

Procurement Document Library

Invitation to Quote

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

Subject **UK SBS Review of models of support for disabled students**

Sourcing reference number **BLOJEU-CR16095HEFCE**

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 North Star House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF
VAT registration GB618 3673 25
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

Section	Content
1	<u>About UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
2	<u>About our Customer</u>
3	<u>Working with UK Shared Business Services Ltd.</u>
4	<u>Specification</u>
5	<u>Evaluation model</u>
6	<u>Evaluation questionnaire</u>
7	<u>General Information</u>
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

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 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	£35,000 - £40,000 including 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	30/09/2016
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions should be received through Emptoris messaging system	06/10/2016 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all potential Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	11/10/2016
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	20/10/2016 14:00
3.10	Anticipated rejection of unsuccessful Bids date	01/11/2016
3.11	Anticipated Award date	01/11/2016
3.12	Anticipated Contract Start date	03/11/2016

3.13	Anticipated Contract End date	19/05/2017
3.14	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Introduction

The Higher Education Funding Council for England promotes and funds high quality, cost-effective teaching and research, meeting the diverse needs of students, the economy and society.

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (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. Our main role is to allocate funding from the Government to universities and colleges. The range of institutional activities that this money supports and our current policies in each area can be found on our website: <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/whatwedo/>

The Council's main office is in North Bristol and there is a second London office near Chancery Lane. We currently have around 250 permanent staff.

2. Aims

HEFCE intends to conduct a two-phase review of models of support for disabled students in the HE providers that it funds. This tender relates to the first phase, which will review current levels of support and progress towards an inclusive model. This will then inform a follow up review to assess the impact of increased HEFCE funding to support disabled students.

The review will provide evidence about how support for disabled students is currently structured and the progress institutions have already made towards an inclusive model of support for disability prior to the increase in HEFCE funding. The follow-up review will evaluate the progress made by the end of the 2017-18 academic year.

3. Objectives

The three key elements of the first phase review are:

- Analysis of current models of support from the institutional perspective.
- Analysis of planned monitoring and evaluation of changes over the 2016-17 and 2017-18 academic years and beyond.
- Quantitative analysis of the 2015-16 data for disabled students. To include student numbers and retention and success trends.

The objective is to understand the current models of support for disabled students in the sector as of the start of the 2016-17 academic year. The review will also explore how much progress the sector has made towards establishing inclusive models of support for disabled students and will establish how providers intend to monitor and evaluate their progress in further improving the inclusiveness of their provision and support over the coming academic years. It will provide a baseline against which to measure the progress made in a follow up review at the end of the 2017-18 academic year following two years of increased HEFCE

funding to support this area.

The quantitative analysis will be undertaken in house by HEFCE's Analytical Services Directorate. This may use a range of data sources including the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data on students in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance as well as those who self-report as having a disability. The analysis will provide the latest figures on disabled students numbers and student outcomes. Non-continuation data for the 2014-15 cohort will be available through the HESA data in the spring 2017 but this will not be available for the 2015-16 cohort until later. We will therefore focus on trends in retention and success over time.

We are seeking to commission external consultants to undertake the first phase of the review of models of support for disability. The review will gather views from institutions on the current models of support that they provide for disabled students and the extent to which they feel they are delivering an inclusive model of support for disability. This may cover the following areas:

- Where does strategic responsibility for supporting disabled students rest in the institution, e.g. Vice Chancellor's office, Deputy VC?
- Where is day-to-day support for disabled students managed?
- How does the main support service work with other departments e.g. academic, learning support functions, estates, accommodation etc.
- How do providers understand inclusivity and the ways in which this is manifested?
- What training, if any, is put in place for staff across the institution to support disabled students?
- What steps have providers taken to ensure that their estate is inclusive and accessible (accommodation, teaching and learning facilities)?
- What steps have providers taken to introduce and mainstream technology assisted learning e.g. lecture capture?
- What steps have providers taken to ensure that learning resources are inclusive?
- How far along do providers feel they are in providing an inclusive model of support?
- To what extent is practice disseminated across the entirety of the institution?
- How is disclosure encouraged?
- How do providers engage with the student body on issues around disability support?
- How do HE providers interact with local NHS services?
- Are providers conducting a review of disability support (in light of DSA and funding changes)?
- How are providers evaluating the effectiveness and impact of their support and monitoring student success?

4. Background to the Requirement

The number of disabled students accessing higher education has increased from just over 16,700 new entrants in 2003-04 to just over 51,300 in 2012-13. In 2014 7.2% of all full-time undergraduate students were in receipt of Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA) compared to 3.6% in 2004-05 (HESA performance indicators).

From 2016-17 Government reforms to the DSA has placed further responsibility on HE providers by making them responsible for the provision of certain levels of non-medical help, specialist accommodation and costs for various computer accessories. This requires a shift

from the medical model of support (that the DSA has to a large extent influenced through its focus on individual impairments and relevant adjustments), towards the social model of support, which assumes that barriers to success are a result of institutional processes rather than individuals and therefore promotes the development of inclusive learning and teaching practices and environments.

