Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of UK Space Agency

Subject: UKSA Regulatory Development Studies

Sourcing Reference Number: UKSBS PR18134

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)
www.uksbs.co.uk

Version 3.3

Table of Contents

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

UK Space Agency (UKSA)

The Agency is responsible for all strategic decisions on the UK civil space programme and we provide a clear, single voice for UK space ambitions. The UK Space Agency is at the heart of UK efforts to explore and benefit from space. The UK's thriving space sector contributes £9.1 billion a year to the UK economy and directly employs 28.900 with an average growth rate of almost 7.5%.

Collaboration lies at the core of the UK Space Agency ethos and applies across Government as well as to external organisations including European and global partners such as the European Space Agency (ESA), the European Union, national space agencies and the United Nations.

The Agency provides funding for a range of programmes via programmes such as the National Space Technology Programme and FP7 and works closely with national and international academic, education and community partners.

Spaceflight Regulation:

Driven by UK Government's commitment to space growth described in its National Space Policy, the UK must be ready to license its first domestic commercial launches by the early 2020's.

The advent of the Space Industry Act means the UK Government's regulatory powers over spaceflight activity have increased significantly. The UK Space Agency, together with its co-regulators, the Civil Aviation Authority and the Health & Safety Executive, have been developing a new regulatory framework and licensing service to support the first commercial spaceflight operators.

To support this regulatory development the UK Space Agency is funding a series of studies to develop ourknowledge on a variety of launch related topics. The first phase of these studies is part of this ITQ. The intention is to release further towards the end of 2018 and the beginning of 2019.

https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/uk-space-agency

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	UK Space Agency Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon SN2 1SZ
3.2	Buyer name	Melanie Hollingsworth, Procurement Specialist UKSBS.
3.3	Buyer contact details	Email: MajorProjects@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	Total value of the requirement is £80k divided into three Lots are follows: Lot 1 - Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice - £30k excl. VAT Lot 2 - Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes - £30k excl. VAT Lot 3 - Review of Flight Safety Systems - £20k 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 will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	29/08/2018 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	14/09/2018 11.00 BST
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	17/09/2018 11.00 BST
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	19/09/2018 11.00 BST
3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available if face to face clarifications are required	Not Applicable
3.11	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids *	15/10/2018

3.12	Anticipated Award date*	22/10/2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date*	29/10/2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date*	08/02/2019
3.15	Bid Validity Period	90 Days

*Dates are anticipated times only and may change during the tender process.

Section 4 – Specification

Introduction:

The UK Space Agency (UKSA) is an agency of the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) and will be responsible for the regulation of certain aspects of launch under the Space Industry Act 2018, including all launches to orbit. To support the ongoing regulatory development the UK Space Agency is funding a series of studies to develop the general understanding of a variety of launch related topics. The areas to be studied are split across 3 core themes; technology, operations and safety. The output of these studies will feed into the guidance material and the regulatory approach being developed by the Government. The three studies have been divided into three Lots as follows:

- Lot 1: Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice
- Lot 2: Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes
- Lot 3: Review of Flight Safety Systems

Lot 1: Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice

Maximum budget value: £30k (not including VAT)

Lot 1 is for a study on launch collision assessment best practice. Launch collision assessments are performed to assess the probability of collisions between the launch vehicle and existing objects on-orbit. If the likelihood of collision falls within certain thresholds, the launch is held leading to gaps/closures/cut-outs in the overall launch window. Key factors considered during these assessments include the type of objects which must be screened (manned, unmanned or both) and the miss distance between the objects. While future UK launch operators will seek to maximise the number of available launch opportunities within the window, the UK must continue to satisfy its international obligations by setting suitable guidelines to ensure sustainable utilisation of space. This study seeks to review global best practice for launch collision assessments and provide recommendations on a future approach for the UK.

Aims: This study seeks to; 1) review global best practice on launch collision assessment, 2) provide insight into assessment approaches and tools used, 3) provide recommendations on the UK's approach.

