Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Research England

Subject: Knowledge exchange funding: Novel Evaluation Methods

Sourcing Reference Number: CR19047

Shared **Business Services**

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

Version 3.6

Table of Contents

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for the Contracting Authorities of shared business services in the UK public sector, continuously reducing cost and improving quality of business services for Government and the public sector.

Our broad range of expert services is shared by our Contracting Authorities. This allows Contracting Authorities the freedom to focus resources on core activities; innovating and transforming their own organisations.

Core services include Procurement, Finance, Grants Admissions, Human Resources, Payroll, ISS, and Property Asset Management all underpinned by our Service Delivery and Contact Centre teams.

UK SBS is a people rather than task focused business. It's what makes us different to the traditional transactional shared services centre. What is more, being a not-for-profit organisation owned by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), UK SBS' goals are aligned with the public sector and delivering best value for the UK taxpayer.

UK Shared Business Services Ltd changed its name from RCUK Shared Services Centre Ltd in March 2013.

Our Customers

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Services (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.
Our Contracting Authorities who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed here.

Privacy Statement

At UK Shared Business Services (UK SBS) we recognise and understand that your privacy is extremely important and we want you to know exactly what kind of information we collect about you and how we use it.

This privacy notice link below details what you can expect from UK SBS when we collect your personal information.

- We will keep your data safe and private.
- We will not sell your data to anyone.
- We will only share your data with those you give us permission to share with and only for legitimate service delivery reasons.

https://www.uksbs.co.uk/use/pages/privacy.aspx

For details on how the Contracting Authority protect and process your personal data please follow the link below:

https://www.ukri.org/privacy-notice/

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Research England

Research England is a new council within UK Research and Innovation, operating from April 2018. As a key component of the research funding system, Research England will oversee UK Research and Innovation’s England-only functions in relation to university research and knowledge exchange. This includes providing grant funding to English universities for research and knowledge exchange activities; developing and implementing the Research Excellence Framework in partnership with the UK Higher Education funding bodies; overseeing the sustainability of the Higher Education research base in England; overseeing the £900 million UK Research Partnership Investment Fund; and the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF).

https://re.ukri.org

UK Research and Innovation

Operating across the whole of the UK and with a combined budget of more than £6 billion, UK Research and Innovation represents the largest reform of the research and innovation funding landscape in the last 50 years.

As an independent non-departmental public body UK Research and Innovation brings together the seven Research Councils (AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, STFC) plus Innovate UK and a new organisation, Research England.

UK Research and Innovation ensures the UK maintains its world-leading position in research and innovation. This is done by creating the best environment for research and innovation to flourish.

For more information, please visit: www.ukri.org

Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

In this section you will find details of your Procurement contact point and the timescales relating to this opportunity.

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority Name and address	Research England Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SR
3.2	Buyer name	Declan Ward
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£50,000.00 Excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	**All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	Monday 01st July 2019
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Monday 08th July 2019 at 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Tuesday 09th July 2019 at 14.00
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Monday 15th July 2019 at 14.00
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Monday 22nd July 2019
3.12	Anticipated Award date	Wednesday 24th July 2019
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	Monday 29th July 2019
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	Friday 11th October 2019
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

Research England

The Higher Education and Research Act (HERA) 2017 established Research England as a Council of UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) alongside the other existing Councils (the seven Research Councils and Innovate UK). Research England is formed of the Research and Knowledge Exchange functions of the former Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE).

Research England (RE) shapes healthy, dynamic research and knowledge exchange in English universities. RE is responsible for funding, engaging with and understanding these institutions, and working with devolved funding bodies and the Office for Students to understand their strategies, capabilities and capacity. RE supports and challenges universities to create new knowledge, strengthen the economy and enrich society.

RE distributes over £2.2 billion to universities in England every year, principally through quality-related research (QR) funding, and the Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF), as well as c. £180m in formula-based research capital. We are responsible for administering the Research Excellence Framework, used to inform QR funding, and for delivering the forthcoming Knowledge Exchange Framework.

