

Request for Quote

RFQ Ref	PR2101
RFQ Name	Green Recovery and Innovation Project (GRIP) Evaluation
Issue of Specification	18 th November 2022
Closing date	30 th November 2022

1. About us

1.1. The South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP) has a central role in determining local economic priorities and securing investment to support business innovation and growth. To do this we link together the public and private sectors with academia to coordinate housing, transport, commercial development, energy infrastructure and raise workforce skills, in line with employers' needs, for the benefit of the wider economic area. We prioritise driving up productivity, creating jobs and promoting long-term, sustainable growth.

1.2. SEMLEP has three main roles in delivering strategic economic growth.

- 1.2.1. Setting the strategic direction for the area's future economic opportunities, challenges and priorities.
- 1.2.2. Direct intervention to increase growth. We are responsible for securing and overseeing the spend of two main sources of growth funding as well as coordinating business support through our Growth Hub
- 1.2.3. Facilitating growth by convening partners to assist cross-boundary collaboration on short and long-term economic issues.

2. Background

- 2.1. Green Recovery and Innovation Project (GRIP) is funded the UK Government's Community Renewal Fund via North Northamptonshire Council.
- 2.2. The programme aimed to provide support to 100 businesses in North and West Northamptonshire that are looking at ways to grow, improve productivity and increase the sustainability of their business. By providing one to one support; one to many workshops and grant support which aimed to increase innovation levels and increase the green objectives and delivery of local businesses including through support for innovation projects, decarbonisation measures and plans.
- 2.3. The programme offered a range of interventions to help businesses to identify and achieve their Decarbonisation and/or Innovation Plans. Businesses were invited to express an interest in joining the programme and be invited to suitable next steps which may have included attending a workshop or applying for a grant through the Green Recovery and Innovation programme.

The GRIP programme launched in February 2022, with delivery of all interventions with businesses to be complete by 31st December 2022. SEMLEP is now looking for an experienced external organisation to evaluate the programme.

3. Key requirements

3.1 SEMLEP is seeking to appoint a supplier to evaluate the effectiveness of SEMLEP's GRIP project. The successful bidder will carry out:

- Evaluation of the effectiveness of the GRIP project
- Assessment of the resulting impact on the Southeast Midlands economy
- Assessment of value for money and customer satisfaction delivered by GRIP
- An interim report delivered by 5th January 2023 based on desk based research
- A final report delivered by 31st March 2023 including customer consultation

Access to GRIP data, [CRF evaluation guidelines](#) will be provided. We anticipate some direct engagement with GRIP recipients will be required by the successful contractor with the potential of using online survey methods for this and / or in depth telephone interviews. The effective evaluation should include:

- Appropriateness of initial project design
- Progress against targets
- Delivery and management
- Outcomes and impact
- Value for money
- Lessons learnt and scalability/replicability

More information on evaluation guidelines is found in the [CRF evaluation guidelines](#) under section 3 of the guidelines.

3.2 Detail Requirements

- The provider will need to clearly demonstrate in their tender response how they will meet the required deliverables within the available budget and timescales.
- The successful bidder will be required to complete an initial report by 5th January 2023 covering a summary of all the areas listed above.
- A full evaluation of the project by 31st March 2023 will provide a more detailed analysis under each heading.
- Produce a range of case studies following interviews with alumni of the GRIP project.

The evaluation report will:

- Examine and appraise the operational effectiveness of the GRIP project including its initial design, processes and systems, and its engagement with stakeholders, service providers and local businesses.
- Measure and assess value for money based on the cost of delivery and the number and type of business support interventions provided.
- Measure and assess the impact on local businesses supported particularly in terms of reducing their carbon footprint and improving their innovation plans.
- Compare the operating model with other decarbonization / innovation programmes and where possible compare effectiveness and value for money.
- Make recommendations for learnings for future iterations of the programme.
- Evaluate the impact the decarbonization and innovation grants have had on the business and local economy.
- Gain satisfaction data from participants on the project to understand how the project could be improved for future roll out.
- Understand the views of the CRF programme team at North Northants and any feedback from them on the wider comparison of GRIP within the overall NNC CRF programme

Key questions to address under each section of the report are as follows

Appropriateness of initial design

- What was the project seeking to do?
- What was the economic and policy context at the time that the project was designed?
- What were the specific market failures that the project was seeking to address? Was there a strong rationale for the project?
- Was it appropriately designed to achieve its objectives? Was the delivery model appropriate?
- Were the targets set for the project realistic and achievable?
- How did the context change as the project was delivered and did this exert any particular pressures on project delivery?
- Bearing in mind the project design itself and any changes in context could the project reasonably be expected to perform well against its targets?

Progress against targets

- Has the project delivered what it expected to in terms of spend and outputs?
- What are the factors which explain this performance?
- When the project draws to a close, is it expected to have achieved what it set out to?

Delivery and management

- Was the project well managed? Were the right governance and management structures in place and did they operate in the way they were expected to?
- Has the project delivered its intended activities to a high standard?
- Could the delivery of the project have been improved in any way?
- For projects with direct beneficiaries: did the project engage with and select the right beneficiaries? Were the right procedures and criteria in place to ensure the project focused on the right beneficiaries?

