

Invitation to Tender: Understanding the lived experiences of those approaching later life

Clarification Questions

Methods, data analysis and age group focus

- 1. Question 3 under Aims asks about common life events in the relevant age group, and whether certain events are more likely in this age group. Is the expectation that data analysis will cover people of all ages, in order to compare the specified age group to other stages in the life course?**

The predominant focus should be the current experiences of the 50-69 age group. However, in answering some of the research questions, it may be necessary to compare this group to other age groups or different generations (using historic data). The specifics of the methodological approach have been left to Bidders to decide. Note that this may not require data analysis in all circumstances. As mentioned in the ITT, bidders can also use existing literature.

- 2. Which age group is the main focus of this project?**

See question 1.

- 3. Do you anticipate the methodology to include samples from those aged 70+?**

See question 1.

- 4. Can bidders propose alternative approaches such as causal relationships between life experiences and life outcomes, alongside other descriptive analysis? In addition, please could you advise if the qualitative research in work package two could be provided through deep insight into one case study in the form of a particular city and surrounding area?**

Yes, we have purposefully left the methodology open for Bidders to suggest. Please note that the qualitative research needs to provide insight into a range of perspectives (as described in the ITT) but if Bidders can demonstrate how this will be achieved in a single geography, we would be open to considering the approach. With respect to causal analysis between life experiences and outcomes, we are open to this approach as long as it does not duplicate work already conducted. For example, the links between poor experiences in childhood and poor outcomes in later life, have been well documented.

- 5. Would the Centre for Ageing Better consider holding one or more of the round tables in areas outside of London, to get the views and experiences of a broader swathe of the UK population?**

We are open to that. Note that the original idea behind the roundtables was to test out ideas with researchers, policy-makers and other stakeholders. Also note that the Centre for Ageing Better focuses on England.

6. Do you have an idea of timescales of roundtables and the number of people you expect at each event?

We would be able to predict this more accurately after the inception meeting and the successful bidder has been appointed. These were originally intended to come towards the end of the project to test out some of the findings and to co-create policy solutions. However, we are open to other suggestions.

7. You refer to privately held data sets. Do you have access to such datasets or is that something you would expect the successful bidder to provide?

No, we expect the bidder to suggest what datasets they will analyse and to gain access to them.

8. What is the geographical scope of the study?

The geographical scope of this study is limited to England only.

9. Would you be open to consideration for us also including something more longitudinal above and beyond the main time-frame and scope of the project?

We need to deliver this project in a maximum of 18 months for internal strategic reasons.

10. Is there a reason for the 18 month deadline? Is it acceptable to deliver sooner?

See question 9. Yes, it is acceptable and preferred if delivery is sooner.

Definitions

11. The [Later Life in 2015 report](#) included a segmentation. Does the Centre believe a segmentation would be beneficial for this group?

It is up to bidders to suggest approaches but we would like to avoid duplication of work previously done.

12. Does the Centre for Ageing Better have a set definition of people who are at risk of missing out on a good later life?

Please refer to the information provided in the ITT. We have a high-level definition of those who are at risk. A more specific, measurable definition for the purposes of this research will be decided collaboratively between ourselves and the successful Bidder.

13. Is the Centre for Ageing Better interested in other emerging groups among people approaching later life, apart from those who are at risk of missing out on a good later life?

In answering the research questions, module 1 is likely to start with some high-level analysis of the whole 50-69 age group before focusing more directly on those who are at risk. Other 'emerging groups' are not within the scope of this research.

14. Please could you provide a rationale for which ‘homeless people or those in prison’ are excluded from this.

While we recognise the challenges facing these groups and the importance of improving their situation, there are specialist organisations who would better placed to undertake this work.

15. To what extent does this work require the testing and refining of the risk factors, or have these been previously validated and agreed in some form?

We do not expect testing of the risk factors as these were created following an extensive process in 2018 which culminated in our revised strategy (although note that this did not include any sort of data validation). Also see question 12.

Budget and Day Rates

16. We note that you have allocated £20,000 for digital outputs. Is there scope for the team delivering this contract to use any of that budget to create digital outputs directly from the two research work packages?

As discussed in the ITT, we will be creating digital outputs and the successful Bidder will be expected to collaborate with us in the design of the outputs and provide access to case studies (where appropriate). Therefore, Bidders should not include the costs of digital outputs in their tenders. The £20,000 budget is not included as part of this tender and should be discussed separately. Bidders may of course want to suggest other outputs, in addition to these and the written reports detailed in the tender.

17. Can you clarify if the round tables will be costed as part of the work package or separately?

The roundtable should be costed as part of the work package.

18. Regarding videos and other digital outputs, will they be a set of distinct products from the study and how do these outputs fit into the main research work?

See question 16. It is likely that the written and digital outputs will be launched at the same time.

19. On the proposed budget, the tender mentioned that the split between the work package 1 (quantitative perspective) and work package 2 (qualitative perspective) will be £80k vs £100k. We wondered if there is any flexibility to allocate the budget across the two work packages?

There is no flexibility to allocate the budget across the two work packages.

20. Could questions posed in the ‘quantitative’ work package be answered by qualitative research methods?

In theory we are open to this however, we are not sure how effectively this could be done whilst also giving us the information we need.

21. Can the Centre for Ageing Better be more specific about the use of research outcomes?

Please refer to the deliverables section in the ITT.

22. Linked to this, is Ageing Better open to the idea of interweaving package 1 and 2, e.g. conducting qualitative work prior to quant research and desk research?

