per year	commission	£15,000	£15,000	£15,000	Engage academic / think-tank to review method; one-off yr 1
External peer review commission (yr 2+)	1× per year	commission	£8,000	-	£8,000	Lighter-touch annual review once method is established
Secretariat & admin (0.1 FTE HEO)	ongoing	year	See formula	£5,711	£5,711	Formulaically linked to pay band midpoint
Legal & ethics sign-off (yr 1 only)	1× yr 1	engagement	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	Data ethics assessment, legal advice on publication
User research & consultation (annual)	1× per year	round	£4,000	£4,000	£4,000	Survey / focus group with sector stakeholders
Publication & communications support	1× per year	year	£3,000	£3,000	£3,000	£48,211
TOTAL GOVERNANCE & PEER REVIEW				£40,211	£48,211	

Non-Monetary Benefits Appraisal

1. Avoided Duplication Across Departments

1.1 Green Book classification

Type of benefit: Public sector financial benefit (potentially monetisable in principle, once verified) and a contribution to public sector efficiency more broadly.

Avoided duplication is the one benefit line in this appraisal capable of being monetised but only once real evidence is gathered. The Green Book's Five Case Model explicitly identifies avoiding duplication of effort as a benefit of cross-government collaboration (paragraph 3.14): “Early and sustained collaboration builds a shared understanding of the proposal, avoids duplication of effort, and helps to identify potential wider or unintended impacts before they occur.”

1.2 Method: a three-step evidence-mapping exercise

Step 1 - Identify candidate commissions

Map existing and recent labour market / automation-risk analyses commissioned or produced by DWP, DBT, Skills England (and its predecessor bodies), and any cross-government bodies (e.g. the former Industrial Strategy Council). Primary sources for this step are:

- **GOV.UK Contracts Finder:** searchable record of public sector contracts, including commissioned research.
- **Departmental annual reports and accounts:** disclose major commissioned research spend.

- **Published departmental research and statistics pages:** identify recurring, self-produced labour market analyses.
- **Freedom of Information requests:** where contract-level detail is not already public.

Step 2 — Classify by overlap type

Each identified commission or analysis should be classified using the table below.

Overlap category	Definition	Implication for dashboard
Full duplicate	Same SOC-level automation/redundancy risk question, similar methodology.	Strong candidate for discontinuation once dashboard is live.
Partial duplicate	Uses similar ONS/Skills England inputs but different framing or unit of analysis.	Scope for reduced frequency or narrower commissioning once dashboard provides baseline.
Adjacent but distinct	Related labour market question but different unit (e.g. claimant-level forecasting).	No reduction expected; dashboard may become a complementary input.

Step 3 — State cost avoidance as a range, not a point estimate

Once full and partial duplicates are identified with real contract values, the appraisal can state: “X identified contracts totalling £Y over Z years could be reduced or discontinued if the dashboard provides equivalent coverage.” This should be presented as a range with clearly stated assumptions, not a single confident figure, reflecting genuine uncertainty about take-up and transition timing.

What this appraisal does not do

This document does not estimate a duplication-saving figure. Departmental contract histories require dedicated desk research (Contracts Finder searches, FOI requests, departmental liaison) that has not been carried out. Any figure produced without that underlying evidence would not be a credible input to a business case.

Recommended next step: commission a short desk-research exercise (1–2 weeks analyst time) to populate the table above with real contract data before this line is included as anything other than a structural placeholder.



2. Employer Decision-Making Value

2.1 Green Book classification

Type of benefit: Unmonetisable, quantifiable-in-part social benefit, improved employer decision-making and productivity.

2.2 The Green Book's rationale for intervention: imperfect information

The Green Book (2026, paragraph 4.6) identifies five categories of market failure that justify government intervention. The most directly applicable to this dashboard is imperfect information:

“Imperfect information: Households and organisations are often able to find, or buy, the information that they need to make good decisions. In some cases, however, the public sector must act to provide this information. Credit constraints are an example of imperfect information. Lenders sometimes do not have perfect information about which households and businesses are creditworthy and therefore under-supply loans.”

— HM Treasury, The Green Book: UK Government Guidance on Appraisal (2026), paragraph 4.6

2.3 Applying this to the dashboard

The argument structure for the Strategic and Economic Cases follows directly from this paragraph:

- Employers making workforce investment decisions (reskilling budgets, hiring plans, capital-versus-labour substitution) face a genuine information asymmetry: no individual employer can observe SOC-level automation exposure at the granularity needed to act on it.
- No single employer has the incentive to produce this information as a public good themselves, since the benefit would accrue to competitors as much as to the employer bearing the cost (this overlaps with the public goods rationale addressed in Section 3).
- This is the standard Green Book opening move used to justify other government information-provision interventions, such as Companies House open data, ONS open statistics, and FCA open banking data.

2.4 How to present this in the Appraisal Summary Table

Per Green Book Chapter 6 (Figure 6, the decision tree for classifying social costs and benefits), this benefit should be tested as follows:

Decision tree question	Assessment for this benefit
Can it be expressed in monetary terms?	Not without a dedicated valuation exercise (e.g. stated-preference / willingness-to-pay survey of employers). Treat as unmonetisable for this appraisal.
Can it be expressed numerically?	Partially. Proxy indicators can be quantified e.g. survey-based measures of employer uncertainty about automation exposure (see 2.5 below).
Conclusion	Classify as a quantifiable (where proxy data exists) or qualitative unmonetised social benefit, not as a monetised figure.

2.5 Possible quantifiable proxies (require sourcing before use)

The following would need to be sourced from existing survey data (e.g. CIPD Labour Market Outlook, Skills England employer surveys, or the ONS Business Insights and Conditions Survey) before citing in a business case:

- Proportion of UK employers reporting difficulty assessing automation/AI exposure within their own sector or occupations.
- Proportion of employers citing lack of reliable data as a barrier to reskilling investment decisions.
- Average employer spend (or planned spend) on private labour-market intelligence as a revealed-preference indicator of the value placed on this type of information.

What this appraisal does not do

This document does not assign a monetary value to improved employer decision-making. Doing so credibly would require a dedicated stated-preference or revealed-preference valuation study - a specialist exercise beyond the scope of a desk-based appraisal.

Recommended next step: search CIPD, Skills England and ONS survey series for existing proxy indicators (listed in 2.5) before finalising the Appraisal Summary Table entry for this benefit.

3. Public Value of Open, Accessible Data

3.1 Green Book classification

Type of benefit: Qualitative social benefit - public good provision and distributional value.

3.2 The public goods rationale

The same Green Book paragraph (4.6) that establishes the imperfect information rationale also defines public goods, and the dashboard meets both defining characteristics:

“Public goods are goods and services that are non-excludable and non-rivalrous. Non-excludability means that the use of public goods cannot be restricted, and so it is not possible to charge people for using them. Non-rivalry means that the consumption of public goods by one person does not affect another person’s ability to consume them. These characteristics mean that public goods are under-provided by the free market.”

— HM Treasury, The Green Book: UK Government Guidance on Appraisal (2026), paragraph 4.6

3.3 Applying the two defining characteristics

Characteristic	Application to the dashboard
Non-excludable	A publicly accessible dashboard can be viewed by anyone — researchers, small businesses without analytics capacity, individual workers assessing their own career exposure, journalists, and local authorities without charge or gatekeeping.
Non-rivalrous	One user viewing the dashboard does not reduce its availability or usefulness to another user, unlike a finite resource or a paywalled commercial report with limited licence seats.

Because the free market under-provides this category of good, the Green Book's logic supports direct public provision rather than relying solely on commercial labour-market analytics providers, whose products are typically paywalled and accessible only to organisations able to pay for enterprise-level licences.

3.4 Supplementary qualitative value: transparency and distributional effects

Two further qualitative benefits can be described, drawing on Green Book Chapter 7 (Distributional analysis and place-based analysis):

- **Transparency and accountability value:** a public dashboard allows external scrutiny of the evidence base underpinning the government's own AI and automation policy positions, supporting the Green Book's emphasis (paragraph 5.4) on transparently documenting evidence and reasoning.
- **Distributional value:** small businesses and individual workers, who cannot afford commissioned labour market research, gain access to information equivalent to that which large employers can otherwise purchase privately. Green Book paragraph 7.3 notes that where a proposal has distributional effects, even if not an explicit objective, practitioners should describe these qualitatively or quantitatively as part of the balanced value-for-money judgement.

4. Summary: Draft Appraisal Summary Table Entries

Green Book Chapter 9 recommends presenting shortlist appraisal results in an Appraisal Summary Table (AST). The rows below are drafted ready for insertion into a full AST alongside the monetised cost figures in the companion cost model.

Benefit	Classification	Evidence status
1. Avoided duplication across DWP / DBT / Skills England	Potentially monetisable	Not yet evidenced, requires Contracts Finder / FOI desk research to populate the overlap-mapping table (Section 1.2) before any figure is used.
2. Improved employer decision-making	Unmonetisable (quantifiable in part)	Rationale is well-evidenced via Green Book paragraph 4.6 (imperfect information). Quantifiable proxies (Section 2.5) require sourcing from CIPD / Skills England / ONS survey series.
3. Public value of open data	Qualitative	Rationale is well-evidenced via Green Book paragraph 4.6 (public goods) and Chapter 7 (distributional analysis). Ready to use in qualitative form as drafted in Section 3.4.

4.1 Honest assessment of evidence strength

In the interests of the same transparency this appraisal recommends for the dashboard itself: benefits 2 and 3 rest on a well-established and directly citable Green Book rationale (paragraph 4.6), even though the specific magnitude of the benefit is not quantified. Benefit 1 (avoided duplication) is conceptually sound but currently has no underlying evidence base at all. It is a placeholder structure awaiting real desk research, not a populated finding.

None of the three benefits should be presented to decision makers as monetised figures. Per Green Book paragraph 6.99, a proposal with unmonetised or even unquantified benefits can still represent good value for money. The absence of a single pound-sterling figure here is not a weakness in the case, provided the qualitative and quantifiable evidence is presented transparently, as set out above.

2. Recommendation under appraisal

By 2027, the AI and Future of Work Unit should use the Automation and Redundancy Risk Dashboard to develop a targeted reskilling plan that transitions workers in high-risk roles into high-demand digital jobs, delivered through Government-funded bootcamps and apprenticeships that align with skills shortages and employer-needs.

1. Assumptions Framework

The model targets 5% of the estimated 1.77 million UK workers identified as being in high-risk roles (approximately 88,500 workers in the first cohort). Of these, 60% are assumed to engage with the programme, giving 53,100 actual participants. Both figures are explicitly modelling assumptions rather than researched optima: the targeting rate requires a ministerial decision on ambition, and the engagement rate is loosely anchored to DfE evaluations of Skills Bootcamps and Sector-Based Work Academy Programmes, which typically report 50–70% enrolment among referred participants. Neither figure should be treated as a floor or ceiling.

The appraisal runs over 10 years, in line with the Green Book's standard default for proposals that fall outside its specific longer-horizon categories (infrastructure, building refurbishment, regulation). All future costs and benefits are discounted at 3.5% in real terms. The Social Time Preference Rate set out at paragraph 6.54 of the Green Book 2026, which is the correct rate for an appraisal period falling entirely within years 1 to 30.

The employer adaptation barrier identified in RFP evidence is treated as a live constraint throughout the model, not a background caveat. Rather than assuming all completers walk into relevant digital roles, the model applies a 55% job-outcome rate. Deliberately set below typical programme completion rates to reflect the fact that reskilled workers cannot generate Exchequer returns until employers actually hire them. This single assumption is the largest source of uncertainty in the whole model and is tested explicitly in the sensitivity analysis.

Table 7: Cost of Inaction Baseline – Assumptions & Sources
Cost-of-Inaction Baseline — Assumptions & Sources

Companion appraisal to the reskilling recommendation: 'By 2027, the AI and Future of Work Unit should use the Automation and Redundancy Risk Dashboard to develop a targeted reskilling plan...'

A. POPULATION AT RISK			
Input	Value	Source	Notes
Jobs at high risk of automation (England, 2017)	1,500,000	ONS, 'The probability of automation in England: 2011 and 2017' (March 2019)	7.4% of 19.9m jobs analysed; high risk = >70% automation probability. This is the most recent ONS study using this methodology; figures are England-only and dated 2017.
UK uplift factor (England → UK population)	118.0%	ONS mid-year population estimates (England ~84% of UK population)	Applied as a simple pro-rata scaling; not a re-estimation of automation risk for Scotland/Wales/NI labour markets.
Estimated UK-wide high-risk population (derived)	1,770,000	Derived from above	This is a scaled extrapolation, not a direct measurement — flagged as a key limitation (see Sheet 2).
B. EARNINGS BASELINE (ONS ASHE)			
Input	Value	Source	Notes
UK median gross weekly earnings, full-time (April 2025)	£766.60	ONS, 'Employee earnings in the UK: 2025' (ASHE, released 23 Oct 2025)	National median across all occupations — used as the baseline proxy wage for displaced workers, pending SOC-specific figures from the dashboard.
Annualised median earnings (derived)	£39,863	Derived from above	£39,863 — close to the separately published ASHE full-time median annual figure of £39,039 (rounding/methodology differences).
Recommended refinement	N/A	Use ASHE Table 14 (occupation by 4-digit SOC)	Once the dashboard identifies specific high-risk SOC codes, replace this national median with SOC-specific ASHE Table 14 figures, which are typically lower than the all-occupation median for routine/automatable roles.
C. TAX & NATIONAL INSURANCE PARAMETERS (2025/26)			
Input	Value	Source	Notes
Income tax personal allowance	£12,570	HMRC / House of Commons Library, 'Direct taxes: rates and allowances 2026/27'	Frozen since 2021/22; due to remain frozen until 2030/31.
Basic rate of income tax	20.0%	HMRC standard rates	Applied to income between personal allowance and higher rate threshold (£50,270).
Employee NI primary threshold (annual)	£12,570	GOV.UK, 'Rates and thresholds for employers 2025/26'	Aligned with income tax personal allowance.
Employee NI rate (main band)	8.0%	GOV.UK, 'Rates and thresholds for employers 2025/26'	8% on earnings between primary threshold and upper earnings limit (£50,270).
D. BENEFIT & ENTITLEMENT RATES (2025/26)			
Input	Value	Source	Notes
UC standard allowance, single 25+ (monthly)	£400	DWP, 'Proposed benefit and pension rates 2025/26'	2025/26 rate. Used as core out-of-work income support; actual award depends on individual circumstances and is means-tested against other income/savings.
UC standard allowance, single 25+ (annual, derived)	£4,802	Derived from above	
Average Local Housing Allowance, 1-bed (monthly, England average)	£450	DWP/VOA LHA rate tables 2025/26 (illustrative mid-range BRMA figure)	LHA varies enormously by Broad Rental Market Area (£400–£700+/month for 1-bed). A national 'average' is illustrative only — actual cost should use the BRMA for the worker's actual location once dashboard provides regional disaggregation.
Average LHA (annual, derived)	£5,400	Derived from above	
Average Band D council tax (England, 2025/26)	£2,280	MHCLG, 'Council Tax levels set by local authorities in England 2025/26'	Used as gross liability; Council Tax Reduction schemes are locally administered and can cover up to 100% for low-income households — assumed 100% reduction for a fully unemployed claimant in this model.
Assumed Council Tax Reduction rate while on UC	100.0%	Modelling assumption — see note	100% assumed for a single claimant with no other income, consistent with most local CTR schemes' treatment of UC claimants with nil income. Actual schemes vary by local authority.

