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# Section 1: The Invitation

This procurement is being carried out by Defra group Commercial in accordance with the Open Procedure as set out in the Public Contract Regulations 2015 (PCR) on behalf of Core Defra.

The Bidder Pack comes in **two** parts:

The **first part**, **The Core Requirements**, provides details of the General Requirements, Government Transparency Agenda and Government Priorities.

The **second part**, **The Procurement Specific Requirements**, provides details of the Specification Requirements, Terms and Conditions of Contract, Evaluation Methodology, Procurement Timetable and Definitions.

The tendering process seeks to determine the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT). The Authority will evaluate the Tenders using the tender evaluation criteria and weightings listed in Section 4, Evaluation Methodology.

## 1.1 The Opportunity

This opportunity is advertised by Defra group Commercial on behalf of Defra’s Marine and Fisheries Team. For further information please visit: Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

**Government Transparency Agenda**

For further information on the Government Transparency Agenda visit:

[Government efficiency, transparency and accountability - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/government-efficiency-transparency-and-accountability)

The project will be managed by an Officer who sits within the Marine and Fisheries team in Defra (Senior Policy Advisor, Underwater Noise Team) with support from other specialists within the Underwater Noise Team.

Further information about this opportunity is provided in Section 2: The Specification of Requirements.

**The Authority’s Priorities**

Defra’s priority outcomes are to:

* Improve the environment through cleaner air and water, minimised waste, and thriving plants and terrestrial and marine wildlife
* Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase carbon storage in the agricultural, waste, peat and tree planning sectors to help deliver net zero.
* Reduce the likelihood and impact of flooding and coastal erosion on people, businesses, communities and the environment.
* Increase the sustainability, productivity and resilience of the agriculture, fishing, food and drink sectors, enhance biosecurity at the border and raise animal welfare standards.

## 1.2 Timetable

The timetable below is subject to change from time to time as notified by the Authority. All Tenderers will be informed via the Authority’s eSourcing System.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity Ref** | **Activity Title** | **Date (Time)** |
| 1 | Opportunity Notice published in Contracts Finder  Bidder Pack released | 21 February 2023  22 February 2023 |
| 2 | Deadline for clarification questions | 1 March 2023  1700 GMT1.2 |
| 3 | Deadline for receipt of Quotation | 5 April 2023  1700 GMT |
| 4 | Evaluation of Quotations Starts | 11 April 2023 |
| 5 | Evaluation of Quotations Ends | 18 April 2023 |
| 6 | Moderation Meeting | 19 April 2023 |
| 7 | Intended date of Contract Award | 1 May 2023 |
| 8 | Contract Award Notice | 3 May 2023 |
| 9 | Intended Contract Start Date | 3 May 2023 |
| 10 | Intended Delivery Date / Contract Duration | 12 months (estimated) |

All timescales are set using a 24-hour clock and when referring to “days” it means calendar days unless otherwise specified (for example, working days).

**Variant Tenders**

The Authority shall not accept variant Tenders.

For the avoidance of doubt, if the Authority has reserved a right to waive a requirement in this Bidder Pack and chooses to exercise such discretion, the Tender will not be considered a variant Tender.

**Abnormally Low Tenders or Pricing Anomalies**

If the Authority considers your Tender to appear abnormally low, an initial assessment will be undertaken using a comparative analysis of the pricing proposals received from all Tenderers [and the Authority’s valuation of the procurement]. If that assessment indicates that your Tender is abnormally low the Authority will request a written explanation of your Tender, or of those parts of your Tender which the Authority considers contribute to your Tender being abnormally low. The Authority reserves the right to reject your Tender if the response does not satisfactorily account for the low level of price or costs proposed.

The assessment of abnormally low tenders will be undertaken strictly in accordance with Regulation 69 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015, which outlines how abnormally low tenders must be assessed and the circumstances in which the contracting authority can reject the tender.

**Pricing Anomalies**

If in the opinion of the Authority your Tender contains any pricing anomalies (for example apparent discrepancies between the financial submission and other parts of your response) the Authority may seek clarification. If the clarification response indicates that the pricing anomaly was the result of a clear and obvious error, in the interest of fairness the resulting change will be taken into consideration. If the clarification response results in a change to the initial tendered Commercial Response and price, it will not be taken into account.

# Section 2: The Specification of Requirements

## 2.1 The Authority’s Priorities

Through the 25 Year Environment Plan, the Authority has priorities to deliver good environmental status of our seas while allowing marine industries to thrive and complete our ecologically coherent network of well-managed marine protected areas (MPAs). As part of this, the Authority will deliver on achieving good environmental status (GES) on impulsive underwater noise in UK seas through the UK Marine Strategy.

## 2.2 Scope

The Authority’s priorities are to secure a healthy natural environment; a sustainable, low-carbon economy; a thriving farming sector and a sustainable, healthy, and secure food supply.

## 2.3 Overview of Requirement

**Introduction**

In April 2022, the Government published the [British Energy Security Strategy (BESS)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/british-energy-security-strategy). This new strategy outlines how the UK will accelerate its transition towards renewable and more secure sources of energy. The ambition in the BESS is to increase deployment of offshore wind from 40GW to 50GW by 2030, with up to 5GW delivered through floating offshore wind (FLOW). This will help to meet the twin challenge of supporting our climate change commitments and providing greater energy security. The BESS commits to speeding up deployment of offshore wind without weakening environmental protections.

Underwater noise is increasing in the marine environment; a key area of concern is impulsive noise which can be generated from activities such as piling during the installation of turbine foundations. Without mitigation, these noise sources have the potential to kill, injure, and disturb a range of species.

**Commitments**

The UK Government has made commitments to limit the impacts of underwater noise, such as in the [UK Marine Strategy](https://moat.cefas.co.uk/introduction-to-uk-marine-strategy/#:~:text=The%20UK%20Marine%20Strategy%20consists%20of%20a%20simple,practical%2C%20while%20allowing%20sustainable%20use%20of%20marine%20resources.). This is the framework to achieve good environmental status (GES) in UK seas and includes measures on impulsive noise. Part 1 of the UK Marine Strategy describes that GES for underwater noise would be impulsive noise not having adverse effects on marine ecosystems and being managed to the extent that there are no significant adverse long-term affects at the population level.

