



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs

[www.gov.uk/Defra](http://www.gov.uk/Defra)

## **Appendix 2 – Call-Off Procedure:**

**for The Research, Development and Evidence Framework 1**

**Tender Reference: Evidence for NBS in Emissions Trading Scheme: Understanding permanence in carbon storage.**

**Date: 03/08/2023**

## 1.0 Request for Proposal

- 1.1 The following document is to be used as a Call-Off template to be sent to all Contractors on a sub-lot by the Project Manager of the Contracting Authority for completion and return in accordance with the Call-Off procedures detailed in the Form of Agreement.

<b>Research, Development and Evidence Framework</b>				
<b>REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL</b>				
<b>Project title:</b>		<b>Understanding permanence in carbon storage.</b>		
<b>Call off Reference:</b>		RDE367		
<b>Atamis project ref (if applicable):</b>		N/A		
<b>Cost Centre Code (for admin purposes only)</b>		REDACTED		
<b>Date:</b>		31/08/2023		
<b>Contracting Authority (Defra and its arms-length bodies etc)</b>		DEFRA		
<b>Project Manager:</b>		REDACTED	<b>Phone number:</b>	N/A
<b>Authorized by:</b>		REDACTED	<b>Email:</b>	REDACTED
<b>Commercial Contact (if applicable):</b>		REDACTED		
<b>Project Start Date</b>			18/09/2023	
<b>Project Completion Date</b>			04/10/2023	
<b>For any projects over the direct award threshold, full competition is required (i.e. all contractors on the Sub-Lot are invited to quote).</b>			<b>Direct Award</b>	Y
			<b>Mini-comp</b>	N
<b>Call off from Sub-Lot number</b>			RDE 4.1	

<b>Proposal return date:</b>	15/09/2023
------------------------------	------------

**Evaluation criteria:** The quality elements below will be scored on a five-point scale at 0, 20, 50, 70 or 100 we are setting a minimum threshold of 70 (or 'good') for these criteria.

**Contractors:** Failure to meet any minimum score threshold stated will result in the bid being removed from the process with no further evaluation regardless of other quality or price scores.

<b>Quality</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>70%</b>
<b>Price</b>	<b>Weighting</b>	<b>30%</b>

**Quality Sub-Criteria Weightings: (Indicative only)**

<b>Approach &amp; Methodology</b> <i>minimum score threshold 70 will apply</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the contractor demonstrated a clear understanding of the objectives?</li> <li>Has the contractor provided a clear description of how they will address the requirements, in the required timescale including clearly justified details on the chosen methodology?</li> </ul>	<b>10</b>
---	---	-----------

<b>Proposed Staff (inc Pen Portraits) and Contractor's experience/accreditations.</b> <i>minimum score threshold 70 will apply</i>	<p><b>Research experience</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the contractor have experience undertaking evidence reviews?</li> <li>Does the contractor have an understanding of greenhouse gas removals, both engineered and nature-based, and wider understanding of natural carbon cycles, and carbon accounting?</li> </ul> <p>Does the contractor have an understanding of carbon markets and the woodland carbon code?</p> <p><b>Project team and management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the assigned team suitable, please provide a cv of staff?</li> <li>What are the roles and responsibilities and what experience do they have?</li> <li>How will the contractor ensure delivery on time?</li> </ul> <p>Note: Pen profiles and CVs should be provided in the response. CVs should be a maximum of 2 pages per member of staff.</p>	<b>20</b>
---	--	-----------

<b>Project Management (including project plan)</b> <i>minimum score threshold 70 will apply</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will the contractor ensure deliverables are completed on time?</li> <li>Has the contractor provided a project plan/ Gantt chart / timelines / deliverables?</li> </ul>	<b>20</b>
--	---	-----------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will the contractor be available to provide regular updates to Defra?</li> <li>• Will the contractor be able to coordinate with the other contractor (if applicable) to complete the project?</li> </ul>	
<b>Risk:</b> <i>minimum score threshold 70 will apply</i>	<p>Has the contractor provided clear quality assurance proposals?</p> <p>Does the contractor have secure systems in place for data sharing (e.g. cloud-based or other) in line with GDPR requirements?</p>	<b>10</b>
<b>Health &amp; Safety</b>		<b>N/A</b>
<b>Sustainability – Mandatory</b>	<p>The Authority has set itself challenging commitments and targets to improve the environmental economic 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:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/defra-s-sustainable-procurement-policy-statement">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/defra-s-sustainable-procurement-policy-statement</a></p> <p>Within this context, please briefly 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 organization’s approach for this requirement</p>	<b>10</b>

