

Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of UK Research & Innovation (UKRI)
Subject: Innovation to Commercialisation of University Research (ICURE) –
Evaluation of the Programme
Sourcing Reference Number: CR18144



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

Version 3.3

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	Appendix A – ICURe Evaluation – Final Evaluation Report

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

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

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

UK Research and Innovation

Operating across the whole of the UK and with a combined budget of more than £6 billion, UK Research and Innovation represents the largest reform of the research and innovation funding landscape in the last 50 years.

As an independent non-departmental public body UK Research and Innovation brings together the seven Research Councils (AHRC, BBSRC, EPSRC, ESRC, MRC, NERC, STFC) plus Innovate UK and a new organisation, Research England.

UK Research and Innovation ensures the UK maintains its world-leading position in research and innovation. This is done by creating the best environment for research and innovation to flourish.

For more information, please visit: www.ukri.org

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	UK Research & Innovation (UKRI), Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire, SN2 1FL
3.2	Buyer name	Jenny Stratton
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Maximum value of the Opportunity	£45,000.00 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	Monday, 24 th September 2018 Location: Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	Thursday, 4 th October 2018 14.00 BST
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	Monday, 8 th October 2018
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	Thursday, 11 th October 2018 14.00 BST
3.10	Anticipated notification date of successful and unsuccessful Bids	Thursday, 18 th October 2018
3.12	Anticipated Award date	Thursday, 18 th October 2018
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	Tuesday, 23 rd October 2018
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	Friday, 29 th March 2019
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

An Economic Impact Evaluation aims to measure the impact funding has had in practice, compared to what would have happened without it, how it has been delivered and why measured outcomes were achieved.

Why do we need an evaluation process?

- To inform our internal decision making process, understanding what works to maximise impact.
- To improve future programme design.
- To provide evidence for high priority areas.
- To demonstrate that Innovate UK is delivering value for money.
- To generate evidence of what works for the Spending Review or Funding Requests

Funded by the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and Innovate UK, the £21 million ICURe project aims to help accelerate the successful commercialisation of publicly funded university research¹, via licensing agreements and spin out companies. In addition, it aims to develop entrepreneurial skills and market knowledge in a new cadre of Early Career Researchers. To date it has received 329 applications and supported 176 teams from 34 universities across the UK. The programme has seen participants create 50 new companies and 146 jobs in the UK.

This evaluation occurs in the final year of the pilot programme, almost two years on from a previous evaluation (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/icure-evaluation-of-pilot-programme>). It will inform the future scope of ICURe and the strategic direction of commercialisation activity at Innovate UK.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The evaluation will be used to assess the implementation of ICURe pilot cohorts 1-12 and provide evidence as to the suitability of the pilot for expansion and national roll-out. It is envisaged that the evaluation will be designed using a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data sources to assess the impact and process involved. These teams represent 34 Higher Education Institutes across the UK. It is intended to have an output of the key findings from the evaluation building on the 2018 report (cohorts 1-6). This report drew on in-depth research with stakeholders in the programme, analysis of management information collected, a survey of participating teams and those not awarded a place on the programme, and detailed case studies of 10 projects funded. (Report included in the Annex A).

It will involve identifying and confirming which indicators can and should be used to measure the relevant activities/outputs/outcomes and the key metrics that will be used to

¹ July 2014: £2.8m from HEFCE Catalyst funding and £400k from InnovateUK awarded to SETSquared to run the ICURe programme. SETSquared provided £719k in kind funding. InnovateUK made £6.5m in Aid for Start Ups Funding available, and provided finance for 13 spin-outs. In November 2016 BEIS gave InnovateUK an additional £1.7m to extend ICURe into 2017/18. InnovateUK committed an additional £1.37m to provide competitive grants for spin-outs in 17/18. £7.65m in 2018/2019 for 2 additional delivery partners which enabled 4 more cohorts and 4 spin out competitions

determine the impact of the ICURe programme. In addition, it should explore the pros and cons of different methods, as with the addition of cohorts will allow sample sizes to increase thus it will allow more suitability of using econometric techniques, the validity of different methods should be considered. The evaluation will also aim to consider the extent of wider impacts on customers, suppliers, competitors and others and how these might be evaluated. It is expected that the methodology for estimating these wider impacts will go beyond the use of standard techniques such as sector multipliers.

