



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs

# Bidder Pack

**Project Title: Research into measuring and valuing the environmental impacts of chemical pollution in the UK**

**Procurement Reference Number: 37091**

**ITT Number: 10642**

**September 2022**

Version Date: October 2021 (Version 1.0)

# Contents

Section 1: The Invitation .....	3
Section 2: The Specification of Requirements .....	6
Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract .....	16
Section 4: Evaluation Methodology.....	17
Section 5: Performance Management Framework.....	23
Section 6: Key Performance Indicators (KPI's).....	25
Section 7: Appendices .....	27

# Section 1: The Invitation

Defra group Commercial on behalf of Defra group and its Arm's Length Bodies invite you to bid in this competition.

The Bidder Pack comes in two parts.

This 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 Definitions that apply to both parts can be found in Section 7.

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 Chemicals Evidence Team which sits within the Chemicals, Pesticides & Hazardous Waste (CPHW) division. The project will be managed by an Officer who sits within the Chemicals Evidence team in Defra (Economic Advisor on International Chemicals & Waste) with support from economists and other specialists within the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Defra, and the Environment Agency (EA).

The Defra Chemicals Evidence team produces analysis and evidence to support policy development and regulation for REACH, Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), Pesticides and Hazardous Waste. The opportunity entails developing an original framework and methodology to assess the environmental effects and impacts from chemical pollution to support risk assessments, regulation, and appraisal of chemical pollution.

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

## 1.2. Procurement Plan and 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](#).

Procurement Activity	Anticipated Date	
Publish Contracts Finder Notice and Bidder Pack	07 <sup>th</sup> September 2022	
Clarification deadline	Date	Time
	19 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	14:00 GMT
Bidder Pack / ITT response date	Date	Time
	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2022	12:00 GMT
Compliance Checks	26 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Evaluation	26 <sup>th</sup> October 2022 – 03 <sup>rd</sup> November 2022	
Moderation Meeting	04 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Produce Contract Award Report and Draft Letters	10 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Approval of Contract Award Report	11 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Issue Notification of Intention to Award letters	11 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Discretionary Standstill Period	N/A	
Self-Declaration Due Diligence	TBC	
Finalise Contract and obtain approvals (if required)	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Contract award / contract issued	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Contract Start Date	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Publish Contract Award Notice and Redacted Contract	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Handover	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Service Commencement Date	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2022	
Contract End Date	22 <sup>nd</sup> March 2024	

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.

### **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

### 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.

### Overview of Requirement

The UK has longstanding and comprehensive regulatory and monitoring regimes for priority chemicals in the environment, meanwhile research programmes both domestically and internationally have furthered human understanding of the potential harms caused by exposure to specific chemicals or groups of chemicals. The stock of existing chemicals that have not yet made their way into the environment and the development of new chemicals for use in processes and products are increasing rapidly and there is a need to better understand the overall effects and costs of damage from exposure. This is key to justifying action and determining the appropriate controls for effectively managing the risks they pose. If not managed appropriately, some chemicals can disrupt the populations of plants, animals, fungi and microorganisms in ways that can lead to ecological change.

A major hurdle to the risk assessment and management of chemicals is the lack of methods that allow for reliable measurement of environmental endpoint impacts from chemical exposure and the corresponding valuation of the impacts of these effects. Measuring the effect of chemicals is very complicated due to several factors including but not limited to the slow and chronic nature between exposure and effects; differences in sub lethal effects across different species and how this affects populations; differences in the levels of exposure and the medium where exposure takes place; and the interaction with mixtures and other causal factors of effects where chemicals may play a role alongside multiple other causes. These factors are not something that can easily be replicated or controlled for in tests via a laboratory setting. The current regulatory approach is based on what is observed

through risk-based evidence of occupational exposure and laboratory experiments, although for the environment in particular it is often needed to invoke the precautionary principle where the 'potential' risks to the environment are used as a means to justify intervention due to the uncertainties. This, however, does not account for the differences in the level of effects of different substances as the actual possible impact is not quantified. If the relationship between chemicals and environmental impacts can be better estimated, Defra could have better valuations of damage and inform chemicals regulatory actions to a finer level, i.e., more available tools and less blunt policy instruments can be chosen where appropriate. Cost effectiveness and proportionality of chemicals regulation can therefore be further enhanced.

For many chemicals, the environmental impacts associated with exposure remain unknown and is very challenging to disentangle. Defra is commissioning this research to develop a conceptual framework that pushes the boundaries of existing data and tools to assess this. If successful, such a method could be used to support risk assessment of chemicals and benefits monetisation of regulation. As suggested above, it is recognised that significant challenges of scope, data and methods will exist, especially with making the links between causes and effects. Therefore, the tenderer will need to include the right experts, make use of the best available techniques and data, and recognise the caveats and limitations.

## Project Scope

The scope of this project is quite broad to allow flexibility for the researchers to determine the best approach for assessing chemical pollution harms to the environment. The project steering group will consist of economists and technical experts from Defra, Health and Safety Executive (HSE), and the Environment Agency (EA).

