

Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Higher Education Funding
Council for England (HEFCE)**

Subject **UK SBS UKRPIF Design and Implementation of Evaluation
Framework**

Sourcing reference number **CR18005**



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

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

Table of Contents

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

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

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

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

HEFCE funds and regulates universities and colleges in England. We invest on behalf of students and the public to promote excellence and innovation in research, teaching and knowledge exchange. In all our activities we aim to:

- ensure accountability for funding and be a proportionate regulator
- act in the public interest and be open, fair, impartial and objective
- be an effective broker between Government and the sector and in doing so, ensure that we are implementing government policy effectively.

Further information can be found at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

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	Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Cl, Stoke Gifford, Bristol BS34 8SR
3.2	Buyer name	Kerry Hammond
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£100,000.00 Ex VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	Friday 17 th January 2018 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Friday 16 th February 2018 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Monday 19 th February 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Friday 23 rd February 2018 14.00
3.10	Anticipated selection and the selections of Bids notification date	Friday 9 th March 2018
3.11	Anticipated Award date	Friday 9 th March 2018
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	Tuesday 3 rd April 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	Friday 28 th September 2018
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) distributes public money to higher education institutions in England and ensures that this money is used to deliver the greatest benefits to students and the wider public.

In 2016-17 HEFCE directly funded 130 universities and higher education colleges and 210 further education colleges. The funding is used to support institutions' teaching, research, knowledge exchange and related activities. This includes research and activity to ensure that everyone with the potential to benefit from higher education has the chance to do so.

To ensure that this money is being used appropriately, HEFCE:

- monitors the institutions' financial and managerial health;
- ensures that the quality of teaching is assessed;
- organises the assessment of research quality with the other UK funding bodies.

The UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (UKRPIF)

Currently, HEFCE administers the UK Research Partnership Investment Fund (UKRPIF) on behalf of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS). It is a UK-wide scheme. Following the passage of the Higher Education and Research Act,¹ the current research and knowledge exchange functions of HEFCE will form a new organisation, Research England (RE), and be established as one of nine Councils within UK Research and Innovation (UKRI). From 1 April 2018, responsibility for UKRPIF will transfer, along with the staff that currently manage it within HEFCE, to Research England.

UKRPIF is designed to support investment in higher education research facilities and is available to all UK higher education institutions (HEIs). Under the UKRPIF scheme, HEIs can bid for funding between £10 million and £50 million to support projects on the basis that they leverage double match funding from private sources. The fund's current objectives are to:

- i. enhance the research facilities of HEIs undertaking world-leading research;
- ii. encourage strategic partnerships between HEIs and other organisations active in research;
- iii. stimulate additional investment in higher education research;
- iv. strengthen the contribution of the research base to economic growth.

Originally set up in 2012, during five rounds of operation £680m of UKRPIF funding has been allocated to 43 projects, attracting over £1.65bn of co-investment from business and charities. By 2021, in total £900m will have been allocated through the scheme. Round six of the competition is currently in progress.

¹ Available at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/29/contents/enacted/data.htm>

Bids are assessed by an independent panel chaired by Peter Saraga, member of the Research England Council, former Vice-President of the Royal Academy of Engineering and a former HEFCE Board member.

Aims

As part of HEFCE's (in future Research England) role in UKRPIF it is responsible for monitoring progress and evaluating the success of the individual projects and the overall programme. At the start of the scheme, it was envisaged and communicated in award letters that the scheme would be evaluated in the future. The BIS grant letter to HEFCE in 2015 and a later commitment made at the PAC following the National Audit Office (NAO) report into BIS science capital investment² committed HEFCE to start to develop the evaluation programme during 2017, working with BEIS and the funding councils. Subsequently, the 2017-18 grant letter³ asked that HEFCE takes forward proposals for an initial review of activities during 2017-18. HEFCE commissioned an interim evaluation of the scheme in May 2017. The aims of the interim evaluation were to:

- gain an overview of UKRPIF emerging project outcomes across the scheme;
- use the information gathered to identify a subset of projects to develop more detailed case studies;
- inform the design of the framework for a longer-term evaluation.

