

Request for Quotation

Waste Management Data Required for Extended Producer Responsibility in the UK – (i) Evidence Requirements for Linking Material Reprocessors and Exporters Back to Others in the Chain, (ii) Waste Composition.

ITT_8886

Contents

Request for Quotation	3
Glossary	
Conditions applying to the RFQ	5
Acceptance of Quotations	5
Costs	6
Mandatory Requirements	6
Clarifications	6
Amendments	6
Conditions of Contract	6
Specification	<u>6</u>
Prices	6
Quotation Submission	6
Disclosure	7
Disclaimers	7

Request for Quotation

Title: Waste Management Data Required for Extended Producer Responsibility in the UK – (i) Evidence Requirements for Linking Material Reprocessors and Exporters Back to Others in the Chain, (ii) Waste Composition.

You are invited by Defra group Commercial on behalf of Defra, to submit a quotation for the requirement described in the specification below.

Please submit your quotation via the Bravo system on or before the deadline given below;

Procurement Activity	Anticipated Dat	e
Publish Advertisement and Bidder Pack	25/06/2021	
Deadline for Clarification	Date	Time
	08/07/2021	12:00
Deadline for RFQ response	Date	Time
	20/07/2021	12:00
Technical Evaluation	20/07/2021 –23/07/2021	
Moderation Meeting	26/07/2021	
Approval of Contract Award Report	19/07/2021	
Issue decision letters to Bidders issued	21/07/2021	
Contract award / contract issued	21/07/2021	
Contract Start Date	02/08/2021	
Contract End Date	29/10/2021	

Publish Contract Award Notice and Redacted Contract	01/09/2021
Duration of Contract	12 weeks
Extension Period	2 months

Section	Contents	Action
1	Tender Particulars	For Information
2	Evaluation	For Information
3	Specification of Requirements	For Information

Appendices	Contents	Action
Α	Form of Tender	Print, Sign, Scan and Upload to Bravo
В	Authority's Conditions of Contract	For Information
С	Commercial Pricing Proposal	For Information
D	Staff Time in Days Template	For Information

Glossary

Unless the context otherwise requires the following words and expressions used within this Request for Quotation shall have the following meanings (to be interpreted in the singular or plural as the context requires);

Words/Expression	Meaning
"Authority"	Means the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs acting as part of the Crown.
"Bravo"	Means the e-tendering system used by the Authority for conducting this procurement which can be found at http://defra.bravosolution.co.uk .
"Contract"	Means the contract to be entered into by the Authority and the successful supplier
"RFQ"	Means this Request for Quotation and all related documents published by the Authority and made available to suppliers

Conditions applying to the RFQ

You should examine your quotation response to the RFQ and related documents ensuring it is complete prior to submitting your completed quotation.

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

Acceptance of Quotations

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

Costs

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

Mandatory Requirements

The RFQ includes mandatory requirements and, if you do not comply with them, your quotation will not be evaluated. All mandatory requirements are set out in Bravo.

Clarifications

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

Amendments

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

Conditions of Contract

The terms and conditions attached in Bravo (Appendix B) for Short Form (Services) will be included in any contract awarded as a result of this RFQ process. The Authority will not accept any material changes to these terms and conditions proposed by a supplier.

Prices

Prices must be submitted in £ sterling, exclusive of VAT.

Quotation Submission

Details of the Qualification, Technical and Commercial requirements can be located through the Bravo e-tendering portal (http://defra.bravosolution.co.uk).

Disclosure

All Central Government Departments, their Executive Agencies and Non-Departmental Public Bodies are subject to control and reporting within Government. In particular, they report to the Cabinet Office and HM Treasury for all expenditure. Further the Cabinet Office has a cross-Government role delivering overall Government policy on public procurement, including ensuring value for money and related aspects of good procurement practice.

For these purposes, the Authority may disclose within Government any details contained in your quotation. The information will not be disclosed outside Government during the procurement.

In addition, the Authority is subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, which provide a public right of access to information held by public bodies. In accordance with these two statutes, the Authority may be required to disclose information contained in your quotation to any person who submits a request for information pursuant to those statutes.

You should also note that the Authority will publish the RFQ and the Contract on the Contracts Finder Website.

By submitting a quotation, you consent to these terms as part of the procurement.

