Parliamentary
and Health Service
Ombudsman

PARLIAMENTARY AND HEALTH SERVICE OMBUDSMAN (PHSO)

STAKEHOLDER CONTACT DATABASE

ITT EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Draft Version 0.2

Product ID: PR1126

Overview of the Evaluation Process: Key Stages and Dates

Receipt of Supplier Tenders	3^{rd} August 2011 – 12 noon
Procurement Team distribute material to Proposal Evaluation Team and Technical subgroup	**4^{th} August 2011** Team members: page 6
Undertake individual evaluation and scoring of tenders, to prepare for the moderation meeting. Send score to Procurement by **12 August**.	**4^{th} August - 12^{th} August 2011** Evaluation checklists: Appendices A & F Technical checklist Appendix F **Scoring: page 12**
Moderation meeting of evaluation panel to discuss technical subgroup views and panel members' views and to short list the tenders	**15^{th} August 2011**
Invitations sent to short-listed suppliers, inviting them to present to panel on 19 August (if required)	**15^{th} August 2011**
Presentations & demonstrations to the evaluation panel(if required). Panel select preferred supplier.	**19^{th} August 2011**
Evaluation panel nominate questions for reference visits and nominate panel members to make visits	**19^{th} - 26^{th} August 2011** Questions for visits: Appendix H
Reference site visits by nominees of evaluation panel to confirm suitability of preferred supplier	30^{th} & 31^{st} August 2011
Procurement Team debrief unsuccessful tenderers	W/c 9^{th} September 2010
Award of Contract	W/c 9^{th} September 2010

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This document describes the evaluation methodology for the bids received for the provision of a Stakeholder Database and how this evaluation will be recorded. The checklists and forms to record decisions are also included as appendices.

1.2 This evaluation is the third key phase of the process to procure the Stakeholder Database, following on from:

- Business Case
- Invitation to Tender

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 The objective of this procurement process is to award a contract to an organisation submitting the most economically advantageous tender for the provision of a Stakeholder Database which meets the mandatory requirements (checklists **Appendix A** and **Appendix B** refer). The anticipated commencement for this service is the week commencing 12 September 2011.

2.2 The sourcing strategy for this service will be through a tender process. Potential suppliers (listed at 2.4) were identified by the Communications Directorate with support from the Procurement Projects and Business Management team (PPBM).

Pre-evaluation appraisal overview

2.3 A preliminary appraisal is to be conducted by PPBM of the information provided in response to the Invitation to Tender **(Appendix C** of this document). This is to consider whether potential suppliers have sufficient means to perform the contract. This will cover the following areas:

- Financial stability: to pass this aspect of the appraisal the organisation should have provided all of the information requested and there should be no immediate concerns raised from documentation provided. The bidder should be financially stable in terms of cashflow. We will use Dunn and Bradstreet reports for reference and to pass theses reports should also raise no immediate concerns.

- Capability and capacity: to pass this aspect of the appraisal the organisation should be able to assure us of their technical experience from previous projects to give us the confidence that they are able to meet our requirements. The bidder should also satisfy us that it is not undergoing any significant organisational or personnel changes which will impact on their ability to deliver the contract. There should also be no significant adverse legal judgements made against the organisation, and they should be able to assure us broadly of the quality of their work.

- Policies and insurance: The organisation should hold all legally required insurance and preferably all four forms of insurance listed in **Appendix C**. They should have reasonable policies in place.

ITT evaluation overview

2.4 The ITT evaluation is an important stage of the Stakeholder Database procurement process. ITTs were sent to the following potential suppliers on Wednesday 6th July 2011:

- ClickHQ
- IRIS Integra
- Silverbear
- Cantata
- APT Solutions
- SciSys
- Hewlett Packard Enterprise Services
- Softcat Computacenter
- Computacenter

2.5 Each potential supplier had the opportunity to clarify the details of the ITT documentation by submitting questions to PHSO by the deadline of **Friday 22nd July 2011**. PHSO undertook to respond to these questions as soon as possible after that deadline. The responses to the questions submitted to PHSO were sent to all potential suppliers on 26th July 2011.

