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# 1. Introduction

**About Citizens Advice Scotland**

Citizens Advice Scotland (CAS), our 61 member Citizen Advice Bureaux (CAB), the Citizen Advice consumer service, and the Extra Help Unit, form Scotland’s largest independent advice network. Advice provided by our service is free, independent, confidential, impartial and available to everyone. Our self-help website provides information on rights and helps people solve their problems.

We are champions for both citizens and consumers and in 2013/14 the Citizens Advice Service in Scotland helped over 330,000 clients in Scotland and dealt with over one million issues overall. In addition, the Scottish zone of our self-help website received approximately 4.2 million unique page views. In 2013/14, our Scottish CAB network recorded a financial gain for clients of over £125 million. If we paid our volunteers it would cost the service £10 million. Research by the Fraser of Allander Institute into the economic benefits of advice shows that the Scottish CAB Service contributes an annual total benefit to the common good in Scotland of nearly £170 million.

Our Citizens Advice Bureaux network, which includes telephone helpline Citizens Advice Direct, deliver frontline advice services through more than 200 service points across the country, from city centres to rural communities. This network of bureaux is staffed by a team of paid staff and nearly 2500 volunteers.

In addition the Citizens Advice consumer helpline provides a telephone service for those needing advice and information on consumer rights and helps to solve problems with consumer goods and services. Citizens Advice Scotland delivers part of this Great Britain wide service from a call centre in Stornoway, helping people in Scotland and across other parts of Great Britain.

The Extra Help Unit, through a team of telephone caseworkers based in Glasgow, helps people throughout Great Britain who have complex energy or postal complaints or are at risk of having their gas or electricity cut off who are referred though our consumer helpline, Ofgem, the Energy Ombudsman, or their local elected representative.

Citizen Advice Scotland’s simple but robust vision is paramount to all our goals:

**“*A fairer Scotland where people as citizens and consumers are empowered and their rights respected*.”**

# 2. Background

Taken together government statistics highlight the extent of poverty in Scotland and across the UK as a whole and help to illustrate the number of individuals who find themselves in precarious financial situations. In this document we use a commonly accepted definition of poverty as existing when a household is in receipt of 60 per cent or less than the UK median income[[1]](#footnote-1). The latest figures[[2]](#footnote-2) from the Department for Work and Pensions (covering 2012/13) show that, before housing costs, 9.7 million individuals across the UK live in relative poverty[[3]](#footnote-3), while in Scotland, the Scottish Government has estimated that 820,000 individuals live in relative poverty[[4]](#footnote-4).

The broader effects of poverty on society are well known to be damaging and wide ranging. The Child Poverty Action Group[[5]](#footnote-5) has identified just some of these impacts as including lower educational attainment by children from less well-off backgrounds and reduced life chances stemming from poorer health and general wellbeing.

A further consequence of poverty is that low income households often find that they pay more for goods and services simply due to their position in markets. This is known as the *poverty premium*. The notion that ‘the poor pay more’ has been around since the 1960s when American sociologist and early consumer advocate, David Caplovitz, first coined the poverty premium phrase[[6]](#footnote-6). Caplovitz showed how the options and opportunities for lower-income consumers were limited, particularly when faced with powerful door-to-door sales techniques and hire purchase agreements that sought to extract maximum profits from consumers. However, it was in 2007, in a joint briefing published by Save the Children and the Family Welfare Association, which detailed how low income households tend to pay more for essential services like energy, credit, insurance and telecommunications[[7]](#footnote-7). This led to renewed interest in the poverty premium term by poverty campaigners and policy makers alike, something which remains the case today.

Later research by Donald Hirsch for Consumer Futures, which was supported by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation[[8]](#footnote-8), found that low income consumers pay, on average, 10% more for essential goods and services compared to their better-off counterparts. This research examined the operation of markets in the utilities, communications and financial services sectors. In it four common manifestations of the poverty premium were identified along with illustrative examples of how each type impacts low income consumers[[9]](#footnote-9):

1. Consumers paying higher than average utility tariffs for a given amount of consumption:
   * Higher charges for those consumers using pre-payment meters for energy supply, as well as a failure on the part of consumers to be on the best available tariff.
2. Consumers paying more per unit of consumption because of being a low-volume user:
   * A reliance on fixed rather than per-unit charges to reward high volume use, particularly leading to low volume/low income consumers being penalised.
3. Consumers paying more because of limited financial and online capabilities:
   * An inability to take advantage of paperless billing discounts due to a lack of internet access.
4. Consumers paying high interest on consumer credit:
   * A lack of access to mainstream credit forcing low income households to turn to payday loans, rent-to-own arrangements or doorstep lending.

