

Scope & Structure

Any other comments on services ?	
Feedback	Response
There are too many items that are currently or are about to be on other frameworks - Cyber 3, Automation, AI, SPARK, new Management Consultancy, anything Cloud - these should all be removed (or rationale for keeping made clearer)	<p>We have reviewed the range of services included within TS3 and sought to minimise any overlap with G-Cloud, SPARK, and upcoming CCS agreements. Some overlap is inevitable due to the range of services TS3 offers but clear guidance will provide clarity to customers.</p>
Why are the services duplicating what other frameworks have on them	
Overlap between cyber security against the cyber security DPS.	
Considerable cross over with Flexible Delivery Partner Framework, Cyber Services 3. Industry spend considerable time trying to maintain presence on all.	
AI is a framework on the CCS upcoming deals list. So presumably doesn't need to be part of TS3.	
There appears to be overlap between TS3 with other frameworks such as CSS3, DOS4, DAS and G Cloud	
Don't replicate services that exist on existing frameworks. Mix of direct award and mini-competition where appropriate.	
Too many frameworks offering the same services or such similar services it is confusing for suppliers to be able to guide customers.	
RPA is already on CCS upcoming deals list. No need for it here perhaps.	
Overlaps between frameworks for buyers	
Need more guidance for buyers on how to use the frameworks and what TS3 is appropriate for.	
Why not keep G-Cloud services out of Tech Services3?	
Some overlap of scope with Network Services 2 and upcoming BPO (RM3815 replacement) framework, not included on the "where does TS3 fit?" slide (telephony, call centre etc) - thoughts on duplication?	
A document defining what has changed and what has been added from TS2 as GCloud and DOS currently provide	
Cybersecurity shouldn't be in TS3 - Separate Cyber framework	
RPA has it's own framework	
Duplication with other frameworks?	
I think a key view I took was to question whether Cloud migration should be out of scope. we are finding many organisations coming to us looking to build a single overarching Cloud Migration strategy and thus frameworks like GCloud are not applicable as they are fixed services.	
Cloud migration should be in TS3	
Cloud migration planning could be wider than g-cloud - should be part of lot 1&4 - physical/hybrid/virtual digital transform should be part 1 as well	
Should AI be included alongside RPA and be part of Lot 1 and 4	
Lot 4. Should Cloud Services be part of that lot due to the nature of the services	
Call centre automation - should it be linked to RPA and wider org design?	
We are unsure why cloud migration is out of scope. Both buyers and supplier representatives around our table feel this is something which organisations want to develop a service for, rather than the fixed Gcloud type proposal. Thus should be inscope	
Are any of the services with a grey highlight not going to be included on TS3? e.g. Cloud services was on TS2 and overlaps with G-Cloud, so will this not be included on TS3?	
If cloud migration is out of scope of TS3 how could that impact potential design and service transformations where cloud services are included?	
Digital Delivery Capabilities sits with DOS	DOS supports an element of digital delivery but the market has said that it would like a complete digital delivery lifecycle in one agreement which TS3 will support
Where services are covered by two frameworks having flexibility to cover all of the service in one framework will be better than buying through multiple procurements.	We have done this in TS3 with cradle to grave application solutions that can now be supported under Lot 3d - Application and Data Management
Where does the customer go for a cradle to grave solution?	

