



# Mini Competition

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

**Subject UK SBS PGT Survey Development**

**Sourcing reference number FWRECR17076HEFCE Lot 5**

## Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<a href="#"><u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>
2	<a href="#"><u>About our Customer</u></a>
3	<a href="#"><u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u></a>
4	<a href="#"><u>Specification</u></a>
5	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation of Bids</u></a>
6	<a href="#"><u>Evaluation questionnaire</u></a>
7	<a href="#"><u>General Information</u></a>
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 our customers improve efficiency, generate savings and modernise.

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

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

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

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

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

## Our Customers

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

UK SBS currently manages £700m expenditure for its Customers.

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

## Section 2 – About Our Customer

### 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	Liz Vincent
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£60,000 - £90,000 (excluding VAT)
3.5	Process for the submission of clarifications and Bids	<p><b>All correspondence shall be submitted within the Emptoris e-sourcing tool. Guidance Notes to support the use of Emptoris is available <a href="#">here</a>.</b></p> <p><b>Please note submission of a Bid to any email address including the Buyer <u>will</u> result in the Bid <u>not</u> being considered.</b></p>

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Mini Competition to all Bidders	17/07/2017
3.7	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	21/07/2017 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time Mini Competition clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	25/07/2017
3.9	Latest date/time Mini Competition Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	31/07/2017 14:00
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	08/08/2017
3.11	Anticipated Award Date	08/08/2017
3.12	Anticipated Call Off Contract Start	10/08/2017

	Date	
3.13	Anticipated Call Off Contract End Date	30/11/2017
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Working Days
3.15	Framework and Lot the procurement should be based on	BIS Research & Evaluation Framework CR150025 LOT 5

## Section 4 – Specification

### **1. Introduction**

This work is being commissioned by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) on behalf of all the UK higher education funding bodies (HEFCE together with the Department for the Economy in Northern Ireland (DfENI), the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW) and the Scottish Funding Council (SFC)).

HEFCE was established in June 1992 under the terms of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 as a non-departmental public body operating within a policy and funding context set by the Government. The Council assumed responsibility for funding higher education in England on 1 April 1993. The Council's main function is to administer grant provided by the Secretary of State for Education. The Council funds education, research and the associated activities at universities and other higher education institutions (<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/>).

### **2. Aims**

The purpose of this tender is to appoint a contractor from August to October 2017 to develop proposals for the structure and content of a new UK-wide survey for taught postgraduate (PGT) students. These recommendations must be underpinned by a robust evidence base, include input from key stakeholders and reflect good practice in survey design.

### **3. Objectives**

The contractor will be expected to produce recommendations for the following:

1. Criteria for inclusion of questions in the survey
2. Survey content
3. Survey questions
4. Survey structure
5. Response scales

In developing these recommendations, we anticipate that they will seek views from students and those with relevant expertise in the higher education sector, as well as drawing on existing literature on the PGT student experience and their own expertise in survey design. To feed into the recommendations, the contractor must secure representative views and input from important stakeholders. They will also need to demonstrate how their recommendations reflect up to date good practice in social survey design and will ensure appropriate sensitivity of response measurement and data reliability and validity.

#### **4. Background to the Requirement**

The UK higher education funding bodies are developing a UK-wide feedback survey for taught postgraduate (PGT) students. Subject to consultation in 2017, our intention is to pilot this in the academic year 2018-19, with full implementation following in 2019-20.

The development of the survey is being overseen by the Postgraduate Information Steering Group (PGISG), chaired by Sue Rigby, University of Lincoln. This is a subgroup of the Student Information Advisory Group (SIAG) which advises the UK funding bodies on information and indicators in this area ([www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/roiconsult/sg/UKSIAG/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/roiconsult/sg/UKSIAG/)). The subgroup has developed initial parameters for the survey including scope and thematic content together with underlying principles.

We intend to run a formal consultation around the end of 2017 and we are now seeking to appoint a contractor to build on the work of the subgroup to develop recommendations for the structure and content of the survey which will inform consultation proposals.

#### **5. Scope**

The purpose of this work is to develop proposals for the structure and content of the survey, which are underpinned by a robust evidence base, including input from key stakeholders and reflecting good practice in survey design. We envisage the contractor needing to carry out some desk-based and some primary research secure representative views and input from important stakeholders in order to arrive at a set of well-evidenced recommendations.

We intend that the survey will be completed by all those pursuing taught postgraduate courses at UK HE providers (including domestic and international students) which lead to a recognised qualification (excluding undergraduate courses which result in an enhanced award, e.g. MEng). It is likely to be run at multiple points in the year due to the diversity of patterns of study at PGT level. The operational aspects of survey delivery, such as who will deliver it and the contact methods and systems used, and publication arrangements fall outside of the scope of the contract.

The survey will be UK-wide and recommendations must reflect any country-specific needs.