### Definition of chemical pollutants in and out of scope

To fully support chemicals policy action, the scope should consider all environmentally relevant chemicals that can be reasonably considered within the field of regulatory toxicology. Non-toxic chemicals or chemicals not yet proven to be toxic such as very persistent and very bioaccumulative (vPvB) or very persistent and very mobile (vPvM) should be considered out of scope. It is noted within this, that some evidence may be highly uncertain such that inclusion would require considerable time to investigate, and consideration should be given to whether this is proportionate with the likely impact on project outputs.

In scope chemicals would include chemical substances that are registered via UK REACH and pesticides. Defra would suggest excluding the following list below but would welcome suggestions from Tenderers on either a list of chemicals (or groups of chemicals) out of scope or criteria within the proposed method to determine if specific groups of chemicals would be included or not:

- Microplastics
- Air pollutants - chemical pollution to air is in scope but emissions of the 5 key air pollutants are not. (Nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), particulate matter, sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>))
- Nanomaterials

The boundaries of assessment in terms of which environmental compartment and environmental endpoints will be assessed will need to be scoped by the tenderer and agreed with the project steering group. It is envisaged that consideration will need to be given to how to link common ecotoxicological endpoints to chemical impacts on populations and communities and the ecosystem services (including welfare relevant environmental endpoints that people value) that they provide<sup>1</sup>.

## Uncertainty

The aim of this project is to explore how environmental impacts can reasonably be estimated or predicted, whilst recognising assumptions will have to be made. It would therefore be useful to produce sensitivity analysis on these assumptions to demonstrate the impacts it has on the overall outputs. All assumptions will need a red, amber, green (RAG) rating to assess the risk of inflating or deflating the pollution effects.

## Aim

To develop a methodology to measure and quantify the environmental impacts of chemical pollutants in the context of chemicals regulation within the UK. The avoided environmental damage costs from regulation can then be compared against the cost of controls.

## Overarching Objectives

The objectives of this project are to:

- To scope and develop a conceptual framework and methodology to measure and predict the effects of chemical pollutants on the environment. The impacts of these effects on the environment will need to be quantified and, ideally, monetised.
- Develop methods which assess the differences in effects amongst chemical pollutants, which will support risk management and benefits monetisation of regulation.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Forbes, V.E. et al. (2017), "A framework for predicting impacts on ecosystem services from (sub) organismal responses to chemicals," *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, Vol. 36 (4), pp.845-859. <https://setac.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/etc.3720>

## Project Outcomes

The project will provide a conceptual framework for the adverse effects of chemical pollutants in the environment and quantify these impacts in monetary terms. Environmental impacts in scope of this project concerns those specific to nature such as wildlife populations, ecosystem services. but would not concern impacts on humans via the environment. Different approaches will need to be scoped, including the limitations of these approaches.

All assumptions, spreadsheets, modelling tools etc. must be very clearly documented and handed over to Defra at the end of the project so that, if necessary, further analysis could be undertaken either by Defra or externally.

The outputs from this project could be developed further by Defra/Arm Length Bodies (ALBs) to support risk management assessment of chemicals and benefits monetisation of regulation (if deemed to be appropriate). If the project is successful, further work could be undertaken to fully develop the method. Defra may also decide to develop this framework through international partnerships, or through other channels such as the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to mobilise further resources if deemed appropriate.

## Project Outputs

The expected project outputs are;

- A written report that sets out the outline method for a framework to measure and quantify the environmental effects and impacts of chemical pollutants. The objectives and requirements are set out in the work packages below. The report should be between 50-100 pages and may include additional appendices on top of this.
  - All assumptions, limitations, spreadsheets, modelling tools etc. must be very clearly documented and submitted to Defra at the end of the project so that, if necessary, further analysis could be undertaken either by Defra or externally.
- An executive summary of approximately 2 pages that summarises the findings for an informed but non-technical policy audience.
- A summary slide pack presenting the key findings to an informed but non-technical policy audience.
- A workshop with technical experts to assess the validity of the methodology and to support with shaping direction. The recommendations and findings from the workshop should be appended to the final report. Conclusions and recommendations for developing the framework further should be incorporated into the final report.

All outputs must be provided by email to the Defra Project Officer.

## Approach and Methodology

An outline draft project plan, including the proposed approach to each of the work packages and an outline timetable, must be submitted in the tender. As far as is possible Tenderers should specify in their bid the methods, they intend to use at each stage to deliver the work packages outlined below. This should be undertaken with the understanding that this methodology will need to be developed following analysis of existing data and evidence, as well as discussions with Defra, HSE, and the EA. The Tenderers will be expected to clearly set out the methods in which they expect to meet each of the work packages. This may include but is not limited to:

- Literature review
- Analysing existing data
- Calibration and simulation
- Expert elicitation

Tenderers will be expected to participate in regular fortnightly catch ups with our steering group to develop the methodology and agree the assumptions, evidence used and the timeline for delivery of outputs.

