

Invitation to Quote

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

Subject **Recruitment of Mature Students to Healthcare Courses**

Sourcing reference number **CR18018**



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

Table of Contents

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

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 Contracting Authorities improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

It is our vision to become the leading service provider for Contracting Authorities for 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

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 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	Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) Nicholson House, Lime Kiln Cl, Stoke Gifford, Bristol BS34 8SR
3.2	Buyer name	Becky Eldridge
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£60,000.00 Excluding VAT.
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available here. Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <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	29 th January 2018
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	7 th February 2018 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	9 th February 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	14 th February 2018 11:00
3.10	Date/time Bidders should be available if face to face clarifications are required	20 th February 2018 – 22 nd February 2018
3.11	Anticipated selection and the selections of Bids notification date	23 rd February 2018
3.12	Anticipated Award date	26 th February 2018

3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	28 th February 2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	31 st August 2018
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

HEFCE distributes public money to higher education institutions in England and ensures that this money is used to deliver the greatest benefits to students and the wider public.

From 2017-18, pre-registration courses in nursing, midwifery and allied health (NMAH) are transferring to the mainstream HE funding system, hence becoming HEFCE fundable. HEFCE has been working with other governmental and arms-length bodies, as well as sector bodies, to ensure an effective transition.

As part of the funding decisions made by HEFCE's board to support NMAH, it was announced that HEFCE was allocating:

- £1 million for national initiatives that support demand and improve retention to enhance the sustainability of courses, particularly small and specialist pre-registration courses. This element is not part of the recurrent teaching grant distributed to institutions but is included in the funding for national facilities and initiatives and we expect it to continue each year to 2019-20. (circular letter 6/2017, paragraph 7)

HEFCE has developed a suite of interventions for small specialist disciplines. As part of this programme, HEFCE's executive has agreed to commission a piece of research on mature student engagement in NMAH disciplines.

Aims

HEFCE wishes primarily to gain a better overall understanding of the mature segment of the student market entering healthcare courses in order to support continued recruitment of mature students to Higher Education courses.

HEFCE also wishes to better understand barriers to applications from mature male applicants, and

BME (male and female) mature applicants to these disciplines and how these could be overcome.

Objectives

HEFCE requires the winning bidder to deliver three case studies of engagement and recruitment of mature students to HE healthcare courses in three separate geographical areas.

The winning bidder will be expected to produce a report which HEFCE intends to publish and which will provide insight to HE providers as well as governmental and non-governmental agencies on current and future recruitment of mature students to healthcare courses. In order to do so, it will :

- analyse determinants of success in recruiting mature students
- analyse challenges in reaching and attracting mature students
- make recommendations for providers and professional bodies on ways to maintain or increase overall numbers of mature entrants to healthcare courses
- make recommendations for providers and professional bodies on ways to sustain the diversity of mature entrants to healthcare courses.

We hope that the lessons to be learned from these case studies will be valuable to providers and professional bodies regarding mature student engagement in Higher Education overall, so it would be desirable for any such wider lessons to be set out in the report.

Background to the Requirement

Healthcare courses traditionally attract more mature students than other disciplines of Higher Education. Of all HE mature students aged 25 and more at the start of their course, 21% were registered on nursing, midwifery and allied health courses.

In 2017, undergraduate courses in pre-registration nursing, midwifery and allied health (NMAH) transferred to the mainstream HE funding system. In February 2017, UCAS indicated that there was a 23% drop in applications to nursing, and that there was a drop in mature student applications of 23%. Informal feedback from HE providers offering health related courses suggests that the drop in applications in nursing, midwifery and allied health was much more marked for mature students than for young students. Final figures are not available at this point in the cycle.

Courses in scope (see list under scope) all lead to registration with professional bodies, and are accredited by the Nursing and Midwifery Council, the Health and Care Professional Council or the Dental Schools Council, depending on the discipline. This means that the curriculum, and to some extent the delivery, is constrained by standards that providers must meet to ensure accreditation.

Mature student engagement in higher education overall has been declining during the last decade.

Some healthcare disciplines attract a majority of mature students and a drop in mature student applications could therefore jeopardise particular areas of provision, both in terms of geographies and disciplines.

NMAH courses typically lead to very high employability and employers particularly welcome mature graduates.

For some sections of the mature student market, NMAH courses constitute the main route into higher education. This is the case particularly for mature women from low participation neighbourhoods. Reduced participation from this group in healthcare courses, in the absence of signs that their participation is increasing elsewhere in HE, would lead to a reduction in participation in HE by these groups as a whole.

Healthcare courses attract predominantly female applicants (over 90% in nursing and midwifery, and 75% in allied health). An increase in the proportion of males into these disciplines would both increase the overall applicant pool and ensure a better gender balance in the professions, which would be beneficial for service users.

Students from BME backgrounds are under-represented in nursing, midwifery and allied health. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that the representation of different ethnicities varies between the disciplines in scope. Specific patterns of participation relating to different ethnicities, and combined ethnicity and gender, would be worthwhile to explore. Training more NMAH professionals from BME backgrounds would contribute to building a healthcare workforce which is representative of the communities it serves.

