

# Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Government Office for  
Science**

Subject Contracting Authority **Understanding the UK Freight  
Transport System**

Sourcing reference number **UK SBS BLOJEU-CR17131GOS**

**UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)**  
[www.uksbs.co.uk](http://www.uksbs.co.uk)

Registered in England and Wales as a limited company. Company Number 6330639.  
Registered Office Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF  
VAT registration GB618 3673 25  
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

**UKSBS**  
*Shared Business Services*

## Table of Contents

| Section  | Content  |
|----------|--|
| 1        | <a href="#"><u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>  |
| 2        | <a href="#"><u>About the Contracting Authority</u></a>         |
| 3        | <a href="#"><u>Working with the Contracting Authority.</u></a> |
| 4        | <a href="#"><u>Specification</u></a>                           |
| 5        | <a href="#"><u>Evaluation model</u></a>                        |
| 6        | <a href="#"><u>Evaluation questionnaire</u></a>                |
| 7        | <a href="#"><u>General Information</u></a>                     |
| Appendix | Annex A  |

# Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

## Putting the business into shared services

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS) brings a commercial attitude to the public sector; helping Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for Contracting Authorities for of shared business services in the UK public sector, continuously reducing cost and improving quality of business services for Government and the public sector.

Our broad range of expert services is shared by our Contracting Authorities. This allows Contracting Authorities the freedom to focus resources on core activities; innovating and transforming their own organisations.

Core services include Procurement, Finance, Grants Admissions, Human Resources, Payroll, ISS, and Property Asset Management all underpinned by our Service Delivery and Contact Centre teams.

UK SBS is a people rather than task focused business. It's what makes us different to the traditional transactional shared services centre. What is more, being a not-for-profit organisation owned by the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS), UK SBS' goals are aligned with the public sector and delivering best value for the UK taxpayer.

UK Shared Business Services Ltd changed its name from RCUK Shared Services Centre Ltd in March 2013.

## Our Customers

Growing from a foundation of supporting the Research Councils, 2012/13 saw Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) transition their procurement to UK SBS and Crown Commercial Services (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.

Our Contracting Authorities who have access to our services and Contracts are detailed [here](#).

## Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

### GO-Science

The Government Office for Science (GO-Science) works with the Department for Business Innovation and Skills. The office ensures that government policies and decisions are informed by the best scientific evidence and strategic long-term thinking

### Responsibilities

GO-Science is responsible for:

- giving scientific advice to the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet, through a programme of projects that reflect the priorities of the Government Chief Scientific Adviser
- ensuring and improving the quality and use of scientific evidence and advice in government (through advice and projects and by creating and supporting connections between officials and the scientific community)
- providing the best scientific advice in the case of emergencies, through the [Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies \(SAGE\)](#)
- helping the independent [Council for Science and Technology](#) provide high level advice to the Prime Minister

Further information can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/government-office-for-science>

## Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority .

In this section you will find details of your Procurement contact point and the timescales relating to this opportunity.

| Section 3 – Contact details |   |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| 3.1                         | Contracting Authority Name and address                | Government Office for Science<br>1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET  |
| 3.2                         | Buyer name  | Victoria Clewer  |
| 3.3                         | Buyer contact details                                 | research@uksbs.co.uk   |
| 3.4                         | Maximum value of the Opportunity                      | £20,000 ex VAT   |
| 3.5                         | Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids | <b>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available <a href="#">here</a>. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.</b> |

| Section 3 - Timescales |  |                                |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 3.6                    | Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert                                       | 23/10/2017<br>Contracts Finder |
| 3.7                    | Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system       | 26/10/2017<br>14:00            |
| 3.8                    | Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris | 27/10/2017                     |
| 3.9                    | Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris   | 06/11/2017<br>11:00            |
| 3.10                   | Anticipated selection and de selections of Bids notification date                                      | 10/11/2017                     |
| 3.11                   | Anticipated Award date   | 10/11/2017                     |
| 3.12                   | Anticipated Contract Start date  | 13/11/2017                     |
| 3.13                   | Anticipated Contract End date  | 09/02/2018                     |
| 3.14                   | Bid Validity Period  | 60 Days                        |

## Section 4 – Specification

### Background

#### Introduction to the Government Office for Science and Foresight

The UK Government Office for Science (GO-Science) supports the Government's Chief Scientific Advisor in ensuring that the Government has access to, and uses, the best science and engineering advice. It is located within the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), but is professionally independent of it.