The survey has three intended purposes:

- To provide information for accountability and regulatory purposes
- To support prospective PGT students in their decision making
- To provide information for providers to use to enhance learning and teaching and the student experience.

The drivers and priorities for the survey differ between countries, for example, Masters loans are an important driver for greater transparency in the English context but enhancement is a key priority in Scotland.

Reflecting its purposes, we envisage that some or all the data will be published in full, at institutional level and subject level, and potentially at a more granular level if course-level numbers and response rates support this. We are open to elements of the survey being optional and/ or for some aspects to remain unpublished for use by institutions alone.

## **6. Requirement**

### **Services required**

The contractor will be expected to produce recommendations for the following:

1. Criteria for inclusion of questions in the survey
2. Survey content
3. Survey questions
4. Survey structure
5. Response scales

In developing these recommendations, we anticipate that they will seek views from students and those with relevant expertise in the higher education sector, as well as drawing on existing literature on the PGT student experience and their own expertise in survey design. Tenders will need to demonstrate how they will ensure they secure representative views and secure input from important stakeholders. They will also need to demonstrate how their recommendations reflect up to date good practice in social survey design and will ensure appropriate sensitivity of response measurement and data reliability and validity.

1. Criteria for inclusion of questions in the survey

PGISG has developed an initial set of criteria that questions need to meet to be included in the survey. The purpose of these criteria is to ensure that the survey is developed to meet its intended purposes and to provide a framework against which to consider ongoing requests for additions to the survey. The draft criteria are underpinned by the purposes of the survey. The contractor should consider and test the appropriateness of the suggested criteria and recommend any refinements to these as a result of their research.

2. Survey content

PGISG has also suggested a list of desirable areas, or themes, to cover in the survey which are based on HEFCE in-house review of research into PGT experience and provision, and members' own expertise and experience. In addition to this, they have attempted to identify what we might be seeking to measure in each of these areas and any other considerations to take account of in question development.

The contractor should build on the work already carried out by the steering group, drawing on existing literature and input from students and those with relevant expertise within the sector, to propose a list of areas which the survey should cover and link these to the intended purposes of the survey. They should also identify through their research what is important to measure in each of these areas.

Some prioritisation of these areas may be required to arrive at the final recommendations for survey content and structure (for example to avoid the survey being overly long) and the contractor should provide the rationale for their recommendations.

### 3. Survey questions

The contractor should consider the most appropriate type and format for questions in light of its purposes, for example should these be Likert-style positive statements with which students agree/disagree, or other approaches (such as phrase completion questions). They should then suggest questions for each of the areas they have identified for inclusion in the survey, which reflect the criteria and their research into what is important to measure, including from the perspective of students. Although we will carry out in-depth cognitive testing of the survey and individual questions at a later date, it is important that the contractor endeavours to ensure that the questions proposed are understandable to students.

### 4. Survey structure

Recommendations around survey structure should take account of considerations such as:

- The optimum length for the survey
- Whether questions should be grouped and, if so, how
- Whether some proposed questions are applicable only to certain groups of students (for example, there may be questions about the dissertation that only Masters students need to complete)
- Whether there should be mandatory and optional elements of the survey
- Whether providers should be able to add their own questions

The research should explore whether there are benefits to the survey having optional elements. For example the National Student Survey currently consists of a core main questionnaire which all students answer and a set of thirteen optional 'banks' of questions, of which providers may select any number up to six to ask their students. Responses to optional bank questions are not published. If certain areas or questions are likely only to be of use for the purpose of supporting providers in enhancing their provision, the contractor may wish to recommend a similar approach to these.

### 5. Response scales

If appropriate for the type of questions recommended, the contractor should also make recommendations about the response scale to be used for the survey, bearing in mind its purposes and good practice including in relation to sensitivity to response measurement. Where they recommend the use of free-text responses they should also make recommendations about the onward use of comments captured.

#### Student engagement

It is important that we are able to demonstrate that student views are central to the development of the survey. The contractor will be expected to engage with students to:

- Ensure that the areas which they consider to be important aspects of their experience, or

might be factors when deciding on courses, are covered in the survey

- Suggested wording of questions uses terminology which resonates with them, reflects diverse views and is understandable by them<sup>1</sup>
- Understand what considerations we may want to take account of in presenting survey outcomes to inform decision making.

Where possible, students should be sought who are representative of the PGT population as a whole, with consideration being given to age, gender, ethnicity, mode of study, and should be drawn from providers in all countries of the UK. In the past, we have found online focus groups an effective way of securing UK-wide input.

### Engagement with sector

Input from PGISG, whose members have expertise both in survey design and operation and in PGT learning and teaching, has enabled us to produce some initial proposals around question criteria and survey content. We would like the contractor, however, to engage with a wider range of experts across the sector, for example through focus groups or roundtables, to ensure that the proposals on which we consult have been informed by the full breadth of perspectives. We envisage that the contractor will wish to involve some members of PGISG in these broader discussions. Tenders should include a proposed approach to sector engagement, but funding bodies will also be carrying out some informal consultation during this period which the contractors may wish to use to seek information or feedback.

