Invitation to Quote

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

Subject: Process review of UKRI's research and innovation response to Covid19

Sourcing Reference Number: CR21028

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

Version 4.0

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

Version 4.0

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.

Privacy Statement

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.

https://www.uksbs.co.uk/use/pages/privacy.aspx

For details on how the Contracting Authority protect and process your personal data please follow the link below:

https://www.ukri.org/privacy-notice/

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 & Innovation (UKRI) Polaris House Swindon SN2 1FL
3.2.	Buyer name	Victoria Clewer
3.3.	Buyer contact details	victoria.clewer@uksbs.co.uk
3.4.	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£100,000.00 excluding VAT
3.5.	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	**All correspondence shall be submitted within the Messaging Centre of the e-sourcing. Guidance Notes to support the use of Delta eSourcing 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 Contract Advert on Contracts Finder	Friday, 12th February 2021
3.7.	Latest date / time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Delta eSourcing messaging system	Friday, 26th February 2021 11:00
3.8.	Latest date / time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Delta eSourcing Portal	Wednesday, 3rd March 2021
3.9.	Latest date and time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Delta eSourcing	Friday, 12th March 2021 11:00
3.10.	Clarifications if required	w/c Monday, 15th March 2021
3.11.	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Friday, 26th March 2021
3.12.	Anticipated Contract Award date	Friday, 26th March 2021
3.13.	Anticipated Contract Start date	Monday, 5th April 2021
3.14.	Anticipated Contract End date	Wednesday, 30th June 2021
3.15.	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) works in partnership with universities, research organisations, businesses, charities and government to create the best possible environment for research and innovation to flourish. Operating across the whole of the UK with a combined budget of more than £8billion, UKRI brings together the seven Research Councils, Innovate UK and Research England.

UKRI has played a critical role in the UK Government's research and innovation response to COVID-19. UKRI has mobilised a huge amount of its resource on short timescales to intervene through a combination of:

- Funding, in various forms, to support **cutting-edge research and innovation aimed at understanding and/or tackling COVID-19** or its consequences.

- Targeted, financial support to researchers, universities and businesses as part of an overall package to '**steady the system**' and help the R&I community face down the logistical and financial effects of lockdown; and

Alongside this, UKRI has made changes to many of its processes to make bidding for funds easier, to improve the speed of funding decisions and to some of its non-financial policy processes. These changes have enabled UKRI to respond in a more agile manner to the urgent need to fund critical research and innovation to address the pandemic.

UKRI is committed to evaluating its programmes and so wants to robustly evaluate the short- and longer-term impact of its response to Covid-19. Such evaluation is vital to support and inform how UKRI responds to the pandemic as it continues to unfold; and also, to build UKRI's capability and understanding of how to respond to any future pandemics or crises that may arise which once again demand a strong, coordinated response from UKRI.

UKRI is separating evaluating its research and innovation response to Covid-19 from interventions designed to stabilise the research system. This tender is for a piece of research that will form part of UKRI's process evaluation of its research and innovation response to Covid-19.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

1. Aim

UKRI is committed to a rigorous evaluation of its Covid-19 research and innovation response to learn any lessons and to assess the impact of the response. This evaluation will comprise a process review and separately an impact evaluation. This tender is for a process review.

The process review will seek to identify the role UKRI played in terms of the UK Government's Research & Innovation response to Covid-19 and will bring together views of and evidence from relevant parties on UKRI's role. UKRI is an independent organisation that brings together the seven Research Councils, Innovate UK and Research England. The focus of the process review will be on how UKRI worked, and therefore on the interactions between the different parts of UKRI. However, the review will also need to consider how UKRI worked and interacted with external actors, both within the UK (including with the UK Government (eg SAGE, DHSC, HMT) and with the devolved administrations and with other research organisations nationally and internationally). The review will also consider the extent to which UKRI's pre-existing organisational structures – as well as any changes made thereto as part of UKRI's response to Covid-19 – enabled or inhibited its Covid-19 response, and the adequacy and appropriateness of UKRI's R&I response (based on what was

known and needed at the time of decision making, during the height of the response). The review should identify strengths as well as areas for improvement.