The evaluation should cover, as a minimum, the following:

- Improvement in entrepreneurial skills or intent to commercialise
- additional Gross Value Added (GVA) impact of the ICURe programme on the UK economy
- additional turnover and employment created by the ICURe programme
- additional inward investment and exports arising as a result of ICURe
- impact of ICURe on UK global competitiveness in sectors being impacted by the commercialisation of UK research against the appropriate counterfactual
- factors to consider when deciding whether the recommended methodology is suitable for deployment as well as recognising previous methodology used
- assessment of ICURe place in the wider innovation support system
- assessment of the process for delivering an expanded roll out of ICURe, which takes account of how the process has evolved over time
- Strong consideration should be given to the output of the programme in regards to licensing, as when possible the licensing potential should be captured this means all that have been granted, under application or under consideration and the volume of this.

Questions that the evaluation needs to answer

- Has the programme acted as an accelerator speeding up commercialisation processes, has the programme accelerated the likelihood or surviving or failure of those involved with?
- Has the programme enabled/create a cultural and behavioural change in creating entrepreneurial intent in the academic scene? This includes the creation of creative, innovative mind-set before Business Planning. What is the behavioural additionality?
- Has the programme improved entrepreneurial skills or the intent to commercialise, in those involved with the programme? What impact has the perception of research commercialisation had in the different universities involved?
- Success of the programme in turning research output into the marketplace or further research? This includes new ventures, product licensing, new products/services.
- What is the programme's impact to the UK economy?
 - additional Gross Value Added (GVA) impact of the ICURe programme on the UK economy
 - additional turnover and employment created by the ICURe programme, this includes salary increase of those involved with the programme and the commercialisation of research
 - additional inward investment and exports arising as a result of ICURe
- What is the value of the companies being created as part of the programme?

- Valuation of the universities shareholding in the companies created, estimated the returns back into the university.
- How has the programme had on UK global competitiveness in sectors being impacted by the commercialisation of UK research?
- What is the role and place of ICURe in the wider innovation support system?
- How does the delivery of the programme enhance its outputs/outcomes?
 - The perception from current partners i.e SetSquared and newly acquired partners
 - Perception of the programme from two new delivery partners. University of Warwick and the Queen's University of Belfast.
- How does the programme evaluate against its original aims/objectives?

3. Suggested Methodology

To date, ICURe has run 14 competitions which has attracted over 300 applications. The programme has funded 160 teams which has composed 541 participants (176 early career researchers, 165 principal investigators, 122 business advisers and 78 tech transfer officers). Of these successful teams, 60 were recommended to spin out and 50 companies have been established.

The evaluation should be designed using a mix of both quantitative and qualitative data sources to assess the impact and process improvements. The impact evaluation will provide an estimate of the size of the impact while the process evaluation will examine the channels through which impacts are made. The full impact and process evaluation will enable a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of ICURe and the delivery of the programme.

It is expected that a suitable control group will be used wherever possible to enable a more robust counterfactual in the evaluation design. Each stage of the ICURe programme process will result in successful and unsuccessful groups, which could form treatment and control groups, although other options may also be considered. Bidders should also consider the use of other data for constructing a counterfactual, such as university licensing and spin out data..

Innovate UK places great importance on assessing the additionality of impact and as part of the evaluation we are expected to observe robust techniques to estimate factors such as deadweight, displacement (product and labour market displacement should be considered), linkages and multipliers. It is expected that such analysis will go beyond self-reported impacts. The reliance on standard assumptions from the existing literature around these factors will not be considered a robust approach.

