OPEN TENDER

RSSB INVITATION TO TENDER FOR THE PROVISION OF: RSSB2722 - T1158 – Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy

Deadline: Friday 21st December 17:00 Mid-Day

ITT Reference: RSSB2722 - T1158 – Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy

# TENDER DOCUMENTS

1.1 Tenders shall be submitted in accordance with the following instructions. It is important that all the information requested is provided in the format and order specified. If the Tenderer does not provide all of the information RSSB has requested within the tender pack, RSSB may reject the tender as non-compliant.

1.2 Tenderers must obtain for themselves, at their own responsibility and expense, all information necessary for the preparation of their tender. Tenderers are solely responsible for any costs and expenses in connection with the preparation and submission of their Tender, and all other stages of the selection and evaluation process. Under no circumstances will RSSB, or its advisors, be liable for any costs or expenses Tenderers, their sub-contractors, suppliers or advisors incur in this process, including if this tendering process is terminated or amended by RSSB.

1.3 Tenderers are solely responsible for obtaining the information that they consider is necessary in order to prepare the content of their tender and to undertake any investigations they consider necessary in order to verify any information RSSB provides during the procurement process.

1.4 All pages of the tender submission must be sequentially numbered (including any forms to be completed and returned).

1.5 All specifications, plans, drawings, samples and patterns and anything else that RSSB issues in connection with this ITT, remains the property of RSSB and are to be used solely for the purpose of tendering.

1.6 At any time prior to the deadline for receipt of questions, RSSB may modify the tender documents by amendments in writing.

1.7 RSSB (at its sole discretion) may extend the deadline for receipt of Tenders.

RSSB reserves the right to modify or to discontinue the whole of, or any part of, this tendering process at any time and accepts no obligation whatsoever to award a contract.

# GENERAL, LEGAL & COMPLIANCE

2.1 RSSB will check each tender for completeness and compliance with the tender instructions. RSSB reserves the right to reject any tenders it considers substantially incomplete, or non-compliant (each tender will be assessed on its own merit, according to the level/importance of omitted or non-compliant content).

2.2The Tenderer will be excluded should any of the grounds for mandatory rejection or discretionary rejection be triggered. Mandatory requirements can be viewed within the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

2.3 Tenderers are required to confirm in their tender response, they are able to meet all mandatory and discretionary requirements.

2.4 The Tenderer will be excluded should it be assessed that it has a high risk of:

* + Insolvency over the lifetime of the contract; e.g. the Tenderer may be excluded if its current assets to current liabilities ratio is less than 1;
	+ Insufficient financial capacity to deliver the services effectively; or
	+ Over-dependence on RSSB (e.g. the Tenderer may be excluded if its turnover is less than £ [no more than2x the contract value]

# 3.0 TENDER INSTRUCTIONS

3.1 “RSSB” means the contracting authority, seeking to invite suppliers to participate in the procurement process.

“You” or “Supplier” means the legal entity completing these questions, seeking to be invited to the next step of the procurement process Invitation to Tender (ITT)

3.2 Please ensure all questions are completed in full and in the format requested. Failure to do so may result in your submission being disqualified. If the question does not apply you need to clearly state N/A.

3.3 If it is necessary for you to provide additional information this should be provided as an appendix and clearly referenced as part of your declaration.

3.4 **RSSB REPRESENTATIVE**

Your main point of contact is: shareditt@rssb.co.uk

**RSSB OVERVIEW**

If you wish to find out more about RSSB, please visit our website at [www.rssb.co.uk](http://www.rssb.co.uk)

**Timetable**

The timetable for this procurement follows. This is intended as a guide and whilst RSSB does not intend to depart from the timetable, it reserves the right to do so at any stage.

The expected milestones are set out below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Start Date** |
| Pre-tender engagement | 16/8/18 |
| I.T.T published on Contracts Finder | 22/11/18 |
| Supplier clarification questions deadline  | 17/12/18; 17:00 hours |
| **Deadline for Submitting tenders**  | **21/12/18; 17:00 hours** |
| Post Tender Evaluation and Clarification  | W/C 14/01/18 |
| Estimated notification of award decision | W/C 14/01/18 |
| Target contract commencement date | W/C 21/01/18 |

Note: RSSB reserves the right to amend these dates as business requirements demand and will communicate any changes to tenderers.

3.5 **QUESTIONS**

Should you have any questions relating to the project, please email these before the deadlines detailed in the project timeline above to ensure that these questions can be effectively addressed? To ensure equal and fair treatment to all potential suppliers, RSSB will circulate all questions and responses anonymously.

Questions should be emailed to: shareditt@rssb.co.uk

# 4.0 Evaluation Information

4.1 In the interests of an open, fair and transparent assessment, this document sets out how RSSB intends to evaluate tender responses. It outlines the evaluation criteria and respective weightings, as well as the evaluation methodology to be applied.

4.2 **Verification of Information Provided**

 Whilst reserving the right to request information at any time throughout the procurement process. RSSB may enable the Supplier to self- certify that there are no mandatory/ discretionary grounds for excluding their organisation. When requesting evidence that the supplier can meet the specified questions relating to Technical and Professional Ability RSSB may only obtain such evidence after the final tender evaluation decision and only from the winning Supplier only.

