



Mini Competition

Mini Competition against an existing Framework Agreement (MC) on behalf of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI)

Subject UK SBS Research and analysis: Exploring how Higher Education Institutions manage their allocation of formula-based funding within the dual support system – Lot 3

Sourcing reference number CR18118

Table of Contents

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

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Customers.

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

Section 2 – About Our Customer

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 UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Customer Name and address	UK Research and Innovation Polaris House North Star Avenue Swindon SN2 1FL
3.2	Buyer name	Victoria Clewer
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£48,000.00 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	Friday, 17 th August 2018
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	Wednesday, 29 th August 2018 11:00 (BST)
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Monday, 3 rd September 2018
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Tuesday, 18 th September 2018 11:00 (BST)
3.10	Interviews	Tuesday, 2 nd October 2018

3.11	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	Friday, 5 th October 2018
3.12	Anticipated Award Date	Friday, 5 th October 2018
3.13	Anticipated Call Off Contract Start Date	Monday, 8 th October 2018
3.14	Anticipated Call Off Contract End Date	Monday, 31 st December 2018
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.16	Framework and Lot the procurement should be based on	BIS Research & Evaluation Framework CR150025 LOT 3

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

Research England

The Higher Education and Research Act 2017 established Research England as a Council of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) alongside the other existing Councils (the seven Research Councils and Innovate UK).

Research England (RE) shapes healthy, dynamic research and knowledge exchange in English universities. We are responsible for funding, engaging with and understanding these institutions, and working with devolved funding bodies and the Office for Students to understand their strategies, capabilities and capacity. We support and challenge universities to create new knowledge, strengthen the economy, and enrich society. We distribute over £2.2 billion to universities in England every year, principally through quality-related research (QR) funding, and the Higher Education Innovation Fund, as well as c. £180m in formula-based research capital. We are responsible for administering the Research Excellence Framework, used to inform QR funding, and for delivering the forthcoming Knowledge Exchange Framework. We also support specific activities with dedicated project funding, including the £900m UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (UKRPIF), and the £100m Connecting Capability Fund.

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 (UKRI) brings together the seven Research Councils¹, Innovate UK and a new organisation, Research England.

Through UKRI, the government is implementing the recommendations of the Nurse Review, led by Nobel Prize-winning scientist Sir Paul Nurse. The review panel's report called on government to "support the Research Councils to collectively make up more than the sum of their parts", and develop a "smoother pathway to more applied research". UKRI was a proposal of Part 3 of the Higher Education and Research Bill, which received Royal Assent on 27 April 2017. The Bill is now an Act of Parliament, and UK Research and Innovation was created in April 2018.

This exercise forms part of a programme of work that will critically assess what constitutes reasonable balance in England's 'dual support' system to inform future funding decisions. In order to consider the potential impact of changes to the balance of dual support the evidence base must be strengthened, in particular at the institutional- and disciplinary-

¹ The seven Research Councils refers to AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC and STFC - <https://www.ukri.org/about-us/our-councils/>

level, uncovering how the management of formula-based funding is balanced versus the award of Research Council funding.

Under the dual support system, RE provide annual funding to English HEIs in the form of a 'block grant'.² The majority of our funds for research are allocated on the basis of research quality, and take into account the volume and relative cost of research in different areas, so-called quality-related research (QR) funding. To assess the quality of research for funding purposes, RE and the other UK funding bodies³, run a periodic assessment exercise. The most recent of these was the Research Excellence Framework (REF 2014)⁴, the results of which were published in December 2015 and have been used to determine funding from academic year 2015-16 onwards. The Government issues RE with an annual grant letter which sets out the total level of funding and associated guidance on policy priorities. In 2018-19 we will distribute £1.6bn in formula-based QR funding. This breaks down into the following elements:

QR element	Final Allocations (£ / millions)
Mainstream quality-related research (QR) including London weighting	1,050
Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) ⁵	58
QR Research Degree Programme (RDP) supervision	260
QR charity support fund	204
QR business research element	64
QR funding for National Research Libraries	7
Total recurrent research	1,643

Formula-based research capital⁶ is also allocated to HEIs by and for the financial year 2018-19 totals £183m, comprising:

- **HEI Research Capital England** - £96m, allocated in proportion to recurrent QR funding and research income from other (non-Research Council) sources;
- **Higher Education Research Capital (HERC) England** - £87m, allocated in proportion to research income from Research Councils.