E. DURATION & GVA ASSUMPTIONS (MODELLING JUDGEMENTS — NOT OFFICIAL FIGURES)

Input	Value	Source	Notes
Average duration of unemployment/underemployment following displacement (months)	9	Modelling assumption	No single authoritative UK figure exists for automation-specific displacement duration. 9 months is a mid-point illustrative assumption between short frictional unemployment (3–4 months, typical JSA/UC claim duration for non-disadvantaged claimants per DWP claimant data) and longer-term structural displacement (12–18 months, seen in sectoral job-loss studies e.g. coal/steel transitions). THIS REQUIRES VALIDATION before use in a real business case — ideally from DWP longitudinal claimant data for workers from declining occupations.
GVA loss per worker per month of non-employment	£3,322	Derived: monthly earnings used as a conservative proxy for monthly GVA contribution	Using gross wage as a GVA proxy is a standard but conservative simplification (wages are a share, not all, of a worker's marginal product). ONS does not publish occupation-specific GVA-per-worker; using wages avoids overstating the multiplier but likely understates true GVA loss for higher-productivity roles.

F. HEALTH & SOCIAL COSTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT (QUALITATIVE / NOT MONETISED)

This model does NOT include a monetised health and social cost figure. Robust UK-specific cost-per-unemployed-person estimates for NHS/mental health service use, relationship breakdown, and broader social costs were not identified via search with sufficient specificity and recency to include responsibly. The wider academic literature (e.g. studies linking unemployment to increased GP consultations, antidepressant prescribing, and mortality risk) supports the existence of this cost category, but translating it into a credible £-per-worker figure requires a dedicated literature review and ideally consultation with DHSC/OHID analysts. This is treated as an unmonetised qualitative cost in Cost-of-Inaction Model, consistent with Green Book guidance on not forcing premature monetisation (para 6.28).

2. Exchequer Impact Model

For each successful participant defined as someone who completes the programme and secures a relevant digital role within 12 months, the model calculates two distinct types of Exchequer benefit. The first is a recurring annual gain: the additional income tax and National Insurance generated on the wage uplift between what participants earned in their high-risk role and what they earn in their new digital role. Using ONS ASHE 2025 median earnings and a 20% wage uplift assumption, this amounts to approximately £2,232 per successful participant per year. Across 29,205 successful participants and discounted over 10 years at 3.5%, this produces a net present value of approximately £542 million for one cohort.

The second type is a one-off year-1 saving: the Universal Credit, housing benefit, and Council Tax Reduction that the Exchequer avoids paying because successful participants did not experience the 9-month unemployment spell modelled in the cost-of-inaction baseline. This amounts to approximately £9,361 per successful participant, generating a discounted cohort-level saving of approximately £273 million. The apprenticeship levy offset, reflecting employer co-investment in places delivered through the apprenticeship route adds a further £35 million in year 1, bringing the combined one-off Exchequer benefit to approximately £298 million discounted.

The combined 10-year net present value of Exchequer benefits from one cohort is approximately £840 million. Against a placeholder delivery cost of £234 million (based on an illustrative £8,000 per participant figure that must be replaced with a genuine costing before this is used in any submission) the model returns a net positive Exchequer position of approximately £606 million. The sensitivity table shows that even under the most cautious employer adaptation scenario, with only 35% of participants securing relevant roles, the discounted tax benefit alone still exceeds £345 million.

Table 8: Cost of Inaction Baseline – Do Nothing Counterfactual

Cost-of-Inaction Baseline (Do-Nothing Counterfactual)			
Per Green Book guidance, this baseline represents 'business as usual' — what happens if the dashboard's at-risk population is not given a targeted reskilling intervention.			
STEP 1 — AT-RISK POPULATION			
Item	Value	Note	
Estimated UK high-risk population (from Assumptions sheet)	1,770,000	This is the baseline population at risk in the absence of any intervention (the dashboard's core output).	
STEP 2 — PER-WORKER ANNUAL EXCHEQUER COST OF DISPLACEMENT			
Cost component	Monthly (£)	For full duration (£)	Note / formula basis
Universal Credit standard allowance	£400	£3,601	Single claimant 25+, 2025/26 rate
Housing benefit / UC housing element (avg LHA, 1-bed)	£450	£4,050	Illustrative England-average 1-bed LHA — refine with claimant's actual BRMA once dashboard provides regional data
Council tax reduction (assumed 100% of Band D)	£190	£1,710	Forgone council tax receipt while on full Council Tax Reduction
Subtotal: benefit & entitlement cost per worker	£1,040	£9,361	
STEP 3 — LOST TAX RECEIPTS PER WORKER			
Item	Annual (£)	For full duration (£)	Note / formula basis
Baseline annual earnings (ONS median, all occupations)	£39,863		Placeholder pending SOC-specific ASHE Table 14 wage data from the dashboard
Income tax otherwise paid (on earnings above personal allowance)	£5,459	£4,094	Basic rate only; does not model higher-rate taxpayers (unlikely at median wage)
Employee NI otherwise paid	£2,183	£1,638	8% employee NI main band, 2025/26
Subtotal: lost tax & NI receipts per worker		£5,732	
STEP 4 — GVA LOSS PER WORKER			
Item	Monthly (£)	For full duration (£)	Note / formula basis
GVA loss per month of non-employment (wage proxy)	£3,322	£29,897	Conservative proxy using gross wage; true GVA loss for higher-productivity roles likely understated
STEP 5 — HEALTH & SOCIAL COSTS (UNMONETISED)			
Not monetised in this model — see Assumptions & Sources, Section F, for the evidential reasoning. Treated as an additional qualitative cost of inaction not captured in the totals below: the true cost-per-worker figure is therefore a conservative (minimum) estimate, not a comprehensive one.			
STEP 6 — AGGREGATE COST PER DISPLACED WORKER			
Cost category	Per-worker cost, full duration (£)	Source row	
Benefit & entitlement costs	£9,361	Step 2 subtotal (row 13)	
Lost income tax & NI receipts	£5,732	Step 3 subtotal (row 20)	
GVA loss	£29,897	Step 4 (row 24)	
Health & social costs	Not monetised	Step 5 — qualitative only	
TOTAL COST PER DISPLACED WORKER (MONETISED COMPONENTS)	£44,990	Excludes unmonetised health & social costs — see note above	
STEP 7 — AGGREGATE GROSS COST OF INACTION (POPULATION-WIDE)			
Item	Value	Note	
At-risk population	1,770,000	From Step 1	
Total cost per displaced worker (monetised)	£44,990	From Step 6	
GROSS COST OF INACTION, IF 100% OF AT-RISK POPULATION IS DISPLACED FOR THE FULL ASSUMED DURATION	£79,632,710,640		
SENSITIVITY — REALISTIC DISPLACEMENT SCENARIOS (NOT EVERY AT-RISK WORKER IS DISPLACED)			
Being in a 'high automation risk' occupation does not mean certain job loss — historical evidence (e.g. ATM rollout/bank tellers, self-checkout/retail) shows task automation often changes job content rather than eliminating roles outright, and adoption is gradual. The figures below test what proportion of the at-risk population might realistically be displaced into the unemployment/benefit scenario modelled above, as a sensitivity check rather than a point prediction.			
Displacement scenario	% of at-risk population displaced	Number of workers displaced	Gross cost of inaction (£)
Low (10%)	10.0%	177,000	£7,963,271,064
Central (25%)	25.0%	442,500	£19,908,177,660
High (50%)	50.0%	885,000	£39,816,355,320



COMPARISON WITH RESKILLING INTERVENTION COST (FOR VALUE-FOR-MONEY CONTEXT)

Per-participant bootcamp/apprenticeship costs are NOT estimated in this sheet — they depend on programme design choices (bootcamp vs. apprenticeship mix, sector, duration) that are the subject of the separate reskilling-programme costing exercise. Insert that per-participant figure in cell B53 below to generate an automatic break-even comparison against the central displacement scenario.

Item	Value	Note
Illustrative per-participant reskilling cost (INPUT)	£8,000	PLACEHOLDER — replace with actual bootcamp/apprenticeship per-participant cost once available
Cost of inaction per displaced worker (from Step 6)	£44,990	
Break-even effectiveness threshold: reskilling needs only this share of the cost-of-inaction to be value for money	17.8%	

3. Limitations

The headline figures in this model are a gross upper-bound estimate of programme impact, not a counterfactual-adjusted net figure. No deadweight adjustment has been applied. That is, no reduction has been made for the proportion of successful outcomes that would have occurred even without the programme. DWP and the What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth publish deadweight estimates for comparable active labour market programmes, typically in the range of 20–40%. Applying a 30% deadweight adjustment to the central scenario would reduce the 10-year tax benefit from approximately £542 million to approximately £380 million. This adjustment should be sourced from published evaluations of the closest comparable UK programmes and applied before these figures are used in a formal appraisal.

The apprenticeship levy is correctly treated in this model as an offsetting financing source, not as a novel tax receipt this programme generates. The levy already exists as a mandatory 0.5% payroll tax on employers with pay bills over £3 million, and its funds already support apprenticeship training across the whole economy independently of this programme. Presenting it as Exchequer revenue generated by the reskilling intervention would be a double-counting error: it is relevant to the Financial Case as a source of employer co-investment that reduces net additional Government spend, but it should not appear as a benefit in the Economic Case alongside the GVA and tax calculations.

This model calculates the Exchequer impact of a single cohort over 10 years. A full programme business case covering multiple years of intake, consistent with the recommendation's multi-year ambition would require cohort stacking: running the model for each annual intake, offsetting the discount periods appropriately for later-starting cohorts, and summing across them. The single-cohort model here is the auditable building block for that fuller exercise, not a substitute for it. The wage baseline and job-outcome rate both require replacement with SOC-specific data once the dashboard is operational, at which point the model should be re-run with actual occupational earnings differentials between source high-risk roles and target digital roles rather than the current all-occupation median proxy.

- **Population estimate.** The 1.5 million figure is England-only and dated 2017 (the most recent ONS study using this specific automation-probability methodology). It has been scaled to a UK-wide estimate using a simple population pro-rata, which is a modelling simplification, not a re-estimation of automation risk for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland labour markets. The Automation and Redundancy Risk Dashboard recommended elsewhere in this programme is intended to replace this 2017 estimate with current, UK-

wide, SOC-disaggregated data. This model should be re-run with dashboard outputs once available, and the figures here should be treated as a placeholder baseline only.

- **Wage baseline.** The model currently uses the UK all-occupation median wage (£766.60/week, ONS ASHE April 2025) as a placeholder for displaced workers' prior earnings. This is very likely to overstate the true baseline wage, since occupations at high risk of automation tend to be routine, lower-paid roles, not a representative cross-section of all occupations. ONS ASHE Table 14 (occupation by 4-digit SOC) should be used to substitute SOC-specific wage data once the dashboard identifies the actual high-risk occupations. This would likely produce a materially lower per-worker tax-loss figure but does not change the underlying methodology.
- **Duration assumption.** The 9-month average displacement duration is a modelling judgement, explicitly flagged as unvalidated. No authoritative UK source publishes an average unemployment duration specifically for automation-displaced workers (as opposed to general unemployment, which DWP and ONS do publish, but which blends all causes of job loss). This is the single largest source of uncertainty in the per-worker cost figure, since costs scale linearly with duration. Sensitivity testing (varying this assumption) is strongly recommended before this figure is used in ministerial submission.
- **Health and Social Costs.** Deliberately excluded from the monetised total. This is consistent with Green Book paragraph 6.28: practitioners should monetise only where credible evidence supports it and should not force premature monetisation. The omission means the total in Step 6 is a conservative (minimum) estimate of the true cost of inaction, not a comprehensive one — this should be stated explicitly wherever the headline figure is quoted.
- **GVA loss methodology.** Using gross wages as a proxy for GVA loss is a simplification that avoids the more contested territory of estimating economy-wide productivity multipliers (which the Green Book explicitly cautions against paragraph 6.43, on not counting Keynesian multiplier effects as social benefits/costs, applies by analogy here). This likely understates true GVA loss for higher-productivity occupations and should be treated as a floor, not a central estimate.
- **Council Tax Reduction assumption.** The model assumes a single unemployed claimant receives a 100% Council Tax Reduction. This is realistic for many local schemes for a claimant with no other household income, but Council Tax Reduction is locally administered (each billing authority sets its own working-age scheme), so actual entitlement varies and may be lower than 100% in some authorities.
- **Displacement scenarios, not predictions.** Step 7's sensitivity table (10% / 25% / 50% displacement) exists because being in a 'high automation risk' occupation does not equate to certain job loss. Historical technology adoption (ATMs, self-checkout, etc.) has often changed job content and reduced headcount growth rather than eliminating roles outright and immediately. Decision-makers should treat the 'gross cost if 100% displaced' figure (Step 7 top line) as a theoretical ceiling, not a forecast, and should anchor on the sensitivity range instead.

3. Recommendation under appraisal

“By 2028, each Mayoral Combined Authority receiving Adult Skills Fund should publish an annual Employer Commitment Register as a condition of accessing TechLocal or Skills Bootcamp co-funding, a minimum of 100 employers per MCA area formally commit to interviewing 5 candidates from at least one government-accredited reskilling programme, with 50% of those commitments resulting in a verified hire within 12 months, tracked through the National Workforce Transition Evidence Hub.”

