Mini Competition

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

Subject UK SBS Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation Public Dialogue Exploring and Understanding Public Perceptions & Responses to Online Targeting (Evaluator)

Sourcing reference number CR19012

Table of Contents

Version 2.6

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.

<u>Privacy Statement</u>

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

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

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

Version 2.6

Privacy Notice

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

YOUR DATA

The Contracting Authority will process the following personal data:

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

Purpose

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

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

Recipients

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

Retention

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

YOUR RIGHTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTERNATIONAL TRANSFERS

Your personal data will not be processed outside the European Union

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

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

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

CONTACT DETAILS

The data controller for your personal data is:

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

You can contact the Data Protection Officer at:

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

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

The Department is responsible for:

•   developing and delivering a comprehensive industrial strategy and leading the government's relationship with business;

•   ensuring that the country has secure energy supplies that are reliable, affordable and clean;

•   ensuring the UK remains at the leading edge of science, research and innovation; and

•   tackling climate change.

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

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

http://www.beis.gov.uk

BEIS is commissioning this project on behalf of the Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation (Department for Culture, Media and Sport) who are the policy leads. The dialogue delivery contractor's legal relationship will be with BEIS.

Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority (CA) Name and address	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy 1 Victoria Street London SW1H 0ET
3.2	Buyer name	Victoria Clewer
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£23,000.00 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 will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	Monday, 11th February 2019
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Monday, 18th February 2019 11:00
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Tuesday, 19th February 2019
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Monday, 25th February 2019 11:00
3.10	Clarifications if required	Thursday, 28th February 2019
3.11	Anticipated selection and de selection of Bids notification date	Wednesday, 6th March 2019
3.12	Anticipated Award Date	Friday, 8th March 2019
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start Date	Monday, 11th March 2019
3.14	Anticipated Contract End Date	31st January 2020
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.16	Framework and or Lot the Mini competition will be based on	CR16026 Sciencewise Framework Lot Number 3

- ## Section 4 – Specification

Background

The Sciencewise programme, led by BEIS, aims to improve UK public sector policy-making around areas of science, technology and innovation through the use of public dialogue. BEIS works with departments and bodies across the public sector to engage the public on new and emerging technology. The programme provides financial support (through a co-funding model) and specialist advice in all aspects of best practice in dialogue with the public to help Government departments and public sector bodies develop and commission public dialogue. For this project, BEIS will be working with the Department for Digital Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS).

Strategic Context

The ambition of the Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) is for the UK to be at the forefront of global efforts to harness data and artificial intelligence as a force for good. The Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation (CDEI) has been established in support of this. It was set up to undertake major projects focused on the ethical implications of particular data uses and fully explore them through reviewing existing research, conversations with sector stakeholder and experts, and engaging with the public, before reaching conclusions and making recommendations to Government. It has an explicit and unique mandate to advise the government on the measures which are needed to ensure the safe, ethical and innovative use of data and AI. The Centre has committed to embedding public engagement into its work.

The purpose of this public dialogue will be to support the Centre's first project. The Centre has been commissioned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer to undertake a project on online targeting, looking at how this practice affects people's online experiences, and develop advice and recommendations for the Government by spring 2020.

Overview of wider online Targeting project

In the 2018 Budget, the Centre was commissioned by the Chancellor to complete a project on targeting. Targeting (also called micro-targeting) is the use of personal data (including consumer data) and demographics (for example, by service providers and/or retailers) to identify the interests of specific individuals or very small groups of like-minded individuals and influence their thoughts or actions. While this project will focus on targeting carried out by commercial organisations for a variety of reasons and in different contexts, it may also consider the use of targeting by the public sector.

This topic was decided upon after engagement with a range of stakeholders including advocacy and consumer groups, who highlighted the topic as a priority for the Centre. Targeting can improve public services and enhance the experience of citizens if done well – this can range from selling specific products to suit people's preferences, but may also include nudging people to change their behaviour. However, such

practices can become intrusive or even manipulative – and can rely on opaque uses of data. The Centre's work is aimed at understanding this tension and its implications. The Centre needs to explore how data is used to shape people's experiences online and consider what steps can be taken to ensure such techniques are used responsibly so they support business and society.

The Centre's online targeting project will culminate with the publication of clear recommendations and advice for Government by Spring 2020. This is likely to include identifying action needed to improve regulation or governance frameworks, and possibly developing best practice or proposing a code of conduct.

