



Mini Competition

Mini Competition against an existing Framework Agreement (MC) on behalf of Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

Subject UK SBS National Minimum and National Living Wage Impact Assessment – Counterfactual Research

Sourcing reference number FWRECR17070BEIS Lot 2

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About our Customer</u>
3	<u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation of Bids</u>
6	<u>Evaluation questionnaire</u>
7	<u>General Information</u>
Appendix	RPC Opinion – National Minimum Wage Regulations 2017

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Customers.

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

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy brings together responsibilities for business, industrial strategy, science, innovation, energy, and climate change, merging the functions of the former BIS and DECC.

BEIS is responsible for:

- developing and delivering a comprehensive industrial strategy and leading the government's relationship with business
- ensuring that the country has secure energy supplies that are reliable, affordable and clean
- ensuring the UK remains at the leading edge of science, research and innovation
- tackling climate change

BEIS is a ministerial department, supported by 47 agencies and public bodies.

Section 3 - Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Customer Name and address	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy 1 Victoria Street , London, SW1H 0ET
3.2	Buyer name	Liz Vincent
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£60,000 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<p>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here.</p> <p>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.</p>

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	22/06/2017
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	29/06/2017 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	03/07/2017
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	07/07/2017 14:00
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	17/07/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award Date	17/07/2017
3.12	Anticipated Call Off Contract Start	19/07/2017

	Date	
3.13	Anticipated Call Off Contract End Date	30/09/2017
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.15	Framework and Lot the procurement should be based on	BIS Research & Evaluation Framework CR150025 LOT 2

Section 4 – Specification

Background

It is a priority for this Government to create an economy that works for all. The National Minimum Wage (NMW) and National Living Wage (NLW) are fundamental to achieving this by protecting low-paid workers and providing incentives to work. On Saturday 1 April 2017, over two million workers across the UK received an above inflation pay rise as increases to both the NLW and NMW kicked in.

The Government produces an annual Impact Assessment (IA) containing an appraisal of the marginal costs and benefits of that year's uprating to the NLW and NMW rates. Since the annual IA is only concerned with the impact of uprating the current NMW, NLW to the proposed rates, the Department's approach has been to assess the marginal impacts taking the current legal position as given.

Estimating the costs and benefits of the annual NLW and NMW uprating is sensitive to the assumed counterfactual wage level and growth rate of workers affected. This research will suggest appropriate modelling approaches to inform this core assumption used in the Government's annual IA.

The most recent NMW, NLW IA was issued a 'fit-for-purpose' opinion by the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) who provides Government with independent scrutiny of the evidence base put forward in regulatory impact assessments. The proposed research is welcomed by the RPC as a way of improving the evidence base. The research, therefore, aims to help us to achieve further 'fit-for-purpose' ratings from the RPC, and robustly quantify the impacts of the NLW/NMW for the purposes of Ministerial decision making and the Business Impact Target. The research will therefore have a direct, significant and continued impact on Government's assessment of the cost to employers and benefits to workers associated with changes to NMW and NLW rates. The aims and objectives of the project are outlined further in Section 2 of the specification.

Background to NMW and NLW:

The NMW and NLW are uprated annually, now on April 1st, based on recommendations made by the Low Pay Commission (LPC). The LPC presents its recommendations to Government by the end of October and the new rates are announced later in Autumn. The Government then produces an Impact Assessment (IA) which is submitted to the RPC by the end of the year. Following a response from the RPC the IA is published, before the Debates begin and the Regulations are laid in Parliament in the New Year.

The National Minimum Wage (NMW) was introduced to provide protection to low-paid workers by avoiding potential exploitation by employers who, in the absence of government intervention may pay unacceptably low wages. The NMW came into force in April 1999 and since then the NMW rates have been reviewed annually by the LPC. The current aim when setting the rates is to increase the wages of the lowest paid as much as possible, while making sure that their employment prospects are not damaged by setting it too high. This is

effectively targeting the market clearing wage rate at the conceptual equilibrium in a perfectly competitive market; where supply meets demand. The NMW is now a well-established feature of the UK economy and as such its impact and effects on the labour market have evolved over time, alongside wider structural developments in the economy and labour market.

The economy and labour market today are markedly different to that of the 90's when the NMW was first introduced. It has a higher participation rate, higher employment rates; the demographics of workers have evolved with more diversity in the workplace (for example, employment rate for women and disabled people are at record highs), lower unionisation (from 30% to of employees in unions in 1999 to 25% in 2015) and little to no evidence of extreme low pay¹. The NMW was introduced to remove the exploitative pay which existed in the 90's. As set out in the LPC's remit, it has subsequently been uprated to ensure the lowest paid receive the highest wages without impacting their employment prospects and to maintain a level playing field for businesses.

