Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)

Subject: Post Graduate Research Catalyst Evaluation

Sourcing Reference Number: CR18074

UK SBS
Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for the Contracting Authorities 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 Contracting Authorities. This allows Contracting Authorities 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 the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), 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, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) 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 Contracting Authorities.

Our Contracting Authorities who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed here.

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

UK Research and Innovation

Operating across the whole of the UK and with a combined budget of more than £6 billion, UK Research and Innovation represents the largest reform of the research and innovation funding landscape in the last 50 years.

As an independent non-departmental public body UK Research and Innovation brings together the seven Research Councils (AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, and STFC) plus Innovate UK and a new organisation, Research England.

UK Research and Innovation ensures the UK maintains its world-leading position in research and innovation. This is done by creating the best environment for research and innovation to flourish.

For more information, please visit: www.ukri.org

Section 3 - Working with Research England .

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	Contracting Authority Name and address	UK Research and Innovation Polaris House Swindon SN2 1FL
3.2	Buyer name	Amelia Stroud
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£54,166.00 excluding VAT.
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	Wednesday 30th May 2018 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Thursday 7th June 2018 14.00pm
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Friday 8th June 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Thursday 14th June 2018 14.00
3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available for face to face interviews	Wednesday 20th June London and Friday 22nd June 2018 Bristol
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Monday 25th June 2018
3.12	Anticipated Award date	Tuesday 26th June 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	Wednesday 27th June 2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	Tuesday 31st March 2020
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

In April 2018, by Act of Parliament (the Higher Education and Research Act, 2017), the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) was dissolved, its research knowledge exchange policy and funding functions were transferred to Research England (a council within UK Research and Innovation) and a new regulatory office, the Office for Students (OfS) was established.

Research England is a key component of the research funding system, overseeing UK Research and Innovation's England-only functions in relation to university research and knowledge exchange. This includes providing grant funding to English universities for research and knowledge exchange activities; developing and implementing the Research Excellence Framework in partnership with the UK Higher Education funding bodies; overseeing the sustainability of the Higher Education research base in England, including Postgraduate Research Students (PGRs).

The OfS is the independent regulator of higher education in England. It aims to ensure that every student, whatever their background, has a fulfilling experience of higher education that enriches their lives and careers. The OfS took over many of the learning and teaching functions of HEFCE, and began operations in April 2018.

Research England and the OfS have a shared interest in the development and wellbeing of the PGR student cohort, and we are working together on the delivery of this scheme, as set out below.

Mental health and wellbeing of postgraduate research students

In recent years the higher education (HE) sector has seen a rapid rise in demand for support from students at all levels experiencing mental health difficulties and mental distress. Universities UK (UUK) advises that there has been significant growth in specialist support and guidance services provided for students, and many higher education institutions have introduced wellbeing initiatives to support and prevent mental health issues. UUK has recently published a strategic vision and framework for developing whole-university approaches to supporting mental health in HE. The framework highlights a number of areas for the HE sector to consider, including leadership, prevention, early intervention, and partnerships. Previous research has investigated mental health in UK undergraduate students, and it is widely acknowledged by the sector that there is also a problem in the postgraduate research population. But there was little understanding of the specific problems faced by the UK's population of postgraduate researchers

HEFCE commissioned Vitae to carry out focused research to develop a better understanding of wellbeing and mental health in the postgraduate student research community in the UK. This work particularly highlights where there are factors of wellbeing and mental health which are unique to the PGR student community. The report has been published and is available here.

The Catalyst Fund

The HEFCE Catalyst Fund provided targeted investment for project based activity led by universities and colleges. The fund supported:

- government policy priorities, both short and longer-term
- innovation in higher education
- student safeguarding and wellbeing
- risk sharing where there are financial contributions, matched funding, and investments or leverage from appropriate partners and beneficiaries, as well as support for higher risk activities
- additionality - activity that would not otherwise happen without additional investment or which bridged a clear funding gap so that long-term sustainability can be achieved.

In November 2017, the former HEFCE invited English HEIs to bid for up to £150,000 to propose new and/or scale up existing activity to support the mental health and wellbeing of postgraduate research students. Institutions had to match, at a minimum of one to one, the funding requested. Full documentation on the bidding process can be found [here](#).