2.6 The bids from organisations which are appraised as having sufficient means to perform the contract will be evaluated to consider whether they meet our mandatory requirements, and also qualitatively under the following headings:-

a)

- Overall compliance with and demonstrable understanding of PHSO's business needs and relevant sector experience;
- Corporate capability and technical experience, including reference site visits. The resources, including the quality and experience of your staff and any sub-contractors.
- Suitability of proposed approach, methodology / database platform for meeting PHSO's requirements, including training options proposed. Approach to assure the quality of the work, and the quality of your contract management/customer liaison arrangements and procedures for dealing with complaints or problems;
- Contract implementation/mobilisation arrangements
- Commercial considerations including confidence to meet deadlines and budgets;

AND

b) The overall contract price, having taken into account any risks or benefits to PHSO including any cost or saving resulting from the setting-up and running of the Contract.

2.7 The deadline for tenders to be received from potential suppliers is **12:00 (noon) Wednesday 3rd August 2011**. There is a PHSO email address set up specifically for this purpose.

2.8 The outcome of the ITT evaluation will be a ranking of bids and the selection of a maximum of three potential suppliers, who will be invited to present to the PHSO evaluation panel, focusing on clarifications of the tender submission together with a demonstration of their proposed solution. Subject to successful presentation/demonstration one supplier will be asked to enter into a contractual arrangement with PHSO.

2.3.6 Part of the evaluation process will include site visits to existing customers to whom the preferred supplier has provided a contact database similar to that required by PHSO. The questions to be posed to the referees are outlined in **Appendix D**. These are questions designed to address key issues such as implementation, post-implementation support, and training. Panel members will be invited to add questions under these broad headings, if they wish.

3. EVALUATION TEAM

3.1 Core Evaluation Team

3.1.1 The following will form the **Core Evaluation Team** considering the Tender responses and functional requirements:

- Claire Forbes - Director of Communications;
- Tim Miller - Head of Public Affairs;
- Sarah Rayner-Osbon – Database Project Manager;
- John Wallinger, MPP - Data consultant;
- Ros Page - Head of PPBM (price and contract only); and
- Oliver Watling - Procurement Manager (price and contract only).

3.2 Technical Evaluation Sub Group

3.2.1 The following will form the **Technical Evaluation Team** considering the technical requirements of the proposals:

- Tom Stoddart - Head of ICT;
- Keiran Cook - SunGard Service Delivery Manager
- Clint Taylor - Head of Corporate Planning.

3.2.2 Claire Forbes will Chair the Evaluation Team; Tim Miller will deputise if necessary. The Chair will hold the responsibility of endorsing the tenderer's evaluation consolidation reports as drafted by PPBM with the support of other members of the evaluation team as required.

3.3 No Communication

3.3.1 Any communication or correspondence with tenderers regarding the evaluation or selection process relating to paper and interview stages of the procurement process will be addressed to and dealt with by the Procurement Manager.

3.4 Procurement Advice

3.4.1 The Procurement Manager will provide advice and guidance as required on a range of procurement issues e.g. evaluation criteria.

3.4.2 The Procurement Manager may be consulted by the evaluation team or sub group at any point during the evaluation if clarification is required regarding part of a tender.

3.4.3 Typically the Procurement Manager will:

- Provide clarification regarding tenderers' proposed options and/or solutions and schedules;
- Provide details of the bidders' pricing proposals to the moderation meeting (see 5.1.7 below)
- Provide guidance on feasibility and depth of experience;
- Provide advice on risk assessment;
- Provide details on tenderers' proposed amendments to the Terms and Conditions of Contract.

4. MEDIATION

4.1 Mediation

4.1.1 In the event of any dispute from a bidder regarding the evaluation process the mediator will be the final authority regarding the administration of the evaluation process.

4.1.2 The mediator will be independent of the evaluation process and will be:

- Graham Payne - Director of Finance, Planning & Performance.

4.2 Communication

Any communication or correspondence from tenderers regarding the evaluation or selection process relating to this stage of the procurement process will be addressed to and dealt with by the mediator through PPBM.

5. EVALUATION APPROACH, KEY STAGES AND DATES

5.1 Approach Part 1 – Proposal Evaluation Team

5.1.1 Tender evaluation team members will be provided with all the necessary information to enable them to evaluate responses as soon as possible after the tender return date of 3rd August 2011.

5.1.2 At this stage of the evaluation process, the core and technical evaluation teams will receive proposals which are unpriced and contain no reference to price/cost. During the evaluation process the evaluation teams will not score commercial considerations or proposal prices.

