Procurement Document Library

ITQ Invitation to Quote

Version Control

Date	Version	Section affected	Reason for change
10/12/2013	1.0	All Areas	Final Template Version
03/02/2103	1.1	All Areas	Name change GPS - CCS
04/03/2014	1.2	All Areas	Changes from PPN09/13 and 01/14
07/04/2014	1.3	All Areas	Enhancements to Section 5.
04/11/2014	1.4	All Areas	Change to Section 5 narrative
20/03/2015	1.5	All Areas	Branding – Version Control
14/05/2015	1.6	Section 5 – Evaluation Model	Amendments to scoring methodology and evaluation wording

UKSBS

Shared **Business** Services

Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of INNOVATE UK

Subject UK SBS Evaluation of Urban Citizen Dialogue

Sourcing reference number BLOJEU-CR150051INNUK

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

UKSBS

Shared **Business Services**

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 customers improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Customers, our growth projections anticipate this will rise to £1bn in 2013/14.

Our Customers who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed here.

Our achievements

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

- Reduced the Research Councils' 'back office' expenditure from £32m to £31.3m
- Saved £33m for the Research Councils in verified procurement savings, being greater than the entire cost of the services we provided to them
- Grew our customers from 7 to 22 (this will likely grow by a further 10 in 2013/14)
- Grew our customer base from 11,000 to 18,000 and will likely expand to 23,000+ in 2013/14

- Achieved an annual spend with SMEs that stands out across Central Government as a leading light at 32% (that's over £104.5M) against the 25% Government target

Our Procurement ambition

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

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

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

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

We are ideally positioned to "lead the charge" in the government's initiative to reform procurement in the public sector.

UK SBS Procurement's unique selling points are:

- Focus on the full procurement cycle

- Leaders in category management in common and specialised areas

- Expertise in the delivery of major commercial projects

- That we are leaders in procurement to support research

- Use of cutting edge technologies which are superior to those used generally used across the public sector.

- Use of market leading analytical tools to provide comprehensive Business Intelligence

- Active customer and supplier management

> *'UK SBS' contribution to the Government Procurement Agenda has been impressive. Through innovation and leadership UK SBS has built an attractive portfolio of procurement services from P2P to Strategy Category Management.'*
>
> **John Collington**
>
> **Former Government Chief Procurement Officer**

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Innovate UK

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

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

Success Stories

- A successful partnership with Strathclyde University has led to rapid growth at Glasgow business Clyde Space and the award of a contract by the UK Space Consortium for testing, construction and assembly of UKube-1, the UK's first CubeSat system.

- Start-up business Snap Fashion founded by 25-year-old computer science graduate has attracted £300k in private investment and launched an innovative search engine, website and iPhone app on the market after taking part in the 2011 Tech City Launchpad competition.

- With sustained support from Innovate UK, Fife company *PowerPhotonic* has perfected novel techniques for mass producing tiny lenses that get all the individual beams coming from a laser pointing in the right direction. High powered industrial lasers now have a sharper cutting edge thanks to lenses made in Scotland that focus their light into brighter beams - and the repercussions will be far-reaching.

Section 3 - Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Customer Name and address	Innovate UK North Star House North Star Avenue Swindon Wiltshire SN2 1UE
3.2	Buyer name	UK Shared Business Services
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@UKSBS.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£15,000.00 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	09/07/2015 –Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	15/07/2015 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	17/07/2015 14.00
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	22/07/2015 14.00pm
3.11	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	29/07/2015 14.00pm
3.12	Anticipated Award date	29/07/2015
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	31/07/2015
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	March 2016
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

Introduction

Innovate UK fund, support and connect innovative businesses to accelerate sustainable economic growth. We are sponsored by the Department of Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and award £500 million each year in grant funding to UK businesses that are meeting the challenges society faces, both now and in the future.

Much of this funding is carried out by the Innovation Programme at Innovate UK, which has a number of teams looking at specific issues, such as independent living, or low impact vehicles. This project is being run by the Urban Living Innovation Platform (ULIP) team – whose remit is to look at the opportunities for creating more sustainable and more resilient urban areas through the integration of multiple systems – such as food, energy, travel, health, the built environment, resource flow, etc.

