



Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Medical Research Council
(MRC)**

**Subject The Impact of UK-US Research Collaboration: mining REF
2014 data**

Sourcing reference number CR18016



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

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

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About the Contracting Authority</u>
3	<u>Working with the Contracting Authority.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation model</u>
6	<u>Evaluation questionnaire</u>
7	<u>General Information</u>

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for Contracting Authorities for 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](#).

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Medical Research Council (MRC)

The Medical Research Council is a publicly-funded organisation dedicated to improving human health.

The organisation supports research across the entire spectrum of medical sciences, in universities and hospitals, in its own units, centres and institutes in the UK, and in our units in Africa.

Supporting scientists

- Around 5,700 research staff are supported by the MRC, either employed directly in our institutes and units or funded through grants and fellowships.
- We spent £86m on training awards for postgraduate students and fellows in 2011/12, including those in the MRC's own institutes and units.
- At March 2012 there were around 1,900 MRC-funded PhD students and around 400 MRC fellows in higher education institutes and MRC research establishments.

Research examples

- The benefits of MRC research have a national and global impact; from infections in Africa, stem cell advances that can potentially combat brain and heart diseases and improvements in the design of tests for treatments. As well as more and better healthcare, medical research can lead to wider impacts; many millions more lives saved, a vastly improved quality of life and hence a more productive workforce and economic benefits to nations.
- MRC researchers have found markers for cancer cells that may help detect thousands of new cases of cancer a year. The markers are already part of an MRC-developed device that screens for cancer of the oesophagus, are being trialled for cervical cancer screening and could potentially be used in a test for bowel cancer.
- The NHS newborn hearing screening programme, introduced in 2002, improves the early detection of hearing impairment in babies, allowing earlier and more effective treatment for the 900 babies born each year in the UK with permanent hearing loss.
- An estimated 73,000 adults are living with HIV in the UK, according to 2006 figures, but around a third of those people haven't been diagnosed and don't know they're infected. Black and ethnic minority populations accounted for just over half of all 7,000 new cases in 2006. Among many other aspects of HIV research, such as the molecular basis of the condition, treatments and diagnosis, MRC scientists are also researching social and behavioural factors.

<http://www.mrc.ac.uk>

Section 3 - Working with the Medical Research Council (MRC).

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	Medical Research Council (MRC)
3.2	Buyer name	Liz Vincent
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£16,667 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	Monday 29 th January 2018 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Thursday 8 th February 2018 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Friday 9 th February 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Friday 16 th February 2018 14:00
3.10	Anticipated selection and the selections of Bids notification date	Tuesday 27 th February 2018
3.11	Anticipated Award date	Tuesday 27 th February 2018
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	Thursday 1 st March 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	Monday 30 th April 2018
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

The UK Research Councils together invest around £3 billion a year in world class research, innovation, facilities and people. We work with international partners to help the best researchers work together across disciplines and borders to meet challenges and deliver impact. The Research Council UK office in the USA (RCUK USA) represents the seven Research Councils in the US, promotes dialogue and works with US research funders and endowments to create an environment that fosters collaboration.

In order to inform the strategic development of RCUK USA, we would like to gain a better understanding of the value and impact of UK-US research. As a first step towards achieving such an understanding, this project aims to provide the office with a valuable long-term resource – a searchable database of impact case studies originally produced for the REF2014 exercise – to serve as exemplars of impact achieved through UK-US collaboration.

In the short term, the outputs of this project will feed in to a second project which will engage a science writer to write up a selection of impact case studies, and produce a publication for a public audience to celebrate UK-US research impact. Outputs will also be used to provide content for future events, visits and publications.

This is a timely project for a number of reasons:

- The formation of UKRI in April 2018 provides an ideal opportunity to showcase the benefits of UK-US collaboration, with the aim of raising the profile of UKRI in the US and celebrating the strength of UK research.
- The ability to articulate the impact of previous joint investments will enable RCUK USA to demonstrate to US funders that continued collaboration with the UK is a good investment. This is particularly important as federal funders in the US have an increasing imperative to demonstrate return on investment.

