



# Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Innovate UK**

**Subject: The Provision of an Evaluation Framework for the ICURE Programme**

**Sourcing reference number: UK SBS BLOJEU-CR150050INNUK**

**UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)**  
[www.uksbs.co.uk](http://www.uksbs.co.uk)

Registered in England and Wales as a limited company. Company Number 6330639.  
Registered Office North Star House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF  
VAT registration GB618 3673 25  
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

**UKSBS**  
  
*Shared Business Services*

## Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<a href="#"><u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>
2	<a href="#"><u>About our Customer</u></a>
3	<a href="#"><u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>
4	<a href="#"><u>Specification</u></a>
5	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation model</u></a>
6	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation questionnaire</u></a>
7	<a href="#"><u>General Information</u></a>
Appendix 1	Draft Logic model for ICURe programme
Appendix 2	ICURe programme – cohort 1 evaluation
Appendix 3	Illustrative data to monitor ICURe

## 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 growth projections anticipate this will rise to £1bn in 2013/14.

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

### Our achievements

In 2012/13 the Company grew in turnover from £44.7m to £52.4m, within that growth we:

- Reduced the Research Councils' 'back office' expenditure from £32m to £31.3m
- Saved £33m for the Research Councils in verified procurement savings, being greater than the entire cost of the services we provided to them
- Grew our customers from 7 to 22 (this will likely grow by a further 10 in 2013/14)
- Grew our customer base from 11,000 to 18,000 and will likely expand to 23,000+ in 2013/14
- Achieved an annual spend with SMEs that stands out across Central Government as a leading light at 32% (that's over £104.5M) against the 25% Government target

## Our Procurement ambition

Our vision is to be recognised as a centre of excellence and deliver a broad range of procurement services across the public sector; to maintain and grow a procurement service unrivalled in public sector.

Procurement is a market-shaping function. Industry derived benchmarks indicate that UK SBS is already performing at or above “best in class” in at least three key measures (percentage savings, compliant spend, spend under management) and compare well against most other measures.

Over the next five years, it is the function’s ambition to lead a cultural change in procurement in the public sector. The natural extension of category management is to bring about a fundamental change in the attitude to supplier relationship management.

Our philosophy sees the supplier as an asset to the business and the route to maximising value from supply. This is not a new concept in procurement generally, but it is not a philosophy which is widely employed in the public sector.

We are ideally positioned to “lead the charge” in the government’s initiative to reform procurement in the public sector.

UK SBS Procurement’s unique selling points are:

- Focus on the full procurement cycle
- Leaders in category management in common and specialised areas
- Expertise in the delivery of major commercial projects
- That we are leaders in procurement to support research
- Use of cutting edge technologies which are superior to those used generally used across the public sector.
- Use of market leading analytical tools to provide comprehensive Business Intelligence
- Active customer and supplier management

***‘UK SBS’ contribution to the Government Procurement Agenda has been impressive. Through innovation and leadership UK SBS has built an attractive portfolio of procurement services from P2P to Strategy Category Management.’***

**John Collington**

**Former Government Chief Procurement Officer**

## Section 2 – About Our Customer

### Innovate UK

The Innovate UK is the UK's innovation agency – driving innovation to boost economic growth. As well as investing in programmes and projects (£1bn investment budget 2008-2011), much of the board's work is in spreading knowledge, understanding policy, spotting opportunities and bringing people together to solve problems or make new advances. Innovate UK offer support and funding to help business develop new products and services - and bring them closer to market.

Innovate UK aim is simple – to accelerate economic growth by stimulating and supporting business-led innovation.

### Success Stories

- A successful partnership with Strathclyde University has led to rapid growth at Glasgow business Clyde Space and the award of a contract by the UK Space Consortium for testing, construction and assembly of UKube-1, the UK's first CubeSat system.
- Start-up business Snap Fashion founded by 25-year-old computer science graduate has attracted £300k in private investment and launched an innovative search engine, website and iPhone app on the market after taking part in the 2011 Tech City Launchpad competition.
- With sustained support from Innovate UK, Fife company *PowerPhotonic* has perfected novel techniques for mass producing tiny lenses that get all the individual beams coming from a laser pointing in the right direction. High powered industrial lasers now have a sharper cutting edge thanks to lenses made in Scotland that focus their light into brighter beams - and the repercussions will be far-reaching.