5.1.3 Each proposal will be evaluated individually by members of the core evaluation team using **Appendix A** (Requirements Checklists) and **Appendix F** (Non-Functional Evaluation Form) and scored in accordance with the agreed rating mechanism (shown in Section 6), with written comments as evidence of a detailed assessment and analysis of the tender submission.

5.1.4 In addition, members of the technical evaluation sub group will evaluate the mandatory requirements of the tenders (using **Appendix B – Technical Evaluation)**.

5.1.5 The scores and supporting written comments for each tender submission response will be recorded by the evaluator using the tender score sheets provided.

5.1.6 As detailed in Section 3.4, the evaluation team will be able to call upon the expertise of the Procurement Manager where required.

5.1.7 Evaluators will submit their signed score sheets to the Procurement Manager **in advance of the evaluation meeting** by no later than 13th August 2011, who will log and store the completed score sheets in a secure area. Each evaluator will retain a copy of their evaluation forms until the contract has been awarded.

5.1.8 If any comments are subsequently changed, the evaluator must initial and date the adjusted comments.

5.2 Approach Part 2 – Commercial Considerations and Price of the Proposal

5.2.1 The Procurement Manager will undertake an evaluation of commercial considerations proposed by tenderers (using **Appendix E – Evaluation Guidance (Procurement)**. These commercial considerations may relate to alterations proposed by the tenderers regarding the terms and conditions of contract issued in the ITT.

5.2.2 The Procurement Manager will only evaluate commercial considerations and the tender price and will not score any other aspects of the tenderers' submissions.

5.2.3 Where it is identified by the Procurement Manager that a tenderer's price exceeds the budget for this requirement, the Manager will e-mail the evaluation team Chair in order to determine whether the evaluation of the tender(s) should continue. If the evaluation team Chair determines that the evaluation should continue, the evaluation will be conducted in accordance with this document. If the evaluation team Chair determines that the evaluation should not continue, the evaluation of the tender(s) will cease and the Procurement Manager will record this outcome on the Tender Price – Evaluation Spreadsheet.

5.3 Approach Part 3 – Proposal Evaluation Moderation Meeting

5.3.1 Evaluators will hold an evaluation moderation meeting on **15th August 2011** to discuss the individual rating and comments attributed during their individual evaluations of the tenders submitted. The meeting's discussion will include advice and opinions from the Technical Subgroup on the compatibility of the proposed solutions with our existing systems and security requirements. Evaluators will compare evaluation comments and agree a master summary of key points for the main evaluation categories for each tender and rate tenderers' responses by category according to the rating mechanisms in Section 6.1. If there are any particular questions a panel member wants to put forward for the meeting with tenderers, such as finding out more about the different ways the bidders have integrated their software with other systems, these can be added to the summary of the meeting.

5.3.2 If any anomalies in the scoring are identified by the Procurement Manager, the Evaluator(s) will be invited to discuss and review that individual score and adjust if appropriate. This will help ensure consistency in individual scoring patterns.

5.3.3 If any individual evaluation rating is subsequently adjusted during this evaluation meeting, the Evaluator must initial and date the adjusted score. Once individual scores have been discussed and agreed by the evaluation team, the Procurement Manager will provide an overall consolidated score in accordance with the agreed scoring mechanism.

5.3.4 The Procurement Manager will present an evaluation of pricing and commercial information to the meeting after the scores are moderated, in order to facilitate a final ranking of tenderers based on the most economically advantageous bids taking into consideration price, quality and commercial arrangements.

5.3.5 In the event of an overall tied score, the tenderer scoring more highly in the higher weighted areas will take precedence.

5.3.6 The output of the moderation meeting will be (1) an agreed shortlist of up to three bids for further consideration and (2) a list of clarification questions the team have identified should be put to the shortlisted bidders and addressed in their presentations. PPBM will subsequently notify the short-listed bidders of any such specific questions.

5.3.7 Once scoring has been completed, PPBM will store the evaluation spreadsheet in a secure area.

5.4 Approach Part 4 – Demonstration, Clarification and Scenarios

5.4.1 The short listed tenderers will be required to make a presentation to the evaluation team. This will include a demonstration of the proposed software. The presentation will take place on **19th August 2011** in PHSO's offices in London.

