



27 May 2026

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information request: FOI2026/00377

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 28 April in which you requested the following:

Your request:

Made Smarter website: <https://www.madesmarter.uk/>

Where information is already published online, a link is sufficient. Where a question asks for a breakdown you do not hold in that exact form, please provide the closest equivalent breakdown you do hold, and confirm what is and is not held.

If any part of this request is held by another public authority, please transfer it under your section 1(3) duty to advise and assist, and let me know which authority you have transferred it to.

Procurement and spend

1. *Please provide the name(s) of the supplier(s) contracted to design, build, and maintain Made Smarter UK,*
2. *the total value of each contract, the contract start and end dates, and the procurement route used (framework name and lot, or open tender reference).*
3. *Please provide the Find a Tender and/or Contracts Finder reference number(s) for the contract(s) covered by Question 1.*

Problem statement

4. *Please provide the problem statement or business case used to justify the original commissioning of Made Smarter UK.*

User research

5. *Please confirm which user research methods (list provided below) in the GDS Service Manual, were used during the design or build of Made Smarter UK. And for each method used, please confirm the number of participants included in each round of research and testing you did before publishing the Made Smarter UK campaign site.*

- *User interviews (one-to-one)*
- *Contextual research (observing users in their own environment)*
- *Usability testing of prototypes*
- *Usability testing of the live service*
- *Accessibility research with disabled users*
- *Diary studies*
- *Co-design or participatory design sessions*
- *Survey research*

6. *Were disabled people and people with a range of access needs included in the research? Please provide how participants were recruited and a summary of the backgrounds and access needs participants were recruited against (for example, disabled users, users of assistive technology, users with lower digital literacy, users with English as an additional language).*

7. *Please provide a summary of the main user needs identified through your user research for Made Smarter UK.*

Accessibility

8. Please provide the following information about the accessibility of Made Smarter UK:

- a. The date the published accessibility statement was last reviewed.
- b. A list of any parts of Made Smarter UK that are not fully accessible and/or not compliant with WCAG 2.2 AA and the plan, including and deadlines set to fix each issue.

User-centred design roles

9. For each of the following roles, as described in the Government Digital and Data Profession Capability Framework, please state how many people in each role worked on Made Smarter UK:

- User researcher
- Content designer
- Service designer
- Interaction designer
- Solution architect
- Technical architect

10. What proportion of the total contract value paid to the supplier(s) named in Question 1 was allocated to staff in the roles listed in Question 9 (User-centered design roles)? If this breakdown is not held, please provide whatever role or cost breakdown is held.

Service Standard assessment

11. Did Made Smarter UK undergo a GOV.UK Service Standard assessment before being published/going live? If yes, please provide the date of each assessment, the panel's recommendation (pass / pass with conditions / not pass), and the assessment report. If not, please confirm the reason and identify any alternative governance framework or process used.

Measuring success

12. Please provide the success metrics and targets defined for Made Smarter UK and the most recent reporting against those metrics covering at least the last 12 months, and include post-campaign evaluation, behavioural impact assessment, or value-for-money review.

Our response

I can confirm that UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) does not hold information relevant to your request.

Please note, the Made Smarter Review is an independent, industry-led report on UK industrial digitalisation, commissioned by the UK government published on October 30, 2017. Following this, the former Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) commissioned two independent albeit adjacent programmes:

1. The Made Smarter Innovation Challenge, delivered by Innovate UK as part of the Industrial Strategy Challenge Fund; and
2. The Made Smarter Adoption (North West) Pilot, delivered by an independent organisation, [The Growth Company](#).¹ The pilot has since been expanded to nine regions across England.

In 2023, following government changes, both programmes transitioned into the Department of Business and Trade (DBIT) following the closure of BEIS.

With respect to your request, the website you have referred to was commissioned by the Made Smarter Adoption North West pilot and is owned and maintained by The Growth Company. While Innovate UK has provided information about its programme to be hosted on the site, it has had no role in the design, management, or editorial control of the website, nor in relation to the specific information referenced in your request.

On this basis, we do not hold the requested information. You may wish to redirect your request to The Growth Company, who are responsible for the website and its content.

Their contact details can be found here:

<https://www.growthco.uk/>

¹ <https://www.growthco.uk/>

Your rights

If you have any queries regarding our response please do let us know. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review, explaining which elements of this decision you disagree with and why. Internal review requests should be submitted within 40 working days of the date of our response and should be addressed to:

Head of Information Governance


Email: foi@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: www.ico.org.uk.

If you wish to raise a complaint regarding the service you have received or the conduct of any UKRI staff in relation to your request, please see [UKRI's complaints procedure](#).²

Yours sincerely,


Information Governance
Information Rights Team
UK Research and Innovation
foi@ukri.org | dataprotection@ukri.org

² <https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/contact-us/make-a-complaint/#skipnav-target>