4.3 **Please self-certify whether you already have, or can commit to obtain, prior to the commencement of the contract, the levels of insurance cover indicated below:**

* Employer’s (Compulsory) Liability Insurance = £2M
* Public Liability Insurance = £1M
* Professional Indemnity Insurance = £1M

4.4 **Sub- contracting Arrangements**

 Where the Supplier proposes to use one or more sub- contractors to deliver some or all of the contract requirements, a separate Appendix should be used to provide details of the proposed delivery model that includes members of the supply chain and percentage of work being delivered by each sub -contractor and the key deliverables that each sub- contractor will be responsible for.

RSSB recognises that sub- contracting arrangements may be subject to change and not finalised until a later date. However, Suppliers should be aware that where information provided to RSSB indicates that sub- contractors are to play a significant role in delivering the key requirements and any changes to those sub- contracting arrangements significantly affect the ability of the supplier to deliver key requirements the Supplier should notify RSSB immediately of any changes in the proposed supplier sub-contractor arrangements. RSSB reserves the right to deselect the Supplier prior to any award of contract based on an assessment of the updated information.

4.5 **Consortia Arrangement**

 If the Supplier completing this tender submission is doing so as part of a proposed consortium the following information must be provided:

* Names of all consortium members;
* The lead member of the consortium who will be contractually responsible for delivery of the contract (if a separate legal entity is not being created); and
* If the consortium is proposing to form a legal entity, full details of the proposal should be submitted as an Appendix with this Tender.
* RSSB may require the consortium to assume a specific legal form if awarded the contract. If it is deemed that a legal incorporation is necessary for the satisfactory performance of the contract.
* All members of the consortium will be required to provide the information required in all sections of the Tender as part of a single composite response to RSSB i.e. each member of the consortium is required to contribute to completing the response document.

4.6 **Confidentiality**

 RSSB reserves the right to contact the named customer contact and the nominated customer does not owe RSSB any duty of care or have any legal liability, except for any deceitful or maliciously false statements of fact.

 RSSB confirms that it will keep confidential and will not disclose to any third parties for any information obtained from the named customer contact, other than to the Crown Commercial Services and or contracting authorities defined by the Public Contract Regulations.

# 5.0 Evaluation Process

5.1 The process that will be used to select an appropriate Tenderer and award the contract for this procurement is available in more detail in the Evaluation Criteria.

The open procedure is a single stage process.

5.2 **Marking for Award Criteria**

An evaluation panel consisting of representatives of key stakeholders within RSSB will carry out the evaluation. The procurement team will only act as moderator during the assessment phases of the evaluation.

Each evaluation area is weighted to show the relative importance significance of the criteria specific area’s for assessment.

# 6.0 PROCESS AND PREPARATION OF RESPONSES

6.1 The Supplier shall not enter in any agreement or arrangement with any third party which would in any way cause RSSB or its members to incur any financial obligations to the Supplier or any third party.

6.2 The Supplier shall not approach any Customer employee, the Customer’s Representative or its agents to discuss any aspects of the Tender. All communication should be conducted via the Customers Representative.

6.3 The Supplier shall not canvass support for the award of the contract by approaching any employee of RSSB, its Representative or its agents.

6.4 The documents as enclosed are to be accepted in their entirety. No alteration Representative before the date stated for the receipt of tenders. If any alteration is made or these instructions to Suppliers are not fully complied with the tender may be invalidated.

6.5 The conditions of contract included in this Invitation to tender apply. The Suppliers standard terms of business or trade will not be accepted.

6.6 Any requested changes to the conditions of contract must be detailed on the Contract Issues Memo document included for consideration. If this is not completed, it is assumed that the Supplier has accepted all terms and conditions detailed and no further changes will be accepted.

6.7 The Supplier shall be deemed to have satisfied itself as to the nature, extent and the content of the goods, services or works to be provided, the extent of staff required and all other matters, which may affect the tender.

6.8 All prices quoted to be GBP (unless otherwise requested in the Invitation to Tender) exclusive Value Added Tax and firm.

 It is the Suppliers responsibility to ensure the tender is correct at the time of submission. No amendment to the tender will be allowed after the due date.

6.9 Any questions must be emailed to the main point of contact no less than five days before the return date. Note: questions/responses will be circulated anonymously to all Suppliers invited to tender. Tenders received after the closing date and time will not be considered.

6.10 The Customers Representative reserves the right to correct any omissions or inaccuracies in the Invitation to Tender and to clarify and/or amend any of the Customers’ requirements, up to seven days before the return of tenders.

6.11 All information supplied by RSSB must be treated in confidence and not disclosed to third parties except insofar as this is necessary to obtain sureties or tenders required during the preparation of the Tender. All information provided by Suppliers will be treated in confidence except in stances where references may be sought.

6.12 RSSB reserves the right to cancel this Tender at any point and any cost incurred in the preparation of this Tender is at the Bidder’s expense.

6.13 Tenders must remain open for acceptance for a period of 180 calendar days from the submission date.

6.14 The tenderer should include the following information as part of their tender response:

Legal entity name of Tenderer

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Contact person's name, email address, telephone number and postal address for enquiries relating to this procurement

|  |
| --- |
| Name: |
| Postal address: |
| Telephone number: |
| Email address: |

Tenderer’s registered address

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Tenderer’s website address (if available)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Please tick the box for the legal form of the Tenderer

|  |
| --- |
| * Sole Trader [ ]
* Partnership [ ]
* Limited Liability Partnership [ ]
* Private Limited Company [ ]
* Public Limited Company [ ]
* Local Council [ ]
* Voluntary/ charitable/ not for profit organisation [ ]
* Other (please specify below) [ ]
 |

If ‘Other’ has been selected from the question above please provide details.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

