

Invitation to Quote



**Biotechnology and
Biological Sciences
Research Council**

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of UKRI - BBSRC

**Subject: UKRI – PS22040 An Impact Evaluation of BBSRC's
Collaborative Research and Development Strategic Portfolio**

Sourcing Reference Number: PS22040

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

Version 8.0

UK OFFICIAL

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

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> |
| Appendix A | Glossary of Terms |

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

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

Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC)

BBSRC invests in world-class bioscience research and training. Their research is helping society to meet major challenges, including food security, green energy and healthier, longer lives and underpinning important UK economic sectors, such as farming, food, industrial biotechnology and pharmaceuticals.

<https://bbsrc.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 | UKRI Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) Polaris House North Star Avenue Swindon Wiltshire SN2 1UH |
| 3.2. | Buyer name | Mary Cheston |
| 3.3. | Buyer contact details | Scientificresearch@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 Messaging Centre of the e-sourcing. Guidance Notes to support the use of Delta eSourcing is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid not being considered. |
| Section 3 - Timescales | | |
| 3.6. | Date of Issue of Contract Advert on Contracts Finder | Tuesday, 08 February 2022 Contracts Finder |
| 3.7. | Latest date / time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Delta eSourcing messaging system | Monday, 21 February 2022 11:00 |
| 3.8. | Latest date / time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Delta eSourcing Portal | Wednesday, 23 February 2022 11:00 |
| 3.9. | Latest date and time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Delta eSourcing | Tuesday, 01 March 2022 11:00 |
| 3.10. | Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids | Wednesday, 09 March 2022 11:00 |
| 3.11. | Anticipated Contract Award date | Wednesday, 09 March 2022 |
| 3.12. | Anticipated Contract Start date | Wednesday, 16 March 2022 |
| 3.13. | Anticipated Contract End date | Friday, 30 September 2022 |
| 3.14. | Bid Validity Period | 90 Days |

Section 4 – Specification

Background

BBSRC is part of UK Research and Innovation, which works in partnership with universities, research organisations, businesses, charities, and government to create the best possible environment for research and innovation to flourish. BBSRC Mission is to promote and support, by any means, high-quality basic, strategic and applied research and related postgraduate training relating to the understanding and exploitation of biological systems. Also to advance knowledge and technology (including the promotion and support of the exploitation of research outcomes), and provide trained scientists and engineers, which meet the needs of users and beneficiaries (including the agriculture, bioprocessing, chemical, food, healthcare, pharmaceutical and other biotechnological related industries), thereby contributing to the economic competitiveness of the United Kingdom and the quality of life. To lead world-class 21st century bioscience, promoting innovation in the bioeconomy and realising benefits for society within and beyond the UK; through Advancing the frontiers of bioscience discovery; Tackling strategic challenges and Building strong foundations e.g. People and talent.

BBSRC works with many partners to benefit everyone through knowledge, talent and ideas. In 2020-2021, we invested £489 million in world-class bioscience. We support around 1,600 scientists and 2,000 research students in universities and institutes across the UK.

BBSRC is committed to the effective evaluation of its investments in research, innovation and training as part of its strategy for evidence-based decision making.

BBSRC's uses evaluation to examine the implementation and impact of its investments, assessing the extent to which the anticipated effects, benefits and costs were realised. Evidence from evaluation supports several key functions including funding decisions, organisational learning, and informing future policy and practice. Evaluation evidence also helps BBSRC to be accountable to a variety of stakeholders (e.g. BEIS, HMT, the public, the research community etc).

Evidence of BBSRC's impact is crucial for demonstrating that we invest public funds responsibly and provides a compelling argument for future investment. The evaluation deliverables will provide robust, externally validated evidence of the impact of BBSRC's investment in collaborative research and development that will strengthen the evidence base that BBSRC requires to meet this need.

BBSRC is part of UK Research and Innovation, a new organisation created to enable the best environment for research and innovation to flourish.

