



# Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Medical Research Council  
(MRC)**

Subject UK SBS **Bibliometric Profiling Analysis**

Sourcing reference number **BLOJEU-CR16023MRC**

**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 North Star 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 our Customer</u></a>                            |
| 3       | <a href="#"><u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</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>                           |

# 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 our customers improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading provider for our customers 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 customers. This allows our customers 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 its customers, 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 Innovation and Skills (BIS) 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 Customers.

## Our Procurement ambition

Our vision is to be recognised as a centre of excellence and deliver a broad range of procurement services across the public sector; to maintain and grow a procurement service unrivalled in public sector.

Procurement is a market-shaping function. Industry derived benchmarks indicate that UK SBS is already performing at or above “best in class” in at least three key measures (percentage savings, compliant spend, spend under management) and compare well against most other measures.

Over the next five years, it is the function’s ambition to lead a cultural change in procurement in the public sector. The natural extension of category management is to bring about a fundamental change in the attitude to supplier relationship management.

Our philosophy sees the supplier as an asset to the business and the route to maximising value from supply. This is not a new concept in procurement generally, but it is not a philosophy which is widely employed in the public sector.

We are ideally positioned to “lead the charge” in the government’s initiative to reform procurement in the public sector.

UK SBS Procurement’s unique selling points are:

- Focus on the full procurement cycle
- Leaders in category management in common and specialised areas
- Expertise in the delivery of major commercial projects
- That we are leaders in procurement to support research
- Use of cutting edge technologies which are superior to those used generally used across the public sector.
- Use of market leading analytical tools to provide comprehensive Business Intelligence
- Active customer and supplier management

***‘UK SBS’ contribution to the Government Procurement Agenda has been impressive. Through innovation and leadership UK SBS has built an attractive portfolio of procurement services from P2P to Strategy Category Management.’***

**John Collington**

**Former Government Chief Procurement Officer**

## Section 2 – About Our Customer

### Medical Research Council

The Medical Research Council is a publicly-funded organisation dedicated to improving human health.

The organisation supports research across the entire spectrum of medical sciences, in universities and hospitals, in its own units, centres and institutes in the UK, and in its units in Africa.

The MRC has four key strategic aims<sup>1</sup>:

- *Picking Research that Delivers* - Setting research priorities which are most likely to deliver improved health outcomes.
- *Research to People* - Bringing the benefits of excellent research to all sections of society.
- *Going Global* - Accelerating progress in international health research.
- *Supporting Scientists* - Sustaining a robust and flourishing environment for world-class medical research.

On the basis of this strategy the MRC has, through successive Government spending reviews, secured funding for medical research from the Department for Business Innovation and Skills (BIS). The MRC Delivery Plan 2011/12-2014/15<sup>2</sup> sets out in detail how these resources will be used to progress the MRC's strategy and support Government objectives for the science budget. The Delivery Plan for 2015/16 was released in 2014<sup>3</sup>.

In 2014/15 the MRC's gross research expenditure was £772m. The support for world-class medical research to improve human health and enhance the economic competitiveness of the UK included:

- £367m on grants and to researchers in universities, medical schools and research institutes.
- £240m on programmes within the MRC's own units and institutes, including £7m on studentships.
- £84m on programmes within university units.
- £64m on studentships and fellowships in universities, medical schools and research institutes

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.mrc.ac.uk/publications/browse/strategic-plan-2014-19/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.mrc.ac.uk/publications/browse/delivery-plan-201112-201415/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.mrc.ac.uk/publications/browse/delivery-plan-2015-16/>

## **Examples of economic impact from MRC funded research**

- A national Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm screening programme introduced following an MRC funded trial and work at the MRC Biostatistics Unit, saves 6000 lives each year (at a cost of just £2,300 per life)
- The decision to introduce immediate CT imaging to diagnose acute stroke based on MRC funded research, has led to estimated NHS savings £156m-£312m each year
- Cooling therapy, a new intervention based on MRC research to limit brain damage in oxygen-deprived newborns, has been used in 3,000 cases over 3 years. The impact of this treatment has been estimated at £125m to date.
- £32m per year is saved from shorter radiotherapy courses for breast cancer (£24m savings in the NHS, £8m in patient and family time and expenses)
- A spin out company, Heptares Ltd. based on MRC research at two of its institutes, and founded in 2007, was sold in 2015 in a deal worth up to \$400m.