5.4.2 During the initial meeting, the bidders will have up to 1 hour (including presentation) to demonstrate their proposed solution and to clarify any queries arising from the moderation meeting.

5.4.3 Evaluators will use the interview form provided in **Appendix G** to record comments for each tenderer. After each presentation a consensus should be reached on whether the tender meets the expected standards for each section and agree the final mark.

5.4.4 During the software demonstration, evaluators should make detailed notes and a copy of any PowerPoint presentation or screen will be requested and retained by the Procurement Manager.

5.4.5 The Procurement Manager, in conjunction with the member of the evaluation team nominated by the Chair, will decide which of the current customers of the short-listed tenderers will be approached to arrange site visits. The Procurement Manager will make appropriate arrangements for the evaluation team to visit the sites.

5.4.6 Once the marks given to each tender have been discussed and agreed, the evaluation team should agree the order in which tenders rank in terms of overall scoring (including price), and confirm that the highest ranking supplier fully meets the requirement and should be awarded a contract for the services, subject to satisfactory site reference visits.

5.5 Approach Part 5 – Reference Site Visits

5.5.1 As part of the evaluation process, the evaluation team attending the site will complete a site evaluation form provided in **Appendix D**.

5.6 Approach Part 6 – Evaluation Report

5.6.1 The Chair of the Evaluation Team or their nominee will approve a consolidated evaluation report drafted by PPBM.

5.6.2 PPBM will notify tenderers of the outcome of the evaluation, and offer debriefs to unsuccessful tenderers within a reasonable timescale.

5.6.3 After the successful tender has been accepted, the Procurement Manager will develop the contact documentation.

6. EVALUATION WEIGHTINGS AND SCORING MECHANISM

6.1 Scoring mechanism for evaluating tenders

6.1.1 The following scoring mechanism will be used by the Proposal Evaluation Team where scoring is a requirement:

Rating	Meaning
A	Multiple evidence of strengths. No apparent weaknesses
B	Multiple evidence of strengths. Some apparent weaknesses
C	Evidence of strengths outweigh evidence of weaknesses
D	Evidence of weaknesses outweigh evidence of strengths
E	Multiple evidence of weaknesses. Some apparent strengths
F	No evidence of strengths.

In the case of the technical evaluation, at **Appendix B** the technical evaluation team members (see 3.2) will indicate if each of the criteria are met by the tenderers written responses.

6.1.2 The scoring mechanism has been devised to illustrate differences in scores achieved by the tenderers.

6.1.2 Evaluation team members are required to confirm if the tenderers meet the minimum standard or if this needs further clarification from the tenderer. Submission requirements are marked either yes, no or unclear.

6.1.3 When considering responses Evaluators will need to consider:

- Adherence to the requirement (i.e. has the tenderer proposed a viable solution that meets the requirement);
- Credibility of response (i.e. is the proposal based on the tenderer's areas of expertise and is the solution managerially and technically credible);
- Has the tenderer indicated an innovative tender submission that may provide greater value for money;
- To what extent does the tenderer's response answer the guidance questions in the scoring sheet?

6.2 Weightings

Mandatory criteria	% weighting
Overall compliance with and demonstrable understanding of PHSO's business needs and relevant sector experience	15%
Corporate capability and technical experience, including references. The resources, including the quality and experience of your staff and any sub-contractors.	20%
Suitability of proposed approach, methodology / database platform for meeting PHSO's requirements, including training options proposed.	35%
Approach to assure the quality of the work, and the quality of your contract management/customer liaison arrangements and procedures for dealing with complaints or problems;	10%
Contract implementation/mobilisation arrangements	10%
Commercial considerations including confidence to meet deadlines and budgets	10%
TOTAL WEIGHTING	**100%**

6.3 Presentations

6.3.1 The evaluation team, at its discretion, may revise marks to tenderers based on their perception of the quality of answers given in any presentations recorded on the comment evaluation sheet.