² See <http://re.ukri.org/research/how-we-fund-research/>

³ Where the other UK funding bodies are DfE NI, HEFCW and SFC.

⁴ See <http://results.ref.ac.uk/Results>

⁵ Whilst included here as an integral element of QR funding, the GCRF element itself is out of the scope of this exercise.

⁶ See <http://re.ukri.org/research/capital-funding/>

These funding streams are 'un-hypothecated', where the funding is awarded without restrictions on how it is spent, thus allowing HEIs strategic flexibility on how to deploy these resources. Due to this plasticity in spend, there is limited evidence available to identify where this funding has been spent within HEIs resulting in challenges to monitor and evaluate collective impacts and outcomes from this investment. Over 90% of the funding allocated through RE is provided to institutions through a formula-based, single annual grant. (This includes funding for knowledge exchange via the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF), which is out with the scope of this work.) In addition to this, RE run a small number of competitive funding schemes, including the UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (UKRPIF), Connecting Capability Fund (CCF) and Expanding Excellence in England (E3) that enable the HE sector to build on and develop institutional strategy, capability and capacity.

On the other side of the dual-support system, the other Research Councils within UKRI provide hypothecated funding for specific research projects, people and programmes, awarded on the basis of excellence for future proposals rather than past performance. The Councils are well connected with their communities, with a strong tradition of funding excellent research in the sciences, social sciences, arts and humanities, supporting the UK's world-leading universities and research institutions. With a combined budget of more than £4bn the Research Councils are committed to supporting the very best research, with scientific excellence the primary criterion for funding. Funding opportunities are highly competitive and only those proposals judged by experts in the field to be of the highest scientific quality are supported. Grant proposals submitted to the Research Councils are costed at 100% of full Economic Cost (fEC - the total costs of undertaking research) of the proposed research, however if awarded, funding meets 80% of those costs. Within this budget, the Research Councils also invest in science infrastructure, both existing and new, through two capital funding streams:

- **World Class Labs** – used for minor upgrades, capital grants and estates maintenance;
- **Grand Challenges** – used for specific strategic projects and major facilities.

As Research Council funding is awarded to deliver specific outcomes, evidence is collected from HEIs in order to track the impact of investment through this side of the dual-support system. This information includes data such as the volume and purpose of the funding awarded to HEIs and the outcomes arising from the research projects, people, and programmes supported through this investment.

The dual support system (these two elements considered together) is recognised as a key factor in the ongoing quality and research excellence of the UK research base because it strikes a balance between research that is strategically directed aligning research with national priorities and challenges, and research that is engaged from the bottom up supporting novel ideas across the research community and providing the underpinning support for this sector.

Previous analysis and evidence highlights the complementary nature of Research England formula-funding / QR and RC / outcome-based funding, however the currently available evidence base makes it difficult to tease-out sector level positive impacts attributed to either funding stream respectively. This is particularly exacerbated by the relatively sparse evidence base for how formula-based funding is spent. Much of the

current existing evidence is based on case studies or anecdotal evidence, and whilst providing powerful narratives, does not give the granular institutional-level detail / evidence that is required. For example, it is suggested by the sector-level evidence that mainstream QR funding plays an important role in the financial sustainability of HEIs' research environment by supporting the fEC of research, such as core academic salaries and overheads. This allows HEIs the long-term stability required to plan and manage fluctuating project funding. How this varies across the sector, particularly by region, individual institution and area of research is unclear, and in order to draw any firm conclusions on the impact of potential risks or assess the relative effect of additional funding for each / either of the two sides a more substantial evidence-base is required.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The role of UKRI includes providing advice to Ministers on the balance between the dual support funding streams. Under this system, English HEIs receive un-hypothecated formula-based funding from Research England, which includes quality related research funding (QR) and research capital, together with proposal-led grant funding administered through Research Councils. These two streams are complementary, and the dual support system as a whole accounts for almost half of the research income to English HEIs. To ensure that the recommendations it provides concerning the balance of funding are robust, UKRI need to take an evidence-based approach to be able to analyse and understand what constitutes reasonable balance between the dual support funding streams, and model the impact that any changes to the balance could have on the HE sector.

