



INVITATION TO TENDER

OPEN PROCEDURE

ARCHIVES ACCREDITATION ONLINE SUBMISSION SYSTEM

DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF TENDER PROPOSALS: 5PM (UK TIME), 26 AUGUST 2020

1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 TNA is a non-ministerial government department. As the government's national archive for England, Wales and the United Kingdom, we hold over 1,000 years of the nation's records for everyone to discover and use. We fulfil a leadership role for the archive sector and work to secure the future of physical and digital records.
- 1.2 Archive Sector Accreditation (ASA) is the national management standard for archives, created in 2012-13 through a process of sector co-creation, and supported by a UK-wide partnership of archive bodies. The standard is used for service development and improvement. More information can be found at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/archives-sector/archive-service-accreditation/.
- 1.3 Archive services are currently able to submit applications for ASA online. Reviewers are also able to view the information submitted, both on the online application form and uploaded attached documents which support the application.
- 1.4 As the current contract is coming to an end, TNA is seeking a contractor to continue the service. There will be some overlap between the commencement of this contract and the end of the current contract, in order to facilitate seamless transition and to communicate any changes to stakeholders in advance of switchover.
- 1.5 We are happy to receive ideas for redesign which add value to TNA, ASA, applicants, reviewers and/or the Appointed Supplier.

2 PURPOSE

- 2.1 This Invitation to Tender is in two Lots. You may submit for Lot 1, or Lot 2, or both. We intend to award under **either** Lot 1 or Lot 2 (**not both**), dependent on a combination of the quality of bids received and price. The National Archives reserves the right to decide under which Lot to proceed, at its own discretion, after receipt and evaluation of tender responses.
- 2.2 The anticipated term of the contract will be three years, with two optional extension periods of one year each.
- 2.3 **Lot 1:** to appoint a supplier to design, build and maintain throughout the contract terms a web-based facility for archive services to be able to submit applications for Archives Accreditation, and for these applications to be reviewed.
- 2.4 **Lot 2**: to appoint a supplier:
 - a. to train a number of staff at The National Archives to be able to design, build, adapt and maintain the forms and processes required for archive services to be able to submit applications for Archives Accreditation, and for these applications to be reviewed, and
 - b. to provide web hosting for the service throughout the term.

3 THE REQUIREMENT

- 3.1 The information in Sections 3.2 to 3.5 gives detail about how the system works currently and is provided for information only. Although we expect the service to work on broadly similar lines, we recognise that Suppliers may have different ideas about how the system may function better, be it more intuitively for users, more securely or robustly, or providing additional functionality which adds value to TNA, ASA, applicants, reviewers and/or the Appointed Supplier.
- 3.2 The site allows access to three **user types**, each of which requires a different access type and leads to a different user journey:
 - a. Archives Services, based in the UK, who wish to submit an application;
 - b. Reviewers, who may be based anywhere in the UK;
 - c. Administrative users, based at TNA's office in Kew, West London.

3.3 **User journey** – Archives Services users

- 3.3.1 The user journey for Archives Services starts with setting up a login. The Archive Service will provide their own username and password via the website; these details are emailed to TNA for checking prior to activation of the account.
- 3.3.2 TNA advise the user by email that the account has been activated. The user can then log in to access the Online Form for application. The user completes the form and can attach documents to accompany the application. The form and any supporting documents can be saved at any point for later editing or completion.
- 3.3.3 The system allows for upload of a wide variety of supporting documents, including Word, Excel, PDF, jpeg.

3.4 **User journey** – Reviewers

- 3.4.1 Reviewers are given a username and password by TNA, by email. TNA will also advise them, by email, as to which applications they are to review.
- 3.4.2 Reviewers will have access to the information in as submitted in the Online Form and attached supporting documents.
- 3.4.3 An additional online form allows for scoring of submissions.
- 3.4.4 A submission may be reviewed by more than one Reviewer. Each Reviewer acts independently, not collaboratively, therefore more than one online scoring form might be generated for each application. NOTE there is a desire for collaborative working, see Annex A 'Assessors'.
- 3.4.5 Comments, notes and decisions are reported back to TNA by email.

