Invitation to Quote

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

Subject Review of ESRC-DFID Impact Support, Synthesis and Cohort-Building Services, used to support ESRC-DFID Joint Programmes

Sourcing reference number CR19028

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

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

Version 3.6

Table of Contents

Version 3.6

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services
UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS) brings a commercial attitude to the public sector; helping 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

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 Polaris House Swindon SN2 1FL
3.2	Buyer name	Karl Oakley
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	**Maximum** value of the Opportunity	£83,333.00 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	**All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here.** **Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	Friday 7th June 2019 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Tuesday 2nd July 2019 11:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Wednesday 3rd July 2019
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Friday 5th July 2019 14:00
3.10	Date Bidders should be available for Interview element of tender	w/c Monday 15th July 2019
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Friday 26th July 2019
3.12	Anticipated Award date	Monday 5th August 2019
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	Monday 19th August 2019
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	Friday 28th February 2020
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

Background
I. Aims

The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Department for International Development (DFID) are seeking to commission a review of impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services aligned to ESRC-DFID commissioned programmes. The aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of these services, and to draw out comparative lessons for any future similar services. "Effectiveness " is taken to mean the extent to which services deliver against their objectives. Example objectives include "maximising the impact of research on policy and practice" and "implement and strengthen cohort building opportunities" (see Appendix X for full details of objectives). The 3 primary questions for the review are:

1. How appropriate are the design and implementation of these services, in achieving their shared objectives?
2. What are the effective and ineffective aspects of these services in delivering their shared objectives?
3. To what extent do services such as these add value?

It is expected that this review will take a primarily qualitative approach (i.e. interviews and reviewing relevant documentation), though there is scope to include additional methods. In reviewing the effectiveness of these functions and identifying lessons, contractors should consider both how these functions were delivered and what difference or "impact" these services have had.

For the purposes of this review, ESRC-DFID take a wide definition of impact, defining it as "'the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy". This can involve academic impact, economic and societal impact or both, and can include instrumental impact, conceptual impact, or capacity building[1].

This review will focus primarily on three ESRC-DFID programmes and their associated impact support, synthesis and/or cohort-building services. The three programmes of focus are:

1) Joint Fund for Poverty Alleviation Research, known as the Joint Fund;

2) Raising Learning Outcomes in Education Systems Research Programme, known as RLO; and

3) DFID-ESRC Growth Research Programme (DEGRP), known as the Growth Programme.

There are three impact support, synthesis and/or cohort-building services associated with these programmes, which will be the primary focus of this review:

1) **Impact Initiative** (works across both the Joint Fund and RLO);

2) **Programme Research Lead** (PRL – works on RLO only); and

3) **Evidence and Policy Group** (EPG – works on the Growth Programme only).

Where relevant lessons can also be drawn from other services then these should also be considered. In particular, useful lessons may be drawn from the following: 1) Mediterranean Migration Programme Coordination Function which supports the ESRC Mediterranean

---

[1] See here for further details: https://esrc.ukri.org/research/impact-toolkit/what-is-impact/

Migration Research Programme (MMRP); 2) Migration Leadership Team which supports ESRC-AHRC's combined migration research portfolio; and 3) Ecosystem Services for Poverty alleviation (ESPA) Directorate which supported ESPA research.

The Impact Initiative, PRL and EPG are intended to ensure that the research projects commissioned through their associated ESRC-DFID programmes deliver maximum impact on policy, practice and do so in combination at a level above the sum of their parts. Whilst these services (and those related functions listed above) each have their own distinct objectives, there are many similar and shared objectives. The over-arching thread tying these functions together is an aspiration to draw together the findings and learning of the programme, and to ensure they have impact in the most effective way possible. These support services are not off the shelf or inevitable parts of such programmes, but rather each was developed and tailored to their associated programme(s) after extensive discussion. They are also particularly tailored to the needs of working in/with low income countries (LICs), and particular groups of LIC-focused academic communities.

Although there have been small-scale mid-point or break-point reviews (both internal and external) of the Impact Initiative and PRL, these have focussed on reviewing the providers of these functions, rather than the services themselves. And they have not been reviewed to look at the effectiveness of the services in a single exercise, enabling comparison and cross-provider lesson-learning. It is important to make clear that this review does not seek to evaluate the providers of these impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services, but rather to review the services themselves. This is to ensure that the learning and recommendations provided through the commissioned review are of best use to any future similar services.