## 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	Innovate UK North Star House North Star Avenue Swindon Wiltshire SN2 1UE
3.2	Buyer name	UK Shared Business Services
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	<b>Maximum Budget - £150,000 excluding VAT</b> (including the costs for the potential follow up study).
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<b>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available <a href="#">here</a>. 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.</b>

### Section 3 – Timescales

3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	18/08/2015 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	24/08/2015 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	27/08/2015 14.00
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	09/09/2015 14.00
3.11	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	16/09/2015 14.00
3.12	Anticipated Award date	16/09/2015
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	28/09/2015
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	30/12/2016
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

## Section 4 – Specification

### 0 Introduction

#### ***Innovate UK***

Innovate UK (formerly the Technology Strategy Board) is the UK's national innovation agency. Its goal is to accelerate economic growth by stimulating and supporting business-led innovation. It is a business-led executive non-departmental public body set up in 2007.

It works across the whole economy to fund, support and connect innovative businesses of all sizes who have the potential to grow through innovation. It uses a range of tools to deliver its support, from rapid, flexible and responsive programmes supporting knowledge transfer and shorter R&D projects, to large-scale challenge programmes, aimed at bringing about system innovation in key areas such as low carbon vehicles and sustainable agriculture.

Further information on Innovate UK's objectives and programmes is available on its website [www.innovateuk.org](http://www.innovateuk.org). Its Delivery Plan for 2014-15 sets out its latest priorities, and summaries its strategy for the period 2011- 2015.

#### **ICURe (Identifying and Commercialising University Research) pilot**

Funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and Innovate UK, the £9.2 million ICURe pilot project aims to help accelerate the successful commercialisation of publicly funded university research, via licensing agreements and spin out companies. In addition, it aims to develop entrepreneurial skills and market knowledge in a new cadre of Early Career Researchers.

Under the pilot project, Early Career Researchers (ECRs) at the five SETsquared universities (Bath, Bristol, Exeter, Southampton and Surrey) and other selected universities, working with their Principal Investigator (PI) and a Business Mentor, are given tailored training, mentoring and funds to undertake focussed market validation and business model development to speed up the commercialisation of their ideas, technologies, products and services. Teams will gain invaluable marketplace knowledge and first-hand commercial experience, which will be taken back into the research environment to refine the ideas and technologies and to help direct research towards commercial opportunities. Successful outputs are expected to include the creation of university spin-out and start-up companies founded on the teams' ideas; the licensing of IP to an existing company for commercialisation; and research partnerships with industry.

At the start of the pilot over 140 applicants (in total for 5 rounds) are expected to apply, of which only 50% are expected to be successful teams, each team comprising of three people (Principal Investigator and Early Career Researchers). The successful cohorts then go on to receive the business training so, potentially, could be compared to the unsuccessful groups

An 'Options Roundabout' panel assessment review of the business proposals developed under the ICUR pilot takes place around three to six months after admission onto the pilot. It is expected that around 12 teams will be recommended to form spin-out companies and receive support of up to £500k each, with the remaining teams being recommended to commercialise their idea via another route e.g. licensing.

The timetable for the cohorts passing through the ICUR pilot is set out in the table below with dates for boot camp, options roundabout and funders panels.

	<b>Cohort 1</b>	<b>Cohort 2</b>	<b>Cohort 3</b>	<b>Cohort 4</b>	<b>Cohort 5</b>
Bootcamp	23/10/2014	30/01/2015	21/05/2015	18/09/2015	<i>TBC</i>
Options Roundabout	06/02/2015	30/04/2015	21/08/2015	10/12/2015	<i>03/02/2016</i>
Funders Panel	17/07/2015	TBC	TBC	TBC	<i>TBC</i>

The purpose of the evaluation is to undertake the following deliverables

- Literature review
- Logic model
- Agreed approach to evaluation ICUR pilot.
- Evaluation of ICUR pilot, with reports due in 2016, 2017 and 2018
- Recommendations for an evaluation framework of a national programme, should it be rolled out.

The evaluation will be used to assess the implementation of ICUR pilot cohorts 1-5 and provide evidence as to the suitability of the pilot for potential programme expansion and national roll-out. It is envisaged that the evaluation will be designed using a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data sources to assess the impact and process involved.

# 1 Scope and Budget

## 1.1 Scope

This aim of this project is to

### **(a) Undertake an evaluation of the ICURe pilot**

The evaluation should be informed by a literature review that examines the existing literature on impact evaluations of similar research routes to business commercialisation, documenting the methodologies used and results found.

It will include the five cohort rounds of the ICURe pilot to assess the impact of entrepreneurial skills and commercial awareness gained up to the 'Options Roundabout' stage. It will also evaluate the second phase of the ICURe pilot following the 'Options Roundabout'<sup>1</sup> and assess the impact of any new start-ups created and also of other 'ideas' that may take alternative routes to commercialising research. The evaluation will include follow up studies to assess the impact of ICURe over two further years of implementation.

