



Sourcing Commodity / Project Title	Customer Satisfaction Survey
Reference Number	Tender 00000008
Date of Issue	02/02/2021

Business Representative		
Name Jackie Stevenson-Coe		
Contact Number	03003046723	
Email	Jackie.stevenson-Coe@insolvency.gov.uk	

Commercial Representative		
Name Ciara Tuennessen		
Contact Number	03030031767	
Email	Ciara.Tuennessen@insolvency.gov.uk	

Document Control			
Version	Author	Date	Amendment / Change
1	Ciara Tuennessen	02/02/2021	First Release



Authorisation Matrix Sourcing Activity			
Estimated Contract Value			
	<£10K	<£10K - <£50K	>£50k
Sourcing Strategy Document (SSD)	No	Potentially*	Yes
Supplier Recommendation Report (SRR)	VFM	Potentially*	Yes
Contract Summary Document (CSD	No	Yes	Yes
Risk Assessment (RA)	Potentially**	Yes	Yes
Contract Review Document (CRD)	Potentially***	Potentially***	Yes

^{*}An SSD may be produced at the discretion of the Commercial team, dependent upon the strategic importance, value, route to procure and risks associated with the contract.

^{***} If the RA review outcome establishes that contract requires some level of review.

Approval Declaration				
I hereby sign to confirm that this Supplier Recommendation Report is approved:				
Commercial £100K	Commercial £100K			
Name	Signature	Date		
Connie Hunt Commercial Business Partner	C+1-1-	09/02/2021		
[Insert Approval Level]				
Name	Signature	Date		
[Insert Approval Level]				
Name	Signature	Date		

^{**} These contracts may be reviewed to establish if contract management is required.



Summary

Budget:	
Recommended Supplier:	DJs Research
Maximum Contract Value:	
Savings:	

1. Introduction and Details of the ITT Process

- 1.1. This Supplier Recommendation Report (SRR) summarises the sourcing exercise in regards to the Quantitative Customer Satisfaction Survey for the financial sector contract and includes a recommendation for contract award.
- 1.2. The sourcing exercise is for the provision of an organisation that will provide the Agency with the data and reports for a quantitative CATI research commission. The survey builds upon 2018/2019 data and aims to cover financial services performance in 2019/2020. This procurement exercise has intended to find the most appropriately suited solution available to fulfil these requirements in entirety and demonstrate value for money (VFM) in its award.
- 1.3. The proposed contractual term will be from 05/02/2021to 30/04/2021 in line with the fiscal year customer delivery deadline.
- 1.4. This sourcing exercise was carried out using the RM6018 Marketplace Research Framework.
 - 1.4.1. The Dynamic Purchasing System was utilised to down select potential suppliers
 - 1.4.2. The down select shortlist from the DPS suppliers were contacted and invited to bid on the In-Tend platform. The evaluation was performed offline. The supplier returns were assessed and reviewed in a consensus meeting. Only one supplier bid for the work published on In-Tend

2. Clarification Questions

- 2.1. As permitted as part the procurement exercise the Agency received a number of clarification questions from suppliers around this requirement, which were responded to accordingly within the predefined timescales.
- 2.2. No Clarification questions were posed during this tendering process

3. Overview of the Return of Tenders and Evaluation Process

- 3.1. The Agency received one bid for this procurement, from the following supplier:
 - 3.1.1. DJS Research, Unit 3, Pavillion Lane, Straines

Commercial Supplier Recommendation Report

V1.0 28/11/2018

Handling Information: OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE. Contains commercially sensitive information. Not to be circulated further without INSS Commercial authorisation, any printed copies must be kept secure and not read in an unsecure environment.



- 3.2. All tenders submitted were received via In-tend, following a down select from the Dynamic Purchasing Systems, by the due deadline of 28/01/2021. No other tenders were received.
- 3.3. The tender(s) submitted was not opened until after the tender return date had passed.
- 3.4. The tender(s) was checked to ensure that all questions had been addressed, all documents requested had been attached, and that no conflicts of interest had been declared. The tenders were then released to the evaluation panel.

4. Evaluation Process

- 4.1. The tender was evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix A
- 4.2. The evaluation team consisted of the following:

Criterion Evaluated	Evaluator Name	Job Title	
All 4 questions	Amelia Byrne	Customer and Insight Manager	
All 4 questions	Hamish Hore	Head of Operational & Policy Analysis	
All 4 questions	Jennifer Marsden	Customer Experience Coordinator	

- 4.3. Each scoring criteria was marked on a scale of 0-3 in accordance with the Agency's standard scoring guide which was published as part of the ITT documentation.
- 4.4. Each member of the evaluation team independently assessed the responses to against the published evaluation criteria.
- 4.5. On 2nd February 2021, the evaluation team met to moderate the scores given to and agree a single consensus score for each. The meeting was chaired by Ciara Tuennessen, who facilitated discussion to achieve a consensus score.
- 4.6. The complete set of scores for evaluated criteria are shown in Appendix B.

5. Tender Prices, Scores and Analysis

- 5.1. The prices requested in the ITT were for a set of costs based on the following requirements:
 - 5.1.2. The cost element was assigned a 20% weighting of the overall criterium.
- 5.2. The 'Price' score was based on a comparison between the tenderer's price for all requirements and the cheapest (compliant) tenderer's price. The formula in the evaluation matrix derives a maximum score for the cheapest tender. The scores from each part of the requirement was then added together to give the total price scores.

Commercial Supplier Recommendation Report

V1.0 28/11/2018

Handling Information: OFFICIAL - SENSITIVE. Contains commercially sensitive information. Not to be circulated further without INSS Commercial authorisation, any printed copies must be kept secure and not read in an unsecure environment.



- 5.3. Full details of the prices submitted and scores given can be found at Appendix C.
- 5.4. Analysis of cost was made only against the budget and compliancy with requirements as there were no other bids for this project.

6. Estimated Maximum Cost of the Contract and Savings

- 6.1. It was requested that a price was provided for the requirements outlined at 5.1. The value of the contract will be as per commercial workbook submission for the overall cost of the project.
 - 6.1.1. This contract is a call-off without a guaranteed spend. Spend against this contract should be managed by the contract manager Laura Pacey
- 6.2. The total spend against this contract will be monitored using data provided with monthly invoices. It is the responsibility of the contract manager to validate requests for payment and invoices to ensure that the supplier does not over-charge for their products or services.
- 6.3. **Savings** have been applied and calculated using the lower budget estimate and the cost provided by the supplier.

7. Final Scores

7.1. The final score for all compliant suppliers, taking into account both quality and price, are summarised in the following table:

Tenderer	Quality Score	Price Score	Total score
	(weighting applied)	(weighting applied)	
DJS Research	24	9	33

8. Tender Feedback

8.1. The evaluation team recorded feedback against the scoring criteria set out in Appendix A. Feedback will be provided to both successful and unsuccessful suppliers on request. The Commercial Team are content that robust feedback can be provided.

9. Recommendation

9.1. The decision of the evaluation panel is to award the contract to DJS Research, based on compliancy with requirements, completion of all documentation, successful pass rate following evaluation and no further suppliers expressed interest to pursue the project.

Commercial Supplier Recommendation Report

V1.0 28/11/2018



- 9.2. The costs submitted by DJS Reserach is shown at Appendix C of this Report.
- 9.3. This report is presented to the Report Approvers.

10. Confidentiality

10.1. This document contains information that is commercial-in-confidence and is not in the public domain. The contents of this document must not be disclosed or discussed with any third party.



Appendix A





Appendix B Evaluation Consensus Scores





Appendix C Winning Supplier Costs

