



Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Higher Education Funding
Council for England (HEFCE)**

Subject HEFCE Learning Gain NMMLGP Evaluation

Sourcing reference number UK SBS BLOJEU-CR17116HEFCE

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)
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	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About the Contracting Authority</u>
3	<u>Working with the Contracting Authority.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation model</u>
6	<u>Evaluation questionnaire</u>
7	<u>General Information</u>
Appendix	Annex A - 2017 Learning Gain Pilot Project

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

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

HEFCE funds and regulates universities and colleges in England. We invest on behalf of students and the public to promote excellence and innovation in research, teaching and knowledge exchange. In all our activities we aim to:

- ensure accountability for funding and be a proportionate regulator
- act in the public interest and be open, fair, impartial and objective
- be an effective broker between Government and the sector and in doing so, ensure that we are implementing government policy effectively.

Further information can be found at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

By the will of Parliament, the Office for Students (OfS) and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) will be established in place of HEFCE and OFFA in April 2018. Further information is available in the Government's White Paper "Higher Education: success as a Knowledge Economy" and the subsequent "Higher Education and Research Bill" that has now passed through Parliament. HEFCE wishes to make it clear that it is anticipated that this contract will novate as part of the transfer of HEFCE's property, rights and liabilities to the Office for Students. We would not expect this transfer to affect the services required.

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	Higher Education Funding Council for England, Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol BS34 8SR
3.2	Buyer name	Jenny Stratton
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	Maximum value £28,000.00 excl VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. 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.

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	27/09/2017 Location: Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	05/10/2017 14.00hrs
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	10/10/2017
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	16/10/2017 14.00hrs
3.10	Anticipated selection and de selections of Bids notification date	23/10/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award date	23/10/2017
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	30/10/2017
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	29/02/2020
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

There is now an increasing desire to measure how students' knowledge, skills and work-readiness change and improve through their experience of higher education. It is proposed that measuring aspects of students' knowledge, understanding and skills at the start, during and at the end of their period of higher education study will lead to a better understanding of the distance travelled by the student and a more in-depth understanding of how learning and teaching practices contribute to this. This notion of 'distance travelled' is often represented by the term 'learning gain'.

While significant research into the measurement of Learning Gain and its proxies in higher education has taken place in other countries such as the USA, there have been comparatively fewer studies within the UK. Relatively little is therefore known about the validity and feasibility of Learning Gain measurement methodologies in higher education in England.

To help address this, HEFCE launched its Learning Gain programme (<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/lg/>) in 2015 which aims to: provide evidence-informed advice to Government on the potential for a sector-wide approach to measuring Learning Gain in higher education in England; and establish good practice in the use of Learning Gain to enhance learning and teaching. The objectives of the programme are:

- To catalyse activity and dialogue on Learning Gain across the sector;
- To develop sector-wide agreed, common characterisations of Learning Gain (appropriate for the English HE context);
- To identify methods for measuring Learning Gain;
- To explore whether a valid proxy or proxies for Learning Gain could be used that would enable low burden aggregate comparison;
- To identify & share experiences on the use of Learning Gain to enhance learning and teaching strategy and practice.

In order to achieve these objectives the programme has three main strands of activity:

1. Testing and evaluating different ways of measuring and assessing Learning Gain in higher education.
2. Building knowledge about, and capacity for, measuring and using Learning Gain.
3. Promoting partnerships and encouraging dialogue across the sector.

The National Mixed Methodology Learning Gain Project (NMMLGP) straddles all three of these strands through testing one, mixed methods approach to measuring Learning Gain across ten higher education institutions in England. The NMMLGP is a HEFCE-administered longitudinal study combining a critical thinking and problem solving test with self-reflective questions exploring academic motivation, attitudes to literacy and diversity, and dimensions of student engagement.

In addition to the NMMLGP, thirteen collaborative Pilot Projects have been funded at various higher education providers who have identified their own characterisations and associated measure(s) of Learning Gain. An evaluative synthesis and analysis of the experiences and outcomes of these Pilot Projects is also being conducted, with the first report (Annexe A) being published in July 2017. Furthermore, through its Higher Education Learning Gain Analysis (HELGA) work, HEFCE is also exploring the potential of administrative data (e.g. students' prior academic attainments and higher education outcomes) to provide indications of Learning Gain.

Alongside these practical steps, knowledge about Learning Gain is being gathered through research (e.g. RAND report on Learning Gain in higher education (available on the HEFCE website) and analysis of TEF Provider Submissions (also available on the HEFCE website)). The programme is overseen by a Steering Group with additional advice from a technical Expert Group. Further information about all aspects of the programme is available on the HEFCE website at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/lq/>

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The aim:

To commission a longitudinal process evaluation of the National Mixed Methodology Learning Gain Project (NMMLGP) which is part of HEFCE's larger Learning Gain programme. The main evaluation activity will be undertaken over a period of 4 months commencing in November 2017 and the second main period of activity is expected during a further 4 months in 2019-2020. However, this may be subject change as dictated by project needs. To maintain understanding of how the project is developing and to ensure that stage 2 of this evaluation aligns with other elements of the wider Learning Gain programme, regular pre-arranged contact between the contractor and the HEFCE project team is expected. As a result of these meetings there may be the need for the successful bidder to provide updated reports to ensure the evaluation aligns with the wider programme, this regular contact will be crucial in informing Phase 2 of this longitudinal evaluation. As a result of this, bidders should include detail in their response of how they will ensure that a project lead will be available during this period to liaise with HEFCE.