If your business is a registered company, charity or any other registered organisation (including limited, non-limited or Industrial and Provident Society), please state your registration number. This must be the registration number of the Tenderer, providing the country and date of incorporation / registration if other than the UK.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Name of ultimate parent company (if this applies)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Companies House Registration number of ultimate parent company (if this applies)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Additional Notes**

* Fully answer the question given and consider the weighting for the section
* Explain how you will meet the criteria and provide evidence to support your response.
* Further reading on how to complete the tender is available in section 10

# 7.0 TENDER EVALUATION (SELECTION CRITERIA)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Selection criteria** | **Detail** | **Evaluation Criteria** |
| **S1** Supplier’s relevant organisational experience in carrying out WebTAG compliant economic appraisal.[Max 1 page] | The tenderer should provide a short description of at least **2 projects** completed within the past **5 years** that demonstrates their ability to carry out WebTAG compliant economic appraisal to a suitable degree. | Pass: The tenderer provided a short description of at least two projects completed within the past 5 years that demonstrates their ability to carry WebTAG compliant economic appraisals to a suitable degree. Through the above this provides RSSB with a strong degree of confidence in its experience with WebTAG compliant economic appraisal to a suitable proficiency.Fail: The tenderer either fails to provide a short description of at least two projects completed within the past 5 years that demonstrates their ability to carry WebTAG compliant economic appraisals to a suitable degree or fails to provide RSSB with sufficient confidence in its ability to carry out WebTAG compliant economic appraisal to a suitable proficiency.**Note:** Should a tenderer achieve a “Fail” mark at this stage the tenderers bid will not taken further for evaluation. |
| **S2** Supplier’s organisational experience and proficiency in gauging analysis[Max 1 page] | The tenderer should provide a short description of at least **2 projects** completed within the past **5 years** that demonstrates their ability to carry out relevant gauging analysis.  | Pass: The tenderer provides a short description of at least 2 projects completed within the past 5 years that demonstrates their ability to carry out relevant gauging analysis. Further, through the above this provides RSSB with a strong degree of confidence in its ability to carry out gauging analysis.Fail: The tenderer either fails to provide a short description of at least 2 projects completed within the past 5 years that demonstrates their ability to carry out relevant gauging analysisor fails to provide RSSB with sufficient confidence in its ability to carry out gauging analysis.**Note:** Should a tenderer achieve a “Fail” mark at this stage the tenderers bid will not taken further for evaluation. |
| **S3** Summary of the Proposal[Max 1 page] | The Tenderer must provide a concise summary highlighting the key aspects of the proposal and will be used to contextualise the Supplier’s response, in no more than 2 pages. | Pass: The Tenderer has provided a concise summary highlighting the key aspects of the proposal of the supplier.Fail: The Tenderer has not provided a concise summary or has not provided a summary highlighting the key aspects of the proposal of the supplier.**Note:** Should a tenderer achieve a “Fail” mark at this stage the tenderers bid will not taken further for evaluation. |

# 8.0 TENDER EVALUATION (AWARD CRITERIA)

8.1 **ITT Assessment**

**The Contract Award decision is solely based on the basis of Tenderer proposal and price offering.**

8.2 RSSB uses the following quality / price ratio to determine the outcome of the evaluation where quality (technical evaluation) and price are weighted and scored individually before being combined.

 Quality 80%: Price 20%

8.3 Technical criteria are weighted and scored as a percentage of the maximum score available with a minimum quality threshold set.

 **Technical Evaluation**

8.4 Tenders are assessed on how well they satisfy the technical evaluation criteria.

 The relative importance of each criterion is established by giving it a percentage weighting so that all the weightings equal 100%. The Evaluation Matrix provides details of the weightings that RSSB will use in assessing Tenderer proposals.

 The Technical Evaluation will be carried out using Tenderer responses to the tender specification using the scoring scheme (identified in Table below).

8.5 The scored responses are generally assessed out of a maximum of five (5). The Evaluation Panel will not be allowed to give partial scores (for example 3.5); however, once all scores are aggregated, the technical scores will be rounded to two decimal places prior to consolidating with the price evaluation.

8.6 The following shall constitute a failure to evidence satisfactory delivery of the requirement(s) of the procurement and will automatically disqualify the Tenderer:

1. A grade of zero (0) in any of the evaluated technical/quality questions in Section D of Schedule One (a) of Part B of the ITT before the weightings are applied; or
2. a grade of one (1) in more than one of the evaluated technical/quality questions in Section D of Schedule One (a) of Part B of the ITT before the weightings are applied