Higher Education Innovation Fund (HEIF)

In 1999, HEFCE "third stream" funding began with the introduction of funds specifically to support institutions to increase their capacity and capability for Knowledge Exchange (KE) - the broad range of knowledge-based interactions between higher education institutions and the wider world, which result in economic and social impact.

The initial aim of this funding was to achieve culture change and embed capacity and capability for knowledge exchange within HE, with a view to establishing a continuing stream of KE funding (now called HEIF) to underpin on-going KE infrastructure (e.g. a tech transfer office) and activities, akin to HEFCE's other recurrent formula streams.

Initially, funding was awarded solely to time-limited projects. These projects, together with development and implementation of the Higher Education – Business and Community Interaction (HE-BCI) Survey, then provided the basis for developing the formula funding approach to HEIF. HEIF has been allocated through formula since 2006 and is now administered by Research England. In 2016/17, 97 English institutions received HEIF funding.

There has been increased focus on KE funding/activities over time. Recently, for example, a specific definition of KE was included in HERA, with specific powers identified for UKRI and RE to support KE. KE, and particularly commercialisation, is an important focus in the Government's Industrial Strategy. RE now allocates additional project funding for KE, in parallel with the HEIF formula, to achieve specific objectives, including through its Research England Development (RED) Fund[1] and the Connecting Capability Fund (CCF)[2].

A number of other funders support universities to undertake KE activities. Many KE activities are and should be supported by users (reflecting economic/value for money, legal and regulatory arrangements for KE).

Past evaluation of HEIF

In 2008, HEFCE commissioned a major evaluation of the early achievements of HEIF in embedding a culture and capacity within HEIs that supports KE. The report from PACEC consultants and the Centre for Business and Research at Cambridge University was published in April 2009[2]. There were two main challenges in evaluating HEIF;

First, a number of different funding streams had supported the KE infrastructure and the activities being evaluated. Universities were likely to have focussed these different streams cumulatively to build long-term capacity/capability related to their areas of KE strength. KE impacts are likely to emerge long-term. Hence it was unlikely that impacts could be attributed specifically to specific funding streams, as with project funding. The evaluation addressed this by evaluating the progress of the universities in KE, rather than evaluating specific streams of funding. It did, however, comment on the differential effects of different types of funding (specifically projects v formula funding).

Second, the evaluation demonstrated considerable diversity:

- of KE mechanisms used between HE and wider users
- of users engaged with HEIs
- of HEIs that are active in this space
- in the uses of HEIF

and the importance of HEIF in enabling institutions to build solid foundations to engage with external users.

It concluded that overall the flexibility offered by formula funding was preferred and was likely to lead to greater return through the opportunities to be agile, responding to specific user needs, opportunities for leverage and specific real-world circumstances.

The 2009 evaluation used a mixed mode method of evaluation, involving both qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative approach was effective to estimate an overall rate of return from HEIF, using a cost-benefit balance sheet approach comparing HEIF inputs with impacts - using the HE-BCI survey income measures as a proxy for impact. This approach coped well with the flexibility of HEIF and the diversity of HEIs/partners/types of KE mechanisms.

The 2009 evaluation was updated in 2015, with an evaluation focussed on quantitative impacts[3], based on, but refining, the 2009 quantitative method, and a separate study on the non-monetised achievements from HEIF[4].

Data collected to underpin evaluation

Research England regularly collects KE data from universities to inform policy, provide accountability for HEIF and to underpin evaluations. This includes annual return of data to the HE-BCI survey managed by HESA, which is a condition of grant. It also includes data collected on use of HEIF.