There are 3 key elements to the Centre's online targeting project as a whole:

1) The Centre is undertaking its own desk based literature research and conversations with industry and experts to understand how online targeting works, techniques used, and the scale of its use (identifying potential harms and benefits). The Centre will also work with regulators and other key stakeholders to understand the current regulatory framework and to identify areas which could be improved to address risks and support innovation.

2) Understanding what is technically possible in terms of innovations that could be introduced to address people's concerns. The Centre will also consider wider policy solutions that are relevant.

3) A public dialogue to understand how people balance potential benefits with harms in relation to online targeting.

The Online Targeting Dialogue

The purpose of the public dialogue is to understand and explore public understanding, perceptions and attitudes towards online targeting in order to inform the advice and recommendations the Centre will give to Government. It is envisaged that the dialogue will involve a minimum of 105 workshop participants in at least 3 nationwide locations, each workshop to be reconvened once.

- The Centre is particularly keen to understand how public attitudes may differ across different demographics of the population as well as in different contexts (through the use of case studies).
- The public dialogue work will explore the wider cultural/societal impact of online targeting as well as the potential for direct harm. But it may also consider the wider cultural effects of people being recommended music or books because of their previous purchase history (or assumptions made about the preferences from other data sources), as well as the impact of targeting on social cohesion.
- In addition to understanding the context-specific concerns of people, the Centre also wishes to understand and explore generic concerns that emerge across different uses of online targeting.
- The dialogue will need to explore how people feel about data about them being used to target goods or services (or possibly political messages), as well as how they feel about the different online targeting techniques.
- It is anticipated that the dialogue will include topics such as transparency, control and a consideration of different power balances.

Project Oversight and Management

The Centre's Board, will have oversight of the wider project. The CDEI will have a dedicated project manager who will hold the day-to-day relationship with the provider of the dialogue project. An Oversight Group (which the CDEI will administer) will provide challenge to the development of the case studies and the design of the workshops. It will be engaged closely with the development of the project and the design of the deliberative approach. It is envisaged that the oversight group will include stakeholders such as a representative from a consumer body as well as people from business and other advocacy groups. There will also be input from academic experts with knowledge of particular online targeting methods. This Group will play a key role, together with the contractor, in developing the case studies used in the deliberative exercises.

Impact

The final report will be published as the Centre is committed to transparency.

The results of the public engagement activity will be reflected in the Centre's recommendations to Government and therefore make them particularly compelling. For example, the recommendations may outline ways in which regulation/governance should be strengthened to meet people's expectations and address the concerns expressed during the public dialogue.

Aims of the public dialogue

The Chancellor has commissioned the Centre for Data Ethics and Innovation to research and advise upon online targeting using personal and/or demographic data, a practice that has potential to be beneficial but may also be intrusive or even manipulative. The topic was decided upon after engagement with a wide range of stakeholders.

The purpose of the public dialogue is to understand and explore public understanding, perceptions and attitudes towards online targeting in order to inform the advice and recommendations the Centre will give to Government.

Objectives of the dialogue

- To engage a diverse and inclusive sample of publics to explore attitudes to the use of data in targeting public services
- To understand the values and principles underlying public attitudes towards the use of data for targeting products and services

- To understand if and how attitudes vary in different contexts (through a range of case studies) across different sub-groups of participants

- To explore participants' views on the trade-offs involved in the use of data for targeting (in different contexts through a range of case studies).

- To ensure that the Centre's outputs are informed by the public's views and expectations.

Questions for the dialogue to explore with the public

1. What needs to be in place for people to feel comfortable about the way data is used?

2. Is it possible to identify common ground across people with different experiences and attitudes?

3. How do the views of people from different backgrounds differ (e.g. age, socio-economic and ethnicity – the literature review will inform the identification of these groups).

4. Why do people's views differ across the different case studies, what values experiences and perspectives inform such differences? What principles do people apply/use and how do they apply these to different use cases?

5. How do people perceive and respond to potential risks/harms and benefits?

6. How do people balance the trade-offs between perceived (or real) harms and perceived (or real) benefits of targeting? What influences these attitudes?

7. What measures/innovations, governance and regulation, would the public like to see in place to give them increased comfort around the use of targeting?