8.7 Those Tender Responses which fail to demonstrate satisfactory delivery of the requirement(s) of the procurement by reason of failing to achieve these minimum thresholds will be set aside and not considered further.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **Definition of grade** |
| 5 | A wholly excellent Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses all aspects of the question in an informed and comprehensive manner;
* Demonstrates a thorough understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides evidence of how that understanding can be applied in practice;
* Offers full confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service in full;
* Addresses the majority of areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides certain, unambiguous commitments or statements of intent that permit reliance through translation into contractual terms
 |
| 4 | * A good Tender Response that (where applicable):
* Addresses all aspects of the question and is generally of a good standard;
* Demonstrates a good understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides a worked-up methodical approach;
* Offers confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service in full with limited areas of doubt or uncertainty;
* Addresses key areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides commitments that can be translated well into contractual terms
 |
| 3 | A satisfactory Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses the majority of the question and is generally of a good standard but lacks substance or detail in some areas;
* Demonstrates an understanding of what is being asked for;
* Provides a satisfactory approach;
* Offers a general level of confidence that the Tenderer will deliver the service (but with room for doubt in some areas);
* Address some areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Provides some commitments that can be translated well into contractual terms.
 |
| 2 | A Tender Response that (where applicable):* Addresses some of the question but *either* lacks relevant information and detail *or* lacks substance in a manner that would suggest the response is a “model answer”;
* Demonstrates some understanding but with a lack of clarity in key areas;
* Provides an approach which is not wholly appropriate or viable orlacks evidence;
* Shows that the level of confidence that the supplier can deliver does not outweigh the doubt;
* Does not address many areas of doubt and uncertainty; and
* Does not offer sufficient commitment (with doubt as to the extent to which would translate into contractual terms)
 |
| 1 | A generally unsatisfactory Tenderer response that (where applicable):* Does not address the question or has omissions;
* Lacks understanding in significant areas:
* Provides an approach which has gaps or creates concerns;
* Shows that the level of confidence that the supplier can deliver is low;
* Creates uncertainty; and
* Displays significant lack of commitment (with doubt as to the extent to which would translate into contractual terms)
 |
| 0 | A wholly unsatisfactory Tenderer response that (where applicable):* Provides no response or omissions/oversights that prevent scoring;
* Refuses to deliver the requirement; and
* Creates concerns so significant that the response would be detrimental to the interests of RSSB
 |

#  9.0 ITT Evaluation Matrix (Award Criteria)

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation matrix** |
| **Award criteria** | **Detail** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Weighting**  |
| **W1** Supplier’s technical competence in relevant areas for the study[Max 5 pages] | The tenderer should provide evidence of their resource’s technical competence in 1. Economic analysis,
2. Gauging analysis,
3. Additional relevant technical skills required to carry out the project;

And 1. Clearly identify each team member’s role (providing one-page CVs for key project members within an appendix)and demonstrate that team members are appropriate to the assigned tasks**.**
 | The tenderer provides clear evidence that they have: 1. Identified any additional technical skills required to deliver the project in addition to those identified
2. Technical competence in the relevant technical areas
3. Identified relevant individuals against the mix of skills required to deliver the work
 | 25% |
| **W2** Method statement – ability to meet deliverables[Max 5 pages] | Tenderers should provide a method statement that: 1. Detail how they propose to fulfil the project objectives;
2. Identify technical challenges of the project and propose solutions for overcoming them;
3. Detail how the methodology will be implemented keeping within the scope to produce the required deliverables;
4. Explain how they would meet the critical success factors for this piece of research;
 | The tenderer’s response, that they have:1. Demonstrates their understanding of the context of the work, illustrating how the work package objectives, scope and deliverables are related to the wider project objectives, and how they will meet them;
2. Explains how they would apply their expertise and how this would add value in meeting the objectives;
3. Clearly details the project structure and methodology, in a coherent and systematic way to meet the project requirements;
4. Identified suitable ways to address the project’s critical success factors.
 | 30% |
| **W3** Project planning and risk management [Max 5 pages] | Tenderers should outline a project plan which:1. Provides a schedule which allocates resources to successfully deliver to time and quality.
2. Identifies key dependencies, and risks in the project
3. Proposes mitigation strategies for each risks/dependency.
4. Propose a review process which ensures quality of deliverables.
 | The tenderer’s response shows, that they have:1. Provided a credible plan for delivering successful outcomes to time and quality
2. Clearly links to the project’s methodology and structure.
3. Identifies individuals against specific tasks.
4. Identified relevant risks, including those beyond the ITT and proposes and effective mitigation of known risks and suitable contingency to unknown risks.
5. Proposes a sound process for quality assuring the reviewing.
 | 15% |
| **W4** Communication and Stakeholder Management[Max 3 pages] | Tenderers should outline a communication plan which:1. Demonstrate how they would work with RSSB and communicate and engage with relevant industry
2. Identifies relevant stakeholders for the research and comes up with a plan to engage them.
 | The tenderer’s response shows, that they have:1. Proposed a sound plan to communicate with RSSB and the project steering group
2. Has identified relevant stakeholders for different phases of the project.
3. Has proposed a sound methodology to engage with key stakeholders
 | 10% |
| **W5** Cost of project | Tenderers should:* Provide a fixed cost for the project and the associated cost break down. If the fixed cost is above the budgeted amount of £150,000 then a detailed explanation as to why any proposed increase is necessary, and what added value it may provide.
 | * The tender with the lowest total cost will receive 100% of the available weighted score (20%).
* Other tenderer’s will receive a pro-rated score relative to the lowest cost according to the following formula:
	+ Score of other tender = lowest tender total cost / other tender total cost x 100%.
 | 20% |

# 10.0 PRICE EVALUATION

10.1 All prices quoted shall be in sterling (unless otherwise requested in the Tender Documents), exclusive of Value Added Tax and shall be firm.

10.2 A full and comprehensive breakdown of all costs and expenses to provide the goods, services or works requested in this invitation to tender must be provided and all assumptions must be clearly stated.

10.3 Failure to provide adequate detail may cause your tender to be judged non-compliant.

10.4 The construction of the price must be clear and easy to understand. Where appropriate the use of tables to show pricing is preferred. We require the following information:

* + - A breakdown by grade and named individual, indicating the number of days to be worked on each task and the daily rate to be charged.
		- A list of sub-contracts with prices and copies of quotations where available (a similar breakdown by grade, named individuals and rates, as above, is required where the sub-contract is for manpower).
		- Details of any other costs, such as hire charges for equipment.
		- Details of travel and subsistence and all expenses to be incurred. Mileage reclaim will be linked to maximum levels set by HMRC.
		- The above breakdowns should be further broken down into individual work packages.