II.   Funders

ESRC

-
ESRC is part of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI), a new organisation that brings together the UK's seven research councils, Innovate UK and Research England to maximise the contribution of each council and create the best environment for research and innovation to flourish. The vision is to ensure the UK maintains its world-leading position in research and innovation. For more information visit: https://www.ukri.org/

UKRI-ESRC is the UK's largest organisation for funding research on economic and social issues. We support independent, high quality research which has an impact on business, the public sector and civil society. ESRC's total budget for 2017-18 was around £202 million. At any one time ESRC supports over 4,000 researchers and postgraduate students in academic institutions and independent research institutes. Further information about the Council can be found at https://esrc.ukri.org/

DFID

DFID is the ministerial department that leads the UK government's work to end extreme poverty. DFID is responsible for:
- Honouring the UK's international commitments and taking action to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals
- Making British aid more effective by improving transparency, openness and value for money
- Targeting British international development policy on economic growth and wealth creation
- Improving the coherence and performance of British international development policy in fragile and conflict-affected countries

- Improving the lives of girls and women through better education and a greater choice on family planning
- Preventing violence against girls and women in the developing world
- Helping to prevent climate change and encouraging adaptation and low-carbon growth in developing countries

Further information about DFID can be found at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-international-development/about#who-we-are

III. ESRC-DFID Programmes of Focus

The review will focus primarily on impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services for the following three ESRC-DFID programmes.

ESRC-DFID Joint Fund for Poverty Alleviation Research

The Joint Fund was set up in 2005 to commission world class social science research that addresses the goal of reducing poverty among the poorest countries and people globally. Part of a broader strategic partnership between DFID and ESRC, the Joint Fund aims to fund research which provides a robust conceptual and empirical basis for development with strong potential for impact on policy and practice for poverty reduction.

Funding has been awarded in three phases to date, with regular research calls generating a portfolio of more than 180 grants across a broad range of topics. These provide a rich source of development research evidence, both from individual grants and their Pathways to Impact, and also through research syntheses and other programme-level impact activity that pulls together learning from across the portfolio.

To date the Joint Fund has funded a portfolio of 184 grants:

- 46 small/medium research grants from the three calls of Phase 1;
- 70 grants from Phase 2, comprising 55 small/medium research grants from three annual calls, plus 9 Impact and Engagement awards, and 6 Evidence Synthesis Research Awards (ESRA);
- 68 grants from Phase 3, comprising 38 small/medium research grants from the three annual calls, plus seven Development Frontiers call 1 stage 1 research grants, four Development Frontiers call 1 stage 2 research grants, and two Research Programme awards. Plus 17 Development Frontiers call 2 research grants.

For further information see: https://esrc.ukri.org/research/international-research/international-development/esrc-dfid-joint-fund-for-poverty-alleviation-research/

ESRC-DFID Raising Learning Outcomes in Education Systems Research Programme

The RLO programme is a £20 million joint programme between DFID and ESRC to fund a portfolio of research on critical policy areas that are currently constraining education systems in developing countries from translating resources into better learning. ESRC is responsible for delivery of the programme, including leading on the commissioning and management of research awards, on behalf of both funders. The aim of RLO is to provide policymakers and practitioners with concrete ideas on how to improve learning and understanding of how these will translate to their specific context and institutions, and to

demonstrably inform relevant policy and programme decisions. The programme is focused on efforts to raise learning outcomes for all, including attention to issues relating to gender and disability, as well as the quality dimensions of education.

The programme currently runs from January 2014 to March 2022. Research awards have been made through three annual research calls, each with a different but complimentary focus. Call 1 (11 awards) focused on system elements, and specifically on effective teaching. Call 2 (8 awards) focused on contextual factors, and specifically on three challenging contexts: urban slums, remote rural, and border cities. Call 3 (10 awards) focused on dynamics, and specifically on accountability, understood as the relationships and associated processes through which an individual or institution is held responsible for their actions or performance. In addition, follow on/scale up funding was made available for research building on Call 1 pilot/ small grants (2 awards). Additional funding will be available to grant holders via an invitation-only follow-on call which will be open twice a year, in three-monthly tranches, for the next three years.

