

Annex 3 Procurement Specific Questionnaire (PSQ)

Relevant experience and contract examples

Please provide details of three contracts to meet the technical and professional ability criteria set out in the procurement documents that are relevant to our requirement. Examples must be from the past three years.

The named contact provided should be able to provide written evidence to confirm the accuracy of the information provided below.

For consortium bids, or where you have indicated that you are relying on a subcontractor in order to meet the technical and professional ability, you should provide relevant examples of where the consortium/particular member/subcontractors have delivered similar requirements. If this is not possible (e.g. the consortium is newly formed or a Special Purpose Vehicle is to be created for this contract) then three separate examples should be provided between the principal member(s) of the proposed consortium or members of the Special Purpose Vehicle or subcontractors (three examples are not required from each member).

Where the Consultants is a Special Purpose Vehicle, or a managing agent not intending to be the main provider of the supplies or services, the information requested should be provided in respect of the main intended provider(s) or subcontractor(s) who will deliver the contract.

*A Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) is a separate legal entity established for a specific, limited purpose, typically to isolate financial risk or to facilitate specific transactions. It can be used for various purposes, including securitization, financing projects or managing investments).

This question will be scored in accordance with the evaluation criteria as detailed in the scoring methodology below. Particular credit will be given based on relevance of examples provided to the requirement with a particular focus on:

1. Scope of services – i.e. similar roles delivered to those required i.e. hybrid Azure Managed Services, End user computing, network and datacentre migration with UK based support
2. Project size and value – i.e. projects of similar values to the requirement (£3m-£4m)
3. Project complexity – i.e. projects of similar complexity in relation to challenges associated with IT migration and being in a regulated environment
4. Sector – i.e. projects within the healthcare regulator sector and with similar objectives

	Contract 1	Contract 2	Contract 3
--	------------	------------	------------

Name of customer organisation who signed the contract			
Name of supplier who signed the contract			
Point of contact in the customer's organisation.			
Position in the customer's organisation			
E-mail address			
Description of contract including how it specifically meets the areas of focus (400 words per contract).			
Contract Start date.			
Contract completion date.			
Estimated contract value			

1. Scale and Capability

Please describe how the scale and capability of your organisation align with GPhC's operational needs, including:

- Number of users and systems supported,
- Typical volumes of data handled, and
- Examples of how you have provided "right-sized" attention and responsiveness to clients with a similar profile to GPhC;
- How you ensure contracts of this scale do not become deprioritised within larger portfolios.

2. Cultural Fit

Please describe how your organisation's working culture, values, and approach to collaboration align with the GPhC's ways of working and core values of integrity, transparency, and accountability.

<https://assets.pharmacyregulation.org/files/2023-09/Our-values.pdf>

(500 words)

Scoring Methodology

Stage 1	Weighting	Word Count	Scoring Methodology											
1. Relevant experience and contract examples	60% 20% per contract example	400 words per contract	Suppliers must provide up to three contract examples from the last three years that demonstrate their technical and professional ability in delivering services of similar nature, scale, and complexity as those described in the procurement documents.											
			Each contract example will be assessed and given a score out of 5 using the table below.											
			The score will then be multiplied by the relevant weighting to give a final weighted score per contract.											
			Score	Description	0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.	1	Poor: Limited relevance. Example does not demonstrate ability to deliver services similar in scope, scale, or complexity. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.	2	Fair: Some relevance. Limited alignment with scope and complexity of requirement. Some confidence in ability to deliver but more than one element of the criteria is not sufficiently covered.	3	Good: Generally relevant and comparable. Adequate detail showing capability to deliver most aspects of the requirement. Response has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.	4	Very Good: Strong relevance. Clearly demonstrates experience delivering similar services of comparable size, scope and complexity. The response given meets all of the stated requirements with one or two minor deficiencies.
			Score	Description										
			0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.										
			1	Poor: Limited relevance. Example does not demonstrate ability to deliver services similar in scope, scale, or complexity. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.										
2	Fair: Some relevance. Limited alignment with scope and complexity of requirement. Some confidence in ability to deliver but more than one element of the criteria is not sufficiently covered.													
3	Good: Generally relevant and comparable. Adequate detail showing capability to deliver most aspects of the requirement. Response has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.													
4	Very Good: Strong relevance. Clearly demonstrates experience delivering similar services of comparable size, scope and complexity. The response given meets all of the stated requirements with one or two minor deficiencies.													

