

## Invitation to Tender

### RGT Evaluation Framework Agreement, 2016 to 2019

26th May 2016

#### 1. Purpose of this 'Invitation to Tender' (ITT)

1.1. This invitation to tender is for appointment to a three-year framework contract to supply evaluation services to the Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT). RGT welcomes tenders from all organisations with evaluation expertise including those with little or no experience in the gambling industry.

1.2. The purpose and scope of this document is to:

- Provide applicants with sufficient information to enable them to consider the appropriateness of this invitation and to respond
- Outline the information required in the responses
- Outline the tendering process and timetable
- Set out the administrative arrangements for the receipt of proposals.

#### 2. About the Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT)

2.1. The Responsible Gambling Trust is the leading charity in the UK committed to minimising gambling-related harm. The RGT funds education, prevention and treatment services and commissions research to broaden public understanding of gambling-related harm. The aim is to stop people getting into problems with their gambling, and ensure that those that do develop problems receive fast and effective treatment and support.

2.2. The Responsible Gambling Trust raises over £6.5 million each year in voluntary contributions from the gambling industry operating in Great Britain. This donation based system was proposed under the Gambling Act 2005 and is prescribed by the Gambling Commission in its Licence Conditions and Codes of Practice.

2.3. The Responsible Gambling Trust's programme of treatment, education, harm prevention and research are guided by the National Responsible Gambling Strategy, which is defined by the independent Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB) and endorsed by the Gambling Commission.

#### 3. Background

3.1. This invitation to tender is for appointment to RGT's approved panel of evaluation

specialists upon whom RGT will call for its evaluation needs over the next three years (until March 2019). This is a new initiative by RGT reflecting a growing need for independent evaluation and related services to support RGT, its partners and contractors.

- 3.2. RGT has previously appointed individual suppliers from separate open procurement arrangements to evaluate harm minimisation<sup>1</sup> projects it has commissioned, as well as various industry initiatives such as the Association of British Bookmaker's Code of Conduct and its Player Awareness System<sup>2</sup>.
- 3.3. The RGSB recently published the "National Responsible Gambling Strategy 2016-17 to 2018-19"<sup>3</sup> which has 12 priority actions. The third of these is "Consolidating a culture of evaluation".
- 3.4. Lead responsibility for delivering this priority action is allocated as follows: "For harm minimisation interventions, the gambling industry, working with the Gambling Commission and supported by the Responsible Gambling Trust. For treatment interventions, treatment providers, working with the Responsible Gambling Trust."
- 3.5. The National Responsible Gambling Strategy also encourages operators to pilot interventions, so we expect further requests from the industry for RGT to commission independent evaluations to support assessment of the quality, effectiveness and impact of industry actions.
- 3.6. RGT is also continuously reviewing the treatment services it provides, and will wish to evaluate both current and new services.
- 3.7. Rather than issue individual invitations to tender for each of the evaluation projects RGT expects to commission over the next three years, it has determined to appoint a small panel of approved suppliers in advance, and with whom we are able to build working relationships which support RGTs need for independent evaluation. We plan to appoint from within the selected panel as *preferred suppliers*, as and when requirements arise. This will be based on a streamlined process for proposing evaluation approaches and costs for specific needs, and based on terms agreed during this procurement process. This is in recognition of the fact that evaluation projects separately have relatively modest budgets, which can deter suppliers from submitting tenders given the effort required to do so. In aggregate, RGT foresees spending around 5 per cent of its annual expenditure of over £6 million evaluating both its own services and projects and those undertaken by the industry.
- 3.8. RGT will be seeking to appoint approximately 3 - 5 suppliers which between them offer a sufficient range of expertise required to address the types of evaluative work and different contexts it expects to face. This will include at least the two elements described in the Strategy (see 3.4 above).
- 3.9. RGT has three short-term requirements for evaluation studies. One or more

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/commissioning/treatment-and-harm-prevention/harm-minimisation-programme/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/research/research-projects/>

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.rgsb.org.uk/images/stories/RGSB\\_Strategy\\_2016-2019.pdf](http://www.rgsb.org.uk/images/stories/RGSB_Strategy_2016-2019.pdf)

suppliers who are successful in being appointed to this framework panel will be invited to conduct evaluations of the following:

- 3.9.1. Two separate harm Minimisation projects for the armed forces and the criminal justice population (evaluation budget (£20k) – see the ITTs for these initiatives [here](#)
- 3.9.2. Two recently initiated Harm Minimisation projects (evaluation budget (£20k) - see the announcement relating to these initiatives [here](#)
- 3.9.3. Industry Responsible Gambling Initiatives (evaluation budget £100k) – see the ITT for these initiatives [here](#)
- 3.10. RGT expects that throughout the term of this Framework Agreement further opportunities to evaluate its funded treatment services will arise. Information on these services can be found [here](#).