The interim evaluation, carried out by Middlesex University and Belmana Consulting, is due to report in early 2018.

This work is meant to build on the findings of the interim evaluation. Consultants will be appointed to develop a framework for this evaluation that can be applied to the breadth of projects across the UKRPIF programme at an individual project level. The evaluations would be conducted by the host HEIs in line with the framework. HEFCE / Research England would then use the findings of those individual evaluations to enable a wider UKRPIF programme evaluation, as directed, for BEIS, UKRI etc.

Purpose of the full evaluation of the UKRPIF projects and programme

The main purpose of evaluating the individual UKRPIF projects will be to allow assessment of the ongoing value of the entire scheme in meeting its original objectives and responding to changes in government strategy, and in so doing evaluate the strength of the case for future funding. In order to make this assessment, it will be necessary to:

- use previous evaluations of research infrastructure programmes to inform the collective UKRPIF assessment criteria and therefore the individual assessment framework;
- assess the extent to which projects and the broader scheme have delivered their original objectives and the overall value of the programme;
- evaluate scientific, economic and societal outcomes at both project and scheme-level, whether these effects would have been delivered without the UKRPIF funding and whether they justify the cost of the investment;
- identify any broader anticipated or unanticipated effects of the scheme, whether positive or negative, at project, institution, national or international level. This could include the sectoral consequence of focussing funding in certain areas;

² Available at <https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Capital-investment-in-science-projects.pdf>

³ Available at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE.2014/Content/News/2017/Grant-letter-2017.pdf>

- assess the extent to which UKRPIF has acted as a catalyst for further funding or for enabling expansion of the project, research or facility linked to the project beyond that envisaged through the original UKRPIF proposal. This includes attracting additional public research funding such as that allocated by the UK Research Councils;
- assess the association between the HEI/s and their co-investor/s, both current and new, including the existing state and sustainability of the relationship;
- assess the effect of the change or development of individual policies within the UKRPIF programme itself, from Round 1 through to 5, (e.g. the change in minimum and maximum funding thresholds) on the individual projects and therefore the cumulative influence on programme delivery;
- learn lessons to inform further investments.

It is not necessary to evaluate UKRPIF processes as this exercise has previously been carried out in HEFCE's own internal audits and as part of the audit of the programme carried out by KPMG in 2016.

Objectives

The principal objective of this work is to develop a framework for the full evaluation of the UKRPIF programme. The winning bidder will be expected to develop a framework that can be applied by the UKRPIF principal awardees to the breadth of the projects across the UKRPIF programme at an individual level and which then makes it possible to facilitate a full programme evaluation. The framework should answer questions such as (this is not an exhaustive list):

- What qualitative, as well as quantitative, KPIs and range of methodologies would be most appropriate for projects to follow and later on for the scheme to collate, including the limitations of these (with particular reference to the breadth of fields that UKRPIF covers, recognising that one KPI does not fit all)?
- Can counterfactuals, informed by a range of stakeholders, be identified to assess whether the benefits realised might have occurred without UKRPIF funds?
- What is a suitable timeframe for evaluation activity, both at individual project and programme wide level (timings may differ between projects)?

As part of developing the long-term evaluation framework, the successful bidder would be expected to:

- conduct a literature review of infrastructure evaluations conducted nationally and internationally to identify models and criteria to inform this work. This would focus on research infrastructure but might extend approaches to other forms of infrastructure investment that have deliverables beyond those that are research-related, but relevant to UKRPIF;
- build on the information and evidence gathered during the interim evaluation and address evidence gaps in:
 - proposing a framework that is applicable to past and future projects (this might involve a scaled-down version being made available for existing projects), as well as one that is applicable across the diverse range of projects supported by UKRPIF;
 - Propose appropriate sets or categorisations of KPIs, both qualitative and quantitative, to make it straightforward to dissect or interrogate the data in the programme-wide evaluation to look for impact. Here, impact can be qualified as

'Academic', as defined by RCUK⁴, where excellent research is attributable to academic advances including understanding, methods, theory and application, or 'Economic and societal', as defined by REF 2014⁵, where research effects a change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy / services, health or environment, beyond academia. How can any broader actual or potential impacts of the Fund, including unanticipated ones, be accounted for?