Please can there be a service for Apps Dev and Apps Maintenance services for live systems. The duration for Lot 3d is currently 5 + 2 which meets our current needs and suppliers we've spoken too	TS3 Lot 3d - Application and Data Management will now support cradle to grave application solutions. There is the flexibility to support various development and support methodologies based on customer requirements	
Isn't DEVOPS a subset of Application Design, Delivery and Management?		
Will DevOps be split out as service within Lot 3?		
Agile, Data Mgt & Exploitation appear to be missing unless covered within other service boxes (e.g. Digital Transformation, Data Led Transformation).		
Accommodate on-going Agile based development programmes		
Please can there be a service for Apps Dev and Apps Maintenance services for live systems. The duration for Lot 3d is currently 5 + 2 which meets our current needs and suppliers we've spoken too	Elements of cyber are included within TS3 as the Cyber Security framework doesn't support ongoing operational Cyber services	
No cyber - use it's own framework		
Cyber security has a specific framework and soon to be DPS so should direct customers to this rather than duplicating		
Maybe introduce something for tower models. We find it difficult to tender for customers that are in a tower model structure due to the tie in the tower supplier already has		
Will associated products be eligible to be sold through the framework instead of leased or purchased elsewhere?		
Framework lends itself more to big suppliers	Tower models are not recommended by government policy as it creates a barrier to a unified technology service designed to support users. TS3 is aligned more with a logical Technology Services lifecycle.	
Use framework exclusively for Direct Award	Products can be purchased via the Technology Products and Associated Services framework or the upcoming Technology Online Purchasing Content framework	
TS3 should be technology-agnostic so why should it matter what the underlying technology is being "serviced"	We encourage SME's and within the current framework, Technology Services 2, 52% of suppliers are SME's	
It would be beneficial if we could register for opportunities where specific technologies are already being considered, such as RPA, AI & workflow (BPMS). This often cuts across several lots from service design, integration & operations	TS3 will support direct award alongside further competition	
Based on the 'colour coding' slide will a supplier need to be accepted on all lots to offer "Everything as a Service" via TS3?	TS3 is technology agnostic and it's for the customer to advise the market what technology services they require	
I gather from the "Advice Cloud" website that TS3 will be broadly similar to TS2, albeit with four lots.	The CCS upcoming deals page at https://www.crowncommercial.gov.uk/agreements/upcoming-is-the-best-place-to-keep-sight-of-what-technology-frameworks-are-in-the-pipeline	
It would be useful if, at the outset, and when distributing updates, you would make it clearer which requirement you are referring to - rather than just quoting a serial number.	The bid pack will clearly detail what services are covered within each TS3 lot so you can determine the best place to bid	
we would be interested to know more on any changes in TS3 vis a vis TS2	TS3 is an exciting evolution of TS2 with a number of key changes to support customers and suppliers	
By combining lot 1 and 2, will it favour larger suppliers due to potential size?	We aren't sure what serial number you're referring to so please contact us for clarification	
Lot 1 - why would a customer tender for design only? In our experience they either know what they want or FC for full solution	The key details are covered in the TS3 pre-OJEU briefing presentation which is available at https://www.crowncommercial.gov.uk/agreements/RM6100	
The proposed new Lot 1 seems very broad. Would CCS consider retaining the current lot structure and adding SIAM as a new Lot (Lot 5 maybe)?		
digital transform should be part 1 as well		
Not easy to see what services map to the new Lot 2		
4 lots make sense and design and consultancy are done by same teams.		
Combining lot 1 and 2 would mean a lot more suppliers for customers to evaluate and try and engage with.		
Merging lots 1 and 2 will have a huge impact on complexity		
Could Lot 1 be broken down into specialities and sub lots?		
Lot 1 - customer could use Consultancy 2. Reduced risk of conflict of interest. Design integrated into full solution and therefore other lots		
Should Tech Services assurance be part of Lot 1?		
The planned amalgamation of the current lots 1 & 2 doesn't seem to make much sense. In particular, the current lot 2 doesn't make much sense as transition and transformation are completely different things, undertaken by different suppliers at different parts of a project. Adding these into a lot about design, which is something completely different again, seems to make no sense.		
Should cyber security ongoing management sit in lot 1 or is it actually lot 3 operational services?		
Cyber Security + Lot 3		Cyber security is covered with Lot 3b - Operational Management