The National Living Wage (NLW) was implemented in April 2016. The objective for the NLW is more ambitious than that for the NMW. The Government wants to build an economy that works for everyone, where low wage workers are fairly rewarded for their contribution to the economy. The introduction of the NLW in April 2016 marked an important step towards this goal. The NLW is also important for reasons of fairness and equity - the 2020 target for the NLW – that it should reach 60% of median earnings subject to sustained economic growth – explicitly ensures that the wages for low paid workers aged 25 and over increase relative to the middle of the distribution.

The NLW is now the statutory pay floor for workers aged 25 and over, whilst the NMW rates are the statutory pay floors for those aged 16-24. To reflect the difference in labour market conditions for different age groups, for example that younger workers tend to have less work experience, the LPC recommends separate NMW rates by age band (16-17, 18-20 and 21-24 year olds). The Apprentice National Minimum Wage (ANMW) applies to those Apprentices aged under 19 or aged 19 or over and in the first year of their apprenticeship. The level of the ANMW should provide a fair deal for Apprentices, protecting them from exploitation while at the same time not deterring businesses from taking them on and providing quality training. Additionally, the LPC also makes recommendations for the value of the Accommodation Offset up to a maximum daily limit, the only benefit-in-kind that can count towards payment of the NMW, which provides a mechanism to offset the cost of providing accommodation for workers against the NMW.

The Government commissions an independent body, the LPC, to recommend the appropriate NMW and NLW rates. The final decision on whether to accept the LPC's recommendations is made by the Government. As the decision on the appropriate NMW and NLW rates is an evidence-based judgment, the LPC's report contains a large body of evidence and analysis on the impact to date of the NMW and NLW. The LPC considers the prospects for the UK economy by considering the latest available forecasts for growth, average earnings, inflation, employment and unemployment from the Office for Budget Responsibility and the median of the HM Treasury panel of independent forecasters. They conduct detailed analysis on the impacts of previous upratings and use this evidence to

¹ [Low Pay Britain 2016 - Resolution Foundation](#)

inform their recommended rates. They also have an extensive consultation period to include the views and analysis of a number of interested stakeholders.

The Government also conducts its own analysis to inform the decision making process as well as providing evidence on the labour market and policy developments for the LPC². The evidence and data collected and produced by the LPC are used to inform the annual Impact Assessment (IA) carried out by Government appraising the impact of that year's NMW and NLW uprating.

Aims and Objectives of the Project

Overall aims of the project:

It is essential that there is a robust evidence base behind the rates Government proposes for NMW, NLW each year. This ensures that Ministers are able to confidently use the information put forward by the Department in the IA during debates about changes to the rates. Although the RPC gave the Department a 'fit-for-purpose' rating on the last NMW, NLW IA, they expressed some concern about the counterfactual assumed and welcome this project as a way to strengthen the evidence base behind the annual IA in relation to the counterfactual. We believe that an external research project is required to deliver a credible, "best possible answer" to the core counterfactual question. This will support evidence-based debates and decisions on the appropriate rates on one of the Government's largest regulatory interventions that gains considerable Ministerial and media traction.

The outputs of the research will make a significant contribution to meeting these objectives by directly informing counterfactual wage growth assumptions in future NMW, NLW IAs, improving the robustness of our impact estimates. The outputs of the research could also be used for the evidence to the Low Pay Commission which the team provides as part of the annual cycle. The project may also have positive spill-over effects from collecting and summarising what is a large and broad evidence base with a new focus.

Specific objectives of the project/questions to be answered:

The fundamental question to be answered by this research is: what would workers affected by NLW and NMW increases have earned in the absence of government intervention (i.e. assuming no further increase from the current NMW, NLW rate). This counterfactual question covers both wage level of those on NMW, NLW and wage growth of those on NMW, NLW in the absence of the annual uprating. Given that the minimum wage is nationally applicable, the pure counterfactual is unobservable and so final recommendations must be based on a thorough assessment of the theory and evidence. The recommendations and approach should also consider the practical realities of estimating/modelling a counterfactual and impacts, given available data and resources. The winning bidder should also assist the Department in constructing a cost model if appropriate.

The project will have to consider theory, previous research, economic and labour market trends, academic consensus and views from businesses and worker representatives where appropriate.

² [BIS - Final Evidence to the LPC - Autumn 2016](#)

Bidders are invited to suggest how they will meet this aim. However, we think it will be necessary to consider the following questions:

- The fundamentals and economics of the low paid labour market: what does the theory suggest about the aims and behaviour of firms, with particular reference to pay and incentives for its workers?
- How does this apply to market structures, particularly in the low paid sectors?
- Therefore, in theory, how would you expect firms to behave with respect to employees and their pay over a) the short term and b) the long term?
- Is this borne out by evidence?
- What impact has the NMW/NLW had on the wage distribution?
- Are there any other factors which could have influenced the wage distribution? If so, which ones and to what extent have they contributed?
- In reality, how do firms determine their workers' pay in the low paid sector?
- To what extent does this follow the theoretical expectation?
- Considering that the NMW policy has been in place since 1999, to what extent has this 'permanently' changed wage-setting behaviour? Are there likely to have been institutional effects of the policy and how has it impacted the counterfactual?
- How should we appraise the marginal impacts of the annual minimum wage uprating?
- Which economic forecasts, data and policy factors should be considered when determining the most appropriate approach for practically modelling the impacts of the uprating?