#### 4. Aim and expectations

- 4.1. The aim of the evaluation(s) to be commissioned within the Framework Agreement is to provide independent assessment of the extent to which projects or programmes individually have met expectations and added-value in terms of RGTs wider goals within its “National Responsible Gambling Strategy 2016-17 to 2018-19”.
- 4.2. Where appropriate, RGT encourages a formative approach to evaluation so that individual projects and activities can benefit from early evidence and assessment from the independent evaluators.
- 4.3. By the end of each evaluation, RGT will have a clearer picture across the projects of the effectiveness and consequences of the actions taken alongside any issues of transferability. It will better understand aspects of gambling-related harm and how this can be effectively measured, monitored and addressed in specific contexts. RGT will also have a clearer idea of the scalability of projects and implications for other harm minimisation actions. Over time we also expect a foundation of effective evaluation practices and practices to be built up which can be shared with the industry to guide its own embedded monitoring and evaluation activity.

#### 5. Evaluation Framework Requirements

- 5.1. Each of the evaluations will be the subject of a separate ‘call-off’ contract to be agreed under the terms of the Framework Agreement. As the examples provided in 3.9 above show, each will be distinctive in its focus, scope and coverage, and each will have varying levels of monitoring and self-assessment of impact. Preferred suppliers will be likely to be asked to undertake one, or more of these separate evaluations under the Framework Agreement. Each will be subject to either a single tender or mini-bidding process under the Framework Agreement, and preferred suppliers will be expected to be responsive to RGTs needs for providing single tenders/mini-bid within a short timeframe and to the likely need for fast starts for some of the evaluations.

- 5.2. Expected evaluation requirements will be specified by RGT prior to seeking single tenders or mini-bids and are likely to include, for example:
- 5.2.1. Formative assessment of any monitoring and self-evaluation proposals early in the project(s) with particular relevance to the measurement of early and longer term outcomes and impacts.
  - 5.2.2. Formative and summative evaluation of the effectiveness of constituent delivery processes, quality of engagement with participants or beneficiaries and experiences of any delivery partners and key stakeholders. In some circumstances this may involve longitudinal analysis (with staged reporting) harnessing management, monitoring and other information relevant to proposed activities, outputs and outcomes.
  - 5.2.3. Evaluation of the realised benefits, outcomes (short-term) and impacts (longer term) from projects and programmes, the quality of the contribution of the evaluated activity(s) to those outcomes/impacts and an assessment of impact influences and determinants.
  - 5.2.4. Meta-evaluation working across existing monitoring and evaluation evidence from several funded activities to assess achievements and/or impacts and common lessons and implications.
  - 5.2.5. Mid-term (where relevant) and final (end of project) evaluation reports and appropriate dissemination support to assess the progress and achievements of the project(s) and programmes together with recommendations for improvement and/or future practice by RGT and its partners.
- 5.3. Successful bidders are likely to have experience in all or most of these areas of evaluation application, usually from social or policy context but **will not be expected** to have specific experience of evaluation in the gambling sector.
- 5.4. These are general requirements and RGT would work with appointed evaluators from the preferred supplier panel to agree appropriate evaluation methodologies. These methodologies would be customised to the needs and circumstances of each projects but will usually involve some combination of quantitative and/or qualitative evidence gathering through use of available management and monitoring information, comparative data sets, surveys, semi-structured and other interviewing, focus groups, case studies, observation and structured consultation.
- 5.5. Successful bidders will be expected to have experience of a broad range, but not necessarily all, of these methods of evidence gathering and analysis.
- 5.6. Evaluations may in some case need to be intensive, and in other situations may be for 1-2 years duration. Methodologies will be expected to be proportionate to circumstances, but delivered, analysed and reported independently.
- 5.7. At all stages the role of the contracted evaluator(s) will be to support RGT's understanding of the effectiveness and emerging impacts across the programme. Liaison and all deliverables will be provided direct to RGT with the exception of any briefing or feedback proposals which may be required to the project manager(s) in

formative evaluations or staged reviews.