<b>Specification</b>
<b>1. Description of work required – overall purpose &amp; scope (including reporting requirements)</b>
<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>The purpose of this paper is to summarise the current evidence on the permanency of nature-based Greenhouse Gas Removals (GGRs) and how they compare to engineered GGRs in terms of the permanency of carbon storage. This will inform our approach to advocating for nature-based removals in the UK ETS. To note, we are not expecting a detailed understanding of all engineered or nature-based GGRs, but rather want to understand the characteristics of these two groups as they relate to the question of permanency of carbon storage.</p> <p><b>Background</b></p>

As set out in July 2023 Government Response to '[Developing the UK Emissions Trading Scheme](#)', the authority states that 'the UK ETS may offer an appropriate, long-term market for high quality nature-based GGRs, subject to further work to consider a range of potential issues... regarding permanence...'. The response also states that as part of market design, to create the new tradeable commodity, i.e. the GGR, the ETS Authority would have to set market eligibility requirements for a GGR project, which 'at a minimum would mean... taking into account the permanence of the removal...'.

There is a need to better understand how permanency is defined and valued in the literature and how this relates to the characteristics of nature-based versus engineered GGRs. Whilst the paper is interested in nature-based removals as a whole, of particular interest is woodland, given the UK's world leading voluntary carbon market Woodland Carbon Code, which might be eligible to enter the UK ETS given its requirements for generating high integrity carbon units. For example, in addition to the robust requirements under the WCC, woodlands in the UK are a permanent land use change, so once land has been afforested, it must remain forested.

A key area of interest is whether there is a discussion in the literature on permanency of carbon storage around the risk associated with new technologies and their durability versus the known durability of nature-based solutions. For example, woodlands have been sequestering carbon for over 350 million years, but engineered technologies are relatively new. How is this difference in tested durability discussed in the literature? How is maintenance cost discussed in permanency of carbon storage as well as embodied carbon of the 'technology', whether nature-based or engineered?

### **Research questions**

The rapid evidence review should summarise answers to the following research questions:

- a. How is permanence defined as it relates to carbon storage? How does this apply to nature-based and engineered GGRs? What are the key differences as set out in the literature? This should include a discussion of the primary methods for measuring permanency of carbon storage.
- b. How does the literature rank or characterise the permanence of carbon storage of nature-based or engineered GGRs, and what is seen as more permanent and why?
- c. In what situations might nature-based GGRs (e.g. afforestation) be seen as providing the same level of permanence (or better) than engineered?
- d. What time periods are most relevant or important for carbon storage and why?
- e. To what extent is maintenance cost described as it relates to carbon storage and maintenance, and how might this differ for nature-based versus engineered?
- f. How is risk of reversals defined and accounted for, and what does this mean for nature-based GGRs, compared to engineered? Is there any bias against nature-based GGRs?

### **Methods**

It is expected that a rapid review of evidence, including international perspectives, would be undertaken. Given the budget, we would expect around 60 to 80 papers to be

reviewed and should aim to focus in on the question of permanency as it relates to the research questions above.

**2. Required skills / experience from the contractor and staff.** Include any essential qualifications or accreditations required to undertake the work.

The contractor should have a general understanding of Defra’s objectives and forestry objectives specifically, as set out in the England Tree Action Plan.

Essential skills include:

- Experience undertaking evidence reviews
- A scientific understanding of carbon cycle in nature, ideally in woodlands,
- Understanding of greenhouse gas removals, both engineered and nature-based.
- An understanding of carbon accounting.

Non-essential, but useful additional experience includes:

- An understanding of carbon markets, including the emissions trading scheme.
- An understanding of the woodland carbon code.

**3. Proposed program of work and payment table (Detailing specific tasks, key milestones, deliverables & completion date where appropriate) **Payment schedule should detail the % amount that will be paid after delivery of each task****

Task no.	Task and deliverable	Completion date	Payment schedule
1	Inception meeting to confirm interest.	w/c 18 Sept	
2	Draft report	20 October	50% of payment upon receipt
3	Final report	17 November	Remaining payment upon receipt.

**4. Risk**

**Note:** This section is to be used to detail any risks or key elements relevant to the project i.e. Programme deliverable dates, workshops or external requirements, data, consultees, stakeholders etc that could impact the success of the project if they are not managed.

The report will help inform Defra’s stance in a consultation that is expected out at end of 2023/early 2024; therefore speed is of the essence in providing findings.

