

# Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Low Pay Commission (LPC)**

**Subject: Research to help inform the Low Pay Commission (LPC) response to the Taylor Review recommendation that the LPC consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract**



**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

**Sourcing Reference Number: CR18063**

**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. 2013



## 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>

# 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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for the Contracting Authorities 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

### Low Pay Commission (LPC)

The Low Pay Commission (LPC) is an independent public body (sponsored by The Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy: BEIS) that advises the Government about the National Minimum Wage. There are 9 Low Pay Commissioners drawn from a range of employee, employer and academic backgrounds. All the commissioners serve in an individual capacity. They are supported by a small secretariat, which has 8 members of staff.

The Low Pay Commission makes evidence-based recommendations based on:

- commissioned and independent research;
- analysis of relevant data regarding the state of the economy and the impact of the minimum wage;
- consultations with employers, workers and their representatives;
- written and oral evidence from a wide range of organisations; and
- fact-finding visits across the UK to meet employers, employees and representative organisations.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/low-pay-commission>

## 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	Low Pay Commission (LPC) 8th Floor Fleetbank House 2-6 Salisbury Square London EC4Y 8JX
3.2	Buyer name	Jack Noden
3.3	Buyer contact details	<a href="mailto:research@uksbs.co.uk">research@uksbs.co.uk</a>
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity across all lots	Up to £40,000.00 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	13 <sup>th</sup> April 2018
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	1 <sup>st</sup> May 2018 11:00am
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	3 <sup>rd</sup> May 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	8 <sup>th</sup> May 2018 14:00pm
3.10	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	18 <sup>th</sup> May 2018
3.11	Anticipated Award date	18 <sup>th</sup> May 2018
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	23 <sup>rd</sup> May 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	30 <sup>th</sup> November 2018
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

## Section 4 – Specification

### Background

The Low Pay Commission (LPC) invites tenders from researchers for research to help inform the Low Pay Commission (LPC) response to the Taylor Review recommendation that the LPC consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract.

The Low Pay Commission (LPC) has an ongoing remit to monitor the operation of the National Minimum Wage, and to assess the impact of increases in the level of the minimum wage in order to advise Government on future rates. We are also tasked with advising the Government on the path of the new National Living Wage – the higher rate for workers aged 25 and over which is set to increase to 60 per cent of median earnings by 2020.

In addition to this normal remit, the Low Pay Commission has this year been asked by the Government to consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract.

Last year, Good Work: The Taylor Review of Modern Working Practices ([https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/627671/good-work-taylor-review-modern-working-practices-rg.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/627671/good-work-taylor-review-modern-working-practices-rg.pdf)), led by Matthew Taylor, made a series of recommendations to the Government. One of those recommendations was that the 'Government should ask the LPC to consider the design and impacts of the introduction of a higher NMW rate for hours that are not guaranteed as part of the contract'. It then went on to note that the 'LPC will need to consider the rate at which such a premium should be set and the potential impact on marginal hours of employment. It should also consider any potential impact on NMW compliance from a more complicated system. Government should also consider other ways in which employers might be encouraged to guarantee more hours to their staff, including the role of voluntary collective agreements.'

The Taylor Review found many examples of workers benefitting from flexible working arrangements. It also identified a risk of 'one-sided flexibility' in the labour market, and workers' concerns over lack of security and uncertainty over when they will next receive work.

In its response to the Taylor Review, the Government confirmed that it wanted to find ways to tackle this issue while retaining the flexibilities that many workers find valuable, and avoiding placing unnecessary burdens on businesses.

([https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/679767/180206\\_BEIS\\_Good\\_Work\\_Report\\_Accessible\\_A4\\_.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/679767/180206_BEIS_Good_Work_Report_Accessible_A4_.pdf))

The Government also accepted the Taylor Review's recommendation that the Low Pay Commission should be asked to consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract.

The Government has asked the Low Pay Commission to assess the nature and extent of the problem identified in the Review; and to assess the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage for non-guaranteed hours. The Government has also asked that our assessment consider alternative policies that address the same issue, including relevant international comparisons and any evidence provided by stakeholders. The Government has asked that this assessment form part of the Low Pay Commission's October 2018 Report.

There is global interest among policymakers and analysts in this topical area of minimum hours contracts and volatile incomes. The findings from this research will directly inform policy decisions touching the lives of thousands of workers as well as contributing to policy formation in the UK and beyond.

### **Aims and Objectives**

The aim of this study is to help inform the Low Pay Commission (LPC) response to the Taylor Review recommendation that the 'LPC consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract' and as part of this 'to consider any alternative policies that they [LPC] consider address the same issue of one-sided flexibility'.

