



# Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Office of Manpower  
Economics (OME)**

**Subject Contracting Authority Barriers to application for judicial  
appointment**

**Sourcing reference number BLOJEU-CR17081OME**

**UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)**  
[www.uksbs.co.uk](http://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

**UKSBS**  
  
*Shared Business Services*

## Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<a href="#">About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</a>
2	<a href="#">About the Contracting Authority</a>
3	<a href="#">Working with the Contracting Authority.</a>
4	<a href="#">Specification</a>
5	<a href="#">Evaluation model</a>
6	<a href="#">Evaluation questionnaire</a>
7	<a href="#">General Information</a>
Annexes	Annex A - Terms of Reference for the Review of the Judicial Salary Structure

# Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

## Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.

Our Contracting Authorities who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed [here](#).

## Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

### Office Manpower Economics (OME)

The Office of Manpower Economics provides an independent secretariat to eight Pay Review Bodies which make recommendations impacting 2.5 million workers – around 45% of public sector staff – and a pay bill of £100 billion:

- Armed Forces' Pay Review Body (AFPRB)
- Review Body on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration (DDRB)
- NHS Pay Review Body (NHSPRB)
- Prison Service Pay Review Body (PSPRB)
- School Teachers' Review Body (STRB)
- Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB)
- Police Remuneration Review Body (PRRB)
- National Crime Agency Remuneration Review Body (NCARRB)

Further information is at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-of-manpower-economics/about>

## 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	Office of Manpower Economics, 8 <sup>th</sup> Floor Fleetbank House, 2-6 Salisbury Square, London, EC4Y 8JX
3.2	Buyer name	Rebecca Fish
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	Up to £60,000 ex VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<b>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available <a href="#">here</a>. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.</b>

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	20/07/2017 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	23/08/2017
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	25/08/2017
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	30/08/2017 14:00
3.10	Anticipated selection and de selections of Bids notification date	08/09/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award date	08/09/2017
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	12/09/2017
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	09/02/2018
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

## Section 4 – Specification

### 1. Background

The Office of Manpower Economics (OME) provides secretariat support for all of the independent Pay Review Bodies. In doing so, one of the OME's key functions is to provide high quality research-based technical advice drawing on economic, pay, labour market, statistical and other technical data. More information about the OME, the bodies it supports, and the research it undertakes, may be found on its website: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/office-of-manpower-economics/about>

The Senior Salaries Review Body (SSRB) is undertaking a Major Review of the judicial salary structure (the Major Review) with the aim of submitting its advice to the Lord Chancellor by June 2018. Such reviews occur approximately every five years (the last was in 2010-11) to examine the suitability and soundness of the judicial pay system.

The endorsed terms of reference for the Major Review and the SSRB's terms of reference are at Annex A. The SSRB will consult with an Advisory and Evidence Group (AEG) comprising representatives of different levels and jurisdictions within the UK judiciary and other major stakeholders.

A key function of the Major Review is to assess whether remuneration is appropriate in order to recruit, retain and motivate high calibre office holders at all levels of the judiciary. In support of this, the SSRB has requested that qualitative evidence is gathered to explore the range of reasons why some candidates with the apparent skills and experience to take judicial posts (at various levels) do not apply to do so. The OME envisages that this information will be collected via interviews with relevant individuals and this is the subject of the current invitation to tender. The OME will manage the work to be conducted under this contract on behalf of the SSRB.

### 2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The purpose of this project is to provide the SSRB with qualitative information which, along with other data gathered by the SSRB outside of this project, will help the SSRB to understand the factors which influence recruitment to the judiciary. Specifically, this work will examine the reasons why some eligible people do not apply and enable a qualitative assessment as to how these factors might vary according to individual characteristics and experience and across the different levels of the judiciary.

This work is modelled on the methodology used in research commissioned in 2008 by the Judicial Executive Board, The attractiveness of senior judicial appointment to highly qualified practitioners<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ucl.ac.uk/laws/judicial-institute/files/The\\_Attractiveness\\_of\\_Senior\\_Judicial\\_Appointment\\_Research\\_Report.pdf](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/laws/judicial-institute/files/The_Attractiveness_of_Senior_Judicial_Appointment_Research_Report.pdf)  
Methodologically this is an exemplar. However, the context of judicial appointment has changed considerably since 2008, with the role of the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC) (for appointments in England and Wales) now bedded down, and some indications that financial matters, including pensions, workload and autonomy may now be important considerations for those considering a judicial appointment.

