Mini Competition

Mini Competition against an existing Framework Agreement (MC) on behalf of Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

Subject UK SBS An independent impact evaluation of nuclear fusion research at the Culham Centre for Fusion Energy

Sourcing reference number CR19025

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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for Contracting Authorities for 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.

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business Innovation and Skills (BEIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Service (CCS) 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.

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

Privacy Statement

At UK Shared Business Services (UK SBS) we recognise and understand that your privacy is extremely important and we want you to know exactly what kind of information we collect about you and how we use it.

This privacy notice link below details what you can expect from UK SBS when we collect your personal information.

- We will keep your data safe and private.
- We will not sell your data to anyone.
- We will only share your data with those you give us permission to share with and only for legitimate service delivery reasons.

https://www.uksbs.co.uk/use/pages/privacy.aspx

Privacy Notice

This notice sets out how the Contracting Authority will use your personal data, and your rights. It is made under Articles 13 and/or 14 of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

YOUR DATA

The Contracting Authority will process the following personal data:

Names and contact details of employees involved in preparing and submitting the bid;
Names and contact details of employees proposed to be involved in delivery of the contract;
Names, contact details, age, qualifications and experience of employees who's CVs are submitted as part of the bid.

Purpose

The Contracting Authority are processing your personal data for the purposes of the tender exercise, or in the event of legal challenge to such tender exercise.

Legal basis of processing

The legal basis for processing your personal data is processing is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest or in the exercise of official authority vested in the data controller, such as the exercise of a function of the Crown, a Minister of the Crown, or a government department; the exercise of a function conferred on a person by an enactment; the exercise of a function of either House of Parliament; or the administration of justice.

Recipients

Your personal data will be shared by us with other Government Departments or public authorities where necessary as part of the tender exercise. The Contracting Authority may share your data if required to do so by law, for example by court order or to prevent fraud or other crime.

Retention

All submissions in connection with this tender exercise will be retained for a period of (7) years from the date of contract expiry, unless the contract is entered into as a deed in which case it will be kept for a period of (12) years from the date of contract expiry.

YOUR RIGHTS

You have the right to request information about how your personal data are processed, and to request a copy of that personal data.

You have the right to request that any inaccuracies in your personal data are rectified without delay.

You have the right to request that any incomplete personal data are completed, including by means of a supplementary statement.

You have the right to request that your personal data are erased if there is no longer a justification for them to be processed.

You have the right in certain circumstances (for example, where accuracy is contested) to request that the processing of your personal data is restricted.

You have the right to object to the processing of your personal data where it is processed for direct marketing purposes.

You have the right to object to the processing of your personal data.

COMPLAINTS

If you consider that your personal data has been misused or mishandled, you may make a complaint to the Information Commissioner, who is an independent regulator. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF
0303 123 1113
casework@ico.org.uk

Any complaint to the Information Commissioner is without prejudice to your right to seek redress through the courts.

CONTACT DETAILS

The data controller for your personal data is:

The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

You can contact the Data Protection Officer at:

BEIS Data Protection Officer, Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET. Email: dataprotection@beis.gov.uk.

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) was created as a result of a merger between the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), as part of the Machinery of Government (MoG) changes in July 2016.

The Department is responsible for:

- developing and delivering a comprehensive industrial strategy and leading the government's relationship with business;
- ensuring that the country has secure energy supplies that are reliable, affordable and clean;
- ensuring the UK remains at the leading edge of science, research and innovation; and
- tackling climate change.

BEIS is a ministerial department, supported by 46 agencies and public bodies.

We have around 2,500 staff working for BEIS. Our partner organisations include 9 executive agencies employing around 14,500 staff.

http://www.beis.gov.uk

Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

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 (CA) Name and address	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET
3.2	Buyer name	Victoria Clewer
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£49,500.00 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 Mini Competition to all Bidders	Wednesday, 27th February 2019
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Wednesday, 6th March 2019 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Thursday, 7th March 2019
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Friday, 15th March 2019 11:00
3.10	Clarifications if required	Wednesday, 20th March 2019
3.11	Interviews	Tuesday, 26th March 2019
3.12	Anticipated selection and de selection of Bids notification date	Wednesday, 27th March 2019
3.13	Anticipated Award Date	Wednesday, 27th March 2019
3.14	Anticipated Contract Start Date	Monday, 1st April 2019
3.15	Anticipated Contract End Date	Monday, 2nd September 2019
3.16	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.17	Framework and or Lot the Mini competition will be based on	CR150025 Research and Evaluation Framework Lot 3

• Section 4 – Specification

1. **Background**

Background on nuclear fusion energy research in the UK

Nuclear fusion is a high potential future energy source that aims to replicate the nuclear reaction that takes place in the Sun. Fusion could play an important role in the future energy landscape as a sustainable energy source, since it does not produce greenhouse gases and the fuel used is widely available, crucial to one of Grand Challenges underpinning the Industrial Strategy – Clean Growth.

