Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC)

Subject UK SBS New Dynamics of Ageing Programme (NDA Tender)

Sourcing reference number BLOJEU-CR150102

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)
www.uksbs.co.uk

UKSBS
Shared **Business Services**

Table of Contents

Section	Content

Appendix

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS) brings a commercial attitude to the public sector; helping our customers improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading provider for our customers of shared business services in the UK public sector, continuously reducing cost and improving quality of business services for Government and the public sector.

Our broad range of expert services is shared by our customers. This allows our customers the freedom to focus resources on core activities; innovating and transforming their own organisations.

Core services include Procurement, Finance, Grants Admissions, Human Resources, Payroll, ISS, and Property Asset Management all underpinned by our Service Delivery and Contact Centre teams.

UK SBS is a people rather than task focused business. It's what makes us different to the traditional transactional shared services centre. What is more, being a not-for-profit organisation owned by its customers, UK SBS' goals are aligned with the public sector and delivering best value for the UK taxpayer.

UK Shared Business Services Ltd changed its name from RCUK Shared Services Centre Ltd in March 2013.

Our Customers

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Services (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Customers.

Our Procurement ambition

Our vision is to be recognised as a centre of excellence and deliver a broad range of procurement services across the public sector; to maintain and grow a procurement service unrivalled in public sector.

Procurement is a market-shaping function. Industry derived benchmarks indicate that UK SBS is already performing at or above "best in class" in at least three key measures (percentage savings, compliant spend, spend under management) and compare well against most other measures.

Over the next five years, it is the function's ambition to lead a cultural change in procurement in the public sector. The natural extension of category management is to bring about a fundamental change in the attitude to supplier relationship management.

Our philosophy sees the supplier as an asset to the business and the route to maximising value from supply. This is not a new concept in procurement generally, but it is not a philosophy which is widely employed in the public sector.

We are ideally positioned to "lead the charge" in the government's initiative to reform procurement in the public sector.

UK SBS Procurement's unique selling points are:

- Focus on the full procurement cycle

- Leaders in category management in common and specialised areas

- Expertise in the delivery of major commercial projects

- That we are leaders in procurement to support research

- Use of cutting edge technologies which are superior to those used generally used across the public sector.

- Use of market leading analytical tools to provide comprehensive Business Intelligence

- Active customer and supplier management

'UK SBS' contribution to the Government Procurement Agenda has been impressive. Through innovation and leadership UK SBS has built an attractive portfolio of procurement services from P2P to Strategy Category Management.'

John Collington

Former Government Chief Procurement Officer

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Economic and Social Research Council

The UK's largest organisation for funding research on economic and social issues. ESRC supports independent, high quality research which has an impact on business, the public sector and the third sector. At any one time we support over 4,000 researchers and postgraduate students in academic institutions and independent research institutes.

Its role is to:

- promote and support, by any means, high-quality basic, strategic and applied research and related postgraduate training in the social sciences

- advance knowledge and provide trained social scientists who meet the needs of users and beneficiaries, thereby contributing to the economic competitiveness of the UK, the effectiveness of public services and policy, and the quality of life

- provide advice on, disseminate knowledge of and promote public understanding of, the social sciences.

Examples of funded research

Dr Emla Fitzsimons and team, Institute for Fiscal Studies, designed a programme to improve development in early childhood in Colombia. As a result of this research the findings have transformed the Early Childhood Development policy of the Peruvian Government, set to reach 135,000 children across the poorest districts of Peru by 2016.

Professor Paula Jarzabkowski, City University; identified a potential systemic risk, arising from an industry trend for increased complexity and global connectivity in re-insurance products. This research has had a global impact on the re-insurance industry.

www.esrc.ac.uk

Section 3 - Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

In this section you will find details of your Procurement contact point and the timescales relating to this opportunity.