### 3. Suggested Methodology

#### Scope

The research would need to focus on potential candidates for the categories of the judiciary where individuals are generally appointed to the judiciary for the first time (High Court, Circuit Court, District Court and Lower Tribunal judges<sup>2</sup>) capturing reasons as to why they have not applied for salaried or fee-paid roles<sup>3</sup>. Potential candidates would be identified according to criteria provided by the judicial appointments bodies for England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland and in discussion with judges on the AEG as a starting point, followed by an element of “snowball” sampling (see below). A key challenge will be to identify potentially strong applicants (e.g. those who might meet quality thresholds set by the Judicial Appointments Commission (JAC)) while not implying in any way that participation in the study is an informal signal that the individual should consider applying or that they would be successful if they did. This issue is also addressed below and the OME would welcome the thoughts of the successful contractor about possible ways of identifying participants.

The OME envisages that around 40-50 individuals in total will need to be interviewed. The OME emphasises that this research is about **qualitatively identifying and assessing a range of factors** that may influence decisions to apply for judicial posts rather than producing a quantitative return.

As far as possible, the sample of interviewees should include a broad spectrum of people from the potential “feeder group” covering a variety of legal areas<sup>4</sup>, including both barristers and solicitors, and across the UK jurisdictions. The aim is to draw out different points of view. Therefore, the contractor will need to propose ways of ensuring that the interview group meets these criteria and a process for monitoring and managing the “snowball” methodology to ensure that this does not, inadvertently, result in an interview group only of like-minded individuals.

#### Methodology

10. The OME envisages interviews with well-qualified practitioners with questions focused on the attractions or otherwise of judicial office and judicial aspirations. A “snowball sampling”<sup>5</sup> method is proposed. This method is considered appropriate because of the sensitivity of the issue: there may be various professional and / or personal reasons why individuals are not members of the judiciary. The aim is not to encourage people to apply, but to gather information as to why people of potentially appropriate standing have so far chosen not to apply for judicial office. The OME is open to suggestions on an alternative, cost-effective approach to gathering the required information, but all proposals must

---

<sup>2</sup> The terminology used here (and elsewhere in the tender document) relates to the judiciary in England and Wales but equivalents in Scotland and Northern Ireland are in scope of the Review and this work.

<sup>3</sup> It is recognised that fee-paid experience is a requirement for many salaried appointments.

<sup>4</sup> For example, specialists in criminal, family, civil law etc.

<sup>5</sup> As used in the 2008 study (see footnote 1) which was defined then as a method appropriate when studying a particular group whose characteristics are known. The interviewer uses initial respondents to identify other potential participants with specified characteristics.

acknowledge the sensitivity of the data, and the sensitivity of approaching people who might be strong candidates without any perception that the study is encouraging them to apply. Contractors will need to show that they have understood the complexities of this in their bids.

The work is expected to proceed in four stages, as follows:

Stage 1 - Preparation: knowledge-building; agreeing the administration processes; agreeing criteria for interviewee selection; and interview framework design.

Stage 2 - Fieldwork: administering, undertaking and recording approximately 10-20 initial and approximately 30-40 follow-up interviews.

Stage 3 - Collation and analysis of information and any data received.

Stage 4 - Reporting and deliverables.

The contractor will need to work with the OME, who will advise on an initial list of potential judicial applicants, to arrange approximately 10-20 interviews. Additional candidates for interviews will be nominated, firstly, by this initial group and then subsequently by other interviewees who, will be asked if they know of other individuals that might be included. The contractor will need to keep the OME informed about the number of successful interviews conducted and agree with the OME when a suitable size and composition has been obtained so that the “snowball” process can stop. The contractor will also need to devise and agree with the OME a secure and confidential process for administration of the end-to-end interview process, including the arrangements for managing contact with the follow-up group.

Initial approaches, possibly in writing, to all potential interviewees will invite them to participate in the process. Candidates for interview must be given relevant, accurate and easy to understand information about the aims of the research, why their participation is important and how their contribution will be recorded and written-up.

