



Invitation to Quote

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

**Subject UK SBS National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS)
Evaluation**

Sourcing reference number UK SBS BLOJEU-CR17051HEFCE

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

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

UKSBS

Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

| Section | Content |
|----------|--|
| 1 | <u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u> |
| 2 | <u>About our Customer</u> |
| 3 | <u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u> |
| 4 | <u>Specification</u> |
| 5 | <u>Evaluation model</u> |
| 6 | <u>Evaluation questionnaire</u> |
| 7 | <u>General Information</u> |
| Appendix | |

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, 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 Customers.

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

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE)

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

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

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

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 | Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Close, Stoke Gifford, Bristol, BS34 8SR |
| 3.2 | Buyer name | Jenny Stratton |
| 3.3 | Buyer contact details | Research@uksbs.co.uk |
| 3.4 | Estimated value of the Opportunity | £50,000.00 Including VAT and expenses |
| 3.5 | Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids | All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered. |

| Section 3 - Timescales | | |
|------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 3.6 | Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert | 11/04/2017 Contracts Finder |
| 3.7 | Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system | 21/04/2017 16:00hrs |
| 3.8 | Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris | 25/04/2017 |
| 3.9 | Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris | 08/05/2017 12:00hrs |
| 3.10 | Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date | 25/05/2017 |
| 3.11 | Anticipated Award date | 25/05/2017 |
| 3.12 | Anticipated Contract Start date | 1/06/2017 |
| 3.13 | Anticipated Contract End date | 31/12/2017 |
| 3.14 | Bid Validity Period | 60 Days |

Section 4 – Specification

1. Introduction

HEFCE aims to create and sustain the conditions for a world-leading system of higher education which transforms lives, strengthens the economy, and enriches society. We support excellence and innovation in research, learning and teaching and knowledge exchange through providing funding, supportive challenge and information on national trends.

Further information is available on the HEFCE website at: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

Subject to the will of Parliament, the Office for Students (OfS) and UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) will be established in place of HEFCE in April 2018. Further information is available in the Government's White Paper "Higher Education: success as a Knowledge Economy¹" and the subsequent "Higher Education and Research Bill²" that is currently in passage through Parliament.

HEFCE wishes to make it clear that it is anticipated that this contract will transfer as part of the transfer of HEFCE's property, rights and liabilities to the Office for Students. We would not expect this transfer to affect the services required.

Further information about HEFCE can be found on its website at <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>

2. Aims

To appoint an external evaluator to conduct an evaluation of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS). The evaluation should take place between June and October 2017 and is intended to:

1. evaluate the impact and current relevance of the NTFS across the sector, including in relation to those providers who have not participated in the scheme.
2. inform decisions on the future format of the scheme, including the approach to its financing.

3. Objectives

i. **Establish the extent to which the NTFS has achieved its aims across the HE sector in England, Wales and NI.**

Identify:

- a. Using methods consistent with Treasury best practice: what evidence there is of value for money and return on investment in the NTFS.
- b. Why providers participate in the NTFS.
- c. What factors have caused / enabled providers to participate in the NTFS

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/higher-education-success-as-a-knowledge-economy-white-paper>

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/higher-education-and-research-bill>

- d. Why some providers have not participated in the NTFS.
- e. What factors have prevented, discouraged or otherwise influenced providers not to participate in the NTFS.
- f. What evidence there is that the scheme has supported and promoted excellence in learning and teaching.
- g. To what extent have NTFS winners acted “as role models for the rest of the profession”.
- h. What influence or impact have NTFS winners, as role models, had on the rest of the profession.
- i. In what ways has the NTFS influenced culture, policies and/or processes in relation to reward and recognition for teaching both at participating and non-participating institutions.
- j. What, if anything, has been the effect of the absence of the NTFS at some providers.
- k. What are the costs and benefits to individuals and providers of participating in the NTFS.
- l. What evidence there is that the scheme has supported innovative learning and teaching and its take-up beyond the individuals and providers receiving the award
- m. What might reward and recognition for learning and teaching in the sector be like if the NTFS had not existed.

ii. Set out considerations and options for OfS and other funders with regard to the format of the scheme, the approach to delivery and its financing in the new (regulatory) HE landscape.