# 11.0 TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

11.1 In evaluating tenders, the most economically advantageous tender(s) will be sought. This will be using the evaluation criteria and weightings detailed in **ITT Evaluation Matrix** **Award Criteria**.

11.2 The evaluation criteria detail the minimum requirements. Therefore, any tender which cannot demonstrate that it meets any of the minimum requirements will not be marked and will automatically score zero.

Tenderers are advised to carefully consider the attached specifications, ask clarification questions to ensure these are understood.

# 12.0 CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

The terms and conditions of the contract are contained with a separate document.

**Qualification of the Contract**

Where Tenderers have any queries or concerns with any specific condition of the terms and conditions of the contract, these should be submitted in writing to **shareditt@rssb.co.uk** as soon as possible, and in any case no later than 10 days prior to the deadline for submission of tenders.  Please ensure the specific condition(s) and proposed amendment(s) are provided.  These will be reviewed by RSSB on a case by case basis, and, if accepted, revised terms and conditions will be issued to all Tenderers.  Failure to accept the terms and conditions of the contract or to qualify the tender in any way, may result in the tender being rejected by RSSB.

## 13.0 RSSB Company Information

 ***Insert Work Package Title*Introduction**

RSSB was established in April 2003. The Company’s primary objective is to facilitate the railway industry’s work to achieve continuous improvement in the health and safety performance of the railways in Great Britain, and thus to facilitate the reduction of risk to passengers, employees and the affected public. The railway is a complex system with multiple interfaces delivered by many different organisations. At RSSB we bring these different organisations together to make collective decisions. We help the rail industry carry out research, understand risk, set standards and improve performance. We provide a constant point of reference in a changing environment.

We support rail in the areas of safety standards, knowledge and innovation and a wide range of cross- industry schemes requiring our knowledge and independence. Our work involves close collaboration, but as technical experts we also appoint suppliers in the wider market to provide an informed view.

**Key elements of the company’s remit are to:**

* Manage Railway Group Standards on behalf of the industry
* Lead the development of long-term safety strategy for the industry, including the publication of annual Railway Strategic Safety Plans
* Propose change through facilitation of the research and development programme, education and awareness
* Measure, report and inform on health and safety performance, safety intelligence, trends, data and risk
* Support cross-industry groups in national programmes which address major areas of safety concern
* Facilitate the effective representation of the UK rail industry in the development of European legislation and standards that impact on the rail system

RSSB is a not-for-profit company owned by major industry stakeholders. The company is limited by guarantee and is governed by its members, a board and an advisory committee. It is independent of any single railway company and of their commercial interests.

**Specification for research project**

T1158 – Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy

# Background

### Context

Across Europe the distance between the rails (the track gauge) has long been harmonised. However, due to the historical nature of the development of Britain’s infrastructure, compared to Continental Europe, GB has much less space around the tracks (known as the loading gauge) and there remains a large degree of variability in vehicle clearance around the network.

There are potentially significant benefits to having both larger and more consistent loading gauges. Larger gauges could enable greater capacity by allowing use of larger passenger rolling stock and larger freight to be transported. More consistent gauging would improve route interoperability, improved utilisation of rolling stock, and a better platform train interface for the passenger. With the ambition to unlock these benefits, the Vehicle Structures Systems Interface Committee (V/S SIC) have drafted a Gauging Strategy (V/S GS) that outlines a vision for very long term (50 years) planning in Great Britain[[1]](#footnote-1) which is outlined in A. – D. below:

1. **Maximise Capacity on Great Britain’s Rail Network by adopting the largest cost-effective gauge over a core, nationwide network;**
2. **Define and implement standard infrastructure and vehicle gauges and provide an optimised Customer experience at the Platform / Train Interface;**
3. **Lower Costs of gauging to the industry;**
4. **Contribute to Great Britain’s reduction in Carbon emissions through modal shift.**

However, gauging enhancements are typically expensive, and the very long asset life of civil engineering structures means that benefits from such enhancements can take a very long time to be realised. The justification of any significant gauging enhancement therefore requires a good business case for progression. In addition to the current appraisal process, the justification of individual enhancements will likely require consideration of benefits to the wider system, however the approach to quantifying these benefits is not established and are likely complex. Finally, for the benefits to be realised, an approach must be agreed and defined with support at both the policy and practitioner level, and this approach needs to be consistent over the long term.

This VS GS has been endorsed in principle by the Technical Leadership Group (TLG)[[2]](#footnote-2) and the Planning Oversight Group (POG)[[3]](#footnote-3), with the caveat that before full commitment can be given to the strategy, there is a requirement for evidence-based research to support the principles. A detailed economic study was therefore recommended by the groups to better understand the costs and benefits of implementing such a strategy, and if applicable, how it can be implemented to optimise this investment.

### Previous work

There has already been a significant amount of work in this area. The Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) published a Gauging Policy[[4]](#footnote-4). This document was produced with the V/S SIC and since the abolishment of SRA, responsibility for implementing it has been passed to V/S SIC. This philosophy of this document is largely represented in the new VS GS.

