



Mini Competition

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

Subject UK SBS Process, impact and economic evaluation of the Hydrogen for Heat (Hy4Heat) programme (originally known as Hydrogen Innovation Programme)

Sourcing reference number: CR19059

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> |
| Annex | Annex A (GDPR) |

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 | Alexandra Richards |
| 3.3 | Buyer contact details | Research@uksbs.co.uk |
| 3.4 | Maximum value of the Opportunity | £250,000.00 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 | Friday 9 th August 2019 |
| 3.7 | Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system | Thursday 22 nd August 2019 11:00am |
| 3.8 | Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris | Friday 23 rd August 2019 |
| 3.9 | Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris | Friday 30 th August 2019 11:00am |
| 3.10 | Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date | Friday 20 th September 2019 |

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| 3.11 | Anticipated Award Date | Friday 20 th September 2019 |
| 3.12 | Anticipated Call Off Contract Start Date | Monday 23 rd September 2019 |
| 3.13 | Anticipated Call Off Contract End Date | Thursday 30 th September 2021 |
| 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 3 |

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

Background to the programme

Hy4Heat is a programme commissioned by BEIS to explore whether replacing natural gas (methane) with hydrogen for domestic heating and cooking is feasible and could be part of a plausible potential pathway to help meet heat decarbonisation targets ([Hy4Heat website](#)). Currently, using hydrogen for heating represents just one potential option. However, there are necessary steps that must be overcome if hydrogen is to become a viable pathway for this. Some of these steps are addressed in the Hy4Heat programme, including demonstrating the safety case, developing a hydrogen quality standard, and developing and certifying hydrogen appliances.

The two primary objectives of Hy4Heat are:

1. to provide the technical, performance, usability and safety evidence needed to de-risk the use of hydrogen for heat in buildings
2. to stimulate industry to undertake a parallel programme of technical, performance and safety work on the distribution network, such as H21

The Hy4Heat programme has an announced budget of £25m and consists of 10 work packages (WPs):

1. Programme management
2. Definition of a hydrogen quality standards
3. Developing a hydrogen appliance certification
4. Development of domestic hydrogen appliances
5. Understanding commercial appliances and equipment
6. Understanding industrial appliances and equipment
7. Assessment of safety of using hydrogen in domestic properties and buildings
8. Demonstration trials of hydrogen appliances in unoccupied buildings
9. Preparations for future community (occupied) trials of hydrogen in homes
10. Development of hydrogen (fiscal) smart meters

The Arup+ team led by Arup, was appointed as Programme Management Contractor (PMC) to support BEIS in delivery of the Hy4Heat programme. They are responsible for delivering work packages 1 and 9 and elements of 7. Kiwa Gastec, Progressive Energy, Embers and YoEnergy are the other members of the Arup+ team. The other WPs are awarded through different procurement routes. So far, all WPs are underway with the exception of WP8.

More information about the Hy4Heat programme can be found at the following website: <https://www.hy4heat.info/>

An impact, process and economic evaluation of the Hy4Heat programme is now required to assess the Hy4Heat programme against what was agreed in the originally endorsed business case whilst acknowledging external factors which may have influenced the delivery of the programme since then.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

What is the proposed work and why is it required?

Hy4Heat is a relatively complex, novel and high spend integrated programme within the Department's Energy Innovation Portfolio. BEIS needs to account for its impact and learn lessons for future innovation delivery. The evaluation needs to go wider than the management information / Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) collected during the course of programme management, including identifying what impact the programme has had or is likely to have and whether the current delivery method represents the most effective and efficient use of resources. There is also a set of important learning, on *how* these impacts have been achieved and how similar innovation activities should be organised and procured in future.

An externally commissioned evaluation is required to provide additional assurance that the evaluation is carried out independently of the Hy4Heat programme itself, ensuring a robust, transparent and impartial evaluation.

What are the aims and objectives of the evaluation of Hy4Heat?

The overall aim of this research is to conduct a process, impact and economic evaluation of the Hy4Heat programme, specifically aiming to:

1. Identify the overall benefits and impacts of the programme, utilising a wide range of data sources
2. Assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its objectives, success criteria and KPIs for the programme. This will also include identifying whether the policy team client's needs have been met in the programme
3. Assess the cost effectiveness of the programme, understand issues associated with value for money and compare cost effectiveness to other similar programmes
4. Understand how effective and efficient programme implementation has been to inform the process evaluation. This will include assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of the contracted project management, procurement structures and internal governance and internal management structures.

What relevant work has already been conducted?

There has been work relevant to this evaluation that has either been completed or is currently ongoing. Arup+ are responsible for evaluating the WPs and there has been a Gateway Review. More details on these are included below. It is important to note that this evaluation will make sure of the information provided by these activities and will not duplicate them. The evaluation needs to tell us novel information that goes above and beyond what we already know about Hy4Heat. The evaluator should work with Arup to avoid duplication of work already being done.