ULIP is a new part of the Innovation Programme, formed, at least in part, in response to the global trends in urbanisation, and to research which suggests that the global market for integrated system services will be worth £200bn by 2030. However, whilst the theory of system integration is good, our understanding of the practice of it is still weak – this piece of work will help us answer the practical questions that will make our grant-spending more successful and of better value to the UK.

A critical part of this is also understanding the citizen views of system integration. This specification is for the **<u>evaluation</u>** of a project to use the outcomes of a detailed futures analysis of system change and integration to create materials to test the social response to the emerging ideas. Innovate UK has partnered with Sciencewise (a programme of BIS) in funding the design, delivery and evaluation of the public dialogue work to run alongside and support the process of social foresight. These projects will help us understand what the opportunities for urban system integration really are, and what the UK public wants from their urban environments, so that we can better target our grant spending to places where it will have the greatest impact.

Aims

All public dialogue projects co-funded by Sciencewise require an independent evaluation, for which this specification invites tenders. The aims of the evaluation are:

- to provide an independent assessment of the impacts and quality of the dialogue project, covering the outputs and impacts of the project as a whole as well as the design, delivery, reporting and governance of the dialogue activities

- to contribute to the wider effectiveness and use of public dialogue.

Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are:

- to gather and present objective and robust evidence of the nature and quality of the impacts, outputs and activities of the project in order to come to conclusions

- to identify lessons from the project to support capacity building across Government, and the wider development of good practice in public dialogue.

Scope

There will need to be some audit elements to the evaluation but it is not intended to assess the personal performance of those involved. It should rather focus on **identifying the impacts of and lessons from the design, delivery, outputs and outcomes of the dialogue project overall**. This requires analysis based on detailed evidence using the quantitative and qualitative data that will need to be collected by the evaluation.

The evaluation should include consideration of six key questions:

- **Objectives**. Has the dialogue met its objectives? Were the objectives set the right ones?
- **Credibility**. Were the dialogue design, delivery and reporting fit for purpose (appropriate to the context and objectives), and credible with those expected to use the results?
- **Quality**. Has the dialogue met standards of good practice (according to the Sciencewise quality framework and guiding principles[1]? What took place, how, when, where, who with and why? How successful has the governance of the project been, including the role of stakeholders, oversight groups, the commissioning body and Sciencewise?
- **Impacts**. Has the dialogue achieved the expected (and any unexpected) impacts on policy and decisions, on organisational change and learning, and on all those involved? What new insights

---

[1] Sciencewise (2013) *The Government's approach to public dialogue on science and technology.* http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Publications/Sciencewise-Guiding-PrinciplesEF12-Nov-13.pdf and Sciencewise (2015) *Quality in Public Dialogue. A framework for assessing the quality of public dialogue.* http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/quality-in-public-dialogue-a-framework-for-assessing-the-quality-of-public-dialogue/

have been obtained (including on tackling potential social and ethical risks)? Who has seen the results and how have the results been used? What has been the value of the project to those involved, including the extent to which those involved were satisfied with the dialogue outcomes and process?

- **Costs and benefits**. What was the balance overall of the costs and benefits of the dialogue (basic costs compared to benefits, including potential future costs saved)?
- **Lessons**. What are the lessons for future public dialogue projects (including from what worked well and less well)?

The evaluation must adhere to the following principles:

a) **Starting early**: and continuing throughout the detailed design and delivery of the project.

b) **Clarity**: of the purpose, scope, approach, levels of participation in and limits of the evaluation.

c) **Rigorous and fit for purpose**: using appropriate methodologies.

d) **Constructively critical**: seeking understanding and learning rather than apportioning blame.

e) **Confidential**: respecting the sensitivity of data collected, and avoiding personal or reputational harm

f) **Avoiding conflicts of interest**: including privileged access to information not being used for future competitive advantage.

g) **Proportionate**: with sufficient resources and in sufficient depth to meet evaluation objectives.

h) **Transparent**: the evaluation should be explained to all participants and stakeholders, and evaluation findings published.

i) **Practical**: evaluation data sought can be collected, assessed and reported within timescale and budget.

j) **Useful**: evaluation findings should be reported in accessible language and in a form that is useful for learning and to provide evidence of impacts, what works, and lessons for the future.

k) **Independent**: from commissioners, funders, delivery team and participants.

l) **Credible**: status and reputation of evaluator, and use of effective evaluation frameworks and methodology.