6.3.2 In addition, evaluators will consider the detailed criteria as set out in the ITT.

COMPLIANCE WITH SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A STAKEHOLDER CONTACT DATABASE

Contract reference number: PR 1126

Essential

Requirement reference number	**Requirement**	✓	X
SD001	Store and maintain standardised contact data in a single place that is stable and reliable in use.		
SD002	Capture the complexity of public sector relationships including those between organisations, between individuals, and between an individual and many organisations (such as membership of a committee or a non-executive role, in addition to their substantive role). These relationships can be characterised as ‘one to one’ and ‘one to many’ relationships.		
SD003	Limit or control access to stakeholder data based on users’ roles.		
SD004	Support compliance with the Data Protection Act (when using data for communications purposes). For example, has the facility to capture contact preferences for each record and apply filters for these preferences.		
SD005	Provide management information about the quality, quantity and reach of PHSO’s relationships with stakeholders through use of configurable reports. For instance reporting on: high level personnel changes, statistics on recent meetings, number of stakeholders by geography or by audience segment, records due for review.		
SD008	Uses plain English rather than codes in the data screens.		

SD010	Ability to link organisations in a relationship hierarchy, vertically, horizontally, or matrix.		
SD011	Provides user configurable search mechanisms, for example the facility to build queries using multiple field selections.		
SD012	Supports the sorting, printing and saving of search results in variable display formats.		
SD013	Ensures that all retrieval operations are consistent with all access control restrictions, so that an unauthorised user cannot access records by use of an advanced search and retrieval mechanism.		
SD014	A group of records can be selected by applying filters and all database fields available to filter (ideally including pick lists).		
SD018	When adding record(s), there will be an automatic search to see if the record already exists. The user will then be able to review potential matches and make a decision on the next action. For example: o Add contact name, etc to an organisation that already exists in the database o Add new organisation o Add contact name, etc and organisation name and address Link two organisations together that are at different addresses (e.g. xx hospital is part of yyy NHS foundation trust)		
SD020	Facility to upload data from various sources and in various formats, with the facility to flag records according to the source of the data if externally sourced. Examples of these import formats include: .xls, .csv, .txt, MS Outlook, MS Access.		
SD021	User-configurable import templates for regular uploads.		
SD022	Data can be exported easily (.txt, .csv, .xls, etc) for mail merge or email broadcast by another package or for sending externally.		
SD023	*Ability to print reports or export them as Excel, Word or .pdf files.*		

SD024	Reports, counts and selections: All fields and campaign attributes should be available for counts and selections individually or in combinations		
SD025	Reports, counts and selections: There should be a facility to set up user-configurable standard report templates (that can be run from a menu), as well as ad-hoc reports		
SD026	User-configurable activity picklist, to log a communication activity against a data record. For example: Joe Smith's record shows he was invited to xx workshop; or, that PHSO sent him xx consultation paper.		
SD027	Each record included in a campaign should record any response. For example: Joe Smith attended xx workshop; or, he responded to xx consultation on [date].		
SD028	*Counts or selections can be made on campaign attributes (for example, select all those that were mailed about xx workshop and did not attend).*		
SD030	The ability to allow shared access to a single data item.		
SD031	The ability to control access to electronic records. Access rights must be configurable in-house across roles, groups and users.		
SD032	Facility to restrict certain fields in specific records to certain users. An example of this is for Government ministers' mobile numbers to be restricted to the Ombudsman and their private office.		
SD033	*The database must have a backup facility, configurable in-house.*		
SD036	The ability to automatically maintain a full unalterable audit trail for an electronic record, not just delete.		
SD037	The ability to support / provide management information and reporting on audit events.		

Desirable

Requirement reference number	Requirement	✓	X
SD006	Available under concurrent user licences, to reflect PHSO's usage patterns and to keep costs low.		
SD007	Has the potential to support future interactivity via our website. (Our current content management software is Squiz (formerly known as MySource Matrix).		
SD009	Easy to access, easy to search, plain English 'help' screens to support users		
SD015	Search facility by field, with full or partial matching returning one or more records.		
SD016	Facility for user-run counts for individual criteria and for filtered records.		
SD017	*Ability to identify and report on fields with null data so that data for incomplete records can be sourced.*		
SD019	*Ability to notify the record owner of the need to update one or more records. Ideally this would offer an automated facility (such as sending a reminder at predetermined intervals) and a manual facility (e.g. a read-only user needs to notify one of our system administrators of a change that's needed).*		
SD029	*Mass communication function, including supporting email broadcast and response tracking, either through the database or through an external supplier.*		
SD034	*Each user able to access the database using a pass-through from their PHSO network account.*		
SD035	*Confirmation that the proposed solution complies with or supports ISO 27001 – Information Security Standard and UK government IS standards.*		
SD038	*Facility to record and manage stakeholders' data protection preferences and permissions.*		
SD042	The ability to be integrated with standard desktop		

