



Mini Competition

**Mini Competition against an existing Framework Agreement (MC) on behalf of
Department for Business, Innovation and Strategy**

Subject BEIS Review of the implementation of the PSC register – Lot 1

Sourcing reference number CR18132

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About our Customer</u>
3	<u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation of Bids</u>
6	<u>Evaluation questionnaire</u>
7	<u>General Information</u>

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

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 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	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	£120,000.00 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<p>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here.</p> <p>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.</p>

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	Tuesday, 4 th September 2018
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	Monday, 10 th September 2018 11:00 (BST)
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Wednesday, 12 th September 2018
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Tuesday, 18 th September 2018 11:00 (BST)
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	Friday, 28 th September 2018
3.11	Anticipated Award Date	Friday, 28 th September 2018

3.12	Anticipated Call Off Contract Start Date	Monday, 1 st October 2018
3.13	Anticipated Call Off Contract End Date	Friday, 29 th March 2019
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.15	Framework and Lot the procurement should be based on	BIS Research & Evaluation Framework CR150025 LOT 1

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

The Register of People with Significant Control Regulations 2016 ('the PSC Regulations') was introduced following international discussions at the 2013 G8 summit on Tax, trade, and Transparency, as part of a commitment by the UK (shared with other G8 countries) to enact an action plan to promote corporate transparency. This was an effort to reduce organised crime in the form of money laundering, terror financing, and other forms of criminality, and to support wider business and economic growth. Through the PSC Regulations, the UK has established a public register that collects and contains information on company beneficial ownership (PSCs) – information that companies were previously not legally required to make public.

The PSC register, which is a subset of the Companies House public register, requires all UK companies (except listed companies) to record and submit beneficial ownership information to Companies House. There are currently 3.7 million active entities on the PSC register, out of a total of 4.5 million registered entities (including those classified as dormant).

The following criteria identifies a PSC:

- A person holding greater than 25% of shares or voting rights of the company;
- A person whose interest is held jointly with another individual or as the result of shareholdings in the company, such that they would receive greater than 25% of the company's shares or voting rights;
- Any individual holding significant control or influence over a company;
- An individual who holds the right to appoint or remove the majority of the board of directors of the company.

The information required by the PSC Register includes:

- Full name;
- Date of birth;
- Nationality;
- Country or state of usual residence;
- A service address;
- Usual residential address (not disclosed on the public register, but held by Companies House and available to law enforcement agencies);
- The date he/she became a PSC in relation to the company;
- The nature of control (i.e. which conditions are being met).

The availability of this information promotes transparency of companies in the UK by ensuring information on company ownership is available to search for free on the Companies House website, and this is the primary objective of the legalisation. The resulting increase in transparency adds a further source of intelligence to law enforcement investigations relating to counter-terrorism and anti-money laundering. The register also

helps potential investors make informed decisions when considering investments in UK companies, and when financial institutions carry out due diligence checks. Other businesses and society as whole should also stand to benefit from the increase in transparency.

Prior to the implementation of the PSC regulations, an evaluation of the expected effect of the PSC Regulations (and the Protection Regime) was investigated via two impact assessments:

PSC Register IA can be found:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2016/9780111143018/impacts/2016/19>

In 2014, BEIS (formerly BIS) carried out an impact assessment (*IA N° BIS BE022: Transparency & Trust - Enhanced Transparency of Company Beneficial Ownership*) that considered various options for reducing corporate opacity. The IA concluded that the implementation of a central register containing information on Person's with significant control (PSCs) was the option best suited to realising the greatest benefit. Prior to this impact assessment, there was a survey sent out to businesses to measure the impact of future policy proposals aimed at improving transparency and trust within the UK – *The trust and transparency survey* published in 2014. The results from this survey informed the findings put forward in the 2014 impact assessment. Following this IA, and prior to the implementation of the PSC register legislation, another impact assessment was conducted to assess various options for harmful disclosure of certain PSCs.