Background to the requirement

The overall aims of the Urban Living Citizen Dialogue project itself are:

- To produce a futures study into the opportunities for integrated city systems, including future visions, citizen engagement and inter-disciplinary stakeholder collaboration and co-creation.

- To inform the development of the new Urban Living Innovation Programme generally, especially the resulting competitions and funding, by providing citizen insights from possible future scenarios and workshops.
- To enable Innovate UK to learn about the practice of designing and delivering processes of public dialogue to generate useful conclusions that reflect the public voice, and more generally to learn about collaborative ways of working with citizens
- To create future visions of urban living with citizen input
- To implement Open Policy, multi-stakeholder collaboration and new ways of solving inter-disciplinary challenges trialled and learnt from.

In addition the project aims to:

- Allow Innovate the opportunities to evolve and develop their own thoughts and plans - Innovate expect to be closely involved throughout the project.
- Provide materials that we will use to produce a high-quality output that will raise the profile of Innovate UK by clearly showing how we are in the vanguard of this important area, and showing us as leaders in this field.
- Build stronger links between the various Innovate innovation platforms, and help to set out how and where we work together. We expect that the Lead Technologists from other innovation areas will participate in the futures and dialogue workshops to understand the changing context and the citizen views

The objectives of the project are that, at the end, Innovate UK want to:

- have a clearer understanding of the opportunities and risks of system integration in urban areas – not in quantitative terms, but in understanding the opportunities for integration, and the citizen response to different options
- have evolved our own thinking in this area
- be able to clearly set out our vision for sustainably integrating urban systems in a manner that reflects the public voice
- have a communicable set of final outputs that will demonstrate Innovate UK's thought leadership in this area, and which we can use to direct our competition funding.
- have led a series of citizen dialogues both face-to-face and online

These will contribute to key objectives for the project as a whole, to:

- inform the development of the new Urban Living Innovation Programme generally, especially the resulting competitions and funding, by providing citizen insights from possible future scenarios (developed in the other contract and used in this contract) and workshops
- enable Innovate UK to learn about the practice of designing and delivering processes of public dialogue to generate useful conclusions that reflect the public voice, and more generally to learn about collaborative ways of working with citizens
- create future visions of urban living with citizen input
- trial and learn from Open Policy, multi-stakeholder collaboration and new ways of solving inter-disciplinary challenges

The Urban Living innovation Platform (ULIP) is newly formed, and has the remit to look at opportunities for stimulating successful new businesses that can take advantage of the estimated £200bn global market for city system integration services by 2030. ULIP therefore works across many other innovation platform areas (for instance energy, transport, built

environment, resources, food, healthcare) to look for the opportunities that exist when these systems are not considered in isolation, but are considered collectively.

However, whilst the theory of system integration is good, our understanding of the practice of it is still weak, and so we want to undertake this piece of work to answer questions such as: which systems can be integrated and which can't; what would urban areas with differing types of integrated system look like in practice and how would this affect how each system operates; how can we create resilience from integration and avoid domino-effect collapses; how can we tie activities across innovation platforms together such that the directions stimulated in one system support rather than undermine the directions pursued by another.

We also keen to understand social questions such as: How does the vision of technically feasible future visions of experts and scientists compare to the preferred future visions of the public? What are the opportunities are for people and businesses to successfully meet the needs and demands in the integrated urban system future? Who will benefit from the changes, and who might miss out? What new risks might emerge and how acceptable are these to urban society? Where are their specific concerns around data usage, environmental sustainability, social exclusion, changes to health and well-being in city living? How new systems might change the pattern of governance and accountability in cities of the future? How do cities of the future want to be engaged?

We want to understand the opportunities of system integration in urban areas – not in a theoretical way, but in a manner that is grounded in real citizen challenges. These citizen dialogues support, and are supported by, a complementary project to generate integrated system stimulus material that will show some of the possible ways in which different urban systems will develop and combine. These draft materials will be used for the citizen dialogue to explore the ways in which people think / would like an integrated urban future to develop. The results of the citizen dialogue will then feed back into the futures project so that the final results have a solid grounding in the real needs and desires of UK citizens. The citizen dialogue contractor will need to work closely with the futures contractor throughout the duration of the project to ensure that the futures materials generated for the citizen dialogue process, and research questions identified, are fit for purpose, and that the results of the dialogue process can be incorporated back into the futures final results.