**Impacts**

Marine mammals have been the focus of much research on the effects of underwater noise. Mid-frequency sound, from activities such as underwater explosions and impact piling, have been shown to cause permanent hearing loss, tissue damage and lethal injury. The sound can also result in sub-lethal effects, such as disruption of foraging which can be potentially more harmful at the population level as it can impact a larger number of marine mammals. All cetacean species are considered European Protected Species (EPS), protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, where it is an offence under UK law to cause death, injury or disturbance.

Fish have also been shown to have lethal and sub-lethal effects from impulsive sounds. Commercially important species such as mackerel have demonstrated changes in their shoaling behaviour when exposed to piling noise and Atlantic cod have been shown to have delayed migrations to spawning grounds when exposed to pile driving noise. Atlantic cod use sound to coordinate spawning and anthropogenic noise could disrupt this activity[[1]](#footnote-1). Other commercially important species such as spurdog, herring and hake have been shown to be vulnerable to impulsive noise[[2]](#footnote-2).

Since the first round of leasing for offshore wind by The Crown Estate, wind farms and wind turbines have increased in number and size. To meet the commitment of 50GW by 2030, the expected increase in construction activity will have implications for the marine environment, in particular marine mammals which are sensitive to the noise produced during construction. The size and number of turbines are expected to continue to increase into the future, with larger piles that produce more noise during piling.

**Current Approach**

Since 2019, Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) for harbour porpoise have been designated under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to maintain important habitats for this species. Through the Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies’ guidance, disturbance thresholds have been set in these SACs to prevent the favourable conditions of the habitat being lost, and therefore preventing adverse effects on the site integrity[[3]](#footnote-3). The thresholds ensure that no more that 20% of the seasonal area a day, and 10% on average over a season, is unavailable to harbour porpoise. In English waters, the Southern North Sea (SNS) SAC overlaps with current and future offshore wind developments.

Within the guidance, effective deterrence ranges (EDRs) are provided for key activities that produce impulsive noise. For example, the EDR for unabated monopiling is 26 km, whereas monopiling using noise abatement has an EDR of 15 km. For pin-piles (both with and without noise abatement), an EDR of 15km is currently set. We are interested in whether EDRs will differ depending on the threshold value set as part of the piling noise standard.

There are a range of noise abatement systems commercially available to reduce noise during piling. Some can reduce noise by at least 10 dB and up to 20 dB when multiple NASs are combined[[4]](#footnote-4).

NASs in use for offshore wind piling activities include:

* Big bubble curtains (BBC)
* Near Pile Systems such as hydro sound dampeners (net around the pile), AdBM (sound attenuation using plastic attenuators which are released around the pile) and IHC NMS (double wall steeled pipe)
* Source reduction such as the MENCK Noise Reduction Unit or the IHC pulse which soften the impact of the hammer reducing the peak force and the pile accelerations and increasing the peak duration
* Quieter foundation installation technologies such as vibration hammers which vibrate the pile into the seabed and the BLUE Hammer which uses a large mass of water to pile

**Proposed Approach and Models in Other Countries**

It is proposed that the piling noise standard would require noise emitted into the marine environment during piling to be below a set decibel limit, likely necessitating the use of noise abatement systems (NASs) or alternative installation methods. The precedent for a piling noise limit has been set in other countries such as Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands which are achieved through NASs.

For example, a decibel limit of 160 dB at 750m from the turbine is set for piling in Germany. All licences that are granted for construction in their waters will include this mandatory threshold value for underwater pile driving. In Belgium, there have been indications of a reduction in harbour porpoise avoidance in construction areas with the use of NASs to meet the decibel limit of 185 dB at 750m[[5]](#footnote-5).

The exact threshold value of the piling noise standard for England and Wales is yet to be determined, and the focus of this project is to determine what threshold value is achievable in English and Welsh waters. To achieve this, it is important to consider existing piling decibel limits in other countries, the likely anticipated noise levels from future piling projects in English and Welsh waters, the level to which NASs can reduce piling sound levels, and what an achievable decibel limit could be.

The standard will need to be piloted prior to full implementation to ensure that it is functional and NASs can lead to the decibel limit being met. It is expected that the standard would be tested with planned offshore wind piling campaigns. To ensure the trial design is robust, the range of NASs available to developers, suitable locations and projects to test the piling noise standard, the methodology for data collection and analysis and opportunities to collaborate with developers should all be considered.

**2.4 Project aim:**

This project will investigate the feasibility of introducing an offshore wind piling noise standard (decibel limit) in English and Welsh waters and design a robust and scientific pilot programme to trial the piling noise standard.

**2.5 Project scope:**

This project will cover all English and Welsh waters, not limited to protected areas, and with interest in all marine species. Priority should be given to marine mammals and harbour porpoise due to their high sensitivity to impulsive noise. Attention should also be given to fish species sensitive to impulsive noise.

Only offshore wind pile driving will be in scope. The project will support the development of a decibel limit, and the design of at-sea trials. Other work is ongoing by Defra to determine how this will be regulated and managed.

**2.6 Overarching Objectives**

**Part 1: Future piling noise scenarios**

**Objective 1:**

Review the available information on the generator size and associated foundations (e.g., pile diameter) for current and planned projects for offshore wind installation, with consideration of how current trends may change in the future. This should include expected increases in turbine generator size, and if this will affect foundation types.

A review of foundation types, including both piled foundations and quieter foundation installation technologies should be included with the key considerations for how foundation types are chosen.

**Objective 2:**

Using the information obtained in Objective 1, identify piling scenarios that could reasonably be expected in the next 10 years. Potential hammer energies required to install the foundations identified in Objective 1 should be considered. Piling scenarios should include potential sound levels to be produced during pile installation and characteristics such as frequency spectrum. Scenarios should also consider single and multiple piling events at the same time within a project and clusters of developments simultaneous piling at multiple projects. Marine species that would be sensitive to noise in the identified frequency spectrums should be highlighted. Consideration of factors that could influence hammer energy and how sound propagates such as environmental conditions should be included in the piling scenarios.

