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**The Housing and Regeneration Agency**

**The Housing and Regeneration Agency**

Introduction

The purpose of this Further Competition Invitation to Tender (ITT) is to award the call-off contract for the above commission*.*

We ask you to respond to the questions detailed in Part 2, Section 6 (Evaluation Criteria) using the [Response Form](#_RESPONSE_FORM) and to return the Response Form and Resource and Pricing Schedule in Part 3 with your tender.

This Further Competition ITT is divided into 3 parts:

**Part 1 – Commission Requirement**

* Details the commission requirements.
* Details additional terms and conditions for the Further Competition. The successful Supplier will be subject to both the terms and conditions of this Further Competition and the Framework Contract. Unless otherwise defined in these instructions, terms used shall have the meaning given to them in the Framework Contract.

**Part 2 – Instructions for Submitting a Response**

* Contains important information and instructions on preparing and submitting a tender response. Please read these instructions carefully prior to submitting your tender response.
* Outlines the evaluation criteria which will be used for assessment. It is important that Suppliers familiarise themselves with the criteria and ensure they are considered when compiling their tender response.

**Part 3 – Standard Forms**

* Contains the standard forms required to be completed and returned by the Supplier when submitting a tender response.

Part 1 - Commission Requirements

1. **Commission Background**

Homes England launched its comprehensive Evaluation Programme in July 2020. This suite of research activities comprises an ambitious set of studies to better understand the impact that the Agency has through its market-facing interventions, and to learn lessons from delivery to date to inform future delivery. This work supports Homes England in achieving its mission and strategic objectives (set out in its Strategic Plan [[1]](#footnote-2)), and importantly evidence how it is achieving them.

The Cladding Safety Scheme, previously known as the Mid-Rise Remediation (MRR) and Medium Rise Scheme (MRS) takes on all new applications for grant funded remediation since mid-2023. The scheme focuses its effort on making around 5,000[[2]](#footnote-3) buildings safe from risk caused by unsafe cladding – providing funding for remediation of buildings over 11 metres (11-18m in London[[3]](#footnote-4)). As of 31st May 2024, the CSS had 677 applications for grants within the case management system, of which 3 have started on site.

In line with Homes England’s agency-wide evaluation strategy, and to meet government funding requirements, the CSS will be subject to robust evaluation.

The initial process evaluation, that this procurement is the subject of, will focus on the set up and launch of the scheme, as well as reflections on early delivery.

The commission will be overseen by Homes England’s Research and Analysis Team, working within a Steering Group that will also comprise relevant delivery teams and government stakeholders, and other colleagues as appropriate.

1. **Objectives**

The CSS Evaluation Plan sets out nine research questions to be answered through the evaluation of CSS that were developed and iterated by the Research and Analysis team at the Agency, using the Agency-wide Evaluation Framework as a starting point, and through discussion with delivery colleagues and DLUHC colleagues.

The research questions are grouped under four broad headings, including elements of both process and impact evaluation:

1. **What has been delivered through the CSS? (both directly and indirectly focusing on MI data)**
2. **What wider effects has the CSS had?**
3. **What is the ex-post additionality and value for money of the CSS?**
4. **What delivery lessons can be learned from the CSS?**

This initial process evaluation will mainly assess the early stages of the CSS processes due to the limited numbers of buildings that have gone substantively through the remediation process to date. It will answer three main questions, which have been further divided into sub questions to assist in steering the evaluators to areas of focus. A further process evaluation will be commissioned in 2026/27 alongside the first interim impact and value for money assessment. This detailed process evaluation will review the full end to end processes of CSS. A further interim impact evaluation is planned for 2029/30, and a final process, impact and value for money evaluation is planned after the programme completes in 2034.

**Research Questions that should be answered by this initial Process Evaluation**

**RQ7: Were residents kept informed throughout the process of the CSS? Did applicants find the process easy to navigate and the CSS service acceptable (registered entities and leaseholders)?**

***Sub questions***

**How well do beneficiaries/non beneficiaries rate processes?**

* Were processes easy to follow?
* Are there any unnecessary or unexpected delays or blockages in processes?
* Do residents and registered entities feel informed at all stages?