In 2016, as part of accountability for HEIF, institutions with 2016-17 allocations were invited to submit five-year KE strategies. Future HEIF allocations were then dependent on the acceptance of these strategies (HEFCE_2016/16). As part of this reporting, data was collected on projected HEIF expenditures (expenditure out-turns for each AY are then confirmed in RE annual monitoring system (AMS) arrangements):

- By types of expenditure – KE (non-academic) staff costs; academic costs; other project costs
- By categories of KE infrastructure/function
  - Facilitating the research exploitation process (non-TT)
  - Commercialisation (technology transfer)
  - Skills and human capital development
  - Knowledge sharing and diffusion
  - Supporting the community and public engagement
  - Social enterprise and entrepreneurship
  - Exploiting the HEI's physical assets

A report assessing these strategies was published in 2017[5] and included a high-level breakdown of HEIF expenditures across the HE sector. The breakdown of HEIF by types and categories of expenditure as above is calculated annually with AMS data.

Evaluations of HEIF have produced average returns on investment (ROIs) of HEIF at the whole institution/sector level. They have also examined the differences of ROI by cluster type of the institution (also examined in the new KE Framework development). However, data was collected in the 2016 strategies to enable more disaggregated information on ROI by KE infrastructure/function category. The hypothesis was that ROI of use of HEIF for different KE functions, as well as by different types of university, was likely to vary.

HEIs were asked to breakdown their projected use of HEIF across expenditure types, and to link these expenditure types with %s of HE-BCI outputs of various sorts, and to attribute those outputs to HEIF. So, as example, 'university X' might:

- use £1 million of its HEIF allocation on a technology transfer office/unit (TTO)
- attribute 80% of its licensing income, 100% of its spin-outs and 20% of its graduate start-ups to the TT unit
- and attribute 45% of those outputs to HEIF

These data were collected to enable more detailed information on the achievements of HEIF, for example whether it delivered greater ROI through funding for tech transfer than, for example, through funding skills developments.

RE collected more detailed evidence on uses of HEIF in HEIF plans submitted and approved in 2018-19, which sat alongside previously approved institutional strategies. This additional data was required due to additional accountability requirements on uses of additional HEIF from the CCF and to deliver the Industrial Strategy. Research England will be reviewing the strategies and plans templates, to identify data needed for assurance of HEIF, for the next HEIF round due to begin from 2020-21. This data may be useful for the next HEIF evaluation, and this tender should consider the design of strategies/plans templates as a potential source of evaluation evidence.

The Next Evaluation of HEIF

A major evaluation of HEIF is now planned for 2020-21. This is likely to build on past approaches using qualitative and quantitative methodologies, focusing on evaluation of progress of the institutions/HE sector, rather than evaluating specific funding streams. It is planned to evaluate the effects on progress of HEIs in KE from HEIF formula funding, the CCF and RED fund KE projects.

It is likely that the next evaluation will use similar quantitative techniques to past studies.

This tender is then focussed on novel approaches that could be used in the qualitative aspects to the planned evaluation and particularly the potential opportunities to use theory of change/logic model approaches.

The central challenges in evaluating HEIF are:

- the diversity of the HEIs and their KE activities
- the flexible nature of HEIF, which fits well with institutional diversity and flexible nature of formula funding but makes theory of change narratives more complicated
- the effect of additional RE funds i.e. CCF on formula funding
- identifying the long-term impacts that are generated from HE activity and likelihood that these impacts will have been driven by multiple inputs, e.g. HEIF and CCF

Established quantitative approaches have coped well with the diverse character of KE and flexibility of formula funding, generating good evidence on the return on investment of HEIF based on the probability of causation of inputs to outputs. These have also coped well with the long-term nature of impacts, through using cumulative regression analysis. However, quantitative approaches provide high-level and averaged results, and do not provide details of how different uses of HEIF drive different and specific impacts. As examples –

- how does funding for a tech transfer unit specifically deliver an increase in IP licensing income?
- how does funding an enterprise education unit specifically deliver increased numbers of graduate start-ups, or improved employability of graduates in business or other enterprises?