Yes, we are open to this if Bidders clearly explain the benefits of this approach.

23. Please clarify whether the indirect costs and institutional overheads associated with staff costs in a university context are eligible under this tender call, and whether or not you therefore expect our staff day rates to be Fully Economically Costed?

No.

24. In the pricing document, do you just want to see day rates by role?

Yes, we would like to see day rates by role.

25. Do you want to see pricing against all of the activities and deliverables that make up our proposed approach?

Yes.

Miscellaneous

26. Is there an opportunity to discuss on the phone?

No.

27. Section 2.3 is reference a couple of times in the ITT, but we can't see a section labelled '2.3' at all.

There is no section 2.3 in the ITT – this is our mistake, references to 2.3 should have been deleted.

28. Do you have an advisory group for this work and if not would you be open to having one? If so would you expect to manage the advisory group or for the researchers to manage it?

Yes, we are open to having an advisory group. If so, we would be happy to manage the group.

29. Please clarify what kind of evidence you require of previous successful partnership working in the case of consortia bids?

We would want to see examples of previous partnerships with organisations and wherever possible, examples of the Bidders themselves collaborating with one another.

30. The tender makes reference to "pre-ITT consultation". Would you be able to share the findings from this?

The feedback from the pre-ITT consultation was reflected in the final ITT that was published.

Contract-related questions

- 31. Re: IP, there is a requirement (item 22.2 in the Contract document) that “the Company and the Supplier / Contractor shall be responsible for identifying and agreeing in writing on behalf of the Parties any Background Intellectual Property used, or to be used, in the course of the Contract and the owner of the same, prior to or as soon as reasonably practicable following its disclosure in the course of the Contract”. Could you provide a little more information about how this agreement should be accomplished, in what form it should be presented, and at what stage in the tendering process?**

We would be happy to delete this if requested.

- 32. Allied to this, it would be useful if IP rights over any academic papers that might arise from the work in addition to (and after) publication of the main report could be clarified (especially in light of 22.5). Crucially, Item 22.5 suggests that we would have no freedom to publish outside of the main report; since this is the principal *raison-d'être* of the University, this would likely represent a serious stumbling block from our perspective.**

We allow and encourage all teams to use and publish results as they see fit. We stipulate that they let us know plans for publication and acknowledge us as funders.

- 33. To what extent is this document an exact reflection of the likely terms and conditions of the funding, or might the terms of the eventual contract be negotiable? The reason for this question is that there are numerous items which do not seem to apply in the present circumstances, and for us as an academic research organisation (e.g. 4 on TUPE; 5 on Warrantees, much of which seems to apply to the Contractor; 6 on Inspection and Rejection, where we would hope and trust that our measures for Quality Assurance outlined in the Written Return would satisfy the expectations of quality, without there being a requirement for inspection; 9 on the payment schedule, where we would commonly expect phased or staggered payments on delivery to project milestones; 10 on indemnities, where we would not generally indemnify against research results having an injurious effect on the work of the organisation contracting the research since we cannot predict what the results of the research will be; 17 on sub-contracting, which will presumably be a necessary process in the case of consortia bids)**

This is a template contract which could be negotiated at the award stage and could potentially be tailored as appropriate.

- 34. 9.1 of the ‘Conditions of Contract’ - Please can you clarify when payment will be made in the context of this project, if the project is for 12 or 18 months? as the wording reads that invoices should be sent upon completion of the services. For example, would payment be made quarterly in arrears?**

This can be negotiated. We would normally assume payment on satisfactory completion of certain milestones.

- 35. 9.4 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - Please can you clarify this wording, because for example, we would want to ensure that payment is made on a regular basis over the term of the contract. But this wording would seem to indicate that potentially payment could be extended to a much longer period, without our agreement.
We would be happy to remove this from the contract.
- 36. 10.1.3 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - Our organisation doesn't have insurance for indirect losses. If successful, please could this wording be limited to direct loss.
Fine.
- 37. 12.1.3 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - the latest Data Protection Act is 2018
This has been updated on our contract.
- 38. 13.2 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - Please can you clarify if "Extended Expiry Date" is applicable to this project. "?
It is extremely unlikely that this project will require an extension.
- 39. 16.1 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - This wording would seem to imply that the Services can be amended without the Supplier/ Contractor's approval. We would normally prefer to say that any changes to the provision of Supplies/ Services should be agreed by the parties.
Fine.
- 40. 23.7 of the 'Conditions of Contract'** - This wording would seem to imply that we may have to provide details of training proposed and undertaken for all Supplier/Contractor employees in respect of equality and diversity. Although the University complies with all relevant legislation, I'm not sure it's possible to provide such information, particularly for all employees. If successful, could this wording be deleted?
Fine.
- 41. Does the word limit apply to both Work package 1 and 2 together, or should they be set out in separate documents?**
We expect the word limit apply to both Work package 1 and 2 together.
- 42. Do the form of tender, anti-collusion document and non-canvassing certificate need to be physically signed, scanned and returned alongside our proposal, or can they be electronically signed?**
They can be electronically signed.
- 43. Does our proposal need to be in the exact form of the submission form, with no other information, or can it be a proposal which includes these core sections but also has an introduction etc?**

Yes, it needs to be in the submission form format provided but can include your organisation logo, information etc.

44. Do we provide a submission for each work package separately?

No, it is not necessary to create separate submissions for each work package.