In the 2016 grant letter, the Government identified the development of inclusive approaches to supporting disabled students as a priority for HEFCE teaching funding. The move to an inclusive social model was also a recommendation from the recent research commissioned by HEFCE ('Support for higher education students with Specific Learning Difficulties' and 'Understanding provision for students with mental health problems and intensive support needs').

In light of this HEFCE has increased the funding for disabled students to £40m in 2016-17 from £20m in 2015-16 with the aim of supporting HE providers to move towards this model and to meet the rapid rise in students reporting disabilities, particularly mental health problems.

The level of funding is intended to remain at £40m during the 2017-18 academic year, but progress will need to be reviewed across the sector, with a view to informing how the planned Office for Students should provide support from 2018-19 onwards. In order to do this it is necessary to establish the current position against which to measure progress.

5.Scope

HEFCE is seeking bids that bring informed thinking and experience of similar evaluative work to this contract.

It will be for tenderers to put forward an appropriate and robust methodology; however some parameters and suggestions for methodology are outlined below. The list of questions (under section 3) are suggested lines of enquiry but HEFCE would welcome further suggestions in the tender document. In outlining their approach, bidders should address any ethical issues in the design and implementation of the project.

The following are suggested methodology and sampling but we would welcome other suggested approaches:

Suggested methodology for the first phase review:

- Initial in-depth discussions with a small number of providers in receipt of at least £20,000 disability funding in 2016-17 (possibly one HEI and one FEC) to understand the key issues and shape a survey for the whole sector.
- Comprehensive survey to all providers (initially heads of providers) in receipt of at least £20,000 funding from HEFCE to support disabled students in 2016-17 (120 higher education institutions and 19 further education colleges). Survey to include both qualitative and scaled quantitative questions based on initial research.
- In-depth interviews with providers from a representative sample of approximately 10 institutions. To gain a more in-depth understanding of current models of support, plans for the future and intended monitoring and evaluation methods. Sample based

on institution type, size, proportion of disabled students, HEIs and FECs, location, well-developed and less well-developed disability support services.

The analysis, which forms the basis for this ITQ, will include:

- Planning and undertaking in-depth discussions with a small number of providers initially
- design and implementation of an online survey to all relevant institutions
- planning and undertaking face-to-face interviews with a representative sample of HE providers
- data analysis and data validation
- production of a written report for HEFCE, which combines the qualitative assessment with the in-house quantitative analysis.

Tenderers should be mindful that this review will inform a follow up review at the end of a 2017-18 academic year with similar methodology.

6. Requirement

The successful contractor will be expected to deliver the following mandatory key deliverables:

- Statement of work at commencement of the project, outlining the work activities they will undertake and a clear methodology, including both phases of work. This statement of work will be discussed and refined at an inception meeting with the HEFCE Project Manager.
- Project plan and risk assessment
- Sharing of data and findings with HEFCE's Analytical Services Directorate (ASD)
- Weekly progress reports to the HEFCE Project Manager
- Interim (draft final) report
- Final report
- Raw data
- Research instruments

Bidders should consider all possible conflicts of interests and raise any problematic issues in their bid.

As a minimum, the reports should include:

- Executive summary
- Context for the review
- Method
- Analysis
- Key findings
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

The final report for the first phase of the review will need to establish any common themes emerging from the research, establish progress that providers have made in moving to

inclusive models of support and outline evaluative methods planned by providers. The report should highlight any effective practice undertaken at institutions.

The report must be written in accordance with HEFCE's corporate style. Advice and guidance on this will be made available to the successful contractor. It should include an executive summary, context, methods, analysis, conclusions (including lessons learned), and list of interviewees. The format of the reports will be agreed with HEFCE's project manager.

A separate tender will be published for the second phase of the review in 2018. The research instruments and raw data from the project are therefore included in the outputs as they will be required for the follow-up review, particularly if this is not carried out by the same supplier.

The information provided in the report to HEFCE and the rights to all other outputs of the report shall be HEFCE's property. This includes intellectual property rights and copyright.

Throughout the project, the contractor will be expected to be in regular communication with the HEFCE Project Manager to ensure that contractual obligations are being fulfilled and that the project is progressing as expected in terms of scope and time, and to ensure that any potential issues or risks are identified, monitored and managed appropriately.

7. Timetable

Milestone / deliverable	Timeframe
Inception meeting / project start	Early November 2016 (at HEFCE's offices in Bristol/London) To be arranged with successful supplier
Qualitative analysis / surveys / interviews	November 2016 – March 2017
Data validation	February - March 2017
Data-sharing with HEFCE's ASD	January-February 2017
Interim draft report	Mid-April 2017
Final report	Mid-May 2017

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 ($5+5+6=16\div3=5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
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	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding	35.00%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Project Plan and Risk Management	15.00%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Methodology	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	15.00%

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 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.
- 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.

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 (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](#)