

Invitation to Quote

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

Subject UK SBS Review of multi-hazards research and risk assessment approaches

Sourcing reference number CR18075



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

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 the Contracting Authority.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation model</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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

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

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

UK Research and Innovation

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

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

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

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

Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority Name and address	UK Research and Innovation Polaris House Swindon SN2 1FL
3.2	Buyer name	Becky Eldridge
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£30,000.00 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 Contract Advert and location of original Advert	5 th June 2018
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	13 th June 2018 11:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	18 th June 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	17 th July 2018 11:00
3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available if face to face clarifications are required	23 rd July 2018
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	26 th July 2018
3.12	Anticipated Award date	1 st August 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	6 th August 2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	4 th October 2018
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

NERC is seeking a suitably qualified, independent and expert group, which has a good understanding of both academic research, industry practice, and policy to conduct a review of existing environmental multi-hazard literature, approaches and projects across academia and industry in the UK and internationally.

Introduction

Who is NERC?

The [Natural Environment Research Council](#) (NERC) is the leading public funding agency for environmental science in the United Kingdom (UK) investing over £300 million per annum in cutting-edge research, training and innovation.

As well as funding academic research, NERC works with business, government and NGOs to help them find and use environmental science. By transforming the knowledge, data, capabilities and skills of the environmental science community into approaches, tools and solutions that address businesses and policy challenges, NERC contributes to economic growth and responsible environmental management. For example, through the [ENDOWS](#) project, information is being developed for a diverse range of stakeholders (including water suppliers, energy suppliers and farmers) derived from NERC's £12M [UK Drought and Water Scarcity programme](#) and through the [Environmental Risks to Infrastructure Innovation Programme](#) (ERIIP), NERC is working with UK infrastructure owners and operators to understand and manage environmental risks.

NERC provides science to help society manage environmental hazards.

Extreme weather, volcanoes, earthquakes, space weather, pollution, novel diseases and invasive species all have serious impacts on people, supply chains and essential infrastructure in the UK and internationally. Many such hazards are becoming more frequent and severe as our environment changes and as populations and cities grow. NERC-funded scientists are rapidly advancing our understanding of the processes that create natural and man-made hazards, so that we are better equipped to assess and manage risk and make people, business and infrastructure more resilient to environmental hazards and emergencies.

It is recognised that the combination and interaction of hazards (multi-hazards) can result in damages greater than would be caused by either hazard in isolation. Historically, most risk analysis has been undertaken on a hazard-by-hazard basis; however, this may mean that hazard impacts are being underestimated. There is a growing recognition of the need to assess risks associated with combinations of hazards and not simply individual hazards in isolation. What new knowledge and approaches are needed to be able to do this?

This tender is part of preparatory work to understand what role NERC, alongside other funders, may have in supporting further work on this important issue of understanding and responding to the risks posed by multi-hazard events. It requests a review of academic research and capability, a review of industry and policy practice, as well as future research and innovation needs to inform multi-hazard risk assessment.

The tender objectives are to:

- Identify what research is underway (in academia, industry and policy) to understand the processes underlying multi-hazard events, their impacts, and to assess risks;
- Understand what approaches are being used in industry and by policy-makers to understand and assess the risk from multiple-hazards; including how existing risk assessments are taking account of multi-hazards.
- Gather evidence from existing publications on how multi-hazards affect UK economy and society (including, but not solely focussed on UK infrastructure);
- To identify what existing or new knowledge is required to make a step change in our understanding of multi-hazards events, their impacts, as well as the methods and approaches available to assess multi-hazard risks in policy/practice.
- Consider the barriers and solutions to progressing multi-hazard research and its use in risk assessments.

Background

1. What are multi-hazard events?

Environmental hazards and climate change incur considerable costs on society and the economy. Impacts are experienced through direct damage to assets such as infrastructure, buildings, on agriculture, as well as indirect costs due to disruption to businesses and households. The widespread damage and huge economic costs resulting from the increasingly frequent extreme weather events are leading to a realisation that we need to better understand and manage environmental risks. Taking appropriate action in advance of future hazards relies on an understanding the frequency and severity of the hazard, their impact on society and the range and efficacy of potential actions.

Increasingly it is recognised that combinations of natural hazards can result in damages greater than would be caused by hazards in isolation. Hazardous events may occur at the same time and/or location through coincidence or because they are linked in some way. There can be multiple hazards of the same type (e.g. successive heavy rainfall events); or hazards of different types (e.g. heavy rainfall and high winds, linked as both associated with storms) or hazards that trigger other hazards (e.g. rainfall triggers landslides).

There is no one accepted definition of multi-hazard events. The following definition has been developed by Mike Clare (NERC Knowledge Exchange Fellow at National Oceanography Centre) whilst working with a small group of academics and infrastructure owners/operators who are members of NERC's ERIIP programme.