The Foresight programme sits within GO-Science and develops projects using the latest scientific evidence and futures analysis to address complex issues and provides strategic options for policy. Foresight projects examine public policy issues where science might be part of the solution, or a scientific topic where potential applications and technologies are yet to be realised. This provides Government with evidence to help them think systematically about the future and provides signposts for policymakers in tackling future challenges.

#### 1.1. About Foresight [Future of Mobility]

The Foresight Future of Mobility project is run from within the UK Government Office for Science (GO-Science). The Future of Mobility project was launched to try to understand the broad question '*What benefits/ opportunities could the transport system of the future provide and what are the implications for Government and society?*'

Transport is a key enabler, effecting where people work, their commute modes and times, and the costs of moving people and goods. Mobility choices impact on a broadly on things ranging from individual health and wellbeing, to the economy and the environment. The Department for Transport (DfT) are the key customer for this project, however there is cross Whitehall engagement in the project, including from the Department for Health, Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, Department for Communities and Local Government, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office.

### Aims and Objectives of the Project

#### Specification for review of governance

This project seeks to understand the nature of freight within the future of mobility in the UK, looking out to 2040. What goods will be travelling into, out of and around the UK? How might they be transported? What are the impacts of coming technological trends and business models? What are the uncertainties we need to explore and plan for, to help inform decisions that governments (national, regional and local) and industry will need to take?

We are seeking a systematic evidence-based review to understand the current landscape of freight transport systems, across common modes of transport (road, rail, domestic aviation, domestic shipping (including coastal and inland waterways) and freight infrastructure (ports, distribution centres, warehouses and storage depots). All domestic and international freight traffic travelling to, from or through the UK, using UK infrastructure is in scope (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

This commission to understand and visualise what is happening in the current UK freight transport system. We seek to understand **how more efficient use can be made of the**

**current system, how to improve sustainability<sup>1</sup> of the system, any constraints on the system at the moment and what investment is planned to develop the system.** This commission will be reviewed alongside further work into emerging technologies and exogenous trends (such as trends in manufacturing and global trade) that will shape the future freight system.

### **Areas to focus on**

#### **a. What material, goods or products are travelling, through which modes?**

Please provide a systematic review and analysis of the data available on the current movement of freight around the UK. Please cover the types of goods or products moving, the categories of journeys and modes of movement around the UK and categories of vehicle/vessel. What is the freight occupancy of each mode? What would be the maximum capacity of each mode if fully occupied?

Please identify and characterise the key freight corridors in the UK: where they are, who are their key users, how might infrastructure improvements/upgrades affect those corridors?

We expect you to draw on the relevant official statistics published by [Department for Transport](#) and Office of National Statistics (ONS) and combine this with relevant data from other sources. Where data not available or particularly challenging to collect, please identify what we don't know and what research would be needed to fill this gap.

We welcome innovative approaches to explaining and visualising this data.

#### **b. Who are the key actors in the freight transport system?**

##### **Who is a user?**

Please provide a summary of available evidence on freight users. Who are the key actors (by volume and value)? What factors are important for decision making and how is technology being used to meet their needs? Are there any common user groups or supply chains that emerge?

Please provide a summary of the key considerations of users when making choices on shipping freight. How does this compare to what is known about reality of their business decisions? What are the barriers and constraints to user choices? In particular, what are the barriers to choosing shipping solutions with the least environmental impact? What are the barriers to choosing options that make most efficient use of freight system?

##### **Who operates freight infrastructure?**

Please provide a summary of **network operators**, distance of infrastructure covered and annual investment into the infrastructure. Please summarise how freight infrastructure providers charge for use (eg HGV levy).

Please characterise the **terminal and storage providers** (airport, rail depot, port operators, distribution centres) and others involved in freight handling services. What is the level of integration and the business models used to charge for services?

Please characterise the other infrastructure (eg power/refuelling, service stations or driver

---

<sup>1</sup> environmental impact including carbon emissions and environmental pollution (air quality, noise etc)

rest areas, ICT services).that freight is dependent on and provide a summary of the network operators.

