**Request for Proposal (RFP)**

DS01-211 MOD CDE Portal
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# WHATS INCLUDED WITHIN THIS RFP

Appendix A - Customer Requirements (this document)

A1 – Further Requirements

A2 – CDE Business Process

Appendix B - Pricing Matrix (template to be completed)

Appendix C - Award Questionnaire (template to be completed)

Appendix D - Order Form and Call-Off Contract (Customer specific)

Appendix E - Supplier List for Partnering Possibilities

# OVERVIEW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CCS Project Lead: | Kirsty Manning |
| Customer:  | Defence Science & Technology Laboratory (DSTL) |
| Delivery Location: | CDE Harwell, OX11 0QX  |
| Phase(s):  | Discovery to Beta Live (current spend approved up to Beta MVP) |
| Project:  | DS01-211 |
| Required Capabilities: | Include, but are not limited to:[x]  Software engineering and On-going Support[x]  Product Development and Service Design[x]  Agile Delivery Management[x]  Front-End Design and Interaction design[x]  Content Design and Development |
| Contract Charging Mechanism (Discovery Phase): | Capped Time and Materials |
| Contract Charging Mechanism (Alpha Phase): | Capped Time and Materials |
| Contract Charging Mechanism (Beta Phase): | Capped Time and Materials to MVP then Time and Materials |
| Contract Charging Mechanism (Live Phase): | Time and Materials |
| RFP Start Date:  | 31/03/2015 |
| RFP Response Deadline  | 27/04/2015 |
| Proposed length of phase:  | Outlined below |
| Proposed Commencement Date of Project: | 11/05/2015 |

# LOTTING STRUCTURE

## The Customer has structured this procurement as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lot 1**  | Agile Delivery Management |
| **Lot 2** | Software engineering and On-going Support; Product Development and Service Design; |
| **Lot 3** | Front-End Design and Interaction design Content Design and Development; |

# TIMESCALES

The Customer or CCS may change this timetable at any time. The Potential Provider will be informed by email if there are any changes to this timetable.

## It is the Potential Provider’s responsibility to monitor the online messaging facility (e-Sourcing).



#

# KEY DELIVERY DATES

An MVP must be live by mid-October to cover competitions which will require Portal support beyond the end-of-life of the existing service. To this end the project aims to start on 11/5/15

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PROJECT PHASES | START DATE | COMPLETION DATE |
| [Discovery](https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/phases/discovery.html)  | 11/05/2015 |   |
| [Alpha](https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/phases/alpha.html) |   | 01/08/2015 |
| [Beta](https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/phases/Beta.html) | 01/08/2015 | 01/10/2015 |
| Live | 01/10/2015 |   |

#

## CURRENT SITUATION / BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Centre for Defence Enterprise (CDE) sources innovative technologies via competitions to form the basis for new military capability for MOD. Since 2008 it has been a flagship programme delivering Government policy, providing a low-overhead route to contracting research.

CDE has high visibility across MOD, the defence industry and academia. It is a major contributor to the UK growth agenda, receiving and processing over 5000 innovative proof-of-concept research proposals, and subsequently funding over 900 projects worth over £56m since 2008. CDE is highly regarded domestically and internationally, with various UK OGDs and US and Canadian governments interested in the CDE process and Portal.

Portal software is essential to CDE operations as it provides the sole means for CDE to accept innovative proposals in response to the competitions. The Portal allows CDE to be a lean operation, employing only 11 staff, and completing the cycle from application submission to contracting in as little as 5 weeks.

**Current artifacts**

User needs have been identified through a series of workshops held with various users, to the level of a limited/basic Discovery phase (more work may be required in this phase). A detail of user needs and technological requirements can be found in the Requirements appendix. The CDE business process flow diagram is also provided in a basic form to support this document. This lacks detail in certain areas such as assisted digital support, as research has not yielded any data on these users.

Development will be done on-site in Harwell, Oxfordshire using CDE offices there.

In a typical year the Portal will:

* Manage over 5000 user accounts
* Manage over 1500 assessor accounts
* Receive over 1000 proposals
* Facilitate over 4000 proposal assessments
* Facilitate the contracting of over 200 proposals worth approximately £11m
* Facilitate quality feedback to approximately 800 unsuccessful proposers
* Facilitate the assured response to approximately 20 PQs, MQs, departmental questions and FOI requests

A new service must be built with flexibility and to facilitate growth in each of these areas.

## Current Technologies and Languages

The current Portal system was procured as a research project, built in only a few weeks. It is no longer fit-for-purpose and must be replaced with a new digital service. The original Portal software is based on proprietary code and is not available for development.