In summary, this work is intended to provide Research England with the basis to:

- Provide better explanation of how our funding drives success, including how different university KE functions and different additional inputs (academics, users etc) contribute to achievements. This includes increasing the understanding that HEIF drives value across the breadth of KE functions/activities.
- Provides more detail/granularity on the value generated by HEIF, beyond an average ROI figure for HEIF which may be generated by quantitative analysis or ROIs by HEI cluster type. Focussing on differential value created by HEIF by KE category may help particularly the identification and dissemination of best practices.
- But is consistent with a flexible, formula funding approach to allocating HEIF, as example, recognising synergies and interdependencies between KE functions/activities (e.g. running an incubator and enterprise education support).
- And is built upon an appropriate level of burden, commensurate with levels of funds allocated for KE.

1. https://re.ukri.org/finance/apply-for-funding/research-england-development-red-fund/

2. https://re.ukri.org/knowledge-exchange/the-connecting-capability-fund-ccf/
3. Assessing the economic impacts of the Higher Education Innovation Fund: A mixed-method quantitative assessment, Tomas Coates Ulrichsen, Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation Policy (University of Cambridge)
4. Evaluating the non-monetised achievements of the Higher Education Innovation Fund, Public and Corporate Economic Consultants (PACEC)
5. The state of the English university knowledge exchange landscape (RSM PACEC, 2017)

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The focus of this study is to explore methods than may expose the relationships between the uses of HEIF by KE category and the resulting outputs, but at a sufficiently high-level or aggregated basis to provide an appropriate picture for the large-scale English HE sector as a whole, and with proportionate burden.

The study is primarily focussed on causation of impacts by inputs, taking the HE-BCI survey as a main source of evidence on outputs/outcomes/impacts. It is also primarily focussed on larger scale uses of HEIF and activity areas that appear to generate highest ROIs (e.g. measured in HE-BCI income), particularly research exploitation and Continuing Professional Development (CPD). It is not primarily focussed on non-monetised KE i.e. the broader range of activities and impacts that are not presently well described in HE-BCI (e.g. public engagement). This is because there are a range of challenges in identifying value of non-monetised KE work, and other analytical work (to be considered in separate exercises) may be required on these areas.

The aims of this work are to:

- Identify and appraise novel methods that can be used in the qualitative evaluation of HEIF, focused on approaches to explaining at a high-level links between HEIF inputs by KE categories and main outputs (e.g. from HE-BCI).
- Develop a limited series of logic models that describe the main uses of HEIF from expenditure data and provide better explanations of the range of KE functions/activities and high-level causal explanations of how these link to the main quantitative outputs. This should aim to support future evaluations to move away from an average ROI approach. The study may also consider opportunities to look at change over time – for example, effects of inflection points (such as additional Industrial Strategy funding).
- Address the challenge of how to take into account the diversity of HEIs and of their partners, without producing a bespoke series of logic models for each type of HEI/type of partner/detailed mechanism.
- **Not** produce an audit of KE activities, detailed descriptions of every use of HEIF or a list of HEIF outputs and impacts.

The evidence and analysis within this piece of work will:

- Inform the design and methodologies for the future HEIF evaluation in 2020-21. This should consider the design of strategies/plans templates as a potential source of evaluation evidence .
- Provide pilot results to show illustrative logic models
- Comment on how to improve and embed the approaches and learning about theory of change in RE's work more generally

The objectives of this work are to:

- Produce a literature review summarising approaches to Theory of Change modelling that relate particularly to KE activities and to formula funding approaches
- Comment on other novel methods approaches that may be relevant
- Develop high level conceptual / explanatory frameworks that could be used to evaluate HEIF e.g. logic models
- Gather evidence to test the proposed frameworks/models through workshops convened by PraxisAuril – producing a library of refined examples
- Assess the feasibility of implementing these frameworks in an evaluation.
- Present conclusions and recommendations on the methodologies that could/should be employed for the full evaluation.

