

Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of **Government Office for
Science**

Subject Contracting Authority **Understanding the Governance of
the UK Transport System**

Sourcing reference number **BLOJEU-CR17123GOS**

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 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

GO-Science

The Government Office for Science (GO-Science) works with the Department for Business Innovation and Skills. The office ensures that government policies and decisions are informed by the best scientific evidence and strategic long-term thinking

Responsibilities

GO-Science is responsible for:

- giving scientific advice to the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet, through a programme of projects that reflect the priorities of the Government Chief Scientific Adviser
- ensuring and improving the quality and use of scientific evidence and advice in government (through advice and projects and by creating and supporting connections between officials and the scientific community)
- providing the best scientific advice in the case of emergencies, through the [Scientific Advisory Group for Emergencies \(SAGE\)](#)
- helping the independent [Council for Science and Technology](#) provide high level advice to the Prime Minister

Further information can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/government-office-for-science>

Section 3 - Working with the Government Office for Science

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	Government Office for Science 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET
3.2	Buyer name	Victoria Clewer
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum Budget	£50,000 ex 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	03/10/2017 Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	10/10/2017 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	12/10/2017
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	13/10/2017 14:00
3.10	Anticipated selection and de selections of Bids notification date	17/10/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award date	17/10/2017
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	19/10/2017
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	05/02/2018
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

Background

Introduction to the Government Office for Science and Foresight

The UK Government Office for Science (GO-Science) supports the Government's Chief Scientific Advisor in ensuring that the Government has access to, and uses, the best science and engineering advice. It is located within the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), but is professionally independent of it.

The Foresight programme sits within GO-Science and develops projects using the latest scientific evidence and futures analysis to address complex issues and provides strategic options for policy. Foresight projects examine public policy issues where science might be part of the solution, or a scientific topic where potential applications and technologies are yet to be realised. This provides Government with evidence to help them think systematically about the future and provides signposts for policymakers in tackling future challenges.

About Foresight [Future of Mobility]

The Foresight Future of Mobility project is run from within the UK Government Office for Science (GO-Science). The Future of Mobility project was launched to try to understand the broad question '*What benefits/ opportunities could the transport system of the future provide and what are the implications for Government and society?*'

Transport is a key enabler, effecting where people work, their commute modes and times, and the costs of moving people and goods. Mobility choices impact on a broadly on things ranging from individual health and wellbeing, to the economy and the environment. The Department for Transport (DfT) are the key customer for this project, however there is cross Whitehall engagement in the project, including from the Department for Health, Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, Department for Communities and Local Government, the Treasury and the Cabinet Office.

Aims and Objectives of the Project

Specification for review of governance

We are seeking a systematic evidence-based review to understand the current landscape of UK transport infrastructure, across common modes of transport (road – public transport, road – private hire, road – private owner, rail (including high speed and light rail), domestic aviation, domestic shipping (including ferries), , cycling and walking). All domestic transport, including freight and commercial, in the UK is in scope (England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland).

It is anticipated that the review would be conducted in two stages with key issues identified in the first stage and pursued in more detail in stage 2, following a discussion with GO-Science.

- Stage 1: An initial landscape map and analysis of factors affecting influence (intended for internal government use) should be completed by 20/11/17.
- Stage 2: Detailed analysis and report. We would expect a 2 page executive summary, finalised landscape map (s) and a longer report split between the four key areas (A), (B), (C) and (D) below.

The final report and the final landscape map are intended to be published on the Foresight Future of Mobility webpage. These two products will be drawn upon and used in the main project report (Future of Mobility). They will also be used to inform discussion with policy makers. Reviews should be written in plain English, in a style that would be accessible to policy makers. You must avoid the use of jargon – everything written must be accessible and

digestible to a non-expert.

As a guide, the final product might be around 10,000 words (excluding annexes). Please note that you may include as much quantitative analysis as you like as additional material in an annex to the main report. For example, for section (A) you might include a few pages of narrative with a system diagram and include an annex with detailed information about each organisation. The report should be appropriately referenced. If figures are included, the underpinning data should ideally also be sent.

Your final submission must be science and evidence-based, must not contain value laden language and all evidence sources must be cited. However, where there is emerging science and/or disputed evidence, this should be highlighted. We do not have a style guide.

Any implications for policy makers are important to draw out, but these must be based on evidence.

Given the complexities in the system, we welcome innovative proposals that will help visualise the system and the way the different bodies interact or influence under different contexts. We are open to proposals that involve speaking with different bodies to gather information (within the time limits of the review). An introductory letter can be provided from GO-Science to explain the project and how the governance review fits into this. We are also open to workshops or other events to discuss governance issues. Please describe any other support you require from GO-Science in undertaking this review.

Areas to focus on:

A. Institutional structures: Who are the key actors in the UK landscape for transport infrastructure?

The review should identify bodies that have a **policy, regulatory or financing** role in the field. This would include public sector bodies across the UK that have legal responsibilities but also private sector, NGO or non-UK organisations that have a major influence on development of UK transport infrastructure.

(i) What mode of transport do they have a role or influence on? What role do they play? What is the legal or other basis for this? How do they exercise this influence?