The main aim of the evaluation is to understand the logistical requirements of administering a sector-wide Learning Gain test/questionnaire across multiple higher education providers in England. This will entail an in-depth exploration of these requirements through evaluating the experiences of the higher education institutions and students in the administration, implementation and use of NMMLGP approach and through identifying examples of good practice from elsewhere (nationally and internationally).

The findings of this evaluation will provide evidence to inform future policy development and recommendations on the feasibility of a common, sector-wide approach to measuring Learning Gain.

The objectives of this evaluation are to:

1. Understand the plans and processes put in place by the ten NMMLGP institutions to recruit students to participate in the test/questionnaire and, where appropriate, to support students, particularly those who may have concerns with their test outcomes.

2. Identify approaches and practices that worked well, and those that were less effective.
3. Identify opportunities and challenges, and how these were utilised / overcome.
4. Understand students' experiences and opinions of the NMMLGP.
5. Identify issues and considerations for scaling up the NMMLGP to a sector-wide approach.

3. Suggested Methodology

The evaluator is expected to engage with a range of stakeholders including HEFCE, IFF Research (<https://www.iffresearch.com/>)

the organisation administering the NMMLGP survey, staff and students (both participating and non-participating students) at the ten institutions involved in the NMMLGP and HEFCE's Learning Gain Pilot Projects' External Evaluator; as well as drawing information from relevant national and international literature / researchers on administering longitudinal studies and achieving high engagement.

The supplier is expected to design the specific methodology. Capturing the student experience in particular is likely to be challenging due to the privacy issues around contacting students. Currently the two options available include: Asking institutions to contact students who were given the opportunity to participate in the 2016 survey to invite them to participate in the evaluation work; and incorporating evaluation into a later tranche of the NMMLGP survey. However, further exploration of options would be welcome.

This piece of work is not focused on the statistics, data linking and analysis, this is being considered by another strand of the Learning Gain programme. Stage 1 of this evaluation and the developments and regular contact between the contractor and the HEFCE Project Team will inform the specific details of stage 2 (for example, as the results from the NMMLGP and other strands of the Learning Gain programme emerge, the focus of the questions may alter), however, the overall approach during stage 2 of the evaluation is expected to be very similar.

4. Deliverables

The contract will include the following mandatory key deliverables:

- An interim report (including an executive summary, background information on learning gain, scope and methodology of the evaluation, findings, considerations for the sector, references) for internal HEFCE use – December 2017. – Stage 1
- A final report for external publication (including an executive summary, background, scope, methodology, detailed discussion of findings, considerations for stakeholders, recommendations to OfS on the logistics and feasibility of administering a sector-wide, longitudinal learning gain survey, summary and conclusions, references). – Stage 2

All reports must be written in accordance with HEFCE's corporate style and standards for research and evaluation reports published by HEFCE.

In line with the copyright statement, HEFCE requires that it may freely make use of the findings, including publishing a version of the report in the public domain, which may

incorporate use of the provider's name/logo. Reports should meet the 'Standards for research and evaluation reports published by HEFCE and be:

- supplied as an editable document in A4 Microsoft Word format
- have an executive summary and be clearly structured
- have a minimum font size equivalent to 10.5pt Arial, with any additional information (such as charts or diagrams) to have a minimum font size equivalent to 10pt Arial. (If highly complex tables or diagrams make this unworkable this should be flagged up.)

Reports should not contain any personal data.

If the appointed provider holds any intellectual property in the outputs of its work that it wishes to protect and retain copyright it should indicate this at the outset or at the earliest opportunity.

It is expected that the Contractor will liaise closely with HEFCE regarding quality and with external representatives having critical oversight of the programme of work.

Throughout the project, the contractor will be expected to be in regular communication with the HEFCE project manager or other project team members as appropriate to ensure that contractual obligations are being fulfilled and that the project is progressing as expected in terms of scope and time, and to ensure that any potential issues or risks are identified, monitored and managed appropriately. Communication management to be discussed in more detail during the inception meeting.

There will be an expectation that the contractor will make themselves available to participate, as necessary, in any relevant discussions with HEFCE during the work.

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	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
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
Commercial	AW4.3	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	AW4.4	Non Disclosure Agreement
Price	AW5.3	Compliance with maximum budget
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	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach	20%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	20%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Environment	25%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	15%

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

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 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 2nd 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](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)