



Mini Competition

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

Subject Contracting Authority **Evaluation of Devolved Institutions
Sourcing reference number **CR18147****

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About the Contracting Authority</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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

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

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

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

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

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business Innovation and Skills (BEIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Service (CCS) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

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

The Department is responsible for:

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

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

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

<http://www.beis.gov.uk>

Section 3 - Working with Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority (CA) Name and address	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy of 1 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0EP
3.2	Buyer name	Declan Ward
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk 01793 867005
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	The maximum value of this opportunity is £150,000.00 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	28/09/2018
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	04/10/2018 at 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	05/10/2018 at 14.00
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	12/10/2018 at 14.00

3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available if face to face clarifications are required	15/10/2018- 17/10/2018
3.11	Anticipated selection and de selection of Bids notification date	23/10/2018
3.12	Anticipated Award Date	26/10/2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start Date	01/11/2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End Date	31/04/2019
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.16	Framework and or Lot the Mini competition will be based on	CR150025BIS BEIS Research & Evaluation Framework- Lot 4

- **Section 4 – Specification**

1. Background

The Cities and Local Growth Unit is a cross government unit jointly housed in The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). The Unit's priorities include driving place-led economic and productivity growth.

This research project will evaluate the internal institutional processes of devolved authorities established via the Cities and Local Growth Unit's devolution deals programme, and include evaluation of early outcomes in public and business perceptions. These include the six Mayoral Combined Authorities (MCAs) of Greater Manchester, Liverpool City Region, Tees Valley, West Midlands, West of England and Cambridge and Peterborough. The project will also examine Cornwall Council, and London (Greater London Authority, London Assembly and London Mayor's Office), as examples of rural devolution and mature devolved city region mayoral governance.

Rationale and theory of change for the English Devolution Agenda

The devolution agenda was initiated to unlock the potential of local economies by improving strategic governance and decision making across functional economic areas with clearer accountability; enabling better spatial tailoring of interventions with local knowledge and context; enhancing opportunity for innovation; exploiting economies of scale, and synergies in policy and budget management. Established local authority governance in England sometimes lacks strategic scale (with multiple authorities across a single functional economic area, such as a city) and the policy tools to drive economic growth. This can result in sub-optimal strategy and decision-making and exacerbate barriers to growth.

The UK remains one of the most centralised countries in the advanced world. The proportion of spending controlled by the centre is greater than in the US, Germany, Spain, Canada, and has been rising since 2006. Local expenditure is similar to much smaller countries such as Hungary, Slovenia and the Netherlands ([OECD, 2013](#)). An [OECD \(2005\)](#) report highlights the wider range of economic functions European counterpart cities control over a wider metropolitan or sub-regional level. It further stresses that although the correlation is not straightforward; evidence suggests that: "...where cities are given more freedom and autonomy, they have responded by being more proactive, entrepreneurial and successful".

Moreover, recent [OECD \(2015\)](#) evidence indicates that fragmented governance structures tend to have lower levels of productivity. For a given population size, a metropolitan area with twice the number of municipalities is associated with around six percent lower productivity; an effect that is mitigated by almost half by the existence of a governance body at the metropolitan level.

Policy approach taken

In practical terms, English 'devolution deals' involved the creation of mayoral combined authorities across functional economic geographies. A combined authority is a legal body set up using national legislation that enables a group of two or more councils to collaborate and take collective decisions across council boundaries. The combined authorities agreed through devolution deals are led by a directly elected Mayor who chairs their meetings and is responsible

for providing strategic leadership. Cornwall Council is an exception in that they received a devolution deal, but remained a unitary council over a rural county without a mayor, rather than city region geography, and received more limited powers and budgets.

These mayoral combined authorities received bespoke deals of powers and budgets based on their own proposals. Although they typically contained additional investment funding of between £15m and £36.5m per year for 30 years; devolved multi-year transport budgets; some include strategic planning and housing powers; devolved adult education budget funding; and greater local influence on employment support.