Disclaimers

Whilst the information in this RFQ and any supporting information referred to herein or provided to you by the Authority have been prepared in good faith the Authority does not warrant that this information is comprehensive or that it has been independently verified.

The Authority does not:

- make any representation or warranty (express or implied) as to the accuracy, reasonableness or completeness of the RFQ;
- accept any liability for the information contained in the RFQ or for the fairness, accuracy or completeness of that information; or
- accept any liability for any loss or damage (other than in respect of fraudulent misrepresentation or any other liability which cannot lawfully be excluded) arising as a result of reliance on such information or any subsequent communication.

Any supplier considering entering into contractual relationships with the Authority following receipt of the RFQ should make its own investigations and independent assessment of the Authority and its requirements for the goods and/or services and should seek its own professional financial and legal advice.

SECTION 2: Specification

1. Aim of research

1.1. To determine the standard of evidence needed to support successful extended producer responsibility (EPR) for packaging in terms of data and other information that links reprocessors and exporters back to others in the chain, the options for providing this, the standard of that evidence required to enable the system to be effectively enforced and the calculation of common metrics including municipal recycling rates. To identify how waste composition should be recorded for successful EPR for packaging.

2. Background

- 2.1. To successfully implement EPR for packaging, all stakeholders, including government need to be confident that all data requirement and availability issues, including financial data, are sufficiently covered to ensure high levels of transparency and to protect against the risk of fraud. The introduction of digital waste tracking may help fill some but perhaps not all data gaps. Modelling will also be helpful but is not likely to be sufficient in itself.
- 2.2. To be successful EPR must enable capture and flow of adequate 'evidence' (i.e. data and other information) from reprocessors and exporters back up the chain to the so called 'First Points of Consolidation' (see EPR consultation¹ for further explanation of this new category or waste site Extended Producer Responsibility). The reasons for this are twofold:
 - it will support mass balance monitoring of packaging, reducing the risk of fraud or misreporting, thereby increasing transparency and producer confidence in the system;
 - ii. it could help facilitate incentive payments for high quality collection, sorting and reprocessing to either to meet government-imposed targets or producers demands.

2.3. Key questions include:

 a) what value would this flow back of reprocessing evidence add in terms of increased transparency and reduced fraud;

- b) what the evidence / data would look like in terms of reprocessing quality for different material types;
- c) whether it is possible to / how would you set 'acceptable' or 'average' loss rates to help identify misreporting, fraud, or inefficiency within the system

 $^{^{1}\,\}underline{\text{https://consult.defra.gov.uk/extended-producer-responsibility/extended-producer-responsibility-for-packaging}$

- (especially where this data is passed back through several facilities or contracts); and
- d) how quickly this evidence is likely to flow back through the system in order to substantiate the collection evidence.
- 2.4. It is expected that such evidence will form part of contractual arrangements that would see the evidence flow back through the value chain from the reprocessor, who could be required through legislation to pass this evidence on, to First Points of Consolidation and the First Points of Consolidation would be required to present adequate evidence of reprocessing to the EPR Scheme Administrator/s, taking account of acceptable losses. It is thought that such an approach should strengthen feedback through the system on both quality and contamination.
- 2.5. Adequate data will also be required to ensure that government and other stakeholders can calculate standard metrics, particularly recycling rates by broad material type and potentially by quality.
- 2.6. For successful EPR there is also a need for granular data on waste composition and the Authority (Defra) and the Devolved Administrations need to know whether that should be predicated on, or developed from, existing EU waste data catalogue codes, Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes or based on a completely different descriptor and what role would such granular compositional data have in the context of accurately recording and reconciling material received at points of first consolidation to facilitate the netting off of material values, making accurate payments to waste collectors, and helping establish how to share collection and sorting costs between producers.
- 2.7. Electronic waste tracking might fill some of these data and information gaps, but at this stage the Authority cannot assume that it will definitely meet all the needs, so thought will need to be given to whether digital waste tracking (plus other compositional data that should flow from the proposed Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) regulation amendments²) is the only or best solution for the challenges set out above.
- 2.8. To meet these objectives Defra is commissioning a two-stage project. These are:
- 2.8.1. **Work package 1**: will be a relatively 'light touch' scoping study which will set out the parameters of the issues in broad terms and explore where the main risks potentially are that would threaten successful and effective EPR.
- 2.8.2. **Work package 2:** will investigate the high-risk areas emerging from WP 1 in more detail and explore and recommend options for solutions.
- 2.8.3. Stakeholder engagement will be a very key part of the work, including around industry reporting.
- 2.8.4. Progression into work package 2 will be dependent on successful delivery of work package 1.