			<table><tr><td>5</td><td>Excellent: Directly relevant and highly comparable. Demonstrates extensive experience delivering equivalent services in similar regulatory environments with exceptional outcomes. Outstanding confidence in ability to deliver with no deficiencies.</td></tr></table>	5	Excellent: Directly relevant and highly comparable. Demonstrates extensive experience delivering equivalent services in similar regulatory environments with exceptional outcomes. Outstanding confidence in ability to deliver with no deficiencies.										
5	Excellent: Directly relevant and highly comparable. Demonstrates extensive experience delivering equivalent services in similar regulatory environments with exceptional outcomes. Outstanding confidence in ability to deliver with no deficiencies.														
2. Scale and Capability	30%	500 words	<p>This criterion will assess the bidder’s ability to deliver an appropriate level of service, scalability, and attention for a client of GPhC’s profile, while providing confidence that the contract will be prioritised appropriately over its term.</p> <p>The response will be assessed and given a score out of 5 using the table below. The score will then be multiplied by the relevant weighting to give a final weighted score for this question.</p> <table><tr><th>Score</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Poor: Limited response lacks evidence of relevant experience or capability and/or raises concerns over suitability or prioritisation. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Fair: Some alignment with GPhC’s needs, but response lacks detail in key areas or provides limited evidence with more than one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>Good: Generally, aligns well with GPhC’s needs. Provides clear examples and adequate detail on capability and prioritisation mechanisms. Response given has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>Very Good: Strong alignment with all stated needs. Demonstrates clear ability to scale services appropriately and prioritise clients of GPhC’s profile. Response given meets all of the stated</td></tr></table>	Score	Description	0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.	1	Poor: Limited response lacks evidence of relevant experience or capability and/or raises concerns over suitability or prioritisation. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.	2	Fair: Some alignment with GPhC’s needs, but response lacks detail in key areas or provides limited evidence with more than one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.	3	Good: Generally, aligns well with GPhC’s needs. Provides clear examples and adequate detail on capability and prioritisation mechanisms. Response given has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered	4	Very Good: Strong alignment with all stated needs. Demonstrates clear ability to scale services appropriately and prioritise clients of GPhC’s profile. Response given meets all of the stated
Score	Description														
0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.														
1	Poor: Limited response lacks evidence of relevant experience or capability and/or raises concerns over suitability or prioritisation. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.														
2	Fair: Some alignment with GPhC’s needs, but response lacks detail in key areas or provides limited evidence with more than one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.														
3	Good: Generally, aligns well with GPhC’s needs. Provides clear examples and adequate detail on capability and prioritisation mechanisms. Response given has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered														
4	Very Good: Strong alignment with all stated needs. Demonstrates clear ability to scale services appropriately and prioritise clients of GPhC’s profile. Response given meets all of the stated														

			<table><tr><td></td><td>requirements with one or two minor deficiencies</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>Excellent: Fully meets and exceeds all stated needs. Provides robust evidence of right-sized service delivery, strong client engagement, and contract prioritisation within larger portfolios. Demonstrates best practice with high confidence in delivery. The response given delivers against all stated requirements with no deficiencies.</td></tr></table>		requirements with one or two minor deficiencies	5	Excellent: Fully meets and exceeds all stated needs. Provides robust evidence of right-sized service delivery, strong client engagement, and contract prioritisation within larger portfolios. Demonstrates best practice with high confidence in delivery. The response given delivers against all stated requirements with no deficiencies.		
	requirements with one or two minor deficiencies								
5	Excellent: Fully meets and exceeds all stated needs. Provides robust evidence of right-sized service delivery, strong client engagement, and contract prioritisation within larger portfolios. Demonstrates best practice with high confidence in delivery. The response given delivers against all stated requirements with no deficiencies.								
3. Cultural Fit	10%	500 words	<p>Suppliers must demonstrate how their organisation’s culture, values, and collaborative working style align with the General Pharmaceutical Council’s (GPhC’s) ways of working, specifically in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Integrity – including ethical practices, honesty, and openness in delivery.• Transparency – including proactive communication, reporting, and decision-making.• Accountability – including ownership of outcomes, service performance, and issue resolution. <p>The response should also detail how the supplier fosters collaboration with clients, supports inclusive decision-making, and encourages constructive partnership working across mixed supplier teams or stakeholder environments.</p> <p>The response will be assessed and given a score out of 5 using the table below.</p> <p>The response will be assessed and given a score out of 5 using the table below. The score will then be multiplied by the relevant weighting to give a final weighted score for this question.</p> <table><tr><th>Score</th><th>Description</th></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Poor: Limited evidence of alignment or collaborative practices. No or weak examples.</td></tr></table>	Score	Description	0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.	1	Poor: Limited evidence of alignment or collaborative practices. No or weak examples.
Score	Description								
0	No response or irrelevant response. Fails to meet any of the stated evaluation criteria.								
1	Poor: Limited evidence of alignment or collaborative practices. No or weak examples.								

				Low confidence in cultural fit or partnership working. Most of the criteria are not sufficiently covered.
			2	Fair – Some elements of alignment described but lacking in consistency or evidence. Limited examples of collaborative working or cultural alignment. More than one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.
			3	Good – Clear alignment with GPhC's values and culture. Adequate examples of collaborative working with some demonstration of accountability and transparency. The response given has met most of the stated requirements, but with a number of minor deficiencies and / or one element of the criteria not sufficiently covered.
			4	Very Good – Strong evidence of cultural alignment and embedded collaborative behaviours. Demonstrates active practices that support integrity, transparency, and accountability. High confidence in fit. The response given meets all of the stated requirements with one or two minor deficiencies
			5	Excellent – Fully demonstrates a shared ethos with GPhC, with well-evidenced examples of collaboration and strong organisational behaviours aligned to all core values. High degree of confidence in successful, values-led partnership. The response given delivers against all stated requirements with no deficiencies.