In line with the rationale for English devolution outlined above, these new mayoral combined authorities were intended to improve local governance by strategically convening leadership, powers and resources across functional economic geographies. Devolution and the associated governance changes aim to support growth and productivity by improving policy coordination and prioritisation across related themes (e.g. housing, planning, and transport) and enhancing investment capacity through integrated budgets, improved coordination and risk sharing. It is also hoped that this will enable improvements in civic engagement and public services by enhancing visible, accountable leadership and convening disparate partners around local challenges; placing economic levers closer to communities, and balancing scale with local knowledge and engagement.

Creating new authorities also carries potential challenges, as risks exist where the net benefits to be gained from spatial governance reform and devolution of powers/budgets could have been incorrectly assessed. For example, there could be interventions of limited scale where duplication across different geographies would waste resource. In such cases, central government may be better placed to align resources (e.g. to national/sectoral priorities). All the above aspects will have to be considered in further developing the theoretical framework or theory of change that underpins the English devolution deal agenda.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

Aims

The project will evaluate the internal institutional processes of devolved authorities, in particular examining devolved authority implementation, management and delivery. It will also explore some early outcome factors on public perceptions and understanding.

The evidence produced will help to illustrate the extent to which the policy aim of improving local government institutions has been borne out. It will also help to identify unintended consequences, risks and threats. Finally, it will directly inform future outcome and impact evaluations of devolution deals, by building a more detailed picture of the processes by which these institutions have designed and implemented their socio-economic interventions. The detailed knowledge gained will enable the design of more tailored and effective outcome/impact evaluations.

We will look to repeat this exercise in future to track the progress of the Devolved Authorities, although this will depend on the research results and policy direction of devolution. For any potential future iteration, this study will provide comprehensive baseline data.

Rationale

Existing monitoring and evaluation provisions for the devolution deals focus on outcomes and impact, and do not consider evaluating institutional processes. This is problematic considering the policy logic for devolution deals centres around the policy making and service delivery advantages of devolved authority institutional models, as previously outlined. Furthermore, there is currently very little evidence in the wider devolution literature on devolution domestically in England, the UK or internationally, that could compensate for this evidence gap.

This proposed evaluation will examine institutional processes including strategy and decision making; transparency and accountability, and civic engagement, as three broad areas to which devolution deals aimed to bring institutional improvements in local governance. It will not examine socio-economic outcomes and impacts. It will also explore some early outcome factors on public perceptions and understanding, where they overlap with the process evaluations around transparency, accountability and civic engagement.

This evaluation will examine the broader mayoral combined authority model; specific mayoral combined authorities; rural non mayoral devolution in Cornwall, and mature devolved mayoral governance in London which predates the devolution deal programme, but exists within the wider policy context of English devolution and on-going devolution policy. Despite the fact they have different constitutional set ups, we have referred to the Mayoral Combined Authorities, London, and Cornwall, as 'Devolved Authorities' for ease.

The evidence on devolved authority institutional processes that this project will provide, will directly support the existing monitoring and evaluation provisions focussing on outcome and impact assessment.

These other evaluations include:

- outcome and impact assessment conducted by SQW (research and analysis contractor), of the devolved Investment Funds which are paid to combined authorities through the Single Pot assurance framework and subject to five yearly gateway reviews.
- Monitoring and evaluation conducted by devolved authorities of non-investment fund programmes/projects, for which support is provided by Whitehall analysts and the What Works Centre for Local Economic Growth.

Combining these with the institutional evidence the project under discussion will provide, will form a more holistic evaluation and evidence base for devolution policy.