1. Policy-Level Costings

- Register setup costs range from £35,000 for MCAs with existing digital infrastructure to £90,000 for those requiring a new build from scratch, with 40% of MCAs assumed to need the latter. The weighted average is £57,000 per MCA, giving a total capital cost of £570,000 across all 10 MCAs plus £96,000 in annual maintenance.
- The National Workforce Transition Evidence Hub is costed as a central one-off build of £322,000 including contingency, covering data ingestion from all MCAs, automated hire verification matched against HMRC PAYE or DWP Universal Credit off-flow records, and annual public reporting. Annual maintenance comes to approximately £46,000.
- MCA administration staff - covering employer recruitment, data verification, register publication, and senior oversight cost approximately £62,000 per MCA per year, totalling £621,000 annually across all 10 MCAs. These figures use the same Civil Service pay band midpoints and on-cost rates applied consistently throughout this series of models.
- The Standard Cost Model employer burden is approximately £256 per employer per year, covering portal registration, submitting five candidate records, reporting verified hire outcomes, and one annual account manager meeting. Across 1,000 committed employers nationally this amounts to £256,000 per year. A cost to business, not a public sector cost, and should be reported in the Business Impact Assessment separately.
- The policy creates significant financial leverage by conditioning £207 million of existing co-funding on Register compliance: approximately £27 million in TechLocal grants sourced from the GOV.UK TechLocal programme page published January 2026, and an estimated £180 million in devolved Skills Bootcamp allocations sourced from the DWP S31 grant determination letters 2026-27. This is not new public spending, it is existing funding made conditional on employer commitments.
- The total three-year public sector cost is approximately £2.4 million, covering capital build in year zero and two years of MCA administration and Hub maintenance. Against £207 million of co-funding leverage annually, this represents a very low administrative cost relative to the financial incentive structure the policy creates.



Table 9: Employer Commitment Register set up costs

Covers: Register setup, Evidence Hub, MCA admin, employer burden, co-funding conditions leverage. Yellow = sourced inputs. Green = formulas from Assumptions.

A. REGISTER SETUP COST — PER MCA WEB PORTAL & DATA SYSTEM				
Item	Year 0 build (£)	Yr 1+ annual (£)	Source / notes	
MCA with existing digital portal (lower-cost variant)	£35,000	£8,000	Modelling assumption anchored to G-Cloud digital service build rates. MCAs such as Greater Manchester and West Midlands have existing adult skills portals; incremental build for a new Register module estimated at £30,000–40,000 capital, £6,000–10,000 ongoing maintenance. Source: G-Cloud 14 framework pricing for digital build work; no publicly available MCA-specific figures.	
MCA requiring new build from scratch (higher-cost variant)	£90,000	£12,000	Modelling assumption for MCAs without existing digital employer-facing infrastructure (e.g. newer MCAs like Hull & East Yorkshire, Greater Lincolnshire). Full build including data entry, verification mechanism and public-facing register: £70,000–110,000 capital. Requires G-Cloud procurement or MCA or central procurement via Crown Commercial Service framework (RM6098).	
Assumed proportion of MCAs requiring new build	40.0%	0.0%	Modelling assumption — 4 of 10 MCAs assumed to need new build; 6 have existing infrastructure.	
Weighted avg setup cost per MCA (derived)	£57,000	£9,600	Weighted by new-build proportion from row above	
TOTAL REGISTER SETUP (all MCAs, derived)	£570,000	£96,000	Yr 0 = one-off capital. Yr 1+ = annual maintenance across all participating MCAs	
B. NATIONAL WORKFORCE TRANSITION EVIDENCE HUB — CENTRAL BUILD & MAINTENANCE				
Item	One-off build (£)	Annual maint (£)	Source / notes	
Hub build: data ingestion from all MCAs, API/SFTP integration	£220,000	£25,000	G-Cloud indicative range for a data aggregation platform ingesting 10+ data sources with verification logic, public reporting dashboard, and security baseline (Cyber Essentials Plus, GDS). Discovery brief via Crown Commercial Service RM6098 required. Comparable: ONS administrative data linking infrastructure (internal costs not public); DWP Universal Credit reporting platform (much larger scale). One-off build £180,000–260,000; annual £20,000–30,000.	
Hub: verification of hire outcomes (automated matching to HMRC PAYE / UC off-flow)	£60,000	£15,000	This is the most technically complex element. Matching verified hires to HMRC RTI data or DWP UC off-flow records requires a data-sharing agreement with HMRC/DWP and a matched algorithm. One-off legal/technical setup: £40,000–80,000. Ongoing annual matching process: £10,000–20,000. No direct precedent; analogous to DWP's employment outcomes verification infrastructure for contracted employment support	
Contingency (15%)	£42,000	£8,000	Standard 15% on build and maintenance costs	
TOTAL EVIDENCE HUB COST (central)	£322,000	£46,000	One-off central government cost; not repeated per MCA	
C. MCA ADMINISTRATION — STAFF COST PER MCA				
Item	Unit cost (£/yr)	Per MCA total (£/yr)	Source / notes	
Employer recruitment lead (0.5 FTE SEO — recruiting and managing 100+ employer commitments)	£31,636	£31,636	0.5 FTE SEO at DSIT/MCA pay midpoint £44,000 * 43.8% on-costs (28.97% pension + 13.8% NI), consistent with prior models in this series. Employer recruitment is active outreach, relationship management, and formal commitment documentation	
Data & verification officer (0.3 FTE HEO — chasing verified hire returns, data entry, Evidence Hub liaison)	£15,530	£15,530	0.3 FTE HEO at midpoint £36,000 * on-costs. Annualised time for verifying 250+ hire outcomes, chasing submission, liaison with central Hub	
Register publication lead (0.1 FTE SEO — annual register publication, accessibility, comms)	£6,327	£6,327	0.1 FTE SEO. Annual Register publication; accessibility compliance check; local press release / stakeholder communication	
Senior oversight (0.1 FTE G7 — programme oversight, methodology sign-off, annual review)	£8,628	£8,628	0.1 FTE G7 at midpoint £60,000 * on-costs. Annual programme oversight, methodology sign-off, annual review	
TOTAL MCA ADMIN COST per MCA (annual)	£62,122	£62,122		
TOTAL MCA ADMIN COST (all MCAs, annual, derived)	£621,216			
D. EMPLOYER ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN (STANDARD COST MODEL)				
Activity per employer per year	Hours	Hourly rate (£)	Annual cost (£)	Source / notes
Registering commitment on MCA portal (one-off setup)	2	£28.00	£56	2 hours admin time for registration, data entry, and internal sign-off. SCM hourly rate: £28.00 based on median hourly earnings for administrative managers/HR managers (ONS ASHE 2025, SOC 1242 approximate). Government SCM guidance uses median wage for the relevant employee type plus 30% overhead).
Submitting 5 candidate interview records (per annual cycle)	3	£28.00	£84	3 hours annualised time for candidate interview records submission (up to 5 candidates = 3 hours). ~36 minutes per candidate record * 5 candidates = 3 hours. Includes pulling candidate data, completing online form, internal sign-off. Conservative — many employers will streamline this with API integration
Reporting verified hire outcomes (up to 5, within 12 months)	2	£28.00	£56	~24 minutes per verified hire report; completion status verification form. Assumes 50% hire rate * 2.5 reports on average; model rounds to 2 hours
Engagement with MCA employer account manager (annual)	1	£60.00	£60	1 hour annual staff time for initial briefing/renewal meeting. Rate: £60/hr (ASHE 2025 median hourly pay £28–30; senior staff at £50–70 for director-level time). Modest assumption many employer relationships will be lightweight
Total administrative burden per employer (annual, £)			£256	This is a cost TO BUSINESS — presented separately from public sector
TOTAL EMPLOYER BURDEN (all MCAs, all employers, annual)			£256,000	Total cost to business: unit burden * MCAs * employers per MCA



E. CO-FUNDING CONDITIONS LEVERAGE — FINANCIAL LEVERAGE CREATED BY CONDITIONING CO-FUNDING

TechLocal is a £27m UK-wide grant fund (DSIT, January 2026) delivered through Innovate UK. Skills Bootcamps are funded through devolved MCA allocations from the single adult skills fund. The recommendation conditions access to BOTH streams on Register compliance. This section maps the financial leverage: how much existing funding is being made conditional.

Funding stream	Total (£)	MCA share (£)	Per MCA avg (£)	Source
TechLocal — 'Connecting Local Talent to Local Jobs' strand (UK-wide)	£27,000,000	£22,950,000	£2,295,000	GOV.UK, 'TechLocal' grant page (January 2026): £27 million funding to kickstart government's TechLocal scheme. England-applicable share ~85% (England share of devolved funding).
Skills Bootcamps — devolved MCA allocations (England, 2026-27, est.)	£180,000,000	£180,000,000	£18,000,000	DWP, Skills Bootcamps funding allocations 2026-27. Total allocations to MCAs estimated at ~£180m (England total Skills Bootcamps budget less non-devolved areas). Actual per-MCA allocations vary significantly from historical spend. Source: DWP S31 grant determination letters 2026-27.
TOTAL FUNDING MADE CONDITIONAL (leverage)	£207,000,000			

F. SUMMARY — THREE-YEAR PUBLIC SECTOR COST (Yr 0 build + Yr 1–2 operation)

Component	Yr 0 / one-off (£)	Annual (£)	2-yr total (£)	Notes
Register setup (all MCAs)	£570,000	£96,000	£762,000	
Evidence Hub (central)	£322,000	£46,000	£414,000	
MCA admin (all MCAs, annual)	£0	£621,216	£1,242,432	
TOTAL PUBLIC SECTOR COST (3-year)			£2,418,432	

Note: employer administrative burden (Section D) is a COST TO BUSINESS, not a public sector cost — it is shown separately and should be reported in the Business Impact Assessment, not added to the public sector total.

2. Forecasted Outcomes

- At the policy minimum, the floor-level employment outcome is 2,500 verified hires annually. The product of 100 employers per MCA, 5 interview candidates each, a 50% hire rate, and 10 participating MCAs. This is an arithmetically derived floor, not a forecast of likely performance.
- Of those 2,500 verified hires, approximately 2,125 are reportable through the Evidence Hub at the 85% data completeness assumption, meaning around 375 actual hires will occur but cannot be verified and attributed in annual published statistics.
- Wages are disaggregated by MCA, with the Greater London Authority applying a 25% wage premium and all nine non-London MCAs applying a 12% regional discount to the national ASHE 2025 digital occupation median. The total annual wage bill from verified hires across all MCAs is approximately £107 million.
- GVA is modelled using the wage-based proxy as a conservative floor, consistent with methodology used throughout this model series. As an upper-bound comparator, the Digital and Technologies Sector Plan published by DSIT in 2026 records GVA per employee in the digital sector at £119,000, which is 53% above the UK average. This multiplier is presented as contextual evidence, not as the recommended calculation method for this appraisal.
- Approximately 55% of verified hires are assumed to fill previously unfilled roles rather than replace attrition, based on Skills Bootcamps evidence that a significant proportion of placements represent genuinely new headcount. These represent the employer growth impact: organisations that could not grow due to digital talent shortages. A barrier referenced in the RFP evidence as affecting over 40% of organisations are now able to fill vacancies they could not otherwise recruit for.

Table 10: Forecasted Outcomes

Forecasted Outcomes — Employment, Wages, GVA & Employer Growth				
A. FLOOR-LEVEL EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES (policy minimum arithmetic)				
Item	Value	Source / formula		
Interview commitments per MCA (100 employers × 5 candidates)	500	From Assumptions Framework — policy minimum		
Verified hires per MCA at 50% hire rate (central, policy minimum)	250	Interview commitments × verified hire rate		
Total verified hires, all MCAs (central scenario)	2,500	Per-MCA hires × number of MCAs		
Evidence Hub reportable hires (adjusted for 85% data completeness)	2,125	Total hires × Hub completeness rate — this is what can actually be VERIFIED and published		
B. WAGE OUTCOMES — REGIONAL DISAGGREGATION BY MCA				
MCA	Hires (central scenario)	Assumed median wage (£)	Annual wage bill (£)	Note
Greater London Authority	250	£58,500	£14,625,000	London premium applied (+25% vs national median)
Greater Manchester	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
West Midlands	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
West Yorkshire	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
South Yorkshire	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
Liverpool City Region	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
North East	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
Cambridgeshire & Peterborough	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
Tees Valley	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
West of England	250	£41,184	£10,296,000	Non-London MCA: national median × (1-12%) discount applied
TOTAL annual wage bill — verified hires (all MCAs)	2,500		£107,289,000	Sum of MCA wage bills
C. GVA CONTRIBUTION (GREEN BOOK METHODOLOGY)				
Green Book appraisal: labour income (wages) is used as a proxy for GVA contribution per worker, consistent with approach in companion models. Digital & Technologies Sector Plan (DSIT, 2026) reports digital sector GVA per employee at £119,000 in 2024 (53% above UK average). This is used as an upper-bound comparator; wage-based GVA is the conservative floor.				
GVA measure	Value (£)	Source		
Conservative: wage-based GVA proxy (= total annual wage bill of verified hires)	£107,289,000	GVA estimated as annual labour income — conservative floor		
ONS GVA multiplier for digital/IT sector (ratio to national average GVA per worker)	153.0%	DSIT Digital & Technologies Sector Plan (2026): "GVA per employee £119,000 in 2024 (53% higher than UK average)." UK average GVA per worker ~£78,000 (ONS productivity data 2024). Ratio = 119,000/78,000 ≈ 1.53.		
Central GVA estimate (wage proxy × digital sector multiplier)	£164,152,170	Product of wage-proxy GVA and sector multiplier — upper bound for this methodology.		
D. EMPLOYER GROWTH — FILLING PREVIOUSLY UNFILLED DIGITAL ROLES				
RFP evidence cited in the recommendation states >40% of organisations cannot grow due to digital talent shortages. This section models the output gain from employers filling previously unfilled roles. This is a QUALITATIVE / QUANTIFIABLE benefit per Green Book classification — the model provides a structured approach but not a monetised figure.				
Item	Value	Source / notes		
Proportion of verified hires filling PREVIOUSLY UNFILLED roles (vs replacing attrition)	55.0%	Modelling assumption. Skills Bootcamps evidence suggests a significant proportion of placements represent genuinely new roles rather than replacement hires; 55% is an illustrative central estimate. Should be validated through employer survey follow-up once Register is live.		
Hires filling previously unfilled roles (derived)	1,375	Total verified hires × proportion filling new roles		
Estimated productivity gain per filled role (output uplift over vacancy period)	Not monetised — qualitative	The Green Book (para 6.28) permits qualitative treatment where monetisation is premature. A conservative monetised range would apply median digital sector productivity (£119,000 GVA/worker/year per DSIT) to the vacancy duration, but this requires vacancy duration data not yet available at MCA level.		