Hirsch’s report pinpointed the root cause of the poverty premium in these sectors to be the fact that essential regulated services are, in general, designed to benefit and attract higher income consumers. Lower income consumers are limited in their ability to counteract this because they are constrained in their consumer choices by their financial circumstances.

Indeed, some economic theory assumes that ‘free markets’ will deliver efficient outcomes for consumers and that fostering greater competition on the supply-side of the equation will deliver better and cheaper services for those on the demand-side. This is based on Adam Smith’s long-standing assertion that certain conditions need to exist to ensure that market exchange will lead to efficient outcomes. When these conditions are met, a market is said to be ‘perfectly efficient’ whereby individual self-interest will lead to benefits for all consumers. But if those conditions are not met, ‘market failure’ is said to occur, when there may be a case for government intervention to improve efficiencies and equity for consumers.

The ‘natural dynamics’ of a market economy will ensure that goods and services are available and affordable without government intervention. This assumes that suppliers will bring goods and services to market at the lowest possible price consumers are willing to pay. This view of ‘sovereign consumers’, acting as the driving force behind market allocation, is what – in theory at least – determines what is produced, how it is produced and how much it will sell for.

However, the evidence on the poverty premium suggests that market mechanisms, despite operating in today’s regulatory environment, are failing to provide adequate incentives for producers and suppliers to sufficiently meet the needs of lower income households[[10]](#footnote-10). In practice, this has meant that low income consumers have remained marginalised in the consumer landscape while producers and suppliers continue to focus on those segments of the market that are seen to be more lucrative and where consumers are better placed to take advantage of the best money-saving deals on offer.

This is not to suggest, however, that progress has not been made at tackling instances of the poverty premium whenever it has been identified. In recent years there has been movement with some businesses looking to meet the specific needs of low income consumers. The introduction of basic bank accounts[[11]](#footnote-11) is a notable example, as is reductions to the costs of energy supplied to pre-payment meter customers following an investigation by the energy regulator. In this latter example, Ofgem’s investigation found that when compared to customers who used a direct debit, prepayment meter customers were paying significantly more for their energy than it cost to supply it. The consequence was that, since 2009, energy suppliers have been required to ensure that the price paid by prepayment meter customers more closely reflects the cost of this form of energy supply when compared with direct debit and standard credit tariffs. The result was that the unit price for energy reduced for pre-payment meter customers, which while welcomed, did not equalise unit prices for pre-payment, direct debit and standard tariff consumers. In addition, the overall increases in energy prices across the same period counteracted the benefits being realised to any significant degree.

While this particular example of action by the energy regulator is not unique, in addition to the previous research, it shows how it is not sufficient to place the ‘blame’ for the poverty premium, nor its solution, with low income consumers themselves. While those on low incomes may choose more expensive goods and services, CAS suspects that these choices are constrained by the nature of markets and their regulation, and by the fact markets are designed primarily to meet the needs of higher income consumers, thereby making them less suitable or attractive for those on lower or restricted incomes.

The detriment experienced by low income consumers can be caused by a number of factors, of which the poverty premium is but one part. This can include factors that also affect higher income consumers, like limited access to markets due to geographical location or personal circumstances[[12]](#footnote-12),[[13]](#footnote-13). The Citizens Advice service, as well as regulators in the essential regulated industries, has statutory duties to take account of vulnerability and disadvantaged consumers in those sectors. This involves strengthening regulation, advocating to suppliers and giving voice to those consumers who cannot or will not speak for themselves in making choices or seeking redress when things go wrong.

Despite this and the increasing attention paid to the concept of the poverty premium in recent years, low income consumers continue to pay more for essential goods and services compared to better-off households.

The effects of the poverty premium have been studied in a number of areas including food, fuel and finance[[14]](#footnote-14) and energy[[15]](#footnote-15). Collectively this evidence has found that the poverty premium is an everyday reality for most people on low incomes. However, the poverty premium is a complex issue with many causes, consequences and, we believe, solutions. This research will, therefore, help CAS answer particular questions about how businesses, industries, governments and regulators can begin to address the unfair detriment consumers experience in markets, as described above, and what steps can be taken to change consumer behaviour so that low income consumers are guarded against unnecessarily paying more for essential goods and services.