Objectives: To achieve the aims above the bidder must satisfy the 5 objectives below:

1. Critically review the global best practice for launch collision assessment practices/techniques: The review should include 1) detailed insight into the analysis techniques/methodologies use to assess the risk (inputs, methodology, outputs), 2) an overview of global policies for closures/acceptable risk including a justification of these approaches, 3) identification of the challenges and uncertainties in the analysis, 4) descriptions of the tools/software used globally for this analysis (descriptions should include insight into their user community, capability and

commercial availability. At this stage any gaps in the tools/software should be identified).

2. Launch Collision Avoidance Process Assessment. Upon establishing a suitable methodology and thresholds for launch collision assessments, there must be a suitable process to include the outputs into the launch schedule. This objective is to review this process and the typical interactions between the entity performing the screening and the launch vehicle operator. At a minimum this review must include the following; the frequency and duration of the screening process, the process by which launch window closures are included in the launch schedule, interaction between the various operators at the launch site (range, spaceport operator), process to consider launch scrubs.

3. UK recommended approach/methodology: On the back of 1) and 2), provide a recommendation for suitable risk thresholds and a procedure for assessment in the UK. The recommendation should identify the inputs required to perform the screening, the chosen methodology to assess collision probability, assumptions, thresholds and outputs. The output of this objective should act as a step-by-step approach to assess launch collision risk which could act as a releasable overview of the topic. Critically, the procedure should be described in sufficient detail to allow for it to be independently reproduced.

4. UK Launch Example : Building upon the previous objectives, produce an example launch window with associated closures for a commercial launch from the UK. The example should use the recommended methodology identified in this study to illustrate the risk and impact of the gaps/closures on the launch window. The example UK launch window should be for a typical small launch to both a Polar Orbit and Sun Synchronous Orbit at 500 km. The proof of concept example developed here can be significantly simplified compared to a real case, but all assumptions should be documented. The proof of concept should be delivered at the end of the project and is not considered to be a tool that is to be distributed – it is purely an engineering model to demonstrate the use of the methodology.

5. Recommendations for further work: Identify areas for further work such as further tool development, refining assumptions, reducing uncertainties.

Requirement :

- Deliverables :
  - Technical note detailing the outputs of the objectives,
  - Executive summary providing an overview of the outputs of the study. Approximately 2 pages and in a releasable format.
  - Final presentation, and
  - Proof-of-concept model and supporting information (model can be developed in Matlab, Excel or in any other commercial software identified by the bidder).
- Meetings :
  - Kick-off (t0)
  - Mid-term review (t+1.5 months)

- Final review (~t+3 months)

Timetable: The study is proposed to be completed in approximately 3 months. The deliverables should be completed for review for the final presentation and completion of the whole project by the 8th February 2019.

Lot 2: Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes

Maximum budget value: £30k (not including VAT)

Lot 2 is an assessment of launch vehicle failure modes. A critical component in the assessment of launch risk is accurate knowledge of the probability of failure of the vehicle and the associated failure modes/vehicle responses. There are numerous methods available to determine the probability of failure / vehicle reliability ranging from the use of empirical evidence (such as flight experience and test data) to bottom up sub-system based reliability analysis. Upon developing these failure probabilities it is then important to map/allocate them to the flight times and associated vehicle response. Ultimately, these assessments underpin the risk calculations which serve as a vital input to the license decisions. The UK Space Agency is currently developing its regulatory approach which includes the development of internal tools to assess risk. The output of this study will support this tool development and help broaden the understanding of the regulatory team of launch risk.

Aims: The aim of this study is to improve the UKSA's general understanding of launch vehicle failures, methodologies for calculating failure probability/frequency and ultimately determine the vehicle response. The output of the study will be used to improve the understanding of the Regulator both on common failures during launch and the associated methodologies to derive failure probabilities and the likelihood of certain vehicle response modes. Ultimately the recommendations provided by study will be used to help develop the internal capability to assess future launch licenses.