Background to BBSRC's Portfolio of spin-outs

BBSRC plays an important role in engaging and supporting academic researchers and businesses to collaborate on research and development in bioscience and biotechnology. We help businesses to grow and thrive through co-design, co-investment and co-delivery

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>in strategic, industrially-relevant collaborative R&D programmes with the bioscience research base.</p> <p>We provide strategic funding to eight institutes. They deliver innovative, world-class bioscience research and training, leading to wealth and job creation, generating high returns for the UK economy. They have strong links with business, industry and the wider community, and support policy development.</p> <p>The institutes' research underpins key sectors of the UK economy such as agriculture, bioenergy, biotechnology, food and drink and pharmaceuticals. In addition, the institutes maintain unique research facilities of national importance.</p> <p>BBSRC has two cohorts of spin-outs, firstly, those 'university supported spin-outs' from our data collection system 'researchfish' and those spin-outs that have derived from BBSRC-funded institutes. Through both cohorts we have been able to trace around 300—400 businesses whose creation can be attributed to BBSRC. The BBSRC grant awards for research that led to these spin-outs commenced over a fifteen-year period from 2006-2021.</p> <p>As a publicly funded body BBSRC has the responsibility to report the outcomes of our research and demonstrate the value that the research base can add to our economy and to society.</p> | |
| <p>Aims and Objectives of the Project</p> | |
| <p>The aim of this evaluation activity is to conduct an outcomes and impact evaluation of the BBSRC strategic investments in the spin-outs created and supported by BBSRC. This study seeks to monetise the economic impacts delivering a Gross Value Added figure. The Economic Impact Assessment should be designed to consider impact over time as companies develop and grow, collecting evidence over the spin-outs lifecycle.</p> <p>The successful bidder will provide a robust methodology for assessing the economic performance and impact of spinouts supported by BBSRC (60 selected spin-outs) and apply this to our existing dataset. The methodology must be scalable and be able to be repeated in future years as the creation of more spin-outs is supported.</p> <p>The analysis should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested appropriate economic metrics (and potential non-economic) by which to assess spin-outs taking into account the company type e.g. private company, community interest company, charity etc. • Details of spin-outs: length of time in existence, have been purchased (and by whom), other investors i.e. other research councils, number of employees and the economic impact of this employment. • Details and potential of market (overall UK and Global value) the company operates in and details of the competition • Local/regional impact of the company, including employment, and skills base developed or contributed to, expansion (including future plans), investment e.g. any regional development income, collaborations and partnerships, growth characteristics | |

- Supply chains including local suppliers and who they supply to
- Ownership of Intellectual Property rights
- Impact on skills and recruitment practices
- Areas of interest include:
 - Imports and exports (international sales)
 - International sales and collaborations (if possible)
 - Investment, where from including sector and how much
- Innovations (patents, datasets, software etc.) reported by the spin-outs and their economic value and or potential.

The Evaluation Questions are:

- i. **What is the Gross Value added of the cohort of BBSRC companies supplied?**
- ii. **What is the Gross Value added of the cohort of BBSRC companies supplied at specific sectoral level e.g. Industrial Biotechnology, agri-food etc.?**

Case studies of individual spin-outs with coverage across the different bioscience sectors

Proposals should adopt a mixed-methods approach in order to build up a robust picture of spin-out performance over time and contribute to the estimation of economic impact. The proposal should set out how the economic impact assessment will be undertaken, analysed and presented. The same applies to any analysis and the individual case studies.

The economic return should be calculated using a methodology that is compliant with Treasury Green Book and Magenta Book guidance (see more on methodology below), bearing in mind the challenges of quantifying benefits and impacts from fundamental research and development.

We would expect the BBSRC grants data, and outcomes data via researchfish to provide the basis for analysing collaboration, leverage, and other outcomes from the portfolio, with any gaps in the information filled through secondary research methodologies (desk research, literature reviews, interviews, surveys etc.).

In addition to the economic impact study, the expectation is to have case studies from focus areas within BBSRC's portfolio. The case studies should take a holistic view of the benefits arising in the area but aim to provide information on the mechanisms which highlight, for example, benefits or outcomes arising from the spin-out.

Proposals should indicate what methods (i.e. the sampling approach) and tools (i.e. face to face, phone interview etc.) are going to be implemented. The Methodology should be repeatable. It is envisaged that in each case study the impact narrative is developed with clear range estimates on returns to investment/quantifiable benefits (where possible), to demonstrate the impact of BBSRC investment in supported spin-outs.