### **(b) Develop an evaluation framework for a scaled-up, national programme, recognising that increased scale may allow for more robust methods to be deployed.**

Include recommendations for an evaluation framework for the ICURe programme going forward to measure its impact and understand the process. This will cover the two key elements of a) improving the commercialisation skills of the participant research teams in relation to business know-how and b) the economic impact from the creation of spin-out and start-up companies; the licensing of IP; and other establishment of collaborative research partnerships, as well as any other outcomes. The evaluation framework should use a mix of quantitative and qualitative data sources, identify which indicators should be measured, and set out options for setting a baseline and assessing a counterfactual, if practical to do so.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Options roundabout is a panel of experts that assess the business proposal made by the research team and decide which option offers the best route to commercialisation. This may result in an award for a business spin out but could also recommend an alternative route.

## **2 Specification**

### **2.1 Literature Review**

Bidders should set out how they propose to undertake a literature review and present their findings. Commercialising academic research is a complex process that has the potential to generate economic impact through a number of tangible and intangible channels in both short and long term. Measuring their impact therefore presents a greater challenge than in the case of more straightforward policy interventions such as grants.

Similar interventions for commercialising academic research exist in many other advanced economies. A review of international literature on good practice should therefore detail:

- The methods which have been used to evaluate the economic impact of programmes similar to ICURe
- The evidence demonstrating the economic impact of supporting research to commercialisation, including an assessment of the robustness of this evidence
- Highlight any relevant differences in national innovation infrastructure

### **2.2 Logic Model**

Proposals should clearly set out how a logic chain process for ICURe activities relate to enhancing entrepreneurial skills and generating economic impact. The logic chain should be used to inform how to evaluate the effectiveness of the ICURe programme over time. This element of the project will deliver a comprehensive logic model for the ICURe pilot and research questions regarding the measurement of impact and process. An illustration of a draft logic model is provided in Appendix 1.

### **2.3 Evaluation design**

The evaluation should be designed using a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data sources to assess the impact and process improvements. The impact evaluation will provide an estimate of the size of the impact while the process evaluation will examine the channels through which impacts are made. The full impact and process evaluation will enable a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of ICURe and the delivery of the pilot.

It is expected that a suitable control group will be used wherever possible to enable a more robust counterfactual in the evaluation design. Each stage of the ICURe pilot process (described in the introduction section) will result in successful and unsuccessful groups, which could form treatment and control groups, although other options may also be considered. Proposals should also consider the use of other data for constructing a counterfactual, such as university licensing and spin out data. Proposals should clearly state the intended control group/counterfactual, where appropriate, with a justification for that selection and must clearly identify potential issues.

There is ongoing research undertaken by Dr Robert Newbery from Plymouth University who has gathered baseline data on entrepreneurial / commercial intent that could be used to feed into this component. This captures intentions and skills, but not subsequent behaviours. See appendix 2 for further details.

At the university level, similar universities or groups of universities could potentially provide a benchmark against which levels of spinouts or licensing deals have changed following engagement with ICURe. The Higher Education Statistics Authority <https://www.hesa.ac.uk/> provides data on, license numbers, income and performance of spin outs for universities outside of the Setsquared group<sup>2</sup>. Another source could be the Royal Society of Edinburgh Enterprise Fellowships that provide a similar mentor funding option, however, it doesn't offer business support to applicants after completing the training. More information at this link [http://www.royalsoced.org.uk/636\\_ScottishEnterprise.html](http://www.royalsoced.org.uk/636_ScottishEnterprise.html)

and evaluation findings at this link

<http://www.evaluationsonline.org.uk/evaluations/Documents.do?action=download&id=618&ui=bas ic.>

## ***2.4 Recommendations for an evaluation framework for a national ICURe programme***

Proposals should set out how tenderers will use the outputs from the pilot evaluation to examine different approaches to evaluating the impact of a national roll out of the ICURe programme from start to finish, and to offer a recommendation. The evaluation framework should cover both the impact and process components. It will include impacts of all ICURe inputs and activities, such as the Setsquared group role as a trainer and facilitator for developing research ideas, not just the impact of the follow on grants that will be made available after the 'Options Roundabout'.

It will involve identifying which indicators can and should be used to measure the relevant activities/outputs/outcomes and the key metrics that will be used to determine the impact of the ICURe programme. In addition, it should explore the pros and cons of different methods, such as propensity score matching and whether sufficient sample sizes would enable these techniques to be used as part of the evaluation design. Tenderers should also consider the extent of wider impacts on customers, suppliers, competitors and others and how these might be evaluated. It is expected that the methodology for estimating these wider impacts will go beyond the use of standard techniques such as sector multipliers.