More recently The Network Rail Utilisation Strategy for Passenger Rolling Stock (RUS RS)[[5]](#footnote-5) recognised the complexity of the interaction between rolling stock and fixed assets and made several recommendations including:

1. Industry to develop standard passenger gauges
2. Infrastructure improvements and rolling stock procurement are planned together
3. A clearance strategy be adopted, whereby the gauging work required to accommodate trains of each type is carried out at the same time as other gauging activity.

Significant progress has been made on the development of standard passenger gauges, for all vehicles, the Development of a Revised Lower Sector Vehicle Gauge (LSVG)[[6]](#footnote-6), and for passenger vehicles Standard Vehicle Gauges PG1 (20m) and PG2 (23m)[[7]](#footnote-7) have already been incorporated into GERT8073; with the likely addition of the 26m Vehicle Standard Gauge[[8]](#footnote-8) (PG3) in the next revision. These revisions hope to simplify the introduction of new, and cascade of existing passenger rolling stock onto the railway network. Additionally, there has been continual developments of the National Gauging Database.

Since the RUS RS, there has also been a more systematic approach to the planning of gauge improvements. The DfT published a The Rail Freight Strategy[[9]](#footnote-9) in 2016 and the introduction of the Strategic Freight Network (SFN)[[10]](#footnote-10) aims to expand the compatibility and capacity of the freight loading gauge by enhancing a core Network to a W10 gauge. Furthermore, the Long-Term Planning Process (LTPP) has set out aspirations for freight clearance improvements over a 25-year time horizon down to a route section level.[[11]](#footnote-11)

# Objectives

The aim of this research project is to understand whether there is a strong economic and value for money case for adopting the principles from the Gauging Strategy, and how these principles can best be applied to maximise the potential benefits. To do this, the project must:

1. Understand the approach and factors included in the current appraisal, policy and decision process for infrastructure renewal and gauging enhancement programmes.
2. Identify, define and quantify the benefits from implementing larger gauge capability and more consistent gauging, beyond current factors considered.
3. Investigate the feasibility of considering these benefits in current processes and propose an approach for their inclusion.
4. Test this approach against a case study, taking into consideration the constraints of the system and increased costs, and determine the optimum long-term strategy.
5. Use the learning from the study undertaken to make recommendation to amend and take forward the gauging strategy across the GB network.

The results of the work will be used to inform the Gauging Strategy and how its principles could be applied; this will then be presented to key stakeholders and decision makers in industry so that an evidence-based decision can be made in the adoption of the strategy and future planning of the Network.

# Scope

This section defines the tasks to be tendered against, and the technical content against which the submissions will be assessed.

### In scope

The following aspects are expected to be addressed by the tenderers’ response

* Both passenger and freight operations
* Stakeholder engagement and communication, likely to including workshops or interviews for example.
* Economic analysis, including likely consideration of:
	+ Costs of infrastructure upgrades
	+ Economic quantification of the benefits
	+ Consideration for different future levels of demand (Freight and Passenger)
	+ Scenario planning to demonstrate the recommendations that are value for money in a range of possible futures
* Cost benefit analysis for a specific case study
* Gauging analysis for a specific case study

### Out of scope

Any of the following aspects are not expected to be addressed by the tenderers’ response; any proposal which covers these aspects should provide clear explanations on the value being brought through associated work and should be presented as a separately costed option.

* New research around the Platform to Train Interface (PTI) position in Great Britain
	+ Platform height and offset position
	+ New strategies for Gap Closing devices
* New research into vehicle design / size
* Design of new gauges
* Innovations around gauging calculations or measurements
* Revision of the existing, or development of a new gauging strategy
* Network wide quantification of benefits
* Development or design of gap closing devices or passive provision of removable sections of platform

### For consideration

The following points may require consideration if deemed relevant:

* Costs and options for passive provision of removable sections of platform edge
* Use of existing gap closing solutions
* Use of European gauges

# Methodology

Suppliers are expected to explain the methodology that they are intending to use to successfully meet the objectives of this work. Suppliers are welcome to propose their own methodology and work package structure for delivering the requirements of the research project. A suggested framework has been set out in the following sections:

### **Work package 1**: Economic analysis

An exploration of the potential benefits of applying longer-term gauging principles. The following tasks are suggested:

1. An examination of the benefits considered in the current appraisal process. This should consider the range of approaches taken (if applicable) and should identify best practise as a baseline. This will likely require the tenderer to engage with industry, and in particular practitioners at multiple levels at Network Rail. The tenderer should make allowances for interviews, travel, and workshop activities as applicable. The project steering group will assist where possible with industry contacts, but the tenderer should also plan to make their own arrangements.
2. Identification of the potential benefits not considered in current practise. Benefits are likely to include (but will not be limited to):
	1. Increase in capacity through larger passenger vehicles and freight loads
	2. Improved customer experience and safety from an improved platform train interface
	3. Potential reduced costs from economies of scale from reduction of bespoke rolling stock design
	4. Reduction in cascading costs from better rolling stock route compatibility by lowering the difficulty of gauging assessments / route acceptance for rolling stock
	5. Improved route availability from better rolling stock route compatibility
	6. Reduction in disruption from more diversionary route options from better rolling stock route compatibility
	7. Potential reduction in long term costs from removal of incremental duplication in gauging enhancements (for example with downstream electrification projects).
	8. Potential reduction in carbon from modal shift to rail, from increased capacity.
	9. An assessment of the potential risks of a gauging strategy, including:
		1. Potential in creation of redundant costs (i.e. for those that do not realise benefits)
		2. The implications of creation of monopoly suppliers to future costs and efficiency of standardisation of rolling stock and gauge.