3. Exchequer Impacts

- Each verified hire generates approximately £8,497 in additional income tax and employee National Insurance annually, applied to the wage uplift above the personal allowance of £12,570 using the 2025/26 basic rate of 20% and employee NI main band of 8%. Across 2,500 verified hires, this produces approximately £21 million in additional annual tax receipts.

- Benefit savings are modelled as a one-off year-one saving per verified hire, using the same UC standard allowance, Local Housing Allowance, and Council Tax Reduction basket from the companion cost-of-inaction model. Each hire generates approximately £9,361 in avoided benefit expenditure over a 9-month displacement period, totalling approximately £23 million across the full cohort.
- The Register is estimated to improve the Skills Bootcamp employment conversion rate from a baseline of 75% (the figure recorded in the GLA Wave 6 decision document of March 2025) to approximately 82% with employer commitments in place, reducing the cost per positive outcome from around £4,203 to £3,844. This 7% uplift is a modelling assumption that requires evaluation evidence to confirm.
- Deadweight is not applied to the headline figures, consistent with the approach taken in the companion reskilling models. The deadweight framework identifies two key drivers: 40% of committed employers are assumed to already hire from reskilling programmes and represent near-pure deadweight; 60% are genuinely new to this hiring channel. Applying a further 75% additionality rate to the new-to-channel employers produces a net additionality rate of 45% and approximately 1,125 genuinely additional verified hires after deadweight adjustment.

Table 11: Exchequer Impacts

Exchequer Impacts — Tax, Benefit Savings, ASF Efficiency, Deadweight				
A. ADDITIONAL TAX RECEIPTS — VERIFIED HIRES				
Item	Per hire (£/yr)	All hires (£/yr)	Source / notes	
Blended median annual wage of verified hire (from Forecasted Outcomes)	£42,916		Weighted blended MCA wage	
Income tax on earnings above personal allowance (£12,570)	£6,069		20% basic rate; full-time median wage well below £50,270 higher-rate threshold	
Employee NI contribution (8% on earnings above threshold)	£2,428		2025/26 employee NI main band 8%	
Total additional tax & NI per verified hire per year	£8,497	£21,241,920	Per hire × total verified hires	
B. BENEFIT SAVINGS — UC & JOBSEEKER PAYMENTS AVOIDED				
Participants who secure a verified hire through the Register are assumed to exit UC / jobseeker status. This uses the same benefit basket as the cost-of-inaction model for consistency: UC standard allowance + LHA + Council Tax Reduction. The saving is one-off per cohort (9-month displacement duration avoided), not recurring annually.				
Benefit component avoided	Monthly (£)	Per hire saving (9 months)	Source	
UC standard allowance, single 25+ (2025/26)	£400.14	£3,601	DWP benefit rates 2025/26	
Local Housing Allowance (avg 1-bed, England)	£450.00	£4,050	VOA LHA tables 2025/26	
Council Tax Reduction (100% assumed, Band D annual / 12)	£190.00	£1,710	MHCLG council tax stats 2025/26	
TOTAL benefit saving per hire (one-off)		£9,361		
TOTAL benefit saving — all verified hires (one-off, year 1)		£23,403,150	Applied in year 1 only — one-off avoidance	
C. ADULT SKILLS FUND EFFICIENCY — COST-PER-JOB-OUTCOME IMPROVEMENT				
The Register conditions co-funding on employer commitment, creating a direct incentive for Skills Bootcamp providers to focus on learners who have realistic job prospects. This may improve the employment conversion rate of existing ASF/Skills Bootcamp spend — reducing the cost-per-job-outcome metric without increasing total expenditure.				
Item	Baseline (no Register)	With Register	Improvement	Source / notes
Skills Bootcamp positive outcome rate (within 6 months)	75.0%	82.0%	7.0%	Baseline 75% from GLA Wave 6 decision (March 2025): 'at least 75% of completers will have a positive outcome within 6 months'. With Register: assumed 82% (conditional employer commitment creates pull-through incentive). This 7pp uplift is a modelling assumption requiring evaluation evidence to confirm.
Cost per positive outcome — Skills Bootcamps	£4,203	£3,844	£359	Cost per learner / outcome rate. Using £3,152 per learner (GLA Wave 6). Lower = more efficient.



D. DEADWEIGHT ADJUSTMENT

Deadweight = proportion of verified hires that would have occurred even without the Register. As in the companion exchequer impact model, no blanket deadweight figure is applied in the main model — but the key parameters driving it are identified here. A 30% deadweight assumption (mid-range for UK active labour market programmes per DWP/What Works Centre evaluations) is tested as a sensitivity.

Deadweight driver	Share of deadweight (modelling assumption)	Notes
Employers already hiring from reskilling programmes (per Assumptions Framework)	40.0%	40% of committed employers already hire this way — their commitments are near-pure deadweight.
Employers genuinely new to this hiring channel	60.0%	60% are genuinely new — their hires are additionality candidates, subject to further attribution analysis.
Net additionality rate (central estimate — genuinely new employers × assumption they wouldn't have hired otherwise)	45.0%	75% of genuinely new employers assumed to represent genuine additionality (some would have hired from other routes even without the Register). Modelling judgement.
Adjusted verified hires (net of deadweight)	1,125	The number of genuinely additional outcomes after deadweight adjustment.

4. Scenarios and Sensitivity

- The low scenario assumes 8 MCAs participate, 70 employers are recruited per MCA, and the verified hire rate falls to 35%, reflecting employer reluctance to formalise commitments and capacity constraints in smaller MCA economies such as Tees Valley and West of England. The high scenario assumes 12 MCAs qualify by 2028, 130 employers per MCA exceed the minimum threshold through reputational incentive, and a hire rate of 65% is achieved, consistent with the upper range of Skills Bootcamps outcomes data.
- The derived outcome range runs from approximately 875 verified hires annually in the low scenario to approximately 5,525 in the high scenario, with the central policy-minimum floor of 2,500. Annual Exchequer tax receipts range from approximately £8 million to approximately £47 million across these scenarios.
- The verified hire rate is the single most sensitive variable in the model: a 15% swing above or below the 50% central case produces approximately a 30% change in every downstream outcome and Exchequer metric. It should be tested at 35%, 50%, and 65% in any challenge function review.
- The number of participating MCAs is the second most sensitive variable, with each additional or lost MCA representing a proportional 10% change in all national aggregates. The wage level of roles entered is the third, affecting Exchequer tax receipts more than employment counts.
- Evidence Hub data completeness affects only what can be verified and published, not actual employment outcomes. At 70% completeness, nearly a third of real hires would be invisible in public annual statistics, which has implications for the policy's accountability mechanism and the credibility of the annual register as a performance measure.
- The deadweight and additionality rate is the hardest parameter to observe without longitudinal employer survey data and requires an evaluation design to be built into the programme from launch rather than attempted retrospectively.

Table 12: Central / Low / High Scenarios & Sensitivity Testing

Central / Low / High Scenarios & Sensitivity Testing				
Parameter	Low scenario	Central scenario	High scenario	Notes
Number of MCAs participating	8	10	12	Low: 2 MCAs fail to meet conditions or challenged legally. High: 2 additional MCAs from devolution pipeline qualify by 2028.
Employers recruited per MCA	70	100	130	Low: smaller MCAs (Tees Valley, West of England) struggle to recruit 100 employers. High: reputational incentive drives over-commitment.
Verified hire rate	35.0%	50.0%	65.0%	Low: employer reluctance to hire untested programme graduates; economic slowdown reduces vacancies. Central: policy minimum. High: Skills Bootcamp evidence suggests 75% positive outcomes are achievable — 65% verified hire is conservative optimism.
Proportion of hires genuinely additional (net additionality)	35.0%	45.0%	60.0%	Low: majority of committed employers were already hiring from reskilling routes (high deadweight). High: Register successfully brings in genuinely new employers
Evidence Hub data completeness	70.0%	85.0%	95.0%	Low: significant MCA capacity variation; smaller MCAs struggle to return complete data. High: robust central support infrastructure.
Blended wage of digital roles (£)	£38,000	(£0)	£55,000	Low: entry-level digital roles (junior developer, data assistant) at lower end of pay range. High: mid-career digital roles / premium tech occupations.
DERIVED OUTCOME RANGES ACROSS SCENARIOS				
Outcome metric	Low scenario	Central scenario	High scenario	Calculation basis
Total interview commitments (MCAs × employers × 5 candidates)	123	£42,916	423	Direct policy arithmetic
Total verified hires (central: floor-level policy outcome)	43	2,500	254	Interview commitments × hire rate
Net additional hires (after deadweight)	30	1,125	241	Total hires × additionality rate
Annual tax & NI from verified hires (£)	-	£21,241,920	-	Tax + NI on wage above personal allowance
KEY SENSITIVITIES — VARIABLES THE MODEL IS MOST SENSITIVE TO				
<i>In order of model sensitivity (ranked by impact on total verified hires and annual Exchequer tax receipt):</i>				
Rank	Variable	Why it matters	Recommended action	
1st	Verified hire rate	50% central → ±15pp swing = ±30% change in total verified hires	Most sensitive — test at 35%/50%/65%	
2nd	Number of participating MCAs	±2 MCAs = ±20% change in all national-level outcomes	Material — test at 8/10/12 MCAs	
3rd	Wage level of roles entered	±£8,000 annual wage = ±£2,000 in annual tax receipt per hire	Moderate — test at £38k/blended/£55k	
4th	Evidence Hub completeness	Affects reportable (verifiable) hires only — does not affect actual outcomes	Affects verification, not outcomes — test at 70%/85%/95%	
5th	Deadweight / additionality rate	Moving from 35% to 60% net additionality materially changes the value-for-money case	[Text cut off at bottom of source image — please confirm the recommended action for this row]	

5. Assumptions Framework

- The model covers 10 Mayoral Strategic Authorities currently receiving devolved Adult Skills Fund and Skills Bootcamp funding, sourced from the House of Commons Library and the 2026-27 S31 grant determination letters. The central assumption is 100% MCA

participation, justified by the coercive policy mechanism: any MCA wishing to retain TechLocal or Skills Bootcamp income must comply.

- The policy minimum thresholds are fixed inputs from the recommendation itself. 100 committed employers per MCA, 5 interview candidates each, producing 500 interview commitments per MCA and 5,000 nationally.
- The verified hire rate is set at 50% as the central case, anchored to the policy floor. Skills Bootcamps Wave 6 outcomes data from the GLA records a 75% positive outcome rate for completers within 6 months, suggesting 50% is a conservative rather than optimistic threshold.
- Wages for digital roles are modelled using ONS ASHE April 2025 data, with a 12% regional discount applied to non-London MCAs and a 25% premium for the GLA, producing a weighted blended wage of approximately £42,900 across all 10 MCAs.
- The Skills Bootcamps employer co-funding rates are sourced from the Wave 6 guidance: large employers contribute 30% of training costs and SMEs contribute 10%, producing a blended employer co-funding rate of 16% based on an assumed 70/30 SME-to-large employer split.
- A 60% new-employer rate is assumed, meaning 60% of committed employers are genuinely new to hiring from reskilling programmes which drives the additionality calculation in the Exchequer Impacts sheet.
- Evidence Hub data completeness is assumed at 85% centrally, meaning around 15% of actual verified hires may not be countable in public reporting in any given year.

Table 13: Employer Commitment register – Assumptions Framework

Employer Commitment Register — Assumptions Framework By 2028			
<i>Recommendation: Each MCA receiving Adult Skills Fund publishes an annual Employer Commitment Register as a condition of TechLocal / Skills Bootcamp co-funding. Min 100 employers per MCA, 5 interview commitments each, 50% verified hire rate within 12 months, tracked through National Workforce Transition Evidence Hub.</i>			
Proportion of qualifying MCAs assumed to participate at 2028 launch (central assumption)	100.0%	Modelling assumption — the recommendation conditions co-funding access on participation, creating a near-mandatory incentive for any MCA wishing to retain TechLocal/Skills Bootcamp income.	100% participation is the central assumption because the payment mechanism (loss of co-funding if non-compliant) is coercive rather than voluntary. The low scenario tests 80% participation (8 MCAs) to reflect capacity constraints or legal challenge. High scenario tests all future MCAs eligible by 2028 (up to 12).
Number of MCAs in model (derived)	10	Derived from above	
B. MCA EMPLOYER RECRUITMENT & COMMITMENT THRESHOLDS			
Input	Value	Source / basis	Notes
Minimum committed employers per MCA (policy threshold)	100	Stated in recommendation text	This is the policy floor, not a forecast. The low scenario assumes only 70 employers per MCA (shortage of employers willing to commit formally in smaller economy MCAs such as Tees Valley or West of England). High scenario tests 130 per MCA.
Interview commitments per employer (policy minimum)	5	Stated in recommendation text	Fixed at 5 across all scenarios — this is a policy design parameter, not an empirical estimate.
Total interview commitments per MCA (derived)	500	Derived	
Verified hire rate — central assumption (policy minimum)	50.0%	Stated in recommendation text — 50% of commitments must result in a verified hire within 12 months.	50% is the policy floor. Skills Bootcamp Wave 6 outcomes data (GLA Wave 6 decision document, March 2025) records a 75% positive outcome rate for completers within 6 months — suggesting 50% verified hires is a conservative floor. Low scenario tests down to 35%, high scenario tests up to 65%.
Proportion of committed employers assumed genuinely new to hiring from reskilling programmes	60.0%	Modelling assumption — no published data source specifically measures this.	This matters for deadweight: the 40% already hiring from reskilling routes would likely do so without the Register (pure deadweight). The 60% genuinely new to this hiring channel drives the additionality estimate in Sheet 5. Should be validated through MCA employer surveys once Register is live.