- develop the approach in consultation with host HEIs to ensure that the methodology identified is robust but deliverable in practice at a minimum level of burden - we would suggest using a workshop involving both host HEIs and other stakeholders, such as co-investors for this engagement;
- develop the approach in consultation with other funding bodies across the UK to ensure that an evaluation will meet their needs;
- identify and use a robust methodology that permits the collection, analysis and presentation of the collated data in a consistent manner, and ensuring that this is coherent with BEIS, UKRI and HMT Magenta⁶ and Green⁷ book approaches.

Deliverables

- A literature review of research (and broader) infrastructure or other parallel evaluations nationally and internationally, which can be used to inform and develop the appropriate evaluation methodology or methodologies.
- A framework for the evaluation of all individual projects and overall programme synthesis. This would include an overarching logic model, core KPIs and timelines for evaluation. This should be produced as a document that sets out the approach in a manner that is easy for host HEIs to understand and implement, and to consolidate for the full programme evaluation.
- A scope for implementing the framework in a pilot study, including suggested HEI participants.
- A means of presenting the framework to host HEIs and funders that can be used to explain the rationale behind the evaluation (pros, cons and risk analysis), the approach that has been taken in its development and the mechanism of delivery. This should include the delivery approach that HEFCE / RE should take, as well as an indication of the cost of the exercise to both the host HEIs and HEFCE / Research England.

Approach

1. Literature review: This will involve reviewing the available literature on research infrastructure or other parallel evaluations done in the UK or abroad, and analysing the methodologies used so as to derive or recommend the most appropriate methodology for UKRPIF. The report from UKRPIF's interim evaluation will identify initial objectives.
2. Framework development: The literature review, as well as information from UKRPIF's interim evaluation, should inform the development of a flexible framework that can be applied across the variety of UKRPIF projects. Host HEIs and their main project stakeholders, such as co-investors, should also be consulted, perhaps through a workshop, as they will be able to provide input on

⁴ Available at <http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/innovation/impacts/>

⁵ Available at <http://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/pubs/2011-02/>

⁶ Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book>

⁷ Available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-green-book-appraisal-and-evaluation-in-central-government>

deliverability of the evaluation framework in practice. It is important to engage host HEIs directly, as while conversations with them through both the audit and interim evaluation indicate that they are keen to showcase their achievements, they are unlikely to be willing to undertake an additional burdensome and costly evaluation exercise. Developing a framework that meets such requirements, as well as one that mitigates the risks, for example that accurate assessments of economic and social impact are hindered by difficulties with attribution or finding appropriate counterfactuals, might require the consultants to think imaginatively about their approach and adopt a range of methodologies, such as contribution analysis.

The approach will also include:

- Discussion with relevant HEFCE / RE staff, steering group and reference to partner organisations and other relevant parties outside HEFCE / RE where relevant and practicable;
- Correspondence with the selected institutions using approaches that keep institutions engaged;
- Regular update calls between the consultant and HEFCE / RE UKRPIF team.

Project Milestones

1. Methodology for the work (to be agreed with HEFCE / RE).
2. Delivery of draft literature review and emerging findings for potential frameworks.
3. Proposal of a framework (following engagement with HEIs and their stakeholders).
4. Delivery of final framework, including scope for pilot study / studies and approach for presenting the framework.

Background to the Requirement

The UKRPIF projects are long-term investments in major capital projects for which the research outcomes will be realised over many years into the future. Some of the projects have completed the capital development stage and are now fully operational. A number of these projects are now beginning to report early research outputs or broader impacts stemming from the original investment.