For further information see: https://esrc.ukri.org/research/international-research/international-development/esrc-dfid-raising-learning-outcomes-in-education-systems-research-programme/

DFID-ESRC Growth Research Programme

The Growth Programme is a jointly-funded initiative between DFID and ESRC focused on economic growth and related issues in low income countries (LICs). The aim of the Growth Programme is to strengthen evidence-based policymaking that contributes to inclusive and economically sustainable growth and poverty reduction in LICs, through enhanced quality and impact of relevant social science research. Since its inception in 2011, the Growth Programme has facilitated cutting-edge social science research, with large potential for impact on policy and practice. Following a soft merge in 2014 with the DFID-ESRC China and Africa research programme and additional budget of £4.5 million, the Growth Programme now includes four themes:
- Agriculture and growth
- Innovation and productivity growth
- Financial sector development and growth
- China and Africa

For further information see: https://esrc.ukri.org/research/international-research/international-development/dfid-esrc-growth-research-programme-degrp/

IV. Impact Support, Synthesis and Cohort-Building Services of Focus

The three impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services of focus for the review are as follows.

Impact Initiative
The Impact Initiative is funded by the ESRC-DFID Joint Fund and the RLO to support impact on both programmes. The Impact Initiative (commissioned originally as the "Evidence and Policy Directorate" or EPD) is a collaboration between the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and the University of Cambridge's Research for Equitable Access and Learning (REAL) Centre. The Impact Initiative aims to increase the uptake and impact of research from the Joint Fund and RLO. Two over-arching objectives underpin the Impact Initiative's activities:
- Maximising the impact of ESRC-DFID funded research on policy and practice relevant to developing countries;

- Maintaining and strengthening the international profile of the ESRC-DFID Strategic Partnership and programmes within this, enhancing their reputation as centres of excellence for social science research on international development.

The Impact Initiative provides over-arching strategic direction for the design of a coherent programme of activities designed to achieve three key deliverables:
- Ensure findings from each programme's research are effectively cohered, communicated and disseminated in ways which support their use by policy makers and practitioners, particularly in developing countries;
- Establish and/or enhance a strong international profile for the research generated through the programme(s);
- Build a reputation for the programmes as centres of social science research excellence in international development.

The Impact Initiative was initially contracted to run from March 2015 to March 2019. Following the completion of its mid-term review in 2017, one-year contract extension option has been taken up by the funders, bringing this to a total investment of circa £2.5 million. For further information see: http://www.theimpactinitiative.net/

Programme Research Lead (PRL)

The Programme Research Lead (PRL) is funded by the RLO and aims to maximise the scientific value of the RLO programme by identifying, promoting and supporting opportunities for research collaboration and synergy across the portfolio of RLO projects. The Programme Research Lead - a senior academic appointment funded for 24 months - was appointed by the funders to deliver three programme-level aims:

- **Support and provide evidence of the scientific, conceptual and methodological contributions of the programme.**
  This should be delivered through developing a sophisticated knowledge and understanding of the research being conducted situating this strategically within both the overarching aims of the programme and the broader scientific landscape, championing RLO research, and supporting RLO grant holders to maximise scientific engagement and dissemination of their research.

- **Maximise scientific quality and best practice between RLO grants across calls and around cross-cutting themes.**
  This should be delivered through identifying synergies and/or areas of scientific importance or convergence in the approaches, methodologies and findings emerging from funded research and identifying appropriate research audiences and channels to capture and disseminate these synergies and contributions.

- **Implement and strengthen cohort-building opportunities and activities within the RLO programme.**
  This should be delivered through facilitating communication and connections, and enabling and strengthening cooperation among grants; including the organisation of an annual scientific conference for the programme grant holders.

The PRL ended in March 2019. For further information on the function see: http://www.education.ox.ac.uk/research/raising-learning-outcomes-in-developing-countries/. A revised format of the PRL function will be commissioned – the nature of this revised function is currently being scoped.

Evidence and Policy Group (EPG)

The EPG was contracted in September 2012 to support the Growth Programme. It aims to help projects maximise the profile, uptake and impact of their research. The EPG has the following objectives:

- Strategy Development: Pathways to research uptake and use are identified, developed and exploited so as to maximise the impact of the Programme as a whole.
- Knowledge exchange: Programme researchers and potential users of their work internationally are encouraged to effectively engage to exchange knowledge, information and ideas.
- Research Communication: Non-academic audiences are able to access and understand the policy and practice relevance of (emerging) research findings at a project, programme and thematic level
- Capacity building and user support: Grant holders are able to maximise the outreach and impact of their individual research projects and, collectively, the Programme(s) as a whole.
- Connectivity: The impact of the Programme as a whole is maximised by identifying common themes and synthesising the results to focus on policy and practice
- Evidencing impact: Research impact/uptake is monitored and evidenced across the programme in a way that maximises and demonstrates quality.

