



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

Bidder Pack

Procurement Specific Requirements

OAK SPLASH Procurement

Procurement Reference Number C-5542

01/2023

Version Date: January 2023 (Version 3.1)

Contents

Section 1: The Invitation	2
The Opportunity	3
Timetable	5
Section 2: The Specification of Requirements	6
The Authority's Priorities	7
Scope	7
Division of the Contract into Lots	7
Accessibility.....	7
Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract	7
Section 4: Evaluation Methodology.....	8
Section 5: Appendices	17
1.Definitions	18
2.Form of Tender	19
3.Specification.....	20
4.Conditions of Contract.....	20

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 5, Appendix 1 of the Procurement Specific Requirements.

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.

The Opportunity

This opportunity is advertised by Defra group Commercial on behalf of Defra.

The Futures team of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) is responsible for providing strategic foresight in support of the departments strategy and policy development. We use a range of futures methodologies to provide non-mainstream insight and generate novel forms of thinking and evidence. We have identified the strategic need to (1) explore innovations in AI as part of HMGs Artificial Intelligence Strategy¹ and its application in environmental² policy foresight generation and (2) provide new forms of evidence (e.g., narrative³) to strategic policy priorities (e.g., International Strategy, Land Use Change and Water)⁴. We are therefore seeking an academic partnership to conduct collaborative prototyping and research on the use of Artificial Intelligence⁵ to identify and analyse various futural features^{6,7} found within unstructured textual data. We are seeking to enter into an initial 9-month partnership with the possibility to extend to output evaluation.

¹ HMG (2021) [National Artificial Intelligence Strategy](#)

² 'Environmental' is used here as an umbrella term for the full range of policy responsibilities Defra owns.

³ See for example, Dillon and Craig, [2022](#)

⁴ OAK SPLASH, as a foresight science project seeks to support in general with the Environmental Principles, chiefly, the Prevention and Precautionary Principles. Defra (2022) [Policy paper, Draft environmental principles policy statement](#)

⁵ We use AI as a broad term and take it to include a range of techniques, such as Machine Learning and NLP etc.

⁶ See Overview Document.

⁷ OAK SPLASH primarily considers futurity from a phenomenological perspective, e.g., DeRoo ([2013](#)) and Strawson in Bayne and Montague, ([2011](#))

As a collaboration, Defra will commit a permanent allocation of scientist and project management staff time. As a partnership, we will be weighing more favourably proposals that will provide a contribution to the project through their own spend, joint-partnering (e.g., with another University or research centre) and/or targeted use of additional funding sources (e.g., PhD placements). We welcome and encourage creative approaches that will maximise the exposure and accessibility of this research in order to stimulate further policy-focused research and development in AI for environmental foresight more broadly.

For further information please visit

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/department-for-environment-food-rural-affairs>

The following UK public sector bodies are authorised and enabled to use the contract Defra Group.

Background

‘Ash before Oak, you’re in for a soak, Oak before Ash, you’re in for a splash.’ This folklore is grounded in observations of tree flowering and rainfall, and what we should anticipate based on what we see ahead of time: a flowering Ash before Oak, you’re in for a wet summer. A future image emerges based on temporal reasoning (Farming Forum, [2019](#); RHS, [2022](#); Teagasc, [2021](#)). As Conway ([2022](#)) has recently put it, ‘images and ideas about the future are constructed in people’s minds and generate social, collective realities that are the construct by which our futures are made ‘real’. Zittoun and Gillespie ([2018](#)) conclude that ‘the only access we have to people’s meaning-making is through externalization, that is, the part of these semiotic dynamics made perceptible to others’. One of the most abundant forms of these externalised future imaginaries are found in textual data, whereby text that is ‘about’ the future, manifests a cognitive thought that is a ‘future manifest’ (e.g., Strawson in Bayne and Montague, [2011](#)). Secondly, we can find a special form of narrative - ‘Future Narratives (FNs)’ in textual data (Bode, [2013](#)). These FNs act to set out choices, set expectations and frame particular futures over others. If these arguments hold, there exists a mass amount of empirical futures data which exceeds the ability of a human analyst to process, but arguably contain stronger associations with ‘real futures’ than any form of trends analysis or probabilistic assessments. With OAK SPLASH, we set out to find, surface and analyse these ‘real futures’ – from the mundane and functional to the aspirational or threatening. Between October 2021 and October 2022, the Futures team, together with academics specialising in futures narratives drawn from the Defra Futures Advisory Group, worked with a commercial AI company to conduct an initial discovery phase of finding these

futures within unstructured textual data. This demonstrated some initial feasibility⁸ in identifying, extracting and classifying futures within unstructured textual data.