3.5 **User** journey – Administrative users

- 3.5.1 Administrative users also require a username and password. On commencement of the contract, the Appointed Supplier will be expected to set up at least one Administrative user, who can then set up accounts for other Administrative users.
- 3.5.2 Administrative users can:
 - a. Set up all three types of user accounts;
 - b. Obtain management information reports; on individual applications, groups of applications, all applications, and customised reports.
- 3.6 **The new system** should provide the following features and functionality:
 - 3.6.1 The Online Form for applications (Archive Sector users) should include complex field functionality (e.g. free text, dropdowns, check boxes, matrices, help text) that is easy for non-technical staff to use, and should enable a variety of documents to be uploaded as supporting evidence. The system should log an audit trail of activity which feeds back into the reporting tool(s) used by Administrative Users.
 - 3.6.2 An intuitive and seamless workflow allowing a Reviewer to access any applications and relevant supporting documentation which they have been allocated, ensuring that there is no possibility of documents from different applications being mixed. Reviewers should complete an online scoring form, which intuitively matches the criteria on the Online Form for applications, for ease of completion and avoidance of error. A submission may be reviewed by more than one Reviewer. Each Reviewer acts independently, not collaboratively, therefore more than one online scoring form might be generated for each application. The system should log an audit trail of activity which feeds back into the reporting tool(s) used by Administrative Users.
 - 3.6.3 Administrative users must be able to set up all three types of user account and obtain clear and useful reports on the progress of applications and reviews. Pre-set and/or customisable reports should also be able to be generated across the dataset, and deliverable in multiple common formats (e.g. MS Office, PDF) suitable for on-screen reading, printing and email.
 - 3.6.4 The system must be secure.
- 3.7 Additional information and examples of the current forms can be found at **Annex A** at the end of this document.
- 3.8 **Lot 1** of this Invitation to Tender is for a supplier to design, build and maintain (including hosting throughout the contract term) a web-based facility for archive services to be able to submit applications for Archives Accreditation, and for these applications to be reviewed (based on the information above).

- 3.9 **Lot 2** of this Invitation to Tender is for a supplier to train a number of staff at The National Archives to be able to design and build the forms and processes required for archive services to be able to submit applications for Archives Accreditation, and for these applications to be reviewed (based on the information above), and to provide web hosting for the service throughout the term.
- 3.10 You may submit for Lot 1, or Lot 2, or both. We intend to award under <u>either</u> Lot 1 or Lot 2, dependent on a combination of the quality of bids received and price. The National Archives reserves the right to decide under which Lot to proceed, at its own discretion, after receipt and evaluation of tender responses. If you are submitting under both Lots, we recommend that you submit your response to each Lot by separate emails.

4 BUDGET

- 4.1 The maximum available budget for this contract is:
 - a. For initial onboarding, a maximum of £4,000 (exclusive of VAT); and
 - b. For the three year contract period £12,500 (exclusive of VAT).
- 4.2 You are also asked to submit your pricing for the two optional extension periods of one year each.

5 HOW TO RESPOND

- 5.1 Any requests for clarification should be submitted to procurement@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk by 12 noon (UK time), 12 August 2020.
- 5.2 Tender Responses should be submitted to procurement@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk by 5pm (UK time), 26 August 2020.
- 5.3 Your Tender Response must include:
 - 5.2.1 Details of the **Lot** for which you are submitting a response.
 - 5.2.2 Your understanding of the project **brief and deliverables**.
 - 5.2.3 The names and relevant **experience of individuals** assigned to the project, clarifying their involvement with each phase or unit of the work.
 - 5.2.4 Your proposed **methodology** to address, and how your proposed **solution** meets, all of the requirements. Please include your proposed **Service Level Agreement** (SLA).
 - 5.2.5 **Examples** of similar work you have undertaken.
 - 5.2.6 Your **contract price**, including a breakdown for each phase or unit of work, day rate of each team member and any other costs or expenses. You should also include your price for the two optional extension periods of one year each.