We envisage the use of analysis, narrative, case studies and data visualisation, to demonstrate the impacts covering qualitative as well as quantified benefits wherever possible. Case studies should have information that will be useful for different audiences

including Treasury/Government, business/investors, and the public. Some aspects that the case studies could bring out (not limited to) are:

- What evidence is there that BBSRC-funded research has led to benefits to the end users, for example to businesses etc. in terms of cost savings, improvement of processes, maximising their productivity, etc.?
- Which industries and sectors have benefitted from the research that has been enabled by BBSRC funding and how?
- What additional private sector leverage has occurred?
- What is the economic value or the quantified benefit of the impact that was enabled by the research partnerships?

Case studies should ensure a balanced view of the strategic portfolio. They are likely to be a mix of individual companies, or individual sectors, and may provide lessons for organisational learning. This will be discussed with the project team.

Data and other information provided by BBSRC to help the study

Successful bidders will be provided with the following information:

1. Data collected through the grants system on applications (currently the Joint electronic Submission (Je-S) form.
2. A set of funded research grants data for investments in spin-outs which will include title, awarded institution name, award value, partners on grants, their contributions, principal investigator (PI) name and a brief summary of the project.
3. Portfolio-level data on project, event and publications
4. Research Outcomes Collection data submitted by the PI in researchfish against those grants that include narrative impact, key findings and any information provided on the following:
 - a. Publications
 - b. Collaborations and partnerships
 - c. Further funding
 - d. Engagement activities
 - e. Influence on policy
 - f. Research tools and methods
 - g. Research databases and models
 - h. Intellectual property and licensing
 - i. Medical products, interventions and clinical trials
 - j. Artistic and creative products
 - k. Software and technical products
 - l. Spinouts
 - m. Awards and recognition
 - n. Other outputs and knowledge
 - o. Use of facilities and resources
 - p. Secondments, placements and internships
5. Any annual or end-of-award reports submitted to BBSRC in addition to the researchfish data.

We anticipate there may be a need for further collection of information, particularly in regards to information which will help to understand and define overall outcomes and wider impacts.

Interaction with successful bidder

We expect the successful bidder to work closely with BBSRC and the evaluation steering board to develop the approaches and methods by which the questions posed in the study could be answered. Regular updates should be provided to the BBSRC project management team through phone/email updates; these should include access to topic guides and other research material used to gather primary information. The successful bidder will be expected to present the methodology to the steering board at the project inception meeting as well as present key findings at set intervals to the steering board to ensure that the project delivers a robust evaluation. The successful bidder would be expected to act on any advice provided by the steering board that is within the scope of the evaluation.

The successful bidder will be required, at any stage (as necessary) and/or at the end of the project, to provide BBSRC with their methodology and any other associated methods / approaches to calculations and findings, as well as providing a copy of all raw and processed data.

3. Suggested Methodology

If applicable:

Total number of Participants (experimental design)

Insert numbers:

0

Total number of Interviews (survey)

60

Total number of Interviews (qualitative)

30

Total number of Focus Groups

2

Total number of Case Studies

5-10

Any other specific requirements

It is anticipated a mixed methods approach will be used. Bidders are expected to identify and justify the most appropriate method(s) and propose approaches to evidencing attribution, and BBSRC's contribution, through investments that support science and innovation in particular industries, e.g. agri-food, industrial biotechnology, etc. and sectors. The methods are expected to also provide insights to the existing evidence and sector baselines, and a counterfactual (see next section).

We are keen to understand the economic impact of BBSRC supported spin-outs and expect the study to highlight demonstrable and quantifiable impacts. We understand

that an assessment of economic impact might attempt to make a qualified quantifiable assessment of the economic value of the outputs that have been achieved by the projects.

The bidder is expected to propose methodologies and plans of how they are going to progress and deliver this study addressing the challenges of impact assessment from investments in fundamental and low Technology Readiness Level (TRL) applied research. The Return on Investment calculations in particular should be based on robust assumptions and sound economic principles. The overall evaluation should follow government guidance on evaluations as outlined in the [Magenta Book](#) which is a complementary guidance to the H.M.Treasury [Green Book](#).