The UK has been a key player in establishing the foundations to fusion energy since 1950s. The Culham Centre for Fusion Energy (CCFE) is the central site for fusion research and development in the UK.

UK Atomic Energy Agency (UKAEA) officially opened CCFE in 1965, having moved its fusion research operations from the nearby Harwell research site, which is now being decommissioned . Culham also amalgamated fusion activities that were previously undertaken at Aldermaston and other UK locations to form a national centre for fusion research.

In 1977, following protracted negotiations, Culham was chosen as the site for the Joint European Torus (JET) tokamak. Construction began in 1978 and was completed on time and on budget, with first plasma in June 1983. Since then the machine has gone on to set a series of fusion milestones, including the first demonstration of controlled deuterium-tritium fusion power (1991) and the record fusion power output of 16 megawatts (1997).

JET is the world's largest and most powerful tokamak and crucial to development of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), the focal point of the European fusion research programme, currently under construction in the South of France.

In the 1980s, Culham Laboratory was instrumental in the development of the spherical tokamak concept – a more compact version of the tokamak. This is thought to offer potential advantages by enabling smaller, more efficient fusion devices. The START (Small Tight Aspect Ratio Tokamak) experiment at Culham (1991-1998) was the first full-sized spherical tokamak. Its excellent performance led to the construction of a larger device, MAST (Mega Amp Spherical Tokamak), which operated between 2000 and 2013. MAST has recently been subject to an upgrade (in practice a complete rebuild) to extend its capabilities and is currently being commissioned. The upgraded machine, MAST-U, is a UK facility but it will be also used by teams of scientists from the EU and there is also a strong collaboration with the USA.

In the 1980s, the UK's involvement in the technology development activities needed for a fusion reactor were ramped down as a result of funding cuts. Consequently, until recently the technology activities have been restricted to those needed for the JET and the MAST programmes. This narrowed the scope and restricted the scale of CCFE technology activities. More recently the EUROfusion programme has significantly increased the scale of technology R&D activities and the UK has seized this opportunity to rapidly expand its

technology activities. This UK is already a major player in some aspects of the European fusion technology activities. In other areas CCFE is still at relatively early stages of rebuilding its capabilities but is making rapid progress following significant recent UK investment. Given this context there are not many examples of spin-offs in the UK and so a wider European perspective may be necessary to help to form a representative picture of the economic benefits of the fusion programme.

The Centre's current activities encompass tokamak plasma physics, technology developments for the DEMO prototype fusion power plant, the development of materials suitable for a fusion environment, engineering activities, the training of students, graduates and apprentices, and public and industry outreach activities.

This project aims to gather evidence to evaluate the impacts, i.e. costs and benefits, of nuclear fusion research in the UK to date, this evaluation will also consider the counterfactuals and the subsequent impact on the UK to date. Possible counterfactuals will include scenarios where the Government would directly invest in technologies such as Robotics, which often benefit from Fusion spin-off research.

The UK has been leading on fusion research over several decades; a significant amount of money has been spent by the UK government and other organisations, and it is important to understand the costs and benefits that funding has had, including unintended costs and benefits such as spin-off research, to inform further fusion research spending decisions.

Related reviews and sources

Current published reviews on nuclear fusion research in the UK provided a body of positive evidence for the UK's leading expertise in this field with a focus on scientific impacts. However, there is limited evidence on the economic impacts of fusion research on the UK with a lack of quantitative assessments.

- EPSRC Independent Review of Fission and Fusion Research, March 2016

  This review concluded that the UK's fusion research programmes are of world-class quality, in facilities, people and research impact. For example, Fusion research at CCFE helped the UK industry to win £100m EU fusion research contracts (up to 2015). These programmes were found to be world-leading and cost-effective, while being intimately woven into the international effort.

- Government Office for Science Reports: Nuclear Technologies Trajectory Review (2016)

  This Review provides an independent assessment of the UK's priorities, and potential for international collaboration, in the development and demonstration of nuclear energy technologies, including both fission and fusion technologies. On fusion, the Review commends the moves in recent years to start Culham on a journey from being a fusion laboratory to being a civil nuclear laboratory.