Box 1 – Working definition of Multi-hazard

Multi-hazard' is the succession of the same hazard, or combinations of different hazards that occur within a time and/or space window **that generate an impact that is different to that of the individual hazards in isolation**, through one or more of the following mechanisms:

- Interact with each other to change the impact
- Change the background conditions thus changing the likelihood or severity of subsequent hazards
- Interact with the infrastructure network at different points or times which may change the resilience/flexibility of the network.

Importantly, **the outcome of the impact will be different to a scenario where the hazards occurred in isolation**. This may be an amplified, modified or even reduced impact to that expected by a single hazard.

The group went on to define three different types of multi-hazard events (see below).

How to define multi-hazards ?

Concurrent Hazards: The concurrence of two (or more) hazard events in time and/or space

- E.g. Algae bloom in important water reservoir at time of drought impacting water supplies

Successive Hazards: The recurrence of the same hazards within a significant time window

- E.g. Repeated low pressure systems in Atlantic (that may be becoming more frequent/likely), which bring successions of storms to the UK – high winds, rainfall, flooding – that repeatedly tests network resilience

Cascading Hazards: Primary hazards triggering other secondary/tertiary hazards

- E.g. Heavy rain during a storm may trigger landslides (second natural hazard), some of which may dam rivers and exacerbate flooding. This in turn could cause slope erosion and trigger further landslides

National Oceanography Centre
noc.ac.uk
NERC SCIENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

For the purpose of this review, the knock on effects of a single hazard caused by interconnected infrastructure systems is NOT included i.e. Flooding of electricity substation leads to power outage which then has further effects on the system/network.

2. Why it is important to understand multi-hazard events and their impact

Historically, most risk analysis has been undertaken on a hazard-by-hazard basis. This could be severely under-estimating the potential impact of hazards.

Some recent examples of multi-hazard events, which have had significant social and economic consequences, include:

- The combined effects of high winds, persistent rainfall, intensity/height of coastal storm surges and waves, etc. that affected the UK from December 2013 to February 2014 and created significant infrastructure damage (Dawlish rail collapse, flooding of Somerset levels, etc.)
- The dramatic switch from drought and hosepipe bans in England in spring 2012 to the wettest April to June ever, created widespread flooding (as summarised in the [CEH report of the event](#))

There is a growing recognition of the need to assess risks associated with combinations of hazards and not individual hazards in isolation. For example, the UK's [Climate Change Risk Assessment](#), recognises "cumulative impacts from multiple, correlated risks" as priorities for the future. The [National Risk Assessment of Civil Emergencies](#) considers the interdependency between risks as an emerging area of work. On a broader international scale, the [Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030](#), specifically references the need to understand and assess multi-hazards.

Historically, infrastructure owners and operators tend to assess environmental risks posed by singular hazards i.e. high winds or storm surge or flood, however they are beginning to recognise that assessing risks due to singular events is no longer adequate. The nuclear industry has to assess the impact of 30 different hazards including the likelihood of hazard interactions and combinations. Operators of national networks (e.g National Grid, Network Rail) must have an understanding of the risks across the infrastructure system/network, in order to better prepare: what resource is needed?; how should those resources be distributed geographically across the network? For others they need to inform planning and design: how to design infrastructure to be resistant to high winds, as well as waterlogged soils, for instance? New information is required in order to make informed assessments of the likelihood of 'multi-hazard' events and the risks from these hazards, to infrastructure assets.

Although all these groups share this interest in multi-hazard risk assessment, it is unclear to what extent the requirements of these different groups are similar or different and what these groups require in terms of new knowledge or new approaches/methods for risk assessment.

3. What has NERC done so far?

A number of NERC research programmes have started to look at this challenge although multi-hazard events has not been the focus of any. The [UK Droughts and Water Scarcity Programme](#) looked at the multiple drivers and impacts of drought events, the [Natural Flood Management](#) programme, and in an international context, the [Science for Humanitarian Emergencies And Resilience](#).

The NERC [Environmental Risks to Infrastructure Programme](#) has considered "likelihood and impact of multi-hazard events" as a core theme. However, relatively few multi-hazard projects have been funded to date, leading to a set of activities to further scope this area. The ERIIP programme has conducted a number of activities (details and outputs of which will be available to the successful contractor)

- A series of 1:1 conversations with ERIIP members about their concerns and approach to multi-hazard risk assessment, including HS2, National Grid, EDF, Scottish Water, Transport Scotland and HR Wallingford.
- Funded a small number of collaborative projects between academic and industry:
 - Playing Games to Understand Multiple Hazards and Risk from Climate Change on Interdependent Infrastructure, Simon Tett, University of Edinburgh.
 - RV-DSS: An industry-friendly resilience-based interdependency assessment tool - case study North Argyll, Donya Hajjalizadeh, Anglia Ruskin University
 - Combination Hazard of Extreme rainfall, storm Surge & high Tide on estuarine infrastructure (CHEST), Thomas Coulthard, University of Hull
- A workshop was held on 3rd October 2017, led by a NERC Knowledge Exchange Fellow (Mike Clare, National Oceanography Centre) with representatives from academia and industry to understand how they define and assess multi-hazards and what the key issues are. The workshop led to the definition of 'multi-hazard events' used above.
- Established a steering group of infrastructure owners and operators interested in this topic whose views have shaped this tender.