Arup+ Evaluation Activities

Arup+ are already conducting evaluation activities of the individual WPs. These are more technically focused on the outputs and impacts of the individual WPs to feed into WP9 and to provide evidence to inform WP9

It will be essential that the evaluation contractor works with Arup+ to avoid duplication of efforts. Overall, Arup+ will be responsible for evaluating the technical outcomes of each WP and whether the WP objectives have been achieved, whereas this evaluation contract will be an evaluation of the programme as a whole, looking broadly at whether the Hy4Heat programme has met its objectives, how the process of the programme has worked, what BEIS has received for its £25m and what are the wider benefits of the Hy4Heat programme (unexpected or otherwise).

Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA) Gateway Review

An internal IPA Gateway 2 review¹ has already been conducted on the Hy4Heat Programme. As part of this review, many stakeholders involved in the project were interviewed. There is some overlap between these stakeholders and the ones relevant for this evaluation. Given that part of this assurance is benefits management, which links to evaluation, we will ensure that any relevant information gathered during the IPA Gateway 2 review will be made available to the contracted evaluators subject to Hy4Heat programme board approval.

What decisions/processes will it inform?

The proposed impact evaluation, alongside the work conducted by Arup+, will pull together key evidence, which will help inform continued debate on the utility of hydrogen for heat and future decisions on any potential roll out of hydrogen. This evaluation should also inform future policy and innovation programmes run by BEIS across different policy areas including hydrogen, electrification and heat pumps, including how best to procure innovation and projects to deliver innovation

What are the key research questions?

As part of creating an evaluation approach, BEIS has set out several high-level questions (HLQ) and hypotheses, which require evidence. These are the questions that we envisage being able to answer after this research. **We expect these questions to be refined, expanded and finalised during the initial phase and as the work proceeds.**

- **What impact has the programme had?**
 - To what extent were the objectives of the programme achieved? To what extent has the programme met its success criteria and KPIs?
 - Has the programme met the needs of the policy team clients (Low Carbon Gas Team and Hydrogen Economy Team)?
 - To what extent has the Hy4Heat programme contributed to an evidence base to assist decision-making about using hydrogen as a strategic option to decarbonise heat, including providing evidence to inform the next steps on the hydrogen pathway?

¹ Guidance on Infrastructure and Projects Authority (IPA) available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/infrastructure-and-projects-authority-assurance-review-toolkit>

- How do impacts differ for different types of stakeholders in different types of circumstances? (e.g. potential outcomes for consumers, supply chain, market, system and state)
- Were there any unintended outcomes? For example:
 - Has Government activity crowded out any private sector work?
 - Has there been any duplication of international activities?
- **How has the programme achieved these impacts?**
 - How did the programme achieve its objectives? How did the WPs achieve their objectives? [Arup+ to address *whether* WPs achieved objectives, whereas this evaluation contract will focus on *how*. For example, by which mechanisms did Hy4Heat allow WPs to achieve their objectives (knowledge spill over, increased stakeholder input etc.)]
 - What is the contribution of Hy4Heat (relative to other programmes/factors) to intended outcomes?
- **How effective and efficient has the delivery of the programme been?**
 - How effective has the organisation of a contracted project management and procurement structures been?
 - How effective and efficient have the internal (BEIS and Arup+) governance and internal management structures been?
 - How effective and efficient has the interaction with assurance review been?
 - Have the different approaches to commissioning WPs been effective at delivering innovation and standards (although this was not aim of commissioning strategies)?
- **What is the overall cost-effectiveness of the programme?**
 - What were the cost-benefits of the programme? At a basic level, how do the cost-benefits compare to other similar programmes?
 - Have the barriers in the economic case for completing the Hy4Heat programme been addressed?
 - To what extent has the programme contributed evidence to aid understanding about the potential savings if hydrogen were chosen as a strategic option to decarbonise heat? For example, by clarifying the costs of transitioning downstream of emergency control valve.
- **What is the wider learning from the evaluation for BEIS?**
 - How better can we use demonstration projects to stimulate industry and drive forward innovation?
 - What evidence/approach does industry need to be stimulated?
 - How best can we link the different stages of innovation to progress understanding and stimulate industry?

What are the hypotheses we are testing?

We have developed a number of hypotheses relating to the above research questions to be assessed in the evaluation.

What impact has the programme had?

- Programme activities contributed to the de-risking of a hydrogen transition resulting in hydrogen continuing to be considered a viable option for heat decarbonisation.
- The Hy4heat programme stimulated stakeholders to consider, prepare, research hydrogen.