Tenderers should undertake socioeconomic appraisal in line with government guidance on appraisal where relevant. Tenderers should present or apply methods to estimating environmental damage from chemical pollution. This will include:

- a) Identifying the existing gaps in literature (e.g., on drawing the relationship between exposure and environmental impacts including ecosystem services).
- b) Attempting to fill the gaps by developing a framework<sup>2</sup> (to predict the relationship between exposure and environmental impacts)

In the final report produced Tenderers should document in detail the methodology used and assumptions made, with consideration of the impact of these. Assumptions should be explained and justified based on the best evidence and secondary data sources available.

**Work Package 1:** Scope the possibility of constructing a method to assess the environmental impacts of chemical pollutants.

- Conduct a secondary review of the data available and potential methods across stages for assessing environmental impacts of chemical pollutants. Clearly lay out the methodology, data and evidence that will be gathered and used at different stages of appraisal. Any exclusions should also be documented with reasoning for these.
  - The researcher will need to establish what is possible and what would be the most robust approach and agree this with Defra.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Forbes, V.E. et al. (2017), "A framework for predicting impacts on ecosystem services from (sub) organismal responses to chemicals," *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, Vol. 36 (4), pp.845-859. <https://setac.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/etc.3720>

- Explain the strengths and limitations of different approaches against other approaches considered.
- It is recommended that experts should be consulted with or integrated throughout this process to ensure rigour and shape direction. Two workshops are expected to be run at the beginning of the process to shape direction and to review the proof of concept towards the end. This will require external experts and tenderers will be expected to include day rates or the costs of the expert's time in their bid (if required).
- The following may need to be considered although our steering group is welcome to other suggestions
  - Modelling exposure and concentrations
  - Identify possible primary toxic effects that can be linked to environmental impacts. Consider which environmental compartments and endpoints should be in scope.
  - Link exposure to estimates to environmental effects in biota or other organisms and the corresponding impacts on ecosystem services.
  - Consider spatial scale – local vs regional vs country or indeed global.
  - Value the impacts of environmental effects or on ecosystem services.
  - Consider how to portray uncertainty. This could be in the form of a probabilistic distribution between exposure and effects.
  - Consider whether legacy chemical pollutants can be used to support assessment of pollutants where toxicity data is still emerging (this is the case with many substances that are being regulated today).
- An interim draft report will need to be completed to set out the methodology and framework.

**Work Package 2:** Proof of concept study for applying outline method to chemical pollutants

- Select chemical pollutants which are relevant for applying the methodology and framework.
  - This may be a chemical that is a Persistent Bio-accumulative Toxic (PBT) or is being considered in the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) regulations. It may also be useful to test a legacy chemical pollutant which is rich with toxicity data.
  - The chemical pollutant will need to be agreed with our steering group.
- The proof of concept should assess what the key gaps and limitations are with assessing the pollutants. And recommendations on how these could be overcome.
- Develop a model which includes the inputs, calculations, and outputs, and follows best practice modelling design.
- The assumptions and sources of data should be clearly laid out in an assumptions and data log which includes the validity and impact these have on the outputs.
- Produce a sensitivity analysis to develop illustrative ranges of impacts. The tenderer will need to set out their approach to capturing uncertainties.

- Ensure the model comes with guidance and is clear on how results should be presented and what caveats to include. The written report should capture the methodology, analysis, assumptions and results clearly and concisely.
- The framework and methodology may need to be further revised based on data availability and if results don't appear to be robust.

**Work Package 3:** Review of analysis, expert panel review/workshops, and final recommendations

- Produce an initial evaluation of the analysis, with a particular focus on limitations.
- To ensure the methodology is fit for purpose, an independent review should be undertaken through expert panel review workshops.
  - The researchers will need to identify and gather a balanced panel of experts from relevant backgrounds in the field of chemical pollution. This could for example include but is not limited to environmental economists, risk management experts, eco-toxicologists, ecologists, environmental epidemiologists, and other relevant backgrounds. Defra would seek to include HSE, the EA and other relevant experts (i.e., Health Substances Advisory Committee).
  - The researchers should present a draft report and slides to the expert group and allow experts time to review this before an expert workshop take place. Defra are expecting a peer review (which will be needed if this work is to be published). Defra thinks the workshops will need to be half a day long or multiple workshops could be carried out depending on the expert's time and availability.
  - The purpose of the workshop would be to facilitate discussion around the chosen methodology, assumptions and outputs, data gaps, alternative approaches and whether the method is suitable for meeting the objective.
  - The tenderer will be expected to chair and organise these sessions, which could be undertaken as a virtual or face to face meeting subject to discussion and agreement with our project steering group.
  - The recommendations from the expert workshop will need to be considered and incorporated into the final draft of the report.
- The final report should include any consideration and recommendations to develop this work further. Next steps could be written in the form of a short specification so that the steering group can then decide whether to commission further work on the back of this.