Protection Regime IA can be found :

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2016/9780111143018/impacts/2016/18>

Implementation of the PSC Regulations was met with concern from various parties on the basis that due to their association with companies, certain PSCs would be at risk of harm from public disclosure. In response, another impact assessment (*IA N° RPC15-BIS-2366: A Register of People with Significant Control over a Company – Protection Regime Final*) was commissioned to consider the various policy options for treating this issue of potentially harmful identity disclosure. The IA concluded that the establishment of a 'Protection Regime' for vulnerable PSCs would provide the greatest benefit. This protection regime allows vulnerable PSCs to apply to the registrar of companies for their PSC information to be protected from public disclosure and public PSC registers, and was included as an addendum to the original PSC register regulations.

The PSC Register regulation has been in place since 2016. This study will provide the evidence base for a statutory review to be published three years after the legislation has been implemented; which will need to be published by June 2019.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The overarching aim of this project is to provide a credible body of research that takes into account a number of perspectives and data streams that will detail the effectiveness of the 2016 PSC regulations. This analysis will contribute to the formation of the post-

implementation review of the 'PSC Register' regulations (including the protection regime addendum) due to be published in June 2019. This research project will therefore seek to collect data that would allow an assessment and understanding of the costs, benefits, and overall effectiveness of the PSC register in promoting transparency, and if the protection regime provides adequate protection for vulnerable PSCs.

This can be identified by evaluating the effect of the regulations on certain targeted groups, and looking at the validity of data on the register:

1. To consider the effects of abiding by the regulations (in terms of cost) for businesses that register beneficial ownership information.
2. To look at how the PSC register is being used by law enforcement agencies, and whether the increased transparency acts as a contributing factor to their investigations.
3. To consider the opinions of CSOs, investor associations, and financial institutions on the effectiveness of the PSC register, and whether they perceive an increase in transparency as a result of the regulation.

3. Suggested Methodology

To gather the required data, we are proposing a mix of methods:

Telephone Survey with Companies on the PSC Register (quantitative data):

To gather data relating to the costs for companies of complying with the regulation.

A mix of telephone and face-to-face in-depth interviews with other interest groups (qualitative data):

Law enforcement agencies inc.:

- HMRC
- City of London Police
- Metropolitan Police
- Home Office
- National Crime Agency

More will be identified during the course of the project.

To gather data relating to their perceptions of the PSC Register, and whether they perceive it to add value to their investigations relating to money-laundering and counter-terrorism.

Civil society organisations inc.:

- Global Witness
- Transparency International
- Open Corporates

More will be identified during the course of the project.

To gather data relating to their perceptions of the PSC Register, and whether or not it has brought any improvements to the level of transparency in the UK.

Investor associations & Financial Institutions: To gather data on whether the increase in transparency (resulting from the PSC register) is contributing to more investment into UK businesses and a reduction in due diligence costs for potential investors; and on the extent to which registry provides support to financial institutions carrying out anti-money laundering due diligence checks.

These organisations will be identified during the course of the project.

Additional activity:

Desk Research: Undertake analysis of the PSC register and consider the accuracy of data recorded. This could be achieved by cross-referencing the data companies have provided for the PSC register with their actual ownership information. This can be achieved by asking related questions in the telephone interviews.

Assess the efficacy of the Protective regime: Undertake analysis of the efficacy of the Protection Regime by looking at various secondary data streams supplied by Companies House.

A description of the construction of the sample sizes and justifications will follow in the data collection section.

Prior to the interviews and surveys, there should be cognitive testing of the survey instruments.

8-10 initial interviews for cognitive testing should suffice.

A logic model has been developed by BEIS staff to provide a framework for the research, and context for the questions that will inform the PIR.

Context: The 2013 G8 summit set the standards for corporate transparency to decrease money laundering activities, as well as increase investment for businesses in the UK economy. In response to a shared commitment to reducing corporate opacity made at the summit, the UK implemented action plan which resulted in the PSC register.