How has the programme achieved these impacts?

- The programme advanced knowledge through an effective package of work which was managed by an external consortium
- That the Hy4Heat programme made an additional and significant contribution to a stakeholder set of activities, which would otherwise have been slower

How effective and efficient has the delivery of the programme been?

- Flexibility and variation in procurement and management routes has allowed the right fit of contractual and support arrangements to facilitate innovation and value for money.

What is the overall cost-effectiveness of the programme?

- NPV is positive and substantial assuming a hydrogen pathway

What is the wider learning from the evaluation for BEIS?

Hy4Heat has advanced knowledge of SICE and BEIS on how best to run and procure innovation projects

3. Suggested Methodology

Overview

As part of developing this requirement, BEIS has considered a range of potential methods and the preferred method is described in this specification. The preferred approach involves an evaluation strategy led by theory-based approaches, specifically a contribution analysis with a CBA alongside this.

Tenderers are asked to propose their alternative methodologies, as long as they are suitably credible and justified in the bid. However, each bidder must only submit one methodology, and must not submit a number of options. All bids must fit within our budget and timeline criteria, regardless of methodology proposed.

Methodological Stages

Stage One: Data mining, desk review and Theory of Change development:

Admin data

- **Purpose:** A thorough review of current programme documentation and evidence base developed to date by Arup+. This will allow the evaluation contractors to develop a comprehensive understanding of the Hy4Heat programme so far and assess where sufficient data already exists, avoiding a duplication of work.
- **Methodology:**
- Review the following documentation (plus any other relevant documentation identified):
 - Current log of success criteria collected across the WPs collected by Arup+
 - Current evaluation activities that Arup+ have already conducted/are already conducting
 - SICE KPIs that have been collected by Arup+ across the WPs

- The benefits map, benefits management strategy and benefits realisation plan created by Arup+
- Any / all work commissioned by the programme including the technical baselines for each WP outputs and reports, literature reviews, surveys and evidence to design studies so far.
- Assessing the documentation and recommendations made by the IPA as part of the Formal Gateway Review

Desk research

- *Literature review:*
 - A literature review (including broader Departmental research) to understand the baseline/current state of industry and academic knowledge about using hydrogen for heat, to provide a baseline for understanding how the Hy4Heat programme has advanced current knowledge and to understand level of academic activity in this area. Whether this literature review is required will be assessed after the administration data has been reviewed.
- *Comparison to other programmes:* Review similar UK programmes, such as H21 or Mission Innovation Hydrogen Innovation Challenge (IC8), and how they monitor and evaluate the success of these programmes, with the aim to try to compare and combine learnings across the similar programmes.
- *Database analysis:* analysis of databases, such as Beauhurst, Crunchbase, Pitchbook and Prequin, to understand current funding levels into hydrogen innovation and funding trends. The contracted evaluator is required to provide their own access to the databases. Bidders should confirm that they will have access to these databases and apply any additional costs for this to their price schedule.
- *Patent analysis:* assessing the current patents on hydrogen technology and appliances relevant to the Hy4Heat programme. The contracted evaluator should suggest sources of patent information, such as patents in progress or number of patent applications.
- *Other:* assessing industry magazines, newsletters, social media to understand the level of activity surrounding hydrogen for heating activities.

Theory of Change development

- Approximately five 1-hour, face-to-face scoping interviews should be conducted to aid programme understanding, to create a definition of programme success and to understand any risks and assumptions about the programme.
- A Theory of Change should then be drafted and refined in a Theory of Change workshop with key stakeholders involved in the Hy4Heat programme.
- This Theory of Change should identify:
 - How the programme is expected to work and what evidence there is to support this thinking
 - The outputs, outcomes and impact, explicitly tracing causal links between them
 - Non-linearity in the design

- The risks, uncertainties and assumptions that affect progression along the theory
- Prior to the next stage, and after Theory of Change development, the following steps should be conducted to ensure a strong theory-based evaluation:
 - Develop clear hypotheses about how we envisage the programme is having an impact, developed and agreed by the Hy4Heat programme board. We have outlined some basic draft hypotheses above, in Section 2: Aims and Objectives of the Project.
 - Outline the evidence we would expect to see to refute and strengthen the credibility of the hypotheses. This could involve developing alternative hypotheses. For example, unsuccessful WP bidders stating that the Hy4Heat programme has impacted the development of hydrogen appliances might constitute stronger evidence than a successful WP bidder making the same statement.
 - Map expected data onto the proposed Theory of Change and developing a clear data collection plan to ensure all questions are addressed and to systematically test the programme logic.
 - State the tests that will be used to scrutinise these causal claims and the quality of evidence you would expect to see
 - Identify areas where evidence already exists in admin or scheme data to avoid duplication of work with Arup+. This will also help to identify evidence gaps that will need to be addressed in the next stage.