The impact case studies collected during REF 2014 provide a valuable resource that can provide insight in this area. This project can build on previous work to analyse this data carried out by Digital Science and King's College London¹.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The specific objectives of this project are:

1. To develop a **database of REF Impact Case Studies** that include UK-US collaboration. These will be a subset of the 1,545 case studies which have been geo-tagged as 'United States' by the Digital Science project². Defining the remit of this database will be an iterative process, to remove case studies that have only

¹ King's College London and Digital Science (2015). *The nature, scale and beneficiaries of research impact: An initial analysis of Research Excellence Framework (REF) 2014 impact case studies*. Bristol, UK: HEFCE.

² See impact.ref.ac.uk

tangential relevance to the US and pare down the 1,545 case studies to a more manageable number. The final database should include a diverse range of case studies, in terms of discipline of the underlying research, type of impact, source of funding etc.

2. To **analyse the database** and draw out relevant thematic details (such as type of collaborator, type of impact, source of UK/US funding, US state, other collaborating countries, ODA relevance).

3. Suggested Methodology

Case studies will be drawn from the REF 2014 impact case studies – see <http://impact.ref.ac.uk/CaseStudies/>

This project will use data collected as part of the REF 2014 exercise, which has been compiled into an online database.³ We will share this data with the successful contractor at the start of the project.

It is expected that the contractor will use a mixture of text mining and human coding to refine the database (objective 1). This process might also involve cross-referring to other databases, such as Web of Science, to identify author location details for publications cited in the REF impact case studies. Refining the database will be an iterative process, and the contractor is expected to suggest stage gates at which the project manager will be consulted. The final database should include a minimum of 50 case studies with a diverse spread of research disciplines, geography, impact type, funder etc.,.

Objective 2 is likely to require close reading and manual coding of a maximum of 50 case studies identified through objective 1 to draw out thematic details. However, we welcome suggestions of where text mining / automated approaches might prove valuable.

Contractors may wish to consult previous work carried out on the REF Case Studies dataset, including:

- http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2016/refimpact/Title_108841_en.html
- <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/year/2015/highperform/>
- <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/Cultural/-/Projects/Creative-role-research.aspx>
- <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/publications/The-impacts-of-academic-research-from-Welsh-universities.pdf>
- <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/publications/non-academic-impact-of-international-development-research.pdf>

4. Deliverables

- Detailed work plan, with milestones – within one week of project initiation
- Fortnightly update on project progress
- Interim database of case studies with US collaborators, precise format to be agreed during the project – within three weeks
- Final database of case studies with US collaborators (Objective 1) – within four weeks

³ See impact.ref.ac.uk

- Final database with thematic coding (Objective 2) – within seven weeks
- Draft report outlining key thematic findings, methodologies used and challenges encountered (Objective 2) – within eight weeks
- Final report outlining key thematic findings, methodologies used and challenges encountered (Objectives 2) – by contract end

Terms and Conditions

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 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
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
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms - Justification
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
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 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	PROJ1.2	Risk Management	10%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Methodology	40%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	30%

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:

$$\text{Score} = \{\text{weighting percentage}\} \times \{\text{bidder's score}\} = 20\% \times 60 = 12$$

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 $(60+60+40+40) \div 4 = 50$

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

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

Once the evaluation process and due diligence is complete, should the result of the process result in a tied place(s) then the supplier(s) who scored the highest total in the Quality criterion shall be considered the successful supplier and shall be awarded the opportunity . Should the above still result in a tie we will go to a secondary tie decision which will be who scored the highest total in the Price criterion (Question AW5.2) they shall be considered the successful supplier and shall be awarded the opportunity.

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. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure
- 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 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 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.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority 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 the Contracting Authority 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 must 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 as part of the evaluation process.
- 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 the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 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 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.
- 7.35 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 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.

- 7.39 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, 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.

- 7.41 The Government is introducing 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](#)