Conducting the full evaluation of HEIF is not included in this tender.

3. Suggested Methodology

a. Conduct literature review on logic model insights relevant to HE KE and formula funding
b. Develop conceptual framework
c. Generate primary evidence from working groups to test framework (additional data collection outside of these working groups will not be required)
d. Use evidence to refine framework and inform recommendations for future evaluations

4. Deliverables

The successful bidder will be expected to:

Phase 1 – by end of August

- Deliver a summary literature review on logic model insights relevant to HE KE and formula funding and if appropriate presenting further novel methods that could be used in evaluation of HEIF.

Phase 2 – by end of August

- Describe a conceptual framework to describe at least seven KE function/activity areas and outline the methodological approach that will be used to gather evidence and refine the proposed models. The models and approach will be subject to approval by Research England before proceeding to the next phase.

Phase 3 - by end of September

- Attend working groups co-ordinated by PraxisAuril. The successful bidder is expected to use these working groups to test the proposed framework/models and to generate primary evidence to refine them (they will not be expected to conduct any further data collection outside of these workshops).
- Produce a draft report presenting the refined logic models and recommendations on the design of future evaluations. This report will be subject to approval by Research England before proceeding to the next phase.

Phase 4 – by 11th October

- Produce a final report containing the summary literature review, refined logic models and the conclusions and recommendations on the methods that should be employed for future evaluations

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÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria

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

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

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

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%

Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/ Methodology	35%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Project Environment	15%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20**%**.
Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:
Score = {weighting percentage} x {bidder's score} = 20% x 60 = 12

The same logic will be applied to groups of questions which equate to a single evaluation criterion.

The 0-100 score shall be based on (unless otherwise stated within the question):

0	The Question is not answered, or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.
40	Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.
60	Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
80	Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.
100	Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider.

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

Example
Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40
Your final score will (60+60+40+40) ÷ 4 = 50

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100.
All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion.

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.
Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.
Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.
Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 (80/100 x 50 = 40)

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

Bidders should note that the evaluation questionnaire is located within the **e-sourcing questionnaire.**

Guidance on completion of the questionnaire is available at **http://www.uksbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx**

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Responses received after the date indicated in the ITQ shall not be considered by the Contracting Authority, unless the Bidder can justify that the reason for the delay, is solely attributable to the Contracting Authority

7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.

7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission, we may reject your Bid.

7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution

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

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

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

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

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

7.11 Do ensure that the Response and any documents accompanying it are in the English Language, the Contracting Authority reserve the right to disqualify any full or part responses that are not in English.

7.12 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

What makes a good bid – some simple do not's ☹

DO NOT

7.13 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.14 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.

7.15 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.16 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.

7.17 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.18 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.19 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.20 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.21 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.22 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.23 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.24 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity.

Some additional guidance notes

7.25 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

7.26 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.

7.27 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.28 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.29 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.30 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.

7.31 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.32 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.33 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public

7.35 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.36 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified, we may reject your Bid.

7.37 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.

7.38 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.39 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

7.40 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

7.41 All timescales are set using a 24-hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.42 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non-Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, the Contracting Authority may disclose within Government any of the Bidders documentation/information (including any that the Bidder considers to be confidential and/or commercially sensitive such as specific bid information) submitted by the Bidder to the Contracting Authority during this Procurement. The information will not be disclosed outside Government. Bidders taking part in this ITQ consent to these terms as part of the competition process.

7.43 The Government introduced its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme on the 2nd April 2014 to replace the current Government Protective Marking System (GPMS). A key aspect of this is the reduction in the number of security classifications used. All Bidders are encouraged to make themselves aware of the changes and identify any potential impacts in their Bid, as the protective marking and applicable protection of any material passed to, or generated by, you during the procurement process or pursuant to any Contract awarded to you as a result of this tender process will be subject to the new GSC. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-security-classifications

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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