Input: The UK government created a public register comprising details of all PSCs to tackle the issue of corporate opacity and the illicit activities it allows, and to encourage more investment. An addendum to the PSC Regulations allows PSCs that are at risk of harm from disclosure to apply to have their names removed from the register.

Output: UK companies are required to obtain and hold adequate records on their ownership. Companies House then makes this information available on a public register. Where justifiable, the protection regime allows the removal of details for individuals deemed at risk of harm (based on their control and influence within their companies, or the perceptions of their companies) from the register.

Outcomes: A public register that supports tax and law enforcement activities, assists financial Institutions in combatting money laundering, and provides transparent information on company ownership. Additionally, the increase in information will assist law enforcement agencies in their investigations against money laundering, terrorist activity, and other organised criminal activity.

Impacts: The increase in transparency will lead ultimately to an increase in economic growth for the UK, as well as greater incentives for individuals to set up businesses here due to there being a more transparent business environment. In addition, the increased perception of transparency will lead to doing businesses in the UK being viewed as a more attractive proposition for overseas companies.

BEIS staff have also developed a set of research questions (using the logic model as a framework) which we expect bidders to engage with and discuss in their bids.

Context

- Prior to implementation of the PSC Register, were companies already keeping accurate in-house records of beneficial ownership?
- How did law enforcement agencies obtain beneficial ownership information prior to the PSC register was set up?
- Does implementation of the PSC Register satisfy the commitments the UK made at the 2013 G8 Summit?

Input

- Do businesses perceive the PSC register as being beneficial to their operations?
- Did Companies House have sufficient collaboration with other Government departments, law enforcement agencies, and CSOs when implementing the PSC register?

Outputs

- How significant are the costs for businesses in complying with the requirements of the PSC Regulations?
- Should companies be required to record more information on the ownership chain?
- What is the number of businesses that have applied to the protection regime, and what is the number of applicants that have been unsuccessful in applying for the protection regime?
- Is the data on the PSC Register accurate? Are Companies providing accurate data?
- Is prosecution a sufficient incentive for companies to record and attain ownership information?

Outcomes

- Has the PSC register met its objective of enhancing corporate transparency? (should be the primary question for the key stakeholders).

- Does the PSC register result in reduced due diligence costs or more informed decisions for investors (or intermediaries) when considering investment into UK companies?
- Does the increase in transparency contribute to law enforcement investigations by way of increased intelligence?
- Have successful prosecutions (using the PSC register as an investigatory tool) acted as a deterrent to companies to commit crimes?
- Has the increase in transparency (resulting from the PSC register) affected business practices? If so, how?

Impacts

- Has the business environment in the UK changed because of the increase in transparency? If so, how?
- Has there been an increase in the number of foreign businesses relocating (and an increase in FDI) to the UK as a result of the increase in transparency of company ownership?
- Has the PSC register had a positive effect upon on economic growth in the UK?

This study will take place relatively soon after the passing of the regulations. Bidders should consider what questions are realistic to ask at this point in time and whether these is suitable proxy information that could be collected to estimate longer term outputs or impacts.

Data Collection

We envisage two methods of data collection for this project:

- A quantitative survey of PSC Register companies
- A qualitative study of key stakeholders

PSC Register Company Survey

Given that we seek to gain inferences about the effect of the regulation on companies, we believe it would be valuable for the researchers to interact directly with companies. We require quantitative analysis of companies' experience of abiding by the regulation.

PSC Register Companies Survey	
Population	3.7 million active entities registered on Companies House public register.

Respondents	Senior staff who possess information regarding ownership, and who have experience with registering beneficial ownership information.
Suggested Sample Frame	Cross-referencing the Companies House public register with the FAME database to gain details of all eligible businesses (excluding listed companies).
Suggested Sampling Approach**	Purposive sampling, according to the size of the business and the complexity of the ownership structure.
Achieved Sample Size	Telephone surveys sent out to 500 businesses to ensure meaningful representation of SMEs and large businesses, as well as the complexity of the different ownership structure (see below for an explanation of the criteria used).
Mode	Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews.
Interview Length	20 Minutes
Key Outputs	Quantitative data - relating to the cost of abiding by the PSC register regulations. Estimates should be used when businesses don't have accurate cost records.