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Customer Name and address	Economic and Social Research Council Polaris House, North Star Avenue Swindon SN2 1FF
3.2	Buyer name	Liz Vincent
3.3	Buyer contact details	Tel: 01793 867740 Email: research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£40,000
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	**All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	12/01/2016
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	22/01/2016 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	27/01/2016
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	15/02/2016 11.00
3.11	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	24/02/2016
3.12	Anticipated Award date	24/02/2016
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	29/02/2016
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	31/10/2016
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

E·S·R·C
ECONOMIC & SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

NEW DYNAMICS OF AGEING PROGRAMME

EVALUATION BRIEF

1.   Background

1.1   The New Dynamics of Ageing (NDA) Programme was a ten year £20 million multidisciplinary research initiative with the ultimate aim of improving quality of life of older people. It was launched in 2005 and ended in 2015 and has funded a total of 35 projects, including eleven multi-site collaborations. The Programme aimed to develop practical policy and implementation guidance and novel scientific, technological and design responses to help older people enjoy better quality lives.

1.2   The Programme combined expertise from across the research councils in pursuit of five overarching objectives:

- to explore the ways in which individual ageing is subject to different influences over the lifecourse, including identifying the biological determinants of healthy ageing and the social and environmental factors contributing to ageing well;
- to understand the dynamic ways in which the meaning, understanding and experience of ageing are currently changing and becoming more diverse;
- to investigate the diverse ways in which ageing is/has been understood and represented at different times and in different cultures;
- to encourage and support the development of innovative multidisciplinary research groups and methods;
- to provide a sound evidence base for policy and practice (including the development of prototype systems, procedures and devices) so that research contributes to well-being and quality of life.

1.3   The NDA was directed by Professor Alan Walker (University of Sheffield), and was funded jointly by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), the Biological and Biotechnology Research Council (BBSRC), the Medical Research Council (MRC) and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). The cross-Council Ageing Research Group (XCAR), comprising representatives from all of the Programme's core funders, was responsible for the management of the Programme. The NDA Advisory Committee advised on the strategic direction of the Programme and on issues around stakeholder engagement, dissemination and knowledge transfer. The Older People's Reference Group provided advice on how the NDA should reflect the different perspectives of older people. For more information about the Programme, see **Annexes 1 and 2.**

2.   Evaluation Aims

2.1   The ESRC is seeking to commission an evaluation to consider the achievements of the NDA Programme . The evaluation will also build on and complement earlier evaluation activities that considered the quality and impact of aspects of NDA, including evaluations of individual research projects and an impact evaluation of the NDA Programme . *Bidders are strongly recommended to consider the final report of the impact evaluation of the NDA Programme (available on [ESRC website](http://www.esrc.ac.uk) - http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/research/evaluation-and-impact/evaluating-the-impact-of-the-new-dynamics-of-ageing-research-programme-final-report/) before designing their approach.

2.2   The NDA Programme evaluation will provide:

     (a)   accountability for the Research Councils' investment in the Programme;

     (b)   an assessment of the academic quality and impact of the Programme;

     (c)   an assessment of the value added by organising the research within a programme;

     (d)   an assessment of the value added by cross-Council collaboration;

     (e)   guidance on future research priorities.

3.   Evaluation Criteria

3.1   The Evaluators will assess:

     (a)   Design and Objectives
     An assessment of the design and implementation of the Programme, and the extent to which it met its aims and objectives.

     (b)   Research quality and academic impact
     An assessment of the academic quality of NDA research in the international context, the contribution to relevant research fields, and the achievement of research objectives, including the degree of innovation and international focus.

     (c)   Multidisciplinary and international
     An assessment of the extent and success of multidisciplinary collaboration within NDA including the extent to which NDA projects successfully integrated researchers from different disciplinary backgrounds, whether there were challenges for the funders and peer reviewers in assessing multidisciplinary applications, and the extent to which NDA outputs were multidisciplinary. Including an assessment of international linkages, especially with Europe and North America.