- 2015 Triennial Review of UKAEA

  In 2015, the then Department for Business, Innovation and Skills conducted a Triennial Review of the UK Atomic Energy Authority (UKAEA), which is responsible for UK and European fusion power research programs at Culham

and Harwell. Apart from reviewing the budget, structure and governance of the Authority, this report also commented that CCFE's commitment to training and developing young scientists and engineers, and its contribution to the Culham/Oxford/Harwell triangle for innovation, are key to ensuring that the UK benefits from its investment in fusion technology.

In addition to the above reviews, the EU Commission published several documents related to fusion research, providing background information for fusion research in the EU and in the world:

- European Research Roadmap to the Realisation IN BRIEF of Fusion Energy

The European Fusion Roadmap outlines the research and development required to provide the basis for an electricity-generating fusion power plant in the next 50 years, but with no specific timetable outlined. In the short to medium term, the key research infrastructure is the ITER project - a worldwide endeavour for constructing a magnetic fusion device that has been designed to prove the feasibility of fusion as a large-scale and carbon-free source of energy. This is planned to lead to DEMO - nuclear fusion power station that demonstrates first electricity production grid to the grid by fusion.

- The interim evaluation of the 2014-2018 Euratom programme

This European Commission's evaluation concluded that Europe currently has a leadership position in fusion research and this has been achieved through the Euratom programmes that have led to a coherent approach in the Member States. The fusion part of the Euratom Programme is clearly relevant as it enables Europe to address the challenge of ensuring an energy production that simultaneously meets the goal of long term sustainability, security of supply and support to the development of the economy. The evaluation recommended the JET experimental research should be extended up to 2024, and highlighted JET is a unique European fusion asset and it is a fundamental part of the ITER project. JET was found to be a clear example of European Added Value.

- Spin-offs from fusion research

This EUROfusion website describes how, while the fusion community continues its quest to harness fusion for energy needs, the research has borne some short-term benefits. Fusion research with its complex, multidisciplinary nature has pushed advances in disciplines ranging from medical technology and environment, to astrophysics and material sciences. But there are no quantitative data on numbers and value of spin-off companies and their associated impacts.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

Project aims and objectives:

- to generate evidence to inform future UK government policy relating to nuclear fusion research;

- to assess how fusion research and its associated infrastructure has affected the UK with a focus on scientific progress, scientific impact, industry links, environmental impact and economic impact;
- to provide a suite of case studies that include both direct impacts from UK fusion research and indirect/spill-over impacts (in plain language); and
- to identify the financial costs of the UK nuclear fusion research and associated infrastructure.

This project aims to provide an independent impact evaluation of the nuclear fusion research programme to build a solid evidence base for long-term future strategic and investment decisions in wide-ranging policy contexts including spending reviews and EU-exit.

Overarching research questions to be answered:

- What have been the public and private financial costs of the UK's nuclear fusion research?
- What impacts has UK nuclear fusion research had on the UK?
    - Scientific impact and progress
    - Environmental impact
    - Economic impact

1. Suggested Methodology

We would welcome bidders' alternative and innovative suggestions for methodology providing that they also meet the project aims and objectives. Below we set out in some further detail important aspects of the key research questions in terms of where we are seeking evidence and possible metrics.

- What have been the public and private financial costs of the UK's nuclear fusion research?
    - Investments in facilities and equipment
    - Administration costs
    - Skills and talent investment
    - Research programme experimental costs
    - Collaborations including business support
    - Staff costs

- What impacts has UK nuclear fusion research had on the UK?
    - Scientific impact and progress
        - Publications, citations & impacts
        - Major scientific/technological progress and outcomes
        - Any increased and accelerated translation of research into innovation/commercialisation of technology in the fusion industry or any other field
    - Environmental impact
        - Land use change
        - Positive or negative impacts on emissions
        - Waste issues
    - Economic impact
        - Leveraged overseas and business investments
        - Industry links and business benefits including:

        - Number of spin-offs, new firms and supply chain firms supported
        - Direct and indirect business growth such as increased profits, employment and sales or value added
        - Value of IP income or from licenses
        - General capabilities and wider benefits arising from fusion research and related quality assurance technologies
    - Value of commercial contracts won to date and potential future wins and the number of high skilled jobs created/safeguarded
        - Occupation (SOC) and wage levels of those jobs
        - Industry (SIC) of those jobs
    - Apprenticeships and training programmes
        - How these programmes contribute to future capability needs in the sector

Based on our experience, we recommend the project use Contribution Analysis, based on a mixed methods approach, to determine the contribution of nuclear fusion research in the UK to the observed effects and a causal link between the activities and the effects.