8. What levels of transparency do the public expect in the ways organisations are using data?

9. How much personal control do people want over how and when they are targeted online?

Recruitment

In order to understand different people's attitudes and perceptions, the Centre envisages that the demographically representative public dialogue will be enhanced by weighting the sample to allow an additional focus on 3 relatively broad demographics, these include age, socio-economic background and ethnicity. These will be chosen based on the extent to which there are questions relating to whether specific groups might have different attitudes and perceptions compared to the general population. The literature review will be used to define the additional broad demographics in consultation with the contractor. It is also important that workshops take place across the country in order to demonstrate a commitment to nationwide engagement.

In order to demonstrate balance, no more than one of the sets of reconvened workshops should take place in the SE of England, and at least one set in one of the devolved nations. Our analysis of the literature review will guide our preferences for further locations (e.g. north/south, urban/rural etc.).

Methodology of the public dialogue

CDEI expects the dialogue provider to propose the structure of the public dialogue, but anticipates the core of the process will involve dialogue workshops designed to meet the Sciencewise principles, reconvened once, in at least 3 locations to demonstrate a nationwide reach. In order to demonstrate balance, no more than one of the sets of reconvened workshops should take place in the SE of England, and at least one set in one of the devolved nations. The Centre's analysis of its own literature review will guide our preferences for further locations (e.g. north/south, urban/rural etc.), and will be decided in collaboration with the contractor.

The Centre envisages a total minimum participation level of 105 people. It expects the provider to recruit a minimum of 75 participants to reflect the demographic make-up of the country with an additional set of at least 30 participants recruited from the 3 key demographics to be decided after the literature review in order to weight the sample for these groups and explore the specific perspectives of those demographics.

We are looking to the dialogue contractors to propose the most effective way to structure the workshop programme to ensure participants from these demographics are able to participate and contribute effectively while meeting the Centre's objectives. We would be happy to consider a process which:

The Centre envisages a total minimum participation level of 105 people. It expects the provider to recruit a minimum of 75 participants to reflect the demographic make-up of the country with an additional set of at least 30 participants recruited from the 3 key demographics to be decided after the literature review in order to weight the sample for these groups and explore the specific perspectives of those demographics.

We are looking to the dialogue contractors to propose the most effective way to structure the workshop programme to ensure participants from these demographics are able to participate and contribute effectively while meeting the Centre's objectives. We would be happy to consider a process which:

- includes the additional 30 participants in the core reconvened workshops;
- holds core reconvened workshops with 75 participants and runs three additional, shorter workshops involving a total of 30 people, one for each of the demographics recruited; or
- an alternative proposed approach that meets the Centre's objectives.

To understand how people's attitudes change in different contexts, the public dialogue will need to explore up to 3 different case studies which cover different methods and/or contexts of targeting – the Centre will provide the raw materials (using the research from the literature review) for the case studies which will include a description of the use case, details of the sorts of organisations using the particular targeting techniques and different ways consumers/clients receive information. The Centre will expect to work with the provider to develop these case studies which will cover different uses of online targeting, and may include:

- direct marketing of products or services

- the targeting of political messages

- the targeting of media and entertainment content

In addition to understanding the context specific concerns of people, the Centre also wishes to understand and explore generic concerns that emerge across different uses of online targeting.

We are inviting contractors to develop and provide a rationale for a process that meets these minimum requirements and to explain any associated challenges.

Deliverables

Project Timeline

January – February = CDEI commission literature review and begins to collate potential case studies.

February = CDEI extract raw materials for case studies, from literature review development of case studies (raw materials drafted by CDEI and passed to dialogue contractor).

March = Clarification interviews (11th March) and dialogue and evaluation contract award (w/c 11th March)

March = Inception meeting (14th March) with dialogue and evaluation contractors. Participant recruitment plans and workshop locations agreed. CDEI provides contractor with background materials, including raw material for case studies development

Late March/early April = first meeting of the Oversight Group (organised by CDEI on 26 March)

April - May = specialists and participant recruitment and development of dialogue materials, venue booking (by contractor)

May, April - July = Deliberative workshops underway (designed and facilitated by contractor provider who will also book locations and recruit participants)

Mid-August – September = Oversight Group review drafts of final dialogue report

September - October = final dialogue report

November = draft evaluation report

December = wash-up meeting

January 2020 = final evaluation report

Final report from dialogue

- The Centre understands that the numbers involved from these three additional demographics may not be enough to draw robust conclusions about the perspectives of these demographics.
- It is expected therefore that the final report of the public dialogue should include recommendations for further research if appropriate, particularly in relation to the different demographic groups recruited.
- The final report will need to identify areas of consensus across different groups as well as areas of difference.
- The final report will be published as the Centre is committed to transparency.

