ID	Clarification Question	Nuffield Foundation Response
1	Whether you envisage the scope extending to include criminal justice and policing?	Work should cover all jurisdictions/areas of law, although we are especially interested in the evidence on administrative, civil and family justice - which may be compared and contrasted with position in criminal justice. However, *policing is out of scope*.
2	If you are interested in evidence from outside of England and Wales (e.g. there are a number of international scoreboards/surveys which include England and Wales and rate transparency/public engagement in our justice system)?	Yes, we are open to the inclusion of evidence from other jurisdictions. We expect the focus to be on the jurisdiction of England & Wales but would welcome comparative work and insights to be drawn from elsewhere where relevant, particularly other UK jurisdictions and other comparable jurisdictions.
3	Whether you would want to include evidence around engaging the public in the legislative process/rule of law questions?	This review is very much concerned with the Rule of Law, insofar as it applies to the delivery of justice and functioning of the justice system itself. We had not anticipated exploring public involvement in the legislative process and lawmaking as part of this review, and we are cautious about broadening the scope of the review further. However, we are open minded about this and tenderers are welcome to suggest why looking at this aspect would be important with regards to addressing the purpose and research questions as set out in the Invitation to Tender specification. That being said, though we recognise the importance of public engagement in the legislative process our primary interest with regards to the context of this review is on how the public currently, and would like to be, involved in the delivery of justice, legal processes and decision making.
4	If there is any flexibility at all on the methodology? Our concern being that if the scope is limited to public engagement in justice outside criminal justice a systematic review may not yield very much evidence.	There is flexibility in the methodology. We are open to suggestions from bidders about different or additional ways to frame or address the key issues and questions at the heart of this review – the key issue is that choice of methodology should be clearly set out and justified, and be robust/systematic in approach. We recognise that this review is seeking to empirically assess what are essentially normative positions and principles. Recognising the challenge this brings, we anticipate working closely with the contractor to refine the review approach in a flexible and agile way.
5	Whether you are interested in understanding who commissions/funds/leads public engagement activities as part of the review?	This was not an issue we had anticipated exploring as part of this review, and we are cautious about broadening the scope of the review further. However, we are open minded about this and

	tenderers are welcome to suggest why looking at this aspect would be important with regards to addressing the purpose and research questions as set out in the Invitation to Tender specification.

Please also note that the deadline for the submission of tenders and the timetable for assessing tenders has been revised on 29 August 2025. **The deadline for submitting tenders has been moved back to 11AM, Monday 6 October 2025**. The changes to the commissioning timetable are set out in the timetable below with revised milestone dates indicated in *red italics*:

Commissioning activity	Date
Issue tender	6 August 2025
Submission of clarification questions	11am, 22 August
Publish response to clarification questions	29 August
Deadline for submission	*11am, 6 October*
Shortlisting	*10 October*
Appoint contractors	*13 October*
Project start and inception meeting	*20 October*
Project end	July 2026