**The suggested sampling approach shares similarities with the approach taken in the 2013 Trust and Transparency survey which can be found at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/389176/bis-14-1279-trust-and-transparency-survey.pdf which interviewed a total of 574 UK businesses. The results of which would ultimately inform the findings of the PSC register Impact Assessment, which was one of the initial stages in bringing establishing the PSC register as a policy.

The companies should be purposively selected to include a spectrum of size and the complexity of the company's ownership structure. Complexity of a company's ownership structure can be found by cross-referencing the information on the PSC register with the FAME database, and size can be derived from the company's responses in the interview. FAME is a dataset that is based on company records and filings (submitted to Companies House) and would therefore allow us to obtain the names and registered addresses of all companies (including subsidiaries) in scope, and to draw a representative sample. We expect the selected contractor to identify the relevant contacts within companies identified, who would be able to respond to the survey or to nominate others within the company best placed to do so.

Although the purposive sampling approach is our preferred method, we also welcome recommendations from the contractor on their recommended sampling method.

A description of the two criteria is indicated:

Ownership Structure:

- **Simple:** Less than three layers of ownership
- **Reasonably Complex:** 3-5 layers of ownership above the company, but no additional complications (i.e. foreign ownership or trusts in the chain)
- **Complex:** Either more than 5 layers of ownership, foreign ownership, trusts in the chain, or any combination of these factors.

Business Size:

- **Micro and small:** Turnover is under £6.5m, balance sheet is under £3.36 million, and fewer than 50 employees.
- **Medium and large:** Turnover is £6.5m or over, balance sheet is £3.36m or higher, 50 or more employees.

Key Stakeholder Interviews

The benefits resulting from the PSC Regulations are likely to be difficult to monetise. Therefore, the data gathered from law enforcement agencies, investor associations and civil society groups will be purely qualitative to reflect this.

A summary of the sampling approach for law enforcement agencies is indicated below:

	Law Enforcement Interviews
Population	HMRC, City of London Police, The Metropolitan Police, Home Office, and the National Crime Agency.
Respondents	Law enforcement personnel from different levels of seniority with experience of money laundering investigations.
Suggested Sample Frame	Identify law enforcement personnel with experience in money laundering investigations after consulting with The Metropolitan Police, HMRC's investigation unit, the National Crime Agency, and the Home Office.
Suggested Sampling Approach	Purposive sample of key law enforcement personnel based on consultation with steering group & policy leads and law enforcement agencies.
Achieved Sample Size	5 organisations – 2 interviews per organisation. 10 interviews in total.
Mode	Mix of Face-to-Face and in-depth telephone interviews.
Interview Length	30 minutes for telephone, 45 for face-to-face.

Key Outputs	Qualitative data Opinions about whether the PSC register contributes to intelligence in law enforcement investigations, and if the register acts as a deterrent for criminals setting up UK companies.
<p>The population will be defined after the BEIS policy team identify key contacts within these organisations, whom will be open for interviews themselves, or alternatively will identify others most suitable to do so.</p> <p>For civil society groups (NGOs), the organisations included in the scope of research are: Transparency International, Global Witness, and Open Corporates, among others that will be identified after consultation with the policy team and the contractor. The BEIS policy team in conjunction with the contractor will identify key contacts within these organisations, and will make them aware of the research project. For investor associations and financial institutions the total samples will be constructed after the BEIS policy team identifies key contacts for the successful bidder, who will then make contact with the various associations to draw up a sample.</p>	
	Civil Society Organisations (CSO), Investor Associations (IA) and (FI) Financial Institutions.
Population	CSOs: Transparency International, Global Witness, Open Corporates (among others that will be identified during the course of the project). IAs: British Private Equity, Venture Capital Associations. FIs: These will be identified during the course of the project by the policy leads, but the successful bidder will be expected to seek out the relevant contacts.
Respondents	CSOs personnel that have engaged in anti-corruption and transparency work. IA intermediaries who make decisions about investment into companies, and can comment on the due diligence process of investment decisions. FI staff that have been involved in anti-money laundering directives.
Suggested Sample Frame	Purposive Sampling - The sample frame will be constructed after the successful bidder makes contact with the different organisations and identifies appropriate staff.
Suggested Sampling Approach	The successful bidder will make the final judgement on the composition of the sample after consulting with policy leads and the organisations.