     (d)   User engagement, knowledge exchange and impact[1]
     An assessment of the extent to which NDA successfully engaged with stakeholders (public, private and third sectors) throughout the research process, the relevance of the research to user priorities, the effectiveness of communication with potential users and evidence of impact on policy and practice (since the completion of, and not duplicating the earlier Impact Evaluation).

     (e)   Research capacity and training

---

[1] This is not expected to be a substantial part of the present evaluation, which should not duplicate the earlier Impact Evaluation. Attention should focus on achievements and activities since the completion of the earlier study and new messages or lessons arising from them.

An assessment of NDA's contribution to enhancing the UK's capacity to undertake integrative, interdisciplinary ageing research and to ensure that the UK has the skills to underpin continuing innovation in this area.

(f)   *Data collection and management*
An assessment of the quality and value of data collected by NDA researchers.

(g)   *Programme management*
An assessment of the effectiveness of NDA management arrangements, including Director's leadership and management of the Programme, coordination across the Research Councils, and the role and contribution of the Advisory Committee.

(h)   *Added value*
An assessment of the value added to NDA by the programme organisation, including synergy between research projects, research coherence and enhanced collaborations and impact, and enhanced capacity to interact with a variety stakeholders, and influence practitioners and policy-makers. The added value of the Programme being funded jointly by five Research Councils should also be assessed.

(i)   *Legacy*
The overall successes and weaknesses, and legacy of the Programme, the activity of the NDA community since the Programme has ended, the continuation of NDA collaborations, continuation of research/projects via successful attainment of other funding, and the preservation and continued availability of Programme and project outputs and resources within and, where relevant, beyond academia.

(j)   *Key lessons for future Programmes*
Best practice and lessons learned for use in future programmes.

The ESRC will provide the Evaluators with full briefing on these requirements.

4.   Evaluation Evidence

4.1   The evidence to be assessed will include:

(a)   *Project Final Reports*
NDA grants have submitted final reports to the ESRC and these, together with rapporteur assessments, will be made available to the programme evaluator;

(b)   *Publications*
Including Programme-wide outputs, data, and publications nominated by project-holders.

(c)   NDA *Programme Director's Reports*
The Director's annual and final reports will be made available to the Consultants.

(d)   *2015 Impact Evaluation Report*
The ESRC commissioned a study that considered the engagement, impact and knowledge exchange achievements of the NDA Programme. This report is available on the ESRC's website at the following link:-
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/files/research/evaluation-and-impact/evaluating-the-impact-of-the-new-dynamics-of-ageing-research-programme-final-report/

(e)   *Stakeholder Survey*
The Evaluators will design and administer questionnaires to capture a wide range of stakeholders' views about NDA. Stakeholders will include NDA award-holders, research assistants, post-doctoral researchers, PhD students, Programme staff,

research users, and academic commentators.

    (f)   *Stakeholder Interviews*
The Evaluators will conduct interviews with key stakeholders, including the NDA Director, Advisory Committee Chair, Older People's Reference Group and other members, NDA funding panel members, award-holders and researchers, students, policy-makers and practitioners, relevant business interests and officers from each of the funding Research Councils.

4.2   The Evaluators are invited to propose the inclusion of any other materials, data sources or methodologies that they feel may add value to the evaluation.

4.3   The Evaluators are expected to participate in a briefing meeting with an ESRC Evaluation Manager shortly after appointment to discuss this programme of work. This meeting can be held via teleconference, if required.

5.   Eligibility

5.1   Given the multidisciplinary nature of the Programme, it is likely that a team approach, including expertise from across the remits of the relevant Research Councils, will be required. Bids from suitably qualified UK and international teams will be considered.

5.2   Any association with the Programme or the project award-holders should be declared. Bidders should not have been employed on any of the projects funded under the Programme (see Annex II) or be employed by the University of Sheffield.