This process review should look at UKRI's R&I response holistically. However, in order to provide this holistic review, it will be necessarily to consider the processes for each of the individual interventions.

UKRI's R&I response to Covid-19 can be summarised as:

- Various forms of funding to support research and innovation to understand, tackle and/or mitigate the Covid-19 pandemic
    - UKRI open call for Covid-19 focused research
    - DHSC/UKRI rapid response initiative
    - GCRF/Newton Fund agile response call to address Covid-19
    - Whole Genome Sequencing Alliance
    - GenOMICC Consortium
    - Global Effort on Covid-19 (GECO) Health Research – UKRI/DHSC
    - Covid-19 Africa Rapid Grant Fund - Newton
    - Innovate UK competition for Covid-19 focused innovation
    - Ventilator Challenge scale-up
    - Vaccines Manufacturing Innovation Centre scale-up
    - Increasing testing capacity
    - ACCORD – Accelerating COVID1 – Research and development platform (UKRI/DHSC)
    - RECOVERY (Randomised Evaluation of Covid-19 Therapy) trial (UKRI/NIHR)
- Non-financial interventions
    - Changes to UKRI's funding and operational processes (eg virtual peer review)
    - Communication and dialogue with the R&I community and wider public
- Business as usual
    - Funding for Covid-19 focused research
    - Re-purposing of existing grants towards Covid-19 focused research

This process review will gather evidence that will be used to help assess the effectiveness of UKRI's R&I response by looking holistically at the overall UKRI response and:

a. Understanding the environment within which UKRI was operating. UKRI's response began before the pandemic affected the UK and continued as the pandemic unfurled. At the same time UKRI "business as usual" continued. It will be important to place the changes made and decisions taken in context;

b. Summarising the actions taken by UKRI and placing these actions in the context of the environment within which UKRI was operating. This needs to include an assessment of the information available when decisions and actions were taken, and the bodies available to assess the information);

c. Gather evidence and perceptions from key stakeholders on UKRI's R&I process in terms of what was done, how and why;

d. Identifying any organisational or environmental factors that enabled the Covid-19 response, how and why they enabled the changes as well as any that slowed or inhibited process changes;

e. Identify and record any lessons learned, both to identify short-term changes that could be made as well as lessons for design and delivery that could be considered for the future. This should include a consideration of whether UKRI has appropriate and effective cross-UKRI horizon scanning systems in place to enable it to mount an effective system wide response, and the extent to which it is able to flex resources across the organisation to deliver priorities.

2. Review Questions

a. This review forms the first stage of a wider programme of work to evaluate UKRI's response to Covid19. Some of the questions for this review have been developed to support the wider evaluation. The intention is to build an evidence base to determine the success of UKRI's

response and to inform lessons learned for the future. This evidence base may also be used more widely, for example, as Government more generally learns lessons from its Covid19 response or in planning for future pandemics.

Audience and purpose of the question	Sub evaluation questions
Appropriateness – process review questions	

For UKRI - To understand [how the organisational structure facilitated the changes, and the speed at which changes were made, to help UKRI] to learn lessons for the future	As part of the review, a set of questions will be refined, these will include but will not be limited to the following areas:
	
	- Strategic Rationale
	   o What role did UKRI play? To what extent was this role decided by UKRI versus a role UKRI was encouraged to adopt? To what extent did this response need, and was able, to flex as the pandemic unfolded? How were decisions taken? What was the governance for decision taking?
	   o When and how did UKRI's R&I response to Covid-19 begin? UKRI's response was largely managed within business-as-usual. What were the advantages, and disadvantages of this? What are the lessons? Where there were differences compared to business as usual, what were these differences? Were these planned and anticipated? What drove any differences?
	- Funding and process changes
	   o To what extent were funding and/or application processes changed? Did these changes adequately reflect the objectives of the Covid19 response? Did the changes achieve the objectives? What was the effect of funding and process changes?
	   o To what extent were the Covid-19 funding streams distinct from business as usual? To what extent were appropriate policies in place to empower these different funding routes? Were these policies used effectively? Were the distinctions clear to staff and potential applicants?
	