**Objective 3:**

Undertake noise propagation modelling for each of the identified piling scenarios and predict injury ranges for key marine species in English and Welsh waters, with priority given to marine mammals and focus on sensitive fish species. Up to ten key species should be presented to Defra for review prior to modelling with justification for the choice of each species. Each of the piling scenarios should be modelled at multiple locations to represent different sediment types, water depths and sea temperature. Once available, the recommendations provided through the *ORJIP Offshore Wind: Reducing conservatism in underwater noise assessments (ReCon*) project should be considered when undertaking the modelling.

**Part 2: Feasibility of applying a piling noise standard in English and Welsh waters**

**Objective 4:**

Identify available and soon-to-be available NASs and determine their applicability in English and Welsh waters. Consider whether the NAS can be effectively used in the range of conditions found throughout English and Welsh waters. This should include consideration of the spatial area different NASs can be used by reviewing depths and seabed conditions in relation to where offshore wind construction could take place. The efficacy of noise reduction and the impact on marine species should be investigated for each type of NAS, using NASs individually and in combination. Consideration should be given to current commercially available NASs, and ones expected on the market within the timeframe (10 years) of the future piling scenarios identified in objective 2. The factors and findings in Verfuss *et al*, 2019[[6]](#footnote-6) should be considered.

**Objective 5:**

Using the data collected in Objective 3 and 4, determine whether noise levels from current and future piling in English and Welsh waters could be sufficiently reduced to meet the same decibel limit as that applied in Germany. If noise predicted to be produced from future piling cannot be reduced to the German threshold, consider how much the noise can be reduced by and make recommendations for what a feasible threshold value (dB), or multiple threshold values, would be for piling in English and Welsh waters.

Undertake noise propagation modelling of the feasible threshold value(s) on the piling scenarios identified in Objective 3 and analyse the effect the threshold value could have on marine species. Based on the species identified, predict injury ranges, and propose EDRs for the threshold value(s) in English and Welsh waters.

**Objective 6:**

Investigate the feasibility of imposing a decibel limit in English and Welsh waters. Consideration should be given to whether the threshold value would be realistically achievable in English and Welsh waters, including the availability and cost of NASs required, expected lead in times of equipment, if the use of NASs changes the installation time of piles and how the cost of using NAS compares to costs associated with construction being delayed to avoid cumulative noise impacts.

**Objective 7:**

Based on the findings of the project, consider the achievability of the threshold values identified (including the German threshold). They should be scored and ranked giving consideration to the ranges at which injury could occur in future piling scenarios, the effectiveness of available NASs, and the practicalities of using these systems in English and Welsh waters. For each threshold value, a suitable buffer should be calculated in the case that the threshold value is exceeded. The buffer should still allow for protections to the marine species identified in Objective 5.

**Part 3: Design a pilot programme to trial the threshold value for the piling noise standard**

**Objective 8:**

Design a pilot programme to test whether the threshold value/piling noise standard agreed and set by UK Government can be met during offshore construction in England and Wales in 2024 onwards, and to test the practicalities of implementation. This will be carried out in close collaboration with Defra and a Steering Group who will provide steer and join-up with ongoing work determining the regulatory process of the piling noise standard.

Identify suitable planned offshore wind developments at which piloting could occur, ideally in different locations representing a range of variables such as depth, substrate type, wind speed, etc. Offshore wind developers should be contacted to gauge willingness to participate in the pilot monitoring programme and, with assistance from Defra, meetings should be held to discuss participation. Where possible, in-principle agreements from developers to be involved in the pilot programme from 2024 onwards should be obtained.

Using the information collected in Objective 4, identify NASs that can be used as part of the pilot programme in English and Welsh waters to achieve the threshold value set as part of the piling noise standard. Suppliers of these NASs should be consulted to understand the lead-in times and availability for the trials. The monitoring programme should record noise from piling with and without the chosen NAS.

As part of the piling noise standard, and comparable to the German approach, developers will be required to undertake real-time noise monitoring of their pile driving activity to verify whether the threshold value has been met or exceeded. Consider how many recorders will be needed, where they will be located relative to the noise source and whether this may vary in different locations identified to reflect local conditions. Consider whether the same NAS will be used at all locations or if this will vary depending on conditions. Describe what data analysis will be undertaken and how long this will take.

In addition, consider monitoring of marine mammal responses to the piling with and without NAS, e.g., by recording cetacean vocalizations. The proposed monitoring programme will be discussed with the project Steering Group before being finalised.

In addition to monitoring the noise levels, it is important that the practicalities of adhering to the piling noise standard are also tested and for the experience of developers and operators to be captured and fed back to Defra and regulators. These include but are not limited to: ease of deploying the NASs in English and Welsh waters; ease of undertaking real-time noise monitoring of piling noise in practice and the ease of reporting this monitoring data and information back to regulators. Consider how such practicalities of adhering to the piling standard will be recorded as part of the pilot programme. Information will be provided to the successful supplier of how a piling noise standard is expected to be regulated and therefore what the requirements and practicalities of adhering to the piling noise standard are expected to be.

**Part 4: Project reporting**

**Objective 9:**

It is expected three separate draft reports (reports A, B and C) will be provided to Defra following completion of each of Parts 1, 2 and 3 respectively to allow Defra and the project Steering Group to review and provide comments. Milestones for submitting each of the draft reports to Defra for review are set out under ‘Key milestones’ below.

A final report compiling all three draft reports should then be produced at the end of the project. Given the anticipated detail and length of the project report, detail can be provided within annexes. The results of the project will be presented to Defra and the Steering Group at the end of the project. The successful supplier may also be asked to present findings from the project at a future stakeholder meeting.

**2.7 Key deliverables**

The output of this project is a final written report of publishable quality supplemented by annexes. The final report is to include the results and recommendations of the objectives listed in the outline of work. Results of the project will be presented to Defra and the Steering Group at the end of the project. The successful supplier may also be asked to present findings from the project at a future stakeholder meeting.

It is expected that the supplier will hold regular meetings with Defra to update on the progress of the project. The frequency of these meetings will be determined at the first meeting between Defra and the supplier but should be no less than fortnightly.

A Steering Group to guide the project will be established, with meeting frequency to be determined during the first meeting between Defra and the supplier.

