



# Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of Department for Business,  
Energy and Industrial Strategy**

**Subject: International Heat Networks Market Frameworks Research**

**Sourcing Reference Number: UK SBS CR18137**



**UK Shared Business Services Ltd (UK SBS)**  
[www.ukpbs.co.uk](http://www.ukpbs.co.uk)

Registered in England and Wales as a limited company. Company Number 6330639.  
Registered Office Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF  
VAT registration GB618 3673 25  
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

Version 3.3

## Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<a href="#"><u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>
2	<a href="#"><u>About the Contracting Authority</u></a>
3	<a href="#"><u>Working with the Contracting Authority.</u></a>
4	<a href="#"><u>Specification</u></a>
5	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation model</u></a>
6	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation questionnaire</u></a>
7	<a href="#"><u>General Information</u></a>
Appendix	Annex A
	Annex B

# Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

## Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Contracting Authorities.

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

## Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

### Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) was created as a result of a merger between the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), as part of the Machinery of Government (MoG) changes in July 2016.

The Department 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; and
- tackling climate change.

BEIS is a ministerial department, supported by 46 agencies and public bodies.

We have around 2,500 staff working for BEIS. Our partner organisations include 9 executive agencies employing around 14,500 staff.

<http://www.beis.gov.uk>

## Section 3 - Working with the Contracting Authority.

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

Section 3 – Contact details		
3.1	Contracting Authority Name and address	Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 1 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0ET
3.2	Buyer name	Jenny Stratton
3.3	Buyer contact details	<a href="mailto:Research@uksbs.co.uk">Research@uksbs.co.uk</a>
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£50,000.00 excluding VAT
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<b>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available <a href="#">here</a>. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.</b>

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	Tuesday 11 <sup>th</sup> September 2018 Location: Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Monday 24 <sup>th</sup> September 2018 14.00hrs
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Tuesday 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Monday 01 <sup>st</sup> October 2018 14.00hrs
3.10	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2018
3.11	Anticipated Award date	Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2018
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	Monday 15 <sup>th</sup> October 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	Thursday 31 <sup>st</sup> January 2019
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

## Section 4 – Specification

### 1. Background

#### **Heat networks:**

Heat networks are systems of insulated pipes that deliver heat from a central source to multiple end-users. Heat network pipe infrastructure is heat source and fuel agnostic, so can take heat from a variety of low carbon sources including renewables, recovered heat and combined heat and power.

There are two types of Heat Networks. The first is communal heating, in which all dwellings within a single building are supplied by a central heating system. The second is district heating, where heat is produced from a central source and delivered through a network to multiple buildings or sites. Buildings could be residential, public or commercial use or some combination of these.

Heat Networks are a key element of the Clean Growth Strategy for the UK's decarbonisation of heat. Heat decarbonisation is essential for the UK to meet its climate change obligations.

For low-carbon heating to be prominent in the UK in the future, a large growth in heat networks is going to be required. The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) central scenario for the 5th carbon budget shows heat networks serving 18% of buildings heat demand in 2050 (81TWh) and saving 15MtCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. Achieving this level of expansion in the market will require Government support in overcoming barriers to deployment and increasing the heat network market growth considerably.

Government has already established a Heat Network Delivery Unit (HNDU) to address local authority capacity issues in the development of heat networks.

The Government is investing £320m of capital through grants and loans for heat network projects to accelerate the growth of the UK heat networks market through the Heat Networks Investment Project (HNIP). This will help create the conditions necessary for a sustainable heat network market to emerge in the 2020s.

The first funding round in 2016/17 was run as a pilot, with the “main scheme” expected to launch in Autumn 2018.

Heat networks have some qualities of natural local monopolies, as consumers have limited ability to switch suppliers and there may be the potential for collusion/barriers to entry.

#### **Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) market study and ADE taskforce:**

The Competition Markets Authority (CMA) has undertaken a market study on heat networks. In their [study](#) they have found that price and quality of service is comparable to the alternatives for many heat network customers. However, for some customers – particularly in some private schemes – price and service outcomes are poorer and, across the board, heat network customers aren't getting the same levels of protection that gas and electricity customers receive. The CMA have stated that the sector should be

regulated and set out key principles for this. Calls for a regulatory framework to be put in place have also come from other consumer bodies such as Citizens Advice.

In March 2017 an industry task force led by the ADE was set up to develop recommendations on what industry and government could do to reduce investment risk for new heat networks, and how to ensure customers receive good service and a fair deal. The task force [report](#) recommended a regulatory framework with measures to reduce investor risk like a demand assurance scheme to guarantee revenues for heat network developers. This would be contingent on a set of binding consumer protection standards.