Scope

The investigator will be expected to produce a report on mature student engagement with NMAH since 2011 with a specific focus on understanding changes since the announcement of changes to funding for these courses in November 2015.

The report is expected to focus primarily on courses in scope for the reform. This includes undergraduate and post-graduate pre-registration courses in the following disciplines:

- Nursing adult
- Nursing mental health
- Nursing child
- Nursing learning disability
- Midwifery
- Physiotherapy
- Occupational therapy
- Dietetics
- Orthoptics
- Prosthetics and orthoptics
- Diagnostic radiography
- Therapeutic radiography
- Speech and language therapy
- Podiatry
- Operating department practice
- Dental hygiene and dental therapy

Because the methodology recommended is a series of case studies, it would be acceptable if not all disciplines were represented. However it is desirable that disciplines which traditionally attract large proportions of mature students are represented, including adult nursing, mental health nursing, learning disability nursing, occupational therapy, podiatry, therapeutic radiography and operating department practice.

It would be desirable for the investigator to consider within their field work and within the report the wider picture of mature student engagement within the HEIs selected, in particular in other healthcare disciplines, but this could be broadened to other subject areas where mature students constitute a large proportion of the student body.

Requirements

The winning bidder will be expected to critically review existing research on mature student participation in healthcare disciplines and in other relevant areas of higher education.

HEFCE will provide the winning bidder with quantitative analysis of HESA data, which will give information on characteristics of the current and recently graduated student populations.

Reaching people who are prospective mature applicants is particularly difficult as they are often not enrolled in formal education, as students of school leaving age might be. Individual providers may however have a good understanding of where their mature students come from, and a workable approach would therefore be that of comparative case studies based on a selection of local areas. The winning bidder would be expected to identify HE providers in these localities and main feeder routes that mature students come from. These would include FE colleges and NHS trusts. An avenue to explore if possible would also be that of understanding rationales behind decisions made by mature applicants who did not take up offered places.

The winning bidder is expected to develop a methodology to produce three meaningful case studies of networks of FE, HE and employers in three different geographies which would identify different strategies that organisations, and specific disciplines, put in place to engage with and recruit mature students. The methodology would also need to take into account local contexts in order to analyse what the barriers as well as success factors are to continued or increased engagement with all mature students. The methodology would also be designed to investigate what factors, both in terms of strategy and context, can lead to diversifying the pool of mature applicants to include more males and more BME students.

Two of the geographical areas would be outside London, and one in London. It is envisaged that these geographic areas would cover 3 to 4 universities and their networks, except in London where it may focus on one HEI and its network. Networks in this context include FE colleges and NHS Trusts and other employers, as potential feeders to NMAH courses. The winning bidder should put in place ethical approval processes where required for the study to take place. The winning bidder would also need to reflect on how to anonymise outcomes of the research for publication.

The HEIs and areas chosen would be expected to provide representative coverage across NMAH provision. Particular effort should be made to include good coverage of courses with large proportions of mature student participation, and in particular learning disability nursing, adult nursing, mental health nursing, podiatry, therapeutic radiography, occupational therapy and operating department practice. The winning bidder will be expected to work with HEFCE to identify geographical areas and HE providers that would best meet the objectives of the study.

The report should aim to compare and contrast strategies developed by HE providers to engage with mature students and their outcomes, both within geographical areas and across the three areas, identify communalities between disciplines as well as what may distinguish markets, strategies and outcomes in the different disciplines and identify how engagement with and recruitment of mature students has evolved since the announcement of the transfer of funding for NMAH to the mainstream HE system.

HEFCE will aim to convene a reference group with representation from other regions to provide the contractor with insight into how the selected geographical areas compare with the rest of the country. The winning bidder would be expected to attend meetings of the reference group. The winning bidder will also be expected to consider how recruitment strategies and delivery patterns put in place by providers of HE who are not HEIs may provide good practice in attracting mature students. The winning bidder will need to be mindful of admissions and delivery requirements that providers must meet to comply with professional accreditation.

It is envisaged that the project will be overseen by a steering group which would work with the winning bidder to secure access to relevant members of staff and student groups in educational institutions and, as far as possible, NHS trusts and other employers.

Estimated Timetable

Stage	Date
First steering group meeting (Agreement of methodology)	w/c Monday 12 March
Second steering group meeting (Draft report)	w/c Monday 4 June
Third steering group meeting (final report)	w/c Monday 9 July
Publication of report	Summer 2017

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.

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	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
-	-	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.			
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	40%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding The Requirements	20%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Methodology	15%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	15%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Risk Management	10%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

Example if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 12% by using the following calculation:

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

- 7.1 Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.
- 7.2 Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure
- 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 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 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 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.
- 7.16 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority 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 or the Contracting Authority 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 must 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 as part of the evaluation process.
- 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 the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 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 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.
- 7.35 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 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.

- 7.39 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, 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.

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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