	applications such as Microsoft Office and Outlook.		
SD043	Compatible with our web content software, Squiz (formerly known as MySource Matrix).		
SD049	Configurable in-house, post-implementation.		
SD050	Incorporate ‘help’ screens that are configurable in-house.		
SD055	Advice and support on deployment methods and approaches.		
SD056	Best practice project management should be adopted commensurate with PHSO’s project governance and standards.		
SD072	*Provide additional consultancy/development if and as required, as a variation to this contract.*		

Appendix B

COMPLIANCE WITH TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

CONTRACT FOR THE PROVISION OF A STAKEHOLDER CONTACT DATABASE

Contract reference number: PR 1126

Essential

Requirement reference number	Requirement	✓	X
SD039	The system must support operating on a platform of Windows Server 2008; and the database must be compatible with Active Directory user authentication and access control.		
SD040	The database must have a 0 Client footprint and be able to operate under multiple environments such as virtual desktop, specifically VMWare VDI; and the system must support a database platform of SQL Server 2008.		
SD041	*The database should be browser interfaced, operating on all industry browsers types and be compliant at a minimum to AA web accessibility.*		
SD044	Provide a user interface that is compatible with accessibility software that may be used (e.g. Dragon Naturally Speaking, ZoomText).		
SD045	Presents consistent user interface menus, commands and other facilities in all parts of the application.		
SD046	Applies consistent terminology to functions and actions in all parts of the application.		
SD047	Support the use of, and navigation by, hyperlinks and other cross-references that are contained in records.		
SD048	*PHSO's system administrator can change or add new records, fields, reports.*		
SD051	Pre-implementation advice and consultancy – development of a project plan which covers installation, configuration, integration, and a menu		

	of training options for PHSO users and ICT team from which PHSO can select a training package.		
SD052	Advice and a specification on the type of hardware and other system arrangements required.		
SD053	Thorough testing before going live, this will include system testing, functional testing and user acceptance testing.		
SD054	The contractor will be required to advise on the format for the data to be transferred into the database and to load the initial dataset into the database.		
SD057	The Contractor shall provide full and comprehensive system documentation, including installation drawings/instructions.		
SD058	The Contractor shall provide full and comprehensive user documentation, including a comprehensive, plain English user manual.		
SD059	The Contractor shall prepare training materials in consultation with PHSO, covering how to use, manage and administer the database.		
SD060	The Contractor shall provide the following training options for PHSO users and ICT team to be exercised at PHSO's discretion: • ICT manual in soft copy (Word or Powerpoint) • e-learning technical training package for ICT team • Plain English user manual in soft copy (Word or Powerpoint) • Training for a group of 10-15 superusers • e-learning package for users • e-learning script for users		
SD061	The Contractor shall have clear service levels in place with guaranteed response times on a sliding scale depending on the severity of the issue.		
SD062	The Contractor shall provide an established escalation procedures for the raising of bugs and		

	issues		
SD063	The Contractor shall provide a service level agreement for support for the duration of the contract		
SD064	The Contractor shall provide software that is supported by an annual support agreement that includes the cost of software upgrades for each year of the contract		
SD065	The system shall demonstrate a lifespan of more than three years in the market.		
SD066	The system shall have a clear strategy to upgrade and validate software components to later versions as they become available.		
SD067	The system shall be easily scaleable so that any requirement for additional licences can be seamlessly implemented.		
SD068	Provide a professional service and have relevant experience.		
SD069	Have sound management of administrative processes, including meeting deadlines, good progress reporting, and quality assurance processes.		
SD070	Develop and agree monitoring arrangements to be applied to their work under the contract. Acceptance criteria will be agreed with us.		
SD071	Maintain a suitable procedure for escalation within the Contractor's organisation		

Desirable

Requirement reference number	**Requirement**	✓	X
SD042	The ability to be integrated with standard desktop applications such as Microsoft Office and Outlook.		
SD043	Compatible with our web content software, Squiz (formerly known as MySource Matrix).		
SD049	Configurable in-house, post-implementation.		
SD050	Incorporate 'help' screens that are configurable in-house.		
SD055	Advice and support on deployment methods and approaches.		
SD056	Best practice project management should be adopted commensurate with PHSO's project governance and standards.		
SD072	*Provide additional consultancy/development if and as required, as a variation to this contract.*		