### **The need for the international heat network research:**

BEIS is currently reviewing the CMA's recommendations and ADE's report with a view to identify the actions that both the government and industry should take to help deliver a sustainable market for heat networks and assess whether this would require a regulatory framework. As part of this process, it is important that we have a detailed understanding of how other countries have themselves developed their heat network sectors and addressed issues such as those identified by the CMA. This research will therefore focus on lessons regarding consumer protection measures (e.g. statutory protections in place, details of ombudsmen), information on if/how other countries regulate prices, how other countries regulation has influenced the investability of heat networks and de-risked investment, details of any obligations/incentives supporting the use renewable energy sources and of how other countries have supported switch of generating capacities towards low carbon technologies. An important part of the research will be to explore the effectiveness, as well as the characteristics, of other countries' market frameworks for heat networks.

## **2. Aims and Objectives of the Project**

This research will be essential to build upon the evidence base to support policy development. It is important that the research provides a critical assessment and overarching framework that compares the characteristics and impacts of different regulatory models that have been adopted in other countries, along with consideration of their applicability to the UK.

There are already a number of relevant studies that this research can build on as a starting point. Examples of these include:

- [The international comparisons of heating, cooling and heat decarbonisation policies](#) study. The planned research aims to build on this research and conduct more detailed analysis of heat network regulations and frameworks.
- The UKERC report [best practice in heat decarbonisation policy](#) has a small amount of content that is directly relevant to our research questions.
- An [international review of heat networks](#) provides an overview of a range of factors regarding heat networks, such as end user categories and fuel sources. This does not however provide insight into our research questions surrounding market frameworks.
- An Erra & Fortum 2011 report details policies in five countries outside of the EU.
- [Appendix C](#) of the Competition Market Authorities Heat Networks Market Study looks at regulatory frameworks in five different countries.
- [The EcoHeat4EU project](#) produced a series of detailed reports between 2009 and 2011 which analysed the existing legislative market in different countries.

- An IEA (2011) study was run in parallel to the EcoHeat4EU project. This study looks at institutional barriers and best practice in supporting heat networks and combined heat and power (CHP) through reviewing countries such as China, Russia, USA, Canada, South Korea and selected European countries outside the EU.

The first part of the study will be to synthesise relevant existing research/evidence into one place, and critically analyse them to provide an up to date overarching, comparative assessment of the different approaches that are being used to address consumer protection, pricing, decarbonisation and investability in heat networks.

The high-level research questions for the study are:

- What are the characteristics of regulatory frameworks for heat networks that are being used in other countries?
- What consumer protection lessons can the UK learn from other countries market/regulatory frameworks for heat networks?
- How do other countries heat networks determine pricing, and what have the impacts of these been? How applicable are these for heat networks in the UK?
- How do regulations and market frameworks in other countries support the 'investability' of heat networks?
- Are there obligations/incentives to consider/use renewable energy sources? Do they apply to new build and existing buildings/networks?

Examples of the types of issues that we'd envisage the research exploring within each of these high-level research questions are set out below.

### ***Regulatory models***

RQ1: What are the characteristics of market/regulatory frameworks for heat networks that have been adopted in other countries?

Examples of things that might be explored are:

- What are the key objectives (e.g. consumer protection, fair pricing) and design characteristics (e.g. the options countries have/use to achieve their objectives) of heat network regulations in other countries? Where are their similarities and differences (and why)?
- What are the key roles and responsibilities of different actors, in relation to other countries regulatory frameworks?

### ***Consumer Protection***

RQ2: What consumer protection lessons can the UK learn from other countries market/regulatory frameworks for heat networks?

Examples of things that might be explored are:

- What statutory consumer protections are included within other countries regulatory frameworks for heat network (e.g. price transparency, billing & information requirements, level of service, metering, etc)?
- Is there an independent ombudsman/ or equivalent system in place to deal with complaints? How does this operate?

- Do the same consumer protection measures apply to district and communal heat networks?
- Are minimum consumer protection measures a condition under a licensing/concession system?
- Are there mandatory technical standards for heat networks (and what do they cover)? Are these a condition within the context of a licensing/concession system?
- Is there a right to disconnect?
- What happens in situations where a heat supply company goes bankrupt (e.g. is there a Supplier of Last Resort similar to the arrangement in the UK electricity market)?
- How effective have different market/regulatory frameworks been in protecting consumers/improving technical standards in heat networks? What have been the costs to businesses from compliance with these policies?

