

Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Office of Manpower
Economics (OME)**

Subject UK SBS **SSRB Major Review of the Judicial Salary
Structure**

Sourcing reference number **BLOJEU-CR17061OME**

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

Registered in England and Wales as a limited company. Company Number 6330639.
Registered Office Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF
VAT registration GB618 3673 25
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.
2	About our Customer
3	Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.
4	Specification
5	Evaluation model
6	Evaluation questionnaire
7	General Information
Appendix	Annex A - Attached to RFX Attachments section of this tender. Annex B - Attached to RFX Attachments section of this tender. Annex C - Attached to RFX Attachments section of this tender.

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business, 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 Customers.

Our Customers who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed [here](#).

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Office Manpower Economics (OME)

The Office of Manpower Economics provides an independent secretariat to eight Pay Review Bodies which make recommendations impacting 2.5 million workers – around 45% of public sector staff – and a pay bill of £100 billion:

- Armed Forces' Pay Review Body (AFPRB)
- Review Body on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration (DDRB)
- NHS Pay Review Body (NHSPRB)
- Prison Service Pay Review Body (PSPRB)
- School Teachers' Review Body (STRB)
- Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB)
- Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB)
- National Crime Agency Remuneration Review Body (NCARRB)

Further information is at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-of-manpower-economics/about>

Section 3 - Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Customer Name and address	Office of Manpower Economics 8 th Floor Fleetbank House 2-6 Salisbury Square London EC4Y 8JX
3.2	Buyer name	Rebecca Fish
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	Up to £100,000 ex 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 <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	25/05/2017
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	07/06/2017 12:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	08/06/2017
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	14/06/2017 14:00
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	29/06/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award date	29/06/2017
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	30/06/2017
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	03/11/2017
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

Introduction

1. The Office of Manpower Economics (OME) provides support for all the independent Pay Review Bodies. In doing so, one of the OME's key functions is to provide high quality research-based technical advice drawing on economic, pay, labour market, statistical and other technical data. More information about the OME, the bodies it supports, and the research it undertakes, may be found on its website: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-of-manpower-economics>. The OME will manage this project.
2. The Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) is undertaking a Major Review of the judicial salary structure (the Major Review) with the aim of submitting its advice by June 2018. Such reviews occur approximately every five years (the last was in 2010-11) to examine the suitability and soundness of the judicial pay system.
3. The terms of reference for this Major Review, and the SSRB's terms of reference, are at Annex A. The SSRB will consult with an Advisory and Evidence Group (AEG) comprising representatives of different levels and jurisdictions within the UK judiciary and other major stakeholder communities.
4. A key function for the Major Review is to ensure that the numerous judicial roles are appropriately mapped together onto the correct points in the judicial salary scale. Therefore, to support the Major Review, the SSRB has requested that work be commissioned to compare and group judicial roles to assist it in making recommendations in this context.

Purpose of the Project

5. The purpose of this research is to provide the SSRB with a grouping and hierarchy of judicial posts, achieved through the allocation of judicial posts into salary groups. The proposed groups will form the basis for a consultation in the autumn.
6. This project is concerned with defining the appropriate salary **groups** and not

with levels of salary or the salary differentials between the groups. These latter issues will be addressed by the SSRB using alternative sources of evidence.

7. The outcome of this project will be a body of evidence which the SSRB will use to help it to:

- a. assign judicial posts into appropriate salary groups;
- b. understand which salary groups new posts should be placed in and to identify and understand any anomalies in the current groups;
- c. identify and understand where stakeholders hold different views about the placement of particular posts;
- d. categorise and assess how leadership roles and functions should affect placement of relevant roles into salary groups; and
- e. consider whether there is scope to simplify the current structure.

8. The evidence gathered in this project will, therefore, form an essential part of the Major Review. This project is not, however, a formal job evaluation / weighting exercise based on factor analysis, as has been used in previous reviews of the judiciary. Instead, the OME is proposing a methodology based on an explicitly comparative analysis, taking account of a range of expert views for the groupings.