6 EVALUATION CRITERIA (APPLICABLE TO BOTH LOTS)

- 6.1 Each Lot will be evaluated separately. We intend to award under either Lot 1 or Lot 2, dependent on a combination of the quality of bids received and price. The National Archives reserves the right to decide under which Lot to proceed, at its own discretion, after receipt and evaluation of tender responses. If you are submitting under both Lots, we recommend that you submit your response to each Lot by separate emails.
- 6.2 Tender responses will be evaluated using the following criteria:

CATEGORY	MAXIMUM AVAILABLE SCORE	WEIGHTING	MAXIMUUM AVAILABLE WEIGHTED SCORE
Extent to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the brief (section 5.2.2)	10	2	20
Knowledge and experience relevant to the project (section 5.2.3)	10	1.5	15
Methodology, solution and SLA (section 5.2.4)	10	3	30
Examples of similar work (sections 5.2.5)	10	1	10
Price (section 5.2.6)	10	2.5	25

6.3 For each Category (apart form Costs, see section 8.3 below) a points score between 1 and 10 is available. These points will be allocated applying the criteria as listed in the table below. If any Category within your Proposal mainly has the criteria of one score but also has one or more criteria of a lower score, then that Category will be awarded the lower score.

Points Outstanding: Potential Supplier has provided a response that addresses all parts of the requirement Potential Supplier has provided evidence to support all elements of their response The evidence supplied is convincing and highly relevant to the requirement Potential Supplier's response is clear and easy to understand Where relevant, Potential Supplier has demonstrated a high level of capability to deliver new and innovative service approaches Good: Potential Supplier has provided a response that addresses all parts of the requirement

- Potential Supplier has provided evidence to support most elements of their response
- The evidence supplied is good and relevant to the requirement
- Potential Supplier's response is clear and easy to understand
- Where relevant, Potential Supplier has demonstrated some level of capability to deliver new and innovative service approaches

Average:

Potential Supplier has provided a response that addresses some parts of the requirement

4 Points

- Potential Supplier has provided evidence to support some elements of their response, but not all
- The evidence supplied has some limited relevance to the requirement
- Potential Supplier's response is not always clear and easy to understand
- Where relevant, Potential Supplier has demonstrated limited capability to deliver new and innovative service approaches

Poor:

Potential Supplier has provided a response that fails to address most parts of the requirement

Potential Supplier has provided little or no evidence to support most elements of their response

1 Point

- The evidence supplied is very weak and has very limited relevance to the requirement
- Potential Supplier's response is not always clear and easy to understand
- Where relevant, Potential Supplier has demonstrated little or no capability to deliver new and innovative service approaches
- 6.4 The lowest priced submission will be awarded the maximum score available for the Cost Category. All other bids will be awarded the maximum score reduced by the proportion by which they are more expensive.
- 6.5 Following this evaluation, TNA at its sole discretion choose to request interviews and/or demonstrations, at TNA's premises, following which any Potential Suppliers selected for will have their submission/interview/demonstration re-evaluated on the following basis:

CATEGORY	MAXIMUM AVAILABLE SCORE	WEIGHTING	MAXIMUUM AVAILABLE WEIGHTED SCORE
Extent to which the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the brief (section 5.2.2)	10	1.5	15
Knowledge and experience relevant to the project (section 5.2.3)	10	1	10
Methodology, solution and SLA (section 5.2.4)	10	2.5	25

Examples of similar work (sections 5.2.5)	10	0.5	5
Price (section 5.2.6)	10	2.5	25
Interview/demonstration	10	2	20

8 PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE

The Procurement Timetable is as follows:

No.	Description	Date(s)
1	Invitation to Tender published	29 July 2020
2	Deadline for potential suppliers to submit clarification	12 noon (UK time),
	questions to procurement@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk *	12 August 2020
4	Deadline for potential suppliers to submit their Tender	5pm (UK time), 26
	Responses to procurement@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk	August 2020
5	Timebox for TNA and partners to evaluate Tender	7 to 9 September
	Responses, including possible interviews/demonstrations	2020
	with shortlisted potential suppliers	
6	Contract award and feedback to unsuccessful potential	16 September 2017
	supplier	

^{*} Any clarification question received that TNA deems to be relevant to more than one Potential Supplier may be shared with all Potential Suppliers.

9 CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- 9.1 The contract will be awarded under our <u>standard terms and conditions for services</u>. Please note your Tender Response may be used, in whole or in part, to populate the contract schedules. As such, you should make clear and unambiguous statements about the commitments you are making.
- 9.2 The National Archives reserves the right not to appoint and to achieve the outcomes of the project through other methods.

Annex A

Archive Service Accreditation Online Application System Requirements

User types

System can accommodate three types of user, in addition to system administrators:

- Archive services, based in the UK, who wish to submit an application (Applicants);
- Assessors who may be based anywhere in the UK;
- Panel members who may be based anywhere in the UK, who can see selected applications in bulk – these may be a form of assessor account

Secure login for individual users: applicants, assessors and panel members

Each group requires different access permissions on the online system

System

Allows for multiple forms to reflect the phases of the programme.

- For applicants: form for new applications, award midpoint review stage form, provisional review form (optional)
- For assessors: assessment form for new applications, assessment form for midpoint review stage, assessment for provisional review (optional)
- For Panel: headline assessment form giving overview

Online form for applications (archive services) should include complex field functionality (e.g. free text, dropdowns, check boxes, matrices, help text) and should enable a variety of formats to be uploaded as supporting evidence, including Word, Excel, PDF, jpeg.

One application may be composed of multiple forms (eg reflecting the structure of introductory matter, three substantive modules and appendices)

Logic can be applied to questions to make them conditional, mandatory, optional, or set up for validation (dates, lookups).

Application documentation should be kept separate for each individual applicant with unique identifier.

The system should log an audit trail of activity which feeds back into the reporting tool(s) used by administrative users.

Administrators must be able to export documentation and forms in bulk and per application.

Form data can be exported in a variety of formats for review and reporting (MS Excel as a minimum, **please tell us** which other formats your solution supports).

The system allows at least 20 assessor users (including Panel members) and at least 400 applicants to be live users of the system at one time

Applications can remain live in the system for a number of years

Bilingual capacity is desirable as the system should be able to offer both English and Welsh language applications

Meets online accessibility standards (WCAG 2.1)

Data storage must meet UK Government cloud security principles. Sensitive personal data is not collected as part of the programme.

System Administrators

Are based at The National Archives, Kew

Administrators must be able to identify progress of applications through all stages of application process

Administrators must be able to reopen applications, for example reopening for applicants who have made errors in their application

Administrators can allocate selected applications to assessors and Panel members

Administrators can set up all three types of user accounts

Administrators obtain management information reports; on individual applications, groups of applications, all applications, and customised reports including on content of applications and statistics regarding assessment.

Administration are able to download application and assessment data as reports, and to download entire applications including supporting documents.

Administrators able to edit and set up forms/templates/edit permissions etc

Applicants:

Applicants can set up own login to the system

Applicants have access to support for system issues e.g. lost passwords

Applicants can enter and save partial data, returning to complete applications over a period of weeks or months

Applicants can read the application once submitted but can no longer edit

More than one application form may be accessible for the same applicant.

More than one user should be able to work on each application as they may be completed by teams

Applicants can see relevant forms through granular permissions (eg the midpoint or provisional review form may be released once they have received the award)

Assessors

Assessor can review (but not edit) forms and any associated documentation for the application(s) that they have been allocated

Assessors can complete an online assessment form for each applicant.