- How are project activities perceived by stakeholders and beneficiaries? What are their perceptions of the quality of activities / delivery?

Outcomes and impact

- What progress has the project made towards achieving the intended outcome and impacts?
- To what extent are the changes in relevant impact and outcome indicators attributable to project activities?
- What are the gross and net additional economic, social and environmental benefits of the project (where relevant and applicable to project activities)?
- Can these benefits be quantified and attributed to the project in a statistically robust way?
- How has the project contributed to the wider strategic plan under which it was developed?

Value for money

This element of the report will need to provide a clear analysis of the value for money that the project has provided. As a minimum, reports should provide cost per output analysis.

Where appropriate this can also be supplemented by benefit cost ratio analysis to provide additional insight. Various methods can be used to assess benefits and costs of an intervention from the perspective of society or government which has helped to fund the activity. The [Green Book](#) provides a fuller explanation of these methods.

Lessons learnt

It is suggested that the lessons learnt element of the report is structured around identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the project. They should also highlight specific lessons for the following audiences:

- The grant recipient / project delivery body
- Those designing and implementing similar interventions
- Policy makers

The supplier will be required to have the skills, experience and qualifications needed to successfully evaluate the project, must be able to clearly demonstrate and evidence successful delivery of similar evaluation and show how they plan to disseminate the assessment as part of the tender documentation.

4. Deliverable Timescales

- 4.1. Below is an indication of this Quote timeline, this may change and SEMLEP will not be liable for any changes.

RFQ issued	18 th November 2022
Closing date for quotes	30 th November 2022 5pm
Interviews or appointment of supplier	2 nd December 2022
Contract start date	2 nd December 2022
Interim report submitted	5 th January 2022
Final report submitted	31 st March 2023
Contract end date	31 st March 2023

5. Budget

The budget for this work will be up to £10,000 including VAT.

6. Selection and Award Criteria

This RfQ application has a two-stage process: Part A and Part B. The first stage will assess Part A in accordance with the Selection Criteria that assesses the ability of the tenderer to perform a contract based on qualitative information related to the economic and financial standing of the applicant, suitability, equalities and insurance. If the application passes stage one that is Part A, it will be assessed under the Award Criteria “Part B”, stage two.

Stage One - Selection Criteria

Section 3 to 5 of the application form is Part A. Questions 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7 are pass / reject. If you fail these questions, your application will be rejected.

Stage Two - Award Criteria

If your application passes on “Part A” it will progress to “Part B” that is the Award Criteria. The applications will be scored under the Award Criteria set out in Annex 1.

7. RFQ responses

Please note that your response must include:

- **SEMLEP’s RFQ Application Form fully completed**
- **Any additional information you wish to provide to support your response. Please keep additional information to no more than 3 A4 pages**
- All prices quoted shall be fixed and firm and shall apply for the full duration of the contract
- All costs are deemed to include expenses and any other on-cost
- All prices quoted shall be inclusive of Value Added Tax (VAT)
- The quotation response must be on SEMLEP’s Request for Quotation Application Form
- Any queries regarding completion of the response please email procurement@semlep.com or contact us on 01234 436100
- Please send your completed forms and any supporting information electronically to procurement@semlep.com with the name of the tender in the subject header. Please note we **do not** want hard copies to be sent in the post.

Annex 1: AWARD CRITERIA EVALUATION

Criteria	Score	Score	Score	Weighting (%)
Price: It is necessary to illustrate the value for money in the proposal and how your proposal will deliver the best value per £ of public funds.	Exceptional, covered thoroughly, prices are very good and better than other suppliers. Score 8-10	Average. Brief covered adequately; Prices are reasonable. Score 4-7	Bidder meets or does not meet requirements of brief. Score 0-3	30%
Ability to deliver the required service and within timescales: Outlines what is to be delivered and how will be delivered.	Exceptional, covered thoroughly, Score 8-10	Average. Brief covered adequately, Score 4-7	Bidder meets or does not meet requirements of brief. Score 0-3	40%
Quality of delivery: Provide details about the quality of delivery indicating key members of the team that will be working on the project and relevant experience	Exceptional, covered thoroughly, have provided a satisfactory information of the key members that will be involved on the project delivery and their relevant experience compared to the requirements of the brief. Has provided very good response, covered the structure of proposal and 8-10	Average. Has provided adequate / fair information regarding the key members that will be involved on the project delivery and their relevant experience compared to the requirements of the brief 4 -7	Poor, have not provided satisfactory information 0-3	25%
Social Value: The proposal needs to show the social value of the contract and how your business contributes to the society and community in which you operate.	Exceptional, covered thoroughly, providing apprenticeship and placements, helping local charities and other community work. Score 8-10	Average. Brief covered adequately, Do community and charity work but do not provide apprenticeship / placements or vice versa. Score 4-7	Does not meet requirements of brief. Score 0-3	5%
			Total	100%