## Timetable

The project will commence from October 2022, and the Authority expects all deliverables from this project will need to have been signed off by March 2024. Suppliers should show how they will work at pace to deliver within these timescales. Defra expect significant progress to be made by this financial year. A break clause is included at the end of the financial year (March 22/23), so Defra isn't committed to spend beyond this point. The

tenderer will need to break down their bids by the milestones as well as up to the break clause period.

Tenderers should allow time for review of reports and quality assurance by our steering group, including possible internal review of final report and project outputs.

## Payment

Interested bidders must submit a proposed project delivery plan including interim deliverables and milestone dates. The proposed project delivery plan should set out the expected costs for delivery of each work package

Payment will be in line with above project milestones agreed with the successful bidder following award of the contract. Defra expect payments to be made in 3 stages following satisfactory completion of **work package 1 (35% of total cost – the break clause point)**, following completion of **work package 2 (25% of total cost)**, and the completion of the **final report (40% balance)**.

## Project Governance

Defra will nominate a Project Manager who will be responsible for the day-to-day management of this contract and ensure it meets the project aim and objectives. The Defra Project Manager will monitor progress and provide advice, support, and guidance on project scope, methodology, policy focus, and project outputs. Meetings have been incorporated into the Programme of Work (see below Table 1) to discuss progress and to ensure timely support as required.

The successful Tenderer will be expected to appoint a Project Manager who will act as the principal point of contact for Defra and who will be jointly responsible for the day-to-day management of the project. The successful Tenderer will be required to regularly update the nominated Defra Project Manager on project progress.

## Geographic area of Study

The tenderer may consider impacts of chemical pollutants used within the United Kingdom and outside of it. Damage from chemical pollutants may include transboundary effects caused to countries outside of the UK. For some persistent chemicals, the main sink for pollution effects would be the ocean, so there will need to be consideration of spatial impacts. If possible, Defra would like to distinguish between impacts within the UK and outside of the UK.

## Project Outputs and Programme of Work

Defra expects high quality outputs. Key outputs will need to be reviewed and commented on by Defra, potentially resulting in revisions needed. **Defra welcomes submissions that include opportunities for junior members of staff to undertake continuous personal development.** However, it is expected that more experienced team members would provide the necessary support and oversight to ensure quality outcomes.

Deliverables and milestones have been set by Defra in advance of beginning the contract period. Progress against milestones will be regularly monitored throughout the contract period. Continuous monitoring of the project will also be used to refine the scope and address issues which may arise.

**Table 1: Key Project Deliverables**

Milestones	Deliverables	Deadline	Payment Schedule
Inception meeting	Kick off meeting with project steer group and suppliers	October 2022	
Progress updates	Fortnightly online meetings/calls on progress to update Defra project officer on progress, with steering group if required	Ongoing throughout project	
Work package 1	Outcome for WP1 including proposed framework/methodology	March 2023 Workshop expected prior to delivery of WP1	
<b>Interim report draft</b>	Draft report for WP1 ( <b>break clause included at this point</b> )	March 2023	<b>35% - March 2023</b>
<b>Work package 2</b>	Findings for WP2 including proof of concept.	October 2023	<b>25% - October 2024</b>
Work package 3	Outcome for WP3 including review of analysis, draft report and	January 2024	

	recommendations from expert workshops		
Draft final report	Draft report including findings from all WP1-2, including all outputs and supporting text	January 2024	
<b>Final report</b>	Final report and presentation of findings from all WP1-3	Early March 2024	<b>40% - March 2024</b>

## Audiences

The main audiences for this research are the Defra chemicals evidence team, and experts at HSE and the EA. The findings could support the assessment of chemical risks and assessing the benefits of regulation, which may be useful for audiences outside of Government. As such, Defra is content for the successful Tenderer to publish the results of this work. However, this is subject to satisfactory and robust completion of the project, and meeting publication guidance. The Authority reserves the right to determine if and how results should be published.

## Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract

The Terms and Conditions of Contract for this procurement are DgC Research and Development.

The Terms and Conditions are split into Core Terms and Contracting Authority Terms within the Annexes / Schedules, and details of the legal priority are similarly within the contract's Annexes/Schedules.

The Authority proposes to enter into Contract(s) for a maximum period of (18) months with the successful Tenderer(s) from 29<sup>th</sup> October 2022 to 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2024.

Defra will consider the proposals and recommendations put forward in each of the stages of the project as outlined above. However, Tenderers should note that the Authority is under no obligation to proceed with all stages of the project or proceed with payment for the remainder of the contract.

Defra will only proceed with the next stage of the project upon satisfactory completion of each stage outlined above or in the tender submission and this will be agreed in good faith by the parties.

The anticipated commencement date is **29/10/2022**.

### **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.

## 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 and **Appendix C**. The detailed questions and guidance are set out in the Authority's eSourcing:

### Evaluation of Responses

Tenders will be evaluated on technical and price using the evaluation criteria set out in Bravo to determine which response is the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT). 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 following weightings have been applied.