### **Pricing**

RQ3: How do other countries' heat networks determine pricing, and what have the impacts of these been? How applicable are these for district heating in the UK?

Examples of things that might be explored are:

- Is a price cap in place, and how is it calculated? What is the reference price if there is one? What body is responsible for administering it?
- Are there cost allocation rules in place? Do they cover both fixed and variable charges? Are connection costs included in the price cap? What are the separate arrangements for connection costs if there are any?
- Are there examples of price caps being introduced after development of the heat network sector? What were the transition arrangements for heat networks that were previously far above the price cap?
- What have been the relative advantages and disadvantages of these price cap mechanisms (e.g. have assessments been made on any negative impacts on investment or innovation? Has it increased prices for some consumers?)?
- What are the arrangements for collective negotiation of price caps? Are they agreed regionally?

### **“Investability” of heat networks and the regulations/structures that underlie these differences**

RQ4: How do regulations and market frameworks in other countries support the ‘investability’ of heat networks?

Examples of things that might be explored are:

- On what models are heat networks financed in these countries? At what levels of cost and where does the financing come from?
- How does the policy/legal framework mitigate the investment risk? Does the framework rely on demand assurance/guarantees? Does the framework rely on planning approach and mandatory connections? Is the framework based on a concession system/a licensing system?
- Does the framework allow separate investment in piping and the heat source along the lines of the PipeCo model suggested in the ADE report? Is this commercially led? What are the legal similarities with the UK?
- Are there separate investment support mechanisms for new-build developments and conversion of existing developments to heat networks?

- How are responsibilities split between local and central governments?
- Do heat networks benefit from statutory access, wayleave, and permitted development rights, and rights for compulsory purchase on private land? Is planning permission waived or modified?
- Does the regulatory framework incorporate provisions relating to third party access (and how do they work)? If not included in the regulatory framework does this model exist commercially in the country and what are the economic models that enable this?
- Are there mechanisms within the framework which enable strategic over-sizing of networks that meet wider decarbonisation goals?

### **Decarbonisation & renewables**

RQ5: Are there obligations/incentives to consider/use renewable energy sources? Do they apply to new build and existing buildings/networks?

- How have other countries supported the switch of generating capacities towards low carbon technologies?

### **3. Suggested Methodology**

We remain open to the methodological approach that is used to deliver the research aims.

An example methodology that could be used could involve:

- A literature/evidence review of existing research and evidence that covers some of the research questions.
- A review of regulatory and policy documents in other countries
- Interviews with policy officials and experts in other countries

Phase 1 of the research should involve a literature review of existing material. This would involve identifying relevant existing literature, assessing its robustness, synthesising it into one place and mapping out where the evidence gaps are. A search strategy for identifying relevant literature and regulatory documents, and an assessment of its robustness will need to be set out. It is anticipated that this would include using a systematic approach for identifying research such as through the use of specific search terms (e.g. relating to the topic areas and key regulation in other countries), and looking at research citing the main existing evidence in the area. It is anticipated that the first stage of the research would focus on a broader range of countries than the second stage (described below).

A key output of the first stage of the research will be an accessible, high level comparative assessment of the regulatory frameworks that exist in other countries. Whilst we will not be prescriptive about how bidders should do this assessment, we anticipate that it will require them having expertise or access to expertise in regulation so that they are able to critically assess existing evidence in terms of the options, effectiveness and applicability of heat network regulations.

There will be a review point in the contract after the delivery of Phase 1 outputs of the research. We expect this review period to be concluded after 2 days. BEIS reserves the right to terminate the contract after the review. In the event of this happening full costs up to this point will be paid to the successful bidder.

It is envisaged that the second stage of the research could involve doing 'deep dives' into

particular countries of interest (although we remain to open these deep dives being on specific areas or topics of interest). It is anticipated that this could involve:

- Interviews with experts and policy officials in other countries of most interest. These could be used to help ensure relevant documentation has been reviewed, understand other ways that countries might ensure effective consumer protection, investability and pricing and to gain insight into how effective other country measures have been (given that ex-post evaluation evidence may not exist in many areas). It is envisaged that interviews with policy officials, experts and/or key stakeholders in other countries might be conducted. It is anticipated that semi-structured interviews without the need for full typed transcripts or thematic analysis will be sufficient for the research. BEIS has emailed a small list of contacts involved in heat network regulation and management in the countries given as examples to gauge their interest in participating in the study. These should not be relied upon but may act as a good starting point for initial discussions.
- Reviewing relevant regulatory and policy documents in these countries, which will provide up to date insight into the more detailed aspects and coverage of the regulation/policy.