**THE
GLOBAL
CITY**

**WOMEN
PIVOTING
TO DIGITAL TASKFORCE**

C. TIME HORIZON & DISCOUNTING			
Input	Value	Source / basis	Notes
Appraisal time horizon (years from 2028 implementation)	1000.00%	Green Book (2026), para 6.11: '10 years as a standard measure for all other proposals'.	The Register is an ongoing annual obligation, not a time-limited programme. 10 years is the Green Book default for non-infrastructure proposals. A longer horizon (15 years) could be run as a sensitivity given the policy is intended to persist as an ASF condition.
Social Time Preference Rate (Green Book discount rate)	3.50%	Green Book (2026), para 6.54: '3.50% in real terms for years 1 to 30'	Applied to all years in this model, consistent with prior reskilling programme appraisals in this series.
First year of operation	2028	Stated in recommendation text	Costs in year 0 (2027) = build/setup; benefits accrue in 2028.
D. WAGE LEVEL OF DIGITAL ROLES ENTERED THROUGH THE REGISTER			
Input	Value	Source / basis	Notes
National median annual earnings — IT & Telecommunications occupations (SOC major group 11/21, full-time)	£46,800	ONS ASHE 2025 (released Oct 2025), Table 2 (occupation by 2-digit SOC). IT directors: £86,033; software developers and programmers broadly: ~£52,000–56,000 median; digital roles at entry-level: lower. £46,800 is an estimated composite for Level 3–5 digital roles consistent with Skills Bootcamp target occupations.	This is an illustrative composite — precise figures require SOC-specific ASHE Table 14 data for the specific digital occupations targeted by the Register. Regional variation is captured separately below. ASHE Table 3 (region by 2-digit SOC) is the correct source for MCA-level disaggregation once dashboard occupational pairings are known.
Regional wage discount applied to non-London MCAs (relative to national median)	-12.0%	House of Commons Library, 'Average earnings by age and region', ASHE 2025: median weekly pay was highest in London and lowest in North Region. Gap between London and Northern regions broadly 20–25%; for tech roles outside London, typical discount vs national median ~10–15%.	Applied to all non-London MCAs. London (GLA) uses national median or a premium; all others apply this discount. Produces a blended figure used in sensitivity testing — a proper model should assign SOC-specific regional medians from ASHE Table 15 per MCA.
Blended national median wage for verified hires (non-GLA MCAs, derived)	£41,184	Derived from above	
Wage for GLA / London verified hires	£58,500	London premium ~25% above national regional median (House of Commons Library, ASHE 2025 regional data)	
Weighted blended wage across all MCAs (1 London MCA, 9 non-London, derived)	£42,916	Weighted average: 1 GLA out of 10 MCAs	Used as the central wage assumption throughout the costing and outcome models.
E. SKILLS BOOTCAMPS CO-FUNDING LEVERAGE			
Input	Value	Source / basis	Notes
Average Skills Bootcamp cost per learner	£3,152	GLA MD3344 Skills Bootcamps Wave Six (March 2025): 'minimum of 7,704 learner starts at an average cost per learner of no more than £3,152.'	This is the GLA Wave 6 average. DSIT internal data shows similar ranges nationally. Used as the central estimate for cost-per-place conditioned on employer commitment.
Employer co-funding rate — large employers (Skills Bootcamps)	30.0%	Skills Bootcamps Wave 6 (Hull City Council FAQ, 2025): 'Large employers contribute 30% of the cost'	Applies when a larger employer (250+ staff) is training its own employees through a bootcamp. When a bootcamp serves unemployed/new-hire participants (the typical Register use case), employer co-funding typically does not apply — full cost falls on Government. This rate is therefore relevant to the co-funding leverage calculation only where commitments involve existing-employee upskilling.
Employer co-funding rate — SMEs	10.0%	Skills Bootcamps Wave 6 guidance: 'small or medium employers (SMEs) contribute 10%'	Most committed employers under the Register will be SMEs. For the Register's hire-from-unemployment/reskilling use case, co-funding applies differently — see notes on co-funding conditions in Sheet 3.
Proportion of committed employers estimated as large employers (250+ staff)	30.0%	Modelling assumption — no Register-specific data. DBT business population estimates suggest a small minority nationally (~1% of firms) but account for a large share of tech-sector hiring.	70% SME / 30% large employer split for blended co-funding rate calculation.
Blended employer co-funding rate (derived)	16.0%	Derived	
F. EVIDENCE HUB DATA QUALITY ASSUMPTIONS			
Input	Value	Source / basis	Notes
Assumed completeness of verified hire data returned to Evidence Hub (central)	85.0%	Modelling assumption — no UK precedent for a national skills outcomes database at this scale. DWP's claimant hire completeness (source: DWP statistics methodology notes) is used as an analogy; 85% completeness is considered good performance for a newly-established admin system.	This parameter affects how many verified hires are actually counted and reported through the headline outcome. At 85% completeness: 15% of actual hires may not be verifiable in the system. Low scenario assumes 70% completeness (significant MCA capacity variation); high scenario assumes 95%.
Lag between hire event and data entry in Evidence Hub (months)	3	Modelling assumption, consistent with DWP benefit data reporting lags and typical HR system reporting cycles.	Does not affect the headline employment outcome counts, but relevant to the timing of verified reporting relevant for annual publication schedules.

4. Recommendation under appraisal

“By 2028, Government should offer 300 SMEs a £7,500-10,000 wage subsidy through committing to hire a Tech First Women's Programme participant, with at least 60% of placements converting to permanent roles at month six.”

1. Policy-Level Costings

- The gross maximum subsidy if all 255 placements converted would be £2.55 million, but the model recommends a pay-on-conversion design. Payment only when the 6-month permanent role is verified via HMRC PAYE, reducing the actual subsidy paid to approximately £1.84 million at the 72% central conversion rate.
- Conditionality verification (an outcome tracking officer at 0.2 FTE SEO plus a per-placement gateway administration fee of £2,500, benchmarked against Kickstart's £360 per participant gateway fee scaled up for a higher-value scheme) adds approximately £650,000 annually. A surprisingly large overhead relative to the subsidy itself, driven by the per-placement admin cost assumption which should be stress-tested.
- Programme administration is estimated at 10% of actual subsidy paid, a conservative rate below Kickstart's observed 16% overhead, adding approximately £184,000.
- Total year-1 Exchequer outlay across subsidy, verification, and administration is approximately £2.67 million. This is the figure against which all returns are measured.
- The conditionality cost is the most scrutinisable line in this sheet: the £2,500 per-placement admin figure is a professional judgement rather than a sourced rate. If a lighter-touch verification mechanism (e.g. automated HMRC PAYE cross-check analogous to the existing Kickstart model) can bring this to £360–500, total outlay drops by approximately £500,000.

Table 14: Policy-Level Costings

Policy-Level Costings — Gross Subsidy, Administration & Programme Overhead			
A. GROSS SUBSIDY COST			
Item	Value	Source / notes	
Total subsidised SME placements (from Assumptions Framework)	255	300 × 85% = 255 placements	
Subsidy per placement (£)	£10,000	£10,000 maximum per placement	
GROSS MAXIMUM SUBSIDY COST (all placements, before conversion conditionality)	£2,550,000	At 255 placements × £10,000 = £2.55m. Maximum total if all placements paid regardless of conversion.	
Number converting to permanent role at month 6 — central scenario	184	255 × 72% central conversion = 184 subsidised permanent placements	
ACTUAL SUBSIDY PAID (only on confirmed conversions at month 6)	£1,836,000	Subsidy paid only on verified conversions — reduces net cost vs gross maximum	
B. CONDITIONALITY VERIFICATION COST			
Item	Unit cost (£)	Total (£)	Source / notes
Staff cost: outcome tracking officer (0.2 FTE SEO × 12 months — chasing 6-month verification returns, HMRC PAYE cross-check)	£12,654	£12,654	0.2 FTE SEO at DSIT/DWP pay midpoint £44,000 + 43.8% on-costs. Verification involves: contacting SMEs at month 5, cross-referencing against HMRC PAYE RTI data (analogous to DWP Kickstart verification: 'every 30 days we use information from HMRC to check the young person is being paid through PAYE' — GOV.UK Kickstart guidance). Annual recurring cost.
Designated body administration overhead (gateway function — processing applications, payments to SMEs, record management)	£2,500	£637,500	Per-placement administration estimate analogous to Kickstart gateway fee: £360 per placement (GOV.UK Kickstart guidance). For a more complex, higher-value scheme with outcome verification, £2,500 per placement is used. Total admin = £2,500 × 255 placements.
TOTAL CONDITIONALITY COST (annual)		£650,154	
C. PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION OVERHEAD — BENCHMARKED AGAINST KICKSTART			
Kickstart benchmark (NAO, 2021; Committee of Public Accounts, 2022): £1.9bn budget for ~163,000 placements = £11,656 per participant total cost. Admin cost element (£360 gateway + £1,500 setup = £1,860) represented ~16% of per-participant cost. Applying 10% overhead to gross subsidy spend (a conservative benchmark, lower than Kickstart given smaller scheme with simpler eligibility).			
Item	Rate	Total (£)	Source / notes
Programme administration (application processing, payments, outcome tracking system)	10.0%	£183,600	10% of actual subsidy paid. Kickstart achieved ~16% admin overhead — 10% is conservative for smaller, better-targeted scheme.
D. TOTAL EXCHEQUER OUTLAY — THREE-YEAR SUMMARY			
Component	Year 1 (£)	Year 2 (£)	Notes
Gross subsidy paid (on verified conversions, year 1 cohort only)	£1,836,000	-	One-off capital outlay in year 1 when conversions verified at month 6
Conditionality verification cost	£650,154	£650,154	Annual recurring — ongoing for each year's cohort
Programme administration overhead	£183,600	-	One-off for year 1 cohort
TOTAL EXCHEQUER OUTLAY	£2,669,754	£650,154	

2. Forecasted Outcomes

- The floor-level employment outcome is 138 net genuinely additional sustained jobs — 255 placements multiplied by the 72% conversion rate, then adjusted downward by the 25% deadweight assumption to isolate jobs that would not have existed without the subsidy.
- Cumulative wage income from those 138 women over five years is approximately £15 million, with wages growing at 3.5% annually and a declining retention profile that reduces the cohort from 138 in year 1 to roughly 69 by year 5.
- GVA is modelled using two methods: a conservative wage-based proxy of approximately £15 million over five years, and an upper-bound digital sector multiplier of approximately

£82 million applying the DSIT figure of £119,000 GVA per digital sector employee. The wage proxy is the recommended figure, the multiplier almost certainly overstates the contribution of entry-level SME placements, which are unlikely to match the productivity of frontier-tech firms that dominate the sector average.

- The SME growth effect (the output gain from filling previously unfilled digital roles in businesses that could not previously attract tech talent) is treated as a qualitative benefit rather than a monetised figure, consistent with Green Book paragraph 6.28. However, the model notes that if each of the 184 converting SMEs achieved even 1% additional annual revenue from unlocked digital capability, the aggregate gain across the cohort would be approximately £2.8 million, roughly equal to the entire gross subsidy cost. This is contextual framing, not a model output.

Table 15: Forecasted Outcomes – Employment, Wages, GVA, SME Growth

Forecasted Outcomes — Employment, Wages, GVA, SME Growth			
A. EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES — CENTRAL			
Item	Value	Source / formula	
Subsidised SME placements (central)	255	255 placements	
Sustained employment at month 6 (72% conversion, central)	184	Key metric — genuine permanent roles	
Net additional sustained jobs (after 25% deadweight)	138	Genuinely additional outcomes	
Proportion remaining in employment at year 3 (retention assumption)	80.0%	Modelling assumption — 20% attrition over 3 years. Low: 65%. High: 90%.	
Net additional jobs still in post at year 3 (derived)	110	Net additional × retention rate	
Cumulative person-years of additional employment over 5-year horizon (derived)	496	Declining retention: 100% yr1, 80% yr2, 70% yr3, 60% yr4, 50% yr5. Approximation.	
B. WAGES — CUMULATIVE EARNINGS OVER 5-			
Year	Net additional women employed	Annual wage (£)	Annual wage income (£)
Year 1	138	£28,500	£3,924,450
Year 2	110	£29,498	£3,249,445
Year 3	96	£30,530	£2,942,778
Year 4	83	£31,598	£2,610,230
Year 5	69	£32,704	£2,250,423
TOTAL CUMULATIVE WAGE INCOME — 5 years, net additional women			£14,977,325
C. GVA CONTRIBUTION			
GVA is estimated using two methods: (1) wage proxy — conservative floor, consistent with prior models. (2) Digital sector GVA multiplier — upper bound using DSIT Digital & Technologies Sector Plan 2026 figure of £119,000 GVA per employee (53% above UK average). For an entry-level role in an SME context, the multiplier approach likely overstates individual contribution; the wage proxy is the recommended method.			
Item	Annual (£)	5-year total (£)	Notes
Annual GVA — wage proxy (net additional women × starting wage)	£3,924,450	£14,977,325	Conservative floor — wages as proxy for worker's marginal GVA contribution
Annual GVA — digital sector multiplier (net additional women × £119,000 sector GVA/employee)	£16,386,300	£81,931,500	Upper bound — sector average includes highly productive firms not typical of SME entry-level context
D. SME GROWTH EFFECT — EMPLOYER OUTPUT			
The recommendation references RFP evidence that >40% of organisations cannot grow due to digital talent shortages. For the 184 SMEs that convert to permanent employment (central scenario), filling a previously unfilled digital role may unlock broader hiring or revenue growth. This is modelled as a qualitative benefit — not monetised in the main model — consistent with Green Book para 6.28 (qualitative treatment where monetisation is premature). If each SME achieves even 1% additional annual revenue from unlocked digital capability, and typical UK SME turnover is ~£1.5m, the aggregate annual revenue gain across 184 SMEs would be approximately £2.8m — roughly equal to the entire gross subsidy cost. This is contextual evidence, not a model output.			



3. Exchequer Impacts

- Five-year discounted income tax and employee National Insurance from the 138 net additional women generates approximately £2.2 million, applied at the standard 20% basic rate and 8% employee NI main band on earnings above the £12,570 personal allowance.
- Employer National Insurance at 15% on salaries above the £5,000 secondary threshold contributes a further approximately £1.8 million to the Exchequer over the same period. This is an often-overlooked inflow that meaningfully improves the net cost calculation.
- Benefit savings of approximately £430,000 are estimated from UC standard allowance, Local Housing Allowance, and Council Tax Reduction avoided for the 50% of participants assumed to have been on UC or out of work before placement, over a 6-month displacement period. This assumption (that half the participants were on benefits) is a placeholder with no programme-specific evidence to support it and should be the first thing validated from intake data once the programme launches.
- Total five-year discounted Exchequer returns of approximately £4.4 million against a gross outlay of approximately £2.67 million leaves a **net Exchequer cost of approximately £1.7 million**, meaning the government does not fully recover the £10,000 subsidy within five years at central assumptions. The net cost per sustained additional job is approximately **£12,300** higher than Kickstart's ~£7,000 per participant, but on a significantly higher-paid cohort generating stronger per-head annual returns that accumulate more favourably over longer timeframes.