**How well do beneficiaries/non beneficiaries rate HE staff support?**

**What could or should have been done differently? / What lessons can be learnt?**

**RQ8: How well has the Cladding Safety Scheme been delivered by Homes England? What has worked well and less well? What lessons have been learned for future ways of working?**

***Sub questions***

**How well/less well did the scheme transition from Mid-Rise Remediation (MRR) and Medium Rise Scheme (MRS) to CSS?**

* Did this affect the speed of set up and initial delivery?
* Did the launch of the scheme go as planned in terms of sign off and marketing?
* What could or should have been done differently? / What lessons can be learnt?

**What were the operational and governance changes from MRR and MRS to CSS and what have been the impact for HE and beneficiaries?**

* What has been the impact of the new delivery board and governance arrangements?
* Have the increased responsibilities/delegation from DLUHC improved decision-making abilities or sped up delivery?
* What could or should have been done differently? / What lessons can be learnt?

**Have the current processes enabled the scheme to operate/deliver as planned?**

* Do the scheme parameters and application criteria impact delivery?
* What could or should have been done differently? / What lessons can be learnt?

**What recommendation for change would be suggested?**

* To be implemented now to assist with delivery of the current scheme.
* To be implemented for future schemes/similar programmes.

**RQ9: What external factors have influenced the delivery of the Cladding Safety Scheme and what has been the impact?**

***Sub question***

**How have Macro-economic conditions impacted set up and delivery of the scheme?**

* How the scheme been adapted to mitigate these factors?

**Is the CSS flexible enough to adapt to external impacts?**

* What could or should have been done differently? / What lessons can be learnt?

**What recommendation for change would be suggested?**

* To be implemented now to assist with delivery of the current scheme.
* To be implemented for future schemes/similar programmes.
1. **The Services**

As a minimum this initial process evalution will require:

* A survey of registered entity applicants (beneficiaries and non beneficiaries)
* A survey of households (beneficiaries and non beneficiaries)
* Consultations with delivery teams and sector stakeholders
* Analysis of programme management information
* Contextual analysis of external factors impacting the scheme

Bidders should also explore if and how the evaluation can make use of non-project data, such as housing market data. Bidders are also encouraged to put forward other suggestions for what should be included/involved in delivering this commission.

1. **Key Deliverables**

Outputs for this commission include:

* A Project Initiation Document post-inception meeting, confirming the agreed workplan, information requirements, and timescales for the study;
* Research tools, which must be approved by the study Steering Group before their use;
* A short interim findings presentation setting out progress, issues arising in the study process, and early findings;
* Final report that answers each of the research questions set out above. The main body of report should be no more than 50 pages. The report should be accompanied by a max. 4 page Executive Summary. Annexes may be included for further technical detail only, as deemed by the supplier.
1. **Indicative Programme**

Suppliers should note the indicative programme dates when preparing their Programme information in the Response Form.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key Delivery Milestones | Anticipated Date |
| Commencement Date | July 2024  |
| Inception meeting | July 2024 |
| Project Initiation Document submitted to Homes England | July 2024 |
| Interim findings presentation submitted to Homes England | September/October 2024 |
| Draft report submitted to Homes England | November 2024 |
| Final report submitted to Homes England | December 2024 |
| Completion Date | December 2024 |

1. **Management**

A Senior Economic Research Specialist atHomes England) will be the day-to-day contact for the supplier.

The supplier will also need to work closely with the delivery team to source data and contact details for consultees.

The supplier will submit a Project Initiation Document, draft report and final report, as per the table above (Indicative Programme). In addition, the supplier must provide fortnightly verbal/email progress updates, to ensure that any issues with progress are highlighted, and can be rectified, promptly.

**Meeting Requirements:**

**Start-up meeting**

The inception meeting for the study will be held in the week 29/07/2024. It will be attended by the supplier and the full evaluation Steering Group, comprising the Research and Analysis Team, the delivery team at Homes England, and DLUHC colleagues. The purpose of the meeting will be to discuss and confirm the approach to the study, including key dates and project management arrangements.

**Review meetings**

Further full meetings of the Steering Group will be held in the weeks following receipt of the interim presentation, draft report and final report, to discuss feedback on the outputs, and agree any potential changes to be made to the approach/reports.