The study should clearly outline any assumptions that are used on any estimation of economic benefit. These might include measures of deadweight, spillovers and leakages, where possible. We would like to see these considerations in the proposal. Given the nature of the study there will be an expectation of relying on estimates drawn from the wider literature; proposals should highlight why these are the best and represent robust estimates in order to help the study draw quantifiable conclusions. Additionally, the bidder should consider the challenges and limitations for the evaluation and propose measures to address these where it is feasible.

The case studies should be developed through in-depth exploration and analysis of evidence and where possible should include quantifiable information. Case studies should be developed such that it can be used for a variety of audience such as policy makers, government departments i.e. Treasury and BEIS, Ministers, general public and others. Bidders are invited to outline the methodologies they will use to meet the aims of the evaluation.

Bidders are encouraged to think innovatively in terms of how they propose to address the evaluation aims, although innovation should not be to the detriment of robustness. The funding partners are keen to push boundaries in their evaluations, in order to improve the quality of their evidence base.

3.1 Data collection

BBSRC will supply a list of company names and companies house numbers (where applicable).

Bidders may wish to consider a combination of data collection and analysis methods, such as from Annual Accounts at Companies House, the Annual Business Survey or using databases such as FAME, Crunchbase and Beauhurst. Proposals should set out how different data collection and analysis methods will be deployed and will be combined to produce the final findings. Further, the proposal should set out how the particular data collection and analysis methods will address the evaluation questions and in a robust manner.

It is envisaged that interviews will need to be undertaken to fill in information gaps such as:

- Employment costs
- Cost of production (supply chain costs)
- Profit
- Spin-out revenue

Bidders are expected to identify and justify their proposed approaches, paying particular attention to evidencing attribution. Where outcomes have not yet materialised, for example due to long lead times, the evaluation must consider whether there are interim outcomes that provide an indication of future impact. In all instances of data collection by the successful bidder, the burden on respondents must be minimised as far as possible.

Data collection must build on what is already collected from award holders and other data sources through existing processes, either of funding organisations or third-parties.

Bidders should consider how to survey or collect data and information from individuals that UKRI does not have funding or contractual relationships with. Hence they will need to consider how data may be obtained efficiently and effectively from these individuals or broader pool of industry to be compliant with GDPR. Bidders should consider the most streamlined way to collect information from these individuals with an aim to maximise quality and rate of response.

If case studies are proposed, bidders should give an overview of what selection/sampling methods (i.e. random selection, willingness to participate approach) and tools (i.e. face to face, phone interview) are going to be implemented, taking into consideration the time and costs of the different tools implemented. Proposals should also set out how case study findings will be analysed and presented.

Primary data collection must build on what is already collected through existing processes, either of funding organisations or third-parties, with any new data collection designed to fill in the gaps. This is to minimise the burden on respondents. The evaluation may utilise data-linking from existing data sets, potentially including to proprietary third-party datasets. Access to these datasets should be considered and costed into proposals.

3.3 Data analysis

Proposals should clearly set out where reliable, quantified impact estimates are expected to be achieved, and where a more qualitative or descriptive approach might be expected. It should also include an ROI for the portfolio where possible.

We anticipate this will be challenging due to an imperfect/incomplete evidence base and uncertain future impact, but the evaluator should use sensitivity and/or scenario analysis to produce a best possible estimate. In view of the estimated the return on investment, the evaluator should assess the value for money of the programme using appropriate benchmarks.

Analysis methods could include, but are not limited to econometric analysis including counterfactuals, analysis of primary or secondary data or theory-based techniques such as contribution analysis.

If an econometric analysis and survey is proposed as a method for evaluation, the bidders should indicate the type (face to face/phone/online) of survey to be implemented and should provide the required sample size in the bid, power analysis where relevant (with an aim to achieve appropriate statistical significance) and how low power issues will be mitigated if the evaluation were to encounter them. Bidders should also comment on any strategies to maximise the response rate.

Counterfactual Group

The bidders should also consider a variety of counterfactuals e.g. the additionality of our intervention by following up funded/unfunded projects, participating / non-participating

industry. Also, a baseline of comparative businesses, which if using econometric analysis, could be selected using the Virtual Micro Laboratory to access the BERD and other databases. Bidders may consider using Propensity Score Matching, and a Difference-in-Difference approach and conduct some econometric analysis on the growth of companies over time.