Table 16: Exchequer Impacts — Tax, Employer NI, Benefit Savings, Net Cost per Job

Exchequer Impacts — Tax, Employer NI, Benefit Savings, Net Cost per Job			
A. ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX & EMPLOYEE NI — 5-YEAR DISCOUNTED TOTAL			
Year	Women in employment (net add.)	Annual tax+NI per woman (£)	Discounted total (£)
Year 1	138	£4,460	£593,427
Year 2	110	£4,740	£487,410
Year 3	96	£5,029	£437,193
Year 4	83	£5,328	£383,542
Year 5	69	£5,638	£326,628
TOTAL employee income tax + NI (discounted, 5 years)			£2,228,199
B. EMPLOYER NATIONAL INSURANCE ON PLACED WOMEN'S SALARIES			
Year	Women in employment	Employer NI per woman (£)	Discounted total (£)
Year 1	138	£3,525	£468,978
Year 2	110	£3,675	£377,882
Year 3	96	£3,829	£332,929
Year 4	83	£3,990	£287,210
Year 5	69	£4,156	£240,767
TOTAL employer NI (discounted, 5 years)			£1,707,765
C. BENEFIT SAVINGS — UC & JOBSSEEKER PAYMENTS AVOIDED			
<i>Applied only to the proportion of women assumed to be out of work or on UC immediately before placement. The TechFirst programme targets both new entrants and women returning after career breaks (GOV.UK March 2026). Benefit saving is modelled as a year-1-only one-off avoided cost for the duration of the placement subsidy period (6 months at month 6 conversion point), using the same UC/benefit basket as prior models in this series.</i>			
Item	Per woman (£)	All net-additional women (£)	Source
Assumed proportion of participants previously on UC/out of work	50.0%		Not a sourced figure — placeholder assumption.
UC standard allowance avoided (single, 25+, 6 months)	£2,401	£165,298	£400.14/month × 6 months = £2,400.84 (DWP benefit rates 2025/26)
LHA avoided (6 months, average 1-bed)	£2,700	£185,895	£450/month × 6 months (VOA LHA rates 2025/26)
Council Tax Reduction (6 months)	£1,140	£78,489	£2,280 annual Band D CT / 12 × 6 months (MHCLG 2025/26)
TOTAL BENEFIT SAVINGS (one-off, year 1, net additional women × [50%])		£429,682	
D. NET EXCHEQUER COST — COST PER JOB SUSTAINED			
Component	5-year NPV (£)	Notes	
Employee income tax + NI receipts	£2,228,199	From Section A	
Employer NI receipts	£1,707,765	From Section B	
Benefit savings (one-off, year 1)	£429,682	From Section C	
Total Exchequer returns (5-year NPV)	£4,365,647		
Gross subsidy outlay (actual paid, pay-on-)	£1,836,000	From Policy-Level Costings Section A	
Administration and conditionality costs	£833,754	Annual conditionality + admin overhead	
NET EXCHEQUER COST (gross outlay – Exchequer)	(£1,695,892)		
NET EXCHEQUER COST PER SUSTAINED JOB (net cost / net additional sustained jobs)	(£12,316)	KEY METRIC: compare this to Kickstart (~£7,000/participant DWP)	

4. Scenarios and Sensitivity

- Wage level is the most sensitive variable in the model: moving from £24,000 (low, data analyst entry level) to £35,000 (high, software developer in demand) changes the annual tax receipt per woman by approximately £3,000 (a 45% swing) and determines whether the scheme generates a surplus or a sustained deficit. At £35,000 and 7-year tenure the scheme returns a small net surplus; at £24,000 and 3-year tenure the net cost approximately doubles.
- Employment duration is the second most sensitive variable, because Exchequer returns accumulate annually while the subsidy cost is one-off. Three years versus seven years of sustained employment roughly doubles cumulative tax and NI receipts, making post-programme retention tracking the single most important evaluation metric.
- Deadweight is the hardest parameter to observe and the most strategically important for policy credibility. At 40% deadweight (the Kickstart comparator level) the scheme's genuine cost per additional job rises to approximately £20,000; at 15% it falls to below £9,000. A comparison group design, tracking non-subsidised TechFirst placements alongside subsidised ones should be built into the programme from launch rather than attempted retrospectively.
- The apprenticeship comparison shows the two routes are cost-comparable at the per-place level. Approximately £7,700 in government co-funding for a non-levy SME digital apprenticeship versus £10,000 for the TechFirst subsidy, but they serve structurally different populations. TechFirst targets already-trained women who need employer connection, not entry-level learners needing in-work training. The higher starting salary (£28,500 vs £24,000 for tech apprentices at SMEs) means TechFirst generates stronger per-head annual Exchequer returns, partially offsetting the higher per-place cost.
- The sensitivity table tests subsidy amount (£7,500 vs £10,000), where a £7,500 subsidy at unchanged conversion and retention reduces gross outlay by £368,000 and improves the cost per sustained job materially. If the policy intent is primarily demonstration effect rather than volume, £7,500 with a hard 6-month conversion condition is likely to deliver near-equivalent employer incentive at lower fiscal cost.

Table 17: Scenarios, Sensitivity Testing & Apprenticeship Comparison

Scenarios, Sensitivity Testing & Apprenticeship Comparison				
Variable	Low	Central	High	Notes
Number of subsidised placements reaching trigger	225	255	285	Low: 75% of 300 go to eligible SMEs. High: 95%.
Conversion to permanent role at month 6 (%)	60.0%	Value	80.0%	Low: policy minimum. High: programme exceeds target through intensive preparation.
Starting salary (£)	£24,000	-	£35,000	Low: data analyst entry (£23-25k). High: software developer/AI in demand SME (£33-37k).
Employment duration (years)	3	1	7	Low: high early attrition. High: strong retention with progression.
Deadweight rate (% of subsidies that would have happened anyway)	40.0%	-	15.0%	Low: high early attrition. High: strong retention with progression.
Subsidy amount per placement (£)	£7,500	£10,000	£10,000	Low: £7,500 (lower bound from recommendation). High: £10,000 maximum.
SENSITIVITY RANKINGS — VARIABLES THE MODEL IS MOST SENSITIVE TO				
Rank	Variable	Why it matters most	Impact direction	Recommended action
1st	Starting wage level	Wage drives ALL Exchequer return calculations (tax, [NI, GVA])	Higher wage → stronger return	Use ASHE Table 14 SOC-specific data for the actual roles placed once programme data is available
2nd	Employment duration (years in post)	Exchequer returns accumulate over time. 3 years vs 7 [years roughly doubles cumulative returns]	Longer tenure → stronger return	Build programme evaluation to track employment outcomes at 12, 24 and 36 months post-conversion
3rd	Deadweight rate	At 40% deadweight (Kickstart [estimate] net additional jobs fall sharply)	Lower deadweight → better value	Include comparison group design (non-subsidised TechFirst placements) from programme launch to allow counterfactual
4th	Conversion rate	Drives the number of subsidies actually paid (pay-[on-conversion])	Higher conversion → more placements but [higher gross outlay]	Monitor conversion data from month 7 HMRC PAYE verification
5th	Subsidy amount (£7,500 vs £10,000)	Within the range in the recommendation, [£7,500 vs £10,000 changes gross outlay by 25%]	Lower subsidy → better net position	Consider £7,500 as default with £10,000 available for hard-to-fill specialist roles
APPRENTICESHIP COMPARISON — IS THE SUBSIDY BETTER VALUE THAN FUNDING AN APPRENTICESHIP?				
This is a structural comparison only — not an empirical equivalence claim. The two schemes serve partially different purposes. TechFirst Women's Programme: targets women with existing skills who need employer connection, not in-work training. Digital apprenticeship: provides structured training + employment, typically for lower-qualified entrants.				
Item	TechFirst wage subsidy (£10,000)	Level 3-4 digital apprenticeship	Notes	
Government cost per participant	£10,000	£7,700 (95% of £8,105 avg. cost [in SME funding band])	Apprenticeship government contribution ~£7,700; TechFirst subsidy £10,000.	
Training element	Pre-supplied (£4m programme [funds training])	Included in the £8,105 funding [band]	TechFirst training already funded separately under £4m programme — the £10,000 is [a wage subsidy only]	
Minimum employer commitment	6 months guaranteed placement + 60% [conversion target]	12 months minimum	Apprenticeship minimum duration reduced to 8 months in 2025 (GOV.UK); TechFirst 6-month [placement is shorter]	
Average starting wage	£28,500 (model central)	£24,000 (SME tech apprentice, Prospects 2026)	TechFirst participants target higher-paid roles (programme for experienced/trained women) vs apprentice entry-level. Higher wage → stronger [Exchequer return]	
Target demographic	Women already skilled, seeking [employer connection]	Any adult (often entry-level)	Different populations — not a direct substitute.	
Employer NI relief	None (employer pays full NI on wages)	Employer NI exempt for apprentices under [25]	Apprenticeship has additional NI savings advantage for under-25 cohort (GOV.UK).	

5. Recommendation under appraisal

“By 2029, the National Workforce Transition Evidence Hub should publish an annual AI Transition Evidence Report using the TechFirst Women's Programme as a pilot that shows conversion rates, progression data, SME barriers, and regional delivery findings”

Summary

- The report requires three people: one HEO Analyst at 50% time, one SEO Report Lead at 60% time, and one G7 Project Lead at 0.3 FTE with 100% of that time attributed to this recommendation. Total effective FTE attributable to the annual AI Transition Evidence Report is approximately 1.4 FTE across three grades.
- Year 1 total cost is approximately £99,300 staff costs (including pension and employer NI) account for £92,300 of this, with non-staff costs of £7,000 covering graphic design, data software, accessibility audit contingency, and regional travel.
- Year 2 onwards the annual cost is approximately £100,500. Marginally higher than year 1 because the 5% staff uplift for additional year-on-year comparison work slightly outweighs the saving from not repeating the first-year design commission.
- The dominant cost driver is the SEO Report Lead's salary and on-costs at 60% FTE, which accounts for approximately 40–45% of total annual cost. The main policy lever for cost reduction is reducing this attribution below 60%, though below approximately 50% the quality and depth of a credible published report become difficult to sustain.
- Cost per data stream is approximately £15,000–£25,000 of staff time, with progression data being the most expensive because there is no automatic data feed and the team must conduct structured employer follow-up to collect it. This cost can be reduced materially if the TechFirst delivery body is required from the programme's outset to supply data in a standardised, machine-readable format.

Table 18: Civil Service Pay Band Reference — Evidence Hub Team (National, Non-London, 2025/26)

Civil Service Pay Band Reference — Evidence Hub Team (National, Non-London, 2025/26)							
Sources: Defra Civil Service Grades page (SEO national min £39,439; G7 national min £52,120; G6 national min £62,605). FOI response 2025-044: HEO Corporate £34,437–£43,886 (avg £37,661); SEO Corporate £40,178–£44,780 (avg £44,251); G7 Corporate £55,789–£66,021 (avg £59,819). IFG civil service pay data: DSIT median salary £55,810. On-costs: alpha pension employer contribution 28.97% (Civil Service Pension Scheme); employer NI 15% on earnings above £5,000 (2025/26).							
A. PAY BAND MIDPOINTS & ON-COSTS (NATIONAL RATES)							
Grade	Role in Hub	Salary min (£)	Salary max (£)	Midpoint (£)	Pension 28.97% (£)	Employer NI 15% (£)	Total employment cost (£)
HEO	Analyst (data collection, cleaning, drafting support)	£34,437	£43,886	£39,162	£11,345	£5,124	£55,631
SEO	Senior Analyst / Report Lead (lead drafter, methodology, stakeholder liaison)	£40,178	£49,887	£45,033	£13,046	£6,005	£64,083
G7	Project Lead / Head of Evidence (part-time; senior sign-off, external liaison, quality assurance)	£55,789	£66,021	£60,905	£17,644	£8,386	£86,935



B. ON-COST EXPLANATION		
On-cost item	Rate	Notes
Employer pension (alpha scheme)	28.97% of pensionable pay	Civil Service Pension Scheme — alpha employer contribution rate. Used consistently throughout this series of models. This is the largest on-cost item and significantly exceeds typical private-sector pension contributions.
Employer National Insurance	15% on earnings above £5,000/year	2025/26 rate following April 2025 increase from 13.8% to 15%, with secondary threshold lowered to £5,000/year. Source: GOV.UK 'Rates and thresholds for employers 2025/26'.
Total on-cost multiplier (approximate)	~43–44% of base salary	Derived: pension (28.97%) + NI (effective ~14% at these salary levels) ≈ 43%. This means each £1 of salary costs the Exchequer approximately £1.43 in total employment cost.