(ii) For each organisation, how are decisions made? What criteria or approach do they use/take into account? How do evaluate successful delivery of infrastructure projects or operation of infrastructure?

(iii) How do these different organisations interact with each other? What are the overlaps? What approaches are used to coordinate decision-making between different bodies?

B. Governance and Influence: What are the factors affecting influence within the UK transport system?

(i) What issues affect the balance of influence within this landscape, how and under what circumstances? For example, how do responsibilities or influence change in relation to: scale or cost of the project and financing arrangements, location - UK-wide, England or devolved administrations, multi or single local authority, London compared to other major UK cities), stage of project – how do responsibilities and influence evolve from scoping/development of new infrastructure, to delivery, to ongoing operation.

What other factors or context will affect the role or influence of different actors?

(ii) What are the practical examples or case studies that help illustrate these institutional responsibilities and relationships and how they vary by mode and context?

C. Outcomes from the system: what works?

(i) What has been reported about the current pain points, friction or challenges arising from the current governance in transport infrastructure systems?

(ii) What does the evidence suggest about factors that create the conditions for successful infrastructure governance and decision-making? What case studies or examples best illustrate this (UK and international)?

D. What will change (out to 2040)?

(i) Given likely future changes and trends, how will these disrupt both legal, and normative governance and regulatory systems in transport?

(ii) How might this change the centres of influence (legal and actual)?

(iii) What are the implications for decisions needing to be made today?

(iv) What are the research gaps in understanding what works or will work in future governance of the transport system?

We expect this to be a mixture of academic research, case studies and potentially workshops and structured interviews dependent on if the bidders felt these were necessary. But we would welcome alternate approaches if they will tackle the research questions, in a rigorous way, that would pass academic peer review.

Article structure and style:

Articles will ultimately be presented to senior policy makers, and the article's language and focus should reflect this. The layout and style described in the **Author Guidelines** has been designed specifically for the time-constrained professional so that the reader's attention is drawn directly to the information they require.

If you wish to discuss the development of the paper or any particular issues which arise during the course of its production, the Project Team will arrange further discussion. Please note that 30% of the full agreed fee will be paid to you once the first draft has been deemed acceptable to proceed to peer review by the project team.

The criteria for approval of your article at this phase of the process are:

1. The paper includes all required article sections (see **section 4.Key article sections in our Author Guidelines**)
2. The article clearly fulfils the research question/objective and is within the scope defined in the agreed proposal.
3. The language used is accessible and understandable to a non-expert (see **section 3.Language and writing style** in our Author Guidelines)
4. The discussion and arguments presented are adequately supported by the appropriate references.
5. The references used to support the report are from credible sources, are relevant and sufficiently recent.
6. Figures and tables are of a high quality.
7. The paper is deemed acceptable following evaluation using plagiarism detection software, which compares the submitted manuscript with full text articles from all major journal databases and the internet.

All articles undergo double-blind peer review following internal approval of the first draft by the project team.

The paper may undergo further rounds of review if:

1. Large amounts of new information are added to the paper by the author following the

recommendations made by the peer reviewers/project team.

2. The peer reviewers/project team do not feel that the paper has been sufficiently amended following revision by the author, in which case the paper may be submitted for assessment by the project's expert advisory group.

Please note that the paper may be subject to internal feedback from policy developers, or a roundtable discussion. You will be informed if this is the case.

If the project team finds that the paper has not been sufficiently revised by the author to meet either or all of the following:

1. the objectives of the agreed article proposal;
2. our article requirements (see section 4 of Author Guidelines);
3. feedback from peer reviews/expert advisory group.

We may choose to withdraw the article commission at this point, with no further payment to the author.

Important information

During the preparation of your article, you should not (or allow others to) publish your review or make it generally available without prior agreement. Your work may be used internally or for publication by GO-Science. This can be discussed with the Project Lead following submission of proposals.

We may also hold workshops as part of the project and may wish to use your article, and/or invite you to attend.

Timeframes for delivery of proposal and final paper

Stage 1: An initial landscape map and analysis of factors affecting influence (intended for internal government use) should be completed by 20/11/17.

Stage 2: Detailed analysis and report. We would expect a 2 page executive summary, finalised landscape map (s) and a longer report split between the four key areas (A), (B), (C) and (D) below. Completed by COP 15/12/17.

Steps	Action	Delivery Date
<i>Internal/ external peer review</i>		
1	Internal review by GO-S team and notification of approval to proceed to peer review (including 30% of full fee to author OR suggested amendments)*	20/12/2017
2	External review by independent reviewers and possibly the expert advisory board. Recommended revisions to author.*	12/01/2018
<i>Author revision and re-submission</i>		

3	Author makes revisions and submits updated paper	19/01/2018
4	Paper approved by GO-S staff *	26/01/2018
5	Paper submitted for internal clearance. Author is paid remaining fee following approval.	05/02/2018
6	Paper is published	~ 4-8 weeks following acceptance



Annex A- Author guidelines.docx

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
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
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
Commercial	AW6.2	Non-Disclosure Agreement
Price	AW5.8	Maximum Budget
-	-	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	15%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding the requirement	15%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Project Plan and Risk Management	30%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Methodology	10%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	30%

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.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](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)
- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)