**Poor Performance Meeting**

These meetings will hopefully not be required. However, if poor performance is repeated following escalation to the Supplier’s Key Personnel to resolve the issue, as required in the Framework Management Schedule of the Framework Contract, the Framework Manager must be notified and Homes England may call for a Poor Performance Meeting. Beforehand, Homes England will present areas of concern so that the Supplier and Homes England can discuss what happened and why, what will be done to prevent it happening again and how matters will improve. The Supplier subject to such a meeting would be expected to outline in writing in a Rectification Plan afterwards what improvements/modifications they will be putting in place. There will be a maximum of two Poor Performance Meetings before termination of the commission.

1. **Key staff**

The role of all staff involved in the study must be included in the Resource and Pricing Schedule. CVs should also be included for all staff alongside other bid documents.

1. **Risks**

Bidders are required to set out any risks they identify with their approach, and their methods for mitigating them.

1. **Payment**

Payments will be made on: finalisation of the Project Initiation Document (10%); interim presentation (35%); receipt of draft report (35%); and final report (20%).

1. **Budget**

The budget for this commission is £100,000 (excl. VAT).

1. **Termination**

Should performance during the period of this appointment prove unsatisfactory following the Poor Performance meeting provisions set out in the Management section above, Homes England will exercise its right under the Termination and Suspension of the Contract clause in the Framework Contract to give notice to terminate the arrangement with immediate effect.

If the services are no longer required, for whatever reason, then Homes England reserves the right to terminate the appointment and pay for services completed at that point

1. **Conflict of Interest**

Homes England will exclude the Supplier if there is a conflict of interest which cannot be effectively remedied. The concept of a conflict of interest includes any situation where relevant staff members have, directly or indirectly, a financial, economic or other personal interest which might be perceived to compromise their impartiality and independence in the context of the procurement procedure.

Where there is any indication that a conflict of interest exists or may arise then it is the responsibility of the Supplier to inform Homes England, detailing the conflict in a separate Appendix.

1. **Confidentiality**

This Further Competition ITT and associated information is confidential and shall not be disclosed to any third party without the prior written consent of Homes England. Copyright in this Further Competition ITT is vested in Homes England and may not be reproduced, copied or stored on any medium without Homes England's prior written consent.

Suppliers shall not undertake, cause or permit to be undertaken at any time any publicity in respect of this Further Competition process in any media without the prior written consent of Homes England.