The evaluation framework should cover, as a minimum, the following:

- Improvement in entrepreneurial skills or intent to commercialise
- additional Gross Value Added (GVA) impact of the ICURe programme on the UK economy
- additional turnover and employment created by the ICURe programme
- additional inward investment and exports arising as a result of ICURe
- impact of ICURe on UK global competitiveness in sectors being impacted by the commercialisation of UK research
- defining a counterfactual
- factors to consider when deciding whether the recommended methodology is suitable for deployment
- assessment of ICURe place in the wider innovation support system
- assessment of the process for delivering an expanded roll out of ICURe, which takes

---

<sup>2</sup> The full data set (10 year) will be provided by HEFCE

- account of how the process has evolved over time
- set out the number of waves of surveys that would be required and the approximate cost per survey for undertaking each wave.

The recommended methodology should be robust. The Maryland scale can be considered as a reasonable hierarchy of robustness.

### 3 Method

The successful bidder will be required to work directly with the partners involved in delivering the ICUR programme to deliver the evaluation framework and evaluation reports. They will need to work closely with the Setsquared group to develop an understanding of the cohorts involved in the ICUR programme and understand what work has already been done in this area, as well as what data is and can be made available. Any necessary data-sharing agreements will be put in place between the successful bidder Innovate UK and the relevant partner organisations.

All proposals should follow best-practice guidance in designing evaluations as set out in HM Treasury's Magenta Book<sup>3</sup>. Innovate UK places great importance on assessing the additionality of impact and bidders are expected to consider robust techniques to estimate factors such as deadweight, displacement (product and labour market displacement should be considered), linkages and multipliers. It is expected that such analysis will go beyond self-reported impacts. The reliance on standard assumptions from the existing literature around these factors will not be considered a robust approach.

The wider spill over impacts of the ICUR programme are considered as important, since the commercialisation and application of new knowledge from project outputs form a key rationale for the investment of public money in this programme.

It is anticipated that the proposed evaluation methodology will require a combination of analytical techniques. These could include case studies, surveys of stakeholders, in-depth interviews, data linking, and econometric analysis of primary and secondary data, although it may be that not all are appropriate and the successful bidder should set out the pros and cons, with clear recommendation of the preferred approach.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book>

## 4 Deliverables

This project is expected to deliver, as a minimum;

- A standalone literature review **by end of November 2015**
- An evaluation approach for the pilot that will include a) logic model, and b) evaluation design **by end of January 2016**
- A process evaluation of the ICUR pilot that will include recommendations for the evaluation framework to assess a wider roll out of the programme **by end of April 2016**.
- An impact evaluation with case studies **by end of November 2016**
- Proposals for 2 follow up studies over 2 – 3 year time frames. These will track progress with co-horts of researchers and spin out companies using survey tools and provide reports in **November 2017** and **November 2018**

*[Note there will be a break clause included in the contract following the first phase of the work to assess the need for follow up studies in later years]*

All reports must include an executive summary. Any analysis carried out for the reports must be clearly set out in the reports. Any datasets used in the analysis should be anonymised and provided alongside the respective reports.

### 4.1 Quality Assurance Requirements

Proposals should set out internal quality assurance procedures that will be used in this project. The winning proposal may be put to an external, independent peer review group of academic evaluation experts. The successful bidder will be expected to consider and, if appropriate, respond to any comments from peer reviewers. Any costs incurred through this process will be covered by Innovate UK.

## 5 Data

The majority of relevant data is held by the SetSquared partners, Innovate UK and HEFCE or will need to be collected as part of this commission. Examples of the type of data that can or is being collected is set out in Appendix 3. The full HE-BCI data set will be available at the institutional level<sup>4</sup>. The successful bidder will have to work with each of the partners involved in the ICUR programme to understand what data is available and what data could be made available in order to achieve the most robust and yet practical impact evaluation framework.

Availability of data may vary, but it is vital that the evaluation framework is underpinned by the Magenta Book principles and standards.

### 5.1 Security

This project will involve utilising data held by the ICUR programme team. Proposals should set out the data security arrangements that will be in place for this project. The successful bidder will be expected to sign binding non-disclosure agreements with InnovateUK. At the end of the project, the successful bidder and any sub-contractors must return all data to InnovateUK and destroy any copies they hold.