4. How will NERC use the information from this tender?

This tender is to understand what role NERC may have, if any, in supporting further research or innovation in this area of multi-hazard risk assessment. It is important that new investments are based on a clear evidence base including an understanding of:

- the economic/societal challenge that needs to be addressed, the scale of that challenge and the range of actors involved (e.g. policy, regulatory, private sector etc..)
- the knowledge required to address the challenge (recognising that societal challenges often need to draw on a range of disciplines)
- the research that has already been undertaken and whether the required knowledge can be found through applying existing science and/or whether new scientific advances are needed. If so, what are the science questions that need to be answered?
- the potential outcomes and impact on society, how stakeholders (in business, and policy) will need to be involved in order to achieve that impact, i.e. how will science make a difference and what is the pathway to impact?

Therefore the output of this work will be primarily aimed at the NERC Executive responsible for considering and defining future research and innovation funding.

Tender Requirement

NERC is seeking a suitably qualified, independent and expert group, which has a good understanding of academic research, industry practice and policy, to conduct a review of existing environmental multi-hazard literature, approaches and projects across academia and industry in the UK and internationally.

1. Scope /clarifications

The study should focus on two or three key sectors where multi-hazards have impacts, including UK infrastructure owners and operators. Other sectors to be agreed with NERC. The infrastructure owners /operators should include (but not limited to) members of NERC ERIIP programme. It should also include key risk assessment policy-makers in the UK, such as the Cabinet Office/ National Risk Assessment of Civil Emergencies and Adaptation Sub-Committee/Climate Change Risk Assessment.

The study should identify good practice in identifying and dealing with multi-hazard events from other sectors /organisations/ countries where these provide good illustrative examples.

Focus of the economic and social consequences of multi-hazard events should be on the UK, but where useful for illustration, examples could also be drawn from outside UK. Wherever possible, impacts should be quantified to illustrate the scale of the issue, e.g. in economic terms, or the proportion of agricultural land affected, reduction on yield, number of customers affected, number of minutes delay etc. (Please note that these impacts should be drawn from existing literature sources (academic as well as grey literature) and not be primary research into socio-economic impacts).

The study should also not exclusively be on

- 1) just one specific area/site/region
- 2) just one combination of hazards (e.g. river and storm surge flooding),
- 3) just one type of method or approach (e.g. just physical process interaction – needs to also include statistical approaches and others).

Although the focus of study should be on combinations of natural hazards (e.g. flooding, high winds), it would be useful to include the extent to which the concern of industry/ policymakers/ practitioners relate to combinations of natural hazards with other events, e.g. signal failure caused by electrical issue.

The scope excludes:

- Multi-hazards which occur as a result of the knock on effects of a single hazard caused by interconnected infrastructure systems i.e. Flooding of electricity substation leads to power outage which then has further effects on the system/network.
- Single-layered hazards that have no interaction (e.g. where multiple hazard maps can be stacked and the risk summed, but the interaction between hazards is not considered). This is akin to an all-hazards-at-a-place approach and is not a truly multi-hazards assessment.

2. Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are:

Current activity in multi-hazard research and risk assessment

- 1) To map **research activity and capability in the academic community (UK and international), in industry and policy to understand the processes underlying multi-hazard events, their impacts, and to assess risks.** This should also include research within or commissioned by businesses, policy-makers and operational agencies (e.g. Environment Agency). Research areas to include: the underlying physical processes of multi-hazards hazards (and how they interact), socio-economic impacts of hazards, the approaches used to quantify the risk from multi-hazard events (including physical modelling and statistical methods), and their associated uncertainties.
- 2) To understand **how policy-makers and industry currently consider and approach multi-hazard risk assessment.** What level of awareness exists? What are key concerns? What combinations of hazards are of greatest concern? What are they doing about it, if anything? What frameworks and approaches are being used in policy/practice to understand and assess

the risk from multiple-hazards? What are the potential short-comings of using existing approaches for assessing single-hazards for multi-hazard events? What is it that they want to know (that they currently don't) or want to do /do better?

What is the scale of the problem caused by multi-hazard events?

- 3) To look at existing (grey and white) literature to find examples of **key societal/economic consequences of multi-hazard events, ideally these examples will quantify the economic consequences**. Focus should be on the UK, but where there are useful illustrative examples from outside UK, these can also be included. Impacts should include but not solely focus on, UK infrastructure. (See scope section for further information)

Barriers, research gaps and enablers?