Stage Two: data collection

Primary data collection will be used to address the evidence gaps identified in Stage One.

It is envisaged that multiple stakeholders are to be interviewed. It is important to acknowledge that not all stakeholders will be interviewed for all aspects of the evaluation and for each Hy4Heat objective, therefore, the evaluation and objective are also listed below. A list of key stakeholders will be created during the initial stages of the evaluation.

| Stakeholder | Number of individual face-to-face interviews | Evaluation | Objective |
|--|--|------------------|------------------------|
| Work package contractors | 16 (2 interviews per work package) | Process, impact | Objective One |
| Unsuccessful bidders for work package contracts | 16 (2 interviews per work package) | Impact | Objective One |
| Attendees of Hy4Heat events who did not bid for work package contracts | 10 | Impact | Objective Two |
| Industry stakeholders | 20 | Impact, economic | Objectives One and Two |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| BEIS – Hy4Heat programme team | 5 | Process, impact, economic | Objectives One and Two |
| BEIS – Policy | 6 x 2 = 12 | Impact | Objectives One and Two |
| Arup+ | 6 | Process, impact, economic | Objective One |
| Total | 85 | | |

Impact evaluation:

Objective One: advance of technical innovations

- Stakeholder interviews with WP contractors (n = 16, 2 per work package) to understand the advance of technical innovations during the Hy4Heat programme, how knowledge and skills have been advanced in their company and what work in this area they will continue to do after the Hy4Heat programme has finished. Arup+ are responsible for evaluating the technical impacts of each WP and so their evaluation activities will inform the technical impact that these companies have achieved. The evaluation contractor will be responsible for evaluating the *how and why* such impacts have been achieved.
- Stakeholder interviews should also be conducted with those who applied to complete the work packages but were not successful (n = 16, 2 per work package, where possible and accessible). The purpose of this is to understand what work surrounding using hydrogen for heat they are doing outside of Government-funded initiatives. This will also include an understanding of the impact of other related programmes of work. If they did not continue with hydrogen-related activities, the interview will aim to understand the barriers for not continuing with this.
- Quantitative data to inform the understanding of whether there has been technical advancement could also involve assessing the following aspects, amongst others:
 - Number of patents for relevant technologies
 - Number of relevant published articles on hydrogen
 - Changes in technology efficiency or Technology Readiness Level (TRL)
- Other sources of quantitative data could include the KPI data collected by Arup+ and data gathered from relevant academic journals, industry press, social media and patent databases. Other sources of relevant quantitative data could be assessed in stage one of the evaluations.

Objective two: stimulate industry

- 20 face-to-face 1-hour interviews with key industry/sector stakeholders
 - It is envisaged that these interviews could include the following stakeholders: HSE, Ofgem, standards bodies, DNOs, trade associations, manufacturers, academics and Committee on Climate Change.
 - The evaluation contractor should work with policy colleagues and Arup+ to identify key industry stakeholders who are either pro-hydrogen or anti-hydrogen or ambivalent/hesitant about it to get a balanced view and to further the understanding of who the key stakeholders in this space are.
 - These interviews should cover topics such as whether this programme has encouraged the private sector to conduct Research and Development (R&D) into

using hydrogen for heat and to create plans and processes for if this is adopted in the UK.

- These interviews should assess not only the impact of the reports delivered from the Hy4Heat programme on industry but also the impact of events such as the announcement of the Hy4Heat programme. These interviews should also assess barriers and drivers for using hydrogen that industry currently see and what evidence they would need to overcome this.
- 6 interviews with policy colleagues in BEIS x 2
 - To understand whether, and how, the Hy4Heat programme has advanced policy thinking surrounding using hydrogen for heat in the future in the UK, what evidence gaps there are, whether Hy4Heat has added to the wider BEIS hydrogen approach/thinking and whether their needs have been met with the programme. These interviews should be conducted at the start of the evaluation and towards the end to understand whether the Hy4Heat programme has met policy objectives. Therefore, there should be a total of 12 interviews.
- 10 face-to-face 1-hour interviews with individuals from companies who attended relevant Hy4Heat events, such as the launch event.
 - This will be to understand what relevant R&D they are doing and what the influence of the event was on these activities. This should also include an understanding of the impact of other related programmes of work and the input these have had on their work. The most appropriate companies to interview will be decided in stage one of the evaluations.
- In addition to the qualitative interviews, quantitative data could be gathered, including the following:
 - Amount of private investment in hydrogen
 - Number of new companies formed
 - Number of jobs supported
 - Number of new collaborations made
 - Amount of private follow-on funding
- One source of quantitative data could be from the KPI data collection process specifically the following KPIs that Arup+ are tracking:
 - KPI 3: Number (and size) of Organisations supported to deliver project (Lead Partner and Other Organisations as named on grant offer/ contract)
 - KPI 4: Number of active Business Relationships and Collaborations supported (Formal and Informal, Overall and New)
 - KPI 6i: Initial Financial Leverage from the private sector to deliver project
 - KPI 6ii: Follow-on Funding to take project further forward
 - KPI 9: reduction in carbon emissions
- Additional sources of quantitative data could be gathered from database analysis, such as Beauhurst, Pitchbook etc, social media analysis and analysis of industry materials, such as magazines and newsletters.