## Section 3 - Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

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                         | Customer Name and address                             | Medical Research Council<br>Polaris House<br>North Star Avenue<br>Swindon<br>SN2 1FL   |
| 3.2                         | Buyer name  | Rebecca Fish   |
| 3.3                         | Buyer contact details                                 | <a href="mailto:research@uksbs.co.uk">research@uksbs.co.uk</a>   |
| 3.4                         | Estimated value of the Opportunity                    | £25,000 excluding 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   | 15/02/2016<br>Contracts Finder |
| 3.7                    | Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system                | 23/02/2016                     |
| 3.8                    | Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris | 25/02/2016                     |
| 3.9                    | Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris   | 02/03/2016                     |
| 3.11                   | Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date  | 09/03/2016                     |
| 3.12                   | Anticipated Award date   | 09/03/2016                     |
| 3.13                   | Anticipated Contract Start date  | 10/03/2016                     |
| 3.14                   | Anticipated Contract End date  | 15/04/2016                     |

|      |                     |         |
|------|---------------------|---------|
| 3.15 | Bid Validity Period | 60 Days |
|------|---------------------|---------|

## Section 4 – Specification

### **1.0 Background**

The MRC regularly monitors, evaluates and reports on successes and the outcomes, outputs and impact of the research support. To better understand how MRC research leads to economic, societal and academic impact, all MRC-funded researchers are required to provide feedback on the impact of their work via an online system called researchfish®<sup>4</sup>. These data are supplemented with additional information from other sources, such as bibliometric analysis. Combined, these datasets provide a detailed picture of the progress, productivity and quality of the science we support. This includes developing new medicines and technologies, improving clinical policies and practices, and encouraging inward investment to the UK.

The MRC is interested in developing its approach to the tracking of benefits from its intramural programme. To assist with this, the MRC requires some additional bibliometric analysis, and advice/assistance on ways to visualise and compare the fields of research studied in different research organisations.

There is additional interest in this analysis given that the MRC has transferred a large number of its units and its largest institute into new governance arrangements, involving expenditure of £100m per year and the transfer of over 1,500 researchers to new employers.

The quinquennial review (QQR) of MRC units and institutes provide the most important route for assessing the benefit of this mode of support, and recent changes to governance, given that it will include expert, international peer review, but we expect that between QQRs there will also be an occasional need to report and review, especially on the wider economic benefits and effects of interaction with UK Universities.

### **2.0 Summary of work required**

This specification relates to the analysis of publication data from the output of a sample of MRC's intramural programme in the five years leading up to 2015.

A custom bibliometrics analysis is required for this set of research publications, plus the compilation and analysis of a set of comparator research organisations. The supplied MRC intramural publication dataset will be approximately 2,000 records.

These records will be provided by the MRC. The publication output of the comparator organisations is to be sourced by the supplier.

For the 14 comparator organisations experience has shown that a five year publication record is likely to include approximately 70,000 records.

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.researchfish.com](http://www.researchfish.com)

Analysis of this publication output is required to include citation impact, collaboration, productivity (papers per £ invested), and field of research/subject area analysis, at an institution/organisation level. Data on the expenditure in comparator research organisations will have to be sourced by the supplier (from annual reports etc.).

### **3.0 Data**

#### **3.1 General**

- Publication data for the subset of the MRC intramural programme will be provided by MRC using data submitted in Researchfish at the start of 2015, or extracted from annual reports.
- The publication data will include PubMed ID and be provided as a single MS Excel file.
- All primary peer reviewed publications/articles and reviews (not to include letters and conference proceedings) will be included in the analysis.
- 5 years of publications – 2009 to 2013 (2010-2014 if citation data can be obtained to the end of 2015)
- Citation data will include citations up to the end of 2014 (2015 if available in the timescale)
- The supplier will extract the data for the comparator organisations using their usual process which is based on addresses and all suitable variations of the addresses.
- Data on the expenditure in comparator research organisations will have to be sourced by the supplier (from annual reports etc.) and appropriate conversions to sterling currency applied.

#### **3.2 Comparator Organisations**

The selection criteria used for the 14 comparator “organisations” included the size of the organisation, their perceived reputation, geographic coverage and where possible the research focus.

- Babraham Institute
- CRUK London Research Institute
- Weatherall Institute of Molecular Medicine (WIMM)
- The Russell Group Universities (average)
- The Scripps Research Institute (TSRI)
- EMBL Heidelberg
- Max Planck Institute for Biochemistry
- Howard Hughes Medical Institute
- Rockefeller University
- Pasteur Institute
- The Salk Institute
- US National Cancer Institute (NCI)
- US National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)
- MRC National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR)

## **4.0 Analysis**

To note MRC will require the raw citation and bibliographic data for all comparator organisations as data items in an MS Excel spreadsheet or Access database, as well as charts/figures in the report, and a license to freely re-use/re-analyse, and if desired to publish.

### **4.1 Citation impact**

Citation data should be normalised by subject field/field of research for all publications identified for the sample intramural data set and the comparator institutes.

One way of summarising the distribution of normalised citation impact scores by year is shown in the following graph (Extracted from an MRC Institute review). Although alternative ways of presenting the results can be considered.