Tendering organisations for the framework agreement are asked to note the contexts of the framework, the indicative areas of evaluation activity and types of evaluation that might be needed, and RGTs need for responsiveness and flexibility. They are also asked to note the breadth of evidence gathering and analytical requirements which might include, for example:

- a) Use of programme specific monitoring information
- b) Design and conduct of provider or participant surveys
- c) Semi-structured interviewing and other qualitative methods
- d) Case study research.

Experience of manipulation of large data sets and data analytics would also be useful but not essential. RGT are seeking to appoint individuals and organisations who can demonstrate use of methods such as these in social contexts and for independent and action-orientated evaluation. Experience of evaluation or applied research will also be welcomed including, for example in one or more of:

- i) Employee skills and training
- ii) Young person's education and awareness
- iii) Information, advice and guidance to consumers
- iv) Third sector activities and engagement
- v) Consumer behavioural studies
- vi) Counselling and psycho-social interventions
- vii) Social messaging

Experience of one or more of these areas of expertise in gambling will be welcomed but RGT is keen to encourage bidders from other areas of applied research in social contexts or policy evaluation.

## 6. Tendering Process and Timetable

6.1. On receipt of the proposals, an independent review panel will undertake an assessment of proposals, with a view to selecting one or more organisations to perform the evaluation(s). The awarding criteria are outlined in Appendix A.

6.2. Applicants may be required to attend a meeting to clarify any aspect of proposals.

6.3. You may submit, by no later than 17.00hrs GMT on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2016 any queries that you have relating to this ITT. Please submit such queries by email to **commissioning@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk**.

6.4. Any queries should clearly reference any appropriate paragraph in the documentation. As far as is reasonably possible, RGT will respond to all reasonable requests for clarification of any aspect of this ITT and supporting documents, if made before the above deadline.

6.5. Proposals must be submitted by no later than 17.00hrs GMT on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 to the

following e-mail address **commissioning@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk**. Receipt of tenders will be acknowledged by email by RGT. RGT reserves the right to extend any deadline. Any extension granted will apply to all applicants.

6.6. RGT reserves the right to reject any proposals:

6.6.1. Received after the deadline; and/or

6.6.2. Which do not comply with the conditions and requirements set out in this ITT.

6.7. All documents and all correspondence relating to the tender must be written in English. You should consider only the information contained within this ITT and supporting documents, or otherwise formally communicated to you in writing when making your offer.

6.8. The tender documentation should be provided in the following format:

- A cover page which details the tendering organisation, principal evaluator and contact details, and also to which of the funded projects the evaluation bid relates.
- Section 1: List of contents.
- Section 2: Background including your understanding of RGT's requirement for independent evaluation services and how this will support the wider RGT programme.
- Section 3: Experience – a statement drawing attention to recent relevant evaluation experience together with completion of Annex B. Applicants are encouraged to provide in addition two examples of evaluation or applied research reports which illustrate relevant experience and expertise.
- Section 4: Expertise and proposed team: an indication and brief description of the individuals who might be drawn on for the evaluation team, their relevant experience and roles together with completion of Annex C. This will identify the proposed Framework Principal with whom RGT would be liaising directly across the contract period. A short CV (approx. 1pp) should be provided for the Framework Principal but we do not require CVs for other proposed team members.
- Section 5: A brief statement of the added value that the experience (section 5) and expertise (Section 6) brings to RGT and its needs.
- Section 6: A summary of any proprietary intellectual property which will apply to any evaluation activity conducted under the Framework.
- Section 7: A statement of *blended* integrated day rate for professional fees. It is expected this will provide for a single day-rate to apply to all professional inputs, including support costs but excluding travel and subsistence and any additional data access (e.g. survey) costs which will be charged separately. These will be fixed for the duration of the Framework. VAT (as relevant) will be charged in addition at the prevailing rate.
- Section 8: Contact details for two referees.
- Section 9: Any potential conflicts of interest and how these will be managed.