The dialogue project will involve a series of online and offline engagements (facilitated workshops, online platform, etc.) that will test the social questions listed above to answer:

- What are the opportunities are for people and businesses to successfully meet the needs and demands in the integrated urban system future?
- Where might changes create disadvantages for certain groups?
- What new risks might emerge and how acceptable are these to urban society?

In particular there may be real concerns around data usage, environmental sustainability, social exclusion, changes to health and well-being in city living and how new systems might change the pattern of governance and accountability in cities of the future. All of these things we need to understand better so that the solutions we support and the direction that we take in ULIP are really fit for purpose.

The dialogue project will be conducted according to government Guiding Principles of Public Dialogue http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/guiding-principles/

The expectation is that the actual dialogue project will consist of the following design and delivery activities:

- Co-development and agreement on questions (question guide) for public dialogue – with the futures contractor, Innovate UK and the advisory group
- 12 one day recruited workshops of 25 public each (6 workshops reconvened once, 150 people) in 6 locations across the UK including Northern Ireland)
- The design, building and recruitment to an online discussion / consultation (400 additional participants involved in a range of tasks)
- Detailed process design and stimulus materials, based on question guides and stimulus developed
- Recruitment and briefing of specialists to participate in dialogue events
- Recruitment and incentivisation of participants
- Facilitation and recording of discussions
- Transcripts of face-to-face work
- Analysis of findings, based on question guides and brief
- Production of a complete and final stand-alone report of the dialogue, including findings
- Contribution to the final overall ULIP report – lead by the futures contractor – which will incorporate both the futures and dialogue results

Deliverables From the Dialogue Project:

- A final report, co-published with Innovate UK
- A final set of associated materials that Innovate UK can use to communicate the results of the work – both internally, and externally
- A set of materials that are suitable for the futures contractor to use in the final analysis and project report

Deadlines for The Project Overall:

- The total project is scheduled to begin in July 2015 with the futures analysis. The citizen dialogue contractor will need to participate in discussions from the beginning to ensure that the materials generated are fit for their needs
- We expect the workshops for the citizen dialogue to take place in November or December 2015 – and should be completed and reported by February 2016 in order to have time to finish the full project before the end of the financial year.
- All parts of the project will be completed by the end of this financial year.

Requirement

Requirement

The evaluation contractor is expected to have a strong track record and expertise of evaluation of public dialogue and/or other public engagement processes, and of using best practice techniques to evaluate dialogue processes involving the general public, experts and policy-makers.

The evaluator will develop the evaluation process, and provide a detailed methodology, including success criteria and metrics as appropriate.

The evaluator must undertake all aspects of the evaluation, including data collection, collation and analysis. The evaluator may wish to outline the support they would require from the delivery contractor in aspects of the process (e.g. data collection).

All evaluation plans, materials (e.g. questionnaires and interview schedules) and all reports need to be discussed in draft with Sciencewise, and formally signed off before use.

Stages of evaluation

The evaluator will be expected to attend an inception meeting at the beginning of the project, and a final wash-up meeting at the end of the project.

Formative evaluation will also be important, and the evaluator should be prepared to provide on-going feedback, based on evidence from evaluation research and emerging evaluation findings, to support project development.

It is expected that there will be three main stages of the evaluation, with brief reports on the first two stages that feed into the final evaluation report which will be expected to cover all three stages:

- **Baseline assessment**. An early review of the specific policy context within which the project is operating, and the expectations of the commissioning body and other key stakeholders about the likely achievements and impacts of the project on policy decisions. A very brief report on this stage may be required but essentially this will provide a basis for the final evaluation assessment.

- **Interim assessment of design and delivery**. As soon as possible after the completion of the dialogue events, a review of the quality of the design and delivery of the dialogue activities based on the evidence from evaluation research, including observation of events and feedback from public and other participants (e.g. experts and other stakeholders). Again, a very brief report on this stage may be required but essentially this will also feed into the final evaluation report.

- **Final assessment of the project overall**. Final research and analysis following the publication and dissemination of the dialogue project reports to gain further feedback from those involved (e.g. the oversight group, commissioning body, delivery contractors and others). This new data, together with data from the earlier stages of evaluation research,

should be used to produce an overall evaluation report providing an assessment of the impacts of the project and of the quality of the design, delivery and reporting of the dialogue project overall.