Government spend controls require that the final solution is developed in an Agile and Open Source manner, adhering to the Technology Code of Practice and Digital by Default Service Standards. It must be easily portable between G-Cloud-based hosting and database providers with minimal cost (eg by using an open-source framework such as PHP or Ruby on Rails).

# CDE aims to draw on code already being written for a similar project, “R-Cloud”, to facilitate this project through a “running start” at these CDE requirements and possible future efficiencies of eg hosting of both services with one provider.

## REQUIRED OUTCOMES

## A new Portal is required to address functional shortcomings and an impending service provision termination with the current supplier in January 2016. Because of the CDE competition timelines a new service will need to be in place by mid-October 2015 to receive proposals into competitions whose process will not complete before the existing service goes offline.

## Additional detail can be found in the supporting appendix “Requirements v5.1”. This is based on MoSCoW rules where "M" requirements are essential in an MVP. It is envisaged that an MVP with similar functionality to that described will be an Alpha/Beta threshold-type system. While it details essential requirements for an MVP this document is intended to give a general overview of the requirements, and is not necessarily explicit in methodology or structure of the final service.

# TEST & DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

The Portal service should include the capability to spin-up a T&D environment when required.

# CAPABILITIES AND ROLES

|  |
| --- |
| Current Roles and Responsibilities of the Customer |
| **Role** | **Responsibilities**  |
| **Product Owner (x3)** | Providing guidance on product requirements |
| **Project Manager (x1)** | Ensuring delivery to time, cost and quality |

|  |
| --- |
| Required Capabilities and Outcomes of the Supplier |
| **Capabilities** | **Outcomes** |
| **Software Engineering and Ongoing Support** | Portal code written, tested, adapted and maintained in an efficient and transparent way, with a relentless focus on how it will be used. Continuous improvement to the Portal service by identifying new tools and techniques and removing technical bottlenecks. |
| **Product Development and Service Design** | A rapidly developed, deep understanding of the users and their needs. Constant measurement of the success of the Portal service and initiation of iterative improvements to them to keep meeting the needs of the people who will make use of them. |
| **Agile Delivery Management** | A supported and enabled Agile Delivery of Portal, with user needs that are well understood, clearly articulated and prioritised. Informed stakeholders, well communicated releases, supported service users, monitored performance etc.  |
| **Front-end Design and Interaction Design** | A user-centred Portal service with a focus on design disciplines, interaction, graphics. |
| **Content Design and Development** | Portal content designed to drive / make clear the user journey; encompassing analysis, information design and content writing in the most usable and user-centric way – across all formats and products.  |

##

# EVALUATION STAGES, MINIMUM PASS MARKS & PRICE EVALUATION

## Evaluation Stages:

## This RFP will be evaluated following a two-stage approach:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stage 1: Technical & Cultural evaluation | All Potential Providers who achieve the required Minimum Pass Mark for a Lot will be added to the Short List, and will be eligible to continue to Stage 2. |
| Stage 2: Pricing evaluation | The Customer has selected the following mechanisms for Price Evaluation:1. Combined evaluation: Price evaluation will be conducted as described in the Lotting Structure of the RFP (inverse proportion to the best price, which will obtain maximum marks). The mark thereby obtained will be combined with the marks from stage 1 (moderated by Stage 2 if applicable) in accordance with the weighting factors defined in the Award Questionnaire (Appendix C)

|  |
| --- |
|  **“Combined evaluation”:** |
| The Potential Provider’s price mark for each Lot will be evaluated by comparing the Total Price offered against all other total prices submitted by other Potential Providers.The Potential Provider who offers the lowest Total Price for a Lot will achieve the maximum score for that Lot. Every Potential Provider will, for each Lot, be awarded a percentage of the maximum score on a reducing basis based on the following formula:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Lowest Price Submitted Per Lot** | **x 100** |
| **Potential Provider’s Price Per Lot** |
| **= % of the maximum score, rounded to 2 (two) decimal places.** |

The pricing score, following the price evaluation; will be added to the scores already recorded for Sections A and B of the Award Questionnaire (Appendix C) to arrive at a final total scoreFor the avoidance of doubt, depending on the results of the evaluation, the outcome of this procurement could consist of a single Potential Provider being awarded all Lots, or each individual Potential Providers each being awarded one of the Lots. |

 |

## Minimum Pass Marks:

The following paragraph applies if a short-listing first stage is used:

## In order for Potential Providers to progress beyond the Short List stage of the process, they must achieve or exceed the Minimum Pass Mark, as defined in the Award Questionnaire, in the evaluation of the first stage.