*Technical: 80%; Commercial 20%*

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 Bravo, 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	Pass/Fail

		<p>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 Bravo and Part 1 of this Section 2 below (in respect of economic and financial standing and technical and professional ability).</p> <p>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.</p>	
Stage 3	Technical & Professional Ability – Project Specific Requirements (Technical Questionnaire)	<p>This stage will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the Technical Questionnaire.</p> <p>Some requirements are mandatory and if you cannot provide them your Tender may be rejected.</p> <p>Scored as 80% weighting of the total available score, consisting of the following breakdown of questions:</p>	<p>Scored (see appendix C)</p> <p><b>F01</b> - Sustainability Weighting= Pass/ Fail</p> <p><b>F02</b> - Health and Safety Weighting= Pass/ Fail</p> <p><b>E01</b> – Organisational Experience, Capability and Resources Weighting = 25%</p> <p><b>E02</b> – Approach and Methodology Weighting = 50%</p> <p><b>E03</b> – Project Risk Management and Mitigation Weighting = 15%</p>

			<b>E04</b> – Communication and Working Arrangements Weighting = 10%
Stage 4	Pricing Schedule	Prices will be evaluated in accordance with criteria set out in the Pricing Schedule on the ITT and Bravo.	Scored
Stage 5	Final score / Award	<p>A Response which passes stage 1 and 2 will proceed to evaluation of Tenders in accordance with stages 3 to 5.</p> <p>The final score is calculated as follows:</p> <p>Total Technical Quality Requirements will make up to a maximum of 80% of total score (Stage 3).</p> <p>Total Price Requirements will make up to a maximum of 20% of total score. (Stage 4)</p> <p>The most economically advantageous Tender will be the Tender with the highest final score.</p>	

- 1.1 Tenders will be evaluated on quality and price using the evaluation criteria set out in Bravo 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 technical quality scores awarded will form **80%** of the final score;
  - The score awarded for price will form **20%** 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 Bravo 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 Bravo. These are repeated as Appendix C of this ITT for information purposes.
- 1.7 The method for scoring price can be found on Bravo.
- 1.8 The submissions against the Technical Quality questions E01 – E04 will be evaluated 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 a Tenderer receives a 'Fail' in either question F01 or F02 they will be eliminated from the procurement. If a score of twenty (20) or less is awarded to a Tenderer's response to any scored question E01-E04 the Authority may choose to reject the Tender.**

The commercial evaluation will be based on a total price and bidders will be required to provide a full price breakdown of the work package, and matched against milestones in the commercial workbook

Tenderers must provide a financial proposal, including rates and hours for each participating team member and costing analysed by work stages. The project is for a fixed cost. A breakdown of costs against each objective and against each key personnel including a detailed breakdown for equipment, consumables; overheads and travel costs are required. The Authority is keen to receive competitive Day Rates which must be set out in the

“Commercial Workbook” (provided in the ITT pack); “Staff Costs” worksheet and ensure the details entered in the “Milestone” worksheet are that of the deliverables detailed in the specification.

The above is required to be uploaded to the ‘Commercial Envelope’ of Bravo.

Where subcontractors or joint contractors are used, a separate breakdown for each should be provided in addition to the overall project costs.

Day rates for all staff should be provided along with a general description of duties.

Tenderers will be required to submit a total fixed cost for completion of the project and include a breakdown of costs against each objective and against key personnel. Costs will need to be reasonable and competitive and offer value for money.

## Evaluation

The calculation used is the following:

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Tender Price}}{\text{Tender Price}} \times 20\% \text{ Maximum available marks}$$

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:

$$\text{Tenderer A Score} = \frac{£3000}{£3000} \times 20\% \text{ (Maximum available marks)} = 20\%$$

$$\text{Tenderer B Score} = \frac{£3000}{£5000} \times 20\% \text{ (Maximum available marks)} = 12\%$$

$$\text{Tenderer C Score} = \frac{£3000}{£6000} \times 20\% \text{ (Maximum available marks)} = 10\%$$

**Commercial Pricing Breakdown applicable to this ITT is on Bravo.** This should be downloaded; completed and attached to the commercial envelope.

### \*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.

## **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.

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: Performance Management Framework

### 1. Overview of the PMF

- 1.1. As part of the Authority's continuous drive to improve the performance of all Contractors, this PMF will be used to monitor, measure, and control all aspects of the Supplier's performance of contract responsibilities.
- 1.2. The PMF purpose is to set out the obligations on the successful Contractor, to outline how the successful Contractor's performance will be monitored, evaluated and rectified for performance.
- 1.3. The Authority may define any reasonable performance management indicators for the Contractor under the following categories:
  - Updates to Authority
  - Data Handling
  - Participatory Outputs
  - Reports
  - Presentations
- 1.4. The above categories are consistent with all Contract awards allowing the Authority to monitor Contractor' performance at both individual level and at the enterprise level with the individual Contractor.