	- Governance
	   o How were decisions taken? What was the governance process for Covid-19 R&I? How did it differ from business as usual and to what extent did it facilitate the Covid-19 response?
	
	- Operations/delivery
	   o To what extent did UKRI have a plan that it could roll-out for managing a its response to a pandemic? Was this plan followed and if so was it effective?

	- To what extent did the Covid19 response impact on "business-as-usual" activities? What was the impact? Was it anticipated? Are there lessons from this? - How was the Covid-19 response resourced? How were resourcing decisions taken? Was UKRI able to sufficiently flex resources across UKRI to resource priorities? Was this sustainable? - Communications - How was UKRI's response to Covid-19 communicated? What was the Covid-19 communications strategy? Was it effective was it? What was its impact - What could we learn from this process to take forward? In keeping the R&I community engaged? - Assessment process - To what extent did the assessment process for the Covid-19 funding streams differ from BAU? - To what extent did the assessment process meet its objectives? What was the outcome (compared with BAU)? - Monitoring process - How is the Covid-19 response being monitored? By whom? What monitoring information is being collected? By whom? How is the monitoring information being used? - To what extent, and why, does the monitoring process for Covid-19 differ from BAU monitoring? - Are there any data deficiencies identified that might have some implications for the evaluation of the Covid19 response?

3. **Evaluation budget**

    a. We have a maximum budget of £100k excluding VAT for this evaluation, with an indicative budget of £75k excluding VAT.

4. **Time period to be covered by the review**

    a. This review should cover 2 time periods, January 2020 – end July 2020 and August 2020 – March 2021.

5. **Stakeholders to be engaged during the evaluation**

    a. The table below indicates the stakeholder groups that are likely to hold information and insights relevant to the evaluation questions. It is not expected that the contractor will necessarily engage with all these groups. For the purposes of this tender, please assume 20 interviews.

Overview of stakeholders	
UKRI	- Chair and representatives of UKRI's Covid-19 Co-ordination Group;

	- Chair and representatives of UKRI's Covid-19 working group - Finance - Strategy - Sample of people running the research calls - Representative from Reforming our Business
Wider stakeholders	- SAGE, DHSC, HMT, GO-science - An external perspective (eg Wellcome) - Grantholders (sample of) - Sir Mark Walport (former CEO UKRI)

 b. UKRI will provide the contractor with contact details of all stakeholders.

6. Oversight and management of the research

 a. This review is part of a wider programme of research to evaluate UKRI's R&I response to Covid-19. The evaluation programme is being managed by the UKRI Covid19 Evaluation lead and is supported by an Expert Advisory Group and an Evaluation Steering Group.

 b. The Covid 19 Evaluation lead will manage the review on a day to day basis. Bidders should allow for 2 (virtual) meetings /presentations to the Evaluation Steering Group. The list of members of the Evaluation Steering Group will be provided to the successful bidder.

7. Overview of Covid-19 monitoring and evaluation activity

This piece of research is part of a wider programme of monitoring and evaluation activity. It is part of the central evaluation of UKRI's R&I response to Covid-19 and is being supported by a number of separately led evaluations of distinct interventions[1] . The evaluation plans for these will be shared with the successful bidder, and findings– where available, will also be shared. Tenderers should note that they will be expected to draw off these evaluations and not replicate them.

8. Overview of other relevant work

9. Other relevant work will be shared with the successful contractor. This may include other relevant evaluation reports and other reports linked to Covid-19

10. Ethics and governance

 a. The bidder is invited to explain how the research will be conducted in accordance with high ethical standards.

11. Data protection and security

 a. The bidder is invited to outline how the evaluation will be conducted in accordance with relevant data protection and security standards, including how they will safely store, use and destroy contact details of stakeholders, documentary sources shared about the investments during the evaluation and the other information collected as part of the evaluation.