Work is ongoing to design other Offshore Wind Environmental Standards (OWES) for a range of other receptors and impacts, led by Defra’s OWES project manager. It is expected the supplier will work with Defra’s OWES project manager and their associated colleagues to ensure this project aligns with the wider OWES programme of work.

**2.8 Required Skills:**

You must have the following skills in order to undertake the proposed project:

* Understanding of the offshore wind sector and underwater noise impacts from pile-driving.
* Skilled in noise propagation modelling and environmental science.
* Knowledge of the relevant regulatory frameworks and energy and marine environment legislation across the UK.
* Ability to take on board, and be led by, feedback from the Steering Group.
* Resources to deliver to short deadlines.
* Strong project management skills to ensure that deliverables are produced on time and of the highest quality.
* The ability to critically analyse evidence and identify and explain the underlying limitations/drawbacks.
* Strong drafting and reporting writing skills, including the ability to communicate coplex technical information to a mixed audience.

**2.9 Timeline:**

Contract award date is 1st May 2023. The Contract start date is 3 May 2023.

We expect the project duration to be twelve months in duration.

**2.10 Price, Fee Schedule and Payments:**

The project will be let on a fixed price basis (excluding VAT). This is an all-inclusive price for the contract and, so long as the scope of the contract remains the same, it is not subject to any review, amendment, or alteration.

Tenderers should provide a breakdown showing the allocation of resources across different components of the project by all key individual members of the proposed team. A pricing schedule has been attached as **Appendix E** and should be filled out with appropriate activities required to meet the objectives of the ITT.

Tenderers should draft a pricing schedule which will provide information on daily rates, overheads, and other related costs for carrying out the work.

Proposals should include a suggested invoicing schedule based on milestones identified in the programme of work.

A payment schedule will be linked to the delivery of a proposed programme of works which can be found in the table below.

**2.11 Milestone Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Task:** | **Task and Deliverable** | **Responsible Party** | **Completion Date** | **Payment Schedule** |
| 1 | Inception meeting | The Contractor | 29 May 2023 | **0%** |
| 2 | Part 1: Presentation of findings to Defra and draft report A submitted to Defra for comments. | The Contractor | 31 August 2023 | **0%** |
| 3 | Part 2: Presentation of findings to Defra and draft report B submitted to Defra for comments. | The Contractor | 31 October 2023 | **0%** |
| 4 | Part 3: Presentation of findings to Defra and draft report C submitted to Defra for comments. | The Contractor | 28 February 2024 | **50%** |
| 5 | Draft final report (Part 4) compiling revised versions of draft reports A-C into a single report with annexes. Submitted to Defra for comments. | The Contractor | 30 April 2024 | **0%** |
| 6 | Completed final report, having taken into account all comments, submitted to Defra. | The Contractor | 2 May 2024 | **50%** |

**2.12 Quality:**

Tenderers should demonstrate how they will ensure high quality is maintained in carrying out the project, including any formal internal quality control procedures.

DEFRA requires the opportunity to comment on draft final reports. The appointed contractor will be responsible for ensuring both the quality of the work as well as the presentation of the material (e.g., proof reading, ensuring clear English).

Any New Intellectual Property Rights created under the Contract is owned by the Authority. The Authority gives the Supplier a licence to use any Existing IPRs for the purpose of fulfilling its obligations under the Contract and a perpetual, royalty-free, non-exclusive licence to use any New IPRs.

## 2.13 Accessibility

As a public body, any product that is published within the public domain must comply with the accessibility legislation. Please ensure that where the end product is to be published, reference is made to the following requirement which can be found here.

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/publishing-accessible-documents>

2.14 Anonymised recruitment

Anonymised recruitment removes the candidate’s personal details from their application. The most common items include name, age, employee number, email address, home address, nationality, and immigration details. This supports diversity in the workforce. It helps to create a more level playing field in the assessment process.

Where procuring an opportunity that requires the provision of CVs, anonymised recruitment should be the default position.

# Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract

The Terms and Conditions of Contract for this procurement are submitted in acceptance of agreed Authority’s terms and conditions of contract.

The Terms and Conditions are split into Core Terms and Contracting Authority Terms within the Annexes / Schedules and details of the legal priority are provided by the agreed Authority’s terms and conditions of contract.

The Authority proposes to enter into Contract(s) for a maximum period of (12) months with the successful Tenderer(s) **(3 May 2023 – 2 May 2024).**

The anticipated commencement date is **3 May 2023.**

We expect the project duration to be twelve months in duration.

**3.1 Suggested Changes to Conditions of Contract**

Tenderers may raise clarification questions relating to the amendment of contract terms during the clarification period only, as specified in the Timetable, if it can be demonstrated that there is a legal or statutory reason why they cannot be accepted. Where a legal or statutory reason cannot be substantiated the Authority has the right to reject the proposed changed.

Such requests must follow the Clarifications Sought by the Tenderer process set out in the Core Requirements element of this Bidder Pack.

## 3.2 Conditions applying to the ITT

You should examine your tender response according to the ITT and related documents, ensuring it is complete prior to submitting your completed tender.

Your tender must contain sufficient information to enable the Authority to evaluate it fairly and effectively. You should ensure that you have prepared your tender fully and accurately, and that prices quoted are arithmetically correct for the units stated.

## 3.3 Acceptance of Tenders

By issuing this ITT the Authority does not bind itself to accept any bid and reserves the right not to award a contract to any supplier who submits a tender.

## 3.4 Costs

The Authority will not reimburse you for any costs and expenses incurred preparing and submitting your tender, even if the Authority amends or terminates the procurement process.

## 3.5 Mandatory Requirements

The ITT includes mandatory requirements and if you do not comply with them, your tender will not be evaluated. All mandatory requirements are set out in Atamis.

## 3.6 Clarifications

The Authority reserves the right to discuss, confidentially, any aspect of your tender with you prior to any award of Contract to clarify matters.

## 3.7 Amendments

The Authority may amend the ITT at any time prior to the deadline for receipt. If it amends the ITT, the Authority will notify you in writing and may extend the deadline for receipt in order to give you a reasonable time in which to take the amendment into account.

# Section 4: Evaluation Methodology

The overall aim of the evaluation process is to select the Tender that is the most economically advantageous to the Authority, having regard to the Authority’s overall objectives and the criteria set out below.