Table 19: FTE Requirements & Time Allocation — Annual AI Transition Evidence Report

FTE Requirements & Time Allocation — Annual AI Transition Evidence Report					
A. TEAM STRUCTURE — WHO IS NEEDED AND WHY					
Role	Grade	FTE (total)	% time on Report	Effective FTE for Report	Rationale
Analyst — Data Collection & Processing	HEO	1.00	50.0%	0.50	Leads data collection from the four streams (conversion rates, progression data, SME barriers, regional findings). Handles cleaning, quality assurance, and liaison with TechFirst delivery body. 50% time attribution: remaining 50% covers other Hub functions (stakeholder queries, ad hoc briefings, mid-year updates).
Senior Analyst / Report Lead	SEO	1.00	60.0%	0.60	Owns the report narrative, methodology, and final draft. Manages internal review process. Leads on resolving data gaps with TechFirst delivery partner. 60% time attribution: a published annual report of this type requires sustained lead effort, more than a typical policy paper.
Project Lead	G7	0.30	100.0%	0.30	0.3 FTE (approximately 1.5 days/week across the year). Full time attributed to the Report — at G7 level this is a dedicated oversight role rather than a shared function. Responsibilities: quality assurance, ministerial/senior sign-off coordination, external stakeholder relations, response to post-publication queries. Would not typically have other Hub functions at this fraction.
TOTAL EFFECTIVE FTE ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE REPORT				1.40	
B. WORKING DAYS BUDGET — HOW TIME BREAKS DOWN ACROSS THE ANNUAL CYCLE					
Workstream	HEO days	SEO days	G7 days	Total days	Notes
Data collection from TechFirst delivery body (structured data request, formats, follow-up)	20	10	2	32	The four data streams each require a structured request and at least one round of follow-up. 20 HEO days is approximately 4 weeks of focused data collection and reconciliation work — realistic given likely inconsistencies in how conversion and progression data are recorded.
Data cleaning, validation and quality assurance	15	5	1	21	Raw data from a programme running across multiple regions and SMEs will require standardisation. 15 HEO days reflects moderate complexity — less than a large ONS data project but more than a simple administrative collation.
Drafting the annual report (four sections: conversion, progression, SME barriers, regional)	10	30	5	45	Report writing is SEO-led. 30 SEO days for a credible published report of 20–30 pages with data visualisation is a reasonable estimate — comparable to a medium DWP/DfE statistical bulletin. 10 HEO days covers background research, chart preparation and fact-checking support.
Internal review rounds (policy leads, legal, press office, senior sign-off)	3	10	8	21	Government publication processes typically involve 2–3 review rounds. 8 G7 days covers quality review, ministerial briefing preparation, and coordinating departmental clearance. This workstream is consistently underestimated in project plans.
Graphic design / layout / GOV.UK accessibility compliance	-	5	1	6	If produced in-house: 5 SEO days for layout, chart formatting, and accessibility review (WCAG 2.2 AA). If commissioned externally, this workstream is replaced by a small design commission (estimated £3,000–6,000 — see Sheet 3). Model uses in-house as central case.
Mid-year internal updates: stakeholder briefings, data refreshes, MCA correspondence	8	6	2	16	Outside the annual report cycle, the team will need to maintain live data, respond to programme partner queries, and produce briefing notes for Ministers or senior officials. Conservative estimate: one half-day briefing per quarter plus ongoing correspondence.
Post-publication queries from departments, researchers, employers	4	6	2	12	A published GOV.UK evidence report typically generates 6–12 weeks of follow-up queries. These are proportionally small but non-trivial: 4 HEO + 6 SEO days estimates one query per week for 10 weeks at approximately 1 hour average response time.
TOTALS (Year 1, all workstreams)	60	72	21	153	Year 1 includes additional setup effort — see Sheet 4 for Year 2+ adjustment
C. WORKING DAYS TO FTE CONVERSION					
<i>Assumption: civil servant standard working year = 228 days (260 weekdays less 8 bank holidays less 25 days annual leave less ~4 days learning & development). This is a standard HMT/Cabinet Office planning assumption for FTE conversion.</i>					
Role	Total days attributed to Report	Working days/year	FTE equivalent		
HEO	60	228	0.26		
SEO	72	228	0.32		
G7	21	228	0.09		

Table 20: Annual Cost Calculation — Year 1 (Pilot) and Year 2+ (Ongoing)

Annual Cost Calculation — Year 1 (Pilot) and Year 2+ (Ongoing)			
A. STAFF COSTS — YEAR 1			
Staff component	FTE for Report	Annual employment cost (£)	Notes
HEO Analyst (data collection & processing)	0.50	£27,815	
SEO Senior Analyst / Report Lead	0.60	£38,450	
G7 Project Lead (0.3 FTE, 100% attribution)	0.30	£26,080	
TOTAL STAFF COSTS (Year 1)		£92,346	
B. NON-STAFF COSTS — YEAR 1			
Item	Cost (£)		Notes
External graphic design / layout for GOV.UK publication	£4,500		Central estimate for a 20–30 page annual report designed to GOV.UK standards (WCAG 2.2 AA, GDS design system). Range: £3,000–£6,000 depending on complexity of data visualisation and number of charts. Sourced from general G-Cloud and creative services market rates; no specific published government benchmark found. This is the ALTERNATIVE to 5 SEO days in-house design time — the model shows both costs; the decision-maker should choose one route. If in-house, this line is £0 and SEO time is costed in Section A.
Data systems / software (survey tools, data sharing platform for TechFirst structured data feeds)	£1,200		Annual licence cost for a secure data collection tool (e.g. SurveyMonkey Enterprise, Microsoft Forms Pro, or equivalent). £1,200 is an illustrative estimate; actual cost depends on DSIT/DWP's existing digital tooling. May be £0 if existing Hub infrastructure covers this.
GOV.UK publishing and accessibility audit (if required separately)	£500		GOV.UK publishing is typically handled in-house via the GDS content team at no additional direct cost. £500 is included as a contingency for any external accessibility audit if the in-house team flags issues. Treat as an optional line.
Travel for regional delivery liaison (MCA visits, stakeholder events)	£800		Estimated 2–3 visits per year to regional partners or MCA offices for data collection liaison. £800 at standard Civil Service rail/accommodation rates. Could be £0 if all liaison is remote.
TOTAL NON-STAFF COSTS (Year 1)	£7,000		
C. TOTAL ANNUAL COST — YEAR 1 SUMMARY			
Component	Cost (£)		Notes
Staff costs (total employment cost including pension and NI)	£92,346		
Non-staff costs	£7,000		
TOTAL COST OF ANNUAL AI TRANSITION EVIDENCE REPORT (Year 1)	£99,346		
D. YEAR 2 ONWARDS — ADJUSTED COST (ONGOING ANNUAL CYCLE)			
<i>Year 2 onwards: additional time required to compare new data against year 1 baseline, update methodology if programme scales, and incorporate feedback from the first publication cycle. Staff costs increase slightly; non-staff costs reduce (no repeat one-off design commission if templates are reused). See Sheet 4 for the Year 2+ breakdown.</i>			
Component	Year 1 (£)	Year 2+ (£)	Key differences
Staff costs	£92,346	£96,963	Year 2+ uplift of ~5% for additional analytical work: year-on-year trend analysis requires comparing two datasets, not just describing one. Also accounts for annual pay uplift.
Non-staff costs (design reuse savings)	£7,000	£3,500	Design commission not repeated in Year 2 (templates reused, saving ~£3,500 net). £1,000 allowed for minor updates/refresh.
TOTAL COST (Year 2 onwards)	£99,346	£100,463	

Table 21: Workstream Detail — Data Collection, Writing, Review, Maintenance & Year 2+ Iteration

Workstream Detail — Data Collection, Writing, Review, Maintenance & Year 2+ Iteration					
A. DATA COLLECTION — THE FOUR STREAMS IN DETAIL					
Data stream	Collection method	HEO days	SEO days	G7 days	Key effort driver
Conversion rates (60% conversion threshold — did each placement convert to permanent at month 6?)	Structured data request to [TechFirst delivery body]		4	1	- Low complexity if HMRC RTI data is already used for subsidy verification. Effort is mainly quality assurance and gap-chasing rather than complex analysis.
Progression data (career movement, salary change, further training) — most complex stream	Requires follow-up survey or [direct employer contact]		8	4	1 Highest effort. Progression data typically requires direct employer contact or participant survey, both of which require design, distribution, and chase-up.
SME barriers (qualitative: reasons for non-conversion, hiring difficulties, cultural factors)	Short structured survey to [SME employers]		3	6	- Effort is in qualitative synthesis, not data cleaning. SEO days dominate because this requires analytical judgement to categorise and characterise barriers.
Regional delivery findings (geographic distribution of placements, conversion variance by MCA area)	Structured regional breakdown [from delivery partners]		5	2	- Moderate effort. Risk is inconsistent regional coding across delivery partners. HEO to build and maintain the regional breakdown table; SEO to quality-check.
B. WRITING & REVIEW — WHAT TAKES THE TIME					
The writing and review process for a credible published government evidence report is almost always underestimated. The model allocates 30 SEO days for drafting — approximately 6 weeks of focused writing — which is appropriate for a first-year 20–30 page published report covering four distinct analytical themes. In comparison, a typical DWP research publication of similar scope takes 8–12 weeks of analyst time from draft to publication. Internal review rounds in government typically run as follows: (1) team review and fact-check; (2) cross-departmental policy review (DWP, DSIT); (3) press office and legal check; (4) senior sign-off. Each round generates comments requiring a response or revision. The 8 G7 days for review co-ordination accounts for this overhead explicitly rather than treating it as part of the drafting budget.					
C. YEAR 2+ ITERATION — ADDITIONAL TIME REQUIREMENTS					
Year 2+ workstream	Additional HEO days	Additional SEO days	Additional G7 days	Rationale	
Year-on-year trend comparison (new data vs year 1 baseline)	3	5	1	Comparing two years of conversion and progression data is more complex than describing one. Requires checking methodological consistency.	
Methodology update (if programme scales beyond 300 placements or adds new regions)	2	4	2	If the pilot expands, the Hub team must update the reporting methodology accordingly — reweighting regional samples, revising the conversion	
Incorporating feedback from year 1 publication cycle	1	4	1	Post-publication feedback from departments, researchers, and employers will identify improvements. Incorporating these (e.g. adding a new data table, changing the regional breakdown)	
Ongoing annual pay uplift on staff costs (approximately 3.5%, per pay remit trajectory)	—	—	—	Not expressed as extra days — reflected in the 5% staff cost uplift applied in Year 2+ on Sheet 3. The 3.5% STPR / pay remit guidance is used as the base; actual uplifts will depend on annual Civil Service Pay Remit.	

6. Recommendation under appraisal

“By 2027, The Equality Office should publish practical, non-statutory guidance clarifying how employers and providers can lawfully design, deliver and participate in women-focused digital reskilling programmes under the Equality Act 2010”

Summary

- **Team required:** Four people at partial-time attribution: a Legal Officer at 50% (lead drafter and researcher), a G7 Lawyer at 15% (legal quality assurance and EHRC engagement), an SEO Policy Officer at 25% (process management, consultation, publication), and a G6 Deputy Director at 5% (SRO sign-off).
- Total effective FTE attributable to this recommendation: approximately 0.95 FTE across four grades. Less than one full-time equivalent, reflecting the bounded, one-off nature of the task.

Year 1 total cost

- Approximately £69,600 in total staff costs (salary plus pension and employer NI on-costs) account for approximately £64,000 of this, with non-staff costs of £5,600 covering plain



English editing, a possible GOV.UK PDF design commission, stakeholder consultation events, and a contingency for an external accessibility audit.

Year 2+ annual maintenance cost

- Approximately £5,085 per year - a marginal cost absorbed within existing caseloads rather than requiring dedicated FTE. This covers 9 Legal Officer days and 2 G7 days for legal review and case law monitoring, plus 7 SEO days for GOV.UK updates and query management.
- In years where a significant case law development, EHRC update, or programme expansion occurs, this could rise to £15,000–£25,000 for a partial redraft (treated as a contingency rather than a baseline figure).

Dominant cost driver

- The Legal Officer at 50% FTE is the single largest cost item, accounting for approximately 45% of total Year 1 staff cost. This reflects that the core task researching and translating sections 158 and 159 of the Equality Act 2010 into practical, accessible guidance is primary legal work that cannot be delegated to a policy officer without compromising legal accuracy.
- The G7 legal quality assurance role, though only 15% of FTE, is non-negotiable for a published document that makes statements about the lawful interpretation of primary legislation.

Internal review and sign-off as the most time-intensive stage

- Interdepartmental clearance (6 SEO days and 2 G7 days) and internal legal review (5 G7 days and 3 Legal Officer days) together account for a larger share of total effort than drafting alone.
- This is consistent with the general pattern for published government legal guidance and should not be folded into drafting time when building the project timeline. It is a distinct workstream requiring its own scheduling and milestone tracking.



Table 22: Equality Act Guidance — Civil Service & Legal Pay Band Reference (2025/26)

Equality Act Guidance — Civil Service & Legal Pay Band Reference (2025/26)							
Sources: GOV.UK Government Legal Service recruitment page: Legal Officer ~£42,000; Lawyer (G7) — GLD range disclosed via FOI: £48,500–£64,000, majority below £51,000 (Roll on Friday / WhatDoTheyKnow). Standard policy grade bands from Defra Civil Service grades page and FOI 2025-044: SEO corporate £40,178–£44,780; G7 corporate £55,789–£66,021; G6 corporate £71,056–£79,061. On-costs: alpha pension 28.97% (Civil Service Pension Scheme); employer NI 15% on earnings above £5,000 (2025/26 rate, GOV.UK).							
A. PAY BAND REFERENCE — ROLES NEEDED FOR THIS GUIDANCE PIECE							
Grade / role type	Function in this piece of work	Salary min (£)	Salary max (£)	Midpoint (£)	Pension 28.97% (£)	Employer NI 15% (£)	Total employment cost (£)
Legal Officer (GLS)	Leads legal research and primary drafting — the Equality Act 2010 interpretation, section 158/159 positive action analysis, case law review, and drafting practical guidance language. Legal Officer is the standard grade for this type of advisory drafting work.	£40,000	£46,000	£43,000	£12,457	£5,700	£61,157
Lawyer / Legal Adviser (G7, GLS)	Quality assurance of the legal analysis; sign-off on the interpretation of sections 158–159 EA2010; managing the EHRC liaison; leading on any complex case law points. Provides the senior legal judgement that non-statutory guidance of this kind requires.	£48,500	£64,000	£56,250	£16,296	£7,688	£80,233
SEO Policy Officer	Manages the process — consultation logistics, stakeholder engagement, GOV.UK publication, interdepartmental clearance co-ordination, ministerial briefing preparation, and post-publication query handling. Not a legal role; standard SEO policy grade.	£40,178	£49,887	£45,033	£13,046	£6,005	£64,083
G6 Deputy Director (Equality Office)	Senior responsible owner — final sign-off on the guidance content, ministerial submission, and interdepartmental clearance. Partial time only, modelled at 0.05 FTE (approximately 12 days across the project).	£71,056	£79,061	£75,059	£21,744	£10,509	£107,312
B. SOURCE NOTES PER ROLE							
Role	Source / caveat						
Legal Officer salary	The GLS Working for GLS page (GOV.UK, last updated 2025) states Legal Officers earn 'around £42,000 (dependent on location and experience)'. No published min/max band for this role exists publicly — the £40,000–£46,000 range is an estimate consistent with this stated figure and the general progression structure from NQ (Legal Officer) to G7 (Lawyer). This should be validated with the Equality Office HR team before the costing is finalised. The legal specialism premium means this grade sits above standard HEO.						
G7 Lawyer salary	The GLD range was disclosed in a FOI request (reported by Roll on Friday, December 2021): highest paid G7 lawyer £64k; lowest £48,500, majority of the 834 G7 lawyers below £51,000. A mid-2021 vacancy notice advertised G7 roles at up to £61k in error. For 2025/26, a 3.5–5% annual uplift per Civil Service Pay Remit 2025 would place the effective range at approximately £52,000–£68,000, but no current published GLD band was found. The model uses the FOI midpoint plus a 5% uplift as the central salary estimate.						
SEO Policy Officer salary	Standard corporate SEO band per FOI 2025-044 (a central government department FOI response from 2025). The Equality Office sits within MHCLG and the relevant pay bands may differ. MHCLG pay band information should be obtained from MHCLG HR to replace this estimate.						
G6 Deputy Director salary	Standard corporate G6 band per Defra Civil Service Grades page and FOI 2025-044. G6 pay is relatively consistent across departments at the national level.						