What influence do operators have on efficiency or sustainability considerations eg vehicle routing? What are the current business models and what new business models are emerging? How are new actors or new approaches having an impact?

Please provide examples or case studies to illustrate key points.

### **Who owns and operates vehicles/vessels?**

Please provide a summary of the available data on **vessel/vehicle freight providers** by industry sector (numbers registered vessels/vehicles and capacity, numbers of companies operating such vessels/vehicles). What distinction is there between the owners of vehicles /vessels and the operators?

What influence do owners and operators have on efficiency or sustainability considerations eg vehicle routing, empty running? What choices can they make and what are the key constraints? What are the current business models and what new business models are emerging? How are new actors or new approaches having an impact?

Please provide examples or case studies to illustrate key points

### **Who provides logistics services?**

Please describe key actors providing logistics services and how they influence choices made about freight journeys?

What influence do they have on efficiency or sustainability considerations eg vehicle routing, empty running? What are the current business models and what new business models are emerging? How are new actors or new approaches having an impact?

### **Overview of key actors**

For each category of freight, where does the balance of power sit in the supply chain between users and service providers? Which businesses or actors are **key influencers**?

How much do businesses tend to specialise to a particular mode of transport? Are there businesses that offer or operate services across modes?

Please characterise the **people** employed in the sector: how many are involved in each part of the freight transport system, what roles do they undertake, what skill sets are required in different roles, which companies are the key employers?

How open are the supply chains to new actors or disruptive business models? What are the other constraints on the system?

We welcome examples, case studies or narratives to describe these.

### **c. Intermodal issues**

What is the current rate of transshipment, transloading and intermodal transfer in the UK at ports, airports, rail and road depots etc?

How provides services to facilitate freight handling? What are the opportunities from increasing flexibility and seamless transfer in this area? What are the constraints? What trends are identifiable? What are the trends on data capture, usage and storage in the sector?

What is the gold standard (internationally) in seamless transfer and how would UK activities rank against this? Please provide relevant case studies.

What are the prospects for more efficient flow of freight in the system? What are the prospects for reducing the environmental impact of freight journeys in the UK?

#### **d. Infrastructure constraints**

Please provide an analysis on factors affecting provision:

What are the key factors for investment decisions? What is the time scale for investment decisions and how does this vary across mode? Who are the key decision makers on investment? What are the key constraints for providers in each mode?

What factors other than investment constrain the development of freight infrastructure? Are there example of good practice in overcoming these constraints (either from UK or internationally)?

#### **Suggested Methodology**

We expect this to be a mixture of academic research, case studies and potentially workshops and structured interviews dependent on if the bidders felt these were necessary. But we would welcome alternate approaches if they will tackle the research questions, in a rigorous way, that would pass academic peer review.

#### ***Article structure and style:***

Articles will ultimately be presented to senior policy makers, and the article's language and focus should reflect this. The layout and style described in the **Author Guidelines** has been designed specifically for the time-constrained professional so that the reader's attention is drawn directly to the information they require.

**Please see a copy of our Author Guidelines for a comprehensive description of the required article sections for this particular article type, how to format your paper, the language and writing style, submission requirements etc.**

The final report and is intended to be published on the Foresight Future of Mobility webpage. It will be drawn upon and used in the main project report (Future of Mobility) and also be used to inform discussion with policy makers. The report should be written in plain English, in a style that would be accessible to policy makers. You must avoid the use of jargon – everything written must be accessible and digestible to a non-expert.

As a guide, the final product might be around 10,000 words (excluding annexes). Please note that you may include as much quantitative analysis as you like as additional material in

an annex to the main report.

If figures are included, the underpinning data should ideally also be sent.

Your final report must be science and evidence-based, must not contain value laden language and all evidence sources must be cited. However, where there is emerging science and/or disputed evidence, this should be highlighted. We do not have a style guide.

**Any implications for policy makers are important to draw out, but these must be based on evidence.**

*Given the complexities in the system, we welcome innovative proposals that will help visualise the system and the way the different bodies interact or influence under different contexts. We are open to proposals that involve speaking with different bodies to gather information (within the time limits of the review). An introductory letter can be provided from GO-Science to explain the project and how this review of the UK freight system fits into this. We are also open to workshops or other events to discuss specific issues in more detail. Please describe any other support you require from GO-Science in undertaking this review.*

## **Deliverables**

Three products are sought: 1. A final report. 2. A brief executive summary or slide pack readable by non-experts of your work, summarising key findings. 3. A detailed annex or slide pack of charts, diagrams and other material to provide a visual representation of the system.