Objectives

Specifically, this study will answer the following questions:

- **1. How do the devolved authorities conduct, manage and perform against the following processes? :**
 - 1.1 Strategy design and decision making
 - 1.2 Ensuring institutional transparency and accountability
 - 1.3 Generating civic engagement and public participation in local governance
- **2. To what extent do these institutional processes challenge or support the policy logic of devolution?**

- **3. What unanticipated benefits or drawbacks have arisen from the design and empowerment of the devolved authorities?**
- **4. What barriers exist to the effective establishment and functioning of the devolved authorities?**
- **5. How do these factors vary across different devolved authorities?**

We will explore devolution using the 5 broad high level research questions above. However to obtain useful results we will need to refine these to explore specific factors- for example with decision making and strategy: how has spatial tailoring and risk sharing changed in policy? These more detailed questions will be expanded upon with the contractor at the procurement stage as part of the development of a devolution deal theoretical framework.

3. Suggested Methodology

Suggested Methodology (main methodology)		Development of a devolution deal theoretical framework followed by secondary review of devolved authority documentation and possible deep dive interventions if required. This will be followed by primary qualitative data collection in the form of key informant interviews, and public & business surveys. Evidence collected across the primary and secondary research work streams will then be combined and compared against the theoretical framework, to constitute a theory based comparative analysis.
If applicable:	Insert numbers:	
Total number of Participants (experimental design)	5296	
Total number of Interviews (survey)	5200	
Total number of Interviews (qualitative)	96	
Total number of Focus Groups	0	
Total number of Case Studies	0	
Please add additional rows if more than one sample is required i.e. learners as well as employers.		
Project completion date	April 2019	

This is a suggested methodology and we would welcome bidders' alternative suggestions providing that they also meet the project aims and objectives. Bidders should also justify why they have suggested an alternative approach.

Bidders may wish to include in their bid a set time period appropriate for conducting the various methodological phases and associated break-down of costs.

The below methodologies will be ordered chronologically if viable within time restraints.

The theory of change/theoretical framework will be the first deliverable produced, and will provide the theoretical basis for all subsequent stages. After this, the review of documentation will commence and will identify where documentation exists and the extent to which this method can be used to explore devolved authority processes. Deep dives will be used to obtain data beyond the limits of documentation reviews. Information obtained at these stages will inform the design of semi structured interviews, and how they can build on the previous stages.

Information gained from the internal devolved authority methods above, will be used to inform more effective survey designs as the last parts of the study.

Theory of change development and theoretical framework

The development of a theoretical framework is required as the basis of the evaluation, and will be developed in partnership between the steering group and contractor. The framework or theory of change will expand on the existing policy logic model, and should be used to identify the causal pathways i.e. inputs-activities-outputs within the devolution process; identify inherent assumptions, and to develop hypotheses regarding the role of the new devolved authorities in the achievement of improved institutional process, and how this could lead to improved socioeconomic outcomes in the future.

As a final stage to the project, evidence collected across the subsequent research work streams will then be combined and compared against the theoretical framework; to constitute a theory based comparative analysis. The contractor will identify and justify a methodology used to conduct this comparative analysis.

Desk review of Devolved Authority documents-

Documentation will be provided by the devolved authorities. Where existing documentation is insufficient to examine institutional processes and performance, deep dives will be used to obtain the necessary information/data. Documents will include for example: meeting minutes, strategy documents such as spatial frameworks, and budgetary reports. Qualitative information will be drawn from these documents to illustrate and examine the research criteria, while quantifiable elements will undergo statistical analysis. BEIS and MHCLG will facilitate this acquisition of documents, Devolved Authority contacts and other relevant logistics. Furthermore, Devolved Authorities, BEIS area leads and officials leading other M&E work streams will be consulted by the steering group in the design of this institutional review, to minimise burden to the Devolved Authorities, and effectively sync with existing reporting arrangements.

Devolved Authority internal semi structured in depth interviews with key personnel- 6 per authority, 48 in total, 30 minutes to 1hr duration.