² Data via the material sampling and compositional analysis proposal as detailed on page 122 of the consultation (link at footnote 1)

3. Research Objectives

- 3.1. The Authority have outlined several objectives and associated research questions to be answered by this project.
 - a. To determine the standard of evidence needed to support successful EPR for packaging in terms of data and other information that links reprocessors and exporters to 'First Points of Consolidation' in the chain. In particular, what is the standard of evidence required around quantity and quality of material flows, including for EPR payments, quality incentives or potential target proposals? For example, would the proof of recycling require First Points of Consolidation to adequately link waste received with waste that leaves the site (via sorting, mixing and bulking of loads). And how would proof of packaging content received and processed by reprocessors and exporters be derived and measured?
 - b. To identify the options for providing this, in particular the possible role of commercial contracts, waste tracking or regulation and any other possibilities, e.g. advances in distributed ledger technologies (beyond blockchain), drawing out the advantages and disadvantages of these and any other relevant information.
 - c. To identify the standard of evidence required to guard against fraud and enable calculation of common metrics, including packaging recycling rates at national and regional level.
 - d. To determine what value the flow back of reprocessing evidence would add in terms of increased transparency and reduced fraud, and information for supporting EPR payments.
 - e. To determine what the evidence and data would look like in terms of reprocessing quality for different material types.
 - f. To determine whether it is possible to / how would you set 'acceptable' or 'average' loss rates to help identify misreporting, fraud, or inefficiency within the system;
 - g. To determine how quickly this evidence is likely to flow back through the system.
 - h. Identify the role of waste data tracking in successful EPR and consider the extent to which the flow of evidence back from reprocessors to First Points of Consolidation' could reduce the need / frequency of compositional analysis sampling at First Points of Consolidation and how WDT could help with this.
 - i. To identify the options consistent with the data needs for successful EPR to enable a sufficient level of detail in waste composition reporting and potential links with WDT – eg use or build on EWC codes, SIC codes, or develop a completely new system?

j. To determine if it is feasible and what the options would be for regulators to regulate or compliance monitor the evidence that is passed back to First Points of Consolidation from reprocessors or exporters.

4. Approach and Methodology

- 4.1. The project will be divided into two work packages. Work package 1 will largely set out the parameters of the issues in broad terms and explore where the main risks potentially are. Work package 2 will investigate the high-risk areas emerging from WP 1 in more detail and explore and recommend options for solutions.
- 4.2. Stakeholder engagement will be a very key part of the work in both work packages.
- 4.3. **Work Package 1**: this will mainly address research objectives a, c, d, e, f, g, and h by, for example, identifying the standard and type of data and other information required to flow back from reprocessors and exporters and the role of waste composition in EPR and implications for granularity.
- 4.4. **Work Package 2**: Work Package 2: this will mainly address research objectives b, i and j by, for example, considering:
 - How available and collectable are the data to the required level of detail and frequency?
 - Where are the main risks that would arise through not being able to obtain the data?
 - How could these risks be managed?
 - How can the data gaps be filled guickly, efficiently and by when?

Any other pertinent risks and the solutions to those

5. Payment

- 5.1. All payment will be made to the successful Contractor by invoice according to the agreed milestones. However, where there has been an overpayment made by the Authority to the Contractor, such monies shall be recoverable.
- 5.2. There will be two payment stages. The first payment (40% of total cost) will be made on completion of the interim report. The second and final payment (60% of total cost) will be on delivery of a satisfactory and final report.