To develop the evidence base and mechanisms to inform this approach, a cross-UKRI group, named the Balanced Funding Working Group and led by David Sweeney (Executive Chair, Research England) and including representatives from across the councils and the UKRI Strategy team, has been convened to manage and deliver this programme of research and evidence-gathering.

The piece of work detailed here will contribute to this programme by exploring, at the individual institution and discipline level, how HEIs manage their formula-based funding allocation, and how this is tensioned against Research Council funding within their institution. There is currently little robust evidence to identify the impacts and outcomes of formula-based funding as it is allocated without restrictions on spend and no auditing process is in place to collect this information. Research Council funding is awarded to deliver specific outcomes allowing the impact and outcomes of these investments to be tracked over the lifetime of the award and beyond.

The aim of this work is therefore to develop a clear picture of how formula-based funding is used and tensioned against Research Council funding within different types of institutions and across the sector as a whole. This evidence will be used to consider sustainability at the HEI level as well as within and between disciplines and spending areas (such as research, teaching, etc.). The data collected and analysed through this work will reinforce the business case for balance between the dual support system for the next Comprehensive Spending Review, expected to take place in 2019.

The principle objective of this piece of work is to explore, at the individual institution level, how HEIs manage their formula-based funding allocation, both resource and capital (the facilities and infrastructure that underpin research and enhance the research environment), with a view to enabling the assessment of the potential impact of changes to the balance of dual support. In order to develop a clear picture of how dual support funding is used to support sustainability at the HEI level and more specifically in terms of research activity we require:

Objective	Outputs and expectations
Review evidence from existing data (for example, TRAC ⁷ , Research Council data, PACEC Review of QR ⁸)	<p>Use existing evidence and interviews with key sector protagonists to hypothesise what formula-funding is used for at a granular, HEI-level. A data-sharing agreement will be required at the point of contracting.</p> <p>Propose any further conclusions that can be drawn based on synthesised evidence (report).</p>
Seek further evidence from the sector	<p>This should be built on the foundations of the available data and further conclusions drawn, as per the above.</p> <p>There are several mechanisms by which this could be undertaken. We would suggest a sector-wide survey, but welcome alternative propositions. This should include questions that probe HEI financial data in more depth, and identify responsible officers within institutions.</p>

⁷ See <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/partnerships-and-collaboration/financial-sustainability-strategy-group-and-trac/>

⁸ See http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/21621/1/2014_qrreview.pdf

	Identify key emerging themes to highlight in an initial summary report, and that will form the basis of a deeper examination of the data.
Identify and engage with the individuals within HEIs with responsibility for the internal distribution of formula funding	Design a mechanism by which those individuals identified in the sector-wide survey can contribute to a greater body of evidence, informed by the key emerging themes identified in the above. This could be through a workshop or structured interviews.
Delivery of a full and comprehensive evidence-base and dataset	Produce an evidence-base and dataset, wholly owned by UKRI, demonstrating the use of formula-based funding (resource and capital) across a range of HEIs and disciplines. With regards the dataset, this should be in a format comparable to and compatible with existing Research Council data and suitable for informing decision-making. These data will be made available to the organisation leading this work following completion of appropriate data-sharing agreements.

3. Suggested Methodology

The scope of this work will be:

All English HEIs eligible for RE funding. The sample should be as large and representative as is feasible, taking into account sufficient coverage of region, institution size, research intensity, volume of formula funding income, specialism, but accounting for the need for ample and in-depth data submission.

For the purposes of this exercise, the following formula-allocated funding streams are to be considered in scope:

- Mainstream quality-related research (QR) including London weighting
- QR Research Degree Programme (RDP) supervision
- QR charity support fund
- QR business research element
- QR funding for National Research Libraries
- HEI Research Capital England
- Higher Education Research Capital (HERC) England

Consultants will be expected to deliver a synthesis review of existing evidence to support a hypothesis on how HEIs currently invest their formula-based funding. This should inform and enable, but not provide the exclusive background, for a further data collection exercise.