Objectives:

1. Failure mode database: Compile a database of failures of rocket-powered orbital vehicles using empirical data for both ground and flight activities (this database may be based on non-proprietary and non-ITAR restricted information). Identify types of failure (including cases of degraded performance), common causes of failure, trends, mitigation strategies and the applicability of data/trends to newly developed small launch vehicles. The bidder should highlight the applicability/dependency of this data on factors such as vehicle developer experience, learning rate associated with vehicle/component testing, new manufacturing techniques or materials etc. The data collected should be used to create a set of common/generic vehicle response modes, which are justified against the database. To note, the taxonomy of failure for the database should be agreed with the UK Space Agency before initiating the work (inclusion of a provisional taxonomy in the proposal would be an advantage).

2. Critically review the approaches to calculate the probability or frequency of failure: Provide a critical review of the approaches to calculating the probability or

frequency of failure. The review should consider both top-down and bottom-up approaches. For the top-down approaches the approaches/methodologies identified must be linked to the conclusions from the failure database (created in objective 1) and actual flight history. Building on this and the data collected (in objective 1) develop values for the probability/frequency of failure at vehicle and stage level for various vehicle types and for different flight histories. This should utilise event-tree and fault-tree analysis where appropriate. The contractor should also identify how the following factors should be included in the analysis; distinguishing between new and experienced developers, distinguishing between new and derived vehicles including vehicles launched from different sites, learning rate associated with testing approaches, vehicle configurations and associated complexity (vertical stack, boost core etc).

3. Identify suitable methods to allocate the probability or frequency of failure to different phases of flight and vehicle response modes : Suitable methods should be identified for the different phases of flight. Importantly the contractor should consider how these approaches changes for different vehicle configurations,

4. UK Launch Example: utilising the work performed in the study provide a worked example for a generic vehicle of how the database and associated methodologies can be used to derive the probability of failure and the likelihood of certain vehicle response modes during different phases of flight. The example should be agreed with the UK Space Agency.

5. Recommendations for further work : Identify areas for further work such as refining assumptions, reducing uncertainties etc.

Requirement:

- Deliverables:
    - Technical note detailing the outputs of the objectives
    - Final presentation
    - UK Launch Example and supporting information (model can be developed in Matlab, Excel or in any other commercial software)
- Meetings:
    - Kick-off (t0)
    - Mid-term review (t+1.5 months)
    - Final review (~t+3 months)

Timetable: The study is proposed to be completed in 3 months. The deliverables should be completed for review for the final presentation and completion of the whole project by the 8th February 2019.

Lot 3: Review of Flight Safety Systems

Maximum budget value: £20k (not including VAT)

Lot 3 is a review of Flight Safety Systems. The Flight Safety System is a key part of maintaining safety within the flight portion of a launch. Within a designated portion of the

flight corridor the Flight Safety System is used to prevent any launch vehicle hazard, including any payload hazard, from reaching a protected area. This study serves to improve the understanding of the Regulator on the design, functionality and testing of Flight Safety Systems. The insight gained will be used to support further work by the Regulator to develop the internal capability to assess future launch licenses.

Aims: The study has two main goals, 1) to raise the awareness of the Regulator of the design, functionality and testing of Flight Safety Systems commonly used for Launch, 2) to review the design, flight history, reliability, operation and testing approach of Autonomous Flight Termination Systems.

Objectives:

1. Review of safety of life critical hardware and design approaches from other industries:
    - Architecture and application, including redundancy, reliability and standards,
    - Testing approach (simulation, acceptance, qualification), and
    - Regulatory approach (licensing approach adopted to guarantee functionality).

2. Review of Ground Commanded Flight Safety Systems, including:
    - Architecture: a review of the various subsystems, components and software on the ground and the launch vehicle and how they function together to constitute a Flight Safety System. Key aspects will be the design standards, performance, redundancy and the reliability of the systems. Identification of the national or industrial approaches adopted for Flight Safety Systems. Additional information on the supply chain and flight heritage would be beneficial).
    - Testing approach: simulation, acceptance and pre-flight testing expected for the various elements that constitute the various architectures identified.

3. Review of Autonomous Flight Safety Systems, including:
    - Development approach and flight heritage : a review of the development approach of Autonomous Flight Safety Systems including flight testing by various operators,
    - Architecture: a review of the various subsystems, components and software that constitute an Autonomous Flight Termination System and how they function together. Key aspects will be the design standards, performance, redundancy and the reliability of the systems.
    - Testing approach: simulation, acceptance and pre-flight testing expected for the various elements that constitute the various architectures identified.