Provide options and suggest considerations for determining the approach to a future NTFS, taking into account the findings above and the funding and regulatory environments in the different nations involved. This will include the degree to which the scheme can be evidenced as promoting quality and whether there is a case for public investment in individual staff beyond the incentives that individual providers have in a competitive environment to support innovation and excellence in learning and teaching, and within that the development and support of individual staff. The evaluator should identify:

- a. To what extent is the NTFS aim “to highlight and reward truly outstanding individual teachers” still required 17 years on from the scheme’s inception (consider all types of providers).
- b. What added value does a *sector-wide* (England, Wales & NI) scheme bring to individuals, providers and the sector.
- c. In what ways does the NTFS complement or overlap other award schemes in the UK (e.g. Times Higher Education, Guardian).
- d. What gaps exist in learning and teaching-related policy within institutions that could be addressed / catalysed through a national award scheme
- e. In what ways does the NTFS complement or overlap the other activities of relevant sector agencies (including the Higher Education Academy, Leadership Foundation in Higher Education and Equality Challenge Unit).
- f. What are the costs and benefits of funding a national award scheme to a *regulator* of higher education.

4. Background to the Requirement

The National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS)

The National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS) was launched in 2000 in order to recognise and reward excellent teaching at a time when institutional promotions' criteria were perceived to focus on rewards for research.

The NTFS is funded primarily by HEFCE, with contributions from the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Department for the Economy (DfE) Northern Ireland.

The NTFS is managed on behalf of the funders by the Higher Education Academy (HEA).

All higher education providers (including further education colleges) in England, Northern Ireland and Wales can submit up to three nominations per annum. Written claims for excellence from the nominees are assessed against established and published criteria. Currently 55 individual NTF awards are made per year and over 750 awards have been made since the scheme's inception. In 2016, a new Collaborative Award for Team Excellence (CATE) was introduced with 6 awards presented.

Further information on the scheme, including criteria, nomination guidance and a directory of winners is available on the Higher Education Academy's website at <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/you/national-teaching-fellowship-scheme-ntfs>

Previous Reviews of and Changes to the NTFS

Since 2000, more than £14 million has been invested in the scheme by the funding councils. The majority of this funding has been awarded to the individual National Teaching Fellows to "support their professional development as a teaching and learning professional and should enable dissemination of their innovative practice within their own institution and across the sector". Initially there were 20 awards each year with the recipient of the award receiving £50,000 over three years to support a project defined at the point of application.

In 2004 the scheme was expanded, increasing the number of awards to 50 as a result of the 2003 Government White Paper, The Future of Higher Education, which noted the success of the scheme but added that "more needs to be done to highlight and reward truly outstanding individual teachers as role models for the rest of the profession"³.

As a result of a review conducted by the HEA in 2005 two strands were developed – individual and project. From 2006 Fellows received an individual award of £10,000, and had the opportunity to bid, as principal investigator, for project funding up to the value of £200,000. There were four annual rounds of bidding for NTFS projects until 2010. 40 projects were funded in total covering a variety of themes.

³ Department for Education and Skills (2003) The Future of Higher Education. p. 53.
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20040117001247/dfes.gov.uk/highereducation/hestrategy/>

In 2010, Wales joined the scheme (though did not adopt the project approach) and the number of NTFs awarded annually was increased to 55.

In 2012, a second review (the most recent review) was conducted by the HEA⁴ which identified key strengths and areas for development for the scheme. The strengths included the status of the award; its focus on teaching; its provision of funding and its role in enabling of personal and professional development. Weaknesses included lack of clarity of the nomination and assessment process; lack, or inappropriate nature, of feedback; insufficient focus on 'real teachers'; lack of systematic utilisation of NTFs' expertise; and the subject profile of award holders.

In 2016, the award money offered to each of the 55 NTFs was reduced to £5,000. The CATE awards were introduced, which rewarded six institutional teams with £15,000 each for dissemination activity.

5. Scope

This external, independent evaluation is part of a package of approaches to an overall NTFS review which includes two information-gathering exercises run by the HEA: their new Ambassadors programme and their ongoing monitoring processes; and gathering of information by HEFCE on efficiency and effective use of the funding allocation.

The external evaluator will be expected to liaise with

- HEFCE to ensure the evaluation contributes to and learns from the other dimensions of the NTFS review, and to draw on their experience of evaluating value for money in other areas of investment
- A range of colleagues and higher education providers across the sector including those that are well-established within the scheme, those who are newer to the scheme (such as Alternative Providers and Further Education Colleges) and those who have not participated in the scheme.
- The HEA to capture information from their internal monitoring and NTFS Ambassadors.
- Other higher education organisations as appropriate.