Scope

9. This Major Review is more extensive in scope than previous reviews as it includes fee-paid judges in addition to salaried posts. The Major Review covers some 180¹ different judicial posts in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The list of all judicial posts in scope is set out in Appendix 2 to Annex A, which contains the terms of reference for the review.

Approach

10. After discussions with stakeholders, the OME envisages an approach based on a 'Delphi' methodology (a judgement panel process) which takes account of

¹ The number of separate posts identified in the terms of reference.

expert views. A four-stage approach is envisaged, summarised as follows², with the contractor responsible for organising, coordinating and driving forward the work to deliver the outcomes required at each stage:

- a. Stage 1 - Production of a set of job summaries from the current job descriptions for all roles in scope of the review, in a standard format according to a set of analytic headings.
- b. Stage 2 - Validation of the job summaries, forwarding draft versions of the job summaries to relevant stakeholders (via the OME) for them to confirm that the job summaries for each role are accurate and comprehensive and, where this is not the case, making proposals for amendments, to enable production of a full set of agreed job summaries.
- c. Stage 3 - Facilitating individual initial groupings / categorisations of the agreed job summaries by inviting the members of a judgement panel³ to, individually, compare and group the summaries and map the roles onto the current salary spine structure, providing responses back to the contractor in a structured format. From this, areas of agreement and contention across the judgement panel will be identified.
- d. Stage 4 - Facilitating the final grouping of the job summaries. The judgement panel will meet and discuss (with facilitation and documentation by the contractor) to explore the reasons for any differences in the placement of posts identified during Stage 3. If agreement can be reached, reasons for any changes of view should be documented. Where consensus cannot be reached on a role's placement, the facilitator will need to explore and capture the reasons for this. The panel will also need to discuss the weighting of judicial leadership roles.

11. Advantages of this 'Delphi' approach are that the SSRB does not ask for self-assessment from interested parties only. Involvement of a range of experts, without any pressure to reach consensus in judgements, will ensure that the rankings acknowledge the complexities of each role.

² The detail of each Stage is explained further under Methodology.

³ See paragraphs 17-18.

12. This research will provide information about the appropriate grouping of posts within the judicial hierarchy, including the placement of new roles, and allow for some examination as to whether the existing categories can be simplified, or in fact need further splitting. This technique will ensure that any disagreements about job placement are not only identified but understood.

13. The research, including the work to draw up the job summaries, will need to clarify leadership roles and functions and give some sense of the additional weight that different stakeholders would assign to those roles, and why. The requirement to focus on leadership is specifically captured in the terms of reference and is a novel component in this Major Review. The contractor will need to assist in ensuring that leadership functions can be defined⁴, captured and assessed.

Data Available

14. The OME will provide a set of job descriptions covering all the roles covered in the scope of the Major Review (and as listed at Appendix 2 to the terms of reference)⁵. A sample set of “raw” job descriptions is at Annex B covering judicial posts in England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The contractor will use these to produce a comprehensive and standard set of job summaries.

15. For the 2010-11 review, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PWC) produced a set of standardised job summaries to support the job evaluation undertaken as part of that review. A sample is at Annex C. The full set of PWC job summaries will not cover all the posts in scope as this Major Review is broader than previous reviews and the analytic headings will be different this time⁶, however, they provide an indication of the scope and level of detail expected for each of the job summaries.

16. The OME will also supply an internal induction pack which summarises the structure of the judiciary and courts across the UK jurisdictions which is largely drawn

⁴ In the main, judicial leadership roles will have some responsibility for the work of other judges, by allocating cases, taking responsibilities for various court matters or having some other recognised seniority. OME is already working with judicial representatives to agree an initial definition of judicial leadership.

⁵ At the time of the tender exercise launch, OME holds 51% of the total job descriptions required and is sourcing the remaining ones as a matter of priority.