Process evaluation

- The same interviews with BEIS Hy4Heat (n=5) and Arup+ (n=6), plus the work package contractors (n=16) described above should also include process evaluation questions. These interviews should cover what has worked well and not so well in the delivery of

the Hy4Heat programme, in addition to what learnings we can take from the contracted project management and novel approach to procuring the work packages.

- This aspect of the evaluation should help to provide insights into how best to manage and procure innovation programmes, how to manage the different types of procurement and to understand any learnings about barriers to evaluation that we can understand and apply to other innovation programmes.

Economic evaluation

- A modest economic evaluation should also be conducted that focuses on the two key aspects described below. BEIS has included detail on this aspect of the evaluation in the specification to allow bidders to suggest an appropriate methodology. However, it is important to note that the focus of this evaluation will largely be on process and impact aspects. We expect that up to 10% of the budget will be allocated to the economic evaluation.

1. How Hy4Heat has addressed the barriers in the economic case

- A key aim of the economic evaluation should be to understand to what extent and how the Hy4Heat programme has addressed the barriers and market failures that prompted the need for the Hy4Heat programme.
- Barriers and evidence gap that should be considered include regulatory barriers, high-upfront capital costs and uncertain consumer demand.
- Key market failures to consider include:
 - Imperfect information – firms are unsure about the safety and feasibility of hydrogen
 - Co-ordination failure – there is a significant coordination challenge given the fragmented gas industry
 - Unpriced negative externalities – the costs incurred to society as a result of continuing to burn fossil fuels to provide our energy
 - Unvalued benefits of knowledge spill overs – undervalued RD&D knowledge spill overs
- The Hy4Heat programme aims to correct some of these market failures and barriers by:
 - Demonstrating and providing evidence that hydrogen can be used safely for space and water heating and cooking
 - Developing tools and generating knowledge that can be utilised in other applications besides the original project
 - Equipping the government with some of the information it requires to make a strategic direction on heat decarbonisation.
- Gathering evidence to understand whether these barriers and failures have been overcome, as the Hy4Heat programme intended will be done mostly through gathering of views across the programme of in-depth interviews as well as a review of market information. This should consider the extent to which the Theory of Change has been realised, which would involve both considering whether Hy4Heat has been successful in the wider context, and whether it has had a perceivable impact on the wider industry.
- Once the evaluation contractor is in place, we will share the Economic Case, which provides further detail on the above proposed market failures and barriers.

2. Cost-benefit analysis

- A proportionate cost-benefit analysis should be conducted to understand whether the programme represented value-for-money, attributing a monetary value on the impact and cost of the Hy4Heat programme. These should be monetised as far as possible but for impacts that can't be readily monetised then qualitative approaches will be taken. Only those costs and benefits that can be quantified will be included in the cost-benefit analysis. We don't envisage any new data collection for the economic evaluation, it should use existing data and data collected through the other workstreams.
- The NAO² approach of the 3Es (economy, efficiency and effectiveness) should be used as an overarching framework for the cost-benefit analysis:
 - Economy: minimising the cost of resources used or required.
 - Efficiency: the relationship between the output from goods or services and the resources to produce them.
 - Effectiveness: the relationship between the intended and actual results of public spending.
- Predicted benefits are:
 - Technology efficiency gains – monetised
 - Technology cost reductions - monetised
 - GVA – monetised
 - Increase in jobs – monetised but not included in cost-benefit analysis as per HMT Green Book guidelines
 - Increased knowledge – qualitative unquantifiable benefit
 - Bringing a decision about hydrogen forward - qualitative unquantifiable benefit
 - Spill overs: qualitative unquantifiable benefits
 - Stimulate investment in other areas of the UK gas sector
 - Stimulate further research in this area – R&D spending
 - Wider benefits include:
 - Investment in R&D in hydrogen networks and in adapting commercial and domestic appliances - monetised
 - Developing UK export markets in the longer-term - qualitative unquantifiable benefit
- Predicted costs include:
 - BEIS input, both financially and in terms of admin input- monetised
 - Cost of WP contracting processes (including to unsuccessful tenderers)- monetised
 - Cost of PMC- monetised
 - Resource commitment from contractors - monetised
- Quantitative data to inform the cost-benefit analysis could be collected from:
 - KPI data specifically KPIs 5 (Advancement of Low Carbon Solutions- Technology Readiness Levels), KPI 6 (initial funding) and KPI 6ii (follow-on funding to take the project further).
 - WP outputs, specifically about the cost of developing domestic commercial and industrial hydrogen appliances (WPs 4, 5 and 6, respectively).
- Further qualitative information to inform the cost-benefit analysis should be collected in the above stakeholder interviews with BEIS Hy4Heat team, Arup+ and industry/sector stakeholders.