### 2. Management of the PMF

- 2.1. Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) shall be monitored on a regular basis and shall form part of the contract performance review. Performance of KPI's will be reported by the Contractor to the Authority on monthly basis. The Contractor shall detail

performance against KPI's in Monthly Reports and at quarterly Contract Meetings with the Authority, who will review this and make comments if any.

- 2.2. The Contractor shall maintain their own management reports, including a Risk and Issues Log and present these as requested by the Authority at any meeting requested by the Authority.
- 2.3. Any performance issues highlighted in these reports will be addressed by the Contractor, who shall be required to provide an improvement plan ("Remediation Plan") to address all issues highlighted within a week of the Authority request.
- 2.4. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are essential in order to align Contractor's performance with the requirements of the Authority and to do so in a fair and practical way. KPIs must be realistic and achievable; they also have to be met otherwise indicating that the service is failing to deliver. The successful Contractor will ensure that failure and non-performance is quickly rectified.
- 2.5. The Authority reserves the right to amend the existing KPI's detailed in section 6 below or add any new KPI's. Any changes to the KPI's shall be confirmed by way of a Contract Change Note (CCN).

## Section 6: Key Performance Indicators (KPI's)

KPI and deliverables	Measurement	Fail	Acceptable
<b>1. Updates to Authority</b>	Regular, and ad hoc, verbal and written updates summarising progress and challenges	Updates are infrequent or lacking enough detail to assure the Authority of progress	Updates are timely and include enough detail to assure the Authority of progress
<b>2. Data handling</b>	Secure, accessible and organised collecting and storage of data/information relating to the project	Data, information and files are not kept up-to-date and are unavailable	All project data and information are up-to-date and accessible to the Authority
a. Evidence synthesis	Collection and storage of external and internal evidence sources, as well as any annotations / analysis	Evidence is only cited and not made available to the Authority	Evidence is gathered, stored and accessible to the Authority
b. Evaluation questions	Proportionate collection and secure storage of key informant views and secondary data underpinning evaluation questions	Inadequate range of views and information accessed and not stored	Key stakeholders consulted and their views and other information are gathered and stored securely
c. Baselines and data collection plan	Collection and storage of data used to develop and test counterfactuals and baselines	Data is inadequate to achieve deliverable	Data is adequate and available to the Authority
<b>3. Participatory outputs</b>	Notes and outputs from participatory exercises with stakeholders	Notes and outputs are incomplete or missing	Notes and outputs are detailed and stored for future reference
a. Theory Change of	Notes and outputs from development of ToC	Notes and outputs are incomplete and do not reflect the participatory process	Notes and outputs show how the ToC was developed in a participatory way with a range of stakeholders
b. Evaluation questions	Notes, information and ratings underpinning	Notes, information and	Notes, information and

	development of the evaluation questions	ratings are incomplete or missing and not clearly linked to evaluation questions	ratings for each evaluation question are clearly linked and transparent
<b>4. Reports</b>	Draft iterations and final reports, including comment logs and requested changes	Reports are late, incomplete and do not adequately address feedback from the Authority or deliverables	Reports are on time, complete, incorporate comments and address all deliverables
<b>5. Presentations</b>	Presentation materials and delivery of key findings	Presentations do not take place	Presentations take place and convey key findings clearly

## Section 7: ITT Glossary and Appendices

### 7.1. 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
<b>“Authority”</b>	The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)
<b>“Bidder Pack”</b>	this invitation to tender and all related documents published by the Authority and made available to Tenderers.
<b>“Contract”</b>	the contract (set out in Appendix B) to be entered into by the Authority and the successful Tenderer.
<b>“EIR”</b>	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.
<b>“eSourcing system”</b>	eSourcing system is the eSourcing system used by the Authority for conducting this procurement, which can be found at <a href="http://defra.eSourcing.solutions.co.uk">http://defra.eSourcing.solutions.co.uk</a>
<b>“FOIA”</b>	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.
<b>“Form of Tender”</b>	means the form contained in Appendix 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.

<b>“Information”</b>	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.
<b>“Involved Person”</b>	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”.
<b>“Pricing Schedule”</b>	the form accessed via eSourcing system in which Tenderers are required to submit their pricing information as part of a Tender.
<b>“Regulations”</b>	the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.
<b>“Relevant Body</b>	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.
<b>“Response”</b>	means the information submitted in response to the Bidder Pack via the online response forms on eSourcing system including the Tenderer’s formal Tender.
<b>“Specification Requirements”</b>	<b>of</b> the Authority’s requirements set out in Section 2 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements.
<b>“Tender”</b>	the formal offer to provide the goods or services described 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.
<b>“Tenderer”</b>	anyone responding to the Bidder Pack and, where the context requires, includes a potential tenderer.
<b>“Timetable”</b>	the procurement timetable set out in Section 1 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements.

## 7.2. APPENDIX A

### FORM OF TENDER

To be returned by 12:00pm (GMT time) on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2022.