# 3. Definition of the problem

Forthcoming research for Citizens Advice suggested that consumers have a ‘hierarchy of priorities’ in their consumer behaviour, and that the goods and services provided in regulated markets tend to be lower down their list of priorities when it comes to investing time and effort when making purchasing decisions[[16]](#footnote-16). Other research, focused particularly on consumers in vulnerable situations and/or on low incomes[[17]](#footnote-17), has attempted to segment different consumer groups as a way of understanding better their attitudes, motivations and behaviours to show the characteristics and levels of engagement different groups of consumers have in markets. With a particular focus on consumer choice and where this is limited, this and other previous research has been useful for revealing the extent to which consumers in particular groups act in similar and dissimilar ways from other groups of people, and the extent to which economic analyses alone can be limited when it comes to influencing behaviour.

Given that the poverty premium continues to be experienced by low income consumers across various consumer markets, CAS believes a new approach is needed so that a concerted effort can be made to tackle different parts of the poverty premium problem. Starting with examining the options and choices Scottish consumers make, we are interested in exploring how changes in the factors that influence consumer behaviour could mitigate the effects of the poverty premium.

Whilst recognising that there are many causes of the poverty premium, Citizens Advice Scotland therefore wishes to commission research that will determine what drives low income consumers to make the purchasing decisions they do and to understand the ways consumer behaviour might be altered so that the poverty premium can be lessened, if indeed it can be changed. We are interested in the following regulated markets that have been identified as our priorities:

* Energy companies (the Big-6, plus smaller suppliers)
* Credit providers (pay day loans, credit cards)
* Telecommunications companies (mobile, landline phone, internet)

While the above three sectors have been identified as our priorities, we would also be interested in knowing about other sectors, such as financial services (bank accounts), insurance services (life, home & car insurance) and food supply (large and small retailers), where there are relevant lessons to be learned.

# 4. Why research is necessary

Case evidence collected by Citizens Advice Scotland reveals to us that low income consumers continue to be disadvantaged by the poverty premium across a number of regulated markets. The consequence of this detriment has been well-documented, as detailed above, and mitigating its effects, in the energy market specifically, is a strategic priority for CAS. However, our own evidence reveals to us that the poverty premium is an issue much broader than just the energy sector. CAS needs to build a strong and up-to-date evidence base showing the causes, detriment and impact of the poverty premium across a number of key consumer sectors. However, we need to also learn from sectors where successful changes have been made to the benefit of vulnerable and low income consumers that could be usefully applied to the energy and other markets.

Previous research, specifically on the poverty premium, has focused on the operation of markets and instances of market failure, rather than understanding the mechanisms that enable or constrain consumer behaviour. Though a wide range of research already exists with respect to the drivers and motivators of consumer behaviour[[18]](#footnote-18), this existing literature is disparate and scattered in terms of the areas studied. In line with Citizens Advice Scotland’s strategic objective to be a strong voice for consumers, CAS would like to commission research that will create a single resource for those studying the causes and effects of the poverty premium, particularly in the regulated industries, in order to facilitate better engagement with governments, businesses, industry and regulators.

A longer-term objective is for CAS to gain recognition from key stakeholders in government, industry and regulators, that low income households suffer because of the way goods and services are marketed and delivered and to gain commitment to work toward changing business practices as a result. However, for our policy and advocacy activity to be effective we need to better understand the factors that influence consumer behaviour, including the drivers and barriers of low income consumer behaviour. By illustrating how and why low income consumers make the purchasing decisions they do, we will strengthen the case for change and provide a benchmark for future action.

In addition to deploying concrete examples of the detriment the poverty premium causes low income consumers, we also require the research to suggest creative solutions by providing a better understanding of the root causes of this disadvantage. CAS will then be in a better position to influence and persuade stakeholders, including government, regulators, retailers, suppliers and service providers of the need for action so that effects of the poverty premium can be lessened.