A submission/application may be reviewed by more than one assessor. Your proposed solution may require each assessor to complete a form each, but we would **prefer** a solution which allows assessors to be able to collaborate.

Panel members

Panel members need to be able to review allocated applications and assessments

This Annex continues overleaf with sample forms from the current solution, for your information only.

Accreditation Assessment Report

Name of Archive Service: {{ submission }}	
Assessor	
Name:	
Second Assessor (if any)	
Name:	
■ Was a validation visit made?	
☐ Yes ☐ No	
Magazine Give date of visit and name(s) of assessment team	
This should only be used to record elements of a validation visit to feapplication).	ed back to the applicants (and not for general comments on the
Service location	
Town or city if possible	
Service scalability type/level	
Local Authority Archive Service Type 1	
☐ Local Authority Archive Service Type 2 ☐ Other Public Sector Archive Service Type 1	
Other Public Sector Archive Service Type 2	
Private and Third Sector Archive Service Type 1	
☐ Private and Third Sector Archive Service Type 2 ☐ Private and Third Sector Archive Service Type 3	
National	
M Overview of the archive service	
For the information of the Panel, please outline key aspects of the se	rvice and your overall view of the application
Assessor recommendation to the Panel: this archive service should	ld be
Accredited	
Provisionally accreditedNot accredited	
The suggested period of provisional approval is:	

1 Organisational Health

Please assess and comment on how far the applicant service meets each requirement or subrequirement

	Is requirement met?	Commentary on requirement
1.1 Mission Statement	MetPartially metNot met	
1.2 Governance	MetPartially metNot met	
1.3 Forward planning	MetPartially metNot met	
1.4 Resources: spaces	MetPartially metNot met	
1.5 Resources: finance	MetPartially metNot met	
1.6 Resources: workforce	MetPartially metNot met	
Overall view of Organisational Health	 Met Partially met Not met	

2 Collections

Please assess and comment on how far the applicant service meets each requirement or subrequirement

	Is requirement met?	Commentary on requirement
2.1 Collections Management	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.2.1 Collections development policy	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.2.2 Collections development planning	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.3.1 Collections information policy	 Met Partially met Not met	

2.3.2 Collections information planning	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.3.3 Collections information procedures	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.4.1 Collections care and conservation policy	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.4.2 Collections care and conservation planning	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.4.3 Collections care procedures	 Met Partially met Not met	
2.4.4 Disaster and emergency planning	 Met Partially met Not met	
Overall view of Collections	MetPartially metNot met	

3 Stakeholders and their experiences

Please assess and comment on how far the applicant service meets each requirement or subrequirement

	Is requirement met?	Commentary on requirement
3.1 Access policy	MetPartially metNot met	
3.2.1 Understanding audiences and analysing their needs	 Met Partially met Not met	
3.2.2 Planning to meet audience needs	MetPartially metNot met	
3.3.1 Information on access	 Met Partially met Not met	
3.3.2 Access procedures	 Met Partially met Not met	
3.3.3 A variety of means of access	 Met Partially met Not met	

	rs' Key Findings	11		
summary	of the assessment for {{ submission	}}		
2				
3				
ļ				
l = "				
	k on actions for applicants lists required and improvement action	one reculting from the access	ment. Pequired actions need to be	a addressed to
	n in future. Improvement actions poir			e addressed to
	Deputing divining 1	Requirement number(,	
	Required/improvement?	relates	Details	
1	Required actionImprovement action			
2	Required actionImprovement action			
3	Required actionImprovement action			
4	Required actionImprovement action			
5	Required actionImprovement action			
6	Required actionImprovement action			
7	Required actionImprovement action			
8	Required actionImprovement action			
9	Required actionImprovement action			
10	Required actionImprovement action			
1	ed Archive Services only			
1 Accredit	,			