Potential interviewees must also be given assurances about confidentiality and data protection. **The anonymity of the participants must be guaranteed and preserved.** However, with agreement, the report may provide anonymised examples of particular cases, including specific quotes, to add colour and context to the report<sup>6</sup>.

Candidates must be made aware that a final report on this research will be published and that this, in turn, will inform the SSRB’s resulting report on the Major Review which will also be published. If candidates decline to participate in the interview process for any reason this decision must be accepted<sup>7</sup>.

As with the 2008 study, the OME expects the interviews to be conducted by telephone or face-to-face with each interview lasting, on average, 30 minutes. The contractor will need to establish a process to capture any written information which interviewees volunteer to supplement their interview. The contractor must also be willing and able to conduct interviews at the convenience of the interviewees, which might be outside “normal” office

---

<sup>6</sup> The 2008 report included four short case-studies. If an interviewee’s contribution is to be used in this way, their specific additional agreement must be sought to this.

<sup>7</sup> If a candidate declines to take part because they think that they do not meet the criteria for interview, it might be appropriate to ask them to nominate someone who could be approached instead.

hours.

The contractor will need to have clear plans for how it will work with the interviewees. This will require great sensitivity, and senior contractor oversight. The person undertaking the interviews must have senior status and an expert knowledge of the UK legal environment, the judiciary and their ways of working. Bidders should identify a named individual or individuals who would undertake this role. The contractor must also demonstrate that it has processes in place for handling confidential information. At every stage, tact, discretion and understanding of the professional issues involved will be vital to the success of the study, and bids will need to show they understand this.

It is recognised that a general research agency may have the expertise and experience to manage many of the administrative issues and initial approaches which this work requires, but not necessarily the legal knowledge and expertise required to carry out the interviews, especially with very senior QCs and others at that level. The OME is, therefore, open to joint bids between an expert and other agencies. Academics or sole researchers who can demonstrate that they have the administrative support to deliver the research and the personal availability to deliver it according to schedule are also invited to tender for this work.

#### *Interview question areas*

The contractor will be expected to work with the OME to produce an interview framework, proactively making suggestions on content and phrasing. This will be agreed with the OME, which may correspondingly consult other stakeholders, prior to use. It is important that the timetable for the project has time built in for such consultation to take place. The contractor will need to ensure that each interview is tailored to reflect the structure and terminology of the UK judiciary / legal system relevant to the interviewee.

Subject to the above, the interview framework should enable the following to be captured:

- a. Screening questions to filter out candidates who do not meet the criteria for inclusion in the sample. A particularly sensitive issue may arise in the case of individuals who have previously applied unsuccessfully for judicial roles, especially when encouraged by colleagues, but who were not appointed. Again, the contractor's thoughts on this would be welcome.
- b. Demographic characteristics (to inform the diversity of interviewees).
- c. Information about interviewee's current position and number of years' experience in this role. (In a discreet way, this area of data should also validate the candidate's suitability for interview.)
- d. The level at which they might consider themselves to be eligible to apply for a judicial position.
- e. Potential attractions of appointment — salaried and / or fee-paid (open ended). At the senior level (High Court and Circuit Court<sup>8</sup>) the focus should be on barriers to application for full-time salaried positions. At District Court and Tribunal levels, interest in both salaried and fee-paid positions should be investigated.
- f. Perceived disadvantages of appointment – salaried and / or fee-paid (open-ended).
- g. Whether ever encouraged to apply and, if so, what the interviewee did in response.

---

<sup>8</sup> See footnote 2.

- h. Beliefs about impact of application on practice and career prospects.
- i. Beliefs about financial impact of a judicial appointment (salary and pension). This is a key issue for the SSRB and information about financial considerations will be crucial. The OME envisages that this will need to move from a relatively open-ended approach to a more closed set of questions about the importance of pension changes (both to the judicial pension scheme and the tax treatment of pensions) as well any information about what level of salary might increase the attractiveness of considering applying to the judiciary.
- j. Attitudes to the selection process (confidentiality and fairness).
- k. Beliefs about impact of appointment on private life.