## 2.0 Proposal

2.1 The following document is to be used as a Call-Off template to be sent to all Contractors on a sub-lot for completion and return in accordance with the Call-Off procedures detailed in the Form of Agreement.

# Research, Development and Evidence Framework 2

## PROPOSAL

**Contractor's Name:** Eunomia Research & Consulting

**Call off Reference:** RDE367

**Sub-Lot Number:** RDE 4.1

**Date:** 20<sup>th</sup> September 2023

### 1. Approach & Methodology

#### 1.1 Task 1. Project Management & Inception

Eunomia starts all projects with an inception process to clarify the project requirements and align expectations. We will use the Inception Meeting to discuss our methodology, highlight any issues of project management, clarify the deliverables and confirm the project timetable. Areas for discussions include:

- The types of nature-based and engineering carbon storage engineered Greenhouse Gas Removals (GGRs) to focus on e.g. woodlands.
- The extent to which international perspective / GGR initiatives are explored compared to those in the UK.
- An initial identification of stakeholders that could be engaged and most relevant method of engagement (e.g. interview or survey).

**Task 1 Outputs:** Within 5 working days, Eunomia will prepare an inception note based on this proposal and capturing discussions. Once signed off by all parties this will represent the agreed way forward.

#### 1.2 Task 2. Literature Review

We will undertake a literature review that outlines how the issue of permanency in carbon storage is defined, measured and characterised, outlining the differences between nature-based and engineered GGRs. The literature review will include a review of around 60 to 80 papers, across academia, non-governmental organisations and policy. The review will be undertaken by using search terms in Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, and Academia in order to access the academic / free journals. Search terms may include: Carbon storage permanence, long-term carbon storage, carbon cycling and permanence, carbon storage in soils, permanency of carbon capture and storage, carbon offset permanency, factors affecting carbon storage duration.

It will include both an international perspective, reflecting that carbon removal projects are occurring around the world, and a specific focus on woodlands.

This review will feed into Defra's considerations over including GGRs within the UK Emissions Trading Scheme which is the key policy-led mechanism in the UK to that encourages decarbonisation across the UK's largest industries.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report that nature-based GGRs have the potential to achieve one-quarter to one-third of the mitigation required to meet climate stabilization targets by 2030<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, nature-based GGRs are among the cheapest ways of absorbing and storing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Possible technological solutions, such as direct air capture of CO<sub>2</sub> followed by injection into rock or soil, are still immature and are currently very expensive, costing between US\$100 and \$300 per ton of carbon removed, compared to planting a tree which can cost US\$15 to \$20 per ton removed.

However, in order for GGRs to be credible, they must permanently store the carbon. This issue of permanency has particular relevance to credit carbon markets given that when a carbon project generates credits, the credits will be used by an end buyer to offset their carbon footprint. For the buyer, the footprint has been balanced by a

<sup>1</sup> Austin et al (2020): <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-19578-z>

corresponding mitigation elsewhere. However, if the mitigation is not permanent, the carbon credit is no longer underpinned by the offsetting function that it is meant to represent.

The proposed structure of the final report is detailed below, subject to alignment with Defra and the research that is undertaken.

### 1.2.1. Section 1. Overview of NBS / Engineered GGRs

The literature review will begin with an overview of the nature-based and engineered GGRs. This will provide high level detail the types of nature-based and engineered GGRs that are currently being undertaken, and specifically outline the differences between types of GGRs with respect to permanency. This initial overview will support framing the discussion to ensure that the most appropriate carbon storage mechanisms are being looked at. The overview will outline the characteristics of the two groups as they relate to the question of permanency of carbon storage.

For nature-based GGRs, this means detailing the differences between broadly four categories: forestry practices, wetland-related practices, restorative agriculture practices and ocean-based practices. The key features of how carbon is stored within the categories will be outlined, for example how in temperate zones, such as Britain, forest soils can contain as much carbon as the trees.

- **Forestry practices:** planting new forests, allowing forests to regrow naturally where they have been cut down, and improved forest management.
- **Wetland-related practices:** conserving and restoring peatlands and coastal wetlands.
- **Restorative agriculture practices:** build soil carbon, such as no-till agriculture and cover crop rotation, to agroforestry and improved livestock management.
- **Ocean-based practices:** restoring seagrass meadows or growing kelp or shellfish to restore or expand marine ecosystems.

For engineered-based GGRs, this means detailing the differences between Carbon Capture and Storage and Direct Air Capture, although there are other types such as ocean alkalisation which can be explored.