Victor Mpehla  
Procurement Advisor  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Procurement and Commercial Function

**TENDER FOR THE: Research into measuring and valuing the environmental impacts of chemical pollution in the UK**

Tender Ref: project **37091**.  
ITT **10642**

---

1. We have examined the invitation to tender and its schedules set out below (the **ITT**) and do hereby offer to provide the goods and/or services specified in the ITT and in accordance with the attached documents to the Authority commencing date **29/10/2022** for the period specified in the ITT.
  - Tender Particulars (Section 1)
  - Specification of Requirements (Section 2)
  - Form of Tender (Appendix A)
  - Authority's Conditions of Contract (Appendix B)
2. If this tender is accepted, we will execute the Contract and any other documents required by the Authority within 10 days of being asked to do so.
3. We agree that:
  - a. before executing the Contract substantially in the form set out in the ITT, the formal acceptance of this tender in writing by this Authority or such parts as may be specified, together with the documents attached shall comprise a binding contract between the Authority and us;
  - b. pursuant to EU Directive 1999/93/EC (Community Framework for Electronic Signatures) and the Electronic Communications Act 2000, the Contract may be executed electronically using the Authority's electronic tendering and contract management system, Bravo;
  - c. we are legally bound to comply with the confidentiality provisions set out in the ITT;

- d. any other terms or conditions or any general reservation which may be provided in any correspondence sent by the Authority in connection with this procurement shall not form part of this tender without the prior written consent of the Authority;
- e. this tender shall remain valid for 120 days from the closing date for tenders specified in the ITT; and
- f. the Authority may disclose our information and documents (submitted to the Authority during the procurement) more widely within Government for the purpose of ensuring effective cross-Government procurement processes, including value for money and related purposes.

4. We confirm that:

- a. there are no circumstances affecting our organisation which could give rise to an actual or potential conflict of interest that would affect the integrity of the Authority's decision making in relation to the award of the Contract; or
- b. if there are or may be such circumstances giving rise to an actual or potential conflict of interest, we have disclosed this in full to the Authority.

5. We undertake and it shall be a condition of the Contract that:

- a. the amount of our tender has not been calculated by agreement or arrangement with any person other than the Authority and that the amount of our tender has not been communicated to any person until after the closing date for the submission of tenders and in any event not without the consent of the Authority;
- b. we have not canvassed and will not, before the evaluation process, canvass or solicit any member or officer, employee or agent of the Authority or other contracting authority in connection with the award of the Contract and that no person employed by us has done or will do any such act; and
- c. made arrangements with any other party about whether or not they may submit a tender except for the purposes of forming a joint venture.

6. I warrant that I am authorised to sign this tender and confirm that we have complied with all the requirements of the ITT.

**Signed**

---

**Date**

---

**In the capacity of**

---

**Authorised to sign  
Tender for and on  
behalf of**

---

**Postal Address**

---

**Post Code**

---

**Telephone No.**

---

**Email Address**

---

## 7.3. APPENDIX B

### AUTHORITY'S CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

Upload on Bravo

## 7.4. 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: **80%** of the overall score will be awarded for technical criteria and **20%** of the overall score will be awarded for commercial.

Please note responses will be assessed against demonstration of understanding of the Specification as outlined in section 2 of the ITT Document.

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:

#### Evaluation criteria:

The tender will be assessed using an agreed evaluation model which will be outlined in the ITT (invitation to tender) document. The evaluation will be conducted against the criteria set out in the ITT document, to determine the most appropriate tender to be offered the contract.

#### Mandatory Questions

##### F01 - Sustainability - Pass/Fail

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.

Your response should:

- demonstrate that the Tenderer has a sustainability policy in place; and
- provide evidence as to how the Tenderer will reduce the environmental impacts of delivering this contract.

A “fail” will be allocated to a response that does not demonstrate any evidence of addressing sustainability.

Please upload your response with filename ‘Your Company Name\_F01’. Your response must be a maximum of 2 sides of A4, minimum font size 12.

## **F02 – Health and Safety – Pass/Fail**

Your response must be a maximum of 2 sides of A4, font size 12 addressing the below questions. Any responses exceeding 2 sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page.

A “Fail” will be allocated to a response that does not demonstrate any evidence of addressing health and safety.

Tenderers should provide details of suitably robust procedures for health and safety, including how they will conduct measurements in a safe manner.

Please upload a document with the filename: F02 Your Company Name.

## **Technical Questions**

### **1. Organisational Experience, Capability and Resources (25%)**

Please describe your organisation’s capability in delivering research projects that are relevant or comparable to this specification. This should include detailed knowledge, experience and capability in assessing the effects and impacts of chemical pollution on the environment and socioeconomic appraisal. Where possible this should include details of your organisation’s experience in delivering research detailed in this specification. Please include a list of references to relevant publications by your organisation or proposed team in the area.

Please describe any resources that you think are relevant to delivery of the project.