In particular this call invited applications from HEIs with existing PGR student populations, to develop and implement sustainable approaches to supporting mental health and wellbeing for these students. The bids had to ensure that the broadest range of PGR students could be reached, particularly those whom may be more vulnerable to mental health difficulties. Proposals were expected to focus on one or a small number of [specific themes](#) (para 9) to ensure delivery of strategic and sustainable change for students.

In March 2018 HEFCE provided £1.5 million for 17 projects to improve support for the mental health and wellbeing of PGR students. The funding began in April, and the projects are all due to complete in January 2020. Activities/support developed during this scheme is expected to be sustained by each project beyond the funding period. The funded projects can be found [here](#).

Research England and the Office for Students

As advised above, Research England and the Office for Students are working together to support the funded projects and deliver this scheme.

Research England is leading on this evaluation, and the successful tender will work with a project manager from Research England. The OfS is leading on the monitoring the 17 projects, and provides the project funding. We expect the bids and the project monitoring reports will be made available to the successful bidder, in order to provide contextual information.

Advisory networks to support evaluation

Research England are in the process of establishing a series of workshops to bring together the 17 catalyst projects. Research England will also establish a PGR Catalyst Advisory Group that will provide guidance on the methodology and outputs developed as part of this contract.

Aims

The aim of this work is to:

- Develop a good practice 'output', which may be in the form of a guide or toolkit, for Research England, the OfS, and the HE sector based on evaluation of the scheme 'Supporting mental health and wellbeing for postgraduate research students'.

To break this down, we expect the successful bidder to (not an exhaustive list):

- Evaluate the funded scheme at programme level (across all of the projects), and demonstrate emerging outcomes from this initiative. Where possible the emerging outcomes should be considered at various levels e.g. student/institutional (to be discussed and agreed with the project manager);
- Develop an output to disseminate good practice to the wider HE sector based on the programme evaluation (licenced as CC BY).

Research England expects the successful team to treat the aims and objectives as complementary strands of work.

Scope

The focus of this work is an evaluation of the 17 funded projects and the development of a good practice 'output' on the basis of the programme evaluation. The work will take place from the contract date to March 2020, and includes (further defined below in the requirements):

- Participate, and facilitate sessions at three workshops of the 17 projects, which will be managed and paid for by Research England (July 2018, February 2019, and February 2020);
- Provide advice at the workshops to the funded universities on their individual project evaluation (at the level of the cohort, and not individual project support);
- Present elements of method and outcomes to the PGR Catalyst Advisory Group for guidance (up to four meetings);
- Deliver a programme level evaluation of the funded scheme;
- Use the programme level evaluation to develop a best practice output for all HE providers with PGR student cohorts to draw from to either develop existing, or create new, activities to support PGR mental health and wellbeing.

The successful bidder will **not be** expected to:

- Evaluate the success of each project at the individual level (projects are expected to do this work as part of the conditions of grant);
- monitor spending of each project (projects will provide financial accountability to the OfS via monitoring reports in January 2019, and January 2020);
- look beyond the 17 projects for best practice;
- provide a literature review to summarise the factors affecting the mental health and wellbeing of PGR students;
  host, or pay for, any dissemination events (projects are expected to disseminate their individual project findings/outcomes and Research England will lead on the dissemination of the good practice output).

Requirement

We expect the successful bidder to deliver the following:

1. Participate in, and facilitate sessions (to be agreed with the project manager) at three complementary workshops of the 17 projects, which will be managed and paid for by Research England (July 2018, February 2019, and February 2020). The successful bidder will work with the project manager to develop a suitable agenda, aims and objectives for each event.
2. Provide advice to the cohort on their individual project evaluation (at the level of the cohort, and not individual project support). This is expected to be a list of suitable indicators
3. Present methodologies, and outcomes of the project at up to four PGR Catalyst Advisory Group meetings
4. Deliver a formative programme level evaluation of the scheme. This will include:
   - Working with the projects to evaluate the programme's success against its aims and objectives
   - demonstrate emerging outcomes and, where possible the impact of the programme
   - where possible, present emerging outcomes at a variety of levels (to be agreed with Research England and the Office for Students) such as: individual, protected/minority groups, and institution
   - identify knowledge gaps across the programme for which further investigation is required
   - identify project approaches which are associated with positive emerging outcomes for PGR students to inform the development of a good practice output. This should

look at types of intervention in themes across the projects, what works and why, challenges faced, and the factors/circumstances required for success.