Table 23: FTE Requirements & Time Allocation — Equality Act 2010 Practical Guidance

FTE Requirements & Time Allocation — Equality Act 2010 Practical Guidance					
This is a one-off piece of work, not a recurring annual function (Year 1). From Year 2 onwards it becomes a lighter-touch maintenance and query-response function — see Sheet 4. All FTE attributions isolate the proportion of each person's time spent on this specific piece of guidance versus their wider caseload.					
A. TEAM STRUCTURE — WHO IS NEEDED AND WHY					
Role	Grade	Total FTE in post	% time on this guidance	Effective FTE (this piece)	Rationale
Legal Officer (lead drafter)	Legal Officer	1.00	50.0%	0.50	This is the primary role for this piece of work. 50% time attribution over approximately 6–8 months reflects: legal research into ss.158–159 EA2010, case law review, EHRC code review, first drafting, and redrafting following consultation feedback. The remaining 50% covers the Legal Officer's wider advisory caseload in the Equality Office. This is a relatively high attribution for a single piece of guidance — justified by the legal complexity and the need to translate statute into plain English accessible to non-lawyers.
Lawyer / Legal Adviser (G7, quality assurance & EHRC lead)	G7 (GLS)	1.00	15.0%	0.15	15% time attribution: approximately 1.5 days/fortnight across the project lifecycle. Responsible for legal quality assurance of the EA2010 interpretation, sign-off on case law analysis, and leading the EHRC engagement. At G7 level this is a supervisory and sign-off function, not primary drafting. The remaining 85% covers the G7's wider legal advisory caseload.
SEO Policy Officer (process manager)	SEO	1.00	25.0%	0.25	25% time attribution: approximately 1 day/week across the project. Manages stakeholder consultation logistics, interdepartmental clearance, GOV.UK publication, press notice, ministerial briefing preparation, and post-publication query management. The remaining 75% covers the SEO's wider policy caseload.
G6 Deputy Director (SRO / senior sign-off)	G6	1.00	5.0%	0.05	5% time attribution: approximately 12 days across the whole project. Provides final sign-off on guidance content and legal position; approves ministerial submission; engages with counterparts at DSIT and DfE for interdepartmental clearance. This is a named SRO function and should not be folded into SEO time.
TOTAL EFFECTIVE FTE ATTRIBUTABLE TO THIS GUIDANCE				0.95	

B. WORKING DAYS BUDGET — ACROSS THE PROJECT LIFECYCLE (YEAR 1 ONE-OFF)

Workstream	Legal Officer days	G7 Lawyer days	SEO Policy Officer days	Total days	Notes
Legal research: EA2010 sections 158–159, associated case law, EHRC codes of practice review	12	3	1	16	s.158 (positive action) and s.159 (positive action in recruitment) are the primary statutory provisions. Case law on positive action is relatively sparse at employment tribunal level but growing. 12 Legal Officer days = approximately 2.5 weeks of focused legal research, including reviewing the EHRC Statutory Code of Practice.
Mapping existing comparable guidance (EHRC, other departments, academic/practitioner resources)	5	1	2	8	The EHRC already publishes guidance on positive action. The new guidance must be consistent with and clearly differentiated from existing EHRC material. 5 Legal Officer days to map, assess, and identify gaps.
Drafting practical guidance (plain English translation for employers and programme providers)	18	4	-	22	This is the most time-intensive legal task. 18 Legal Officer days = approximately 3.5 weeks of drafting, redrafting, and plain English editing of a document likely to be 10–20 pages. 4 G7 days = legal review of each draft.
Stakeholder consultation: employer groups, training providers, EHRC engagement	4	2	8	14	8 SEO days = 2–3 consultation events or written consultation rounds, including invitation drafting, meeting facilitation, and processing written responses into a summary document. 4 Legal Officer days = attending events and responding to legal questions raised.
Internal legal review: Equality Office legal team sign-off round	3	5	1	9	Internal legal review within the Equality Office team. The G7 leads this (5 days). 3 Legal Officer days = addressing comments and preparing revised draft. This is a separate workstream from G7 quality assurance during drafting — it represents a formal sign-off round.
Interdepartmental clearance: DSIT, DfE, and any other interested departments	-	2	6	8	6 SEO days = drafting the interdepartmental clearance submission, chasing responses, resolving any policy concerns raised by DSIT/DfE on the [guidance]. 2 G7 days = legal input on any points raised.
Ministerial sign-off: briefing preparation and SRO sign-off	-	1	4	5	4 SEO days = preparing ministerial briefing note, submission to SRO (G6), handling any queries from the Minister's office. 1 G7 day = legal accuracy check of the submission. G6 time (12 days total) is costed separately via a standalone line in Section A.
Publication: GOV.UK upload, accessibility compliance, press notice, stakeholder comms	-	-	5	5	5 SEO days = GOV.UK content upload (including tagging, metadata, and accessibility check to WCAG 2.2 AA standard), drafting a press notice, and a stakeholder distribution email to programme providers, employer groups, and EHRC.
Post-publication queries: responding to employer and provider questions	2	1	4	7	Practical guidance on a legally complex area reliably generates follow-up questions. 4 SEO days + 2 Legal Officer + 1 G7 day = estimate for 8–12 weeks of query management at approximately 1–2 queries per week. The Legal Officer handles substantive legal questions; SEO handles process queries.
TOTALS (Year 1, all workstreams, excluding G6 SRO time)	44	19	31	94	G6 time (12 days) costed via FTE attribution in Section A, not duplicated here

G6 Deputy Director time: 12 days across the project lifecycle (5% of 228 working days = ~11.4 days, rounded to 12). Includes: reviewing key drafts at milestone points (3 days), attending one external stakeholder event (1 day), approving the ministerial submission (2 days), signing off the final published guidance (2 days), and handling any post-publication escalations from departments or EHRC (4 days). This time is costed in Sheet 3 via the G6 FTE attribution rather than as a separate days line above.

Table 24: Cost Calculation - Year 1 (One-Off Guidance Production) and Year 2+ (Maintenance)

Cost Calculation — Year 1 (One-Off Guidance Production) and Year 2+ (Maintenance)

A. STAFF COSTS — YEAR 1 ONE-OFF

Staff component	Effective FTE for this piece	Annual employment cost (£)	Notes
Legal Officer (lead drafter, 50% FTE)	0.50	£30,579	Total employment cost (midpoint salary + 28.97% pension + 15% NI) × 0.5 FTE
G7 Lawyer / Legal Adviser (15% FTE)	0.15	£12,035	Total employment cost × 0.15 FTE
SEO Policy Officer (25% FTE)	0.25	£16,021	Total employment cost × 0.25 FTE
G6 Deputy Director / SRO (5% FTE)	0.05	£5,366	Total employment cost × 0.05 FTE — costed as a distinct line for SRO accountability
TOTAL STAFF COSTS (Year 1)		£64,000	



**THE
GLOBAL
CITY**

**WOMEN
PIVOTING
TO DIGITAL TASKFORCE**

B. NON-STAFF COSTS — YEAR 1 ONE-OFF

Item	Cost (£)	Notes
Plain English editing and accessibility review	£1,500	External plain English editor for a legal guidance document of 10–20 pages: £1,000–£2,000 at typical GCS/GOV.UK contractor rates. Required to make the Equality Act analysis accessible to employers who are not lawyers. May be handled in-house by GCS colleagues if available — treat as optional.
Graphic design / layout for GOV.UK publication	£2,500	A short practical guidance document is typically published as HTML on GOV.UK (no design commission needed) or as a PDF with simple GOV.UK-style formatting. £2,500 covers a PDF design commission if required. If published as HTML only, this is £0 and GOV.UK publishing is handled in-house.
Stakeholder consultation events (venue, VC kit, catering, travel for 2–3 events)	£1,200	2–3 consultation events at £300–£500 each depending on venue and format. If all consultation is conducted via written round or video call, this drops to approximately £200 for VC tools/platform costs. £1,200 is a conservative central estimate.
EHRC engagement (any formal co-production or review - commission — if required)		£0 in central estimate: EHRC engagement is assumed to be in-kind (reciprocal government-to-government). If EHRC is formally commissioned to review or co-badge the guidance, a small commission of £2,000–£5,000 may apply — treat as a contingency.
GOV.UK upload and accessibility audit (external, if required)	£400	GOV.UK publishing is typically in-house and at no additional cost. £400 covers a contingency for any external accessibility audit if the in-house team identifies compliance issues. Treat as optional.
TOTAL NON-STAFF COSTS (Year 1)	£5,600	

C. YEAR 1 TOTAL

Component	Cost (£)	Notes
Staff costs (including pension and NI)	£64,000	
Non-staff costs	£5,600	
TOTAL COST — YEAR 1 (ONE-OFF GUIDANCE PRODUCTION)	£69,600	

D. YEAR 2+ — ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COST

From Year 2, the one-off guidance production effort ends. The ongoing cost is: (1) annual legal review for case law / EHRC guidance changes (~5–10 Legal Officer days, ~2 G7 days); (2) GOV.UK guidance update if required (~2 SEO days); (3) post-publication query management on a rolling basis (~5 SEO days, ~2 Legal Officer days per year). This is a significantly lighter function than Year 1 and does not require dedicated FTE — it is absorbed within existing caseloads at a small marginal time cost.

Component	Year 1 (£)	Year 2+ annual (£)	Notes
Annual legal review (case law, EHRC updates)	0	— see below	5 Legal Officer days + 2 G7 days per year at respective day rates. Absorbed within existing caseloads.
GOV.UK guidance update (if case law / EHRC change requires amendment)	0	— see below	2 SEO days + 2 Legal Officer days per update cycle. Not every year will require a substantive update.
Post-publication query management	0	— see below	Rolling throughout the year. Estimated 5 SEO days + 2 Legal Officer days annually.

YEAR 2+ ANNUAL COST — DERIVED FROM DAY RATES

Component	Days/yr	Day rate (£)	Annual cost (£)
Legal Officer — annual review + query handling	9	£268	£2,414
G7 Lawyer — legal review sign-off	2	£352	£704
SEO Policy Officer — GOV.UK update + query management	7	£281	£1,967
TOTAL YEAR 2+ ANNUAL MAINTENANCE COST			£5,085

Table 25: Workstream Detail — Legal Research, Drafting, Review, Consultation & Maintenance

Workstream Detail — Legal Research, Drafting, Review, Consultation & Maintenance					
A. LEGAL RESEARCH — THE KEY STATUTORY PROVISIONS AND EXISTING GUIDANCE LANDSCAPE					
<i>The EA2010 positive action framework centres on two provisions: s.158 (general positive action — permits, does not require, positive action where a group is underrepresented or has a particular disadvantage) and s.159 (positive action in recruitment and promotion — tie-breaker provision for equally-qualified candidates). The guidance must explain: which provision applies in which scenario; what 'proportionate' means in practice; how programme design (women-only cohorts, ringfenced places) can be structured lawfully; and what employers and providers must not do (positive discrimination, automatic preference).</i>					
Legal research task	Legal Officer days	G7 days	SEO days	Total	Notes
Reading and annotating ss. 158–159 EA2010 and related provisions (s.4 protected characteristics etc.)		3	-	-	3 These provisions are relatively short but the annotations, interpretive notes, and relationship to wider discrimination law require careful reading. 3 days includes making drafting notes from the statute itself.
Reviewing EHRC Statutory Code of Practice on Employment and EHRC positive action guidance		2	1	-	3 The EHRC Statutory Code is long. The Legal Officer needs to identify the relevant sections specifically on positive action and assess consistency. 1 G7 day to sense-check the Legal Officer's reading of the Code.
Case law review: relevant ET, EAT and CJEU/ECJ decisions on positive action		4	1	-	5 Positive action case law is less developed in the UK than in some EU jurisdictions (following Kalanke, Marschall). 4 Legal Officer days to review key decisions, assess domestic EA2010 tribunal decisions, and identify any unsettled legal points.
Mapping comparable published guidance from other departments and the EHRC		3	1	2	6 Prevents duplication and ensures consistency. 3 Legal Officer days + 2 SEO days to conduct the mapping exercise, prepare a schedule of existing guidance, and identify the gaps the new document must fill.
B. DRAFTING — WHY PLAIN ENGLISH GUIDANCE ON EA2010 POSITIVE ACTION IS MORE COMPLEX THAN IT LOOKS					
<i>The most common misunderstanding the guidance must address is the distinction between lawful positive action (s.158/159 EA2010 — permitted, not required) and unlawful positive discrimination (automatic preference regardless of qualifications — prohibited). Employers and programme providers regularly conflate these. A further complication is that s.158 allows but does not require positive action, so the guidance must explain the permission clearly without creating an implied obligation. Translating this into practical, scenario-based guidance for a non-legal audience — 'can we run a women-only cohort?'; 'can we give interview preference to a female applicant?'; 'what must our evidence base look like?' — requires more drafting cycles than a standard policy document.</i>					
C. YEAR 2+ MAINTENANCE — WHAT TRIGGERS AN UPDATE					
Trigger type	Likelihood	Action required	Estimated days		Notes
New ET/EAT judgment on positive action under EA2010	Low–medium (positive action cases [are rare but growing])	Legal Officer assesses whether the judgment changes the guidance	3–5 Legal Officer + 1–2 G7		
EHRC updates its code of practice or guidance on positive action	Low (codes are updated infrequently)	Legal Officer assesses consistency with the revised code	3 Legal Officer + 1 G7 + 2 SEO		
Legislative change affecting the EA2010 framework	Very low (primary legislation is [rarely amended])	Significant redraft would be required	Full Year 1 redraft — out of scope		
Programme expansion: TechFirst scales beyond 300 placements or adds new protected characteristics	Medium (if programme succeeds)	Minor update to examples and case studies	2 Legal Officer + 1 SEO		
Accumulation of post-publication queries revealing a gap or ambiguity in the guidance	High in Year 2 (guidance on complex [legal areas reliably generates queries])	Batch queries into a FAQ addendum	3 Legal Officer + 1 G7 + 2 SEO		