Countries of interest should be agreed in advance of the second stage with BEIS (for example, as findings emerge from the first phase). However, bidders should provisionally set out the number of countries they envisage exploring in this stage of the research and set out initial views on countries that could be interesting to explore in detail (and why).

Examples of countries that could be interesting to explore are:

- Netherlands
- Sweden
- Germany
- France
- Netherlands
- Denmark
- South Korean
- Bulgaria
- Romania
- Finland

These countries have developed heat network sectors in diverse ways, offering the opportunity of exploring comparisons with countries that have large similarities and differences with the UK. However, BEIS remain open to suggestions as to the countries that could be looked at in more depth in the second phase of the study.

Bidders should also signal if they intend to review content that is written in foreign languages (and for which countries).

#### 4. Deliverables

Bidders should ensure the following is included in the costings and timings for this project:

Phase	Action	Timing (approximate) - completed by
-------	--------	-------------------------------------

1	Agreement (and then results) of search strategy	Mid October
	Search for Literature	End of October
	Finalise plan for phase 2 of the project & Draft discussion guides	End of October
	Analysis of Literature	Mid-November
	<b>Phase 1 output</b>	End of November
Review point in contract		
2	Interviews	Mid-December
	Analysis of regulatory and policy documents	Mid-December
	First draft of report	End of December
	Presentation of findings (before finalising report)	Mid-January
	<b>Final report</b>	End January

The date of the final report should be planned for no later than the end of January. These timings are indicative and may change subject to BEIS's needs, however contractors are expected to plan and resource appropriately to meet the indicative timetable above and to be able to adapt flexibly should the timetable change.

BEIS reserves the right to terminate the contract at the review point. This review point should be clearly signalled in project plans

#### **Search strategy:**

Bidders should further develop and share their search strategy for identifying relevant literature, evidence and regulatory documents. Bidders should allow for flexibility in the search terms (e.g. if new search terms emerge that may be useful to explore or if limited literature is found after an initial search).

Bidders should also provide out a list of evidence sources that have been identified through the search strategy (along with indicating whether a review of these they will be included or excluded in the research).

#### **Phase 2 Plan:**

A short plan detailing the work to be carried out in Phase 2 should be provided. This includes the countries and issues that will be explored in detail (and how this will be undertaken).

Topic guides should be created for interviews and time should be allowed for BEIS to provide comments and final sign-off on these.

#### **Phase 1 output:**

An output from Phase 1 should be produced. This could be a report or slide pack and include an accessible, high level comparative assessment of the regulatory frameworks that exist in other countries. The output should be of high quality as a standalone report/slide pack should BEIS wish to terminate the contract at the review point.

**Presentation:**

Near the close of the project the contractors should give a presentation within BEIS to the wider policy team. This should be timed to allow for any comments received to be taken account in finalising the report.

**Reports:**

At the end of the project (after the final presentation) we require a finalised, fully quality assured report which includes a clear and sufficient technical annex. The report must be written in plain English and be no longer than 30 pages in length (excluding the technical annex). From experience we expect that 2-3 drafts will be needed to reach the finalised report and these drafts should be delivered well in advance with sufficient time built in for review and comments. Each draft must be proof-read and delivered at a professional and publishable standard. Clear, precise and succinct language is essential. We expect this to be costed and accounted for in the timeline.

**Peer Review:**

BEIS may wish to appoint an external peer reviewer for the project. If we do this then we will endeavour (though cannot guarantee) to align timings of this of this with the first set of comments from BEIS on the first draft of the report.

**Publication:**

The final report for this research / evaluation 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)

Please see Annex A for BEIS Social Research Report Writing Guidelines.

### **Working Arrangements / Emerging Findings**

It is important that BEIS are kept informed of emerging findings and project progress.

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.

Weekly progress updates will be required throughout the project. These can be delivered via e-mail to the BEIS steering group or project manager, and/or phone calls. A monthly progress report will also be required via email followed by a phone call. Any changes to contractor team identified in the bid must be approved by BEIS with a plan for mitigating this to reduce impact on project.

All research tools and sampling methodologies will need to be agreed by BEIS.

BEIS will own the intellectual property rights of any and all intermediate products, including the final deliverables, and in particular including presentation slide packs, reports and data.