5. Use the programme level evaluation of the projects to develop a good practice output. This may be in the form of a guide or toolkit for HE institutions with PGR student cohorts to draw from to either develop existing, or create new, activities to support PGR student mental health and wellbeing. This should be published with a CC BY licence and should include:
   - Showcasing pertinent projects supported through the scheme and demonstrate the emerging outcomes for PGR students
   - an outline of the conditions required to embed and develop good practice
   - a mechanism for institutions across the HE sector and operating within varying contexts, to interpret and implement good practice (for example some principles, or guidance)

6. Present the evaluation and its outputs at dissemination events during the life of the project and for up to 12 months after its completion.

7. Remain aware of all new and existing relevant external research, innovations, and debate on the topic of postgraduate research student mental health and wellbeing;

8. Liaise as appropriate with the evaluator of the projects funded in the OfS scheme, to address student safeguarding titled 'Student safeguarding on campus' to determine any complementary information for PGR students.

9. Engage with the Research England project manager on a regular basis (across all phases) and provide regular reports throughout the project. This could include presenting at relevant Research England committees.

Methodology

Bidders are asked to design a mixed methodology for both the evaluation of the programme and the development of the good practice output. A variety of approaches may offer greater flexibility and adaptability for this programme given its complex and diverse nature. The proposed methodology should incorporate the findings/recommendations Vitae report, three workshops which will be managed by Research England (July 2018, February 2019, and February 2020), and up to four meetings of a PGR Catalyst Advisory Group. Proposed methods should include means to disseminate findings with the projects throughout the period April 2018 – Jan 2020 to share any early lessons learnt. It is expected that the research will consist of 'new' fieldwork, with minimal time expended on the exploration of the factors for PGR mental health and wellbeing.

The first phase of work will inform the methodological approach used to evaluate the programme and develop the good practice output. We envisage that a project would include elements of method as outlined in the table below, although we are do not wish to be prescriptive in the method at this stage. The methods used will be regularly reviewed in consultation with the Research England Project Manager. Please note the phases are overlapping and bidders should clearly demonstrate how they will resource each specific phase.

Phase one: Getting to know the projects July 2018 – September 2018	Read the successful project bids.
	Develop and establish links with key contacts at all 17 project lead institutions (utilising the workshop in July 2018).
	Undertake a programme mapping exercise to identify strands of complementary work, and themes associated across and within the 17 projects.
	Provide advice to the cohort on their project evaluation, for example a list of suitable indicators.

Phase two: Agreeing the evaluative methodology July 2018 – September 2018	Facilitate a workshop session at the Research England managed event in July 2018 to develop/explore the suggested indicators which projects could use (advice) at the individual level to monitor their own success.
	Present the advice on relevant indicators to the cohort.
	Articulate a clear methodology and strategy for programme evaluation to the Research England project manager, including the insights gained from the workshop in July, which identifies appropriate quantitative and qualitative approaches. Iterate the method with guidance from the Project Manager and the PGR Catalyst Advisory Group.
	Agree programme level evaluation structure with Research England.
Phase three: Delivering programme level evaluation July 2018 – March 2020	Engage with the project leads and partners to obtain evidence using methods as agreed in phase two.
	Facilitate workshop sessions at the Research England managed workshops (February 2019 and February 2020).
	Use outputs and evidence obtained from projects (method tbc as outlined in phase two) to produce the programme evaluation report.
Phase four: Agreeing the methodology for the good practice guide February 2019 – March 2019	Articulate a clear methodology and strategy for the good practice output to the Research England project manager, including the insights gained from the workshop in July, which identifies how good practice will be presented (themes), and in what form. Iterate the method with guidance from the Project Manager and the PGR Catalyst Advisory Group.
	Agree good practice structure with Research England.
	Present an emerging good practice report (interim) to Research England and the Office for Students.
Phase five: Delivering good practice guide February 2019 - March 2020	Develop a communications plan for the dissemination of the good practice output for Research England and the Office for Students to consider.
	Develop a good practice output for supporting mental health and wellbeing for postgraduate research students.
Phase six: project completion January 2020 – March 2020	Production of end of project deliverables (listed below) to a standard suitable to the Research England project manager. Outputs should be copy edited by someone from outside of the team working on this project.
	Present the good practice output at, at least, one further dissemination event in 2020.
Engage primarily with the Research England project manager, and also the Office for Students as necessary, on a regular basis (across all phases of activity) and provide regular reports throughout the evaluation. This could include presenting at relevant Research England and Office for Students advisory committees, board meetings etc.	