3. Approach

---

[1] Specifically, Innovate UK's Covid-19 interventions, the ISCF Medicines Manufacturing Challenge, the Newton Fund and the Global Challenges Research Fund are being separately evaluated.

12. Analysis and synthesis

a. Bidders are invited to set out their proposed approach to this review and to the report writing to ensure that all findings and conclusions are grounded in the available evidence. This includes being explicit about the limitations, evidence gaps and uncertainties. Bidders should plan for a draft (interim) report that they will present to the Evaluation Steering Group and a final report.

b. It is anticipated that this project will require a combination of desktop research, qualitative interviews and small-scale surveys. UKRI is keen to minimise any burden on its staff and the research community and so proposals should explain how the planned approach to getting the necessary evidence whilst minimising the burden on respondents. Proposals should specify which analytical techniques will be most appropriate and why. Proposals must clearly set out how different analytical approaches will be combined to produce the final findings.

c. For survey activity, proposals should indicate the type of survey to be implemented, and indicate the number required or expected sample size, as well as their strategies to achieve this and steps which will be taken if it is not achieved. This includes methods and approaches used to capture and ensure the maximum response rate possible.

d. For qualitative interviews, the proposals should indicate the number to be conducted and what methods (i.e. the sampling approach) and tools (i.e. web based or phone interview) are going to be implemented, taking into consideration the time and costs of the different tools (and the constraints of social distancing). Proposals should also set out how case study findings will be analysed and presented.

e. This review is part of wider programme of work to evaluate UKRI's response to Covid19. The bidder needs to bear this in mind and consider how the review might feed into the wider programme of work.

13. Challenges for the review

a. It is anticipated that this review will face several challenges which include (but are not limited to):

- Determining the environment at the time decisions were taken. The environment was changing rapidly, and it is important to ensure that decisions are placed in the context of what was known and needed at that time.
- Building on and not replicating other complementary work (such as the Government Internal Audit Review).
- Designing and executing carefully designed surveys and interviews on relatively short time-scales while achieving high rates of response and engagement.
- Using the evidence base obtained through the evaluation to arrive at a series of well-balanced judgements regarding the effectiveness of UKRI's response to Covid19.

The bidder is invited to suggest pragmatic methods to overcome the challenges, highlighting how this has influenced the approach proposed, why it is deemed to be the most robust option and what the limits of it are.

14. Data and information to be used in the evaluation

a. UKRI will provide the successful bidder with information on each of the interventions, data on research grant applications received and grant awarded through the open call, monitoring information, reviews and other work that is complementary and information on (and contacts for) the other relevant evaluations.

b. The bidder may need to collect additional data as deemed necessary for the evaluation.

4. Deliverables

15. High level timeline and deliverable

This work is expected to be delivered at pace, according to the following high-level timeline. This high-level timetable is based on the need to ensure the outputs of this process review can feed-in to decision making in UKRI as well as separate work being undertaken as part of the broader evaluation of UKRI's response to Covid19. However, the timetable is not entirely fixed and there is an extent to which the timeline can be adjusted in order to ensure the work is delivered to a sufficiently high standard.

- Start-up meeting early April 21
- Desktop research, information gathering April 21
- Interviews, surveys, data gathering April/May 21
- Analysis May 21
- Draft report and presentation late May/early June 21
- Final report late June 21

16. Analysis and synthesis

a. Bidders are invited to set out their proposed approach to this review and to the report writing to ensure that all findings and conclusions are grounded in the available evidence. This includes being explicit about the limitations, evidence gaps and uncertainties. Bidders should plan for a draft (interim) report that they will present to a joint (virtual) meeting of the Expert Advisory Group and the Evaluation Steering Group and a final report (including a presentation to the Evaluation Steering Group]. Bidders should also allow for two further (virtual) meetings with the Expert Advisory Group.