² NAO guidance found here: <https://www.nao.org.uk/successful-commissioning/general-principles/value-for-money/assessing-value-for-money/>

- It is expected that this analysis should be conducted at the latter stages of the evaluation, conducted by an economist. A benefit to cost ratio should be developed that is based on a comparison of the resource costs and the benefits involved with the programme. This should align with the principles of the HM Treasury Green and Magenta books. Outputs will be a cost-benefit analysis, spreadsheet and write up.

Stage Three: synthesis and Theory of Change review

Given the collection of data across several interviews and across the two objectives, a synthesis stage is likely needed to collate the data and understand the overarching story and impact of the Hy4Heat programme.

It will be at this stage that the Contribution Analysis will be conducted. The evaluators should go back to the original Theory of Change and understand whether the evidence collected fits with the framework, and revise and strengthen this if necessary. This should involve assembling and assessing the contribution story and assessing the evidence collected against the causal statements made in the scoping stage to make a judgement about causal claims. This should also include a comparison of the results to the wider BEIS hydrogen programmes to provide an understanding of how the Hy4Heat programme has added to the wider BEIS hydrogen approach. The contractor should also propose a method to assess the robustness of the data. The robustness of the evidence should be considered in the synthesis.

Key methodological considerations

Decision points for the evaluation

It is important that an as near to real-time evaluation as possible occurs alongside the delivery of the Hy4Heat programme and so there will be quarterly updates to the Hy4Heat Programme Board; contractors should ensure that they allocate enough time to prepare updates for the Board and attend the board quarterly. Where there are issues or findings from the evaluation that have decision-making implications, this will be fed back immediately to the Project Manager who will then decide on whether escalation to the Hy4Heat

programme board is needed. Evaluation contractors should be aware of the need to feedback important information to BEIS regularly and to engage in weekly calls to ensure real-time learning can occur.

Methodological considerations

Length of interviews

- Interviews will be up to 1 hour in length.
- Interview lengths will vary depending on whether the interviewee is answering questions related to the impact, process and/or economic evaluation and both objectives.

Sampling

- Our envisaged participants are those who are involved in delivering the WPs, who were unsuccessful in the tender process for the WPs, who have attended Hy4Heat events and industry stakeholders.
- BEIS have contact details for these envisaged participants. All individuals will be contacted and asked to participate in the evaluation by the Evaluation Contractor. The sample sizes described above reflect actual conducted interviews, not the number of individuals approached to participate.
- Given that the programme is currently being run, BEIS anticipates no problems with engagement from BEIS stakeholders, Arup+ and WP contractors.
- For unsuccessful WP bidders, there were between several separate bidders. BEIS anticipates that the evaluation contractor should be able to achieve two interviews per WP, but it will be important that all unsuccessful bidders are contacted to take part. It is envisaged that BEIS will notify these of the evaluation and ask them if they would like to be involved. Participation will be framed around giving the company an opportunity to show what work they have completed that is relevant to Hy4Heat and provide their input and ideas. Evaluation contractors should suggest alternative ways to encourage participation in stage one of this project.
- BEIS suggests that the evaluation contractor speak to 20 industry stakeholders. The Hy4Heat team have a stakeholder database of 300+ individuals. BEIS do not envisage any issues with accessing these respondents due to them having already keen interest in the Hy4Heat programme. It is envisaged that BEIS will contact relevant stakeholders to inform them of the evaluation and ask them if they would like to be involved.

Addressing bias

- This approach makes most use of qualitative data and therefore it will be important for the evaluation contractor to address potential issues around bias and to ensure the evaluation stands up to scrutiny.

Timings

- The Hy4Heat programme is due to complete in March 2021. The evaluation will then continue for 6 months after project completion.
- The majority of the evaluation will aim to be conducted during the programme, but it is likely that the economic evaluation analysis will be conducted after the programme has finished to allow for a complete picture of the programme. An interim impact evaluation will be conducted during the programme to allow for changes to be made and then the full impact evaluation will be conducted in the 6 months after the programme has ended.
- BEIS requires that evaluation contractors should ensure access to data for all participants for at least 3-5 years after programme closes and that BEIS/evaluation contractor can contact the participants for further information, if necessary.

