

Invitation to Quote

**Invitation to Quote (ITQ) on behalf of The Department for Business,
Innovation & Skills (BEIS)**

**Subject UK SBS Feasibility Study - Evaluation of Executive Pay
Reforms**

Sourcing reference number BLOJEU-CR17085BEIS

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

Registered in England and Wales as a limited company. Company Number 6330639.
Registered Office Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1FF
VAT registration GB618 3673 25
Copyright (c) UK Shared Business Services Ltd. 2014

UKSBS
Shared Business Services

Table of Contents

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

Section 1 – About UK Shared Business Services

Putting the business into shared services

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

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

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

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

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

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

Our Customers

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

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

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

Section 2 – About the Contracting Authority

Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)

The Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) was created as a result of a merger between the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS), as part of the Machinery of Government (MoG) changes in July 2016.

The Department is responsible for:

- developing and delivering a comprehensive industrial strategy and leading the government's relationship with business;
- ensuring that the country has secure energy supplies that are reliable, affordable and clean;
- ensuring the UK remains at the leading edge of science, research and innovation; and
- tackling climate change.

BEIS is a ministerial department, supported by 46 agencies and public bodies.

We have around 2,500 staff working for BEIS. Our partner organisations include 9 executive agencies employing around 14,500 staff.

<http://www.beis.gov.uk>

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	Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)
3.2	Buyer name	Liz Vincent
3.3	Buyer contact details	research@uksbs.co.uk
3.4	Estimated value of the Opportunity	£45,000 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	28/07/2017
3.7	Latest date/time ITQ clarification questions shall be received through Emptoris messaging system	08/08/2017 14:00
3.8	Latest date/time ITQ clarification answers should be sent to all Bidders by the Buyer through Emptoris	10/08/2017
3.9	Latest date/time ITQ Bid shall be submitted through Emptoris	18/08/2017 14:00
3.11	Anticipated selection and de selections of Bids notification date	29/08/2017
3.12	Anticipated Award date	29/08/2017
3.13	Anticipated Contract Start date	31/08/2017
3.14	Anticipated Contract End date	30/11/2017
3.15	Bid Validity Period	60 Days

Section 4 – Specification

1. Background

In 2013, government introduced legislation to increase transparency and empower shareholders on executive pay decisions. This included two key elements:

- a) The introduction of a new executive pay policy that companies must put to their shareholders at least every three years. The pay policy sets out how executives will be paid over the three years, what measures will be used to evaluate their performance and how much pay they could be awarded.
- b) New reporting provisions in the annual directors' remuneration report which sets out how the pay policy has been applied in practice in the previous financial year.

Shareholders currently approve the pay policy via a binding, simple majority vote and have an advisory vote on the annual remuneration report.

Impact assessments developed at the time (accessible [here](#) and [here](#)) presented the evidence supporting this policy intervention and set out the policy objectives of the reforms. The impact assessments provide further detail, but the objectives can be summarised as follows:

- Empowering shareholders by giving them real leverage on directors' pay.
- Encouraging companies to be proactive in designing pay policies which are acceptable to shareholders and respond appropriately to shareholder challenge.
- Better overall engagement between companies and shareholders.
- Promoting a stronger, clearer link between pay and performance and clamping down on rewards for mediocrity or failure, while still allowing for exceptional performance to be rewarded.
- Ultimately freeing up shareholders' time to focus on more material issues such as company strategy.
- No prior assumption that these measures will directly reduce the overall quantum of directors' pay, although a result of a stronger link between pay and performance could be that average pay levels fall or cease to rise as quickly as they have in the past.

Government has committed to carry out a Post-Implementation Review of the reforms, which will aim to assess to what extent the reform has delivered on the policy objectives. This research will help inform that Post-Implementation Review.

2017 also marks a full three year cycle since the remuneration reforms were introduced, with a second round of pay policies introduced by most companies this year. This means that now is an opportune time to conduct analysis on the effectiveness of the reforms and understand what the impacts have been.