⁶ See paragraph 20.

from the various websites for these groups. The contractor will nevertheless be responsible for ensuring persons working on this project have or acquire a relevant understanding of the structures of the judiciary, noting that there are variations across the devolved administrations. At least some more senior members of the project team will need the knowledge and experience required to be able to operate credibly with the judiciary at all levels.

Composition of the Judgement Panel

17. A judgement panel is critical to the success of the proposed approach. The judgement panel will comprise judges at various levels and other stakeholders (names will be provided by the OME). All members of the judgement panel will be expected to have general knowledge of the judicial system as a whole and able to advise across the breadth of the judiciary, as well as providing a specific insight (at Stage 4) into their particular area of work. Although the final decision will rest with the OME, the contractor is welcome to put forward views about the size and composition of this panel at the tendering stage.

18. It is anticipated that the composition of the judgement panel will be the same in Stages 3 and 4. However, in the event that it is clear that there might be difficulties allocating a judicial role to a category, it may be appropriate for the OME to identify one or more additional panel members with expertise in that particular area to assist Stage 4 of the process.

Methodology

19. Starting from the four-stage approach set out a paragraph 10, the contractor will need to propose the detailed methodology it will use for each of the stages, showing understanding of the objectives of the process and suggesting any alterations and refinements. The contractor should follow the specified approach unless it can present a robust and defensible methodology which demonstrates that it can deliver the outputs required by an improved method. However, any suggestions for improvement are welcome. Any alternative methodology must be agreed with the OME before the project commences.

Stage 1 – Production of a standardised set of job summaries

20. The contractor will analyse the set of job descriptions for all roles in scope of the project (drawn up at various times and by various bodies) and provided by the OME. It will use these to produce a comprehensive and standardised set of job summaries which, for each individual role, will capture the full scope of the roles and responsibilities under the following analytic headings⁷:

	Analytic Headings	Description
1	Jurisdiction	The range of court participation, the nature of jurisdiction, and the types and breadth of cases heard.
2	Complexity and Diversity of Cases	The depth of specialisation and the complexities of the facts and the law, including the length of hearings and the number of matters typically handled within a day.
3	Impact and Sensitivity of Decisions	The impact of decisions on the public and on litigants. This includes the extent to which decisions are binding on lower courts.
4	Court Craft	The skills required to conduct judicial proceedings, including case management, communication skills, dealing with information and delivering judgements.
5	Out of Court, Management and Leadership Responsibilities	A precise definition for this category will be agreed at the beginning of the project. It is likely to cover responsibilities that are not directly connected with sitting on cases such as listing cases, manpower planning and deployment, training, appointments, and responsibility for performance, policy matters and leadership.

21. Each resulting job summary will be set out in a consistent format and more concise than detailed job descriptions provided. Each summary will convey the key features of each role in a few paragraphs to facilitate comparison between roles in Stages 3 and 4 of the process.

22. The contractor will need to identify quickly any shortfall in information needed to enable production of the job summaries and then liaise with the OME to acquire the missing information (or otherwise agree how the gap should be filled) to ensure that the job summaries produced are as accurate and comprehensive as possible

⁷ These headings (and descriptors for headings 1-4) are as used in the 2010 Major Review.

within the time allocated to the work.

Stage 2 – Validation of the job summaries

23. The contractor should organise, manage and oversee the process for the circulation of the draft job summaries produced in Stage 1 to a set of judicial stakeholders for them to confirm that the ones for each role are a reasonable, accurate and comprehensive summary of the role. Unless stated otherwise, all engagement between the contractor and the stakeholders will be handled through OME. The OME will forward the summaries to the relevant individuals, along with the guidance produced by the contractor which will explain to these individuals what they are required to do, how (for example, how they should capture and comments) and by when. The contractor will need to agree a process with the OME for chasing up any late responses. In a small number of cases, discussion may be required to achieve resolution which would be organised through the OME. The outcome of this stage is an agreed set of job summaries.

