Invitation to Quote

Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of the Medical Research Council

Subject UK SBS Bibliometric Data

Sourcing reference number UK SBS BLOJEU-CR16070MRC

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

UKSBS

Shared **Business** Services

Table of Contents

Section	Content

Appendix

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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 Services (CCS – previously Government Procurement Service) agree a Memorandum of Understanding with UK SBS to deliver two major procurement categories (construction and research) across Government.

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

Our Procurement ambition

Our vision is to be recognised as a centre of excellence and deliver a broad range of procurement services across the public sector; to maintain and grow a procurement service unrivalled in public sector.

Procurement is a market-shaping function. Industry derived benchmarks indicate that UK SBS is already performing at or above "best in class" in at least three key measures (percentage savings, compliant spend, spend under management) and compare well against most other measures.

Over the next five years, it is the function's ambition to lead a cultural change in procurement in the public sector. The natural extension of category management is to bring about a fundamental change in the attitude to supplier relationship management.

Our philosophy sees the supplier as an asset to the business and the route to maximising value from supply. This is not a new concept in procurement generally, but it is not a philosophy which is widely employed in the public sector.

We are ideally positioned to "lead the charge" in the government's initiative to reform procurement in the public sector.

UK SBS Procurement's unique selling points are:

- Focus on the full procurement cycle

- Leaders in category management in common and specialised areas

- Expertise in the delivery of major commercial projects

- That we are leaders in procurement to support research

- Use of cutting edge technologies which are superior to those used generally used across the public sector.

- Use of market leading analytical tools to provide comprehensive Business Intelligence

- Active customer and supplier management

'UK SBS' contribution to the Government Procurement Agenda has been impressive.   Through innovation and leadership UK SBS has built an attractive portfolio of procurement services from P2P to Strategy Category Management.'

John Collington

Former Government Chief Procurement Officer

Section 2 – About Our Customer

Medical Research Council (MRC)

The Medical Research Council is a publicly-funded organisation dedicated to improving human health.

The organisation supports research across the entire spectrum of medical sciences, in universities and hospitals, in its own units, centres and institutes in the UK, and in our units in Africa.

Supporting scientists

- Around 5,700 research staff are supported by the MRC, either employed directly in our institutes and units or funded through grants and fellowships.

- We spent £86m on training awards for postgraduate students and fellows in 2011/12, including those in the MRC's own institutes and units.

- At March 2012 there were around 1,900 MRC-funded PhD students and around 400 MRC fellows in higher education institutes and MRC research establishments.

Research examples

- The benefits of MRC research have a national and global impact; from infections in Africa, stem cell advances that can potentially combat brain and heart diseases and improvements in the design of tests for treatments. As well as more and better healthcare, medical research can lead to wider impacts; many millions more lives saved, a vastly improved quality of life and hence a more productive workforce and economic benefits to nations.

- MRC researchers have found markers for cancer cells that may help detect thousands of new cases of cancer a year. The markers are already part of an MRC-developed device that screens for cancer of the oesophagus, are being trialled for cervical cancer screening and could potentially be used in a test for bowel cancer.

- The NHS newborn hearing screening programme, introduced in 2002, improves the early detection of hearing impairment in babies, allowing earlier and more effective treatment for the 900 babies born each year in the UK with permanent hearing loss.

- An estimated 73,000 adults are living with HIV in the UK, according to 2006 figures, but around a third of those people haven't been diagnosed and don't know they're infected. Black and ethnic minority populations accounted for just over half of all 7,000 new cases in 2006. Among many other aspects of HIV research, such as the molecular basis of the condition, treatments and diagnosis, MRC scientists are also researching social and behavioural factors.

http://www.mrc.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	**Medical Research Council** 14th Floor, One Kemble Street, London, WC2B 4AN
3.2	Buyer name	Jenny Stratton
3.3	Buyer contact details	Research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£40k 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 will result in the Bid not being considered.**

Section 3 - Timescales		
3.6	Date of Issue of Contract Advert and location of original Advert	01/08/2016 Location : Contracts Finder
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	04/08/2016 14.00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	08/08/2016
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	10/08/2016 14.00
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	18/08/2016
3.11	Anticipated Award date	18/08/2016
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	22/08/2016
3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	31/10/2016

| 3.14 | Bid Validity Period | 60 Days |

Section 4 – Specification

1.   Introduction

The Medical Research Council (MRC)[1] is a publicly-funded UK organisation dedicated to improving human health.

The MRC supports research across the entire spectrum of medical sciences, in universities and hospitals, in its own units, centres and institutes in the UK, and in its units in Africa.