- **Direct air capture technologies:** Air is passed through a filter which removes carbon dioxide from the air, which is then separated, purified, and stored.
- **Carbon Capture and Storage:** Carbon dioxide that is generated when a fuel (e.g. coal, biomass) is captured, then separated, purified, and stored.

Incorporated into the above will be a comparative overview of the relative maintenance costs required for the two types of carbon storage, such as the cost of protecting the restored woodland or ensuring that no carbon is leaking from underground storage.

*We can align with Defra on the scoping of the respective GGRs given there is a particular focus on woodlands, and there could be preference against other GGR such as ocean alkalisation.*

### 1.2.2 Section 2. Definition of Permanency of Carbon Storage

The issue of permanence with respect to carbon storage will be defined. This will begin with outlining the terminology such as the differences between permanency, durability and risk of reversal with respect to carbon storage given that there are overlapping elements to each.

It will then discuss the key drivers impacting the permanency of GGRs.

For nature-based GGRs, this includes assessing how the environmental conditions, such as how climate change may impact temperature, moisture levels, and soil quality which in turn will affect the stored carbon as well as how land-use practices and management strategies influence carbon permanency, as land-use changes, deforestation, and land degradation can release stored carbon back into the atmosphere. In addition, it will include assessing how policy frameworks and market incentives can either promote or hinder efforts to enhance carbon permanency, particularly around urban expansion pressures.

For engineered-based GGRs, this will include considering aspects such as geological stability, sealing integrity



and injection practices impact the quantity of carbon stored over time. Along with this, it will be considered how the technological advancements of engineered-based GGRs can enhance the permanency of the storage.

Given the above considerations, carbon storage will be defined in respect of the time scales that are appropriate given that no carbon capture can be ensured in perpetuity. This is a key point of difference given that engineered-based GGRs may be measured over thousands of years while nature-based GGRs may be measured over hundreds of years. The implications of this will be outlined.

### 1.2.3 Section 3. Measurement

The measurement of carbon storage will be detailed for both nature-based and engineered GGRs.

For nature-based GGRs, nature can be highly variable with respect to the amount of sequestration and storage, with variables including species type, micro-climates and soil type. There will be a review of different methodologies across the market both from academia as well as key players in the voluntary carbon market. In addition, consideration will be given over the different carbon cycles that occur across the different types of nature-based GGRs.

In contrast, engineered GGRs are likely to be measured with higher precision with a greater number of variables being known or controlled in undertaking the GGRs. For example, the equipment that undertake the Direct Air Capture can monitor the amount of carbon stored underground, with estimates required for the amount of leakage that occurs.

An analysis of how the literature ranks the permanence of carbon storage of nature-based or engineered GGRs will be provided with an indication regarding which is determined to be more permanent, as well as the situations in which nature-based GGRs provide the same or better level of permanence than engineered GGRs.

### 1.2.4 Section 4. Deep-dive into woodlands

A deeper analysis into the carbon storage of woodlands will be undertaken. This is due to the UK's potential for nature-based GGRs through tree-planting as detailed in the England Tree Action Plan 2021-24 which aimed to plant 30,000 hectares per year of trees. In addition to the ambition set by policy, the Woodland Carbon Code mandates that once land has been afforested, it must remain forested, supporting the permanency of carbon storage within the UK through woodland.

The Woodland Carbon Code's carbon calculation methodology will be reviewed. It is recognised as being conservative in its estimates by providing a wide safety margin that mitigates against potential set-back such as slower-than-expected growth or disease.

[Task 2 Outputs: The findings from the focused literature review will be incorporated into the draft and final report.](#)

### **Task 3. Reporting**

We will consolidate our research into a Draft report. This will be approximately 20 pages and will likely follow the structure outlined in Task 2 above but this be flexible depending on the research found and input from Defra. The Draft Report will be provided in Word format, with a request for a single set of non-conflicting comments or tracked changes in the document. Following submission of the Draft Report, we will hold a presentation to discuss our findings with Defra. All amends and responses to feedback will be incorporated into a Final Report which will be provided within the final project deadline.