Stage 3 – Facilitating an initial grouping of judicial roles

24. The contractor should organise, manage and oversee a process whereby members of the judgement panel, individually, group the agreed job summaries produced in Stage 2 within the current salary groups. The desired outcome is a grouping of posts on the basis that all the posts in any one group should be considered equal for salary purposes. The contractor should specify the way that individuals should approach this task and provide guidance accordingly to ensure that a consistent approach is taken by all participants. (This guidance should be reviewed and agreed by the OME). However, the aim of this stage is that the individuals undertake this placement activity based on their own individual judgement, taking a holistic approach and drawing on their knowledge and understanding of the judiciary. If this exercise raises questions about whether or not particular categories should be combined or split, this information should be captured.

25. The contractor would then collate and analyse the individual returns to identify areas of agreement in the placement of a particular role. In this case, with

consensus (full agreement), no further discussion of this role is required. The contractor will also identify areas of disagreement, to be noted in the agenda which the contractor will draw up for the judgement panel discussion in Stage 4 so that placement of these posts can be considered then.

Stage 4 – Facilitating a final grouping of judicial roles

26. The contractor should organise, manage and facilitate a formal judgement panel meeting so that members can collectively discuss and agree the placement of the roles for which consensus could not be reached in Stage 3. This will include considering leadership roles and responsibilities and the weight that should be assigned to them. As above, the judgement panel outcome will be a grouping of posts with the panel determining that all the posts in any one group are appropriately placed together. The discussion would need to reference the placement of posts agreed in Stage 3

27. The contractor should facilitate the discussion to tease out the reasons for disagreement and, where possible, seek consensus if reasons given lead any members of the judgement panel to change their minds. Consensus is helpful but there is no undue pressure to reach it. Whether this results in agreement or continuing disagreement about the proper placement, the key purpose is to ensure a full airing of the *reasons* for the different placements. Where anomalies are identified, the facilitator would need to explore the reasons *why* the different experts took the view that they did and see if exploring the reasoning leads to any changes of judgements. Areas of consensus (whether achieved in Stage 3 or Stage 4) can be reported as an agreed position.

28. In addition to capturing the results of the grouping / placement processes, the contractor will need to capture reasons behind different placements given and any implicit or explicit weightings which individuals or the panel give to the various analytic headings in the job summaries, including leadership responsibilities.

29. The contractor will need to set out a clear approach for facilitation of the judgement panel - for example, whether the panel should start by considering a series of structured questions or simply discuss roles where there was disagreement

- and provide justification for the proposed approach. Bidders should identify the person who would be the facilitator (or named individuals from whom a person would be selected⁸). In advance of the judgement panel meeting, and once the agenda is known, the contractor will discuss and agree with the OME the specific approach that will be taken in the meeting.

30. The contractor will need to develop and apply a clear methodology whereby the views of the judgement panel will be appropriately tested and use other mechanisms to ensure the validity and robustness of the decision making across all stages of the project. In particular, the contractor should identify how the facilitator will work with a group comprising senior members of the judiciary both in terms of interpersonal skills and ensuring effectiveness and fairness of the process, bearing in mind that the judiciary are particularly skilled at advocating a particular point of view. The contractor will also need to identify how it will capture allocation decisions which result in agreement and the reasons why different panel members reached different judgements, particularly where there is no agreement following the group discussion.

31. The contractor should plan on the judgement panel meeting lasting one day in total and specify in its bid whether and how it would charge for any additional sessions that might be required. The OME will host the judgement panel at its offices in London, unless an alternative approach is agreed.

32. At the completion of this stage, all the roles represented by a job summary will have been placed in a grouping and, where this has not been possible, the reasons why captured.

Deliverables

33. Early deliverables include the complete set of job summaries, a detailed methodology report covering Stages 2, 3 and 4 of the project, including the specific methodology to be taken at the judgement panel meeting.