6.   Evaluation Management and Final Report

6.1   The evaluation will be managed by the ESRC's evaluation team on behalf of the Research Council funders.

6.2   The Evaluators will be expected to provide brief monthly progress updates to the ESRC that detail key milestones and highlight any issues that have arisen.

6.3   The Evaluators will prepare the following:

I. Interim report
An interim report, including emerging findings, will be submitted to the ESRC by the end of May 2016. The format for the report will be agreed with the Consultants prior to the submission date.

II. Final Report

The final report will provide an assessment of the NDA Programme against the evaluation criteria detailed above. The report will be no more than 10,000 words in length, and will be structured as follows:

    (a)   Executive Summary - abstract of the main findings of no more than four pages.

    (b)   Evaluation aims and criteria

(c)   Origins and background to the NDA Programme, including financial details.

(d)   Evaluation Methodology

(e)   Evaluation findings and commentary, addressing each of the evaluation criteria detailed in section 3 above.

(f)   Conclusions and Recommendations.

(g)   Annexes – as required.

6.4   The Programme Director will receive the evaluation report and will be invited to provide a formal response. The report will then be presented to the sponsoring Councils.

7.   Timetable

7.1   The timetable for the evaluation is as follows:

February 2016	• Evaluators appointed
March 2016 - October2016	• Evaluators conduct programme of work
May 2016	• Evaluators submit Interim Report to ESRC
October 2016	• Evaluators submit Final Report to ESRC
November 2016	• Evaluators complete any necessary amendments to Final Report

NEW DYNAMICS OF AGEING RESEARCH PROGRAMME

SUMMARY DETAILS

Duration:	*2005-2013*
Budget:	*£20 million*
Programme Director:	*Professor Alan Walker, University of Sheffield*
Advisory Committee Chair:	*Baroness Sally Greengross*

Objectives of the Programme

1. The New Dynamics of Ageing Programme was an eight year multidisciplinary research initiative with the ultimate aim of improving quality of life of older people. The programme was a unique collaboration between five UK Research Councils - ESRC, EPSRC, BBSRC, MRC and AHRC - and is the largest and most ambitious research programme on ageing ever mounted in the UK.

2. The Programme aimed to develop practical policy and implementation guidance and novel scientific, technological and design responses to help older people enjoy better quality lives as they age. This required integrating understandings of the changing meanings, representations and experiences of ageing and the key factors shaping them.

3. The objectives of the Programme were:

   - to explore the ways in which individual ageing is subject to different influences over the lifecourse, including identifying the biological determinants of healthy ageing and the social and environmental factors contributing to ageing well;

   - to understand the dynamic ways in which the meaning, understanding and experience of ageing are currently changing and becoming more diverse;

   - to investigate the diverse ways in which ageing is/has been understood and represented at different times and in different cultures.

   - to encourage and support the development of innovative multidisciplinary research groups and methods;

   - to provide a sound evidence base for policy and practice (including the development of prototype systems, procedures and devices) so that research contributes to well-being and quality of life.

4. Further details of the Programme and the individual projects are available at the programme website: http://www.newdynamics.group.shef.ac.uk/ and the ESRC website: http://www.esrc.ac.uk/

ESRC NEW DYNAMICS OF AGEING PROGRAMME

RESEARCH PROJECTS

There are two distinct groups of projects in the Programme: Collaborative Research Projects (CRPs: 11 projects) and Programme Grants (PGs: 24 projects). CRPs are large scale multi-disciplinary collaborations (spanning at least two of the participating Research Councils) with multiple work packages. PGs are smaller scale research projects. Details of the NDA Research Projects are listed below. For more information about the Programme, visit the NDA website at: http://www.newdynamics.group.shef.ac.uk