# 

# **5. Research objectives**

In each of the consumer markets to be studied, the research should address the following points from the perspective of consumers in Scotland:

* Examine the consumer behaviour of low income consumers in Scotland by exploring the core reasons why this group makes the purchasing decisions they do.
* Build on existing research examining Scottish low income consumers to explore the drivers of their purchasing behaviour and the barriers this group faces when attempting to access the best deals in markets, with a view to altering purchasing habits.
* Compare the consumer behaviour of low income consumers in Scotland – those in a state of relative poverty (i.e. in receipt of 60% or less of the median UK income) – with that of their Scottish counterparts in higher income deciles so that the particular behaviours and choices of Scottish low income consumers can be identified.
* Look at the interaction between low income consumers in Scotland and the companies or products they use and highlight areas of concern from the consumer point of view. (We intend to commission further research next year that will consider further the question of the poverty premium from the point of view of businesses).
* Offer insight on the extent of consumer awareness of the poverty premium in Scotland, particularly amongst Scottish low income consumers, and also on the ways in which the poverty premium burden might be lessened for this group.
* Identify key principles in which the services or products in each of the sectors identified above could be delivered in a way that lessens the burden on Scottish low income consumers.

# 6. Uses of information

* Citizens Advice Scotland will use this research to draw attention to the ways in which low income consumers in Scotland are constrained in their consumer choices and the ways in which their consumer habits might be changed to mitigate the effects of the poverty premium on them.
* We will use the research as the basis for discussions with suppliers of goods and services, as well as industry, governments and regulators, about the full range of issues causing and affecting the poverty premium and the appropriate action they might take to mitigate its existence and impacts.
* More generally we will use the research to add to the ongoing policy and advocacy work being carried out by Citizens Advice Scotland in the above consumer sectors.

# 7. Target population

Our goal is to illustrate from a macro perspective the causes and impacts of the poverty premium in the consumer markets highlighted above, while also drawing out lessons from an individual or micro perspective. We would expect, therefore, that the successful tenderer will likely approach this research with a mix of quantitative, survey-based research that is supplemented with in-depth qualitative analysis. As a result, in preparing their bids, tenderers should outline and justify how their proposed research approach will achieve an appropriate size and scope to ensure robust conclusions can be drawn.

At this initial stage we expect the target population to be:

* For the quantitative element of the research we will require a sample size of no less than 1000 individuals, which will need to be broadly representative of the profile of low/high income consumers in Scotland. We are open to a range of research methods being proposed, but given that low income consumers are less likely to have access to the internet, we would expect that face to face or telephone interviews will be more appropriate that an online survey.
* For the qualitative element of the research we would like, as a minimum, 16 focus groups to be held across Scotland. We would expect at least two focus groups to be held in each of the geographic classes identified in the Scottish Government’s eight fold Urban Rural Classification[[19]](#footnote-19) in order to gain a better understanding of the attitudes, coping strategies and habits that may be particular to low income consumers in certain regions of the country. We will require half of the focus groups to be with low income consumers and the other half with higher income consumers across a range of income deciles. The participants in each focus group should contain a range of people that broadly represents the demographic characteristics of low/high income consumers in each geographic classification, i.e. in terms of wealth, age, gender, etc. The purpose of the focus groups are to reveal in detail and compare the full range of issues consumers face in each location when participating in the markets noted above.

# 8. Anticipated approach

As outlined in the above section, we expect this research to involve both qualitative and quantitative approaches to the research methods. We ask all tenderers to outline in detail their methodological approach for achieving the research objectives, along with a justification for the proposed approach to be taken. While making comparisons with higher income consumers is an important element of the research, our main focus is low income consumers and how to tackle the poverty premium amongst this group. Details like the population of interest, data collection and sampling strategy should be clearly explained in the tenderer’s proposed research design.

For the quantitative element of the research we anticipate a survey will be most appropriate for understanding at scale the full range of issues consumers’ experience, including the causes and impacts of the poverty premium, in the markets highlighted above. The successful contractor will need to draft a suitable questionnaire. The project team at CAS will work with the successful contractor to develop this so that the research objectives will be achieved. We will require the statistical analysis to be presented in an easy to understand manner along with commentary explaining the findings in full. The raw statistical data should be provided to us in SPSS format.

For the qualitative element of the research we are suggesting focus groups, as described above, will be the most appropriate and efficient approach of eliciting in detail the experience of different consumers in the nations of GB. The successful contractor will need to draft a suitable topic guide for structuring the focus groups. The CAS project team will work with the successful contractor to develop so that the research objectives are achieved. We will require a thematic analysis using an appropriate analytical strategy and for the findings to be presented in an easy to understand manner along with detailed commentary. We will require the original transcripts to be provided to us in Microsoft Word format.