### Normalised Citation Impact for an example Research Institute publications 2006-2013



Box and whiskers plot showing the distribution of the normalised citation impact (NCI) for publications from an example Institute by year. Data on 2038 reports of publications entered into Researchfish by principal investigators at the Institute published between 2006 and 2013. These reports resolve to 1723 unique publications, 1697 of these were matched with the Web of Science database and citation data obtained to the end of 2014. Note that 2013 data will be partial, due to the timing of data collection. The inter-quartile mean (blue dots) of the NCI data has a trend-line added. The Institute has an overall average NCI for this period of 1.83, the MRC average is just over 2.0

## **4.2 Collaboration**

Analysis of the extent of collaboration for the sample intramural dataset using the addresses of the authors as listed on the publications.

- Numbers/percentages of publications produced in collaboration with at least one other organisation
  - Co-located universities (the sample dataset will be for MRC investment in a single region)
  - Other UK universities
- Collaboration by country (UK vs international, to include top 10 countries by number/proportion)
- Collaboration by sector (e.g. higher education, UK research council, private sector, hospital etc) to include top 10 organisations and numbers/percentages of papers for each where possible.

## **4.3 Publications by funding**

Publications by funding and citation i.e. numbers of publications per £1m or similar.

Financial data for the sample intramural dataset will be provided by the MRC.

Papers published in the five year period 2009 to 2013 (potentially 2010 to 2014) inclusive will be used in the analysis, therefore consideration should be given to which financial data would be suitable. For previous reports data covered papers published in 2004 to 2008, and financial data was used for 2008 as this was found to be the most complete financial dataset available for the comparator organisations. Supplier to advise on availability and suggest the most suitable data sets (e.g. from annual reports for comparator organisations).

## **4.4 Subject categories**

The comparator organisation may not have the same mission and research focus as the organisations included in the MRC intramural dataset. Therefore using the standard subject categories that are assigned to publications either at the journal level or article level (for generic journals such as Science, Nature and so on) will facilitate comparative analyses across all selected organisations.

The journal categories used in these analyses will be selected a priori as those shown to be major areas of research activity for the MRC sample intramural dataset; the list used previously for an analysis of MRC Institutes is noted below:

- Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
- Biophysics
- Biotechnology & Applied Microbiology
- Cell Biology
- Clinical Neurology

- Computer Science, Theory & Methods
  - Developmental Biology
  - Endocrinology & Metabolism
  - Genetics & Heredity
  - Immunology
  - Neuroimaging
  - Neurosciences
  - Oncology
  - Parasitology
  - Paediatrics
  - Radiology, Nuclear Medicine & Medical Imaging
  - Virology
- Data tables to show numbers and percentage of papers by year, total citation counts, average normalised citation impact, numbers/percentages of uncited and highly cited papers for the MRC sample dataset, and comparator organisation. Represented graphically if possible.
  - Data represented graphically for the MRC sample intramural dataset to characterise strengths by visualising the number of papers in a particular category and the overall average normalised citation impact for each.
  - It is desirable to be able to show the strengths (by citation impact/volume of publications) of various fields of research in the MRC sample intramural dataset against a global map of science (e.g. as displayed in Leydesdorff and Rafols (2009) <http://arxiv.org/abs/0911.1057>), and also for comparator organisations. For this part of the analysis the MRC will be particularly looking for the supplier to provide expertise and transferable approaches and methods, so that the MRC can extend this approach if required.

#### **4.5 Other outputs**

Consideration should be given to whether other datasets available to the supplier, such as patent data, could be brought into the presentation of the baseline.

**The MRC requires the final report to be completed by mid-April for review in early May.**

## 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, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem 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 ( $5+5+6=16\div3=5.33$ ))

| Pass / fail criteria |        |   |
|----------------------|--------|---|
| Questionnaire        | Q No.  | Question subject  |
| 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                               |
| -                    | -      | Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool |

### Scoring criteria

#### Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. UK SBS 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                                  | 20.00%        |
| Quality       | PROJ1.1 | Understanding                          | 25.00%        |
| Quality       | PROJ1.2 | Methodology                            | 25.00%        |
| Quality       | PROJ1.3 | Project Plan and Risk Management       | 10.00%        |
| Quality       | PROJ1.4 | Project Team and Capability to Deliver | 20.00%        |

## 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: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 ( $60/100 \times 20 = 12$ )

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 10% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 10.

**Example** if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 6% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 10 ( $60/100 \times 10 = 6$ )

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:  $\text{Score}/\text{Total Points}$  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.uksbs.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.
- 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 typically 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 your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer'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 and concise 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 Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer 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 Customer 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 may 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.
- 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 UK SBS.
- 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 if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS 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 UK SBS 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 UK SBS 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, UK SBS 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 UK SBS 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 From 2nd April 2014 the Government is introducing its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme 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 from 2nd April 2014. The link below to the Gov.uk website provides information on the new GSC:

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

UK SBS 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](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)