NDA Collaborative Research Projects:
- SomnIA – Optimising Sleep among Older People in the Community and Care Homes: An Integrated Approach – Sara Arber, Surrey University (May 2011).
- NANA: Novel Assessment of Nutrition in Ageing – Arlene Astell, St Andrews University (February 2012).
- SUS-IT: Sustaining IT Use by Older People to Promote Autonomy and Independence – Leela Damodaran, Loughborough University (March 2012).
- Working Late: Strategies to Enhance Productive and Healthy Environments for the Older Workers – Cheryl Haslam, Loughborough University (November 2012).
- Grey and Pleasant Land? An Inter-disciplinary Exploration of the Connectivity of Older People in Rural Civic Society – Catherine Hennessey, Plymouth University (March 2012).
- Healthy Ageing across the Life Course (HALCyon Project) – Diana Kuh, MRC (May 2012).
- Design for Ageing Well: Improving the Quality of Life for the Ageing Population using a Technology Enabled Garment System – Jane McCann, Newport School of Art, Media & Design (April 2012).
- Mappmal: Multi-disciplinary Approach to Develop a Prototype for the Prevention of Malnutrition in Older People: Products, People, Places and Procedures – Paula Moynihan, Newcastle University (February 2012).
- Modelling Needs and Resources of Older People to 2030 – Michael Murphy, London School of Economics (MAP2030), (June 2010).
- Migration, Nutrition and Ageing across the Lifecourse in Bangladeshi Families: A Transnational Perspective – Janice Thompson, Bristol University (November 2011).
- Tackling Ageing Continence through Theory Tools and Technology TACT3 – Eleanor van den Heuvel, Brunel University (April 2012).

NDA Programme Grants:

- A Combined Genetic and Small Molecule Approach to Studying the Role of the p38/MK2 Stress Signaling Pathway in a Human Premature Ageing Syndrome – Mark C Bagley, Cardiff University (June 2012).
- Ageing, Well-being and Development: A Comparative Study of Brazil and South Africa – Armando Barrientos, University of Manchester (June 2011).
- Ages and Stages: The Place of Theatre in Representations and Recollections of Ageing – Miriam Bernard, Keele University (July 2012).
- Transitions, Choices and Health at Older Ages: Life Course Analyses of Longitudinal Data – David Blane, Imperial University (December 2009).
- Psychometric Testing of the Multidimensional Older People's Quality of Life (OPQOL) Questionnaire and the Causal Model of QoL Under-pinning it – Ann Bowling, University College London (Mar 2009) (follow-on funding October 2010 – September 2011).

- Towards Understanding the Biological Drivers of Cellular Ageing – Lynne Cox, University of Oxford (March 2012).
- Detecting and Preventing Financial Abuse of Older Adults: An Examination of Decision-making by Managers and Professionals – Mary Gilhooly, Brunel University (Mar 2011). (Follow-on Knowledge Transfer Grant September 2011 – August 2012).
- Promoting Social Engagement and Well-being in Older People through Community Supported Participation in Musical Activities – Susan Hallam, Institute of Education (January 2011).
- Maintaining Dignity in Later Life: A Longitudinal Qualitative Study of Older People's Experiences of Supportive Care – Liz Lloyd, Bristol University (June 2011).
- Synergistic Effects of Physical and Psychological Stress Upon Immunesenescence – Janet Lord, Birmingham University (September 2012).
- Innovation in Envisioning Dynamic Biomechanical Data to Inform Healthcare and Design Practice – Alastair Macdonald, Glasgow School of Art and Design (January 2009).
- Biomechanical and Sensory Constraints of Step and Stair Negotiation in Old Age – Constantinos Maganaris, Manchester Metropolitan University (October 2012).
- New Metrics for Exploring the Relationship between Mobility and Successful Ageing – Lynn McInnes, Northumbria University (December 2009).
- Promoting Independence and Social Engagement among Older People in Disadvantaged Communities – Michael Murray, Keele University (February 2011).
- Contemporary Visual Art and Identity Construction - Well-being Amongst Older People – Andrew Newman, Newcastle University (January 2013). (Follow-on funding Jan 2012 – January 2013).
- Transitions in Kitchen Living – Sheila Peace, Open University (November 2011).
- Older People's Use of Unfamiliar Space – Judith Phillips, University of Wales (April 2010).
- Dynamics of Cardiovascular Ageing – Aneta Stefanovska, Lancaster University (March 2012).
- Trajectories of Senescence through Markov Models – David Steinsaltz, Oxford University (June 2012).
- Fiction and the Cultural Mediation of Ageing – Phillip Tew, Brunel University (May 2012).
- Ageing, Poverty and Neoliberalism in Urban South India - Penny Vera-Sanso, Birkbeck College (April 2010).
- Families and Caring in South Asian Communities – Christina Victor, University of Reading (June 2011).
- Representing Self – Representing Ageing – Lorna Warren, University of Sheffield (November 2011).
- Landscapes of Cross-generational Engagement – Peter Wright, Sheffield Hallam University (December 2010).