- Regular updates on emerging findings and project progress

- Interim report of findings

- Quality assured final report

- Slides summarising key findings

Vox pops from participants

Aims and Objectives of the Project

The aim of evaluating the dialogue projects co-funded through the Sciencewise programme is to contribute to the programme's overall aim by providing an independent assessment of the impacts and quality of the dialogue project as a whole, including the design, delivery, reporting and governance of the dialogue activities.

The objectives of Sciencewise programme evaluations are to:

- Gather and present objective and robust evidence of the nature and quality of the impacts, achievements and activities of the project in order to come to conclusions.
- Identify lessons from the project to support the design and delivery of future public dialogue projects.

Evaluations will consider a project as a whole, covering all the activities described in the dialogue specification, including:

- any preliminary activities (e.g. desk research, literature review)
- governance (e.g. steering or oversight groups; other decision making processes)
- stakeholder engagement
- public dialogue activities (e.g. number, location and design of events; sampling, recruitment and number of participants; quality of information provided; specialists involved)
- any other related public engagement activities (e.g. polls or online surveys)
- the key questions addressed by the public
- methods of recording and analysis of public discussions
- reports from the project including to public participants
- activities to disseminate and use the dialogue results
- any other relevant activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results.

Evaluations must be conducted independently of the dialogue project, and in accordance with the Sciencewise programme note, *Guidance on Evaluating Projects*. This can be found on the UK SBS portal. They should also should be undertaken against the quality standards identified

in the Sciencewise Quality Framework[1], and in the broader context of the Sciencewise guiding principles[2].

Focus of Sciencewise programme evaluations

Sciencewise evaluations should include formative and summative elements.

- **Formative:** The evaluator will be expected to use evidence gathered throughout the project to support the delivery of a high quality project.
- **Summative:** Identifying the impacts of and lessons from the governance, management, design, delivery, outputs and outcomes of the dialogue project overall. This requires analysis based on detailed evidence using the quantitative and qualitative data that will need to be collected by the evaluation. The focus should be on identifying the impacts of the project and how the design, delivery, governance and outputs contributed to these.

The evaluation is not intended to assess the personal performance of those involved.

The following six key questions must be answered when evaluating a Sciencewise dialogue project:

- **Lessons**. Based on the results of the public dialogue how can the centre build on this for future projects? What are the lessons for future public dialogue projects (including from what worked well and less well)?
- **Objectives**. Has the dialogue met its objectives? Were the objectives set the right ones?
- **Credibility**. How and why were the dialogue design, delivery and reporting appropriate to the context and objectives, and credible with those expected to use the results?
- **Quality**. Has the dialogue met standards of good practice (according to the Sciencewise Quality Framework and Guiding Principles)? What took place, how, when, where, who with and why? How successful has the governance of the project been, including the role of stakeholders, oversight groups, the commissioning body and the Sciencewise programme?
- **Impacts**. Has the dialogue achieved the expected (and any unexpected) impacts on policy and decisions, on organisational change and learning, and on all those involved? What new insights have been obtained (including on tackling potential social and ethical risks)? Who has seen the results and how have the results

---

[1] Sciencewise (2017) *Quality in Public Dialogue. A framework for assessing the quality of public dialogue.* This is available on the UK SBS portal.

[2] Sciencewise (2017) *The Government's Approach to Public Dialogue on Science and Technology.* This is available on the UK SBS portal.

been used? What has been the value of the project to those involved, including the extent to which those involved have been satisfied with the dialogue outcomes and process?

- **Costs and benefits**. What was the balance overall of the costs and benefits of the dialogue (basic costs compared to benefits including potential future costs saved)?