Finally, in November 2016 the government published the [corporate governance reform green](#)

[paper](#). This set out various options for changes the UK corporate governance framework, including further reforms on executive pay. Part of the role of this study will be to help develop an evaluation strategy so that we may more robustly assess the effect of our future reforms. .

Existing research

The previous set of significant changes (pre 2013), which introduced the requirement for companies to create the “Directors’ remuneration report” (see “The Large and Medium-sized Companies and Groups (Accounts and Reports) Regulations 2008”), was evaluated by Deloitte for DTI in 2004 (accessible [here](#)).

The evaluation focused on compliance based on assessing companies annual reports. Changes to behaviour were assessed via a small scale survey (24 respondents) of shareholders and other stakeholders. However, the evaluation was not comprehensive and there was no direct engagement with companies or an assessment of the costs and benefits of implementing the set of measures.

There also exists a reasonably large body of academic research on the effects of shareholder voting rights (‘Say on Pay’) and reforms of the system within and outside the UK. The team within BEIS has had a preliminary look at this research body and created a slide-pack summarising key messages and references. The team would be happy to share this work, which could act as a starting point for this proposed work, with the successful bidder.

However, we believe there is value in conducting a more comprehensive literature review that assesses the evidence with the entire set of policy objectives in mind. The literature review would go into greater detail on the methodologies used in the existing research and assess whether common evaluation strategies can be applied to this particular reform context, or whether alternative approaches should be considered.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

Aims

1. To conduct a literature review on the effect of policies around executive pay, such as ‘Say on Pay’ or disclosure requirements, both in the UK and abroad. This would include a literature review of academic studies that have specifically reviewed the UK 2013 executive pay reforms and an identification of the evidence gaps. This would help inform our Post-Implementation review of the 2013 reforms.
2. Assess the feasibility and suitability of different evaluation techniques for assessing the effectiveness of the 2013 executive pay reforms. In doing so, the research will help inform the upcoming Post-Implementation Review of the 2013 reforms.
3. Provide options for evaluating the current set of executive pay and corporate governance reforms, for example by advising what measures will need to be put in place to be able to evaluate the future set of reforms, including what data if any, will need to be collected in advance. In doing so, the research will help BEIS in ensuring that future evaluations on corporate governance reforms are well informed, provide value for money and guide future policy development.

Objectives

The project should address the following set of questions:

- I. What can we learn from the existing literature on executive pay disclosure and on

shareholder voting on pay?

On this, the work should provide a literature review of studies on executive pay, focusing on attempts to evaluate the effect of government reforms both here and abroad.

- II. Does the existing literature suggest that the 2013 reforms have delivered on their policy objectives? What are the gaps in this evidence and how can these be filled?
- III. What approaches have been used by the existing literature to appraise the effectiveness of policies of shareholder voting policies on executive pay and can any of these approaches be applied to the UK 2013 executive pay reforms? What are the advantages and limitations of these approaches?

What methods could be used to evaluate future reforms on corporate governance and executive pay? What are the advantages and limitations of each method? What data if any should be collected and/or gathered.

3. Suggested Methodology

This piece of research does not require the collection of primary data. Instead, it should contain of two main elements:

1) Literature review

The team in BEIS has already analysed a lot of the existing research and this could be used as a starting point. However, we believe that there is merit in conducting a more comprehensive review of the literature to inform the upcoming Post-Implementation Review.

The successful bidder will need to build on the evidence provided and create a structured literature review, assessing existing evidence against the policy objectives as set out in the impact assessments at the time.

More specifically, and as set out in the aims and objectives of this specification, the literature review would:

- a) assess the impact of government policy on executive pay on outcomes such as shareholder and voter engagement, pay structures, the strength of the pay-performance link, and remuneration levels; and
- b) as part of this, place a special focus on existing research examining the impact of the 2013 reforms in the UK and provide an overview of potential evidence gaps.