At the start of the scheme, it was envisaged and communicated in formal award letters that the scheme would be evaluated in the future but with no detailed plans of how that might happen. HEFCE and the funding councils committed to work with the BEIS to develop an evaluation programme during 2017.

In our approach to evaluating the UKRPIF scheme we wish to use the most robust methodology in measuring outcomes, but also one which is consistent with BEIS and HMT Magenta and Green book approaches. As such, we are already working closely with BEIS, the National Audit Office (NAO) colleagues and other experts in scoping this work. The evaluation is being carried out in two stages:

- a. An interim evaluation to identify emerging outcomes and develop a small set of case studies, as well as inform the development of the next stage of the evaluation;
- b. A framework for a more in-depth long-term evaluation (this project).

The winning bidder will be responsible for delivering a framework that can be used for the evaluation of the UKRPIF programme.

HEFCE / RE works closely with the four UK funding bodies (SFC, DfE and HEFCW) to administer and monitor UKRPIF. A steering group has been established to help steer the project activity in some capacity, including representation from the devolved administrations. The main contact for the winning bidder will be a member of HEFCE / RE's UKRPIF team.

Further details on UKRPIF, including the guidance which sets out terms and conditions of funding and a list of funded projects can be found here:

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/ukrpiif/>

National Audit Office review of BIS's capital investment in science projects

During 2015, the NAO launched a review of BEIS's capital investment in science infrastructure, with UKRPIF as a case study programme. The study addressed the overarching question 'Is BIS's investment in scientific infrastructure delivering the anticipated benefits and maximising potential?'

- Does BIS have a long-term strategy for scientific infrastructure facilities which clearly articulates its objectives and future direction?
- Has BIS prioritised investment in the projects which are most likely to add value and are consistent with its strategy?
- Has BIS evaluated the impact of its investment into scientific infrastructure facilities?

The scope of the study included Research Council capital projects of over £2m and eight UKRPIF projects.

The NAO's report, which was published on 10 March 2016, concludes that BEIS and the research councils do not have a common systematic framework for assessing whether operational projects are delivering expected benefits, and few of the projects examined have calculated the economic impact of projects. The report recommends that BEIS take a more systematic approach to evaluating the impact of operational projects and to work with HMT to consider how best to provide a predictable funding framework for planning scientific capital investment as part of any review of future spending. In response to these recommendations BEIS are developing guidance for the appraisal and evaluation for science capital projects to be used by BEIS and partner organisations.⁸

KPMG audit

In February 2016, HEFCE commissioned KPMG to undertake an audit of the UKRPIF programme, building on a pilot audit of three projects which took place in the summer of 2015. The final report was submitted in October 2016.

As part of the audit process, KPMG asked HEIs for feedback on the bidding, monitoring and audit process. A number of institutions suggested that an evaluation of the academic

⁸ BEIS partner organisations consist of HEFCE and the seven Research Councils (AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, STFC.)

and research outcomes of the project would be beneficial. HEIs would also welcome guidance on how the success of a project will be evaluated.

The development of a framework for the long-term evaluation of the UKRPIF programme, together with the interim evaluation carried out by Middlesex University and Belmana aim to respond to the NAO report and feedback received in the KPMG final audit report.

Scope

The scope of this work will be the entire UKRPIF programme. The details of projects funded, up to and including round 5, can be found at:

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/ukrpif/projects/>

Bidders will be expected to develop a framework that can be applied by the UKRPIF HEI awardees across the programme at an individual level and which then makes it possible to facilitate a full programme evaluation. This will include:

- a literature review (including previous programme audit and interim review), from which emerging findings will be incorporated into example frameworks to be presented to HEIs and stakeholders;
- engagement with HEIs and stakeholders in framework development;
- delivery of a framework that can be applied to all individual projects across the breadth of UKRPIF subject areas and projects, and how the framework outputs will be synthesised into a full programme evaluation;
- a means by which the framework can be presented to HEIs and stakeholders by the HEFCE / RE UKRPIF team.

