

Should the supplier be investigated for debarment?

Overarching assessment	Risk Statement	Criteria ID	Questions	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
Should the supplier be investigated for debarment?	The more contracts a supplier holds or could hold that are higher value, complex, high risk contracts and the greater number of contracting authorities those contracts are with, the greater the supplier's public procurement footprint, dependency upon the supplier and the greater risk to public procurement the supplier will pose. And therefore, the greater the likelihood that the supplier meeting an exclusion ground would present an unacceptable risk to public procurement, meaning central intervention may be appropriate.	1	<b>Scale of public procurement exposure</b>	Data available indicates that any one of the following applies:  The supplier supplies non-central contracting authorities only (other than NHS or Local Authorities);  The supplier's public contract portfolio of live contracts: has > 50% bronze contracts (or equivalent);  The supplier holds a single public contract valued < £75m TCV;  The supplier has bid, or is expected to bid within 24 months, for public procurement(s) valued < £50m expected TCV;  The supplier does not hold any live/extant public contract and is not known to have bid for any on-going procurements and is not expected to bid for any future procurements in the next 24 months.	Data available indicates that any one of the following applies:  The supplier supplies to no more than two central contracting authorities (government department);  The supplier supplies NHS or Local Authorities;  That the supplier's public contract portfolio of live contracts: has > 50% silver contracts (or equivalent);  The supplier holds a single public contract valued between £75 - £100m TCV;  The supplier has or is expected to bid, within 24 months, for public procurements valued between £50m and £75m expected TCV	Data available indicates that any one of the following applies:  The supplier is a cross government strategic supplier;  The supplier is being considered for cross government strategic supplier status;  The supplier supplies at least three central contracting authorities (government departments);  The supplier's public contract portfolio of live contracts: has >= 50% GOLD contracts (or equivalent);  The supplier holds a single public contract valued > £100m TCV;  The supplier is expected to bid, within 24 months, for public procurements valued > £75m expected TCV.
	If the goods, services and works that the supplier provides contribute to essential services, there is a risk that the supplier meeting an exclusion ground can present a risk to the government's ability to maintain supply of those services and the greater the likelihood that central intervention may be appropriate.	2	<b>Are the goods, services or works provided by the supplier linked to the government's ability to deliver essential services?</b>	Information available indicates that the goods/works/services the supplier provides do not contribute to the availability of essential services, including: 1. Transport, 2. Healthcare, 3. Education, 4. Financial services, 5. Food, 6. Water, 7. Energy, 8. Emergency services, 9. Telecommunications 10. Government services, 11. Security and defence.	Information available indicates that the goods/works/services the supplier provides may contribute to the availability of at least one essential service, including: 1. Transport, 2. Healthcare, 3. Education, 4. Financial services, 5. Food, 6. Water, 7. Energy, 8. Emergency services, 9. Telecommunications 10. Government services 11. Security and defence.	Information available indicates that the goods/works/services the supplier provides contributes to at least one essential service, including: 1. Transport, 2. Healthcare, 3. Education, 4. Financial services, 5. Food, 6. Water, 7. Energy, 8. Emergency services, 9. Telecommunications 10. Government services 11. Security and defence.
	If the circumstances that the case is based upon, has had an impact on national priorities (including national procurement priorities) there is a risk that continuing to award public contracts to the supplier could put these priorities at further risk and therefore, a greater likelihood that central intervention may be appropriate.	3	<b>Have the circumstances that gave rise to the exclusion ground, impacted national priorities?</b>	Information available indicates that the circumstances that gave rise to the exclusion ground have not: 1. negatively impacted human welfare, including fatalities directly attributable to the event, casualties resulting from the event (including illness, injury and mental health impacts), and evacuation and shelter requirements. 2. led to changes in societal behaviour, or levels of public outrage. 3. negatively impacted essential services, including: disruption to transport, healthcare, education, financial services, food, water, energy, emergency services, telecommunications and government services. 4. caused economic damage, including numbers of working hours lost. 5. negatively impacted the environment, including damage to the environment. 6. negatively impacted security, including on law enforcement agencies, armed forces, border security, and the criminal justice system. 7. caused international impacts, including damage to the UK's international relations and ability to project soft power, disruption to international development, violation of international law and norms, and international displacement and migration.	Information available indicates that the circumstances that gave rise to the exclusion ground have, on a local scale: 1. negatively impacted human welfare, including fatalities directly attributable to the event, casualties resulting from the event (including illness, injury and mental health impacts), and evacuation and shelter requirements. 2. led to changes in societal behaviour, or levels of public outrage. 3. negatively impacted essential services, including: disruption to transport, healthcare, education, financial services, food, water, energy, emergency services, telecommunications and government services. 4. caused economic damage, including numbers of working hours lost. 5. negatively impacted the environment, including damage to the environment. 6. negatively impacted security, including on law enforcement agencies, armed forces, border security, and the criminal justice system.	Information available indicates that the circumstances that gave rise to the exclusion ground have, on a national scale: 1. negatively impacted human welfare, including fatalities directly attributable to the event, casualties resulting from the event (including illness, injury and mental health impacts), and evacuation and shelter requirements. 2. led to changes in societal behaviour, or levels of public outrage. 3. negatively impacted essential services, including: disruption to transport, healthcare, education, financial services, food, water, energy, emergency services, telecommunications and government services. 4. caused economic damage, including numbers of working hours lost. 5. negatively impacted the environment, including damage to the environment. 6. negatively impacted security, including on law enforcement agencies, armed forces, border security, and the criminal justice system;  OR  the circumstances has caused international impacts, including damage to the UK's international relations and ability to project soft power, disruption to international development, violation of international law and norms, and international displacement and migration.
	The greater the negative reponse to the applicable circumstances, the greater risk that a decision not to investigate the supplier or continuing to award public contracts to the supplier that is found to be excluded/excludable could lead to the trust in GCF and public procurement being undermined and/or government's ability to deliver public services to be questioned. Therefore, a greater likelihood that central intervention may be appropriate.	4	<b>Public trust in Procurement</b>	The circumstances of the case and the decision not to investigate, are unlikely to attract public and/or media attention and generate concern that could meaningfully undermine public trust in public procurement.	The circumstances of the case and the decision not to investigate, are likely to generate or have generated some level of public and/or media interest that could undermine public trust in public procurement.  (this could be indicated by evidence of potential or emerging scrutiny, such as FOI requests, pressure group activity, PM questions, media and press, as examples).	The circumstances of the case and the decision not to investigate, are highly likely to attract significant, sustained or international public scrutiny, such that failing to investigate would seriously undermine trust in public procurement at a systemic level.  (this could be indicated by widespread, persistent media coverage at a national or international level, large-scale public mobilisation (campaigns, formal complaints etc.), FOI requests, pressure group activity, PM questions, media and press, as examples).