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.

1	Opportunity Notice published in Find a Tender System and Bidder Pack released	W/C 09/01/2023
2	Evaluation of Supplier Questionnaires	Start 25/01/2023 End 31/01/2023
4	Deadline for clarification questions	19/01/2023 12:00 pm
5	Deadline for Responses	24/01/2022 17:00 pm
6	Evaluation of Tender	Start 25/01/2023 End 31/01/2023
7	Moderation	01/02/2023 – 03/2/2023
8	Contract award notification	w/c 06/02/2023
9	Contract Drafting	w/c 06/02/2023
10	Contract award	w/c 13/02/2023
11	Contract start date	w/c 13/02/2023
12	Transition period	n/a
13	Service commencement date	w/c 13/02/2023

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.

⁸ Annex X: List and Sample of Phase 1 Outputs: to be made available upon registration of interest.

Abnormally Low Tenders or Pricing Anomalies

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

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

Pricing Anomalies

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

Section 2: The Specification of Requirements

The Authority's Priorities

Intent

The intent of OAK SPLASH is to explore the use of NLP and other associated AI technologies in processing large volumes of open-source textual data to derive useful, policy-relevant evidence of futures and narrative existing in circulation within the 'information domain'. This project is positioned as a second discovery phase endeavour and we are not seeking to operationalise any findings within the 12-months of the contract. Rather, we seek to test the feasibility, validity, robustness and capacity to derive novel evidence for policymaking. Therefore, the project will be framed around 3 challenge questions:

In relation to a specific policy-focused area of interest:

- Q1.** How might we identify and analyse the narrative composition of a given locality?
- Q2.** How might we identify and analyse what types of future are present in a given locality?
- Q3.** How might we identify and analyse the contingent elements of certain futures and futures we are being warned of?

Scope

Appendix 3 sets out the Specification of Requirements.

Division of the Contract into Lots

This procurement requirement is not divided into Lots due to the requirements

The Authority intends to award a Contract to the most economically advantageous tender (in accordance with Section 4: Evaluation Methodology).

Accessibility

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

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

Section 3: Terms and Conditions of Contract

The Terms and Conditions of Contract for this procurement are DgC Short Form Contract.

The Terms and Conditions are split into Core Terms and Contracting Authority Terms within the [Annexes / Schedules], and details of the legal priority are provided in. Order Form for the DgC Short Form.

The Authority proposes to enter into Contract(s) for a maximum period of 9-months with provision to extend by a further period of 1 year with the successful Tenderer(s).

The initial contract term shall be 9-months with the potential for 1 year extension period.

The anticipated commencement date is 3/02/2023.

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:

Please complete and return attached document called Technical Evaluation Document:



Technical
Evaluation Document

Summary

	Section Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Question Scoring/Weighting (%)
Evaluation Stage 1 - Technical	Selection Stage: Selection Questionnaire (SQ) responses submitted in response to the Contract Notice	Part 1: covers the basic information about the supplier, such as the contact details, trade memberships, details of parent companies, group bidding and so on and is provided for information only.	Weighted scoring as detailed in each Question. Minimum pass rates are included against relevant questions
		Part 2: covers a series of self-declarations by the supplier regarding whether or not any of the questionnaire exclusion grounds apply and will be assessed on that basis.	Weighted scoring as detailed in each Question. Minimum pass rates are included against relevant questions
		Part 3: covers a series of self-declaration questions regarding whether or not the	Pass/Fail

		company meets the selection criteria in respect of their financial standing and technical capacity.	
	Section Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Question Scoring/Weighting (%)
	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 the eSourcing System/accept the Form of Tender statement in the SQ your Tender will be rejected as non-compliant.	Pass/Fail

Evaluation Stage 1 - Technical	Section Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Question Scoring/Weighting (%)
	Evaluation Stage: Technical	<p>This stage will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria set out in SQ above.</p> <p>All responses will be evaluated and scored as detailed in the scoring breakdown contained in the below document.</p>	<p>Weighted scoring as detailed in each Question.</p> <p>Minimum pass rates are included against relevant questions</p>
<p>The Technical evaluation will account for 80% of the total score. All responses will be scored in accordance with [the detailed guidance within the Authority's eSourcing System]</p> <p>Tenderers who fail to achieve the stated Technical Thresholds will not proceed to the Commercial evaluation.</p>			