Part 2 - Instructions for Submitting a Response

1. **General**
	1. The Further Competition deadline is 17:00 on 08/07/2024 and tender responses must be submitted on ProContract. Please regularly check ProContract for any amendments to the Further Competition deadline. For all ProContract portal issues please contact ProContractSuppliers@proactis.com.
	2. Suppliers must ensure that suitable provision is made to ensure that the submission is made on time. Any tender responses received after the Further Competition deadline shall not be opened or considered unless Homes England, exercising its absolute discretion, considers it reasonable to do so. Homes England, may, however, at its own absolute discretion extend the Further Competition deadline and shall notify all Suppliers of any change via ProContract.
	3. Please note all communications during the tender period will be via the ProContract website. All Suppliers that have registered their interest for the Procurement will receive a direct email notification from ProContract on any updates via the Suppliers registered email address. No approach of any kind should be made to any other person within, or associated with, Homes England. It is the Suppliers responsibility to check the ProContract website for any updates to the Procurement process. No claim on the grounds of lack of knowledge of the above mentioned item will be entertained.
	4. The Supplier should check the Further Competition ITT for obvious errors and missing information. Should any such errors or omissions be discovered the Supplier must send a message via the messaging function on ProContract. No alteration may be made to any of the documents attached thereto without the written authorisation of Homes England. If any alterations are made, or if these instructions are not fully complied with, the tender response may be rejected.
	5. All clarification requests must be sent using ProContract no later than 5 working days before the Further Competition deadline shown on ProContract. Any queries submitted after this may not be answered. Homes England will respond to clarifications as soon as practicable.
	6. Suppliers should specify in their clarification questions if they wish the clarification to be considered as confidential between themselves and Homes England. Homes England will consider any such request and will either respond on a confidential basis or give the Supplier the right to withdraw the clarification question. If the Supplier does not elect to withdraw the question and Homes England considers any clarification question to be of material significance, both the question and the answer will be communicated, in a suitably anonymous form, to all prospective Suppliers who have responded. If Suppliers consider that page limits set out in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria) are insufficient to provide the information required by the question then a clarification request should be raised. No guarantee can be given that the page limit will be increased.
	7. Tender responses must not be accompanied by statements that could be construed as rendering the tender response equivocal and/or placing it on a different footing from other Suppliers. Only tender responses submitted without qualification strictly in accordance with the Further Competition ITT (or subsequently amended by Homes England) will be accepted for consideration. Homes England’s decision on whether or not a tender response is acceptable will be final.
	8. Tender responses must be written in English.
	9. Under no circumstances shall Homes England incur any liability in respect of this Further Competition or any supporting documentation. Homes England will not reimburse the costs incurred by Suppliers in connection with the preparation and submission of their tender response to this Further Competition.
	10. Homes England reserves the right to cancel this Further Competition process at any time.
2. **Quality**
	1. A Response Form template has been provided in Part 2 to respond to the Quality questions detailed in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria). The Response Form must be completed and returned as part of the tender response.
	2. Suppliers must provide information on proposed staff in the Response Form and Resource and Pricing Schedule provided in Part 2. If the Supplier is a consortium or intends to sub-contract the Services, in whole or in part, then it should specify precisely in the Resource and Pricing Schedule which economic operator shall perform the Services (or parts thereof).
3. **Pricing**
	1. A Resource and Pricing schedule has been provided with this Further Competition ITT which must be completed and returned as part of the tender response.
	2. The pricing approach for this Further Competition is lump sum fixed fee.
	3. Suppliers are reminded that day rates for all individuals must be the agreed Framework Contract rates unless discounted rates are offered and will be used for all of the services.
4. **Evaluation**
	1. Tender responses will be evaluated on the basis of the overall most economically advantageous Tender (MEAT) submitted to Homes England. The evaluation criteria (and relative weightings) that Homes England will use to determine the most economically advantageous Tender are set out in Section 20 (Evaluation Criteria) below and the scoring approach is detailed in Section 25 (Worked Example). Scores will be rounded to two decimal places.
	2. Evaluators will initially work independently. Once they have completed their independent evaluation they will meet to discuss, understand and moderate any differences they have via a consensus meeting, where a single consensus score for each question will be agreed.
	3. Award decisions will be subject to the standstill period if over the FTS Services threshold. Unsuccessful Framework Suppliers will be provided with their scores and feedback to explain the award decision.
5. **Documents to be Returned**

Suppliers are expected to provide the following information in response to this Further Competition ITT:

* Completed Response Form
* Completed Resource and Pricing Schedule
* Supporting CVs for staff proposed to undertake this commission (no more than 1 page each)
1. EVALUATION CRITERIA

|  |
| --- |
| Quality will account for 80% of the Overall Score. The following scoring methodology will apply:**5 – Excellent** Satisfies the requirement and demonstrates exceptional understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response. **4 – Good** Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Supplier of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with evidence to support the response.**3 – Acceptable** Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the Supplier of the understanding and evidence in their ability/proposed methodology to deliver a solution for the required supplies/services.**2 - Minor Reservations** Some minor reservations of the Supplier’s understanding and proposed methodology, with limited evidence to support the response. **1 – Major Reservations/Non-compliant** Major reservations of the Supplier’s understanding and proposed methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.**0 - Unacceptable/Non-compliant** Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Supplier has the understanding or suitable methodology, with little or no evidence to support the response.  **PLEASE NOTE:**If your response scores 0 or 1 for any one question your overall submission will be deemed as a fail. Any text beyond the specified page limits below will be ignored and will not be evaluated. Homes England will not cross-reference to other answers when assessing quality responses. Evaluators will initially work independently. Once they have completed their independent evaluation they will meet to discuss, understand and moderate any differences they have via a consensus meeting, where a single consensus score for each question will be agreed.  |
| **Number** | **Criteria** | **Demonstrated by** | **Weighting** |
| 1 | **Understanding of Project Requirements****PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 3 A4 pages, 11-point Calibri font, 1,500 words | Set out your understanding of CSS, its origin, form and structure, and the issues it seeks to address. Set out any relevant external context that may have influenced the ability of the Agency to achieve project objectives, and how these would be accounted for in the evaluation.Set out the *challenges* of answering the key research questions. Note the *methods* used to address these will be covered in response to Question 2 (Technical Merit of Proposal).Set out how this evaluation could be used to inform ongoing and new activity the Agency delivers, and what should be done in producing the study outputs to ensure this benefit is realised. | 15% |
| 2 | **Technical Merit of Proposal** **PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 5 A4 pages, 11-point Calibri font, 2,500 words | Detail the methods to be adopted in answering the research questions. The proposed methods should be as robust as possible, while being proportionate and cognisant of potential data limitations and budget.Set out key information requirements to complete the evaluation and how you propose that these will be fulfilled.Provide a sequential, step-by-step workplan, describing and explaining each task you will complete for the evaluation overall.*Supported by project examples that demonstrate the ability of the supplier to successfully deliver a study of this nature – included* *within the 5-page limit.* | 40% |
| 3 | **Resourcing and management****PAGE LIMIT:**Maximum 4 A4 pages, 11-point Calibri font, 2,000 words | Who will undertake the study and why have they been chosen?Identify key members of staff and allocation (including time) to tasks.What experience/expertise will these team members bring to fulfilling these tasks?How will the study, study team and any subcontractors be managed?How will you ensure that the study remains within budget?Who will be responsible for reporting to the Client and attend client meetings?Identify risks to the study schedule, and to the study more generally, including its outcomes. What impact might each of these risks have, and how will these risks be mitigated?*Please provide a Gantt Chart setting out timeframes for delivery of the tasks, including in relation to milestones and completion date – included within the 4-page limit.**Supported by resourcing information provided in Resource and Pricing Schedule – separate to 4-page limit.**Supported by CVs for key members of staff – no more than 1 page each, separate to 4-page limit.* | 25% |