6. Deliverables and Timelines

 Inception meeting with the project steering group and supplier.	Week commencing 2021	2 nd August

Progress updates	Fortnightly teleconference/phone call to update the Defra Project Officer on progress, with steering group participation if required technically.	Fortnightly or as issues arise.
Data analysis and outputs	Data collection, collation and analysis.	Ongoing throughout WP1 and then WP2, subject to successful delivery of WP1
WP1 completed	Interim report, including provisional findings from WP1	Week commencing 30 th August
WP2 completed		Week commencing 4th October
Draft final report	Draft final report to include all outputs and supporting text. To be provided by e-mail to the Defra Project Officer.	Week commencing 11th October 2021
Final Report	Final report, incorporating comments from the steering group on the draft report. To be provided by e-mail to the Defra Project Officer.	By 22 nd October or within two weeks of receipt of Defra's comments, whichever is the later.

Please Note:

Tenderers must be aware that all Tenders are submitted in acceptance of agreed Authority's 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.

SECTION 3: EVALUATION

Evaluation comprises the stages set out in the table below. More information on evaluation criteria is set out in Bravo

Stage	Section Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Question Scoring/
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.	Weighting (%) Pass/Fail
Stage 2	Organisation and Contact Details	This stage is not scored but you will be eliminated from the procurement if the information is not provided in full.	Pass/Fail
Stage 3	Grounds for Mandatory Rejection	This stage is not scored but if you answer "Yes" to any of the questions the Authority will reject your Tender.	Pass/Fail.
Stage 4	Grounds for Discretionary Rejection	This stage is not scored but if you answer "Yes" to any of the questions the Authority may reject your Tender.	Pass/Fail.
Stage 5	Financial & Economic Standing	This stage is not scored but you may be eliminated from the procurement if the Authority believes your organisation does not have the financial resources to provide the goods/services required.	Pass/Fail
Stage 6	Technical & Professional Ability – Project Specific Requirements) (Technical Questionnaire)	This stage will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in the Technical Questionnaire.	Scored. The Total Technical Score will be produced by the sub- weighted scores of the following questions: E01 – Understanding of the policy context - 10% E02 – Approach, methodology and outputs - 50%

			E03 – Expertise and experience 25% E04 – Project management, quality assurance, risk management and mitigation – 15%
Stage 7	Pricing Schedule	Prices will be evaluated in accordance with criteria set out in the Pricing Schedule	Scored
Stage 8		If you pass stages 1 to 5 your Tender will be evaluated in stages 6 to 7 The final score is calculated as follows: 80% is made up of the total of Stage 6 20% is made up from Stage 7	Scored

Stages 1-5

1.1 The Authority will review your responses to these stages. The Authority may choose to reject your submission based on your responses, as detailed in the table above.

Financial standing (pass/fail)

- 1.2 The Authority will review the economic information provided in Section 5 of the response form 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.
- 1.3 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 your parent company, if applicable; and/or
- 1.4 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.
- 1.5 The Authority's assessment of economic and financial standing will consider financial strength and risk of business failure.

- 1.6 **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.
- 1.7 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 1.9 are applied.
- 1.8 Each question will be scored separately, and no reference will be made between the questions.
- 1.9 To ensure that the relative importance of both sets of criteria is correctly reflected in the overall score, a weighting system will be applied to the evaluation:
 - the total quality scores awarded will form 80% of the final score;
 - The score awarded for price will form **20%** of the final score.
- 1.10 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.
- 1.11 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.
- 1.12 Tender responses will form part of the Contract awarded to the successful Tenderer.

STAGE 7: TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

Technical evaluation

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, in order to determine the most appropriate tender to be offered the contract.

The Technical will form 80% of the Evaluation and the Commercial 20%.

Scoring Criteria - Technical Evaluation

If a score of twenty is awarded to a response to Questions E01 to E04 the Authority may choose to reject the Tender.

The Technical Evaluation will be scored as follows:

Scoring Criteria (for information)

- ➤ For a score of 100: Excellent Response is completely relevant and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirement and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full providing additional added value.
- ➤ 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.

E01 – Understanding of the Policy Context (weighting: 10%)

Please set out your consideration of how the policy context will inform and shape this project, as well as your own understanding of its aims and objectives. Outline your understanding of the policy/research context and the key issues/challenges that the project needs to address.

Evaluation criteria

Higher marks will be awarded to those who demonstrate:

• a clear understanding of the policy and research context of the study and

 the key issues and challenges coming out of the project that you propose to address.

Your response must be a maximum of one side of A4, font size 11. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E01 Your Company Name'.