Achieved Sample Size	Up to 10 organisations in total – 2 interviews per organisation. Up to 20 total interviews.
Mode	Mix of face-to-face and in-depth Telephone Interviews.
Interview Length	Up to 60 minutes for Face-to-Face, up to 45 minutes for Telephone.
Key Outputs	<p>Qualitative Data</p> <p>CSOs – general perceptions of the PSC register, and if they perceive it as being beneficial to the UK in terms of increased transparency.</p> <p>IAs - Whether an increase in transparency results in reduced due diligence costs to investors.</p> <p>FIs - How the PSC register assists financial institutions in combatting money laundering</p>

The face-to-face and in-depth telephone interviews will allow us to test various aspects of the logic model, particularly the wider impacts of the PSC Regulations, and whether some of the regulation's intended objectives have been achieved – particularly an increase in transparency. The in-depth interviews should typically be between 45 minutes to an hour long.

Interviews/Surveys

Prior to the main fieldwork, the contractor will need to outline their proposed approach. This will be in the form of methodologies, data collection strategy, and survey design. Additionally, the contractor will be required to provide full advice on questionnaire wording, format, and length. The cognitive testing of survey instruments will contribute to their selected approach, and the contractor should explain their approaches for:

- Selecting respondents and ensuring participation;
- Conducting cognitive testing of survey instruments. Following the pilot survey the contractor should discuss the results, including the implications for survey content with staff at BEIS.

BEIS will require the contractor to make survey respondents aware that the survey is designed for use by the government, and is looking to capture evidence on the impacts of the 2016 PSC Register Regulations, and will contribute to the policy-making process. Respondents should also be made aware that BEIS is the lead agency, and should be supplied with contact details for key BEIS personnel. Respondents should also be given assurances that their data will be anonymized, and should be made aware of how the results of their survey will be used. The contractor will need to ensure that all data collection, storage, and handling is compliant with GDPR requirements, and should clearly set out how their approach will satisfy these requirements.

Assessing the efficacy of the 'Protection Regime'

As part of the legislation, there is a protection regime addendum (which is detailed in the background section). Assessing the efficacy of the Protection Regime is an important part of this research project. However, given the sensitive nature of individuals listed on the Protection Regime, it will not be possible to interview these individuals directly. Analysis of the Protection Regime will be necessary. We suggest an approach that involved looking at the time taken to process applications for the regime, the percentage of applications that have been successful, percentage declined, the time taken to process requests, type of criteria, type of business, and number of appeals and outcomes. To gather information regarding both the accuracy of data and efficacy of the protection regime, the successful bidder will need to collaborate with Companies House, for whom BEIS can provide names and details for key contacts.

In addition to our proposed approach, we are also open to suggestions from the contractor on what their preferred method of assessing the efficacy of the protective regime is.

Additional Activity

The accuracy of data on the PSC Register is an important part of the credibility of the register and contributes significantly to transparency. It will be important to assess the accuracy of data on the PSC Register. This can be achieved by drawing a small sample of companies from the public register, and then making contact with the businesses to inquire whether the records match. In order to assess how accurate the data is, we recommend including questions on the survey that can identify the company information provided on the register is accurate.

Analysis and reporting requirements

Responses from companies on the PSC Register should be analysed to assess the costs of complying with the PSC Regulations, as well as the ease of complying with the regulations. Cognitive testing should establish whether costs incurred by businesses should be framed in terms of money or time, and to test the validity of other questions. The contractor will also need to provide a summary of any desk research undertaken (i.e. data relating to the accuracy of data and the process of using the protection regime); full data tables on the quantitative survey, and a full analytical report combining results from the quantitative and qualitative elements, including recommendations and conclusions.