For further information see: https://degrp.odi.org/

V. **Additional Relevant Services and their Associated Programmes**

Where relevant lessons can also be drawn from other impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services, then these should also be considered. In particular, useful lessons may be drawn from the following services:

Mediterranean Migration Programme Coordination Function

The Mediterranean Migration Programme Coordination Function supports the Mediterranean Migration Research Programme (MMRP). This programme was launched in 2015 in response to the ongoing migration crisis in Europe. Part of ESRC's Urgency Mechanism, the programme was set up to fill in research gaps in relation to the dynamics and drivers of the crisis by creating an evidence base to inform policy responses. Eight projects were awarded research grants, spanning from a period of one to two years. The Coordination Function of this programme was created to bring cohesion across the funded grants, facilitating knowledge exchange and impact activities, networking opportunities and the provision of liaison between both the Programme and DFID's policy team as well as between the ESRC portfolio management team and the Programme. The Coordination role began in March 2016, six months into the roll out of the research projects. The role was split between two research institutions, Warwick and Durham (later Loughborough). For further information see: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/mmrp/

Migration Leadership Team

The Migration Leadership Team supports ESRC-AHRC to provide intellectual leadership for, and maximise the impact of, their combined migration research portfolio. The team aims to:

- Provide strategic and intellectual leadership over the portfolio – mapping, curating and synthesising the portfolio so as to maximise potential impact on policy agendas. Identifying synergies between existing investments and strategic gaps, to support the development of a cohesive portfolio.
- Liaise with academics working in this and related fields, connecting with users, and engaging with policy makers and stakeholders, to maximise the impact of the portfolio's policy agenda.
- Establish and exploit connections with other migration programmes and activities in Europe, the developing world, and elsewhere.
- Identify and advise on opportunities to develop the portfolio through future interdisciplinary activities in this area.

The role began in January 2018 and is led by SOAS University of London. For further information see: https://www.soas.ac.uk/lidc-mlt/

Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation Directorate

The Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation (ESPA) Directorate was "a nine-year, £43.9m programme, jointly funded by DFID, the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC), and ESRC, to explore links between environment and human wellbeing in developing countries. Established in 2009, ESPA represented an ambitious attempt to produce research that not only met standards of academic excellence, but was also relevant and usable for policy and practice. …Over the course of nearly a decade, ESPA has funded 125 research projects in 53 countries, involving nearly 1,000 researchers, half of whom are based in the Global South."[2] For further information see: https://www.espa.ac.uk/

<u>**Aims and Objectives of the Project**</u>

The over-arching aim of this review is to assess the effectiveness of impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services aligned to ESRC-DFID commissioned programmes in achieving their shared objectives, and to draw out lessons for any future similar services. "Effectiveness " is taken to mean the extent to which services deliver against their objectives. Example objectives include "maximising the impact of research on policy and practice" and "implement and strengthen cohort building opportunities" (see Appendix X for full details of objectives).

In reviewing the effectiveness of these functions and identifying lessons, contractors should consider **<u>both</u>** how these functions were delivered and what difference or "impact" these services have had. We are not only looking at efficiency and effectiveness of these activities, but their end result in delivering impact.

---

[2] Valeria Izzi, ESPA Impact and Learning Specialist 2017 – 2018, LSE Impact Blog.

For the purposes of this review, ESRC-DFID take a wide definition of impact, defining it as "'the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy". This can involve academic impact, economic and societal impact or both, and can include instrumental impact, conceptual impact, or capacity building[3].

The review is funded by the Joint Fund, RLO and Growth research programmes, therefore we expect focus to centre around these programmes and the services linked to them, specifically the Impact Initiative, PRL and EPG. However we are keen to learn lessons from - and for learning to be applicable to – wider ESRC programmes and impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services. Therefore services such as the Mediterranean Migration Programme Coordination Function, the Migration Leadership Team and the Ecosystem Services for Poverty Alleviation Directorate may also have applicable information and learning upon which to draw.

It is important to note that this review does not seek to evaluate the providers of these impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services, but rather to review the services themselves. This is to ensure that the learning and recommendations provided through the commissioned review are of best use to any future similar services.

Beyond feeding into the development of any future similar functions, it is intended that results from this review inform an upcoming programme evaluation of the Joint Fund and discussions around a potential second phase of the RLO programme. Whilst ESRC and DFID will be the main users of this review, other audiences could include the wider academic community, UKRI, policy makers, practitioners and other research users and donors. These secondary audiences may be able to incorporate learning into their own impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services activities. The intention is to publish the full review report, as well as the executive summary.