The MRC has four key strategic aims[2]:

- *Picking Research that Delivers* - Setting research priorities which are most likely to deliver improved health outcomes.
- *Research to People* - Bringing the benefits of excellent research to all sections of society.
- *Going Global* - Accelerating progress in international health research.
- *Supporting Scientists* - Sustaining a robust and flourishing environment for world-class medical research.

On the basis of this strategy the MRC has, through successive UK Government spending reviews, secured funding for medical research from what is now the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy[3]. The MRC Delivery Plan 2016 - 2020[4] sets out in detail how these resources will be used to progress the MRC's strategy and support Government objectives for the science budget.

In 2014/15 the MRC's gross research expenditure was £772m. The support for world-class medical research to improve human health and enhance the economic competitiveness of the UK included:

- £367m on grants and to researchers in universities, medical schools and research institutes.
- £240m on programmes within the MRC's own units and institutes, including £7m on studentships.
- £84m on programmes within university units.
- £64m on studentships and fellowships in universities, medical schools and research institutes

A primary output from MRC funded research is the publication of journal articles and reviews. Approximately 9,000 such publications are produced each year, at least in part as a result of MRC support. Analysis of these publications can provide a useful view of part of the productivity and quality of MRC research. The MRC is interested in the details of the

[1] www.mrc.ac.uk

[2] http://www.mrc.ac.uk/publications/browse/strategic-plan-2014-19/

[3] On the 14th of July the Department of Business Innovation and Skills (BIS) became the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-business-innovation-skills

[4] http://www.mrc.ac.uk/publications/browse/mrc-delivery-plan-2016-2020/

publications arising from the research it funds, the fields of research these papers focus on, the way that these publications are cited by others, and how these results compare with the output from other countries and the output from specific research organisations.

2. Aims

The MRC regularly monitors, evaluates and reports on successes and the outcomes, outputs and impact of the research support. To better understand how MRC research leads to economic, societal and academic impact, all MRC-funded researchers are required to provide feedback on the impact of their work via an online system called researchfish®[5]. These data are supplemented with additional information from other sources, such as bibliometric analysis. Combined, these datasets provide a detailed picture of the progress, productivity and quality of the science we support. This includes developing new medicines and technologies, improving clinical policies and practices, and encouraging inward investment to the UK.

The main reason for this tender exercise is to update, or if necessary replace, the bibliometric data that MRC holds on publications arising from the research it has funded since 2006.

3. Objectives

Each year the MRC asks researchers that have been funded by the MRC since 2006 to provide details of any publications that have arisen as a result of MRC funding. Researchers provide this feedback via the researchfish® system for capturing research outputs[6].

Researchfish returns were last submitted in February/March 2016, the resulting data has been checked for completeness, and a unique set of publication records assembled. The MRC requires a supplier who can:

- Match the new records of publications to an established international database of bibliographic data (the main identifier for our records is the PubMed ID (PMID). To date the MRC has had its publications matched to the Web of Science (WoS) dataset, so records often also have a UT identifier.
- Ensure all records have the fullest set of metadata available (e.g. whether papers are peer reviewed or other types of articles, full author details, author locations, open access status, funder information, identifiers such as DOI, categorisation for scientific field)
- Provide citation data for all records (number of citations, expected citations, normalised citation impact weighted for scientific field)

Provide citation data for a number of comparator organisations/countries at aggregate level.

---

4. Background to the Requirement

Previous tender exercises have resulted in bibliometric data being provided from the WoS[7] dataset, although analysis has been supported by various suppliers since 2008. MRC has no prior preference for the WoS dataset, although use of a different bibliographic database may introduce work for the supplier in matching existing records to this database using identifiers from the WoS or PubMed.

Suppliers will need to demonstrate a good understanding of the bibliographic dataset, the fields provided, the matching process, as well as the bibliometric data required. It is essential that the supplier is transparent about their methods for calculating citation impact and normalising this.

The MRC has a skilled team of 16 information analysts and research evaluation staff, that have a detailed knowledge of MRC publication data and have experience in handling Excel, Access and SQL databases to support this work. The supplier will liaise with the MRC Head of Information and Analysis, Matthew Coles, and MRC Senior Analyst, David Morgan.

5. Scope

What is included (details in the "mandatory" sections of the requirements below):

- Matching records within the MRC database of publications to a database of bibliographic information – e.g. WoS
- A short report on the success of the matching process and recommendations for improving data quality/completeness
- Returning a dataset of full bibliographic details for all these publications (as set out under "bibliographic and publication metadata" in the requirements below)
- Returning bibliometrics including citation data and normalised citation impact scores for these publications, to the end of 2015 (as set out under "citation data" in the requirements below).
- Returning a set of comparator citation data, as set out under "comparator data" in the requirements below, including a description of the approaches used to select papers by field, country and organisation.
- Documentation of the data tables provided.
- Providing documentation explaining the methods and data used to match records and calculate bibliometrics
- Updating the MRC team via regular teleconference meetings
- Receive/provide data via an FTP process or similar secure data transfer.