It will be necessary to describe an appropriate counterfactual in detail, consisting of what would have happened in the absence of nuclear fusion research. This will need to consider what the research money might have instead been spent on; how the land for the Culham and Harwell centres might otherwise have been used; and what the fusion industry in the UK might have been like in the absence of UK Government funding.

We recommend the project will include the following elements:

1. **Around 5 in-depth interviews** with key staff from the Culham and Harwell centres to acquire key data on spend, scientific impacts and leveraged investment and to identify key stakeholders and beneficiaries. Prior to these interviews, the centres will be provided with a list of requested information in order for them to prepare data. Where appropriate, the answers should be accompanied by relevant documents. These interviews will be used to clarify information and acquire further data if needed.
   Key research questions at this stage could include:
    - What has been spent from public, private and overseas sources to date on nuclear fusion research and development in the UK?
    - What has nuclear fusion research contributed to the UK Nuclear fusion research? (e.g. in terms of publications, numbers of PhDs/apprentices trained, and major scientific progress made)
    - What evidence do you hold in relation to the scientific impact of nuclear fusion research in the UK, in terms of both progression towards the eventual commercialisation of nuclear fusion as an energy source, and the use of technologies, developed through the research, in other fields?
    - What economic impact have the CCFE and Harwell centres made on the UK? (e.g. in terms of value of commercial contracts won to date and potential future wins and leveraged overseas and business investments)
    - What environmental impacts has the nuclear fusion research to date had, in terms of emissions, waste and land use?

2. **A web-based survey** to invite submissions of evidence and findings from this survey will inform discussions in meetings with key stakeholders and case studies. A previous similar EPSRC survey (2016) received 41 responses.

   Research questions may include:
   - In which role did you encounter the CCFE (or other UK fusion centre)? (multiple options)
   - How would you rate the UK's standing in fusion research? (multiple options)
   - What is your view on CCFE's training programmes' contribution to future capability needs in the fusion sector? (multiple options and comments box)
   - If your organisation has been supported by the CCFE for winning contracts from any international projects, how would you rate the support your organisation has received? (multiple choices)
   - What impacts has your work with the CCFE (or other fusion centre) – in terms of investment costs, sales, additional jobs created in your organisation or its suppliers, additional profits or scientific progress?
   - What synergies do you see between the Culham' activities and those of your organisation?
     - How can joint working in these areas be enhanced?

   As this is a commissioned evaluation in a specialised area, there is no publicly available sampling frame/business registers for the survey and focus groups.

   We expect contractors to compile a sampling frame of key stakeholders including industrial specialists, leading academics in fusion research and businesses supported by CCFE based on previous similar reviews and mainly from information provided by the CCFE. Further, the contractors could do analysis of Gateway to Research to identify projects which mention Culham or Fusion. This could give them a sample frame for academics involved in the field and some information on outcomes (if not impacts).

3. **Around three focus groups** with representatives of key stakeholders from the industry, academia and advisory groups to unpick additionality and spill over effects of the programme. This may be complemented by around 10 in-depth telephone interviews for those who are not able to attend these group meetings. These methods will be used to refine online questions to be more in-depth and enrich the survey data.

   Questions to be asked in these groups will vary by type of attendee organisations. For the industry focus group, we'll identify additional value the CCFE has added in supporting these firms to win contracts and to accelerate commercialisations. The academic and advisory groups' questions will probe attendees' views on the scientific progress of CCFE fusion technologies and its contribution to research excellence and meeting the needs of future skills in this area.

4. **Around three case studies** can be conducted through semi-structured interviews with spin-offs and firms supported by CCFE:
   - to assess direct and wider effects of Culham nuclear fusion research on these organisations

- to understand mechanisms that drive impacts.

These case studies will identify more details of spin-offs and CCFE's role in developing these technologies and supporting these firms and their suppliers. Research questions will focus on CCFE's direct/indirect effects on business growth in terms of the value of investment costs, contracts won so far, employment/sales growth, profits, and scientific progress perhaps measured partly through intellectual property generated.

5. **Desk research and review of data** on funding, background papers and reports

The analysis should feed into an overall impact assessment carried out using HM Treasury Green Book techniques. This assessment will be quantitative, taking into account displacement and crowding out, unless there is insufficient data to monetise the benefits, in which case it will be qualitative.

2. Deliverables

Project inception meeting: contractors and BEIS steering group will meet to discuss how the project will proceed.

Online survey and Questionnaire: a questionnaire designed for an on-line survey on an appropriate platform (such as Citizen space). Appropriate measures (such as sending reminders) will be taken to achieve a good response rate.