Evaluation of Tenders comprise of the stages set out in the table below.

The Authority will carry out its evaluations of the Technical and Commercial elements according to the criteria, sub-criteria and weightings set out in the table below:

The Authority will carry out its evaluations of the Technical (70%) and Commercial (30%) elements according to the criteria, sub-criteria and weightings set out in the table below and **Appendix C**. The detailed questions and guidance are set out in the Authority’s eSourcing System.

## 4.1 Evaluation of Responses

Evaluation of Responses will be undertaken by a panel appointed by the Authority. Each panel member will first undertake an independent evaluation of the Responses applying the relevant evaluation criteria for each question. Then, a moderation meeting will be held at which the evaluation panel will reach a consensus on the marking of each question.

During the consensus meeting, the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage if the consensus view is that the Tenderer has failed to meet any minimum or mandatory requirements, and/or provided a non-compliant response.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stage** | **Section Reference** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Question Scoring/ Weighting (%)** |
| **Stage 1** | Form of Tender | This stage is not scored but if you do not upload a complete, signed and dated Form of Tender in accordance with the instructions in Atamis, your Tender will be rejected as non-compliant. | Pass/Fail |
| **Stage 2** | Selection Stage: | This stage is designed to select those Tenderers who are suitable to deliver the Authority’s requirements and will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in Sections 1 to 5 of the response form in Atamis and Part 1 of this Section 2 below (in respect of economic and financial standing and technical and professional ability).  Failure to meet the stated selection criteria will result in a Response being rejected at this stage and no further assessment of the remainder of the Response (including the Tender) pursuant to the remaining stages below will be undertaken by the Authority. | Pass/Fail |
| **Stage 3** | Technical & Professional Ability – Project Specific Requirements (Technical Questionnaire) | This stage will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the Technical Questionnaire.  Some requirements are mandatory and if you cannot provide them your Tender may be rejected.  Scored as 70% weighting of the total available score, consisting of the following breakdown of questions: | **Scored**  **E01** - **Organisation’s capacity and resource** Weighting = **10%**  **E02**– **Project management and organisation’s quality assurance**  Weighting = **10%**  **E03** – **Proposed approach to research and methodology**  Weighting = **40%**  **E04** - **Capability and Expertise of Proposed Project Team**  Weighting = **30%**  **E05 –** Sustainability  Weighting = **10%** |
| **Stage 4** | Pricing Schedule | Prices will be evaluated in accordance with criteria set out in the Pricing Schedule on the ITT and Atamis. | **Scored weighting 30%** |
| **Stage 5** | Final score / Award | **A Response which passes stage 1 and 2 will proceed to evaluation of Tenders in accordance with stages 3 to 5**  **The final score is calculated as follows:**  **Total Technical Quality Requirements will make up to a maximum of 70% of total score.**  **(Stage 3)**  **Total Price Requirements will make up to a maximum of 30% of total score. (Stage 4)**  **The most economically advantageous Tender will be the Tender with the highest final score. (‘Stage 5)** | |

1.1 Tenders will be evaluated on quality and price using the evaluation criteria set out in Atamis to determine which Tender is the most economically advantageous. The Authority will award the Contract to the Tenderer which submits the most economically advantageous tender which will be the highest scoring Tender after the weightings in clause 1.3 are applied.

1.2 Each question will be scored separately, and no reference will be made between the questions.

1.3 To ensure that the relative importance of both sets of criteria is correctly reflected in the overall score, a weighting system will be applied to the evaluation:

* the total quality scores awarded will form **70%** of the final score;
* The score awarded for price will form **30%** of the final score.

1.4 Each scoring question in the quality evaluation is given a weighting to indicate the relative importance of that question in the overall quality score. Weightings for quality scores are provided with the evaluation criteria and are detailed on Atamis for each question in the response form. The evaluation criteria for price are set out in the Pricing Schedule.

1.5 Evaluation of Tenders will be undertaken by a panel appointed by the Authority. Each panel member will first undertake an independent evaluation of the Tenders applying the relevant evaluation criteria for each question. Then, a moderation meeting will be held at which the evaluation panel will reach a consensus on the marking of each question.

1.6 Questions asked by the Authority to evaluate submission’s Technical Quality can be found on Atamis. These are repeated as Appendix C of this ITT for information purposes.

1.7 The method for scoring price can be found on Atamis.

1.8 The submissions against the Technical Quality questions E01 – E05 will be evaluated using the following scoring criteria:

## 4.2 Scoring Criteria

**Calculation Method**

**If a score of twenty (20) or less is awarded to a Tenderer’s response to any scored question the Authority may choose to reject the Tender.**

Evaluation will be based on two assessments: firstly technical/quality evaluation criteria (70%) and secondly commercial/price criteria (30%). These are detailed below.