• Met

• Partially met

• Not met

Overall view of Stakeholders and

their experiences

		Requirement number(s) to which it	
	Outstanding action	relates	date
1			
2			
3			
1			
5			
6			
7			
3			
)			
0			
there	anything to note regarding progres	ss against previously set actions which is not	otherwise included in the assessr

Review Assessment Report

Name of Archive Service			
Accreditation Number			
Assessor			
Was a validation visit made?			
] Yes] No			
If yes, please give the names o	of the assessment team and the date	e of the visit	
	e with particular reference to any de	velopments since achieving a	ccredited status.
Progress against action points	identified during application for Arch	nive Service Accreditation Requirement (s) to which	Drogress against action
1	Required or Improvement	it rolatos	Progress against action
	Action • Required Action	it relates	point
2	Action • Required Action • Improvement Action • Required Action	it relates	
0	Action Required Action Improvement Action Required Action Improvement Action Required Action	it relates	
3	Action Required Action Improvement Action Required Action Improvement Action	it relates	

6	Required Action Improvement Action	
7	Required ActionImprovement Action	
8	Required ActionImprovement Action	
9	Required ActionImprovement Action	
10	Required ActionImprovement Action	

Organisational Health



	Accreditation Assessment	Review Stage Assessment	Commentary
1.1 Mission Statement	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
1.2 Governance	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
1.3 Forward Planning	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
1.4 Resources: Buildings	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
1.5 Resources: Finance	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
1.6 Resources: Workforce	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
Overview of Organisational Health	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	





	Accreditation assessment	Review Stage assessment	Commentary
2.1Collections Management	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.2.1 Collections Development Policy	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.2.2 Collections Development Plan	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.3.1 Collections Information Policy	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.3.2 Collections Information Plan	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.3.3 Collections Information Procedures	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.4.1 Collections Care Policy	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.4.2 Collections Care Plan	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.4.3 Collections Care Procedures	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
2.4.4 Disaster Recovery Plan	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	
Overall view of Collections	MetPartially metNot met	 Met Partially Met Not met	

Stakeholders and their Experiences



	Accreditation assessment	Review Stage assessment	Commentary
	• Met	• Met	
	 Partially met 	 Partially met 	
3.1 Access Policy	 Not met 	 Not met 	_

3.2.1 Understanding of community	 Met Partially met Not met	 Met Partially met Not met	
3.2.2 Methods of analysis in place	 Met Partially met Not met	MetPartially metNot met	
3.2.3 Documented plans to improve access	MetPartially metNot met	MetPartially metNot met	
3.3.1 Information on how to access collections	MetPartially metNot met	MetPartially metNot met	
3.3.2 Documented access procedures are in place	MetPartially metNot met	MetPartially metNot met	
3.3.3 A variety of means of access	 Met Partially met Not met	MetPartially metNot met	
Overall view of Stakeholders and their Experiences	 Met Partially met Not met	MetPartially metNot met	

~ —					
ŏ-	Are there any	new required	or improvement	teedback	actions?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Additional feedback actions for the archive service

Required actions need to be addressed to meet accreditation in future. Improvement actions point to areas of future service development.

	Required or Improvement	Requirement to which it relates	Details
1	RequiredImprovement		
2	RequiredImprovement		
3	RequiredImprovement		_
4	RequiredImprovement		
5	RequiredImprovement		
6	RequiredImprovement		
7	RequiredImprovement		

8	RequiredImprovement	
9	RequiredImprovement	
10	RequiredImprovement	

Panel Decision: Accreditation Award

Archive Service Name: {{ submission }}
Date of Panel meeting
/(YYYY/MM/DD)
■ Decision on award of accredited status
☐ Provisionally ☐ Accredited ☐ Not Accredited
Provisional approval is awarded for:
Accreditation number
Each accredited archive service has a unique number identifying their accreditation
7 Panel Narrative
This section records the overall views of the Panel on this application.