We would aim to conduct interview with senior personnel including but not limited to: Chief Executives; Managing Directors; Policy Directors e.g. housing, transport, skills; Chiefs of Staff or Heads of Mayoral Offices. However we will propose the specific research questions we wish to answer at the procurement stage, and allow flexibility for contractors to propose an optimal sampling approach/frame.

Staff numbers at the Devolved Authorities (barring London) are currently low, and saturation will

be reached quickly. We believe 6 interviews with senior officials at 30m to 1hr duration will be sufficient to achieve the desired data, and this also minimises burden on the Devolved Authorities. BEIS and MHCLG via the steering group will support in identifying the interviewees.

Devolved Authority external/third-party semi structured in depth interviews with key personnel- 6 per authority, 48 in total, 30 minutes to 1hr duration.

We would aim to conduct interviews with senior personnel in local organisations that had interacted with the Devolved Authorities before and after their establishment. This would include for example: Local businesses and contractors, hospitals and universities, housing associations and transport bodies.

Participants will be identified in discussion with the steering group, contractor, and during the desk review of documentation- which will provide a clearer view of who the primary external partners and stakeholders to the devolved authority are.

Public Survey/Questionnaire- sample size will vary by geography and population of each devolved authority area, but as a guide will constitute a minimum of 500 respondents per area. 500 has been identified in discussion with an external survey analyst as a sufficient minimum sample size to provide representative data in any of the selected areas. We will also conduct a pilot study to test responses and refine questions. MHCLG and BEIS have conducted significant work and thinking around the question design for this survey, and these materials will be discussed with the contractor to provide a starting point.

The survey will be conducted online; constrained by postcodes; use simple multiple choice questions requiring little or no research by the respondent, and last for approximately 15-20 minutes. The contractor will design and provide sample frames, and ensure that these are representative of the local populations.

Survey of local business- sample size will vary by geography and business community size and composition in each devolved authority area, but as a guide 150+ respondents in each of the 8 areas will be taken. This number has been identified in discussion with BEIS analysts as an appropriate range to gain representative data in any of the sample areas. We will also conduct a pilot study to test responses and refine questions.

The survey will be conducted online and eligibility will be constrained by postcodes. It will use simple multiple choice questions requiring little or no research by the respondent and last for approximately 15-20 minutes, minimising the burden to respondents. Respondents will be identified by using a private market research database/panel of paid respondents. The steering group will discuss with the contractor how to achieve a sample representative of the local business community, for example considering business size to ensure appropriate representation of SMEs (0-250 employees) and Large Businesses (>250).

4. Deliverables

The following deliverables are required as minimum as part of this research project:

- Interim and final findings reports
- Processed datasets

- Workshop and presentation of results at BEIS or MHCLG

Publication

The final report for this research project must be formatted according to BEIS publication guidelines, therefore within the Research paper series template and adhering to BEIS accessibility requirements for all publications on GOV.UK. The publication template will be provided by the project manager. Please ensure you note the following in terms of accessibility:

Checklist for Word accessibility

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

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

[javascript:void\(0\)](#)

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	Special Terms
Price	AW5.1	Maximum budget
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Quality	AW6.2	Variable bids

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this Mini Competition. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with the framework.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	Proj1.1	Approach	25%
Quality	Proj1.2	Staff to Deliver	25%
Quality	Proj1.3	Understanding the Environment	20%
Quality	Proj1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

Non-Price (Quality) elements

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

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

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:

$$\text{Score} = \{\text{weighting percentage}\} \times \{\text{bidder's score}\} = 20\% \times 60 = 12$$

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

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

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.

40	Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.
60	Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
80	Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.
100	Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider.

All specific: questions will be marked based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be averaged to determine your final score as follows:

Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 80

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 60

Your final score will be calculated as follows $(60+40+80+60) \div 4 = 60$

And

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

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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.ukpbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx>

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

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

DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected, unless the Framework explicitly permits this.
- 7.23 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority / UKSBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this Mini Competition Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Call Off Contract to the successful Bidder.
- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)