# 4.3 Technical/Quality Evaluation Criteria (70%)

The following scoring criteria is to be used when evaluating responses to Stage 3 Technical Questionnaire. A Tenderer’s response will be assessed against the detailed criteria provided for each question E01 - E05 and be assigned a Descriptor and score from the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptor** | **Score** | **Definition** |
| Very good | 100 | Addresses all the Authority’s requirements with all the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. There are no weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority complete confidence that all the requirements will be met to a high standard. |
| Good | 70 | Addresses all the Authority’s requirements with all the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. The response contains minor weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority confidence that all the requirements will be met to a good standard. |
| Moderate | 50 | Addresses most of the requirements with most of the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. The response contains moderate weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority confidence that most of the requirements will be met to a suitable standard. |
| Weak | 20 | Substantially addresses the requirements but not all and provides supporting information that is of limited or no relevance or a methodology containing significant weaknesses and therefore raises concerns for the Authority that the requirements may not all be met. |
| Unacceptable | 0 | No response or provides a response that gives the Authority no confidence that the requirement will be met. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Weighting** | **Assessed from:** |
| **E01: Organisation’s capacity and resource** | **10%** | Brief outline of organisation; please explain how you manage your workflow capacity and staff resources particularly in peak periods.  Your evidence should include measures you have in place to ensure critical delivery.  Please confirm that staff resources are available to complete the entire contract in the timescales required, as shown in the ITT.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * ability to deliver this project to time   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E01 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |
| **E02: Project management and organisation’s quality assurance** | **10%** | Please outline your approach to managing the project, in terms of project structure and provision for communication with the Authority. You should include a work plan demonstrating adequate time for review of deliverables.  Provide a risk register that assesses risks to the successful delivery of the project and explains how the risks will be mitigated. Explain how you would handle unexpected events and what systems you have in place to deal with these.  You should outline how you plan to keep Defra informed of progress made and alert the Project Officer at the earliest opportunity of any difficulties encountered e.g., milestone dates at risk.  Please also indicate the level of input and guidance you require from the Project Officer and Steering Group.  Please outline your planned project management and internal governance for this project. You should also describe your organisation’s approach to project management and how this is implemented.  Please outline Quality Assurance measures and processes to ensure quality of research and outputs delivered.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Simple, transparent management structure, with named individuals and clear accountability * How the team will be managed, particularly if managing a multidisciplinary team or a consortium * The level of input required from Defra * The organisation’s approach to project management and how this will be used to deliver the project deliverables on time, to the expected quality and to budget * A risk register that demonstrates an understanding of the likely challenges and issues faced with suitable mitigation strategies * Resilience for dealing with unexpected events * A credible, effective plan to keep the authority informed of progress made and any difficulties encountered * Adequate resources available for drafting report(s) and handling feedback from Defra.   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E02 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |
| **E03: Proposed approach to research and methodology** | **40%** | Please include a detailed account of your proposed project. Please detail your approach and methodology for the objectives, demonstrating a clear understanding of the requirements and consideration of issues. Please specify resources and days allocated for each activity.  Your workplan should include adequate time for the review of the deliverables.  Please use the aim and objectives as stated in the Specification of Requirement or present a clear explanation if you are considering a proposed approach and methodology.  If your proposal will deliver additional objectives or includes optional additional work packages, please clarify these and separately cost any optional work packages**.**  **Evaluation criteria:**   * An understanding of Defra’s requirements and the policy context demonstrated through the proposed approach * A robust, detailed and credible methodology for meeting or exceeding the objectives set out in the specification * A realistic and measurable deliverable workplan * A robust quality assurance plan that demonstrates how the quality of inputs and outputs will be ensured * Clearly demonstrate the key issues, challenges and risks that your organisation is proposing to address in this project * Provide a description of how each piece of work will be delivered:   + how the work will be conducted in order to ensure that those objectives and steps are met in a transparent and robust fashion;   + how data will be managed, particularly in accordance with Data Protect legislation. * A work plan and detailed programme with key deliverable dates   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E03 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |
| **E04: Capability and Expertise of Proposed Project Team** | **30%** | Brief outline of staff experience, plus CVs, of those who will be involved and outline of how much time each member of staff will spend on the research project.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Excellent understanding of the subject area that provides confidence in the Tenderer’s ability to deliver the project * Breadth and depth of expertise available within the team * How the team’s skills, knowledge and experience are relevant to meeting the project requirements * Significant relevant experience * Staff experience, skills and time (by milestone) are sufficient and appropriately allocated throughout the project, providing confidence in the quality and timeliness of delivery, as well as good value for money in the diverse range of staff and their skill sets * Success in delivering relevant projects   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11 for the outline (plus CVs). Please upload a document with the filename: “E04 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |
| **E05: Sustainability** | **10%** | The Authority has set itself challenging commitments and targets to improve the environmental and social impacts of its estate management, operation, and procurement. These support the Government’s green commitments. The policies are included in the Authority’s sustainable procurement policy statement published at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/defra-s-sustainable-procurement-policy-statement>  Within this context, please explain your approach to delivering the services and how you intend to reduce negative sustainability impacts. Please discuss the methods that you will employ to demonstrate and monitor the effectiveness of your organisation’s approach.  A “Fail” will be allocated to a response that does not demonstrate any evidence of Sustainability policies.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Demonstrate that the Tenderer has a sustainability policy in place * Provide evidence as to how the Tenderer will reduce the environmental impacts of delivering this contact.   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11 for the outline (plus CVs). Please upload a document with the filename: “E05 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |

# 4.4 Commercial/Price Evaluation Questions (30%)

Please complete the pricing schedule, providing prices in £ Sterling excluding VAT. Please detail any risks and assumptions made and what has been included in the prices and list any additional expected expenses separately. Indicate if VAT will apply to your services and at what rate. We welcome applications from individual organisations or from consortia.

Tenderers are required to submit a total fixed cost for completion of the project and include a breakdown of costs against each task (Please see Milestones Table) and against key personnel. Costs will need to be reasonable and competitive and offer value for money.

When completing the pricing schedule (**Appendix E**) Tenderers should ensure they provide the total fixed cost and a breakdown of costs for each task.

Prices submitted should not include any pricing assumptions and should detail exactly what has been included in the price submitted. Any assumptions should be clarified during the clarification period.

## 4.5 Evaluation

For both elements, providing the bidder has met any mandatory criteria and minimum quality thresholds, the total weighted scores are calculated as follows:

**Technical (WT)**

Bidder’s Total Technical Score

Highest Technical Score

X 100 = X

then

X

100

X [Weighting]

**Commercial (WC)**

Lowest Commercial Score

Bidder’s Total Commercial Score

X

100

then

X [Weighting]

X 100 = X

The Total Score (weighted) is then calculated by adding the Total Weighted Technical Score to the Total Weighted Commercial Score: **WT+ WC**.

**\*Please Note:**

Tenderers must be aware that all bids are **submitted** in acceptance of agreed Defra terms and conditions of contract. Any clarifications regarding terms and conditions must be discussed & agreed during the tender period. No discussion of terms and conditions of contract shall be held following tender submission. Failure to agree with the terms and conditions of contract post tender shall result in a bid being deemed non-compliant.

**4.6 Evaluation of Responses**

Evaluation of Responses will be undertaken by a panel appointed by the Authority. Each panel member will first undertake an independent evaluation of the Responses applying the relevant evaluation criteria for each question. Then, a moderation meeting will be held at which the evaluation panel will reach a consensus on the marking of each question.