Additional items that would add value to the offering from the supplier (details in the "desirable" sections of requirements below):

- Bibliographic data other than the fields set out under "bibliographic and publication metadata" below (e.g. fields of research assigned to papers, categories to group author addresses, open access status of the paper)
- Information (e.g. subject categories) for the citing papers and/or for cited papers.
- Additional comparator fields, countries, or organisations.

---

[7] Web of Science http://ipscience.thomsonreuters.com/product/web-of-science/?utm_source=false&utm_medium=false&utm_campaign=false

6. Requirement

Matching records

Mandatory

In 2016 the MRC publication data can be sorted into 5 "Tiers", based on the presence or absence of a valid identifier. There are 88,000 records (Tier 1), which split into 76,000 with PMIDs and 11,000 without (Tier 2). From the table below (Tier 3) it can be seen that there were 15,500 new unique publication records captured this year which need matching to bibliographic details (10,000 of these have PMIDs). Over 72,000 records were present in the previous year of data (66,000 with PMIDs and 6,000 without), and these should already be matched to the Web of Science, or have gone as far as possible with the process of assigning other identifiers. Just 893 of the new records have no identifier of any type.

The MRC publication dataset will be provided as an Access database, or an Excel spread-sheet

Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3		Tier 4		Tier 5		
Unique Publications										
87617	Total	11273	No PMID	5692	Previous	1178	Has UT			
						6	Not abstracted/book			
						4508	Not found	2098	Has DOI	
								2410	No DOI	
				5581	New			4564	Has DOI	2
										43
								1017	No DOI	1
		76344	Has PMID							8
				66383	Previous					
				9961	New					

8

The supplier should provide a report summarising the extent of success of their matching process, in particular how many of the records that currently have no identifier could be matched, and any recommendations for improving data quality in future.

Bibliographic and publication metadata

Mandatory

For all matched records the MRC requires full bibliographic information, including:

- "document type" and definitions (used to distinguish journal articles and reviews from books, conference proceedings, editorials etc.).

---

[8] PMID – PubMed ID, DOI – Digital Object Identifier, UT – Web of Science unique article identifier.

- whether the publication is peer reviewed
- author names and addresses of all authors (and any sector coding for these locations[9]), this data to be supplied as separate tables, with the linkage being a unique identifier at the article level.
- details of funding acknowledgements (funder and grant reference number), this data to be supplied as separate tables, with the linkage being a unique identifier at the article level.

Desirable

In addition the MRC is interested in any data, other than the bibliographic record, that can also be provided by the supplier. This may include:

- one or more categories or fields of research[10] for the paper based on journal, or preferably at the level of the individual article
- categories applied to the author locations (e.g. private/public/charity sector addresses).
- Information about the open access status of the paper

Citation data

Mandatory

From the table of records above it is likely that citation data will need to be updated for between 70,000 and 80,000 records, for citations to the end of 2015.

For each MRC publication the MRC requires:

- Cumulative citation count to end of 2015
- Annual citation counts (the number of times a publication has been cited in any one year)
- Normalised citation impact, based on the journal or field of research assigned to the publication.

The supplier should provide documentation setting out clearly the tables of data they have provided, including any desirable/additional data agreed to be included. This documentation to allow the MRC to easily identify the tables, what fields the columns refer to, and the total number of records.

Desirable

In addition the MRC is interested in data on the *citing* articles, for example the field of research categories for publications citing MRC papers, for the purposes of examining the diffusion of these ideas into literature aimed at other disciplines. Data on the citing articles should be provided as a separate table, again with linkage to MRC publications at the article level.

Data on the *cited* articles referenced in MRC papers may also be of interest. This information may be used to comment on the breadth of research that the authors drew upon. Again this data would need to be provided as a separate table including linkage to MRC

---

[9] For example whether addresses are considered public or private sector
[10] For example WoS "subject categories"

publications at the article level and subject categorisations for the cited papers.

Comparator data

Mandatory

The MRC requires aggregated citation data for a number of organisation and country level comparators.

For each comparator the following data is required for the period 2009-2014 with citations to the end of 2015:

- Total number of papers
- Total citations
- Average normalised citation impact
- % uncited
- % highly cited (normalised citation impact of more than 4 times world average)
- % very highly cited (normalised citation impact of more than 8 times world average)

For country level comparators the MRC requires the data to be disaggregated into:

- health and medically relevant research
- clinical research
- biological sciences

The supplier should explain how they are to select publications in the above fields.