Consultants will carry out a collection exercise that is representative of the sector to address the questions posed by the current evidence, as well as to address any gaps, to show how dual support funding is used to support sustainability at the HEI-level and specific research activity. As part of this work, HEIs should have the opportunity to engage with the mechanism at varying levels of information provision, with those able to provide a granular level of detail encouraged to identify responsible officers with the aim that they could contribute to further dialogue with the consultants / RE. This could take the form of a workshop or structured individual interviews, and should be designed in principle by the successful consultants, to be delivered by the consultants following the termination of this contract, funded and hosted by RE. – for example to look at cause and effect and future planning rather than current evidence – e.g. evidence of strain, reach, effect of shift in balance (one way and other).

4. Deliverables

The objective of this work is to explore, at the individual institution level, how HEIs manage their allocation of formula-based funding, gathering robust evidence with a view to enabling the assessment of the potential impact of changes to the balance of dual support.

When considering how HEI's currently manage their finances, and taking into account previous evidence collection exercises, consideration should be given to:

Objective	Requirement	Suggested evidence or evidence gaps
Review evidence from existing data	Written paper-style report - Learnings from previous review/s and suggested approach:	<u>Test known evidence concerning HEI preferences for formula-based funding further:</u> - QR is valued as a stable source of funding that enables long term strategic development of research and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify trends and any potential counterfactual/s - Identify evidence gaps in current data to inform the evidence gathering portion of this exercise - Hypothesise what formula-funding is used for at the institutional level and propose any further conclusions that can be drawn based on synthesised evidence <p>The report will be signed-off by the Balanced Funding Working Group prior to acceptance.</p>	<p>the development of critical mass research capability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater predictability and certainty of QR funding would be valued - Non-hypothecation is an important attribute of QR funding in facilitating flexibility - Flexibility is constrained by the need for QR funding to contribute towards predetermined expenditures such as salaries of core tenured staff, FEC contributions to Research Council grants, etc. - QR funding is used to attract and lever research funding into the HEI including matched funding in bids for RC, charity or EU funding - QR funding is used to ease the pressure between agile project / programme funding
<p>Seek further evidence from the sector</p>	<p>Develop a clear picture of how dual support funding is used to support sustainability at the HEI level and more specifically in terms of research activity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Propose / iterate format and questions for data collection, including extent of circulation (with a sample size appropriate for considering use of dual support funding accounting for region, size, 	<p><u>Test known evidence further</u></p> <p><u>Detailed allocation strategy / mechanism</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What does strategic mean? (exact direction of spend, does this align with wider institutional strategy, are there wider strategic implications from HEI consortia or inter-institutional commitments)

	<p>research intensity, QR / formula funding income, specialism)</p> <p>The mechanism proposed to complete this activity will be signed-off by the Balanced Funding Working Group prior to acceptance to ensure it is aligned with the aims of this programme.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional commitments - Centre - College / School / Department - What are the key drivers underpinning decision-making? - Where are the decisions made? Is there a bidding or business-case process? - How does RC / other funders allocation drive decisions for internal allocation of formula-funding? - Policy shifts or other factors affecting strategic distribution - Time period or frequency of strategy revision (length of strategy e.g. 2, 5, 10 year, does this align with other timing implications e.g. REF period, studentship funding allocations) - Appetite for risk <p><u>Practices in ring-fencing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Treatment of discrete lines of formula-funding (QR-main-stream, charity, business, RDP, Capital) - Are any ring-fenced? - Are they differentiated or treated as one-pot? - Are they used as single source or 'topped-up' from other streams / HEI own finances / other?
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where are the decisions made? - Strategy? Is there a bidding / business-case process? - Are there implications on flexibility / agility of use once ring-fenced commitments are dispensed? <p><u>Prevalence of a formal resource allocation model (RAM)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Operating level of resource allocation (Centre / College / School / Department) <p><u>Prevalence of top-slicing⁹</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Operating level of top-slicing (Centre / College / School / Department) <p><u>Strategic management in securing effective and efficient use of formula-funding</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it monitored internally (Centre / College / School / Department) - Mechanism for monitoring – collection and reporting <p><u>Detailed expenditure (staff, studentships, equipment, estate, research, strategic initiatives, new initiatives)</u></p>
--	--	--