It may be helpful to refer to the research conducted in Annex A of the [2017 National Minimum Wage and National Living Wage Impact Assessment](#).

In addition, the RPC made a number of comments on the methodological approach in their latest opinion on the impact assessment for the April 2017 NMW and NLW upratings (the full opinion is attached as an Appendix):

1. The RPC consider it highly likely that individuals at the very bottom of the pay distribution would experience zero wage growth (at least in the short term) under a counterfactual scenario. They believe that the IA modelling should reflect this eventuality to avoid under-estimating the costs of regulation and explicitly consider how long zero wage growth could persist at the very bottom (e.g. by using a 'shadow wage curve' approach).
2. The RPC was also concerned that the use of a one-year appraisal period, with the counterfactual reset each year, potentially misses 'base-raising' or ratchet effects. If

so, the longer term impacts of the NMW and, in particular, NLW might not be captured.

3. The RPC consider that different modelling approaches and assumptions may be required for NMW and NLW, given their different objectives and expected impacts on employment, in order to best capture the long-term effects of the NLW.
4. The RPC have encouraged us to assess the degree to which the introduction of the NMW may have 'permanently' changed wage-setting behaviour, resulting in real wage 'stickiness' and/or 'hysteresis'.

Bidders may also wish to refer to previous RPC opinions on minimum wage impact assessments³.

Suggested Methodology

Literature review, Theoretical/conceptual Analysis, Primary and Secondary data analysis, Consultation with stakeholders and Economic Modelling should all be included in the methodology.

Please include details of how you propose to partner with or otherwise involve leading labour market academics in the project, and how you propose to involve other labour market experts in the project. Include suggestions of who you propose to involve and the additional value this will bring to the project.

We encourage the bidder to use their expertise to develop their own methodology which they feel will be suitable for this project and, most importantly, will meet the project aims and objectives. However, we expect the methodology to include the following:

- Desk-based research with a strong and rigorous basis in theoretical and applied economics at its core;
- Exploration of the existing literature and analysis. The LPC for example, has commissioned a wide range of rigorous studies on the impact of the NMW;
- Secondary analysis of existing data to test and refine theoretical predictions; and
- Primary analysis and economic modelling to supplement and augment the model for the counterfactual proposed. Modelling should acknowledge practical implementation and limitations and availability of data and inputs.

We are not expecting large scale representative surveys for primary analysis. Rather, this is likely to include consultation (with academics, business stakeholders, worker representatives, HR representative bodies, LPC and RPC), focus groups or small scale survey work. In particular, we expect bidders to partner with or otherwise involve leading labour market academics to use their chosen methods to meet the project aims and objectives. We also encourage the researchers to consult the RPC at an early stage in the

³ These include the RPC opinion in relation to the introduction of the National Living Wage: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/484132/RPC-3140_1_-_BIS_-_NLW_-_revised_IA_f_-_opinion.pdf

project to ensure they fully understand the Committee's concerns.

Bidders should elaborate on how they will use the methods identified above and others to meet the aims and objectives. Crucially, bidders should provide clear justification alongside their chosen methodology and outline how it will enable the aims and objectives to be achieved.

Bidders should be aware that the Department has already undertaken in-house work, including literature reviews and data analysis, to arrive at the counterfactual used in the IA for the 2017 uprating. This work should be reviewed, critically assessed and used by the contractor as part of the project. Bidders should also be aware that for their most recent rate recommendations, the LPC used a counterfactual of average earnings growth to model the implications of their proposed rates. Colleagues from the Bank of England previously suggested a distributional forecast for wage growth. This could be an idea which can be investigated if researchers feel this is appropriate.

The task of estimating an unobservable counterfactual is inherently challenging. In terms of approach, we therefore recommend that the contractor considers a wide variety of theoretical hypotheses in response to the questions outlined. The contractors should also be innovative in their consideration of a wide variety of methods and sources on which to test theoretical predictions using both existing and new empirical work and modelling. We think such an approach to the research will help fulfil our objective of arriving at a "best possible" counterfactual by considering the many theoretical and empirical possibilities to the exercise before narrowing on answers.

Bidders should also think carefully about how they propose to incorporate mechanisms for testing and challenging their findings throughout the project. This can be discussed further at the inception meeting.