---

<sup>4</sup> Higher education business and community interaction survey <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/kess/hebci/>

## 6 Background information

In March 2013, the House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee inquiry 'Bridging the Valley of Death: Improving the Commercialisation of Research' drew on a broad range of evidence relating to problems encountered in the commercialisation of UK academic research and support for early stage businesses. The Committee concluded that there are further opportunities to develop the UK innovation eco-system including commercialisation of academic research.

In response to this report InnovateUK, HEFCE and SETsquared agreed to work together on a pilot to investigate the potential of a programme which will tackle these failures and aim to increase the probability of the successful commercialisation of academic research, options signposting and the spinning out of high potential new companies.

### **ICURE programme description and focus:**

The ICURE pilot will focus on commercially-promising research projects undertaken at SETsquared and affiliated universities. The ICURE programme will fund teams to determine whether there is a market for products or services that utilise their research, and then, where there is evidence of market demand, licence or spin-out the research into a company.

ICURE will fund proposals to prove market demand for research with grants of up to £50,000 per project. Applications for the funding should be made by early career researcher (ECR) with the support of a Principal Investigator (PI) and a Business Mentor.

ICURE funding will support three to six months of intense market validation. Early career researchers take on the role of entrepreneurial team leaders, engaging with prospective customers, partners and competitors, and taking steps to validate the commercial potential of their research.

Participating teams will present their business proposals to an options roundabout panel that will offer the team expert guidance on development pathways that will result in commercial success. Projects that possess strong market potential will have the opportunity to secure further grant funding for new company creation.

Commercialisation staff from SETsquared universities, along with SETsquared incubators, will work with each team so that they can be fast-tracked into creating a start-up company. Innovation UK will also be engaged in the process to provide support and guidance as appropriate for funding the early stages of the company.

### **Team Applications**

The pilot will accept applications from teams based at SETsquared Partnership universities – University of Bath, University of Bristol, University of Exeter, University of Southampton and University of Surrey.

Participants apply for admission to the pilot as teams, consisting of the following:

- Principal Investigator, based at a SETsquared Partnership university, with commercially-promising idea or technology
- Early career researcher, based at a SETsquared Partnership university, to take entrepreneurial leadership of the project
- Business mentor motivated to offer expert guidance and support. (If needed, SETsquared will help the team recruit a business mentor from a relevant industrial sector as a third team member.)

Each proposal will pass through the “selection lens” to identify those which are of sufficient interest to progress to the next stage, those who are not suitable will be signposted to other more suitable alternatives. The composition of the selection lens panel is described in the business plan.

For each concept or idea that progresses beyond the selection lens an ‘entrepreneurial team’ will be assembled, comprising the principal investigator or research, an early career researcher who is actively involved in the research and a commercial mentor who possesses market knowledge, commercialisation expertise, etc.

The team will be provided with a 2-3 day intensive residential entrepreneurial training programme and support to go through a hypothesis driven business model discovery process.

The major focus following this training will be activities to identify and validate the market and market potential for the commercial products and/or services.

Funding will be provided to enable time and travel to explore the market opportunities and develop and check ideas with potential customers. During this stage the commercial potential of the prospect will be validated and the route to market will be determined.

Each prospect will be developed by the entrepreneurial team to a stage where a business proposition can be delivered in a standard format (such as business model canvas). A 2 day ‘boot camp’ will be held to refine and hone the model and presentation to be used. All prospects reaching this stage will then be submitted to an options review process, those with the greatest potential to create a new business being ‘spun out’. Other proposals may be taken forward in different way (e.g. IP licensing).

Once completed the pilot will be reviewed and (with further development as necessary) be considered for national implementation across the UK.

Find out more at <http://www.setsquared.co.uk/research-commercialisation/icure-innovation-commercialisation-programme>

## **7 Management of the Agreement**

Proposals should set out the project management approach that will be used. This should include proposed contact with Innovate UK throughout the project, a detailed project timeline (to include monitoring and review milestones), and a clear indication of the roles of each member of the team.

## 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, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem 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 ( $5+5+6=16 \div 3 = 5.33$ ))

### Pass / fail criteria

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
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	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

### Scoring criteria

#### Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. 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	10%
Quality	AW6.2	Understanding The Requirements	18%
Quality	AW6.3	Proposed methodology & Objectives	36%
Quality	AW6.4	Project Management & Contingencies	18%
Quality	AW6.5	Project Team	18%

## 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 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 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:  $\text{Score} / \text{Total Points} \times 50$  ( $80 / 100 \times 50 = 40$ )

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.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.
- 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 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 (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 ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the Contract terms 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 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 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 ITQ 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 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](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)