### **Terms and Conditions**

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

## **Annex A**

### **BEIS Social Research Report Writing Guidelines**

## **1. Introduction**

This guide describes the conventions and standards that we expect in the production of written reports and summaries of all social research, consumer insight and evaluation commissioned by BEIS, whether intended for internal use and/or publication.

The aim of this guide is to help authors produce clearly and concisely presented reports, which reflect the needs of BEIS and will be accessible and engaging to their intended audience. These guidelines should help to: streamline the reporting process; reduce the need for extensive comment and redrafting; and maximise the impact of the final report.

These guidelines are the basis for good reporting practice and may not cover all eventualities (in particular, they are not intended to be a guide for conducting social research). Full discussion with the BEIS project manager about the report structure, format and function will be expected in all cases, to ensure the final report is of high quality and meets individual project requirements.

# 1. General Guidelines

Basic principles to observe:

- Aim for Plain English; keep sentences short, prefer active verbs, and use words that are appropriate for the reader<sup>1</sup>.
- Assume the audience for the main report and summary to be interested, but non-technical / specialist, readers.
- Reports should provide a **concise but clearly evidence-based** presentation of findings, with a separate conclusions section.
- The **main report should be around 25-30 pages long**, with a standalone **3-4 page executive summary**. Annexes should be used as appropriate to include further information and detail. Any exception to this will need to be agreed with the BEIS project manager at the start of the project.
- **Draft reports** should be as **close as possible to the final version of the report and comply with all standards set out in this document**, unless otherwise agreed with the BEIS research project manager.

The remainder of this guide is arranged as follows:

1. Report structure and style
2. Presenting methods, analysis and findings

## 2. Report structure and style

### *a. Report structure*

- The report should contain a standalone executive summary, with a short summary of the objectives, methodology, key findings and conclusions, and normally be no longer than 4 pages.
- The main report should be no longer than 30 pages, unless this has been agreed with the project manager at the start of the project.
- The report should contain an introduction setting out the aims and objectives of the project and the context of the research.
- A short methodology section should also be included and provide sufficient information about the research design, sample and timing, and any limitations for the reader to understand how the findings were generated and interpret the conclusions.
- The findings, which are clearly related to each of the research objectives, should make up the main body of the report.
- Conclusions should be presented in a separate section (N.B. ensure the conclusions are not simply a repeat of the exec summary or vice versa).
- Further relevant information, including detailed methodology, evidence sources, research tools etc., should be included in the annexes.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example Plain English Campaign - <http://www.plainenglish.co.uk/crystal-mark/about-the-crystal-mark/the-crystal-mark-standard.html> or Center for Plain Language - <http://centerforplainlanguage.org/about-plain-language/checklist/>

## ***b. Report layout***

- The report should be standardised to the format of the BEIS Report Template (to be supplied by the BEIS project manager), including chapter numbering, heading styles, font size, typeface and line-spacing.
- Be consistent with punctuation, capitalisation and the use of acronyms and abbreviations.
- Use informative chapter and section headings to guide the reader.
- Use bullet lists where appropriate.
- Be consistent with the format, position and labelling of tables, charts and figures throughout the report, following those included in the report template where possible.
- Use chapter, page and paragraph cross-references where necessary.
- Reports should be page-numbered.

## ***c. Report style***

- Be consistent in the use of tense. Any research findings should generally be in the past tense - 'the research found... / 20% of respondents reported... etc.'
- Be consistent in the use of terminology - e.g. householders / residents; energy companies / energy suppliers; consumers / consumers etc.
- For abbreviations and acronyms, unless in common English usage, put the name in full when first used followed by the abbreviation or acronym in brackets, and then use the abbreviation.
- In addition, it may be appropriate to also include a glossary.
- Avoid unnecessary jargon. Unavoidable jargon terms should be explained the first time they are used.

## ***d. Bibliography and References***

- Number references to published work consecutively throughout the report preferably using Arabic numerals as superscript. References should follow standard citation procedures – for example:
  - Author, A., Author, B. Year. Title of paper. Title of Journal, volume no, pages;
  - Author, A., Author, B. Year. Title of book/chapter, (Editors Title of book) publisher;
  - Author, A., Author, B. Year. Title of report. Available at XXX-web link. (access date)

## ***e. Disclaimer***

- A disclaimer should be inserted on the first inside page of the report, as follows: "The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (nor do they reflect Government policy)."

## ***f. Logos***

- The BEIS logo is provided on the Report Template. Other logos of the contractor / other parties involved may be placed on the inside front cover.