Given the strong theoretical and empirical focus of this work, bidders should also give careful consideration to the staff and their roles put forward in their bid.

Deliverables

In order to maximise the impact of the project, all contractors are expected to provide BEIS with the following outputs and ensure the following are included in the costings for the project:

- A detailed timetable outlining how the project will be delivered. This should also include key risks for slippage and proposed mitigation actions.
- A weekly/fortnightly progress update summarising the progress that has been made and drawing attention to any emerging issues and any risks to the delivery of the assignment within the required timescale. This could also be in the form of a weekly catch up call or email, which can be agreed on inception.
- A draft report reviewed by BEIS.
- A final report including stand-alone executive summary, containing methodological recommendations for future IAs reviewed by BEIS.
- Full copies of both primary and secondary data analysis and modelling (e.g. soft copies of spreadsheets or SPSS files). Any modelling must be accompanied by a full set of user instructions and must comply with modelling best practice and be quality

assured by BEIS.

- Full records of conversations with labour market experts and stakeholders.
A slide pack summarising the key findings and a seminar/presentation of the final results and report by the contractor, where the results and conclusions are shown and presented to key internal and external stakeholders.

The project team will comment on the draft report. It is our intention to publish the final report as a technical research document – potentially in parallel with the 2017 NMW, NLW IA. We therefore stress the importance of a well-structured and clear report. More specific reporting requirements can be offered on commissioning.

Project Management Arrangements

The research will be overseen by the Project Steering Group consisting of analysts from the Labour Market Directorate. The Steering Group will be responsible for day-to-day management of the research, quality assurance and final sign-off of the report.

Publication

The final report for this research project must be formatted according to BEIS publication guidelines, therefore within the Research paper series template and adhering to BEIS accessibility requirements for all publications on GOV.UK. The publication template will be provided by the project manager. Please ensure you note the following in terms of accessibility:

Checklist for Word accessibility

Word documents supplied to BEIS will be assessed for accessibility upon receipt. Documents which do not meet one or more of the following checkpoints will be returned to you for re-working at your own cost.

- document reads logically when reflowed or rendered by text-to-speech software
- language is set to English (in File > Properties > Advanced)
- structural elements of document are properly tagged (headings, titles, lists etc)
- all images/figures have either alternative text or an appropriate caption
- tables are correctly tagged to represent the table structure
- text is left aligned, not justified
- document avoids excessive use of capitalised, underlined or italicised text
- hyperlinks are spelt out (e.g. in a footnote or endnote)
- Datasets to support those to be published in the final report must be provided in an accessible format (CVS, Excel) on submission of the report.

Peer review

The work will be subject to peer review. Contractors should plan for their work to be subject to peer review, and allow enough time for review of a draft of the report, and a final draft of

the report, along with full and comprehensive technical annexes (for example, modelling developed if appropriate).

Section 5 – Evaluation of Bids

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

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

To maintain a high degree of rigour in the evaluation of your bid, a process of moderation will be undertaken to ensure consistency by all evaluators.

After moderation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ($5+5+6=16\div3=5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

The Response Question and Answer Document must be used by all tenderers to answer the PROJ (Quality Questions). This should then be uploaded as an attachment to PROJ1.1. This is the only document assessors will evaluate; any other method used by bidders to answer questions will not be evaluated. Scoring shall be based on 0-100 scoring methodology (as outlined below). Each question has a page limit and this should be adhered to. Any additional content provided beyond this will not be considered or scored during the evaluation process

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this Mini Competition. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach	40%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	10%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Environment	20%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 ($60/100 \times 20 = 12$)

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

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

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

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

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the response to make it acceptable. Only partially answers the requirement, with

	major deficiencies and little relevant detail proposed.
40	Poor response only partially satisfying the selection question requirements with deficiencies apparent. Some useful evidence provided but response falls well short of expectations. Low probability of being a capable supplier.
60	Response is acceptable but remains basic and could have been expanded upon. Response is sufficient but does not inspire.
80	Good response which describes their capabilities in detail which provides high levels of assurance consistent with a quality provider. The response includes a full description of techniques and measurements currently employed.
100	Response is exceptional and clearly demonstrates they are capable of meeting the requirement. No significant weaknesses noted. The response is compelling in its description of techniques and measurements currently employed, providing full assurance consistent with a quality provider.

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there will be multiple evaluators and their individual scores after a moderation process 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 50

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 50

Your final score will $(60+60+50+50) \div 4 = 55$

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions.
- 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 Mini Competition. You should note that typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

- 7.12 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.13 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.14 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.15 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.17 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.20 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.21 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this Mini Competition 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 Special terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal UK SBS reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Call Off Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks UK SBS may decline to proceed with the award of the Call Off Contract to the successful Bidder.
- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

UK SBS reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this Mini Competition to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this Mini Competition 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](#)