[Task 3 Outputs: Draft Report, Presentation and Final Report.](#)

## **2. Project Management (inc Project plan). A project plan may be provided as an attachment with your reply (delete if not required)**

### **2.1 Our approach to project management**

We take a structured approach to project management, breaking the project down into discrete elements or stages with a focus on the delivery of outputs. Our overall approach to project management is based upon the PRINCE2® methodology with many of our Project Managers (PMs) being PRINCE2® certified. Our approach

is characterised by the following principles and techniques which will be applied throughout this project:

- Understanding project's scope, required inputs and outputs, and seeking clarifications from the client.
- Clearly defining roles and responsibilities for the project team and selecting appropriately qualified staff.
- Developing a clear cost plan, resource allocations, careful budgeting and management of expenditure.
- Preparing a clear project programme, including key milestones, dependencies, and deliverables.
- Maintaining good lines of communication internally and externally.
- Ensuring, where possible, flexibility and responsiveness to changing client needs.

## **2.2 Our proposed project management arrangements for this project**

### **2.2.1 Proposed project management roles**

REDACTED Quality assurance efforts will be integrated throughout the project cycle to ensure all project activities and outputs are of the highest quality and delivered in a timely manner. The responsibilities of our **Project Director, Project Manager, Expert Advisors**, and the **Technical Lead** are broken down below:

- **Project Director:** overall responsibility for contract delivery, project direction, methodological rigour and quality assurance of all outputs. Will attend meetings with Defra's Project Manager meetings as necessary.
- **Project Manager and Technical Lead:** responsibility for day-to-day contract management and will be the key contact for Defra's Project Manager and the project team, management of sub-contractors, maintaining the risk register, and progress reporting. Will coordinate regular meetings with Defra's Project Manager, contribute to technical work and ensure the technical inputs are coordinated, including inputs from the expert advisors.
- **Expert Advisors:** responsibility for the input of specialist knowledge to guide the development of high-quality outputs. Will attend meetings with Defra's Project Manager as necessary.

### **2.2.2 Progress reporting and communicating with Defra**

We will prioritise developing close and collaborative relations with Defra's Project Manager. Key practical steps and will include:

- Development of an agreed Project Plan at the outset, with clear and agreed milestones and deadlines, roles and responsibilities and quality assurance processes. This will be a live document regularly updated throughout the project.
- Following an Inception meeting we will arrange regular progress update meetings (we propose fortnightly) with Defra's PM, including our PM and other members of the project team as required, to discuss progress programme, outstanding actions, any emerging issues or risks, and any guidance or clarification required. We will provide brief notes by email to Defra's PM following the meetings.

### **2.2.3 Internal communications**

Our PM will take the initial lead in liaising with team members. The project team will have regular internal project meetings to ensure effective and efficient collaborative working. Effective communication and coordination will be achieved through:

- Internal project inception meeting.
- Project team information and brainstorming call at the start of each task.
- Weekly check-in meetings for each task that is in progress.

## **2.3 Timetable and Gantt Chart**

The Gantt chart (see Appendix 1) sets out our proposed timetable for carrying out the work.

## **3. Proposed Staff who will do the work and briefly state previous relevant qualification/experience. Contractors experience of undertaking similar projects and accreditations (if requested).**

REDACTED

#### 4. Risk

**Note:** This section is to be used to detail any risks relevant to the project i.e. Programme deliverable dates, data, consultees etc.

The table below outlines some of the risks initially identified in relation to this project and presents our proposed measures for mitigating them.

Risk	Likelihood / Impact	Mitigation Measures
Late delivery and/or poor quality of outputs	Medium / High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A clear Project Plan against which progress towards outputs can be reviewed regularly. PM will monitor progress and coordinate closely with the NE PM alerting to any issues.</li><li>• Quality assurance, procedures to ensure delivered to a high standard and to time.</li></ul>
Team become unavailable to deliver the work	Medium / High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Team members have had time reserved for the duration of the project to ensure they are available to deliver. In the event of extenuating circumstances, the team have interchangeable skills to help support one another in delivery, and Eunomia has a wealth of other consultants who can step in, with the agreement of NE, to ensure delivery is not affected.</li></ul>
Insufficient budget & resources to cover all the areas of interest for the research	Low / Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Early agreement with Defra's PM to ensure the work is focused from the outset and any options / priorities agreed.</li><li>• Eunomia PD will manage the budget to agreed cost schedule and programme.</li></ul>

#### 5. Health & Safety (only complete if requested in defined evaluation criteria)

N/A

#### 6. Sustainability (only complete if requested in defined evaluation criteria)

Eunomia is committed to providing efficient, high-quality services to clients and to achieving excellent environmental outcomes. Our goal is to 'walk the talk' by exemplifying high standards in our own practice. We believe these goals are best delivered by setting out clear responsibilities and related actions for both the company and employees. To this end, we operate an ISO9001 and ISO14001 compliant Integrated Management System (IMS), and a systematic approach to standardise and streamline our work practices. The IMS sets out operational procedures, regularly updated targets and objectives, and methods for measuring performance. We ensure that as a company we: stay at the forefront of scientific, political, and social thinking; constantly develop our skills, knowledge and capabilities; and continually improve our own policies and behaviours. We ensure that our services: meet or exceed our clients' expectations of quality; improve environmental outcomes for clients; and meet our own high standards of quality. We ensure that our environmental behaviours exceed the standards set by: environmental legislation and regulations; corporate best practice; and society's expectations.