Cyber can also form operational services	
Long contract lengths to avoid onboarding and off boarding costs	Contract lengths will run up to 7 years depending on the Lot
Lot structure could benefit from more simplicity and less cross-lot structure. Eg. End-user services, infrastructure services, Official services, SI services	The TS3 lot structure has been further developed to ensure alignment with a logical technology services lifecycle. Full guidance will be provided on what lots to use for various services.
They should keep the breakdown of the lots simple and not have services across multiple lots	
Need to ensure the descriptive customer needs per lot are captured	
Architectural services should cross all lots	
Digital Delivery should be available across all lots	
Lot 1- Thinking	
Lot 2 - Doing	
Lot 3 - BAU	
Lot 4 - 1+2 with single supplier	
Info Sec + Lot 1 / 2	
Digital Transformation + Lot 1 / 2	
E as a Svc - What is it?	
Consulting - DOS?	
Customers still find using the Lots in TS2/TS3 to be confusing. What benefit is there in creating lots at all?	
4 lots should help the buyers	
Customers need help defining requirements that fit into the definitions under the framework	
Clarity between lots is essential especially when large services are required to be offered. the splitting of Lot 3 seems to serve little purpose to clients.	
Hi, happy with existing Lot structure from TS2.	
A pull through of the services on a similar basis to TS2 is extremely welcome. There may, however, be benefit in some sub lots based on scale of delivery against some lots to make it simpler to approach smaller suppliers or Tier 2 suppliers over larger firms rather than the single lot whole supplier lists.	
The scope and proposed lots feel appropriate for a framework of this nature.	
Why 4 years not 5	4 years is the standard length for CCS agreements as dictated by the OJEU guidelines.
we often see requirements for SIAM and Service Delivery - can a customer combine lots 2 and 3?	Following market engagement the feedback has requested a SIAM Lot which will support strategy, design and transition to SIAM services.
Is SIAM worthy of it's own Lot? Align to lot 4?	
The PIN mentions 5 lots: — technology strategy and service design, — services transition and transformation, — operational services covering end user support, operational management, technical management and application and data management, — major service transformation programmes, — service integration and management.	
While I am unclear as to the current demand for SIAM it is a useful addition	
Ensure lot 3 covers end user support via 2nd / 3rd line	TS3 Lot 3a - End User services - supports 2nd / 3rd line operations
Will e-learning and development be available in Lot 4?	This will dependent on if the customer requires it as part of their service transformation
Lose List X requirements for Lot 4	This feedback has been taken onboard and List X has been removed from TS3 lot 4 and is now part of the call-off process
Lot 4 could cover everything in the services as they can cover significant outsource type contracts	TS3 Lot 4 will support major service transformations that include elements from Lots 1-3. It covers all security classifications. It has no minimum duration and a maximum contract length of 7 years
Lot 4 - Confused as to what would be different for this and why this couldn't fit into other lots. If it's for large services maybe have a spend category limit	
Existing TS2 has a 'secret' lot 4b - will this apply in TS3? And can this have flexible durations? I.e not 5 yrs straight	
Flexible duration for Lot 4 - not just straight 5 years	
Can Lot 4 include most services mapped out? Examples are they may require service design initially.	
Majority of other services could also be incorporated within it	
Lots are fine as they are, maybe need to look at Lot 4 as not much seems to have come out through this	

introduction of a Lot 5 allowing cross framework procurement - eg network services or technology products. This would need guidance eg: you must be procuring 70% service and 30% products to allow usage of this option.	This is still something that is being reviewed as part of wider CCS strategy and is not part of TS3
Do the number of suppliers have to be unlimited for each lot? Could they be scaled dependent on lot?	The bid process is open and fair and we don't seek to restrict supplier numbers per lot
My company is a fairly niche provider of services around wired/wireless infrastructure in Lot 3c.	You will be able to continue providing services within Lot 3c
What is secure by design and what does it cover?	This covers the inclusion of specific standards to ensure services are secure
Simple and straight forward	This is positive feedback so thank you
Should Org resilience be Tech resilience?	This could be included with TS3 Lot 1 - Technology Strategy and Design - and is more an internal process for an organisation to review
Combine Workplace Resilience with Business Continuity	
Network infrastructure management is missing	This is included under TS3 Lot 3c - Technical Management
Direct award is a necessity on framework	We have found the direct award provides a positive route to market to customers
Need more definition of what the lots and services mean	
Need to be careful not to have too much flexibility and ensure there is clarity on scope of services	
None of this has been defined properly (or at all) for us, and so we can't properly comment. Please define everything and send it to us later, so we can review.	This will be detailed within the TS3 specification as part of the bid pack
Why is the Consulting People specifically via Direct Award??	More information is required to respond to this comment
Can't see User Research, UX or UI in the services and they could be essential to Service Design and delivery	It will be down to the customer to define if these are required as part of their service design outcomes.
Add Sustainability Services to TS3	
We have had discussions with Peter Kirwan around sustainability and how important meaningful metrics are and in particular the gathering of environmental footprint of products at procurement stage so the value of circular and sustainable solutions can be measured	Sustainability services are currently being reviewed as part of a wider sustainability framework
Support longer term programmes	TS3 Lot 4 - Major Service Transformation supports contracts up to 7 years
Risk Management is full lifetime	Agreed and is reflected within the terms and conditions
service seem generally seem fine	Thank you
The services sold on Technology Services 2 were right for Pentesec, as long as the scope doesn't shrink, we should be able to make good use of the lots.	
Unclear how the DPS will work alongside the framework.	
To get on a DPS as a supplier there is no requirement to describe or validate services. How can buyers become aware of new services if there are no specifications on the DPS?	
Is having a parallel DPS going to add confusion? Please don't remove the direct award option though	
DPS for AI	
DPS for Everything as a Service	
DPS for Data led Business Transformation	
DPS for Robotic Process Automation	
DPS for Digital Accessibility	
DPS for Cloud Services	
DPS for Workplace Recovery Services	
DPS for Upskilling Platforms & Services	
Use DPS for all further competition	Following this feedback and review if current and future DPS, the proposal to create a dedicated Technology Services DPS has been cancelled. The ability to support innovative technology services will now be part of SPARK 2