Citizens Advice Scotland will provide access to existing sources of data we hold, including our own statistics and case studies. These can be used to complement the empirical research to help achieve the research objectives and answer the research questions under investigation. In addition, we would like CAB advisers to be able to input into the research, potentially for specific surveys, interviews or focus groups, which tendering contractors should include in their bids.

# 9. Analysis required

The superficial causes and effects of the poverty premium in the consumer sectors to be studied are already well-known in existing literature. We therefore require the successful tenderer to produce an in-depth analysis of the problem from the standpoint of consumers in Scotland, with a particular focus on low income consumers.

While the specific analysis required will depend largely on the final agreed research strategy, we nonetheless expect that the eventual report will produce an analysis across the following areas in a way that high-level themes and conclusions can be identified:

* An examination of the purchasing habits of Scottish low income consumers and the drivers behind consumer choices.
* The ways in which this behaviour might be changed, if indeed it can be changed, so that the burden of the poverty premium is lessened.
* A comparison of high and low income consumer behaviour in Scotland to identify how markets operate and how different groups of consumers participate in them.
* Detail of the common concerns and problems Scottish low income consumers experience when purchasing goods and services in each of the listed consumer sectors, as well as an analysis of their experiences with firms in these areas more generally.
* The use of case studies to illustrate in more detail the points above.
* We will require a breakdown of the above by socioeconomic factors like age, gender, family size, employment status, marriage status, disability, rurality and any other categories tenderers think would be useful to include.

# 10. Deliverables

* Weekly progress reports by phone.
* A full written draft report in Microsoft Word (i.e. – not a rough version of the report, but the full report proof-read, spell-checked and sense-checked for review by CAS’ project team).
* A full written final report (one that has resolved all queries and comments in the draft report) in Microsoft Word setting out the findings with a standalone Executive Summary report and relevant appendices (including copies of questions asked).
* Where applicable, raw quantitative data in .spss and .csv formats, and original qualitative interview or focus group transcripts and recordings.
* A presentation to relevant staff members in Citizens Advice Scotland in Edinburgh to discuss the findings.

**Timescales**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Month(s)** | **Activity** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| August | Inception meeting with successful contractor |
| August – November | Fieldwork, analysis & report writing |
| December | Final report submitted |

# 

# 11. Nature of the Report

The research report will be used by a wide range of people within and outside of Citizens Advice Scotland, not just the team involved in commissioning the work.

Along with all of our research reports, it is intended to contribute to the wider knowledge of consumer behaviour and consumer concerns, not just to the immediate research problem. As such, it must be capable of being used as a secondary data source for many years after the research is completed.

For these reasons it is essential that the report:

* Uses language accessible to readers with varying experience of research and consumer behaviour.
* Contains a comprehensive description of the research method, so that the reader understands what was done and the robustness and/or limitations of the data.
* Organises and, where appropriate, reduces the data so as to lead the reader either to clear conclusions or to a discussion of the implications of the findings.
* Avoids over-summarising or over-simplifying the findings.
* Contains clearly labelled charts, diagrams and tables (if appropriate) summarising and illustrating the results, with a narrative description of what the chart, diagram or table shows – do not leave it to the reader to interpret these.
* Contains a stand-alone Executive Summary, containing a brief description of the background, objectives, method, main findings and conclusions.

Agencies are required to follow best practice in research report writing as specified in the Citizen Advice Research Report Guidelines.

# 12. Performance and quality requirements

Citizens Advice Scotland will require regular meetings, including a project initiation meeting in Edinburgh, to be held between the supplier and ourselves to ensure progress is on track and any difficulties are resolved promptly. Any anticipated shortfall in quality or similar failing shall be brought to the attention of Citizens Advice Scotland immediately.

We advise suppliers to show how they adhere to the MRS Code of Conduct or where appropriate any other professional code of conduct, or quality systems that they have in place.

Ownership of all research outcomes, including the final report and all data produced as a result of the research, resides with Citizens Advice Scotland.

Suppliers should not discuss study findings in public before a final report has been cleared by us, although with prior agreement aspects of the study may be discussed. Following publication, suppliers are free to discuss the study in public; however, we should be given the opportunity to comment on any proposed presentation or publication using data or findings from this study.

The supplier should consider the wide range of equalities issues, including public duties, and ensure that these are all given due consideration at all stages of the research process.