Requirement

The objective of this work is to develop a framework for the full evaluation of the UKRPIF programme. The winning bidder will be expected to develop a framework that can be applied to the breadth of projects across the UKRPIF programme at an individual project level, with the aim of feeding the findings of each of these directly into a wider, full programme, evaluation.

Deliverables

The winning bidder will be expected to deliver the following mandatory key deliverables:

- Statement of methodology and project plan outlining the activities they will undertake, deliverables and timetable. Consultants should clearly state how they intend to engage with HEIs and their stakeholders, as well as with the UKRPIF team. A risk assessment with levels of risk and owners identified, and mitigating actions to address, should be produced alongside this statement. Proposed approaches will be discussed and refined at the inception meeting which will be held following appointment in London / Bristol (April 2018);
- A draft of the literature review of research (and broader) infrastructure or other parallel evaluations nationally and internationally;
- A short summary of emerging findings for potential frameworks that can be presented to HEIs and their stakeholders - the UKRPIF audit, interim review and literature review would have informed this;

- Engagement with HEIs and stakeholders - our suggested approach is through a workshop, but successful consultants are welcome to recommend a different approach;
- A draft framework for the evaluation of all individual projects and overall programme synthesis, set out as a document that is easy to understand and follow. The framework should include an overarching logic model built on the aims of the fund, core KPIs and timelines for evaluation;
- A draft means of presenting the framework to host HEIs and funders, including an explanation of the rationale and approach;
- Final version of the literature review (following agreement with HEFCE / RE - we will also consult with the other funding bodies);
- Final version of the framework (following agreement with HEFCE / RE - we will also consult with the other funding bodies);
- Final version of the host HEI and funder presentation, including the delivery approach that HEFCE / RE should take, as well as an indication of the cost of the exercise to both the host HEIs and HEFCE / RE (following agreement with HEFCE / RE - we will also consult with the other funding bodies);
- Attendance at one interim and one final reporting meeting in HEFCE / RE offices in Bristol / London;
- The winning bidder will be expected to be in regular communication which will include email, telephone and face-to-face meetings as required with the HEFCE / RE UKRPIF team to ensure that objectives and milestones are being met and that the project is progressing as expected in terms of scope and time. Potential issues or risks should also be monitored and managed appropriately through an update of the risk register.

Approach

The approach will include the following as mandatory:

- Literature review;
- Engagement with host HEIs and their main stakeholders;
- Framework development;
- Discussion with relevant HEFCE staff, steering group and reference to partner organisations and other relevant parties outside HEFCE where relevant and practicable;
- Regular update calls between the consultant and HEFCE UKRPIF team.

Conflicts of interest

The winning bidder selected will be required to confirm the individuals carrying out the work have no conflicts of interest with the UKRPIF fund overall. Where the appointed bidder has any potential conflict of interest these should be identified and discussed with HEFCE.

Timetable

It is estimated that this assignment will require approximately up to 60 days work for the consultant(s) including planning and reporting. This work is planned to be carried out in spring through to autumn 2018.

A provisional timetable is below:

Initial project plan and methodology	April 2018
Inception meeting	April 2018
Literature review phase	May 2018
Submission of draft literature review incl. proposals for potential framework(s) and methodologies that can be investigated and explored further	June 2018
Engagement with host HEIs and their stakeholders	June 2018
Interim progress meeting	June 2018
Submission of draft framework	July 2018
Submission of draft presentation/slide pack	July 2018
Submission of final report containing literature review, recommended framework and presentation	September 2018
Final review meeting	September 2018

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
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			
Evaluation Justification Statement			
In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.			
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Risk Management	5%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Methodology	45%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

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

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

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: 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.

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.ukpbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx>

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

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

DO NOT

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

Some additional guidance notes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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