Section 5 – Evaluation model

The evaluation model below shall be used for this ITQ, which will be determined to two decimal places.

Where a question is 'for information only' it will not be scored.

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 (5+5+6 =16÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	**Q No.**	**Question subject**
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding the requirements	19.98%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Project Team	30.01%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Methodology	24.99%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Risk assessment	5.02%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Project Timescales	5.02%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

Each question will be judged on a score from 0 to 100, which shall be subjected to a multiplier to reflect the percentage of the evaluation criteria allocated to that question.

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 (60/100 x 20 = 12)

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 10% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 10.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 6% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 10 (60/100 x 10 = 6)

The same logic will be applied to groups of questions which equate to a single evaluation criterion.

The 0-100 score shall be based on (unless otherwise stated within the question):

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with

	major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.
40	Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.
60	Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
80	Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.
100	Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider.

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.
Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40

Your final score will (60+60+40+40) ÷ 4 = 50

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100.
All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion.

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.
Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.
Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.
Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 (80/100 x 50 = 40)

The lowest score possible is 0 even if the price submitted is more than 100% greater than the lowest price.

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

Bidders should note that the evaluation questionnaire is located within the **e-sourcing questionnaire.**

Guidance on completion of the questionnaire is available at
http://www.uksbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

What makes a good bid – some simple do's ☺

DO:

7.1   Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.

7.2   Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions.

7.3   Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid.   If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.

7.4   Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.

7.5   Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution

7.6   Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.

7.7   Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.

7.8   Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.

7.9   Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.

7.10   Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.

7.11   Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

What makes a good bid – some simple do not's ☹

DO NOT

7.12   Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.13   Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.

7.14   Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.15   Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.

7.16   Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.17   Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.18   Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.19   Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.20   Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.21   Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.22   Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.23   All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

7.24   Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool.   Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.

7.25   Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.26   Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.27   We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.28   All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.

7.29   We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.30   If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.31   Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.

7.32   Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public

7.33   Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34   Bidders may only amend the Contract terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.

7.35   We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.

7.36   If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.37   Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

7.38   Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal UK SBS reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks UK SBS may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

7.39   All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.40   All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, UK SBS may disclose within Government any of the Bidders documentation/information (including any that the Bidder considers to be confidential and/or commercially sensitive such as specific bid information) submitted by the Bidder to UK SBS during this Procurement. The information will not be disclosed outside Government. Bidders taking part in this ITQ consent to these terms as part of the competition process.

7.41   From 2nd April 2014 the Government is introducing its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme to replace the current Government Protective Marking System (GPMS). A key aspect of this is the reduction in the number of security classifications used. All Bidders are encouraged to make themselves aware of the changes and identify any potential impacts in their Bid, as the protective marking and applicable protection of any material passed to, or generated by, you during the procurement process or pursuant to any Contract awarded to you as a result of this tender process will be subject to the new GSC from 2nd April 2014. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-security-classifications

UK SBS reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)