Project management arrangements

The contractor will name a project leader who will act as the main point of contact over the length of the project and will have direct correspondence with the BEIS project manager who will expect a weekly update on the project's progress via email. The contractor's research team, including the project leader will attend meetings at BEIS at key project intervals. Tenderers should account for the cost of three meetings:

1. Project kick-off
2. Prior to undertaking fieldwork

3. Final project review – key findings are presented

These meetings will be held at the BEIS' main office at 1 Victoria Street.

Where the bidder is relying on inputs from sub-contractors, the bidder should set out how it would manage any risks to delivery and the steps it will take to ensure timely delivery of outputs.

4. Deliverables

We expect the contractor to:

- Produce a written report, which has gone through a detailed quality assurance process. This report will present the key findings of the research project, and will eventually be published.
- Provide technical annexes explaining methods, results, data sources and any assumptions used.
- A clean and fully labelled dataset that has been appropriately formatted, and showcases all the data and assumptions used.
- A final presentation to the BEIS staff at 1 Victoria Street, London.

Final dataset

The contractor should provide a clean, fully labelled dataset (including description of weighting) for use in BEIS, and other government departments.

As such, the dataset should be prepared in a way that would make it suitable for publication. There will need to be a confidential dataset, and a dataset which has been suitably anonymised to protect respondents, the details of the anonymisation or pseudonymisation.

The dataset should include all core question variables and all derived variables generated during the sampling, coding, editing and analysis process. All variables must be fully labelled using agreed labels and coding frames. A document summarising the variables (including names, descriptions, plus syntax for derived and weighting variables) must be included either as an annex to the final report or as a separate document.

Final reports

The project will close with a final research report that discusses the findings. The report should consist of a write-up of the statistical findings, along with annexes including the tables with cross-breaks for the main questions asked. The report should follow a basic framework for the analysis that will have been developed with BEIS during the early stages of the project. Tenderers should allow for two drafts of the report and one round of comments at the first stage, subject to the quality of the first draft.

The technical annexes should include full details of the survey methodology and analysis making it possible to replicate both should future iterations of the survey be commissioned.

As part of this they should cover: the sample design and the approach taken, cognitive interviews, pilots, conduct of fieldwork and response rates, details of the derivation of any weights, information on how analysis was conducted including statistical training. Any training materials, interviewer instructions, questionnaires and any letters or associated documents sent to respondents will need to be appended as well as an annex summarising all dataset variables (including names, descriptions and syntax for derived variables).

Reports will be made publicly available on gov.uk, so will need to be formatted according to a pre-specified style guide. This will be supplied to the successful bidder in due course. The report must be submitted in MS Word (or compatible with MS Word) format. The successful bidder is responsible for proof-reading and formatting all written research outputs, including rigorous quality assurance of all analysis and statistics presented.

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 ($5+5+6=16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW4.1	Contracts Terms
Commercial	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Commercial	AW5.5	E-Invoicing
Commercial	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

The Response Question and Answer Document must be used by all tenderers to answer the PROJ (Quality Questions). This should then be uploaded as an attachment to PROJ1.1. This is the only document assessors will evaluate; any other method used by bidders to answer questions will not be evaluated. Scoring shall be based on 0-100 scoring methodology (as outlined below). Each question has a page limit and this should be adhered to. Any additional content provided beyond this will not be considered or scored during the evaluation process.

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 Mini Competition. 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%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach	45%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	15%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Data Security	10%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Risk Management	10%

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 will be multiple evaluators and their individual scores after a moderation process 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 50

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 50

Your final score will $(60+60+50+50) \div 4 = 55$

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 Mini Competition. 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 (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.
- 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 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 Special 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 Call Off 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 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, 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 Mini Competition 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 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](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)

- [Freedom of information Act](#)