2) Feasibility study

Part 1: The effectiveness of 2013 pay executive pay reforms

There exists extensive analysis and research on executive pay levels and structures. This research is not limited to theoretical work, but also includes a variety of quantitative papers. These often focus on the US, but there are also several papers utilising UK data on shareholder voting and executive remuneration.

Existing work typically struggles with causality issues, i.e. it being very difficult to establish a causal link between policy changes and any observed changes, as changes could have also been caused by macro-level developments, by changes to the market structures and by changes in societal attitudes.

The feasibility study should set and explain if, and how, different evaluation methodologies identified in the literature review could be applied to the 2013 reforms; it should assess options on how to carry out an evaluation of the 2013 reforms most effectively.

A new source of information, available for the first time since the 2013 reforms, are the new set of pay policies that most companies will have developed for the recent AGM studies. It would be helpful if the feasibility study could assess to what extent the information contained in changes to pay policies could be utilised by a potential evaluation.

Part 2: Future reforms

The feasibility study should also assess how best to carry out future evaluations on reforms on executive pay and wider corporate governance. It should provide guidance on how to carry out such evaluations and, for example, what type of data should be collected to inform such evaluations.

More specifically, the Government Green Paper identified three main areas for corporate governance reform:

- a) Executive pay. Specific issues raised were the level of shareholder engagement, complicated pay structures, the long-term pay-performance link, remuneration levels and a need to strengthen and make more visible the alignment between executive pay and wider workforce pay.
- b) Better boardroom engagement with employees and other key corporate stakeholders, in part to provide stronger assurances that directors are having regard to the full range of factors set out in section 172 of the Companies Act (2006) which specifies the duties of directors.
- c) The position of large private companies which face lower formal corporate governance and reporting standards than public companies but are often similar in size and economic significance. The Green Paper asked whether these large private companies should be expected to meet higher minimum standards of corporate governance and reporting.

The feasibility study should provide advice on how to measure and monitor changes/progress in these areas most appropriately, and what monitoring and evaluation techniques to apply to best identify where such changes have come about as a result of policy reforms (legislative changes but also 'softer' forms of reform such as code-changes). In doing so, the study would help us put the right procedures in place to evaluate the next set of reforms.

4. Deliverables

- Weekly updates on emerging findings and project progress
- Draft report following the completion of the literature review stage
- Draft final report that includes both the literature review and feasibility study.
- Quality assured publishable final report

Terms and Conditions

Bidders are to note that any requested modifications to the Contracting Authority Terms and Conditions on the grounds of statutory and legal matters only, shall be raised as a formal clarification during the permitted clarification period.

Section 5 – Evaluation model

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

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

The evaluation team may comprise staff from UK SBS, and the Contracting Authority ----- and any specific external stakeholders the Contracting Authority deems required. After evaluation the scores will be finalised by performing a calculation to identify (at question level) the mean average of all evaluators (Example – a question is scored by three evaluators and judged as scoring 5, 5 and 6. These scores will be added together and divided by the number of evaluators to produce the final score of 5.33 ($5+5+6 = 16 \div 3 = 5.33$))

Pass / fail criteria		
Questionnaire	Q No.	Question subject
Commercial	SEL1.2	Employment breaches/ Equality
Commercial	FOI1.1	Freedom of Information Exemptions
Commercial	AW1.1	Form of Bid
Commercial	AW1.3	Certificate of Bona Fide Bid
Commercial	AW3.1	Validation check
Commercial	AW4.1	Contract Terms
Price	AW5.5	E Invoicing
Price	AW5.6	Implementation of E-Invoicing
Quality	AW6.1	Compliance to the Specification
Commercial	SEL3.11	Compliance to Section 54 of the Modern Slavery Act
-	-	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	20.00%
Quality	PROJ1.1	Understanding	25.00%
Quality	PROJ1.2	Project Team and Capability to Deliver	10.00%
Quality	PROJ1.3	Methodology	35.00%
Quality	PROJ1.4	Project Plan and Risk Management	10.00%