### 3. Presenting methods, analysis and findings

#### ***a. Key points about presenting evidence***

- The report should clearly and fully reflect the agreed aims of the research, be impartial, and clearly indicate when the research took place.
- Findings and conclusions should be clearly related to the objectives and research questions for the study.
- All findings must be clearly substantiated by the evidence, and it should be clear to the reader how conclusions have been drawn and what they are based upon.
- Any recommendations, where requested, should clearly stem from the interpretation of the evidence, where possible being linked back to specific key findings.

#### ***b. Presenting the methodology and research tools***

- The methodology section in the main report should include enough information for the reader to understand exactly how the findings were generated, including a brief description of the research design; sampling approach, size and response rate; timing and location of fieldwork; and any limitations of the approach (including implications for robustness of data and findings).
- Detailed methodology should be included in an annex, along with research tools, case study details etc.
- For evidence reviews, the approach and criteria for identification, inclusion and weighting of evidence should be clearly explained in the report.

#### ***c. Reporting findings***

- Any limitations of the evidence should be clearly set out (for example restricted access to participants, gaps in sample coverage, time restraints) and implications for errors / bias in findings.
- In any research study which has included both qualitative and quantitative research, these findings should always be linked and interpreted together in the report.

#### ***d. Presenting quantitative research:***

- Research findings should normally refer to the respondents in the research rather than the general population (i.e. 20% of respondents thought X rather than 20% of householders / people / consumers) unless the research methodology allows such generalisation - i.e. a random sampling approach. In such cases statistical significance should be referred to.
- However, it is not normally appropriate to use significance testing with non-random samples (e.g. quota samples).
- Any reporting of percentages should make clear the base/total number of respondents on which percentages are being calculated. Percentages should not normally be presented on bases less than 100.
- Sub-group analysis should respect minimum sample sizes for quantification and/or significance testing of differences between groups, related to expected size of change or difference between groups.
- Generalisations from samples should only be made where the sample is sufficiently large and representative to warrant this.

- Where precise figures are not available or not appropriate use the greatest degree of precision possible - e.g. 'around three quarters' or 'the majority'.

### ***e. Presenting qualitative research:***

- As part of good qualitative research, corroborating evidence should be used to support and triangulate any findings (including other sources of evidence / data generated or identified by the research). However, there should also be discussion of where there was limited evidence which prevented this.
- Similarly, discussion of any conflicting or rival theories should be presented, e.g. contradictory evidence; absence of evidence.
- It should be made clear that findings relate to the research respondents and are not overarching or generalisable to e.g. the whole population, although may be considered representative of the range of views held by the target group for the research.
- Reporting should make clear the extent to which findings reflect the views of most or few respondents, and/or specific subgroups.
- Very general terms for groups of respondents such as 'stakeholders' should be avoided, rather descriptive terms should be used, as appropriate – e.g. 'local authority representatives' etc.
- Verbatim quotes should be used to illustrate and reinforce a point made in the text, but not as a substitute for presenting a finding. All key points should be illustrated with at least one quote.
- All quotations should be anonymous but give a clear indication of how the respondent fits into the sampling scheme - the details to be included should be agreed with the BEIS project manager before the report is drafted and used consistently throughout (e.g. 'respondent 17, female, homeowner' etc.).

### ***f. Presenting tables, charts, diagrams and statistics***

- Charts and diagrams should be used, where appropriate, to illustrate noteworthy findings and to break up the text.
- Supporting narrative should always be included to highlight, explain, qualify or expand on the message of a table or chart.
- Tables and figures should be headed, numbered and sourced. They should always be clearly and accurately referenced in the text.
- Tables of data should normally be presented with row and column totals.
- Base totals should be presented with every table or chart presenting survey data.
- A definition should be given of the base sample, e.g. all respondents (n) or all respondents [within a subset] (n).
- It should be clear whether any percentages are weighted or un-weighted, and where weighting is used both weighted and un-weighted bases should be provided for charts and tables.
- Any weighting used should be explained to the reader, in a way which is understandable to a non-specialist audience.
- Chart axes should be clearly and unambiguously labelled, and use consistent scales, to avoid false comparison between charts.

### ***g. Anonymity***

- To preserve confidentiality and anonymity, no identifying details of individual participants in the research or of particular organisations should be included in any report to the Department, unless this has been specifically cleared in advance with the individual or organisation concerned.

### ***h. Previous literature***

- Any review of previous literature included in a report of primary research should clearly relate to the aims and objectives of the research. As far as possible, it should also indicate the status of the literature reviewed, whether it has been subject to any rigorous quality control criteria, and how robust any cited findings are.
- Findings or conclusions from previous literature should be clearly differentiated from findings of primary research.
- All sources of evidence should be clearly referenced.