b. It is anticipated that this project will require a combination of desktop research, qualitative interviews and small-scale surveys. UKRI is keen to minimise any burden on its staff and the research community and so proposals should explain how the planned approach to getting the necessary evidence whilst minimising the burden on respondents. Proposals should specify which analytical techniques will be most appropriate and why. Proposals must clearly set out how different analytical approaches will be combined to produce the final findings.

c. For survey activity, proposals should indicate the type of survey to be implemented, and indicate the number required or expected sample size, as well as their strategies to achieve this and steps which will be taken if it is not achieved. This includes methods and approaches used to capture and ensure the maximum response rate possible.

d. For qualitative interviews, the proposals should indicate the number to be conducted and what methods (i.e. the sampling approach) and tools (i.e. web based or phone interview) are going to be implemented, taking into consideration the time and costs of the different tools (and the constraints of social distancing). Proposals should also set out how case study findings will be analysed and presented.

e. This review is part of wider programme of work to evaluate UKRI's response to Covid19. The bidder needs to bear this in mind and consider how the review might feed into the wider programme of work.

17. Challenges for the review

a. It is anticipated that this review will face several challenges which include (but are not limited to):

- Determining the environment at the time decisions were taken. The environment was changing rapidly, and it is important to ensure that decisions are placed in the context of what was known and needed at that time.
- Building on and not replicating other complementary work (such as the Government Internal Audit Review).

- Designing and executing carefully designed surveys and interviews on relatively short time-scales while achieving high rates of response and engagement.
- Using the evidence base obtained through the evaluation to arrive at a series of well-balanced judgements regarding the effectiveness of UKRI's response to Covid19.

The bidder is invited to suggest pragmatic methods to overcome the challenges, highlighting how this has influenced the approach proposed, why it is deemed to be the most robust option and what the limits of it are.

18. Data and information to be used in the evaluation

a. UKRI will provide the successful bidder with information on each of the interventions, data on research grant applications received and grant awarded through the open call, monitoring information, reviews and other work that is complementary and information on (and contacts for) the other relevant evaluations.

The bidder may need to collect additional data as deemed necessary for the evaluation.

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.

The evaluation and if required team may comprise staff from UK SBS and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation and if required moderation 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	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	SEL1.3	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL2.12	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Act and the Data Protection Act 2018
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Compliance to the Contract Terms
Commercial	AW4.2	Changes to the Contract Terms
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Price	AW5.4	E-invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Quality	AW6.2	Variable Bids
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool
	In the event of a Bidder failing to meet the requirements of a Mandatory pass / fail criteria, the Contracting Authority reserves the right to disqualify the Bidder and not consider evaluation of any of the Award stage scoring methodology or Mandatory pass / fail criteria.	

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	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Methodology/Approach	35.00%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	10.00%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Environment	30.00%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project plan and Timescales	10.00%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20**%**.
Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:
Score = {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 questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score as follows:

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) ÷ 4 = 50

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.
Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.
Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.
Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 (80/100 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 how to register and use the e-sourcing portal 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.

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 Delta eSourcing 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 ensure that the Response and any documents accompanying it are in the English Language, the Contracting Authority reserve the right to disqualify any full or part responses that are not in English.

7.12   Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

7.13 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.14 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.

7.15 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.16 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.

7.17 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.18 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.19 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.20 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.21 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.22 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.23 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.24 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.

7.25   All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Delta eSourcing, Telephone 0845 270 7050

7.26   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.

7.27   Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.28   Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.29   We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.30   All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority / UKSBS.

7.31   We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through the Delta eSourcing Portal.

7.32   If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.33   Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34   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

7.35   Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.36   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.

7.37   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.

7.38   If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.39   Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Delta eSourcing Portal.

7.40   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.

7.41   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 the Delta eSourcing Portal.

7.42   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.

7.43   The Government introduced 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
- Contracts Finder
- Tenders Electronic Daily # [✍only leave in if the ITQ is going to be treated like a Full Above threshold procurement] #
- Equalities Act introduction
- Bribery Act introduction
- Freedom of information Act