The style of questioning used must be open, but probe as necessary to elicit replies and cover topics. As with all qualitative work, a key challenge will be to cover the topics in a way that ensures the full range of topics is covered, while not suggesting any particular outcomes or replies. The conversation must be allowed to follow a natural course while covering the topics in the interview framework.

The contractor will need to take contemporaneous notes during the interviews or seek the interviewees' permission to record the interviews for subsequent analysis.

Bidders are asked to set out the extent to which reduced or additional costs might result if:

- a. the length of interviews varies appreciably from the assumption provided; and / or,"
- b. the number of interviews varies appreciably from the assumption provided.

The following stages are envisaged for the research, but the OME is open to suggestions for alternative approaches provided these are demonstrably capable of delivering the quality outputs required. Alternatives must be agreed with the OME before the fieldwork commences.

***Stage 1 - Preparation: knowledge-building; agreeing the administration processes; agreeing criteria for interviewee selection; and interview framework design.***

The contractor will need to do the following:

- a. Ensure they have a working knowledge of various aspects of the UK judiciary.
- b. Design the end-to-end process for administration of the interviews, including engagement with the OME, participant contact methodology, data protection and confidentiality issues. Work with the OME (and other stakeholders as agreed with the OME) to resolve all practical issues which might be identified.
- c. Prepare the explanatory information to be given to candidates and other materials considered necessary to enable effective administration of the interview process.
- d. Agree criteria for selection of interviewees with the OME.
- e. Produce a detailed methodology plan, explaining how the interviews will be administered and the criteria to be used for selection of candidates.
- f. Design the interview framework.

- g. Produce documentation which can be updated throughout the process to record which areas of the judiciary and jurisdictions of the UK have been covered in the interview process, with a view to assessing adequacy of coverage of all relevant areas.
- h. Secure OME agreement to all materials necessary for Stage 2.

### ***Stage 2 – Fieldwork: administering, undertaking and recording the initial and follow-up interviews***

The contractor will need to do the following:

- a. Work with the OME (who will deliver to the contractor the initial nominees for interview as identified by the AEG) to devise a process to seek candidates' agreement to participate in the interviews, which will include a supporting letter from a senior member of the judiciary or other senior stakeholder to encourage participation, and a process to answer any questions about the process and encourage nominees to take part.
- b. Liaise with interviewees to agree a mutually convenient time for the interviews to take place.
- c. Undertake the interviews (as per the interview framework), making a record during the interview and agreeing the process for the interviewee to forward additional information if they choose to do this.
- d. Until such a point that a suitable sample of responses has been achieved (see above), ask the interviewee if he/she can nominate anyone who, noting the purpose of the research, could usefully be interviewed (see below).
- e. Proactively monitor the profile of respondents to assess whether the achieved interview sample represents a diverse range of potential views, working with the OME (and other stakeholders as necessary) to encourage additional people to come forward for interview (if required).
- f. Monitor the interview process as it proceeds, proposing any necessary changes to the OME, for its agreement.
- g. Provide weekly e-mailed progress reports to the OME during the fieldwork period.

When suggesting further candidates for interview, the interviewee would be invited to either provide professional contact details in order for contact to be made by: the contractor; the OME or the relevant judicial office; or to make initial contact with the proposed candidate themselves, using materials supplied by the contractor as necessary.

### ***Stage 3 – Collation and analysis of information and data received***

The contractor will collate and analyse the information and data collected during the interviews, providing also summary information on the demographic of the survey group and current employment status. Specifically they will do the following:

- a. Produce analysis of the key issues and themes (attractions and downsides) identified in responses to the interviews in respect of each of the areas in the interview framework. This will include analysis, such as is possible by: potential judicial area (High Court, Circuit Court, District Court and Lower Tribunal judges); jurisdiction; demographic factors; and according to aspects relevant to salaried and fee-paid roles. The analysis should highlight any recurrent themes, areas of agreement or disagreement and widely expressed opinions and facts captured in the interview responses.

- b. Highlight any areas where it has not been possible to capture information or data. Where it is not possible to draw firm general conclusions this should be clearly stated, but any potential or tentative themes should nevertheless be highlighted.
- c. Prepare up to six short anonymised case-studies, ensuring that there is the interviewee's specific agreement to include this information.

#### **Stage 4 – Reporting and deliverables**

See deliverables section below.