### **Deliverables**

The contractor will be expected to produce a detailed report which makes recommendations in the areas outlined above and the evidence to support these recommendations. The report should explain the methodology adopted by the contractor in approaching the work and how the views of students and the sector have been taken into account. This report will need to meet HEFCE's standards for externally-produced publications.

To ensure that we have a sufficiently strong evidence base to support consultation proposals, tenderers are expected to consider and include any other work that they think should be included in order to form their recommendations, understanding that these fall under the same scope.

The contractor will also be expected to produce an interim report updating on progress and the funding bodies will wish to review outputs as the work progresses, for example the recommended criteria for inclusion of questions will need to be reviewed prior to detailed question development. Detailed timings for this will be agreed when the overall project plan is agreed with the contractor following their appointment.

### **Other requirements**

The contractor will be expected to discuss and agree their approach with the funding bodies and provide weekly updates by telephone. All materials used for research, such as questionnaires and the format of focus groups, must be approved by the funding bodies and, where appropriate, hard copy and electronic materials should be made available in Welsh. The funding bodies will advise where this is likely to be a requirement and provide translation.

---

<sup>1</sup> As noted, we will be carrying out detailed cognitive testing at a later stage of the survey development process.

We will make available the proposed themes and criteria for inclusion of questions developed with PGISG to the contractor.

If necessary to deliver all the elements of the work, we are happy to receive bids where the tenderer works in partnership with another organisation.

## **6. Timetable**

We propose awarding a four-month long contract with a start date of 1 August, 2017. The intention is that research should be completed in the first two months, with an additional two months for reporting.

Final recommendations should be available by 30 September in order to inform the funding bodies' drafting of consultation proposals, with the first draft of a final report available for review by 11 October and a final version suitable for publication by the end of October. The contractor will be expected to present their findings and proposals to up to two steering group meetings in London.

Start date	10 August 2017
Summary of findings and recommendations	11 October 2017
Presentation at steering group meeting	18 October 2017
Draft report	27 October 2017
Final report	15 November 2017
Contract end date	30 November 2017

## Section 5 – Evaluation of Bids

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

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

To maintain a high degree of rigour in the evaluation of your bid, a process of moderation will be undertaken to ensure consistency by all evaluators.

After moderation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ( $5+5+6=16\div3=5.33$ ))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW4.1	Special Terms
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

**The Response Question and Answer Document must be used by all tenderers to answer the PROJ (Quality Questions). This should then be uploaded as an attachment to PROJ1.1. This is the only document assessors will evaluate; any other method used by bidders to answer questions will not be evaluated. Scoring shall be based on 0-100 scoring methodology (as outlined below). Each question has a page limit and this should be adhered to. Any additional content provided beyond this will not be considered or scored during the evaluation process**

## 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 Mini Competition. 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	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Project context and Understanding of Requirements	15%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Methodology	30%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Skills and Expertise	15%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan	10%
Quality	PROJ1.5	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: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 20 ( $60/100 \times 20 = 12$ )

Where an evaluation criterion is worth 10% then the 0-100 score achieved will be multiplied by 10.

**Example** if a Bidder scores 60 from the available 100 points this will equate to 6% by using the following calculation: Score/Total Points available multiplied by 10 ( $60/100 \times 10 = 6$ )

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

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

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
---	--

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

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

### Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 50

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 50

Your final score will  $(60+60+50+50) \div 4 = 55$

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

The lowest price for a response which meets the pass criteria shall score 100. All other bids shall be scored on a pro rata basis in relation to the lowest price. The score is then subject to a multiplier to reflect the percentage value of the price criterion.

For example - Bid 1 £100,000 scores 100,  
 Bid 2 £120,000 differential of £20,000 or 20% remove 20% from price scores 80  
 Bid 3 £150,000 differential £50,000 remove 50% from price scores 50.  
 Bid 4 £175,000 differential £75,000 remove 75% from price scores 25.  
 Bid 5 £200,000 differential £100,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.  
 Bid 6 £300,000 differential £200,000 remove 100% from price scores 0.

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

In the example if a supplier scores 80 from the available 100 points this will equate to 40% by using the following calculation: 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.
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our Mini Competition. You should note that typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do 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 (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this Mini Competition Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the Special terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal UK SBS reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Call Off Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks UK SBS may decline to proceed with the award of the Call Off Contract to the successful Bidder.
- 7.39 All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris
- 7.40 All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

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

## USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

- [Emptoris Training Guide](#)
- [Emptoris e-sourcing tool](#)
- [Contracts Finder](#)
- [Tenders Electronic Daily](#)

- [Equalities Act introduction](#)
- [Bribery Act introduction](#)
- [Freedom of information Act](#)