- 4) To identify **what existing or new knowledge is required to make a step change in our understanding of multi-hazards events, their impacts, as well as the methods and practical approaches available to assess multi-hazard risks in policy/practice**. What do we not know – what are the research gaps? What do we know but do not use - what is available that can be used operationally right now?
- 5) To **consider the barriers, and possible solutions**, to progress multi-hazard research in the UK, and enable a dialogue between research and stakeholders (business and policy) to inform research questions and enable the development of practical approaches for multi-hazard risk assessment.

3.Requirements/Outputs

NERC expects the final outputs of this review to be a comprehensive report, with clear executive summary and annexes which address the objectives described above, as well as an easier to disseminate presentation format output. Some specific deliverables, directed related to the objectives, which should be included as part of this report are:

- 1) Review the use of terminology and definitions around multi-hazard events and risk assessment including how similar/different this is between groups. What do we all mean when we use this term?
- 2) Examples or short case studies (drawn from existing literature) which quantify impact of known multi-hazard event(s). Indicate scale of impact through quantification, e.g. financial impact, the proportion of agricultural land affected, reduction on yield, number of customers affected, number of minutes delay etc... as a clear demonstration of the different impact of multi-hazard compare to singular hazard event.
- 3) A database of existing literature and past/current/planned projects in multi-hazards research, innovation, collaborative R&D (to focus on UK but include significant international projects). This should also include research within academia and/or within or commissioned by businesses, policy-makers and operational agencies (e.g. Environment Agency). This should identify where capability lies within UK research base / business/ policy (plus significant capabilities internationally) in multi-hazards research.
- 4) Provide a short analysis of significant, methods and approaches for multi-hazard research and risk assessment (e.g. statistics based approaches, models of physical processes). What methods currently exist, in what situation are they appropriate? Provide a simplified

summary assessment of the relative maturity, availability of evidence to support the different multi-hazard risk assessment approaches.

- 5) Overview of current industry, policy and practitioner awareness of and approaches to assessing multi-hazard risks. What are the motivations and drivers behind action (e.g. regulation) or inaction? What combinations of hazard events are of greatest interest? What frameworks/approaches do industry and policy use? What are their relative strengths/weaknesses? Where ambitions lie (what is it that they want to know or want to do/ do better?). Draw out commonalities and differences between sectors and organisations including in the approaches used, what ambition is and what combinations of hazard events are of greatest interest.
- 6) Overview of effective ways to spatially represent multi-hazard interactions
- 7) Identify gaps (knowledge, skills etc.) that are required to significantly progress our understanding of multi-hazard events and the practical approaches available for multi-hazard risk assessment. Identify whether these knowledge requirements can be met from existing science or whether new knowledge (new research) is required.
- 8) Identify disciplines which could inform multi-hazard research and risk assessment but may not be currently engaged in this topic, e.g. statistics, complexity science.
- 9) Identify initiatives/ forums/conferences /key publications which are addressing multi-hazard research and risk assessment, within and across academia and in practice – and which could be used to progress discussion on this topic and could encourage the academic-practitioner interaction and the application of existing science.

Managing and steering the work

NERC will nominate a dedicated project manager from within the Innovation Team to be a day-to-day liaison with the successful contractor – it is anticipated that this will be mirrored within the successful contractor organisation. NERC also anticipates a structured approach to project updates including a project inception meeting, regular progress reports and calls to maintain close contact with the contracting delivery team, an interim draft report meeting and a final report workshop.

Preparation for, travel to, and attendance at an inception meeting and a final report workshop meeting should be factored in to submitted proposals. This will be presented to relevant NERC employees (plus some members of the steering group) at a Final Report workshop at the end of the review period.

NERC has consulted a steering group in setting the scope of this tender. Consultation with this group will continue throughout the tender, via NERC. The steering group will be invited to review the progress reports and to the final report workshop.

NERC will supply the successful contracting organisation with:

- 3rd October 2017 Workshop write up
- Project summaries for funded multi-hazard projects
- ERIIP member meeting notes
- Contact information for ERIIP members, other interested stakeholders and other key NERC investments

Timetable

- Contract award – approx. 1st August
- Contract start – 6th August 2018
- Inception meeting – w/c 13th August 2018
- Interim progress meeting – w/c 27th August 2018 (Stage Gate)
- Final report meeting – w/c 17th September 2018
- Final report – w/c 1st October 2018

Terms and Conditions

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

Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			
Evaluation Justification Statement			
In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.			
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/ Methodology	30%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Project Environment	20%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	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:

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

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 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: $\text{Score/Total Points} \times 50$ ($80/100 \times 50 = 40$)

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

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

DO NOT

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

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

the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

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

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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