## **4. Submitting reports**

### ***a. Report outline***

- A report outline, setting out chapter and section headings, and bullets of what will be covered within each chapter/section, should be agreed with the Project Manager well in advance of the draft report. This should show clearly how each of the research questions have been answered.

### ***b. Draft Reports***

- All draft reports should be thoroughly proof read by someone other than the author before submission to BEIS, to minimise spelling and grammar errors and gaps and inconsistencies in information and logic.
- If several authors have contributed separate sections to the report a thorough editorial review is needed prior to submission, to ensure consistent style and avoid unnecessary repetition.
- The date and status of the report should be clear (e.g. Draft 1, June 2016).
- The electronic version of the draft final report should be in Microsoft Word. Other formats should only be used with prior agreement from the BEIS project manager.

### ***c. Interim reports***

- If there have been previously disseminated or published interim reports, the final report should show clear links between the emerging findings in the interim report and the findings in the final report.
- Any other work mentioned in the text, including earlier or interim reports, should be fully referenced.

### ***d. Final draft report***

- The final draft report should have a further proof-read before submission, following comments and sign-off from the BEIS project manager.

### ***e. Supplying data***

- For quantitative research you will be expected to provide copies of cleaned data with documentation at the same time as the final agreed report – this should be presented as excel/CSV or SPSS files. There should be a full and detailed explanation of all labels and variables of the dataset, to allow easy use by researchers within BEIS.

- For qualitative research you will generally be expected to provide transcripts or other notes collated as qualitative data. The data should have clear labels and sufficient explanation to allow further analysis where necessary (e.g. gender, age, geographical location).
- For secondary research / evidence reviews etc. you will be expected to provide summaries and full references of all sources reviewed, e.g. using a proforma developed as part of the research.

## **Annex B**

### **Code of Practice**

BEIS has developed this Code of Practice from the Joint Code of Practice issued by BBSRC; the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra); the Food Standards Agency; and the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) which lays out a framework for the proper conduct of research. It sets out the key aspects of the research process and the importance of making judgements on the appropriate precautions needed in every research activity.

The Code applies to all research funded by BEIS. It is intended to apply to all types of research, but the overriding principle is fitness of purpose and that all research must be conducted diligently by competent researchers and therefore the individual provisions must be interpreted with that in mind.

#### **1. PRINCIPLES BEHIND THE CODE OF PRACTICE**

Contractors and consortia funded by BEIS are expected to be committed to the quality of the research process in addition to quality of the evidence outputs. The Code of Practice has been created in order to assist contractors to conduct research of the highest quality and to encourage good conduct in research and help prevent misconduct. Set out over 8 responsibilities the code of practice provides general principles and standards for good practice in research. Most contractors will already have in place many of the measures set out in the Code and its adoption should not require great effort.

#### **2. COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODE OF PRACTICE**

All organisations contracting to BEIS (including those sub-contracting as part of a consortium) will be expected to commit to upholding these responsibilities and will be expected to indicate acceptance of the Code when submitting proposals to the Department.

Contractors are encouraged to discuss with BEIS any clauses in the Code that they consider inappropriate or unnecessary in the context of the proposed research project. The Code, and records of the discussions if held, will become part of the Terms and Conditions under which the research is funded.

Additionally, BEIS may conduct (or request from the Contractor as appropriate) a formal risk assessment on the project to identify where additional controls may be needed.

### 3. MONITORING OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE CODE OF PRACTICE

Monitoring of compliance with the Code is necessary to ensure:

- Policies and managed processes exist to support compliance with the Code
- That these are being applied in practice.

In the short term, BEIS can require contractors to conduct planned internal audits although BEIS reserve the right to obtain evidence that a funded project is carried out to the required standard. BEIS may also conduct an audit of a Contractor's research system if deemed necessary.

In the longer term it is expected that most research organisations will assure the quality of their research processes by means of a formal system that is audited by an impartial and competent third party against an appropriate internationally recognised standard that is fit for purpose.

A recommended checklist for researchers can be found on the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) website at <http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research>

### 4. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS IN THE CODE OF PRACTICE

#### ***a. Responsibilities***

All organisations contracting to BEIS (including those sub-contracting as part of a consortium) will be responsible for the overall quality of research they conducted. Managers, group leaders and supervisors have a responsibility to ensure a climate of good practice in the research teams, including a commitment to the development of scientific and technical skills.