Appendix C

APPRAISAL OF MEANS TO PERFORM CONTRACT

1. FINANCIAL STABILITY

In order to be able to assess your company's financial stability, please ensure that you supply the following information for the last three financial years. Please note that electronic copies of recently audited financial reports and accounts may be required at a later stage.

a) Annual turnover
b) Gross profit
c) Net profit
d) Return on assets
e) Current liabilities
f) Long term liabilities and share capital structure

Please also answer the following statements:

a) Is the company subject to any significant pending changes in its financial structure?
b) Has your company met the terms of its banking facilities and loan agreements (if any) during the past year? If you have answered "no" to this question then please outline the reasons and what has been done to put things right?
c) Has your company met all its obligations to pay its creditors and staff during the past year? If you answered "no" to this question then please explain why not.

2.CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY

a) Please provide a summary of your organisation's principal area(s) of business activity; including details about your experience in providing similar goods/services as required by IHOL.

b) Please provide details of any significant pending changes to the organisation's Structure, business direction or ownership.

c) Has your organisation been subject to any legal proceedings by current or former customers in the last five (5) years in the UK or elsewhere? If so, please provide brief details, as well as the outcome.

d) Please provide details of the number of staff allocated to technical support and maintenance. Where is your support function based? How will you supply this element to PHSO?

e) Please provide details of any recognised quality assurance accreditation that your organisation holds. If your organisation does not have a quality assurance accreditation, please provide details of any quality assurance system that the organisation adheres to.

3. POLICIES AND INSURANCES

Policies

Please confirm whether you have formal policies in relation to the following and provide copies accordingly:

a) Corporate Social Responsibility Policy
b) Data Security Policy
c) Business Continuity Policy
d) Environmental Policy
e) Equal Opportunity & Diversity Policy
f) Health & Safety Policy
g) Does your company comply with all relevant discrimination legislation e.g. the Equality Act 2010?

Insurance

Please state your annual insurance cover for each of the following insurance policies :

a) Public Liability Insurance
b) Employer's Liability Insurance
c) Product Liability Insurance
d) Professional Indemnity Insurance

Appendix D

Site Reference Evaluation Form

Tenderer name: ____Site Location: ____________________

Date of Visit: _________________________________Customer organisation's name:-
____

Question 1	**Can the Customer comment on the implementation of the Database solution? e.g. Timescales, Budget, was it successful**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 2	**Was the database delivered fit for purpose and does it have the functional requirements that were required? e.g. has what the customer commissioned been delivered?**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 3	**During the implementation phase, was training provided to end users and service administrators? If so, did the service offered meet the expectations of the customer? (e.g. was it undertaken by the tenderer or a specialist training company and of a high standard? What was the overall tone of the feedback from trainees?)**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 4	**Is the account management of a high standard? (e.g. responsive, any problems resolved quickly, the account manager readily available)**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Can we add a question about what type of problems, if any, arose during implementation?

Question 5	**Are invoices presented by the Contractor accurate?**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 6	**Can the Client advise on the Contractor's contract management arrangements e.g. KPIs and response times?**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 7	**Is the Contractor easy to communicate with - can the Customer give examples? (e.g. Both written and oral communication)**
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 8	Does the Contractor provide a proactive approach in delivering the service - can the Client give examples?
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Question 9	Would the Customer contract with the Contractor to provide a database solution again? E.g. with the benefit of hindsight, would they recommend them to other public sector organisations?
{Enter your comments, if any}	

Any Additional Comments:

Name & Role	**Signed**	**Date**
TBA		
TBA		
TBA		

Appendix E

EVALUATION GUIDANCE (PROCUREMENT)