Key considerations for bidders to note

Database Access Costs

As can be seen in Stage One, we have requested that the evaluation contractor provides access to databases relevant for this project. In your bid documentation, please include the database access as a separate line in the pricing schedule.

Structure of the bids

The maximum page limit for tenders is 18 (excluding declarations, pricing schedule and CVs).

Working with stakeholders

It is essential that the evaluation contractor includes enough time for working with key stakeholders in the evaluation. There will need to be sufficient time for working and meeting with Arup+ as the PMC and a key stakeholder to ensuring the success of this evaluation.

Conflict of Interest

For research and analysis, conflict of interest is defined the presence of an interest or involvement of the contractor, subcontractor (or consortium member) which could affect the actual or perceived impartiality of the research or analysis.

This evaluation must be independent from perceived and actual conflict of interest as it is essential that this work is robust, credible and free from bias.

Please note that the appointed supplier for this requirement will undertake evaluation of the Hy4Heat programme including all work packages delivered under the programme. BEIS therefore considers that there is potential for an actual or perceived conflict of interest if companies who have delivered work packages to date under the Hy4Heat programme were to bid for this work. In their tender response, all tenderers (regardless of prior involvement of the Hy4Heat programme or not) are required to ensure that any actual or perceived conflict is declared and satisfactorily mitigated. BEIS reserves the right to exclude any proposals where the bidder has an actual conflict of interest that cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of BEIS.

Working Arrangements

The successful contractor will be expected to identify one named point of contact through whom all enquiries can be filtered. A BEIS project manager will be assigned to the project and will be the central point of contact.

The successful bidder will be expected to work closely with the BEIS policy and analytical teams, draw on BEIS' expertise knowledge and align with on-going analytical projects to ensure appropriate research design and learning outputs.

The project will start with an inception meeting with key policy and analytical teams in attendance.

Bidders should assume that engagement with BEIS will include weekly project management phone calls, weekly progress update reports, steering group meetings (frequency to be confirmed), and face to face meetings as required to design, and deliver the chosen

methods. Throughout the research, BEIS will be required to review and sign off all final data collection instruments, analytical approaches (including key assumptions) and outputs.

BEIS also expects that bidders will establish suitable internal working arrangements and channels of communication. As the research will involve multiple work strands feeding into various research activities, it is important that people assigned to different tasks regularly communicate, feedback and understand what else is happening. It will be the responsibility of the bidder's project manager to ensure that this occurs.

The quality assurance within BEIS requires external peer review of all evaluation reports. BEIS will appoint an external peer reviewer and the successful bidder will be expected to engage and work with this person to maximise the robustness and utility of the research.

Required Skills

BEIS would like you to demonstrate that you can apply your organisations expertise, capabilities and skills to undertake the project. Your tender response should include a how your team will apply their skills and expertise to the following and how this will enable the successful delivery of the project.

The following elements are considered particularly important for this work:

- Application of the understanding to the innovation and UK energy policy landscape;
- Application of specialist knowledge and expertise to the sector;
- Designing, undertaking, project managing and reporting large-scale process, economic and impact policy evaluations, including primary and secondary data collection and research;
- Application of theory-based evaluations in a policy evaluation context, specifically creating and using Theory of Change and ideally knowledge and skills to contribution analysis;
- Ability to engage private sector;
- Collaborative working with policy and analyst teams to understand the Hy4Heat policy aims to support the evaluation;
- Ability to deliver robust and high-quality analytical work;

Data Protection

All collection, processing and storage of personal data must be compliant with GDPR. Contractor must provide evidence to BEIS that practices are compliant with GDPR

Deliverables

The primary outputs will be:

- Interim evaluation report to provide a summary of progress and findings at an interim stage to be delivered at an appropriate point in the contract, likely during 2020. We expect the interim report to be approximately 30 pages in length.
- Final evaluation report providing a full, independent evaluation of Hy4Heat to be delivered in Q3 2021. We expect the final report to be approximately 50 pages in length.
- Full technical evaluation report containing all the technical details of the research undertaken as part of the evaluation to be delivered in Q3 2021.

Additional outputs include a slide-pack and presentation for each the interim and final report. We expect each of the presentations to last approximately 45 minutes, and slide-packs to contain an appropriate level of detail for this length of presentation. Quarterly updates to the Hy4Heat board will also be required in the form of short notes and/or brief PowerPoint presentations.

In line with GSR publications guidance we would expect that the evaluation reports will be published to support policy consultations/strategy documents and for transparency. All quantitative raw data should be sent to BEIS. We intend to publicly archive our data; however, the feasibility of doing so will be addressed during the project.