During the consensus meeting, the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage if the consensus view is that the Tenderer has failed to meet any minimum or mandatory requirements, and/or provided a non-compliant response.

**4.7 Selection Questionnaire - Financial standing**

The Authority will review the economic information provided as part of the Selection Questionnaire response to evaluate a Tenderer’s economic and financial standing. The Authority’s evaluation will be based on all the information reviewed and will not be determined by a single indicator. If, based on its assessment of the information provided in a Response, the Authority decides that a Tenderer does not meet the Authority’s required level of economic standing, the Authority may:

* ask for additional information, including information relating to the Tenderer’s parent company, if applicable; and/or
* require a parent company guarantee or a performance bond.

If the Authority decides that a parent company guarantee or performance bond is required, the Authority will reject a Response if the Tenderer is unable to offer a commitment to make such provision. In addition to the information provided in a Response, the Authority may, at its discretion, consult Dun & Bradstreet reports and other credit rating or equivalent reports depending on where a Tenderer is located.

The Authority’s assessment of economic and financial standing will consider financial strength and risk of business failure. Financial strength is based on tangible net worth and is rated on a scale of 5A (strongest) to H (weakest) obtained from Dun & Bradstreet. There are also classifications for negative net worth and net worth undetermined (insufficient information). Financial strength will be assessed relative to the estimated annual contract value.

The Authority will also consider annual turnover.

In the case of a joint venture or a consortium bid, the annual turnover is calculated by combining the turnover of the relevant organisations in each of the last two financial years. In addition, the annual turnover of at least one of those organisations is expected to be £[X] GBP.

Risk of Business Failure is rated on a scale of 1 (minimal) to 4 (significant) obtained from Dun & Bradstreet. There is also a classification of insufficient information. The Authority regards a score of 4 as indicating inadequate economic and financial standing for this procurement. The Authority will also calculate and evaluate the Tenderer’s:

* operating performance: growth or reductions in sales, gross profit, operating profit, profit before tax and earnings before interest, tax, depreciation, amortisation, exceptional items and profit/loss on sale of businesses;
* liquidity: net current assets, movements in cash flow from operations, working capital and quick ratios, and average collection and payments periods; and
* financial structure: gearing ratios and interest cover.

# Section 5: Appendices

## Definitions

Unless the context otherwise requires, the following words and expressions used within the Bidder Pack (except for Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract) shall have the following meanings to be interpreted in the singular or plural as the context requires.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TERM** | **MEANING** |
| **“Authority”** | the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs acting as part of the Crown |
| **“Bidder Pack”** | this invitation to tender and all related documents published by the Authority and made available to Tenderers. |
| **“Contract”** | the contract (set out in Appendix B) to be entered into by the Authority and the successful Tenderer. |
| **“EIR”** | the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (as amended) together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or any Government Department in relation to those Regulations. |
| **“eSourcing system”** | eSourcing system is the eSourcing system used by the Authority for conducting this procurement, which can be found at <https://defra-family.force.com/s/Welcome> |
| **“FOIA”** | the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (as amended) and any subordinate legislation made under that Act together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or any Government Department in relation to that legislation. |
| **“Form of Tender”** | means the form contained in Annex 2 to the Procurement Specific section of the Bidder Pack which must be signed, scanned and uploaded into the Authority’s eSourcing System by the Tenderer to indicate that it understands the Tender and accepts the various terms and conditions and other requirements of participating in the exercise. |
| **“Information”** | means the information contained in the Bidder Pack or sent with it, and any information which has been made available to the Tenderer by the Authority, its employees, agents or advisers in connection with the procurement. |
| **“Involved Person”** | means any person who is either working for, or acting on behalf of, the Authority in connection with this procurement and/or the Contract including, without limitation, any officer, employee, advisor, agent, member, partner or consultant”. |
| **“Pricing Schedule”** | the form accessed via eSourcing system in which Tenderers are required to submit their pricing information as part of a Tender. |
| **“Regulations”** | the Public Contracts Regulations 2015. |
| **“Relevant Body** | means any other organisation, body or government department that is working with or acting on behalf of the Authority in connection with this procurement and/or the Contract including, without limitation, its officers, employees, advisors, agents, members, partners or consultants. |
| **“Response”** | means the information submitted in response to the Bidder Pack via the online response forms on eSourcing system including the Tenderer’s formal Tender. |
| **“Specification of Requirements”** | the Authority’s requirements set out in Section 2 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements. |
| **“Tender”** | the formal offer to provide the goods or services descibed in section 1.1 of part 1 of the Bidder Pack and comprising the responses to the questions in eSourcing system and the Pricing Schedule. |
| **“Tenderer”** | anyone responding to the Bidder Pack and, where the context requires, includes a potential tenderer. |
| **“Timetable”** | the procurement timetable set out in Section 1 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements. |

**APPENDIX A**

**FORM OF TENDER**

The Form of Tender document is located on the Authority’s eSourcing system.

It is to be printed, signed, scanned and uploaded into the Authority’s eSourcing System as instructed within the eSourcing system.

**APPENDIX B**

**AUTHORITY’S CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT**

Located on the Authority’s eSourcing system for information

**APPENDIX C**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

In line with DEFRA policy, we will be awarding a contract to the Most Economically Advantageous ITT response (MEAT).

The overall score is broken down as follows: 70% of the overall score will be awarded for technical criteria and 30% of the overall score will be awarded for commercial.

Please note responses will be assessed against demonstration of understanding of the Specification as attached above.