⁹ Where top-slicing refers to the setting aside of a part of the total budget, prior to allocation, for a pre-ordained or otherwise purpose e.g. to finance a specific project, service, etc.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting core research infrastructure - Supporting restructuring of research - Supporting impact of / impactful research - Supporting building of strategic funds - Practices in inter-departmental usage / spend (evidence of interdisciplinary or collaborative research) <p>Allow for the possibility to probe HEI financial data in more depth, where, if available and willing, responsible officers are able to supply exact figures.</p> <p>Informed by this exercise, identify responsible officers within institutions willing to engage in further</p> <p>It may be necessary to identify / consult with sector bodies (e.g. Wellcome, UUK, AUDE etc.) that have an interest, claim a stake or wish to take part in this analysis</p>
	<p>Identify where certain disciplines or activities are more heavily supported, or entirely supported, by one side of the dual support system versus the other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effect of fEC (grants from Research Councils, Charities etc.) - How QR plays a role in sustaining research in particular disciplines and activities - pump-prime

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - capacity building / scale-up - match funding - partnerships / collaboration - internationalisation - How each formula-funding stream is weighted in particular disciplines and activities - How QR plays a role in supporting interdisciplinary research and / or interdisciplinary (UoA) - Variance in areas of expenditure
	<p>How / do HEIs use QR to match (or leverage) other funding bids</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leverage of non-mainstream formula-funding funding (business, charity, RDP, capital) - Link to Research Council grant funding (staffing, studentships, doctoral training centres, capital) - RCs for some specific funding schemes/initiatives attach conditions to their award of grant funding that requires contributions from the recipient HEIs - Link to other non-UKRI derived research funding (resource, capital), e.g. NHS, Royal Society, etc. - Link to Charity research funding (staffing, studentships, capital)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Link to teaching funding (resource, capital) - Link to non-UK research grant funding (EU) - Link to industry funding (staffing, studentships, capital) - Link to internal institutional funding (pump prime, equipment, strategic research)
Early Written Paper-Style Report	<p>Synthesis of information from institutional reporting</p> <p>The report will be signed-off by the Balanced Funding Working Group prior to acceptance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key findings - Key messages - What requires further investigation
Identify and engage with the individuals within HEIs with responsibility for the internal distribution of formula funding	<p>Identify individuals at HEI / discipline level (where appropriate) through mechanism above – they should be in a position which allows them to provide and interrogate their institutions data to a sufficient depth to participate in a further engagement activity.</p> <p>- Propose / design mechanism by-which they are engaged.</p>	<p>This will be co-designed and run by the successful consultants, paid for and hosted by RE / UKRI, but invoiced separately to this body of work.</p> <p>- The mechanism could be through a workshop or structured interviews where we re-explore some of the questions posed in the survey – test key findings / messages, what didn't come out at a sufficiently granular level, effects of strain on the system (current and hypothesised), an understanding of commitments and pressures, where the current system can be a hindrance – and could be</p>

		presented as case studies or best practice.
Full Paper-Style Written Report and dataset	<p>Delivery of a full and comprehensive evidence-base and dataset to demonstrate the use of formula-based funding (resource and capital) across a range of HEIs and disciplines.</p> <p>The report will be signed-off by the Balanced Funding Working Group prior to acceptance.</p>	<p>Narrative of how dual support funding is used to aid sustainability at the HEI and discipline level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full synthesis of information from institutional reporting (this may take the form of case studies in some instances) - Analysis of detailed expenditure - Formatted to be compatible with existing Research Council data and suitable for informing decision-making

Section 5 – Evaluation of Bids

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

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

To maintain a high degree of rigour in the evaluation of your bid, a process of moderation will be undertaken to ensure consistency by all evaluators.

After moderation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW4.1	Contracts Terms
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Commercial	AW6.2	Non-Disclosure Agreement
Commercial	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			
Evaluation Justification Statement			
In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this Mini Competition. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.			
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%

Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach	20%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Environment	20%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Risk Management	5%
Quality	PROJ1.6	Interviews	15%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 ($60/100 \times 20 = 12$)

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 10% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 10.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 6% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 10 ($60/100 \times 10 = 6$)

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

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

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

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there will be multiple evaluators and their individual scores after a moderation process will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 50

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 50

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

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

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

DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this Mini Competition Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the Special terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

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

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)

- [Freedom of information Act](#)