The MRC is interested in data from the US, Germany and France, although it has interest in proposals offering data from a wider range of countries.

For organisation comparators the MRC is interested in the following 8 institutes:

BBSRC Babraham Institute (Babraham)

Max Planck Institute for Biochemistry (MPIB)

EMBL Heidelberg Laboratory (EMBL)

The Salk Institute (Salk)

Rockefeller University (Rockefeller)

The Scripps Research Institute (TSRI)

US National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)

US National Cancer Institute (NCI)

Desirable

Suppliers can suggest providing additional comparator data (countries, organisations, and/or

fields of research).

7. Timetable

MRC data is ready to provide to the supplier immediately.

An initial teleconference should be scheduled to agree aspects noted as desirable in the requirements and to clarify any of the mandatory requirements.

Bibliometric data (citation and bibliographic data on matched records) is required as soon as possible, and no later than end of September 2016.

A teleconference should be scheduled every two weeks to update on progress toward delivery of the requirements.

Comparator data and any additional information agreed to be provided by the supplier can be delivered in October, however it is likely work to identify comparator publication records could be scheduled in parallel with the matching of MRC publications.

A final call to sign off the data provided to be scheduled in October.

Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, the Customer and any specific external stakeholders UK SBS deem required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 (5+5+6 =16÷3 = 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	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
-	-	Invitation to Quote – received on time within e-sourcing tool

Scoring criteria

Evaluation Justification Statement

In consideration of this particular requirement UK SBS has decided to evaluate Potential Providers by adopting the weightings/scoring mechanism detailed within this ITQ. UK SBS considers these weightings to be in line with existing best practice for a requirement of this type.

Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject	Maximum Marks
Price	AW5.2	Price	20%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding	25%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Methodology	25%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Project Plan and Risk Management	10%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	20%

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 x 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 x 10 = 6)

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

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

0	The Question is not answered or the response is completely unacceptable.
10	Extremely poor response – they have completely missed the point of the question.
20	Very poor response and not wholly acceptable. Requires major revision to the

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

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

Evaluator 1 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 2 scored your bid as 60

Evaluator 3 scored your bid as 40

Evaluator 4 scored your bid as 40

Your final score will (60+60+40+40) ÷ 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 x 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

DO:

7.1   Do comply with Procurement document instructions. Failure to do so may lead to disqualification.

7.2   Do provide the Bid on time, and in the required format. Remember that the date/time given for a response is the last date that it can be accepted; we are legally bound to disqualify late submissions.

7.3   Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid.   If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.

7.4   Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.

7.5   Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that typically we will release the answer to the question to all bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution

7.6   Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.

7.7   Do consider who your customer is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every customer's needs.

7.8   Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.

7.9   Do provide clear and concise contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.

7.10   Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.

7.11   Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

7.12   Do not cut and paste from a previous document and forget to change the previous details such as the previous buyer's name.

7.13   Do not attach 'glossy' brochures that have not been requested, they will not be read unless we have asked for them. Only send what has been requested and only send supplementary information if we have offered the opportunity so to do.

7.14   Do not share the Procurement documents, they are confidential and should not be shared with anyone without the Buyers written permission.

7.15   Do not seek to influence the procurement process by requesting meetings or contacting UK SBS or the Customer to discuss your Bid. If your Bid requires clarification the Buyer will contact you.

7.16   Do not contact any UK SBS staff or Customer staff without the Buyers written permission or we may reject your Bid.

7.17   Do not collude to fix or adjust the price or withdraw your Bid with another Party as we will reject your Bid.

7.18   Do not offer UK SBS or Customer staff any inducement or we will reject your Bid.

7.19   Do not seek changes to the Bid after responses have been submitted and the deadline for Bids to be submitted has passed.

7.20   Do not cross reference answers to external websites or other parts of your Bid, the cross references and website links will not be considered.

7.21   Do not exceed word counts, the additional words will not be considered.

7.22   Do not make your Bid conditional on acceptance of your own Terms of Contract, as your Bid will be rejected.

7.23   All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool may be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.

7.24   Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool.   Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered.

7.25   Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.

7.26   Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.

7.27   We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement

7.28   All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of UK SBS.

7.29   We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.30   If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.

7.31   Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.

7.32   Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public

7.33   Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.

7.34   Bidders may only amend the Contract terms if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract and UK SBS fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.

7.35   We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.

7.36   If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.

7.37   Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.

7.38   Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal UK SBS reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks UK SBS may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

7.39   All timescales are set using a 24 hour clock and are based on British Summer Time or Greenwich Mean Time, depending on which applies at the point when Date and Time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.

7.40   All Central Government Departments and their Executive Agencies and Non Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further, the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement - including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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