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:

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

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: $\text{Score}/\text{Total Points}$ 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. Unless formally requested to do so by UK SBS e.g. Emptoris system failure
- 7.3 Do ensure you have read all the training materials to utilise e-sourcing tool prior to responding to this Bid. If you send your Bid by email or post it will be rejected.
- 7.4 Do use Microsoft Word, PowerPoint Excel 97-03 or compatible formats, or PDF unless agreed in writing by the Buyer. If you use another file format without our written permission we may reject your Bid.
- 7.5 Do ensure you utilise the Emptoris messaging system to raise any clarifications to our ITQ. You should note that we will release the answer to the question to all Bidders and where we suspect the question contains confidential information we may modify the content of the question to protect the anonymity of the Bidder or their proposed solution
- 7.6 Do answer the question, it is not enough simply to cross-reference to a 'policy', web page or another part of your Bid, the evaluation team have limited time to assess bids and if they can't find the answer, they can't score it.
- 7.7 Do consider who who the Contracting Authority is and what they want – a generic answer does not necessarily meet every Contracting Authority's needs.
- 7.8 Do reference your documents correctly, specifically where supporting documentation is requested e.g. referencing the question/s they apply to.
- 7.9 Do provide clear , concise and ideally generic contact details; telephone numbers, e-mails and fax details.
- 7.10 Do complete all questions in the questionnaire or we may reject your Bid.
- 7.11 Do check and recheck your Bid before dispatch.

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

DO NOT

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

Some additional guidance notes

- 7.23 All enquiries with respect to access to the e-sourcing tool and problems with functionality within the tool must be submitted to Crown Commercial Service (previously Government Procurement Service), Telephone 0345 010 3503.
- 7.24 Bidders will be specifically advised where attachments are permissible to support a question response within the e-sourcing tool. Where they are not permissible any attachments submitted will not be considered as part of the evaluation process.
- 7.25 Question numbering is not sequential and all questions which require submission are included in the Section 6 Evaluation Questionnaire.
- 7.26 Any Contract offered may not guarantee any volume of work or any exclusivity of supply.
- 7.27 We do not guarantee to award any Contract as a result of this procurement
- 7.28 All documents issued or received in relation to this procurement shall be the property of the Contracting Authority. / UKSBS.
- 7.29 We can amend any part of the procurement documents at any time prior to the latest date / time Bids shall be submitted through Emptoris.
- 7.30 If you are a Consortium you must provide details of the Consortiums structure.
- 7.31 Bidders will be expected to comply with the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.32 Bidders should note the Government's transparency agenda requires your Bid and any Contract entered into to be published on a designated, publicly searchable web site. By submitting a response to this ITQ Bidders are agreeing that their Bid and Contract may be made public
- 7.33 Your bid will be valid for 60 days or your Bid will be rejected.
- 7.34 Bidders may only amend the contract terms during the clarification period only, only if you can demonstrate there is a legal or statutory reason why you cannot accept them. If you request changes to the Contract terms without such grounds and the Contracting Authority fail to accept your legal or statutory reason is reasonably justified we may reject your Bid.
- 7.35 We will let you know the outcome of your Bid evaluation and where requested will provide a written debrief of the relative strengths and weaknesses of your Bid.
- 7.36 If you fail mandatory pass / fail criteria we will reject your Bid.
- 7.37 Bidders are required to use IE8, IE9, Chrome or Firefox in order to access the functionality of the Emptoris e-sourcing tool.
- 7.38 Bidders should note that if they are successful with their proposal the Contracting Authority reserves the right to ask additional compliancy checks prior to the award of

any Contract. In the event of a Bidder failing to meet one of the compliancy checks the Contracting Authority may decline to proceed with the award of the Contract to the successful Bidder.

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

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

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

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

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

USEFUL INFORMATION LINKS

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