4. Discussion of approaches to software safety assurance in other industries including:
    - Applicability of concepts such as Fail Safe and Fail Operational, and
    - The use of existing standards for safety critical systems such as space (e.g. ECSS, RCC), avionics (e.g. RTCA, EURCOAE), rail, nuclear or maritime.

Scope:

Requirement:

- Deliverables:
  - Technical note detailing the outputs of the objectives
  - Final presentation
- Meetings:
  - Kick-off (t0)
  - Mid-term review (t+1.5 months)
  - Final review (~t+3 months)

Timetable: The study is proposed to be completed in 3 months. The deliverables should be completed for review for the final presentation and completion of the whole project by 8th February 2019.

Payments

Payment for the Lots 1,2 and 3 will be paid in arrears upon completion of all the work in the requirements unless the bidder requests a stage payment profile. Suggested stage payments will only be paid in arrears against defined deliverables and bidders must provide evidence that this payment profile will not pass any risk back to UKSA. UKSA reserve the right to reject a stage payment profile that does not comply with this.

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.

Notes

The requirement will be competed as three separate Lots. The expected total (i.e. Lot 1+Lot 2 + Lot3) opportunity value for this procurement for the total contract period is a mximum budget of £80k (not incluing VAT).

This tender process may result in up to 3 contracts being placed. Bidders can bid for Lot 1, Lot 2 , Lot 3 or a combination of the Lots based on their expertise and experience.

Bidders who plan on submitting a response to more than one Lot will need to ensure they complete the relevant price and award questionnaire for each Lot.

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÷3 = 5.33)

Pass / fail criteria for: Lot 1 - Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice, Lot 2 - Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes and Lot 3 - Review of Flight Safety Systems.		
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	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	SEL3.14	Previous experience
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Project	PROJ1.6	Capacity
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria for: Lot 1 - Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice, Lot 2 - Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes and Lot 3 - Review of Flight Safety Systems.

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	30%
	PROJ1.1	Approach/ Methodology	20%
	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	15%
	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Project Topic	20%
	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	10%
	PROJ1.5	Risk Management	5%

Evaluation of criteria for Lot 1 - Launch Collision Assessment Best Practice, Lot 2 - Assessment of Launch Vehicle Failure Modes and Lot 3 - Review of Flight Safety Systems.

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 = {weighting percentage} x {bidder's score} = 20% x 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 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 unless expressly sated in the question. Where there is a difference in scoring between evaluators for an individual question, a moderation meeting will be held to discuss the response and agree a consensus score. Where an agreement cannot be reached on a consensus score of an individual question, the question will be scored using the average (mean) of all the evaluators' scores. Please be aware that there may be multiple evaluators. If so, their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score as follows:

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) ÷ 4 = 50

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.
The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100. All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion. For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100. Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80 Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50. Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25. Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0. Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0. Where the scoring criterion is worth 50% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 50. In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points multiplied by 50 (80/100 x 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. Responses received after the date indicated in the ITQ shall not be considered by the Contracting Authority, unless the Bidder can justify that the reason for the delay, is solely attributable to the Contracting Authority

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 for each Lot you are bidding for or we may reject your Bid.

7.11 Do ensure that the Response and any documents accompanying it are in the English Language, the Contracting Authority reserve the right to disqualify any full or part responses that are not in English.

7.12 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

7.13 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.14 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.

7.15 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.16 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.

7.17 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.18 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.19 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.20 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.21 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.22 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.23 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.24 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity.

Some additional guidance notes

7.25 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.

7.26 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.

7.27 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.28 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.29 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.30 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.

7.31 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.32 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.33 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34 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

7.35 Your bid will be valid for 90 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.36 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.

7.37 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.

7.38 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.39 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

7.40 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.

7.41 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.

7.42 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.

7.43 The Government introduced 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
- Equalities Act introduction
- Bribery Act introduction
- Freedom of information Act