|  |
| --- |
| Price will account for 20% of the Overall Score. The lowest price will gain the maximum marks with other prices expressed as a proportion of the best score using the maths explained in the worked example below. |
| **Criteria** | **Demonstrated by** | **Weighting** |
| Price | Completed Resource and Pricing Schedule | 20% |

1. **Worked Example**

**How your quality scoring will be used to give a weighted score**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Question | Score out of 5 | Weighting | Weighting Multiplier | Weighted Score | Total Weighted Score |
| Supplier A | 1 | 2 | 15% | 3 | 6 | 53 |
| 2 | 4 | 40% | 8 | 32 |
| 3 | 3 | 25% | 5 | 15 |
| Supplier B | 1 | 5 | 15% | 3 | 15 | 67 |
| 2 | 4 | 40% | 8 | 32 |
| 3 | 4 | 25% | 5 | 20 |
| Supplier C | 1 | 2 | 15% | 3 | 6 | n/a (fail)\* |
| 2 | 1 | 40% | 8 | n/a |
| 3 | 2 | 25% | 5 | 10 |

\* in the example above Supplier C’s pricing will not be scored

**Worked example of how your price will be used to calculate a score**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Form of Tender price | Lowest price/Supplier’s price (as %) | Price Score (out of 20) |
| Supplier A | 350 | 350/350 = 100% | 100%\*20 = 20 |
| Supplier B | 700 | 350/700 = 50% | 50%\*20 = 10 |
| Supplier C | 250 | n/a | n/a |

**Worked example of Overall Score and Ranking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bidder | Total Quality Score | Price Score | Total Score | Ranked Position |
| Supplier A | 53 | 20 | 73 | 2 |
| Supplier B | 67 | 10 | 77 | 1 |
| Supplier C | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Part 3

3.1 RESPONSE FORM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Framework:** | [insert] |
| **Project Title:** | [insert] |
| **ProContract Identification Number:** | DN [insert] |
| **Supplier:** | [insert] |
| **Date:** | [insert] |

To enable Homes England to evaluate your tender, we require Suppliers to respond to the questions below whilst making reference to the evaluation section above.

Please refer to the evaluation section for page limits for each question. Any text beyond this will be ignored and will not be evaluated.

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Understanding of Project Requirements**  |
| **2. Technical Merit of Proposal** |
| **3. Resourcing and management** |

**3.2 RESOURCE AND PRICING SCHEDULE**

Excel spreadsheet to be embedded by Supplier in response

1. [assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/646f58f6ab40bf000c196a74/Homes-England-strategic-plan-2023-to-2028.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/646f58f6ab40bf000c196a74/Homes-England-strategic-plan-2023-to-2028.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Based on portfolio level assumptions [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The GLA will continue to operate the Building Safety Fund for buildings over 18m in height in the Greater London Area. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)