## 7. Intellectual Property

- 7.1. RGT is committed to delivering an independently commissioned research programme that focuses on gambling behaviour and the effectiveness of various treatment, prevention and education strategies in minimising gambling-related harm. This is intended to improve knowledge amongst all those involved in this issue, so the RGT will wish to publish the results of the research it funds. Our requirements below in respect of intellectual property and confidentiality are intended to promote good project management, quality assurance and research integrity, and are not included in order to influence the independent conclusions of this research or its presentation.
- 7.2. The successful researcher will be required to assign to RGT all rights in and to any intellectual property created or arising from the work carried out by the researcher (or by the researcher's employees or agents).
- 7.3. In the case of academic researchers, RGT will however grant to the researcher a royalty-free, non-exclusive license to exercise such intellectual property rights in relation to project materials for the purposes of the researcher's wider research activities.
- 7.4. RGT acknowledges that the researcher may own proprietary software, analytic tools and techniques which may not be assigned to RGT. Where such software, tools or techniques exist and will be used by the researcher in the proposed research, the researcher should provide details in its tender of the methodology, to be used in the proposed research highlighting clearly where such software, tools or techniques will not be assigned to RGT and/or may not be shared with the public.

## 8. Confidentiality and publicity

- 8.1. The successful researcher will be required to enter into a legally binding agreement with RGT which will contain, inter alia, confidentiality provisions pursuant to which the evaluator will be required to:
  - (a) Keep confidential all intellectual property and know-how, including confidential commercial and financial information, disclosed by RGT to the evaluator during the course of the Framework Agreement;
  - (b) Not disclose to third parties without the express prior written consent of RGT any information arising from the work performed as part of the Framework Agreement; and
  - (c) Ensure that all proposed publications relating to work completed for RGT during the Framework Agreement are submitted to RGT for approval prior to publication with the expectation that approval will be given unless there are reasonable grounds not to do so.
- 8.2. RGT may from time to time require that the successful evaluator's employees and/or other person working on the work under the Framework Agreement enter into a confidentiality agreement with RGT.

## **9. Budget**

9.1. Indicative budgets will be set for each evaluation. Preferred suppliers will be invited to propose for individual evaluations methodologies and specific budgets to meet RGT requirements. RGT is committed to fund the right evaluation for each project but proportionality of approach and value for money will be key considerations for each.

## **10. Eligibility**

10.1. Applications will be accepted from all locations; however, those teams located outside Great Britain must ensure they specify, in their proposal, how they will manage communication during projects.

10.2. In support of RGSB's expressed ambition to expand the pool of evaluators participating in this field, RGT welcomes tenders from organisations with little or no specific experience in the gambling industry. Naturally, expertise and experience in evaluation of projects in other contexts but similar in nature to those envisaged in the gambling industry will be an advantage.

## **11. Conditions of Tender**

11.1. RGT reserves the right to issue the response to any clarification request made by you to all applicants unless you expressly require it to be kept confidential at the time the request is made.

11.2. The information contained in this ITT and the supporting documents and in any related written or oral communication is believed to be correct at the time of issue but RGT does not accept any liability for its accuracy, adequacy or completeness and no warranty is given as such. This exclusion does not extend to any fraudulent misrepresentation made by or on behalf of RGT or to any other liability which cannot be excluded at law.

11.3. By issuing this ITT, RGT is not bound in any way to enter into any contractual or other arrangement with you or any other party.

11.4. It is intended that the remainder of this procurement will take place in accordance with the provisions of this ITT but RGT reserves the right to terminate, amend or vary the tendering process by notice to all tendering organisations in writing. RGT does not accept any liability for any losses caused to you as a result of such termination, amendment or variation.

11.5. You will not be entitled to claim from RGT any cost or expenses that you may incur in preparing your proposal irrespective of whether or not your tender is successful.

11.6. All information supplied to you by RGT, either in writing or orally, must be treated in confidence and not disclosed to any third party (save to your professional advisers) unless the information is already in the public domain.



- 11.7. There must be no publicity by you regarding the project or the future award of any contract unless RGT has given express written consent to the relevant communication.
- 11.8. Applicants must declare any conflicts of interest within their proposal and state how these would be managed. RGT reserves the right to refuse any application based on such conflicts and to terminate any contract if conflicts of interest are found which have not been disclosed or new conflicts of interest arise and satisfactory mitigation of the risk to the credibility of the project is not possible.

## Annexes

### Appendix A – Awarding Criteria

Tendering organisations are required to respond to **ALL** of the criteria below. To assist our evaluation of your tender submission, please ensure you clearly cross-refer your responses in the tender to the criteria.