The final report is intended to be published on the Foresight Future of Mobility webpage. The work should be high quality; it will be peer-reviewed by senior transport academics. The products will be drawn upon and used in the main project report (Future of Mobility). It will also be used to inform discussion with policy makers. It should be written in plain English, in a style that would be accessible to policy makers. You must avoid the use of jargon – everything written must be accessible and digestible to a non-expert.

As a guide, the final product might be around 10,000 words (excluding annexes). Please note that you may include as much quantitative analysis as you like as additional material in an annex to the main report.

The final report and summary must be science and evidence-based, must not contain value laden language and all evidence sources must be cited. However, where there is emerging science and/or disputed evidence, this should be highlighted. We do not have a style guide.

**Any implications for policy makers are important to draw out, but these must be based on evidence.**

### **A time table is provided below for deliverables**

**Step 4:** If the successful bidder wishes to discuss the development of the paper or any particular issues which arise during the course of its production, the Project Team will arrange further discussion.

**Step 6:** Please note that 30% of the full agreed fee will be paid to the successful bidder once the first draft has been deemed acceptable to proceed to peer review by the project team. The criteria for approval of the final report at this phase of the process are:

1. The final report includes all required article sections (see **section 4.Key article sections** in our Author Guidelines)

2. The final report clearly fulfils the research question/objective and is within the scope defined in the agreed proposal.

3. The language used is accessible and understandable to a non-expert (see **section**

### 3. Language and writing style in our Author Guidelines)

4. The discussion and arguments presented are adequately supported by the appropriate references.

5. The references used to support the report are from credible sources, are relevant and sufficiently recent.

6. Figures and tables are of a high quality.

7. The paper is deemed acceptable following evaluation using plagiarism detection software, which compares the submitted manuscript with full text articles from all major journal databases and the internet.

**Step 7:** All articles undergo double-blind peer review following internal approval of the first draft by the project team. **The paper may undergo further rounds of review if:**

1. Large amounts of new information are added to the paper by the author following the recommendations made by the peer reviewers/project team.

2. The peer reviewers/project team do not feel that the paper has been sufficiently amended following revision by the author, in which case the paper may be submitted for assessment by the project's expert advisory group.

*Please note that the paper may be subject to internal feedback from policy developers, or a roundtable discussion. You will be informed if this is the case.*

**Step 8:** If the project team finds that the paper has not been sufficiently revised by the author to meet either or all of the following:

1. the objectives of the agreed article proposal;
2. our article requirements (see section 4 of Author Guidelines );
3. feedback from peer reviews/expert advisory group.

**We may choose to withdraw the article commission at this point, with no further payment to the author.**

#### Important information

During the preparation of the final report, you should not (or allow others to) publish your report or make it generally available without prior agreement. Your work may be used internally or for publication by GO-Science. This can be discussed with the Project Lead following submission of proposals. We may also hold workshops as part of the project and may wish to use your report, and/or invite you to attend.

| Steps                                       | Action  | Delivery Date     |
|---|---|-------------------|
| <i>Initial proposal to draft submission</i> |   |                   |
| 4   | Mid-point review. Submission of initial draft   | w/c<br>11/12/2017 |
| 5   | Draft submission to GO-S team   | 08/01/2018        |
| <i>Internal/ external peer review</i>       |   |                   |
| 6   | Internal review by GO-S team and notification of approval to proceed to peer review ( <b>including 30% of full fee to author OR suggested amendments</b> )* | 10/01/2018        |

|  |  |                                  |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 7  | External review by independent reviewers and possibly the expert advisory board. Recommended revisions to author.* | 24/01/2018                       |
| <i>Author revision and re-submission</i> |  |                                  |
| 8  | Author makes revisions and submits updated paper   | 05/02/2018                       |
| 9  | Paper approved by GO-S staff *   | 09/02/2018                       |
| 10                                       | Paper submitted for internal clearance. Author is paid remaining fee following approval.                           | 09/02/2018                       |
| 11                                       | Paper is published   | ~ 4-8 weeks following acceptance |



Annex A- Author guidelines FoM.docx

### **Terms and Conditions**

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

## Section 5 – Evaluation model

The evaluation model below shall be used for this ITQ, which will be determined to two decimal places.