Please provide details of the proposed project team and team structure that you intend to use to deliver this project. Your response must be a maximum of 3 sides of A4, font size 12, excluding the inclusion of CVs. If relevant, CV’s may be submitted to support your response (max 2 A4 sides per CV). Please upload a document with the filename: ‘E01\_Your Company Name’

Having contacts experienced in scientific research on the environmental impacts of chemical pollution or socioeconomic appraisal of chemical impacts is desirable as these will be needed for the workshops. Please also demonstrate your relevant contacts and your plan to engage acknowledged experts to enable successful delivery of the project.

## **Evaluation criteria**

Your response should demonstrate:

- sufficient recent experience and capability to successfully deliver on the work packages.
- a comprehensive and realistic approach to ensure successful delivery of the contract
- the relevant resources to deliver the project including library or literature search facilities
- the size and structure of the proposed project team is sufficient to ensure that adequate resources have been allocated for all the required roles and responsibilities and the team has sufficient expertise to deliver against the objectives. This should include strong knowledge, experience and capability across relevant scientific disciplines and socioeconomics on assessing chemical pollution impacts on the environment.
- staff retention plans are in place to minimise turnover of key staff members.
- if there are proposals for consortium/sub-contracting arrangements, they are comprehensive and reasonable and there are measures in place to effectively manage these arrangements throughout the contract.

## **2. Approach and Methodology (50%)**

Outline your understanding of the policy/research context and the key issues/challenges you are proposing to address in this project. Please describe your approach and methodology for delivering the full scope of requirements detailed in this specification. Please address each of the work packages given above in a clear fashion. Outline the approaches to be used and set out the work plan for the life of the project stating clearly how you intend to proceed.

Your response must be a maximum of 7 sides of A4, font size 12. Any responses exceeding 7 sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E02\_Your Company Name'

## **Evaluation criteria**

Your response should demonstrate:

- an understanding of the policy and research context of the study, and how the outputs of this work will be used.
- a clear approach to each of the work packages and a realistic deliverable work plan
- a clear and understandable methodology for the main components of the work, with supporting literature if appropriate.
- an understanding of the analytical methods to be used and data analysis requirements.
- use of best evidence available
- an awareness of the key issues, challenges and interdependencies in relation to carrying out the project and how you will manage these
- an understanding of the limitations of developing a framework/methodology

- an innovative approach that will expand and develop assessments beyond how they are currently carried out

### **3. Project and Risk Management and Mitigation (15%)**

Please provide your project and risk management processes for delivering this specification. Your response should contain a list of relevant perceived risks to the project which could affect your ability to deliver the required outputs.

Your response must be a maximum of 2 sides of A4, font size 12, with an additional one side of A4 for a Gantt chart (or similar). Any responses exceeding 2 sides of A4 (excluding the Gantt chart) will not be evaluated beyond the last page. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E03\_Your Company Name'.

#### **Evaluation Criteria**

Your response should demonstrate:

- An outline of the total number of days allocated to the project and the number of days each staff member will contribute, demonstrating that senior staff members would be embedded throughout the whole project. The project must be sufficiently resourced to deliver the work on time, including staff cover.
- If appropriate, outline any sub-contracting or consortium arrangements.
- A Gantt chart detailing the proposed timetable for completion, including key deliverables and milestones.
- A quality assurance plan to ensure outputs are robust and presented/documentated clearly.
- An overview of the key risks associated with this project and the ways you will mitigate these.
- An overview of performance management responsibilities which may include reviews to evaluate whether the project is on schedule against the budget and making sure any milestones outlined in the project are being met.

### **4. Communication and Working Arrangements (10%)**

Please set out clear communication routes and a proposed approach to working with Defra including a strategy for dissemination of the findings. Your response must be a maximum of 2 sides of A4, font size 12. Any responses exceeding 2 sides of A4 will not be evaluated beyond the last page. Please upload a document with the filename: "E04\_Your Company Name".

#### **Evaluation criteria**

Your response should demonstrate:

- a comprehensive and realistic approach for communicating to ensure successful delivery of the Contract.
- a credible approach to liaison.
- a comprehensible approach to dissemination of the findings with due regard to public reassurance and media aspects.

### **Scoring Criteria – Technical Evaluation**

The Technical Evaluation will be scored as follows:

**For a score of 100:** Evidence of the ability to exceed the requirements giving additional benefit

**For a score of 70:** Good evidence of the ability to fully meet the requirement.

**For a score of 50:** Sufficient evidence provided of the ability to fulfil basic requirements.

**For a score of 20:** Significant lack of detail to evidence the ability to fulfil the requirement.

**For a score of 0:** Unable to fulfil the requirement.

# 7.5. APPENDIX D

Commercially Sensitive Information (Attached)  
Please re-produce and upload as an attachment on Bravo if applicable

TENDERER'S COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION	POTENTIAL IMPLICATION OF DISCLOSURE	DURATION COMMERCIALY SENSITIVE INFORMATION OF

# 7.6. APPENDIX E

## PRICING SCHEDULE

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

# 7.7. APPENDIX F

## STAFF TIME IN DAYS TEMPLATE

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