The technical evaluation criteria that will be used to assess responses are set out in the table below.  The Technical criteria is weighted according to its significance to the project, and this will be applied using the following scoring methodology:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Criteria** | **Scoring criteria**  **E01 - E05** will be scored using the following scoring criteria:   * **For a score of 100: Excellent** - Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a best-in-class thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full * **For a score of 70: Good** - Response is relevant and good. The response demonstrates a good understanding and provides details on how the requirements will be fulfilled * **For a score of 50: Acceptable** - Response is relevant and acceptable. The response provides sufficient evidence to fulfil basic requirements * **For a score of 20:** **Poor** - Response is partially relevant and/or poor. The response addresses some elements of the requirements but contains insufficient / limited detail or explanation to demonstrate how the requirement will be fulfilled * **For a score of 0: Unacceptable** - Nil or inadequate response. Fails to demonstrate an ability to meet the requirement   **If you score 20 or less in respect of questions E01 - E06 then you may be eliminated from the procurement.**  **If a Tenderer receives a ‘Fail’ in any of the questions on Sustainability Policy they will be eliminated from the procurement.** | |
| E01: Organisation’s capacity and resource | 10% | Brief outline of organisation; please explain how you manage your workflow capacity and staff resources particularly in peak periods.  Your evidence should include measures you have in place to ensure critical delivery.  Please confirm that staff resources are available to complete the entire contract in the timescales required, as shown in the ITT.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * ability to deliver this project to time   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E01 – Your Company Name” |
| E02: Project management and organisation’s quality assurance | 10% | Please outline your approach to managing the project, in terms of project structure and provision for communication with the Authority. You should include a work plan demonstrating adequate time for review of deliverables.  Provide a risk register that assesses risks to the successful delivery of the project and explains how the risks will be mitigated. Explain how you would handle unexpected events and what systems you have in place to deal with these.  You should outline how you plan to keep Defra informed of progress made and alert the Project Officer at the earliest opportunity of any difficulties encountered e.g., milestone dates at risk.  Please also indicate the level of input and guidance you require from the Project Officer and Steering Group.  Please outline your planned project management and internal governance for this project. You should also describe your organisation’s approach to project management and how this is implemented.  Please outline Quality Assurance measures and processes to ensure quality of research and outputs delivered.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Simple, transparent management structure, with named individuals and clear accountability * How the team will be managed, particularly if managing a multidisciplinary team or a consortium * The level of input required from Defra * The organisation’s approach to project management and how this will be used to deliver the project deliverables on time, to the expected quality and to budget * A risk register that demonstrates an understanding of the likely challenges and issues faced with suitable mitigation strategies * Resilience for dealing with unexpected events * A credible, effective plan to keep the authority informed of progress made and any difficulties encountered * Adequate resources available for drafting report(s) and handling feedback from Defra.   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E02 – Your Company Name” |
| E03: Proposed approach to research and methodology | 40% | Please include a detailed account of your proposed project. Please detail your approach and methodology for the objectives, demonstrating a clear understanding of the requirements and consideration of issues. Please specify resources and days allocated for each activity.  Your workplan should include adequate time for the review of the deliverables.  Please use the aim and objectives as stated in the Specification of Requirement or present a clear explanation if you are considering a proposed approach and methodology.  If your proposal will deliver additional objectives or includes optional additional work packages, please clarify these and separately cost any optional work packages**.**  **Evaluation criteria:**   * An understanding of Defra’s requirements and the policy context demonstrated through the proposed approach * A robust, detailed and credible methodology for meeting or exceeding the objectives set out in the specification * A realistic and measurable deliverable workplan * A robust quality assurance plan that demonstrates how the quality of inputs and outputs will be ensured * Clearly demonstrate the key issues, challenges and risks that your organisation is proposing to address in this project * Provide a description of how each piece of work will be delivered:   + how the work will be conducted in order to ensure that those objectives and steps are met in a transparent and robust fashion;   + how data will be managed, particularly in accordance with Data Protect legislation. * A work plan and detailed programme with key deliverable dates   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11. Please upload a document with the filename: “E03 – Your Company Name” |
| E04: Capability and Expertise of Proposed Project Team | 30% | Brief outline of staff experience, plus CVs, of those who will be involved and outline of how much time each member of staff will spend on the research project.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Excellent understanding of the subject area that provides confidence in the Tenderer’s ability to deliver the project * Breadth and depth of expertise available within the team * How the team’s skills, knowledge and experience are relevant to meeting the project requirements * Significant relevant experience * Staff experience, skills and time (by milestone) are sufficient and appropriately allocated throughout the project, providing confidence in the quality and timeliness of delivery, as well as good value for money in the diverse range of staff and their skill sets * Success in delivering relevant projects   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11 for the outline (plus CVs). Please upload a document with the filename: “E04 – Your Company Name” |
| E05: Sustainability | 10% | The Authority has set itself challenging commitments and targets to improve the environmental and social impacts of its estate management, operation, and procurement. These support the Government’s green commitments. The policies are included in the Authority’s sustainable procurement policy statement published at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/defra-s-sustainable-procurement-policy-statement>  Within this context, please explain your approach to delivering the services and how you intend to reduce negative sustainability impacts. Please discuss the methods that you will employ to demonstrate and monitor the effectiveness of your organisation’s approach.  A “Fail” will be allocated to a response that does not demonstrate any evidence of Sustainability policies.  **Evaluation criteria:**   * Demonstrate that the Tenderer has a sustainability policy in place * Provide evidence as to how the Tenderer will reduce the environmental impacts of delivering this contact.   Please submit no more than 2 pages of A4, Arial, Font 11 for the outline (plus CVs). Please upload a document with the filename: “E05 – Your Company Name”  Any responses exceeding two sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. |
| **Scoring and calculation method** | **Evaluation**  The calculation used is the following:  Score = Lowest Tender Price x 30% Maximum available marks  Tender Price  For example, if three Tender Responses are received and Tenderer A has quoted £3,000 as their total price, Tenderer B has quoted £5,000 and Tenderer C has quoted £6,000 then the calculation will be as follows:  Tenderer A Score = £3000/£3000 x 30% (Maximum available marks) = 30%  Tenderer B Score = £3000/£5000 x 30% (Maximum available marks) = 18%  Tenderer C Score = £3000/£6000 x 30% (Maximum available marks) = 15% | |

**APPENDIX D**

**Commercially Sensitive Information (Attached)**

**Please re-produce and upload as an attachment on Atamis if applicable**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TENDERER’S COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION** | **POTENTIAL IMPLICATION OF DISCLOSURE** | **DURATION OF COMMERCIALLY SENSITIVE INFORMATION** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**APPENDIX E**

**PRICING SCHEDULE**

For Completion (Available on Atamis. Please upload to Atamis)

**APPENDIX F**

**Appendix F - Staff Time in Days Per Milestone Template**

For Completion (Available on Atamis. Please upload to Atamis)
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