If bidders propose the use of control groups as part of the evaluation design then proposals should outline which control group(s) and what characteristics will be used for the purposes of comparison, how data will be collected from the sample (both treatment and control groups), including how any issues around securing engagement and participation from treatment and control groups would be addressed.

Specific Challenges and limitations

During impact evaluations there can be a number of challenges and limitations some of which are noted here.

Attribution: measuring the extent to which the outcomes and impacts could be attributed to BBSRC can be difficult. However, we would hope through the survey that some of the challenges surrounding attribution to businesses can be overcome. We acknowledge that there is increased difficulty in measuring attribution due to changes in policy and practice as a result of the programme.

Difficulty tracking benefits: long timeframes, lag effects, uncertainty, and organisational changes making benefits difficult to track

Spillovers: spillover benefits to other businesses and wider society are generally difficult to measure and predict.

The broad objectives and wide area of interest of this portfolio, in comparison to other programmes, may impact on the ability of the evaluators to draw specific conclusions about the impact of the portfolio. In addition, monitoring arrangements may be limited in the type of data that can be collected.

When surveying successful and unsuccessful applicants, there may be issues with the use of self-assessment data and unsuccessful applicants may not wish to participate. The evaluation supplier should take this into consideration and develop an evaluation methodology and approach that mitigates against this limitation. Furthermore, access to privileged, confidential, commercial and personal data for evaluation purposes may be restricted through GDPR and data sharing agreements.

The bidder should consider how to survey or collect data and information from individuals that UKRI does not have funding or contractual relationships with. Hence the bidder will need to consider how data may be obtained efficiently and effectively from these individuals or broader pool of industry to be compliant with GDPR. Bidders should consider the most streamlined way to collect information from these individuals with an aim to maximise quality and rate of response.

4. Deliverables

The evaluation is expected to provide the following deliverables:

- A Return on Investment (ROI) for BBSRC funded research in supported spin-outs.

- Report covering cumulative and detailed economic analysis.
- Raw data associated with the spin-outs
- Any model or modelling tools used to estimate economic impacts in an Annex. It should be noted that the methodology should be repeatable.
- Phase 1: Conception report to agree the methodology – **31 March 2022**
- Phase 2: Interim report – **30 July 2022**
- Phase 3: Final report based on study findings, including the estimation of economic benefits arising from BBSRC's spin-outs and case studies – **30 September 2022**

Quality assurance of the study and its outputs will be done by the BBSRC appointed Steering Board for the study.

In addition to this, regular progress updates are required to the BBSRC Senior Manager for Evidence and Evaluation throughout the project. This may be in the form of fortnightly to monthly calls with a short status report. The updates would include progress updates on evaluation and a summary presentation of key findings and messages to date.

Any reports planned for publication will be reviewed by BBSRC and/or UKRI. The successful bidder will be expected to make amendments to deliverables in order to satisfactorily respond to comments before publication. Where appropriate peer review comments may be sought and published alongside deliverables. The successful bidder is also expected to present the findings at the end of the project as outlined in Phase 3.

The successful bidder is expected to produce and deliver reports that are:

- Clearly presented with the use of graphics, diagrams and visuals to highlight findings.
- Readable and easy to understand by the general public and non-experts
- Written succinctly with a focus on the findings through data collection and analysis

The successful bidder is also expected to:

- Apply intelligence to the data collected and analysis
- Ensure accuracy and clear assumptions of data used.
- Ensure recommendations are based on robust evidence
- Provide accompanying statistics and data with discussions and explanation of the impact of these data.

All data collected during evaluation must be made available, on request, to contracting organisations or third parties under contract to them, for the purposes of additional research and evaluation. Data from programme participants must be collected in such a way to enable this to happen. Proposals must clearly state how this will be achieved and any limitations to data sharing which may exist.

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.