In order to meet these aims the LPC welcomes tenders for the following lots:

- **Lot 1:** An assessment of the extent to which low-paid workers work beyond their contracted hours;
- **Lot 2:** An assessment of the degree of volatility in those hours from week to week;
- **Lot 3:** The identification of potential solutions to insecurity of income for low-paid workers;
- **Lot 4:** A review of how other countries address this issue;
- **Lot 5:** An investigation of how employers and employees might be affected, paying particular attention to potential negative or unintended consequences; and
- **Lot 6:** A consideration of any practical and NMW compliance-related issues that might stem from any suggested policy changes. In particular focussing on the relationship with the Commission's core rate-setting remit.

The LPC welcomes suppliers to tender for multiple lots and there is not a restriction on the number of lots organisations may tender for. Tenderers may also choose to bid for individual lots.

The LPC expects the research will include an investigation of the nature of insecurity of earnings in low-paying jobs, including an exploration of the nature of contract types where evidence allows, for example zero hours, short hours, temporary, and agency work. It might study trends over time and the characteristics of the jobs (for example, sectors and occupations) and workers (age, gender,

education/skills etc) affected by them. A key aim would be understand the scale of the problem and the direction of travel.

Identification of alternative potential solutions to insecurity of income for low-paid workers and exploring how employers and workers might be affected. Valuable insights may be gained from a review of how other countries address this issue. In this respect, the study might also consider whether any practical and NMW compliance-related issues arise from any suggested policy changes, paying particular attention to potential negative or unintended consequences. The researchers should also be aware of any interactions of potential solutions with the Commission's core rate-setting remit.

The Low Pay Commission invites tenders for research that will provide evidence by September 2018. The findings will inform LPC deliberations in October 2018 in its response to the Government on the Taylor Review recommendation that the Low Pay Commission consider the impact of introducing a higher minimum wage rate for hours worked that are not guaranteed as part of the contract.

**The budget is up to a total of £40,000 excluding VAT across all 6 lots.** Each lot will be evaluated individually in line with the methodology detailed in Section 5. The LPC reserves the right not to award all the lots.

Information about previous LPC research projects is available on our website at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/low-pay-commission-research-2017>

### **Suggested Methodology**

The methods and data used are at the discretion of the prospective researchers, but these should be specified in detail. It is anticipated that this study could use existing data and/or new sources of information to examine relevant issues. Bidders are also welcome to present more than one methodological approach, outlining the implications of the different options for the research. The tender should outline the time period of the data to be analysed.

Appropriate data sources for this type of analysis will be determined by the bidder but it is important that the analysis in Lots 1 and 2 include as much evidence as possible on the extent to which low-paid workers work beyond their contracted hours; and the degree of volatility in those hours from week to week respectively.

Although we have noted that potential contractors are free to use whatever method they consider most appropriate, it is essential that the methodology and analysis stands up to external scrutiny by professional academics, economists, statisticians and other analysts. We will support the winning supplier(s) gaining access to official data.

## **Deliverables**

The initial primary audience for this work will be the LPC. The main output of the study will be a report, detailing the aims and objectives of the research, the methodology adopted and the main findings. The report should include a brief non-technical Executive Summary. An electronic copy (preferably Word and pdf format) for the LPC website will be required. The LPC will make the findings publicly available, and a synopsis of the report will be included in the Low Pay Commission's 2018 Report. The findings will be used to inform the recommendations made in that report.

Deliverables for each individual lot will include:

- A methodology paper;
  - Up to three presentations of the key aspects of the work
    - an informal presentation of data sources and methodology to a small, invited audience in May;
    - potentially a presentation on any initial findings to Commissioners on 20 June (depending on the quality and robustness of those initial findings); and
    - a presentation of findings at the annual research symposium on 6 September 2018;
  - Regular updates on emerging findings and project progress;
  - An interim report;
  - A draft final report;
  - A final report incorporating comments from LPC;
- and
- Key datasets and syntax files if appropriate.

The timescale for delivery of the research is flexible according to the needs of the project, but we would be looking in the first instance for an outline of the project at an inception meeting in May, an informal presentation on data sources and methodology at a meeting in May, a potential presentation on initial findings to Commissioners on 20 June, an interim report by 31 August 2018, with findings for a presentation to the 6th Annual LPC Research Symposium on 6 September 2018 and a draft final report by 21 September 2018. A final paper would be required by 30 October 2018. Project management is likely to include attendance at an inception meeting at LPC, and review meetings as required.

## **Project Timescales**

Initial meeting	Mid-late May 2018 (tbc)
Presentation at informal meeting	Late May 2018 (tbc)
Presentation at a Commission meeting	20 June 2018 (tbc)
Interim report	31 August 2018

Presentation of methodology and emerging findings at the Sixth Annual LPC Research Symposium	6 September 2018
Draft final report	21 September 2018
Agreed final report	28 October 2018
Publication	November/December 2018

**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	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
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 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	10%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding the requirements and context	30%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Methodology and approach	30%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Risk management	30%



## 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:  $\text{Score/Total Points multiplied by 50}$  ( $80/100 \times 50 = 40$ )

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.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. 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 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 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](#)