This will likely require the tenderer to review a wide range of literature, engage with industry and carry out bespoke analysis. Any analysis should be made clear and all assumptions agreed by the project steering group, and all quantifications should include a measure of uncertainty. If benefits cannot be reasonably quantified, these should still be included qualitatively.

1. Define an approach for including the quantification of such benefits at a project level. This will need to consider
	1. At what stage and process the assessment of these benefits can be included in.
	2. The required data or assumptions required for the inclusion of this assessment.
	3. The practicality of the inclusion in a working environment and the effort required.
	4. The underlying uncertainty in their inclusion and how these are represented, including an analysis of the different scenarios where benefits are realisable.

Additionally this task will likely require the tenderer to engage with industry, and in particular practitioners at multiple levels at Network Rail. Arrangements should be made to minimise disruption by combining engagement activities where possible.

### **Work package 2**: Case Study

This work package will carry out a route specific case study of the approach defined in work package 1 (Economic analysis). The following tasks are suggested:

1. Agree the route(s) and areas to be used for the study. The selected route(s) will need to be a suitable case study for both passenger and freight services. The project steering group have suggested that the Trans Pennine route will be a suitable, but the supplier will need to ensure the availability of information and engagement from the route. Or alternatively the supplier can propose a different route / case study.
2. Understanding of the existing long-term plans already put into place for the selected route, using real costing information where possible (and supplemented by assumptions where necessary) to understand this as the base case.
3. Apply the approach developed in work package 1 and propose the largest cost-effective gauge. This will likely require the calculation of a range of scenarios and a range of assumptions for costs, and benefits. Additionally, this will likely require an exploration of the constraints of the case study and the implications of significant upgrades, including the consideration /use of European passenger gauges and level access/uniform platform step/heights.

This work package should result in the creation of a case or range of cases that can be reasonably compared with the base case. The analysis should make clear the assumptions used on costings and benefits, and resultant impacts of the case(s) examined. Including the impact of whole life costs, effects of disruption, timeframe for benefit delivery. Where applicable, it should also include qualitative observations on each of the case(s), from both a freight and passenger perspective.

### **Work package 3:** Recommendations on communication

This work package should bring together the findings from work packages 1 and 2 and make recommendations on the proposed next steps (if appropriate) on how the industry might implement the Gauging Strategy on a GB network-wide basis, to optimise investment for the industry taking a long term (50 year) view.

This work is likely to include:

1. Production of suitable documentation with clear evidence to support the conclusions drawn.
2. Presentations of results and dialogue with key stakeholders, including V/S SIC, POG, Network Rail and the Department for Transport.

# Deliverables

This project will provide the following deliverables:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy – Economic analysis report  |
| **Deliverable Type** | Report |
| **Description** | An interim report detailing the work and conclusions from work package 1.  |
| **Publication** | All documentation to be produced in the standard RSSB format. It will be reviewed and approved by the project steering group and published on SPARK  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy for GB – Case study report |
| **Deliverable Type** | Report |
| **Description** | A report detailing the work and conclusions from case study |
| **Publication** | All documentation to be produced in the standard RSSB format. It will be reviewed and approved by the project steering group and published on SPARK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy for GB – Final report |
| **Deliverable Type** | Report |
| **Description** | A report detailing the work and conclusions from the entire project. |
| **Publication** | All documentation to be produced in the standard RSSB format. It will be reviewed approved by the project steering group and published on SPARK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy for GB – Research Brief |
| **Deliverable Type** | Research Brief |
| **Description** | A 4-page summary of the work undertaken, and conclusions drawn |
| **Publication** | All documentation to be produced in the standard RSSB format. It will be reviewed by RSSB and prepared for wide distribution.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable Title** | Assessing the Case for Implementing a Long-Term Gauging Strategy for GB – Presentations |
| **Deliverable Type** | Presentations |
| **Description** | The tenderer should allow for at least three presentations on the findings and recommendations  |
| **Publication** | A suitably sharable format clearly identifying RSSB as the funders |

# Deliverables review process

The supplier submits the draft deliverables to the RSSB Project Manager. Following submission, the draft deliverables will be reviewed in parallel by the RSSB Project Manager, RSSB Technical Lead and the project steering group (stakeholders are usually given two to three weeks to provide feedback). The Project Manager provides collated feedback to the supplier in order for the deliverables to be revised. Further revisions (as part of the contract) may be requested if previously identified issues have not been resolved. Following revision, the deliverables will be presented to the primary client group. The deliverables are then finalised and published by RSSB

A first draft of the Research in Brief is produced by the supplier and provided to the RSSB Delivery Manager. The Research in Brief is subsequently finalised and published by RSSB.