Information on the processes of the scheme (e.g. guidance for nominees; submission and assessment; support for networking of NTFs) will be gathered by the HEA as part of their ongoing monitoring. Information on innovative practices (individual and institutional perspectives) implemented and/or disseminated by NTFS winners will be explored by the Ambassadors. Information on efficiency and effective use of the funding allocation will be gathered by HEFCE. However, any information on these three areas gained incidentally through the external evaluation will also be considered.

⁴ Higher Education Academy. NTFS review 2012: report on findings.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/ntfs_review_2012_report_on_findings.pdf

6. Requirement

The contract will include the following mandatory key deliverables:

- An interim report for internal purposes (July 2017), to include an overview of methodology (including sources of data) and progress against both objectives i and ii. The evaluator will be expected to meet with HEFCE to discuss this report and the direction of the remaining work.
- A final report (by end November 2017). The report will be for external publication and should include:
 - An executive summary.
 - Background information on the NTFS (as outlined in this specification), including key highlights from previous reviews.
 - Scope and methodology of the evaluation.
 - Detailed findings of the extent to which the NTFS has achieved its aims across the HE sector in England, Wales and NI (objective part i).
 - Set out considerations and options for OfS and other funders with regard to the format of the scheme, the approach to delivery and its financing in the new (regulatory) HE landscape.
 - References.

All reports must be written in accordance with HEFCE's corporate style. Advice and guidance on this will be made available to the successful tenderer. The format of the report will be agreed with HEFCE's project manager.

The information provided in the reports to HEFCE, including the final report, and the rights to all other outputs of the reports shall be the HEFCE's property. This includes intellectual property rights and copyright.

Throughout the project, the external evaluator will be expected to be in regular communication with the HEFCE project manager to ensure that contractual obligations are being fulfilled and that the project is progressing as expected in terms of scope and time, and to ensure that any potential issues or risks are identified, monitored and managed appropriately.

There will be an expectation that the external evaluator will make themselves available to participate, as necessary, in any relevant steering and reference groups, including a discussion meeting with the HEA and funding bodies at the beginning and towards the end of the work.

Indicative Budget

An indicative budget for these activities has been set at around £50,000 (including VAT and expenses). Any bids proposing costs higher than this will be expected to provide evidence within the methodology including any robust justification for the additional funds showing HEFCE return on investment. Tenderers should quote their price in accordance with the price schedule guidance, the figure before VAT is the figure that will be used for evaluation.

7. Timetable

| TASK | DATE |
|--|---|
| Initiation | |
| Inception meeting | 31 May 2017, Bristol |
| Project plan and contract operating plan signed off by HEFCE | No later than 2 weeks following inception meeting |
| Project Lifecycle | |
| Evaluation of NTFS | June-October 2017 |
| Interim report | August 2017 |
| Final report | November 2017 |

Terms and Conditions

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

Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem 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 | AW4.1 | Contract Terms |
| Price | AW5.5 | E Invoicing |
| Price | AW5.6 | Implementation of E-Invoicing |
| Quality | AW6.1 | Compliance to the Specification |
| - | - | Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool |

| Scoring criteria | | | |
|---|---------|---|---------------|
| Evaluation Justification Statement | | | |
| In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type. | | | |
| Questionnaire | Q No. | Question subject | Maximum Marks |
| Price | AW5.2 | Price | 15.00% |
| Quality | PROJ1.1 | Ability to present a robust and appropriate project and resource plan | 15.00% |
| Quality | PROJ1.2 | Ability to present a robust and appropriate methodology | 25.00% |
| Quality | PROJ1.3 | Project team and capability to deliver | 25.00% |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---|--------|
| Quality | PROJ1.4 | Understanding and experience of learning and teaching in HE context | 20.00% |
|---------|---------|---|--------|

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 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.

Once the evaluation process and due diligence is complete, should the result of the process result in a tied place(s) then the supplier(s) who scored the highest total in the Quality criterion shall be considered the successful supplier and shall be awarded the opportunity .

Should the above still result in a tie we will go to a secondary tie decision which will be who scored the highest total in the Price criterion (Question AW5.2) they shall be considered the successful supplier and shall be awarded the opportunity.

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.
- 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 typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

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

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (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 ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the Contract terms 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 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 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 ITQ 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 ITQ to reflect any changes introduced by the GSC. In particular where this ITQ is accompanied by any instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as a result of any changes stemming from the new GSC, whether in respect of the applicable protective marking scheme, specific protective markings given, the aspects to which any protective marking applies or otherwise. This may relate to the instructions on safeguarding classified information (e.g. a Security Aspects Letter) as they apply to the procurement as they apply to the procurement process and/or any contracts awarded to you as a result of the procurement process.

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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