Information required for the BEIS survey control for estimating online survey respondents burden: Occupation/profession of each respondent and length of time used to complete the survey. These can be incorporated into the questionnaire.

Dataset of survey results: key findings and processed/raw survey data

Regular updates on emerging findings and project progress: weekly catch-up with the project manager/steering group to track progress and address any issues that may arise, and priorities work as advised by the steering group.

Undertaking research and analysis with presentations: the contractors will implement the agreed analytical/research approaches including focus groups/telephone interviews/case studies, where needed, to respond to each research question. The contractors are also expected to present their work to the steering group to manage expectations and emerging issues.

Interim report of findings: the contractor will produce a draft report at the end of analysis stage. The contractor will agree the report structure with the project manager, but overall, the report should include an executive summary, context to the work, methodology, data, results, and conclusions. The report will follow the gov.uk guidelines on style, accessibility and should meet plain English requirements. With the draft report the contractors should also provide:

- fully documented software code, used for analysis, and all underlying data (with complete reference) and datasets underpinning the analysis (where the data is not

publicly available, we expect contractors to organise access to the project folder in secure data service (SDS);
- all tables and figures in the report need to be in an excel spreadsheet with data included; and
- all models will be compliant with BEIS QA practice. Further information on BEIS QA practice can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/quality-assurance-tools-and-guidance-in-decc.

Quality assured final report for publication
The final report for this research project must be formatted according to BEIS publication guidelines, template and adhering to BEIS accessibility requirements on gov.uk. The BEIS project manager will provide the template. The contractor needs to ensure the drafts are free from typos, grammatical or syntax errors and are accessible to technical and non-technical audience.
Please ensure you note the following in terms of accessibility:

Checklist for Word accessibility

Word documents supplied to BEIS will be assessed for accessibility upon receipt. Documents which do not meet one or more of the following checkpoints will be returned to you for re-working at your own cost.

- language is set to English (in File > Properties > Advanced) • document reads logically when reflowed or rendered by text-to-speech software
- structural elements of document are properly tagged (headings, titles, lists etc)
- all images/figures have either alternative text or an appropriate caption
- tables are correctly tagged to represent the table structure
- text is left aligned, not justified
- document avoids excessive use of capitalised, underlined or italicised text
- hyperlinks are spelt out (e.g. in a footnote or endnote)

Datasets to support those to be published in the final report must be provided in an accessible format (CVS, Excel) on submission of the report.

Project Cost Guidelines
Where feasible, itemise the cost for each of the deliverables/methodologies in the bid.

Staff to Deliver Guidelines
Bidders should provide details of expertise relevant to this project for each member of the project team. The bids should also outline which team member will lead on which deliverable and how much time each member will contribute to the project.

Project Plan and Timescale Guidelines
The proposed the high-level time table is below. Bidders should propose the overall project timeline and important milestones. In addition, they should outline how they will manage project delivery risks and ensure outputs will be delivered on time. If appropriate, add a short table with main delivery risk, potential risk owners and mitigation steps.
Project Start: March/April 2019
Interim Report: June 2019
Final report: September 2019

Section 5 – Evaluation of Bids

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

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

To maintain a high degree of rigour in the evaluation of your bid, a process of moderation will be undertaken to ensure consistency by all evaluators.
After moderation 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	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
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 Mini Competition. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with the framework.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach (including data collection and analysis)	30%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to deliver	10%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding nuclear fusion research	10%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan, risks and Timescales (be flexible and able to prioritise key information collection and analysis)	20%

Interview	PROJ1.5	Interview	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

Non-Price (Quality) 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 specific questions will be marked based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be averaged to determine your final score as follows:
Example
Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 40
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 80
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 60
Your final score will be calculated as follows (60+40+80+60) ÷ 4 = 60

All the above **OR** specific questions will be marked based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be reviewed in an evaluator meeting, once the individual evaluations are complete and a consensus score will be agreed to determine your final score.

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Responses received after the date indicated in the ITQ shall not be considered by the Contracting Authority, unless the Bidder can justify that the reason for the delay, is solely attributable to the Contracting Authority

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

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 Mini Competition. 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 and concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mail details.

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

7.11 Do ensure that the Response and any documents accompanying it are in the English Language, the Contracting Authority reserve the right to disqualify any full or part responses that are not in English

7.12 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 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, unless the Framework explicitly permits this.

7.23 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity

Some additional guidance notes

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 (CCS – 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 Mini Competition 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, 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 Call Off 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 Mini Competition 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 Mini Competition to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this Mini Competition 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