The wider spill over impacts of the ICURe programme are considered as important, since the commercialisation and application of new knowledge from project outputs form a key rationale for the investment of public money in this programme.

It is anticipated that the proposed evaluation methodology will require a combination of analytical techniques. These should include case studies, surveys of stakeholders, in-depth interviews, data linking, and econometric analysis of primary and secondary data, although it may be that not all are appropriate. We anticipate emphasis to be placed on surveys for data collection to perform a cost benefit analysis and subsequent econometric analysis to validate and extend the evidence from the pilot evaluation.

Given the nature of spin-outs and the commercialisation of research, it might be possible that those interviewed during phase 1 will not be present for re-surveying, it will be of our interest to assess the reason for their movement to other areas/sectors. The evaluation should include stakeholder interviews to assess the delivery of the programme as well as stakeholders that are involved with the wider academic and commercialisation of research outputs. It should include a survey covering cohorts 1-6 to validate the results obtained in previous rounds, and observe further realisation of impacts; as well as creating a baseline and assessing impact of cohorts 7-12. A power analysis has to be performed to assess the preferred sample sizes to obtain significant results. As part of the evaluation structure and governance it is expected to have an inception meeting to discuss the different elements of the evaluation and see the relevance and emphasis in comparison to the pilot study.

4. Deliverables

- Review of the literature around the spinout of academic research from the already published evaluation
- Revised logic model and theory of change from the already published evaluation
- Evaluation plan an approach to replicate and enhance the results of the already published pilot evaluation
- Reports are due in:
 - Deliverable 1- September 2018: Review and Update the Project Plan & Evaluation Framework already developed for the pilot evaluation. In combination with a familiarisation exercise in order to understand the policy area to better implement the evaluation plan.
 - Deliverable 2 – Early October 2018: Topic guides for interviews and survey questionnaires, with an assessment of preliminary data and secondary data sets
 - Deliverable 3 – December 2019: Draft report stating key results in an executive summary format. As well as a full draft report with annexes on survey and descriptive statistics.
 - Deliverable 4 - February 2019: Final Report to be delivered, updating deliverable 3 based on feedback and newly available information, this should also be accompanied by a set of slides highlighting key results.

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	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
Commercial	SEL3.12	Cyber Essentials
Commercial	SEL3.13	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms Part 1
Commercial	AW4.2	Contract Terms Part 2
Price	AW5.1	Maximum Budget
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria			
Evaluation Justification Statement			
In consideration of this particular requirement 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	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Approach/Methodology	30%

Quality	PROJ1.2	Staff to Deliver	10%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Understanding the Environment	25%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Timescales	15%

Evaluation of criteria

Non-Price elements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Example

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40

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

Price elements will be judged on the following criteria.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 6 – Evaluation questionnaire

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

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

PLEASE NOTE THE QUESTIONS ARE NOT NUMBERED SEQUENTIALLY

Section 7 – General Information

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

DO:

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

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

DO NOT

- 7.13 Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.
- 7.14 Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.
- 7.15 Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.
- 7.16 Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Contracting Authority to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you. All information secured outside of formal Buyer communications shall have no Legal standing or worth and should not be relied upon.
- 7.17 Do not contact any UK SBS staff or the Contracting Authority staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.18 Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.
- 7.19 Do not offer UK SBS or the Contracting Authority staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.
- 7.20 Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.
- 7.21 Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.
- 7.22 Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.
- 7.23 Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.24 Do not unless explicitly requested by the Contracting Authority either in the procurement documents or via a formal clarification from the Contracting Authority send your response by any way other than via e-sourcing tool. Responses received by any other method than requested will not be considered for the opportunity.
- 7.25 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

Some additional guidance notes

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

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

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

- 7.43 The Government introduced its new Government Security Classifications (GSC) classification scheme on the 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](#)



Appendix A – ICURe
Evaluation .pdf