The final evaluation report should be produced in draft and circulated internally to the project team, Innovate UK and Sciencewise at least one week prior to the wash-up meeting.

The final evaluation report should explicitly address all six key questions outlined above and cover all dialogue project activities, including:

- Preliminary activities (e.g. desk research)

- Governance (e.g. oversight groups) and stakeholder engagement

- Public dialogue activities (e.g. sampling, recruitment and number of participants; number, location and design of events; the main questions addressed by the public; quality of information provided; specialists involved)

- Any other related public engagement activities (e.g. polls or online surveys), and any other activities affecting the impacts, value and credibility of the dialogue results

- Reports from the project, including to public participants

- All impacts (achieved and expected), and all dissemination and use of dialogue results.

The final report should be written in accessible language and provided in a form that is useful for learning and demonstrating impacts, including an Executive Summary (which can stand alone and which provides a brief description of the project, a very brief summary of the evaluation methodology, and the main evaluation findings particularly on impacts and lessons for the future); with detailed evaluation data provided in annexes.

Deliverables

In summary, the deliverables from the evaluation will be:

- Formative evaluation input throughout the project

- Brief baseline evaluation report for internal circulation only

- Brief interim evaluation report for internal circulation only

- Draft final evaluation report for internal circulation only, circulated at least one week prior to the wash-up meeting

- Attendance at final wash-up meeting to input evaluation findings to date

- Detailed final evaluation report covering previous evaluation reports and all aspects of the work as outlined above agreed with Innovate UK and Sciencewise.

Deadlines

- The total project is scheduled to begin in July 2015 with the futures analysis. It is expected that the evaluator will be appointed so that the evaluation can start at the same time as the rest of the project to ensure that a full understanding of the whole project can be gained.
- We expect the workshops for the citizen dialogue to take place in November 2015 – and should be completed and reported by February 2016 in order to have time to finish the full project before the end of the financial year. This means that the final stages of the evaluation may need to run concurrently with the final stages of the dialogue project.
- All parts of the project must be completed by the end of this financial year (March 2016).

Timetable

Final outputs are needed by the end of the financial year (March 2016), so the final stages of the evaluation research will need to be carefully planned to ensure that they can take account of the final reporting and potential use of the results, while still completing the final evaluation report.

Expected timings of the dialogue project and evaluation (*shown in italic*) are as follows:

July 2015: Project inception meeting for whole project team *including evaluators*

September - October 2015: Series of stakeholder workshops, development of scenarios and stimulus materials (*evaluation observation and review of workshops; baseline interviews*)

October 2015: *Baseline evaluation report completed and circulated*

November 2015: One day workshops in six regions, each with 25 members of the public; reconvened once for one day in all six regions and all participants (*evaluation observation, questionnaires etc*)

December 2015: *Interim evaluation report completed and circulated*

December 2015 - January 2016: Online discussion / consultation with 400 additional participants involved in a range of tasks (*evaluation questions, observation etc*)

January - February 2016: Analysis of workshops and reporting by dialogue delivery contractors

February 2016: *Final evaluation interviews, analysis and first draft of final evaluation report*

March 2016: *Final evaluation report agreed and published.*

Section 5 – Evaluation model

The evaluation model below shall be used for this ITQ, which will be determined to two decimal places.

Where a question is 'for information only' it will not be scored.

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem required.

After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 (5+5+6 =16÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Quality	AW6.2	Impartiality

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

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

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20.00%
Quality	AW6.3	Understanding the Requirements	10.00%
Quality	AW6.4	Proposed Methodology and Objectives	40.00%
Quality	AW6.5	Project Team	14.96%
Quality	AW6.6	Project Management & Contingencies	10.00%
Quality	AW6.8	Risk Assessment	05.04%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 (60/100 x 20 = 12)

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 10% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 10.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 6% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 10 (60/100 x 10 = 6)

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

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

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

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

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 50
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 50
Your final score will (60+60+50+50) ÷ 4 = 55

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.
Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80
Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.
Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.
Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.
Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: 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

DO:

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

7.2   Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.11   Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

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

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

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

7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.

7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

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

7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

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

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

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

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

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

7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.

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

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

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

7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.

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

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

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

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

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

7.34 Bidders may only amend the Contract terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)