E02 – Approach, methodology and outputs (weighting: 50%)

Please provide details of your project design and methodology, and how this meets the aims, objectives and outputs detailed in this specification,

Please describe your approach and methodology for delivering the full scope of requirements detailed in this specification separately setting out the approach to WP1 and WP2. Please address each of the objectives given above clearly. Outline the approaches to be used to achieve the objectives and set out the work plan for the life of the project stating clearly how you intend to proceed.

Where appropriate, please describe the analyses of data you propose to undertake. This should include any statistical inputs

Your Response must include but not be limited to your approach to:

- Determining the standard of evidence needed to support successful EPR with packaging, in particular around quantity and quality of material flows, and the options for providing this, as per objectives 1, 2 and 3.
 - For example determining the feasibility to pass back evidence through the value chain given the possibility that, say, smaller transfer stations might potentially struggle to obtain the evidence from their contractors, and also potential issues for regulators around whether they could compliance monitor against this data that has been provided through contractual arrangements would regulators be able to query/validate the evidence itself?
 - Also determining the feasibility to link end point recycling evidence to the collection evidence given the numbers of facilities this evidence may go through and that waste could be bulked together multiple times and sent on to other facilities for further processing, and also the delays in the passing back of the recycling evidence. These are examples of potential challenges around transparency and accuracy with data flow for successful EPR that the project will need to address.
- Determining the information required to meet the other objectives.
- How the research can be designed to ensure the findings reliably translate from a
 hypothetical research context to a real-life context when EPR is implemented, being
 particularly mindful that stakeholders might have still not fully developed their
 thinking around what will be required for successful EPR, including in terms of data
 flow.

Evaluation criteria

Higher marks will be awarded to those responses which clearly demonstrate:

- a clear approach to addressing the requirements of WP1 and WP2
- understanding of the analytical methods to be used, data analysis requirements.
- how the work will ensure insightful analysis and reporting, including findings and conclusions.

Your response must be a maximum of five sides of A4, font size 11. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E02 Your Company Name'.

E03 – Expertise and Experience (weighting: 25%)

Please outline your proposed project team and provide details of your expertise and previous experience relevant to this requirement. CVs for key individuals who will be involved in delivering the project should be submitted to support your response (maximum of two sides of A4 per CV).

Please describe your project team's capability in delivering research projects that are relevant or comparable to this specification. This should include strong knowledge and possibly experience across the packaging sector.

Please include details of the number of years your organisation or the proposed team has been involved in this activity. This should include details of your organisation's experience in delivering research detailed in this specification. Please include a list of up to 5 references within the last 5 years 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 such as sampling capabilities, data handling and analysis systems.

Your response must include the below.

- Provide details of the proposed project team and the team structure, including an organogram showing the structure of your project team. Please include any subcontractors, if relevant.
- Demonstrate that key individuals have relevant expertise and experience to undertake the proposed project.
- Set out the number of days that each person will be spending on the project and provide a breakdown showing the allocation of time across different components of the project by all key individual members of the proposed team.

Evaluation Criteria

Higher marks will be awarded to those responses which clearly demonstrate:

- sufficient recent experience and capability of effectively delivering comparable projects.
- the size and structure of the proposed project team is sufficient to ensure that adequate resources have been allocated for all of the required roles and responsibilities with a clear demonstration of the time input from key individuals.
- the experience of the staff proposed is appropriate to the roles allocated.

Your response must be a maximum of three sides of A4, font size 11, plus CVs. Links to other documents will not be considered as part of your response. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E03_Your Company Name'.

E04 - Project Management, Quality Assurance, Risk Management and Mitigation (weighting: 15%)

Please provide details of the proposed project management arrangements, including draft timelines and communication with Defra.

Please identify the individual(s) who will have overall responsibility for the contract and a representative available for day-to-day contact with Defra's contract manager.

If relevant, include details of any subcontracting arrangements and how this will be managed.

Please provide details of how you intend to quality assure work undertaken as part of this contract and outputs so that deliverables are provided efficiently, to a high standard and on time. Please identify the key risks associated with this contract and provide details of risk mitigation.

Your response must include the below.