ASSESSMENT AREA
COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS (WEIGHTING 0) (Procurement Adviser):
FORM OF TENDER Is the Form of Tender signed and dated as appropriate? Are there any amendments to the Form of Tender?
CERTIFICATE OF BONA FIDE TENDERING Is the Form of Tender signed and dated as appropriate?
CONFIDENTIALITY OF UNDERTAKING This form does not need to be signed at this stage of the procurement process. The Confidentiality of Undertaking Form will be signed during the exchange of contracts.
VARIATIONS TO CONTRACT FORM Has the Bidder accepted the Buying Solutions Terms and Conditions; are there any significant changes being proposed? What is the impact of the commercial considerations being proposed by the Bidder?
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS Are there any other commercial considerations being proposed by the Bidder? What is the impact of the commercial considerations being proposed by the bidder?
PRICE (WEIGHTING 0) (Procurement Adviser):
How realistic is their Proposed Price; how do they explain their price? Are the rates comparable with the existing service provision allowing for inflation and/or other cost factors? Is it within budget? Has the tenderer confirmed how the submitted price has been arrived at? Have they explained the method of charging and how this is verified – for example, indicative costs or fixed rate? Can the overall total cost (whole life cost) be determined? Does the tendered price provide overall value for money? Has the tenderer submitted a fixed price or an alternative pricing structure?

Appendix F

Non-Functional Evaluation of Tender Submission for Stakeholder Contacts Database

Evaluator:		**Tenderer:**	
Assessment		**Evidence / Comments**	**Score (A - F)**
Overall compliance with and demonstrable understanding of PHSO's business needs and relevant sector experience (Weighting 15%) Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are: o Have they understood PHSO's role and purpose? o Have they understood PHSO's requirements for the database including timescales? o Do they have a customer base consisting of organisations of similar size and function? o What potential is there for developing the system to meet future needs, for example integrating their software with other systems such as our website?		*{Enter your comments}*	
Corporate capability and technical experience, including references. The resources, including the quality and experience of staff and any sub-contractors. (Weighting 20%) Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are: o Are the personnel of high quality; are they available throughout the assignment? o Does the team demonstrate the ability to build and maintain credibility? o Have they been involved in delivering similar systems in other organisations?		*{Enter your comments}*	

Suitability of proposed approach, methodology / database platform for meeting PHSO's requirements, including training options proposed. (Weighting 35%) <u>Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are:</u> o Does the approach in the bid address the needs of PHSO's requirements? o Does the database have suitable search tools and interface? o Does the bid provide screenshots for reference? o Does the bid propose dates for completing the milestones and are they reasonable? o Are the proposed training options suitable? o Does the proposal control of creep of project scope?	*{Enter your comments}*	
Approach to assure the quality of the work, and the quality of your contract management/customer liaison arrangements and procedures for dealing with complaints or problems; (Weighting 10%) <u>Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are:-</u> o Does the bid outline or propose a quality plan? o Does the bid outline a suitable escalation process for complaints/issues? o Does the bid include an appropriate testing period? o Has the bidder given assurance of how they comply with ISO 27001 – Information Security Standard and UK government IS standards?	*{Enter your comments}*	

Contract implementation/mobilisation arrangements (Weighting 10%) <u>Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are:</u> o Does the bid outline an appropriate implementation plan? o Does the bid identify risks (and impacts) and develop plans for addressing them? o Does the bid contain an outline of delivery encompassing all the milestones in the Specification?	*{Enter your comments}*	
Commercial considerations including confidence to meet deadlines and budgets (Weighting 10%) <u>Some of the points to consider in scoring this section are:</u> o Does the bid allocate enough resources to the project (i.e. Staff expertise /Person hours) o Would PHSO be an important client compared with existing clients? o Are contingency plans and risk allowances cited?	*{Enter your comments}*	

	Overall Tender Grade	
Additional comments or points: • What would you recommend to address for presentation? • How might we build on the proposal to better meet the business need? • Are you confident the tenderer can deliver? • Any other questions for the process?		
Signed:	**Print Name:**	**Date:**
Rating Methodology • 10 = Multiple evidence of strengths. No apparent weaknesses • 8 = Multiple evidence of strengths. Some apparent weaknesses • 6 = Evidence of strengths outweigh evidence of weaknesses	• 4 = Evidence of weaknesses outweigh evidence of strengths • 2 = Multiple evidence of weaknesses. Some apparent strengths • 0 = No evidence of strengths.	

Appendix G

CLARIFICATION MEETING EVALUATION SHEET

Name of Evaluator:

Area of proposal considered	Evidence/Comments
Any additional matters	

Appendix H

EVALUATION SUMMARY SPREADSHEET (Example)

Scoring completed by:

	Scoring: Yes/No/ Unclear						