Deliverables

The external contractor will be expected to deliver the following mandatory key deliverables:

Deliverable	Date (approximate)
Progress reports by email, telephone, or face to face as required which may include outcomes of early analysis and updates to risk register. We expect this to initially be weekly and will be revised throughout.	To be determined with the project manager
Statement of work at commencement of the project outlining the activities to be undertaken, deliverables and timetable. This will be discussed and refined at the inception meeting which will be held during the week commencing 2 July in London/Bristol.	Week commencing 2 July 2018
Inception meeting.	Week commencing 2 July 2018
Facilitation of a minimum of one session at each of the three workshops which will be managed by Research England, including secretariat support for the sessions delivered.	July 2018, February 2019, and February 2020
Project plan of key milestones, and risk assessment with levels of risk with owners identified and mitigating actions to address as necessary.	August 2018
Present methodologies, and outcomes of the project at up to four PGR Catalyst Advisory Group meetings	September 2018 – March 2020
A document which maps the projects, identifying complementary activity and themes across and within projects.	September 2018

Advice on indicators which projects could use at the individual level to monitor their own success.
    i. Presentation at a workshop session to explore indicators identified (July 2018).
    ii. Present the advice on relevant indicators to the cohort (guidance document).
	September 2018

Articulation of the method of the formative programme level evaluation for comments and approval by Research England (as outlined in phase two above).	September 2018
Research instruments (e.g. copies of survey questions) and/or interview question scripts.	Ongoing
Articulation of the method of the good practice output for comment and approval by Research England and the Office for Students (as outlined in phase four above).	February 2019
Present an emerging good practice report (interim) to Research England and the Office for Students.	April/May 2019
A communications/dissemination plan for the good practice output.	December 2019
A formative programme level evaluation report for review and sign off by Research England.	Late February 2020
A formative programme level evaluation.	March 2020
Good practice output (CC BY licence).	March 2020

Timetable

Contract Awarded.	Week commencing 25th June
Inception Meeting.	Week commencing 2nd July
Workshop 1 (Research England managed workshop).	Likely the week commencing 16th July

Project plan required.	Late August 2018
Project mapping required.	September 2018
Advice to the cohort of projects on indicators they can use to monitor their own success.	September 2018
Proposed method for the programme level evaluation required.	September 2018
Workshop 2 (Research England managed workshop).	February 2019
Proposed method for good practice output required.	February 2019
Present an emerging good practice report (interim) to Research England.	April/May 2019
A communications/dissemination plan for the good practice output required.	December 2019
Workshop 3 (Research England managed workshop).	February 2020
A programme level evaluation report for review and sign off by Research England and the Office for Students required.	Late February 2020
A programme level evaluation report for review and sign off by Research England and the Office for Student required.	March 2020
Good practice output required.	March 2020

Terms and Conditions

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

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 and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems 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	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
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	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
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 the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority 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	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/Methodology	25%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	10%

Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Project Environment	15%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	5%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Risk Management	10%
Interview	PROJ1.6	Interview	15%

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 = {weighting percentage} x {bidder's score} = 20% x 60 = 12

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

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. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure

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 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 the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority'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, concise and ideally generic 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 Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.

7.16   Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority 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 the Contracting Authority 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 must 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 as part of the evaluation process.

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 the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.

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 during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority 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 the Contracting Authority 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

the Contracting Authority 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, the Contracting Authority 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 the Contracting Authority 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   The Government is introducing its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme on the 2nd April 2014 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. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

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

    The Contracting Authority 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
- Equalities Act introduction
- Bribery Act introduction
- Freedom of information Act