- Demonstrate a robust approach to project management with a description of how this will be implemented, including in relation to change management, issues escalation and quality control.
- Provide a project plan, including a Gantt chart, which sets out how you will achieve
 the key milestones, including timelines, inter-dependencies, risks and issues. (The
 Gantt chart will not contribute to the page limit stated below).
- Provide details of the strategies, policies or systems you will use to ensure the
 delivery of the project meets quality requirements, including work delivered by subcontractors or through consortium arrangements.
- Provide an assessment of key risks, including any technical, personnel, stakeholder, timetable and commercial risks, and provide details of risk mitigation and redress including in the event that outputs do not meet the specification
- Your response should contain a list of relevant perceived Risks to the Project which could affect your ability to deliver the required outputs. An indication of the level of Risk (high, medium or low), the Mitigation measures to be put in place
- Clear communication routes and a proposed approach to working with Defra including a strategy for dissemination of the findings.
- 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 are in place to effectively manage these arrangements throughout the contract.

Evaluation Criteria

Higher marks will be awarded to those responses which clearly demonstrate:

- Clear project management plan
- Good quality assurance
- Scope of consideration of the risk
- Rationale for assignment of risk levels and appropriateness of mitigation measures
- A comprehensive and realistic approach for communicating to ensure successful delivery of the Contract
- A comprehensible approach to dissemination of the findings with due regard to public reassurance and media aspects.

Your response must be a maximum of three sides of A4, font size 11, with an additional one side of A4 for a Gantt chart. Please upload a document with the filename: 'E04_Your Company Name'.

STAGE 8: Commercial Evaluation (20%)

Tenderers are 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:

```
Score = <u>Lowest Tender Price</u> x 20% (Maximum available marks)
Tender Price
```

For example, if three Tender Responses are received and Tenderer A has quoted £3,000 as their total price, Tenderer B has quoted £5,000 and Tenderer C has quoted £6,000 then the calculation will be as follows:

```
Tenderer A Score = £3000/£3000 x 20% (Maximum available marks) = 20% Tenderer B Score = £3000/£5000 x 20% (Maximum available marks) = 12% Tenderer C Score = £3000/£6000 x 20% (Maximum available marks) = 10%
```

Travel and Subsistence

All Travel and Subsistence should be in line with Defra's Travel and Subsistence Policy. Claims should always be supported by valid receipts for audit purposes and must not exceed any of the stated rates below. Should the stated rated be exceeded, Defra reserve the right to reimburse only up to the stated rate.

Rail Travel

All Journeys – Standard class rail unless a clear business case demonstrating value for money can be presented. This includes international rail journeys by Eurostar and other international and overseas rail operators.

Mileage Allowance

Mileage Allowance	First 10,000 business miles in the tax year	Each business mile over 10,000 in the tax year
Private cars and vans – no public transport rate*	45p	25p
Private cars and vans – public transport rate	25p	25p
Private motor cycles	24p	24p
Passenger supplement	5р	5р
Equipment supplement**	3р	3р
Bicycle	20p	20p

^{*}NB the 'no public transport rate' for car and van travel can only be claimed where the use of a private vehicle for the journey is essential e.g. on grounds of disability or where there is no practical public transport alternative. If the use of the vehicle is not essential the 'public transport rate' should be claimed.

UK Subsistence

Location	Rate (Upper Limit)
London (Bed and Breakfast)	£130
UK Other (Bed and Breakfast)	£75
Rates for specific cities (bed and breakfast)	Bristol £100 per night Weybridge £100 per night Warrington £90 per night Reading £85 per night

1

^{**} Under HMRC rules this expense is taxable.

APPENDIX A

FORM OF TENDER

To be returned by 12:00 GMT on 20 July 2021.

TENDER FOR THE: Waste management data required for Extended Producer Responsibility in the UK – (i) evidence requirements for linking material reprocessors and exporters back to others in the chain, (ii) waste composition.

Tender Ref: itt 8886

- 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 02 August 2021 for the period specified in the ITT.
 - Tender Particulars (Section 1)
 - Specification of Requirements (Section 3)
 - 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:
 - 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			

APPENDIX B

AUTHORITY'S CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT

This Document is available on BRAVO Portal

APPENDIX C

Commercial Pricing Proposal

This Document is available on BRAVO Portal

APPENDIX D

Staff Time in Days Template

This Document is available on BRAVO Portal