The evaluation and if required team may comprise staff from UK SBS and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation and if required moderation 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 | SEL1.3 | Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act |
| Commercial | SEL2.12 | General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Act and the Data Protection Act 2018 |
| Commercial | FOI1.1 | Freedom of Information |
| Commercial | AW1.1 | Form of Bid |
| Commercial | AW1.3 | Certificate of Bona Fide Bid |
| Commercial | AW3.1 | Validation check |
| Commercial | AW4.1 | Compliance to the Contract Terms |
| Commercial | AW4.2 | Changes to the Contract Terms |
| Price | AW5.1 | Maximum Budget |
| Quality | AW6.1 | Compliance to the Specification |
| Quality | AW6.2 | Variable Bids |
| Quality | PROJ1.6 | Capacity |
| - | - | Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool |
| In the event of a Bidder failing to meet the requirements of a Mandatory pass / fail criteria, the Contracting Authority reserves the right to disqualify the Bidder and not consider evaluation of any of the Award stage scoring methodology or Mandatory pass / fail criteria. | | |

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 | 10% |
| Quality | PROJ1.1 | Approach/Methodology | 35% |
| Quality | PROJ1.2 | Staff to Deliver | 20% |
| Quality | PROJ1.3 | Understanding the Research and Innovation Environment and Landscape | 20% |
| Quality | PROJ1.4 | Project Plan and Timescales | 10% |
| Quality | PROJ1.5 | Risk Management | 5% |

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 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 there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score as follows:

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

Once the above evaluation process has been undertaken and the scores are apportioned by evaluator(s) this will then be subject to an independent commercial review and moderation meeting, if required by the commercial lead, any and all changes will be formally recorded relative to the regulatory obligations associated with this procurement, so as to ensure that the procurement has been undertaken in a robust and transparent way.

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.

This evaluation criteria will therefore not be subject to any averaging, as this is a mathematical scoring criteria, but will still be subject to a commercial review.

Evaluation process

The evaluation process will feature some, if not all, the following phases.

| Stage | Summary of activity |
|---|--|
| Receipt and Opening | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ITQ logged upon opening in alignment with UK SBS's procurement procedures. Any ITQ Bid received after the closing date will be rejected unless circumstances attributed to the Contracting Authority or the e-sourcing tool beyond the bidder control are responsible for late submission. |
| Compliance check | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check all Mandatory requirements are acceptable to the Contracting Authority. Unacceptable Bids maybe subject to clarification by the Contracting Authority or rejection of the Bid. |
| Scoring of the Bid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation team will independently score the Bid and provide a commentary of their scoring justification against the criteria. |
| Clarifications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Evaluation team may require written clarification to Bids |
| Re - scoring of the Bid and Clarifications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following Clarification responses, the Evaluation team reserve the right to independently re-score the Bid and Clarifications and provide a commentary of their re-scoring justification against the Evaluation criteria. |
| Moderation meeting (if required to reach an award decision) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To review the outcomes of the Commercial review To agree final scoring for each Bid, relative rankings of the Bids |
| Due diligence of the Bid | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Contracting Authority may request the following requirements at any stage of the Procurement. Submission of insurance documents from the Bidder Request for evidence of documents / accreditations referenced in the / Invitation to Quote response / Bid and / or Clarifications from the Bidder Taking up of Bidder references from the Bidders Customers. Financial Credit check for the Bidder |
| Validation of unsuccessful Bidders | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To confirm contents of the letters to provide details of scoring and meaningful feedback on the unsuccessful Bidders Bid in comparison with the successful Bidders Bid. |

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

Guidance on how to register and use the e-sourcing portal 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 Delta eSourcing 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 Delta eSourcing, Telephone 0845 270 7050
- 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 the Delta eSourcing Portal.
- 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 90 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 Delta eSourcing Portal.
- 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 the Delta eSourcing Portal.
- 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

- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)

8.0 Freedom of information

8.4.1 In accordance with the obligations and duties placed upon public authorities by the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (the 'FoIA') and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (the 'EIR') (each as amended from time to time), UK SBS or the Contracting Authority may be required to disclose information submitted by the Bidder to the to the Contracting Authority.

8.4.2 In respect of any information submitted by a Bidder that it considers to be commercially sensitive the Bidder should complete the Freedom of Information declaration question defined in the Question FOI1.2.