Where a question is 'for information only' it will not be scored.

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, and the Contracting Authority ----- and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ( $5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$ ))

| Pass / fail criteria |         |   |
|----------------------|---------|---|
| Questionnaire        | Q No.   | Question subject  |
| Commercial           | SEL1.2  | Employment breaches/ Equality                                 |
| Commercial           | FOI1.1  | Freedom of Information Exemptions                             |
| Commercial           | AW1.1   | Form of Bid   |
| Commercial           | AW1.3   | Certificate of Bona Fide Bid                                  |
| Commercial           | AW3.1   | Validation check  |
| Commercial           | AW4.1   | Contract Terms  |
| Price                | AW5.5   | E Invoicing   |
| Price                | AW5.6   | Implementation of E-Invoicing                                 |
| Quality              | AW6.1   | Compliance to the Specification                               |
| Commercial           | SEL3.11 | Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act            |
| Commercial           | AW6.2   | Non-Disclosure Agreement                                      |
| Price                | AW5.8   | Maximum Budget  |
| -                    | -       | Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool |

| Scoring criteria  |         |                                  |               |
|---|---------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Evaluation Justification Statement</b>   |         |                                  |               |
| In consideration of this particular requirement the Contracting Authority has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. The Contracting Authority considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type. |         |                                  |               |
| Questionnaire   | Q No.   | Question subject                 | Maximum Marks |
| Price   | AW5.2   | Price                            | 15%           |
| Quality   | PROJ1.1 | Understanding the requirement    | 20%           |
| Quality   | PROJ1.2 | Project Plan and Risk Management | 20%           |
| Quality   | PROJ1.3 | Methodology                      | 25%           |
| Quality   | PROJ1.4 | Project Team and Capability to   | 20%           |

|  |  |         |  |
|--|--|---------|--|
|  |  | Deliver |  |
|--|--|---------|--|

## Evaluation of criteria

### Non-Price elements

Each question will be judged on a score from 0 to 100, which shall be subjected to a multiplier to reflect the percentage of the evaluation criteria allocated to that question.

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 20% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 20%.

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:

$$\text{Score} = \{\text{weighting percentage}\} \times \{\text{bidder's score}\} = 20\% \times 60 = 12$$

The same logic will be applied to groups of questions which equate to a single evaluation criterion.

The 0-100 score shall be based on (unless otherwise stated within the question):

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| 0   | The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.   |
| 10  | Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.   |
| 20  | Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.  |
| 40  | Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.  |
| 60  | Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.   |
| 80  | Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.   |
| 100 | Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider. |

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

### Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60  
Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60  
Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40  
Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40  
Your final score will  $(60+60+40+40) \div 4 = 50$

**Price elements** will be judged on the following criteria.

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100. All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion.

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100.

Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80

Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.

Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.

Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50.

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 ( $80/100 \times 50 = 40$ )

The lowest score possible is 0 even if the price submitted is more than 100% greater than the lowest price.

## Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

Bidders should note that the evaluation questionnaire is located within the **e-sourcing questionnaire**.

Guidance on completion of the questionnaire is available at <http://www.ukpbs.co.uk/services/procure/Pages/supplier.aspx>

**PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY**

## Section 7 – General Information

### What makes a good bid – some simple do's 😊

#### DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear , concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

## What makes a good bid – some simple do not's ☹

### DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

## Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.
- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of

any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, the Contracting Authority may disclose within Government any of the Bidders documentation/information (including any that the Bidder considers to be confidential and/or commercially sensitive such as specific bid information) submitted by the Bidder to the Contracting Authority during this Procurement. The information will not be disclosed outside Government. Bidders taking part in this ITQ consent to these terms as part of the competition process.

- 7.41 The Government is introducing its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme on the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2014 to replace the current Government Protective Marking System (GPMS). A key aspect of this is the reduction in the number of security classifications used. All Bidders are encouraged to make themselves aware of the changes and identify any potential impacts in their Bid, as the protective marking and applicable protection of any material passed to, or generated by, you during the procurement process or pursuant to any Contract awarded to you as a result of this tender process will be subject to the new GSC . The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-security-classifications>

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

## USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)