# Stakeholder roles and responsibilities

The key stakeholders and their responsibilities are detailed in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder(s)** | **General role in project** | **Specific role in acceptance of deliverables** |
| RSSB Project Manager | The RSSB Project Manager is the first point of contact during project delivery and is responsible for the detailed project management including project schedules, cost reporting and other relevant project management tasks. The Project Manager leads the project in organising meetings, etc and ensures timely and effective delivery towards project objectives. | Facilitates technical review and acceptance processes, identifies and monitors corrective actions where needed, including facilitating decision making. |
| RSSB Technical Lead | Throughout the project, the RSSB Technical Lead ensures that technical aspects are reflected accurately. Technical aspects can refer to specific issues around railway signalling, track engineering, safety relevant operations or any other specialist field. | Reviews emerging outputs from a technical perspective. |
| Industry sponsor  | The industry sponsor acts as figurehead for the research, championing its importance and its outputs. The industry sponsor forms part of the project steering group, however, their key role as sponsor is to provide steer to the research as it progresses and to exert pressure on industry to make use of its findings. | Reviews emerging outputs from a technical perspective. |
| Project steering group | The project steering group ensures the project delivers to industry needs. As such, it helps formulate specifications, assesses tenders, reviews draft and final outputs and other relevant tasks. | Reviews emerging outputs from a technical perspective. |
| Primary client group  | The primary client group is made up of RSSB members and other stakeholders across industry.The group is kept informed of the project’s progress each Period (4 weeks). A presentation is made by the supplier to inform the client group of the project’s deliverables. | Informed of deliverables. |

# Budget, timescales and responsibilities

# The budget for this work is up to £150,000. Any bid above this value will need to provide detailed explanation on why the supplier doesn’t feel that the budget is adequate and in such case, we strongly encourage suppliers to provide costed options for RSSB to consider.

# The work is expected to start in January 2019 with the ambition to have the work complete by October 2019. These are indicative dates and RSSB is prepared to consider bids that vary from these expectations if they have a robust and realistic project plan, and an explanation of the proposed changes to the dates.

No dependencies have been identified at this stage.

**Appendix X Form of Tender**

This section outlines how the offer from the Tenderer is to be constructed. Please return this Tender Declaration along with your Tender and retain a copy for your records.

Having examined the ITT email, the Instructions to Tenderers, the Information Required From Tenderers, the Conditions of Contract, the Specification and this Form of Tender (the “Tender Documents”), we offer to supply all/part of (delete as applicable) the goods, services or works specified in these Tender Documents.

We undertake if selected, to perform the contract in accordance with the Tender Documents, including the Conditions of Contract contained herein.

We agree that this tender shall remain open for acceptance by the Customer for 180 days from the date stipulated for the return of tenders.

We understand that you are not bound to accept the lowest, or any tender you may receive.

We certify that this is a bona fide tender, and that we have not fixed or adjusted the amount of the tender by or under or in accordance with any agreement or arrangement with any other person. We also certify that we have not done and we undertake that we will not do, at any time before the hour and date specified for the return of this tender, any of the following acts:

1. Communicate to a person, other than the person calling for the tenders, the amount or approximate amount of the proposed tender. Except where the disclosure, in confidence, of the approximate amount of the tender was necessary to obtain insurance premium quotations required for the preparation of the tender.
2. Enter into an agreement or arrangement with any other person that he shall refrain from tendering or as to the amount of any tender to be submitted.
3. Offer or pay or give or agree to pay or give, any sum of money or valuable consideration directly or indirectly to any person, for doing or having done or causing or having caused to be done, in relation to any other tender or proposed tender for the said goods, services or works, any act or thing of the sort described herein.

We recognise that the Customer reserves the right to clarify details of our offer prior to the award of any contract.

We hereby undertake that the period during which this tender remains open for acceptance not to divulge to any persons, other than the persons to whom the tender is to be submitted, any information relating to the submission of this tender or the details contained therein except where such is necessary for the purpose of submission of this tender.

**Appendix X Subcontractors**

All suppliers to RSSB are asked to provide details of all sub-contractors that will be used to perform the contract.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name & Address of Sub-Contractor | Service performed for Contractor | Provide details of staff numbers[[12]](#footnote-12) | Provide latest year’s turnover |
| Name:  |  |  |  |  |
| Address: |  |
| Name:  |  |  |  |  |
| Address: |  |
| Name:  |  |  |  |  |
| Address: |  |

**Appendix X Conflicts** **of** **Interest**

**Tenderers have a continuing duty to disclose actual or potential conflicts of interest in respect of itself, its named sub-contractors and / or consortia members.**

**Please describe any (potential) conflicts of interest that the Tenderer has identified and how these will be managed\*:**

If you **DO** **NOT** have any conflicts to declare, please tick this box: **[ ]**

Tenderers are reminded that failure to identify material conflicts of interest may lead to rejection of its tender response.

Guidance to Tenderers:

Tenderers should describe in the detail the perceived conflict (how it could be perceived in the context of this procurement) and the measures it will take to mitigate the conflict through the procurement life-cycle and service delivery

1. Gauging Strategy – A Vision for Great Britain (V/S SIC, 2017) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See: <https://www.rssb.co.uk/groups-and-committees/rssb-board/technical-strategy/technical-leadership-group> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See: <https://www.raildeliverygroup.com/about-us/governance/strategic-boards/planning-production-board/planning-oversight-group.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Gaugin Policy (Strategic Rail Authority, 2004), see also the Strategic Freight Interchange Policy (SRA, 2004) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Network Rail Utilisation Strategy for Rolling Stock (Network Rail, 2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. T977 – Development of a Revised Lower Sector Vehicle Gauge (RSSB, 2013) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. T978 – Development of a new ‘Surburban’ passenger vehicle standard gauge (RSSB, 2013) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. T1092 – Development of a 26m Vehicle Standard Gauge (RSSB, 2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Rail freight Strategy (Department for Transport, 2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See: <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/industry-commercial-partners/rail-freight/> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See: <https://www.networkrail.co.uk/running-the-railway/long-term-planning/> and for a specific example see: <https://cdn.networkrail.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Route-Specifications-2016-Anglia.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. This is the average annual numbers of both staff and managerial staff employed over the last trading year [↑](#footnote-ref-12)