We aim to minimise our environmental impacts insofar as it is within our capacity to control them and as long as any improvements being sought do not imply excessive costs relative to the benefits achieved. We are committed to: minimising energy consumption; procuring with consideration of the impacts of durability, re-usability, recyclability and energy on product and service lifecycles; actively reducing dependence on any form of travel by embracing communications technologies and challenging ourselves and our clients. Where travel is necessary, we apply a 'travel hierarchy' to prioritise modes of transport with least impact; preventing, re-using, recycling and composting as much of our waste as possible, in that order of priority, and; reducing and controlling pollution through the careful management of harmful substances emitted to the air and water environment. Eunomia also tracks and reports its carbon emissions through digestible information.

**7. Cost Proposal**

Please use day rates, including any applicable discounts, as agreed under the framework contract. A full cost schedule may be attached to support the costs summarised below.

Task No.	Name	Framework grade	Day rate	No. of Days or part thereof	Cost
1,2,3,4	REDACTED	Principal Consultant	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
1,2,3,4	REDACTED	Senior Consultant	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
1,2,3,4	REDACTED	Senior Consultant	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
1,2,3,4	REDACTED	Consultant	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
1,2,3,4	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
<b>Total Staff Costs</b>				<b>£24,878</b>	
<b>Expenses (please detail type i.e. travel, accommodation etc.)</b>				<b>£0</b>	
<b>Overall Costs</b>				<b>£24,878</b>	
By signing this form <i>Eunomia</i> agree to provide the services stated above for the cost set out in your Cost Proposal and in accordance with the Research, Development & Evidence Framework 1 Conditions of Contract.					
<b>Contractor Project Manager:</b>			REDACTED		
<b>Signature:</b>			REDACTED		
<b>Date:</b>			20/09/2023		

### 3.0 Order Form

3.1 The following document is to be completed by the Contracting Authority and sent to the Contractor for counter signature to form a Call-Off contract.

<b>Research, Development and Evidence Framework 2</b> <b>ORDER FORM</b>
<b>To be completed by Contracting Authority Project Manager and sent to Contractor for countersignature.</b>
<b>Project title: Evidence for NBS in Emissions Trading Scheme: Understanding permanence in carbon storage.</b>
<b>Call off Reference: RDE367</b>
<b>Atamis project ref: C21112</b>
<b>Date: 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2023</b>

THE Contracting Authority: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Seacole Building, 2 Marsham Street, London, SW1P 4DF, United Kingdom

THE CONTRACTOR: Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd 37 Queen Square Bristol. BS1 4QS

Contracting Authority guidance: This Order Form, when completed and executed by both Parties, forms a Call-Off Contract. A Call-Off Contract can be completed and executed using an equivalent document or electronic purchase order system.

#### APPLICABLE FRAMEWORK CONTRACT

This Order Form is for the provision of the Call-Off Deliverables and dated [Insert date of issue]. It's issued under the Research Development & Evidence Framework Agreement reference 30210 for the provision of [Insert name of project].

CALL-OFF SUB-LOT: 4.1 Socio-economic.

CALL-OFF INCORPORATED TERMS The following documents are incorporated into this Call-Off Contract. Where numbers are missing we are not using those schedules. If the documents conflict, the following order of precedence applies:

1. Defra Framework Terms and Conditions;
2. Request for Proposal;
3. Proposal;

No other Supplier terms are part of the Call-Off Contract. That includes any terms written on the back of, added to this Order Form, or presented at the time of delivery.

CALL-OFF CONTRACT START DATE: 28<sup>th</sup> September 2023

CALL-OFF CONTRACT EXPIRY DATE: 20<sup>th</sup> November 2023

CALL-OFF PERIOD: 2 months

For and on behalf of the Supplier:

For and on behalf of the Buyer:

## **Appendix 1: Timetable and Gantt Chart**

REDACTED