34. Following Stage 4, the contractor must provide a full draft report on the findings of the project (some draft sections may be shared earlier). This report should

⁸ This recognises practical issues of individual availability.

be readily understood by lay readers but nevertheless stand up to scrutiny by members of the judiciary. The report should cover the following (with use of annexes as appropriate):

- a. Executive summary, including the key results and findings.
- b. The methodology used - the methodology reports mentioned above may form annex to the report).
- c. The complete set of job summaries.
- d. A full analysis of the results of the grouping and placement work - both those agreed, and those that remain unallocated.
- e. An explanation of all cases where grouping differs from the existing placement on the salary structure.
- f. Commentary on leadership roles and responsibilities and the additional weight that should be assigned to those roles, and why.
- g. Commentary on the issues which underpinned different judgements, and any other comment on final results.
- h. Explanation of any anomalies / differences / disagreements identified, the reasons for these and why it was not possible to achieve consensus.
- i. Any assumptions made.

35. Based on the draft report, or further iterations of it following the provision of OME comments, the contractor will be required to make a presentation to some or all of the SSRB and / or AEG on the results, taking on board the comments of members and answering their questions. It is advisable that the presentation should be given by a closely-involved senior member of the contractor's staff.

36. A final report which takes account of all feedback received (which may relate to structure, content and presentation), will then be required. This report will form the basis of consultation and must be of publishable standard.

Project management

37. The contractor will agree with the OME:

- a. detailed arrangements for the management of the project including the

provision of regular progress reports to include progress against milestones, the process for agreeing the methodological details with the OME as set out in the specification, the process for recording decisions reached and the process for telephone catch-ups and perhaps occasional meetings;

- b. detailed timings for the stages of the project, building in time for consultation with the OME and the time requirements of others (at all stages of the project); and
- c. availability of project team members across the life span of the project and for a pre-defined period beyond to answer queries.

Quality standards required

38. The outcome of this work will be used to inform important policy recommendations. The data and analysis used and provided must be accurate and up to date. The contractor must demonstrate that proper safeguards are in place to achieve this.

Timing

39. The following timings are currently provisional and are either indicative (week commencing) or specific dates. The contractor will need to commence work rapidly following award of the contract. The deadline for the Final Report is critical as consultation will be dependent on this. Dates in bold mark specific milestones and may only be deferred by mutual agreement.

Date	Activity
By 30 Jun 17	The successful tenderer will be informed. The OME provides background material, including job descriptions.
By 7 Jul 17	Confirmation of definition of leadership to be used in drawing up the job descriptions
Week commencing 24 Jul 17	Progress meeting with the OME and delivery of job summaries to enable the OME to circulate for validation (Stage 2) and propose dates for Judgement Panel engagement so that the OME can confirm this with participants.
Early Sept 17	Stage 2 complete
Mid Sept 17	Stage 3 Initial grouping of posts

Mid Sept 17	Progress meeting with the OME and to discuss agenda and methodology for Judgement Panel meeting
Late Sept/early Oct 17	Stage 4 Judgement Panel Meeting
13 Oct 17	Draft report submitted
Mid Oct 17	Presentation to SSRB
3 Nov 17	Final report submitted

Publication

40. The final report will be published by the OME on the OME website as part of the evidence for the Major Review. The output of the work will inform the SSRB report (due to be submitted to the Lord Chancellor in June 2018) which will contain its conclusions and recommendation on the Major Review of the judicial salary structure.



Annex A.pdf



Annex B.pdf



Annex C.pdf

Please note the access to the above Annex's can be found within the RFX attachments section of this document.

Terms and Conditions

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to UK SBS 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, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	SEL3.11	Modern Slavery Act Compliance
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			
Evaluation Justification Statement			
In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.			
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding of the requirement	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Approach and Methodology	30.00%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Expertise and allocation of resource	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project plan and management	15.00%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40

Your final score will $(60+60+40+40) \div 4 = 50$

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 $(80/100 \times 50 = 40)$

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions.
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the Contract terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.
- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal UK SBS reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In

the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks UK SBS may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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