#### **Project management**

The contractor will agree with the OME:

- a. detailed arrangements for the management of the project including sign off of materials, documentation of decisions reached, risk-management, regular emailed progress reports against project milestones, telephone catch-ups and occasional face-to-face meetings;
- b. detailed timings for each stage/phase of the project, building in time for consultation with expert advisers; and
- c. availability of project team members across the life span of the project, and for a pre-defined period beyond to answer any queries arising.

#### **Quality standards required**

The results of this work will be used to inform important policy recommendations. The information, data and analysis used and provided must be accurate and up to date. Proper safeguards must be demonstrated to be in place to achieve this. The work must be submitted according to the agreed schedule, in order to feed into the SSRB Major Review.

#### **4. Deliverables**

Early deliverables will include the detailed methodology plan and interview framework. This will need to be agreed by the OME before the interviews commence. These will eventually form the basis for an appendix to the main survey report.

The contractor should produce a draft report on the findings of the interviews. This report should be both readily understood by lay readers and stand up to scrutiny by experts, such as members of the judiciary and analysts. It should cover the following (with use of appendices as appropriate):

- a. Executive summary, including key results and findings.
- b. Methodological information, as necessary to complement and supplement the methodology plan and interview framework mentioned earlier.
- c. A thematic description of interview findings.
- d. Case studies.
- e. A full analysis of the interview responses and case studies. Although the project does not have a formal literature review element, where applicable, the interview data should be

referenced against other data sources identified in the course of the work to provide context.

Based on the draft report, the contractor will be required to make a presentation to some or all of the SSRB and, if necessary, the AEG on the results, taking on board the comments of members and answering their questions<sup>9</sup>. Such presentation(s) should be given by the primary interviewer and/or author or a closely-involved, senior member of the contractor's staff.

The final report must take account of any feedback received on the draft report and presentation, and be of publishable standard.

### **Timing**

The following timings are indicative and provisional at this stage. Timings will be firmed up in consultation both with the contractor and with the OME's expert advisers. The dates marked in bold type are driven by the timing needs of the Major Review and can only be altered by mutual consent.

*By 12 Sept 17:*

The successful tenderer will have been informed and the contract signed. The OME provides background material, including advice on the areas to be covered in the interview framework.

*Mid Sept 17:*

Introductory meeting with the OME.

*Early/mid Oct 17:*

Contractor submits methodology plan, including details of the administration processes, criteria for interviewee selection and the draft interview framework, to the OME.

*By end Oct 17:*

Stage 1 complete: Methodology report and interview framework delivered and agreed. OME comments incorporated into materials. OME identifies the initial candidates for interview. Stage 2 commences (with Stage 3 starting in parallel where possible).

*By mid Dec 17:*

Stage 2 complete. Stage 3 continues.

**19 Jan 18**

Stage 4 - Draft report submitted.

Late Jan 18

Presentation(s) to SSRB/AEG

---

<sup>9</sup> It is likely that two presentations, one for each group, will be required. It may not be possible for these to be held on the same day.

**9 Feb 18**

Final report submitted.

**Publication**

The output of the work will inform the main SSRB Major Review report (due to be submitted to the Lord Chancellor in June 2018) which will contain its recommendations on the judicial salary structure. The final report from this research will be published by the OME on its website within Gov.UK at a time to be decided by the OME, which may be alongside the publication of the SSRB report.

**Terms and Conditions**

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

## Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, and the Contracting Authority ----- and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ( $5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$ ))

### Pass / fail criteria

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	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
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

### Scoring criteria

#### Evaluation Justification Statement

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

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Detailed approach and methodology	30.00%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Expertise and allocation of resource	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the requirement	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project plan and management	15.00%

## Evaluation of criteria

### Non-Price elements

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

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

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:

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

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

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

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

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

### Example

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

**Price elements** will be judged on the following criteria.

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

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.

Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80

Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.

Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.

Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

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

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation:  $\text{Score}/\text{Total Points} \times 50$  ( $80/100 \times 50 = 40$ )

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

## **Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire**

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

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

**PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY**

## Section 7 – General Information

### What makes a good bid – some simple do's 😊

#### DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear, concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

### DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

## Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.
- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of

any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

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

## USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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