The provisional review questions are:

1. **How appropriate are the design and implementation of these services, in achieving their shared objectives?**
   - To what extent is the design and resourcing of each service a good fit with the needs and expectations of grant holders and other stakeholders?
   - Were they brought in at the right time and do services finish at suitable times?
   - What has been distinctive about delivering these services for programmes focused on low and medium income country settings?
   - How economical and efficient are these services? Considering e.g. activities of appropriate quality and cost, and converting inputs into outputs.
   - To what extent has this function been embedded successfully within programmes?
   - What aspects of the governance models/organisation structures work well and less well?

2. **What are the effective and ineffective aspects of these services in delivering their shared objectives?**
   - How effectively are the services engaging with grant holders, funders, each other and others in order to deliver their objectives?

---

[3] See here for further details: https://esrc.ukri.org/research/impact-toolkit/what-is-impact/

- To what degree have the activities and outputs of these services ensured that ESRC/DFID funded evidence is part of the policy debate, both nationally and internationally?
- To what extent do the delivered activities and outputs reflect synergies between projects (both within and across programmes)?
- What have been the effective and ineffective aspects of these services in delivering improved impact/synthesis/cohort-building (as appropriate)?
- To what degree have the activities of the services built capacity among grant holders and other stakeholders?
- To what extent have services given consideration to gender and social inclusion?

3. **To what extent do services such as these add value?**
   - To what extent do these services add to the impact / influence that grant holders would have been able to achieve on their own?
   - To what extent do these services achieve impacts / influence beyond the scope of individual grant holders?
   - What value do the services generate additional to work that could be done in-house by ESRC (and DFID)?
   - Which approaches and activities seem to offer best value in these and comparable services and why?
   - What is the value of services such as these relative to alternative modes of enhancing impact, including allocating funds to additional impact awards for grant holders?

   In answering these questions, tenders may wish to refer to DFID's "Four E Framework" – effectiveness, efficiency, equity and economy.

4. **What lessons can be identified for future similar services, with regards to:**
   - Designing and commissioning comparable services, having regard to the number and range of organisations currently able (and willing) to deliver these functions.
   - Initiating, developing and maintaining relationships with grant holders and others?
   - What constitutes good practice and the mandate, capability, skills and experience required to deliver this
   - Factors which enable and inhibit success
   - The potential to enhance to the role of such services, building on the more effective approaches and activities.

Tenderers may wish to comment on or suggest revisions to this set of questions. A finalised question set will be discussed during inception and requires the agreement of the Management Group.

Suggested Methodology

I. **Proposed Approach and Methods**

Tenderers should spell out as fully as possible the review design and methodology they propose to use and the rationale underpinning this methodology. The potential risks and challenges for the review should be identified, including strategies for how these will be managed. The following provides guidance but tenderers should not feel constrained by it.

It is expected that this review will take a primarily qualitative approach (i.e. 80 interviews and reviewing relevant documentation). The principal methodology is expected to be a substantial set of depth interviews. However, the relevant programmes comprise a large number of research projects and partners. It is vital

that participants and stakeholders in these – including researchers at varying levels, Southern partners and national, regional and international level policy makers - are included adequately in well-designed purposive samples. So proposals will need to consider appropriate balances of in person vs remote and full vs shorter interviews. The funders do <u>not</u> require robust estimates (for example, on satisfaction with services) from representative surveys. Nevertheless, online tools to collect feedback and/or host moderated discussions may be an appropriate and efficient way to broaden participation in the review. We welcome proposals to extend the range of methods applied.

We expect interviews to be conducted with the impact support, synthesis and cohort-building service providers identified above. To underline, data should be collected from a wide range of stakeholders including:

- Senior programme managers within the funders – ESRC and DFID
- A selection of grant-holders and research partners, including Southern researchers.
- An appropriate selection of policy-makers, practitioners and other research users.

Interviews will need to be agreed in advance in consultation with the funders.

Tenderers should also plan to make appropriate use of the following documents, which will be made available:
- Reports and documentation on service providers – This will include annual reports, quarterly reports and mid-term reviews.
- Outputs of the service providers – E.g. Publications including policy briefings, event reports and impact case studies.
- Evaluations of the impact of earlier phases of Joint Fund research, prior to the introduction of the scheme-wide support function provided by the Impact Initiative, in which research uptake / impact was achieved primarily through the actions of individual grant holders.
- Any other relevant documentation.