**Quality Criteria: 65 marks** will be allocated to your response to the award criteria shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1:

| Quality Criteria  | Weighting |
|---|-----------|
| A demonstrated understanding of the background to the Framework Agreement and RGTs needs for evaluation to support its aims and objectives. | x 1       |
| Quality of the relevant experience of the tendering organisation for process, impact and meta-evaluation in social contexts                 | x 5       |
| Quality of the relevant methodological experience of the tendering organisation for a range of qualitative and quantitative methods         | x 3       |
| Quality of relevant expertise of the Framework Principal and personnel proposed for this contract   | x 3       |
| Added value that the proposed evaluation approach/team brings to RGT and its needs.   | x1        |

**Award criteria** will be scored using the indicators set out in table 2 below:

Table 2:

| Scoring Methodology |              |  |
|---------------------|--------------|--|
| 0                   |              | No response or evidence provided in support.   |
| 1                   | Weak         | Response is supported by limited or a weak standard of evidence in some areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the Bidder to deliver within the Framework Agreement and/or to our requirements.                   |
| 2                   | Satisfactory | Response is satisfactory and supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence. Gives moderate confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver within the Framework Agreement and/or to meet the requirements.             |
| 3                   | Good         | Response is comprehensive and supported by a good standard of evidence. Gives a higher level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver within Framework Agreement and/or to meets requirement in most resepects. |
| 4                   | Very Good    | Response is comprehensive and supported by a very good standard of evidence meeting requirements and may exceed them in some respects. Gives a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to                      |

|   |             |   |
|---|-------------|---|
|   |             | deliver within the Framework Agreement and/or to meet all requirements.   |
| 5 | Exceptional | Response is very comprehensive and supported by an exceptionally high standard of evidence. Gives very high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract and/or to exceed requirements in several respects. |

The assessed overall score for each question will be calculated by multiplying the quality score received with the weighting for that question, set out below. This score will then be divided by the total maximum available score for the Quality Criteria and multiplied by 65% to get your final score for that question.

**Price criteria: 35 marks** will be awarded to the lowest priced blended day-rate and the remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure.

For example, if the lowest price is £400, and the second lowest price is £450, then the lowest priced bidder gets 35% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 31.1% ( $50/400 \times 35 = 3.9$  marks;  $35 - 3.9 = 31.1$  marks).

**Overall quality and price scores will be aggregated to provide the final bidding assessment score. This will be used to shortlist bidders. Scores will be moderated across assessors and may be further adjusted after (any) clarification meetings. The 3-5 highest scoring overall bidders after (any) clarification will be the preferred suppliers.**

## Annex B: Experience

Please complete the two tables below (B1 and B2) to indicate your relevant methodological experience in evaluation or applied research studies in policy and/or social contexts. For both B1 and B2 please also add one or two illustrative examples of relevant studies or reports and where possible a url/web-link.

### B1 Relevant methodological experience in selected areas

| Methodological experience   | Extensive experience | Some experience | Little/no experience | Example(s) of studies/projects<br><i>EG: Report; client and date</i> |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|
| Use of programme specific monitoring info.                                  |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Design and conduct of structured surveys                                    |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Interviewing and misc. qualitative methods                                  |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Case study research (in social contexts)                                    |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Manipulation of large data sets; data analytics                             |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Other ( <i>please add other method(s) experience you feel is relevant</i> ) |                      |                 |                      |  |

### B2 Relevant evaluation or applied research subject expertise

| Subject/area experience                       | Extensive experience | Some experience | Little/no experience | Example(s) of studies/projects<br><i>EG: Report; client and date</i> |
|---|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--|
| Employee skills and training                  |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Young persons education and awareness         |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Information, advice and guidance to consumers |                      |                 |                      |  |
| Third sector                                  |                      |                 |                      |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| activities and engagement                                      |  |  |  |  |
| Consumer behavioural studies                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Counselling and psycho-social interventions                    |  |  |  |  |
| Social messaging   |  |  |  |  |
| Other ( <i>Add other subject areas you feel are relevant</i> ) |  |  |  |  |

**Annex C: Personnel**

Please complete the summary table below to show the proposed Framework Principal (C1) and also each of the proposed team members whose skills and experience you might draw on to support RGT in the Framework Agreement. Please add further rows if needed.

| Name of proposed team member  | Title/role in organisation | Qualifications | Likely contribution/role in any RGT commissioned evaluations |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|--|
| <b>C1: Framework Principal</b> <i>(add below)</i>                     |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |
| <b>C2: Other proposed team members</b> <i>(separate row for each)</i> |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |
|   |                            |                |  |