Quality Assurance

Bidders must set out their approach to quality assurance in their proposal. Bidders must:

- Ensure that quality assurance is done by individuals who were not directly involved in the research, analysis or model development
- Specify who will be responsible for quality assurance before it comes to BEIS

Sign-off for the quality assurance must be done by someone of sufficient seniority within the contractor organisation to be able take responsibility for the work done. BEIS reserves the right to refuse to sign off outputs which do not meet the required standard specified in this Invitation to Tender. The Contractor must state how all work on the project will be quality assured within the proposal.

The Contractor will be expected to produce high quality reports that meet the following criteria:

General:

- Answer the research questions clearly, in plain English
- Clearly structured so that information presented in each section of each report is clear
- Connections between sections are clear
- Executive summaries of no more than two sides that set out the findings clearly and their relevance to BEIS policies
- All sections have clear introductions and conclusions (including findings being written concisely upfront)
- Methodology clearly explained so others could repeat the work in future.

Use of good quality English:

- Thoroughly proof-read and peer reviewed for writing quality
- No jargon is used, and all terms are defined and referenced clearly
- All acronyms are written out in full the first time that they are mentioned in each section of each report
- No grammar and phrasing errors
- No typos / typographical errors present
- Concise and non-wordy sentences and paragraphs
- Concise reports that are not too long and do not have vast annexes

Visualisations:

- All visualisations are labelled
- All axes are labelled, including with appropriate units

- Clear and appropriate use of visualisations (large enough size, data can be read clearly without reference to the raw data, and there are not too many visualisations presented at once)
- All visualisations are clearly explained and discussed
- A range of different types of visualisations are used to provide more interesting and innovative ways of presenting the results

Where complex or innovative methods are proposed, bidders should specify how additional quality assurance will be provided. Where necessary, this should include the use of external expertises.

Outputs will be subject to BEIS internal approvals, the more substantive the output the longer the approval time required. Both published and other reports will require three rounds of comments, which should be factored into the timelines. BEIS may wish to appoint an external peer reviewer to provide a high-level peer review.

The successful bidder will be responsible for any work supplied by sub-contractors.

BEIS reserves the right to request an audit of projects against the BEIS Code of Practice for Research and the commitments made in the tender documents and subsequent contract.

For primary research, contractors should be willing to facilitate BEIS research staff to attend interviews or listen in to telephone surveys as part of the quality assurance process.

Other useful sources of guidance and advice that will help bids and the resulting work be of the highest quality include:

- The [Government Social Research Code](#), in particular those that relate to GSR Products:
- [UK Statistics Authority Code of Practice](#)/ or an equivalent standard.
- [The Magenta Book](#), Government guidance on policy evaluation and analysis.
- Supplementary Guidance on the Quality in Policy Impact Evaluations
- [Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A Framework for assessing research evidence](#) provides a Framework for appraising the quality of qualitative evaluations.

[The Green Book](#): appraisal and evaluation in central government.

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 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

| Pass / fail criteria | | |
|----------------------|---------|--|
| Questionnaire | Q No. | Question subject |
| Commercial | SEL3.12 | Cyber Essentials |
| Commercial | SEL3.13 | General Data Protection Regulations |
| Commercial | FOI1.1 | Freedom of Information Exemptions |
| Commercial | AW1.1 | Form of Bid |
| Commercial | AW1.3 | Certificate of Bona Fide Bid |
| Commercial | AW4.1 | Contract Terms Part 1 |
| Commercial | AW4.2 | Contract Terms Part 2 |
| Commercial | AW6.2 | Non-Disclosure Agreement |
| Price | AW5.1 | Maximum Budget |
| Price | AW5.5 | E Invoicing |
| Price | AW5.6 | Implementation of E-Invoicing |
| Quality | AW6.1 | Compliance to the Specification |
| - | - | Mini Competition – received on time within e-sourcing tool |

| Scoring criteria | | | |
|--|-------|------------------|---------------|
| <p>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.</p> | | | |
| Questionnaire | Q No. | Question subject | Maximum Marks |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---|------|
| Price | AW5.2 | Price | 20% |
| Quality | PROJ1.1 | Understanding of Requirement | 7.5% |
| Quality | PROJ1.2 | Understanding of Policy Environment | 7.5% |
| Quality | PROJ1.3 | Approach/ Methodology | 25% |
| Quality | PROJ1.4 | Staff to Deliver | 20% |
| Quality | PROJ1.5 | Project Management Plan Including Addressing Risks and Challenges | 15% |
| Quality | PROJ1.6 | Stakeholder Engagement | 5% |

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

Guidance on completion of the questionnaire is available at <http://www.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. 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 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 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

- 7.12 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.
- 7.23 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

- 7.23 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](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)

- [Freedom of information Act](#)