# 13. Evaluation criteria

Citizens Advice Scotland will make its selection on the basis of that proposal which represents the best value for money. The following criteria will apply:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criterion** | **Description** | **Weighting** |
| Technical experience | Evidence of providing similar services to other organisations and particular skills/experience relevant to the problem.  Also includes your performance on previous projects for Consumer Futures and its predecessor bodies and for Citizens Advice Scotland or Citizens Advice, our sister organisation in England & Wales. | 15% |
| Methodology / Approach | Details and suitability of suggested approach, sampling strategy and data collection method.  Plans for dealing with any risks and contingencies. | 15% |
| Understanding our business needs | Indication of a clear understanding of the problem and the research objectives. | 20% |
| Staffing / Resources | Details of any proposed staff or sub-contractors to be used for the provision of the services. | 5% |
| Implementation plan | Details of your implementation plan to meet the timescales. | 10% |
| Quality | Details of how you ensure that a high quality service is maintained throughout the contract period. | 5% |
| Price | A full breakdown of all costs should be given. | 30% |
| **Total** | | **100%** |

Tenders are evaluated by scoring against each of the above criteria using a 0-10 scale, where 0 = Clearly fails to meet the requirement and 10 = Excellent standard with no reservation at all about acceptability. The supplier with the highest overall score will be awarded the contract.

Please note that on completion of all contracts, suppliers are evaluated against these same criteria based on their performance. This post-project feedback will be considered in future tendering processes.

# 13. Form of proposal

All clarification questions must be made in writing and sent by email to Patrick Hogan ([patrick.hogan@cas.org.uk](mailto:patrick.hogan@cas.org.uk)) or Fraser Stewart ([fraser.stewart@cas.org.uk](mailto:fraser.stewart@cas.org.uk)) no later than **5pm on Wednesday 22nd July 2015**. A response to all clarification questions shall be issued to potential suppliers by Friday 24th July 2015.

Tenders must be sent by email to Patrick Hogan by **5pm on Friday 31st July 2015.**

Bidders should complete tenders in the format indicated below. All questions must be answered in full.

## Company overview and previous experience

* + Please provide a brief overview of your organisation. This must include a brief history and include detail of your capability and capacity.
  + Please provide detail of your understanding of the requirement and evidence your skills and experience for carrying out the services.
  + Please detail two case studies that evidence your ability to deliver the services required. This must include details of the brief, how you delivered the project, and the objectives that were achieved.
  + Please provide the names, addresses, and contact details of two referees that could be contacted to provide a reference of your ability to deliver the services.
  + Please declare if there is a conflict of interest in carrying out this work

## Key personnel

* + Please provide a copy of your organisation chart.
  + Please provide details of the personnel who shall be responsible for the delivery of the services. This must include a brief CV for these individuals that highlight their relevant skills and experience.

## Methodology and delivery of the services

* + Please provide a detailed methodology of how you propose to deliver the services and objectives detailed in the \*ITT/ITQ. This methodology must describe the project from end-to-end; from finalising the conception to delivery of the final report.
  + Please provide a detailed project plan for the delivery of the proposed methodology. This must clearly define who shall carry out the tasks in the plan and the number of days for completion.

## Commercial offer

* + Prices shall be quoted in pounds sterling unless otherwise stated and presented separately from the rest of the \*tender/quote in the downloadable pricing schedule. VAT, where applicable, should be shown separately as a strictly net extra charge. Please detail any other costs associated with the provision of the services under this agreement. Any costs not detailed will be deemed to have been waived.
  + Attached as part of the tender documents are the Citizens Advice Scotland’s Terms & Conditions of contract. Please confirm you acceptance to the terms. Bidders should note that failure to accept the Citizens Advice Scotland’s Terms & Conditions of contract will result in their elimination from the tender process following initial evaluation.

# 14. Procurement timetable

Citizens Advice Scotland will be working to the following timetable, but proposals should address the issue of timing and note any risks around critical points and how those risks will be mitigated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Date** |
| Issue Invitation to Tender | Tuesday 14th July |
| Closing date for clarifications questions | Wednesday 22nd July |
| Date for responses to clarification questions | Friday 24th July |
| Tenders received | Friday 31st July |
| Evaluation of tenders/quotes | Monday 3rd – Tuesday 4th August |
| Inception meeting | Friday 7th August |
| Contract commences | Wednesday 12th August |
| Draft final report due | Friday 13th November |
| Final report due | Friday 4th December |
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