8.4.3 Where a Bidder identifies information as commercially sensitive, the Contracting Authority will endeavour to maintain confidentiality. Bidders should note, however, that, even where information is identified as commercially sensitive, the Contracting Authority may be required to disclose such information in accordance with the FoIA or the Environmental Information Regulations. In particular, the Contracting Authority is required to form an independent judgment concerning whether the information is exempt from disclosure under the FoIA or the EIR and whether the public interest favours disclosure or not. Accordingly, the Contracting Authority cannot guarantee that any information marked 'confidential' or "commercially sensitive" will not be disclosed.

8.4.4 Where a Bidder receives a request for information under the FoIA or the EIR during the procurement, this should be immediately passed on to UK SBS or the Contracting Authority and the Bidder should not attempt to answer the request without first consulting with the Contracting Authority.

8.4.5 Bidders are reminded that the Government's transparency agenda requires that sourcing documents, including ITQ templates such as this, are published on a designated, publicly searchable web site, and, that the same applies to other sourcing documents issued by UK SBS or the Contracting Authority, and any contract entered into by the Contracting Authority with its preferred supplier once the procurement is complete. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their participation and contents of their Response may be made public.

8.5. Response Validity

8.5.1 Your Response should remain open for consideration for a period of 90 days. A Response valid for a shorter period may be rejected.

8.6. Timescales

8.6.1 [Section 3](#) of the ITQ sets out the proposed procurement timetable. the Contracting Authority reserves the right to extend the dates and will advise potential Bidders of any change to the dates.

8.7. The Contracting Authority's Contact Details

8.7.1 Unless stated otherwise in these Instructions or in writing from UK SBS or the Contracting Authority, all communications from Bidders (including their sub-contractors, consortium members, consultants and advisers) during the period of this procurement must be directed through the e-sourcing tool to the designated UK SBS contact.

8.7.2

All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool may be submitted to Delta eSourcing on 0845 270 7050 please not this is a free self-registration website and this

can be done by completing the online questionnaire at <https://uksbs.delta-esourcing.com/>

8.7.3 Bidders should be mindful that the designated Contact should not under any circumstances be sent a copy of their Response outside of the e-sourcing tool. Failure to follow this requirement will result in disqualification of the Response.

Appendix ‘A’ Glossary of Terms

| TERM | MEANING |
|---|---|
| “UK SBS” | means UK Shared Business Services Ltd herein after referred to as UK SBS. |
| “Bid”, “Response”, “Submitted Bid”, or “ITQ Response” | means the Bidders formal offer in response to this Invitation to Quote |
| “Bidder(s)” | means the organisations being invited to respond to this Invitation to Quote |
| “Central Purchasing Body” | means a duly constituted public sector organisation which procures supplies/services/works for and on behalf of contracting authorities |
| “Conditions of Bid” | means the terms and conditions set out in this ITQ relating to the submission of a Bid |
| “Contract” | means the agreement to be entered by the Contracting Authority and the Supplier following any award under the procurement |
| “Contracting Bodies” | means the Contracting Authority and any other contracting authorities described in the Contracts Finder Contract Notice |
| “Contracting Authority” | A public body regulated under the Public Procurement Regulations on whose behalf the procurement is being run |
| “Customer” | means the legal entity (or entities) for which any Contract agreed will be made accessible to. |
| “Due Diligence Information” | means the background and supporting documents and information provided by the Contracting Authority for the purpose of better informing the Bidders responses to this ITQ |
| "EIR" | mean the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or relevant Government department in relation to such regulations |
| “FoIA” | means the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and any subordinate legislation made under such Act from time to time together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or relevant Government department in relation to such legislation |
| “Invitation to Quote” or “ITQ” | means this Invitation to Quote documentation and all related documents published by the Contracting Authority and made available to Bidders and includes the Due Diligence Information. NOTE: This document is often referred to as an Invitation to Tender within other organisations |
| “Mandatory” | Means a pass / fail criteria which must be met in order for a Bid to be considered, unless otherwise specified. |
| “Named Procurement person ” | means the single point of contact for the Contracting Authority based in UK SBS that will be dealing with the procurement |
| “Order” | means an order for served by any Contracting Body on the Supplier |
| “Other Public Bodies” | means all Contracting Bodies except the Contracting Authority |
| “Supplier(s)” | means the organisation(s) awarded the Contract |
| “Supplies / Services / Works” | means any supplies/services and supplies or works set out at within <u>Section 4 Specification</u> |