Evaluation Stage 2 - Commercial	Section Reference	Evaluation Criteria	Question Scoring/Weighting (%)
	Evaluation Stage: Commercial - Pricing Schedule	Prices will be evaluated in accordance with criteria set out in [the Pricing Schedule in the Authority's eSourcing System] and will be based on Fixed Cost.	Scored
The Commercial evaluation will account for 20% of the total score. All responses will be scored in accordance with the detailed guidance within the Authority's eSourcing System]			
	Section Reference	Calculation	
	Final score	<p>The final score is calculated by adding the total quality weighted score with the total commercial weighted score.</p> <p>The most economically advantageous tender will be the Tender with the highest final score.</p>	

Evaluation questions and responses

Please ensure that all questions have a response. Please make sure the response to each question is included in full in each response box, do not worry about repetition between questions as each question will be evaluated separately.

Word limit is the upper limit we do not expect respondents to need this full word count for each response. Please present answers in alternative formats where appropriate.

Question	Criteria / Detail	Score
Part 1 - Technical		

T001	<p>Demonstrable competency in developing, training and proving the robustness of Natural Language Process (NLP) models⁹ - 250 words.</p> <p>Please note that the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage should bids not achieve a minimum pass rate of 70 in this question.</p>	5%
Response		
T002	<p>Ability to apply¹⁰ Natural Language Processing (NLP) to a range of different unstructured textual data forms (e.g. Social Media, blogs, Journals, literature, technical reports, science fiction etc.)¹¹ -250 words.</p> <p>Please note that the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage should bids not achieve a minimum pass rate of 50 in this question.</p>	15%
Response		
T003	<p>Have (or be able to access) a specialist in Media Information Analysis (e.g., reach/engagement metrics, emerging social media environments, media coverage, socio-political media data, audience segmentation, media ownership, demographics etc.) Max word limit is 250 words.</p>	5%

⁹ Herein, NLP includes any other associated techniques (e.g., topic modelling) that could be used.

¹⁰ By 'apply', you should infer 'experiment with'. We are seeking to test feasibility and viability of different forms of unstructured textual data.

¹¹ Available on request – includes a continually growing and refining dataset of ~2000 pre-identified sources, organised in Source Groups. This does not contain raw textual data but does indicate where we would seek to direct scrapping from.

Response		
T004	Knowledge of, access to ¹² and ability to configure appropriate datasets both for training and live testing ¹³ -Max word limit is 250 words.	5%
Response		
T005	Ability to host data in a suitable environment - Max word limit is 250 words.	5%
Response		
T001D	Publicised current research in relevant areas. (Please list references)	1%
Response		
T002D	Ability to apply Natural Language Processing (NLP) to at least one non-English language ¹⁴ - Max word limit is 250 words.	1%

¹² We anticipate this may include purchasing data and expect proposal to budget according for this provision.

¹³ Ibid

¹⁴ Primarily for comparative analysis (e.g., does an NLP Futures Classifier trained on English data provide reliable results on Russian texts?)

Response		
T003D	Access to foreign linguists' for deeper studies on non-English language testing (esp. Russian, Chinese, Arabic or Spanish) - Max word limit is 250 words..	1%
Response		
Part 2 - Delivery		
D001	<p>Produce a high-level, indicative delivery plan that describes how the each of the futural features, capabilities and processes will be attended to¹⁵ -Max 500 words not including figures –</p> <p>Alternative formats will be considered</p> <p>Attach separate document if required.</p> <p>Please note that the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage should bids not achieve a minimum pass rate of 70 in this question.</p>	15%
Response		
D002	Produce a high-level, indicative costed breakdown of named personnel to be assigned to the project, including an appointed research director – attach table.	10%

¹⁵ We anticipate an initial workshop to establish a joint way of working, timings and output schedule within the first month

	Please note that the decision may be taken that a Response will not be carried forward to the next evaluation stage should bids not achieve a minimum pass rate of 50 in this question.	
Response		
D003	Demonstrate (and where necessary develop) appropriate data governance mechanisms - Max word limit is 250 words, making reference to existing institutional policies.	5%
Response		
D004	Commitment to open ¹⁶ , transparent and explainable protocols with a clear focus on critically engaging with and addressing issues of algorithmic and data bias - Max word limit is 250 words, making reference to existing institutional policies.	5%
Response		
D005	Appropriately skilled personnel identified to support the completion of a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) ¹⁷ with the Defra DPO and core team - Max word limit is 250 words with named individual(s).	5%
Response		

¹⁶ Here referring to [Open Standards](#) and towards publishing of theory, methods and results.