Methodology

Overall approach to the evaluation

6.1   It is expected that there will be three main stages of dialogue project evaluation:

- **Baseline assessment**. Early review of the specific policy context for the project, governance and management arrangements and the expectations of those involved about the likely achievements and impacts of the project on policy decisions.
- **Interim assessment of design and delivery**. Review of the quality of the design and delivery of dialogue activities, based on evidence from the evaluation research, including observation of events and feedback from public and other participants (e.g. specialists and other stakeholders), and the role of governance and management arrangements. This will feed into the final assessment of the project, and final evaluation reporting.
- **Final assessment of the project overall and reporting**. Final research and analysis following the dissemination of the dialogue project reports to gain further feedback from those involved (e.g. the oversight group, commissioning body and others). These new data, together with data from earlier stages, should be used to produce the final evaluation report.

Has the dialogue achieved its objectives?

6.2   The evaluator will be expected to determine if and how the dialogue has achieved the objectives specified, providing credible evidence in support of their conclusions. The dialogue objectives are:

1. To explore with participants their current understanding of, and engagement with, the different terms used to describe the technology/practice (e.g. profiling, targeting, personalisation etc.).
2. To explore with participants their current knowledge levels of the practice and the technology involved.
3. To gain understanding of participants' perceptions, aspirations and concerns on the development and use of targeting their reactions to

different potential scenarios of how the technology could be deployed in various ways.

4. To develop understanding of how and in what circumstances public aspirations and concerns regarding online targeting might be addressed.

5. To explore what the public sees as the role of government and regulators in the regulation of the technology (compared with industry) and who they think is responsible for raising awareness and engagement.

Dialogue success factors

6.3 At this stage, it is expected that success of the Targeting dialogue will be assessed by a range of factors including:

- The use of the results of the dialogue to influence national policy making involving targeting;
- The high quality of the design and delivery of the public dialogue project (good practice, value and effectiveness);
- The greater willingness and ability of the commissioning body to undertake public dialogue in future (learning about the place, value and practice of public dialogue in policy and decision making);
- Government and stakeholders will understand more on the risks associated with the use of targeting and will be in a better place to mitigate them;
- The ability of the project to put across issues and possibilities of targeting to non-participants if found;
- The ability of the project to touch a wide range of stakeholders who then go on to use what they have learned in their own policy and practice;
- The robustness of data analysis and quality of reporting;
- Evidence of the distribution and use of the dialogue results among policy makers and industry;
- Evidence of the satisfaction of public and stakeholder participants with the quality and outcomes of the dialogue; and
- Statements from policy makers on the impacts, value and benefits of public dialogue.

6.4 Bidders should indicate how they propose to assess if and how the dialogue has achieved its objectives, drawing on these success factors, and any others they propose.

Design and delivery

7.1   The evaluator will develop the evaluation process, and provide a detailed methodology, including an evaluation framework, success criteria and metrics as appropriate. The evaluator will be required to take part in an initial inception meeting with CDEDI and Sciencewise. , prior to the full inception meeting with all parties.

7.2   The evaluator must undertake all aspects of the evaluation, including data collection, collation and analysis. The evaluator may wish to outline the support they would require from the delivery contractor in aspects of the process (e.g. data collection).

7.3   All evaluation plans, materials (e.g. questionnaires and interview schedules) and all reports need to be discussed in draft with CEDI and Sciencewise, and formally signed off before use.

Formative Evaluation

7.4   The evaluator should be prepared to provide on-going feedback, based on evidence from evaluation research and emerging evaluation findings, to support project development and the delivery of a high quality dialogue. They must be aware, however, of their role as an evaluator and of the need to draw on evidence during any formative evaluation activities and be aware of the risks of "marking their own work".

Meetings

7.5   The evaluator will be expected to attend an inception meeting at the beginning of the project, and a final wash-up meeting at the end of the project. They will also be required to attend Oversight Group meetings and take part in other meetings as required by the CDEI project lead.

Other considerations:

8.1   Final communication, sign-off and reporting requirements and protocols will be agreed between CDEI and the evaluation contractor at the Inception Meeting.

8.2   All outputs must be clearly written, and written in such a way that it makes them easily accessible to a non-technical audience. All technical jargon and terminology must be fully explained and plain English used throughout the reports.

8.3   Circulated drafts and final versions of all outputs should be thoroughly proofread prior to submission. There is a need to build sufficient time (minimum 2 weeks) in to your timetable for CDEI to comment on any draft and final outputs.