Tenderers may wish to adopt in part a comparative approach to the review e.g. making comparisons between existing services; and/or comparing outcomes between programmes with and without impact support, synthesis and/or cohort-building services. A useful comparison programme which does not have these services may be the Health Systems Research Initiative[4].

Data from the interviews and written materials should be collated and analysed to inform answers to the review questions listed above. Methods for data capture and analysis should be specified in proposals. This will form the basis of a written report. A key component of this report should be practical recommendations for achieving impact support, synthesis and cohort building for any future ESRC-DFID programmes, particularly with respect to commissioning services to fulfil these roles.

---

[4] See the following link for further details: https://mrc.ukri.org/funding/science-areas/international-and-global-health-research/funding-partnerships/health-systems-research-initiative/

II.   **Review Team composition**

The expertise the Review Team will need to deliver the work are:
- Expertise in review methods and techniques;
- knowledge and understanding of research impact pathways and how research can best impact policy and practice;
- An understanding of developing country contexts and the international aid architecture.
-

Desirable c expertise are:

- knowledge of gender, social and poverty research and analysis.

III.   **Review Management Arrangements**
The review will be overseen by a Management Group. This group will work with the review team during a short inception period to shape their final detailed approach to the review including, for example, providing guidance regarding stakeholders to interview and documentation to be considered. In addition it will be responsible for approving the review outputs and commenting on draft reports. The Group will include representatives of both funders. On appointment the review team will be provided with a named contact for day-to-day liaison with the funders.

Liaison will include a kick-off meeting and monthly catch-ups which may include presentations by the review team (for example to present interim findings and discuss the remainder of the review; and a second for the final report). These meetings will take place in London or Swindon, but may involve teleconferencing or video conferencing.

The final report(s) may be subject to external peer review.

Deliverables

The Review Team will provide the following:

a) **Detailed review design specification:** Within approximately 4 weeks of the contract start
b) **Monthly progress update:** By email and or supporting teleconferences as needed.
c) **Interim Report:** To be submitted within approximately 12 weeks of contract start. The format for the interim report will be agreed within 4 weeks of contract start, but is likely to entail details of activities and progress so far, and the work program for the remainder of the review period.
d) **Final Report:** First draft to be submitted within approximately 20 weeks of contract start. Any subsequent amendments to the report required by ESRC and DFID will be completed by week 23, with a final draft submitted by week 26.

The above is a proposed approximate timescale. Tenderers are welcome to propose modifications to these suggested timings, however **the final draft of the final report must be delivered before the end of February 2020.**

The report should incorporate the following:

a) Executive Summary (maximum 3 pages).
b) Brief introduction to the programmes, impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services and the review.
c) Review Methodology, including:
   - conceptual approach
   - description of methods used to collate and analyse data
   - key informants/respondents/participants in the study
d) Analysis and discussion of findings, addressing each of the review objectives and questions.
e) Conclusions:
   - Addressing each of the core review questions.
   - On the effectiveness of the review methodology
f) Recommendations:

   - On the ESRC's and DFID's investment in future services
   - On whether future impact support, synthesis and cohort-building services should be conducted internally or externally
   - Which components of the services should be incorporated into any future similar impact service
   - On good practice and specific lessons (in activities, relationships, management, timing, communication processes etc.) for enhancing research impact on policy and practice

<u>Terms and Conditions</u>

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

Section 5 – Evaluation model

The evaluation model below shall be used for this ITQ, which will be determined to two decimal places.
Where a question is 'for information only' it will not be scored.

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

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	**Q No.**	**Question subject**
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Quality	AW6.2	Variable Bids
Quality	PROJ1.4	Capacity
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/Methodology	35%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Project Plan and Timescales	15%
Interview	PROJ1.5	Interview	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20**%.**
Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:
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 the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

Example
Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40
Your final score will (60+60+40+40) ÷ 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 completion of the questionnaire is available at
http://www.uksbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

7.1   Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.

7.2   Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. 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 Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution

7.6   Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.

7.7   Do consider who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.

7.8   Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.

7.9   Do provide clear, concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.

7.10   Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.

7.11   Do 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 Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

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 Emptoris.

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 Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

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 Emptoris.

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
- Emptoris Training Guide
- Emptoris e-sourcing tool
- Contracts Finder
- Equalities Act introduction
- Bribery Act introduction
- Freedom of information Act