The Principal Investigator or Project Leader is responsible for all the work conducted in the project including that of any subcontractors. All staff and students must have defined responsibilities in relation to the project and be aware of these responsibilities.

#### ***b. Competence***

All personnel associated with the project must be competent to perform the technical, scientific and support tasks required of them. Personnel undergoing training must be supervised at a level such that the quality of the results is not compromised by the inexperience of the researcher.

#### ***c. Project planning***

An appropriate level of risk assessment must be conducted to demonstrate awareness of the key factors that will influence the success of the project and the ability to meet its objectives. There must be a written project plan showing that these factors (including research design, statistical methods and others) have been addressed. Projects must be ethical and project plans must be

agreed in collaboration with BEIS, taking account of the requirements of ethical committees<sup>2</sup> or the terms of project licences, if relevant.

Significant amendments to the plan or milestones must be recorded and approved by BEIS if applicable.

#### ***d. Quality Control***

The organisation must have planned processes in place to assure the quality of the research undertaken by its staff. Projects must be subjected to formal reviews of an appropriate frequency. Final and interim outputs must always be accompanied by a statement of what quality control has been undertaken.

The authorisation of outputs and publications shall be as agreed by BEIS, and subject to senior approval in BEIS, where appropriate. Errors identified after publication must be notified to BEIS and agreed corrective action initiated.

#### ***e. Handling of samples and materials***

All samples and other experimental materials must be labelled (clearly, accurately, uniquely and durably), and retained for a period to be agreed by BEIS. The storage and handling of the samples, materials and data must be as specified in the project plan (or proposal), and must be appropriate to their nature. If the storage conditions are critical, they must be monitored and recorded.

#### ***f. Documentation of procedures and methods***

All the procedures and methods used in a research project must be documented, at least in the personal records of the researcher. This includes analytical and statistical procedures and the generation of a clear audit trail linking secondary processed information to primary data.

There must be a procedure for validation of research methods as fit for purpose, and modifications must be clearly indicated and traceable through each stage of development of the method.

#### ***g. Research/work records***

All records must be of sufficient quality to present a complete picture of the work performed, enabling it to be repeated if necessary.

The project leader is accountable for the validity of the work and responsible for ensuring that regular reviews of the records of each researcher are conducted<sup>3</sup>.

The location of all project records, including critical data, must be recorded. They must be retained in a form that ensures their integrity and security, and prevents unauthorised modification, for a period to be agreed by BEIS.

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note ethical approval does not remove the responsibility of the individual for ethical behaviour

<sup>3</sup> Please note that this also applied to projects being undertaken by consortia

A recommended checklist for researchers can be found on the UK Research Integrity Office (UKRIO) website at <http://www.ukrio.org/what-we-do/code-of-practice-for-research>.

## Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS and the Contracting Authority and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ( $5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$ ))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
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
Quality	PROJ1.6	Code of Practice
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

### Scoring criteria

## Evaluation Justification Statement

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

<b>Questionnaire</b>	<b>Q No.</b>	<b>Question subject</b>	<b>Maximum Marks</b>
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/Methodology	30%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	15%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Project Environment	15%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Delivery	15%
Quality	PROJ1.5	Quality Assurance Arrangements	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:

$$\text{Score} = \{\text{weighting percentage}\} \times \{\text{bidder's score}\} = 20\% \times 60 = 12$$

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

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

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

All questions will be scored based on the above mechanism. Please be aware that the final score returned may be different as there may be multiple evaluators and their individual scores will be averaged (mean) to determine your final score.

### Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40

Your final score will  $(60+60+40+40) \div 4 = 50$

**Price elements** will be judged on the following criteria.

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire**

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

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

**PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY**

## Section 7 – General Information

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

#### DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Responses received after the date indicated in the ITQ shall not be considered by the Contracting Authority, unless the Bidder can justify that the reason for the delay, is solely attributable to the Contracting Authority
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear, concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do ensure that the Response and any documents accompanying it are in the English Language, the Contracting Authority reserve the right to disqualify any full or part responses that are not in English.
- 7.12 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

### DO NOT

- 7.13 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.14 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.15 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.16 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.
- 7.17 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.20 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.21 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.23 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.24 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity.

## Some additional guidance notes

- 7.25 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.26 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- 7.27 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.28 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.29 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.30 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 7.31 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.32 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.33 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.35 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.36 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.37 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.38 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.39 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.
- 7.40 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks

the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

- 7.41 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.42 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

The Contracting Authority reserves the right to amend any security related term or condition of the draft contract accompanying this ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

#### **USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS**

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)