8.4   If so required by the CDEI, the contractor shall produce a further version of a project plan for conducting the evaluation in such further detail as CEDI may reasonably require. The contractor shall ensure that the project plan is subject to CDEI approval. The contractor shall ensure that this plan is maintained and updated on a regular basis as may be necessary to reflect the then current state of the implementation.

8.5   CDEI shall have the right to require the contractor to include any reasonable changes or provisions in each version of the project plan.

8.6   The contractor shall perform its obligations so as to achieve each milestone by the milestone dates agreed in each project plan and changes to any agreed milestones, as agreed at project inception shall only be made in accordance with discussion with CDEI.

8.7   Payment terms will be agreed between CDEI and the contractor, at the Inception meeting.

8.8   Before payment can be considered, each invoice must include a detailed elemental breakdown of work completed and the associated costs.

Requirements of contractor

9.1   Bidders should demonstrate a sound understanding of the brief, and should have the appropriate expertise of evaluation of public dialogue and / or other public engagement processes and of using best practice techniques to evaluate dialogue processes involving the general public, experts and policy-makers.

9.2   Applicants should demonstrate how they would be prepared to adapt to developments or changes in the dialogue project. These are likely in this project, as noted in the full dialogue specification.

9.3.   A single contract will be let for the evaluation. Applicants should provide details of any sub-contractors, or support staff, which the evaluator intends to use. Details of oversight procedures should be provided.

9.4   Without compromising the independence of the evaluation process, the evaluator must be prepared to grant access to CDEI and Sciencewise to allow inspection of the work at any time. The evaluator must also be prepared to provide further information to these parties should it be requested.

9.5   Data security arrangements for this project should accord with those specified in the Sciencewise programme framework contract.

9.6   The evaluator will be required to inform CDEI and Sciencewise promptly, in writing, of any cessation of work and of any event or circumstance likely to affect significantly affect the satisfactory completion of the evaluation.

Deliverables

The evaluator will be required to produce the following written reports:

- Brief monthly progress updates (as required);
- Interim report, likely to be required two weeks after the final fieldwork events
- Final evaluation report:
    - draft to be shared with the CDEI project team and Sciencewise lead evaluator prior to the wash-up meeting. They will comment on any initial changes
    - improved draft circulated to attendees at the wash-up meeting, one week in advance of meeting
    - final version in a form that can be published.

Reporting

The final evaluation report should include:

- an executive summary that will work as a stand-alone document: this should include a brief description of the purpose of the project, timing and activities; a brief summary of the evaluation methodology, and the main evaluation *findings* particularly on impacts, lessons for the future and conclusions.
- a description of the project objectives, timescale and activities (including reports), so that readers will know what the purpose of the project was, what took place and when.
- a summary of the evaluation methodology, any metrics, and data collection sources and tools
- detailed analysis and evidenced conclusions from the evaluation research across all three stages.

The report should address all six key questions outlined above and cover all dialogue project activities, including:

- Preliminary activities (e.g. desk research)
- Governance (e.g. oversight groups) and stakeholder engagement
- Project management (both commissioning body and dialogue delivery contractor)
- Public dialogue activities (e.g. sampling, recruitment and number of participants; number, location and design of events; the main questions addressed by the public; quality of information provided; role and value of scientists and other specialists involved)
- Any other related public engagement activities and any other activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results
- Report and reporting (including methods of analysis / recording) from the project, including to public participants

- All impacts (achieved and expected), and all dissemination and use of dialogue results
- Reflective learning, drawing out the main lessons of the evaluation and how these might inform future dialogues.

Detailed evaluation data (e.g. questionnaire responses, frameworks, use of Sciencewise Quality Framework, etc) should be provided in annexes.

The report must be written in coherent and accessible language and provided in a form that is useful for learning and demonstrating impacts.

Section 5 – Evaluation of Bids

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

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

To maintain a high degree of rigour in the evaluation of your bid, a process of moderation will be undertaken to ensure consistency by all evaluators.
After moderation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 (5+5+6 =16÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL3.13	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 – Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Special Terms – Part 2
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria

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

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	25%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Expertise and Knowledge	30%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Evaluation Approach and Quality of Outputs	45%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

Non-Price (Quality) elements

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

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20**%**.
Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:
Score = {weighting percentage} x {bidder's score} = 20% x 60 = 12

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

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

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

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

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

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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.

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

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