¹⁷ ICO, [Data Protection Impact Assessment](#)

D006	Set up and conduct ethics reviews with appropriately skilled personnel and processes - Max word limit is 250 words, making reference to existing institutional policies.	5%
Response		
D007	Able to work in an agile manner, focusing on releasing outputs early and often to support iteration ¹⁸ - Max word limit is 250 words.	5%
Response		
D008	Commitment to interdisciplinary, critical investigation of the NLP methodology, technical tools and processes used ¹⁹ - Max word limit is 250 words.	5%
Response		
D009	Delivery risks identified, assessed and managed - Max word limit is 250 words, presented in a table (optional).	5%
Response		

¹⁸ To best ensure this collaboration can be opportunistic in its support to live policy making, we would aim to work together to agree 'Output Iteration Cycles' (OIC) whereby we can gauge when we can anticipate output.

¹⁹ e.g., Halford et al ([2018](#)); Halford and Savage ([2017](#)); Tinati et al ([2014](#)).

D001D	Has established links with other relevant programmes, projects and institutions broadly related to data innovations in environmental fields - Max word limit is 250 words list.	1%
Response		
D002D	Have established means to ensure (or be willing to support the development of) effective knowledge sharing - Max word limit is 250 words.	1%
Response		
Part 3 – Self Declaration Questions (supplier) - Qualification Envelope - Financial Standing (Duns and Bradstreet report		
Please provide Dun and Bradstreet number:		
Please provide company registration number:		

¹ To best ensure this collaboration can be opportunistic in its support to live policy making, we would aim to work together to agree 'Output Iteration Cycles' (OIC) whereby we can gauge when we can anticipate output.

¹ e.g., Halford et al ([2018](#)); Halford and Savage ([2017](#)); Tinati et al ([2014](#)).

Selection Questionnaire / Qualification Envelope with 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. For this procurement, the Authority expects the contractor to have an annual turnover for each of its last two financial years

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.

Evaluation of Responses

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

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

Scoring Criteria

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

Very good	100	Addresses all the Authority's requirements with all the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. There are no weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority complete confidence that all the requirements will be met to a high standard.
Good	70	Addresses all the Authority's requirements with all the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. The response contains minor weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority confidence that all the requirements will be met to a good standard.
Moderate	50	Addresses most of the requirements with most of the relevant supporting information set out in the Bidder Pack. The response contains moderate weaknesses and therefore the tender response gives the Authority confidence that most of the requirements will be met to a suitable standard.

Weak	20	Substantially addresses the requirements but not all and provides supporting information that is of limited or no relevance or a methodology containing significant weaknesses and therefore raises concerns for the Authority that the requirements may not all be met.
Unacceptable	0	No response or provides a response that gives the Authority no confidence that the requirement will be met.

Calculation Method

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

Technical (WT)

$$\left[\frac{\text{Bidder's Total Technical Score}}{\text{Highest Technical Score}} \times 100 = X \right] \quad \text{then} \quad \left[\frac{X}{100} \times [\text{Weighting}] \right]$$

Commercial (WC)

$$\left[\frac{\text{Lowest Commercial Score}}{\text{Bidder's Total Commercial Score}} \times 100 = X \right] \quad \text{then} \quad \left[\frac{X}{100} \times [\text{Weighting}] \right]$$

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

Section 5: Appendices

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
“Authority”	the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs acting as part of the Crown
“Bidder Pack”	this invitation to tender and all related documents published by the Authority and made available to Tenderers.
“Contract”	the contract (set out in Appendix B) to be entered into by the Authority and the successful Tenderer.
“EIR”	the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (as amended) together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or any Government Department in relation to those Regulations.
“eSourcing system”	eSourcing system is the eSourcing system used by the Authority for conducting this procurement, which can be found at http://defra.eSourcing.systemsolution.co.uk for projects run on Bravo, or https://defra-family.force.com/s/Welcome for projects run on Atamis
“FOIA”	the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (as amended) and any subordinate legislation made under that Act together with any guidance and/or codes of practice issued by the Information Commissioner or any Government Department in relation to that legislation.
“Form of Tender”	means the form contained in Annex 2 to the Procurement Specific section of the Bidder Pack which must be signed, scanned and uploaded into the Authority’s eSourcing System by the Tenderer to indicate that it understands the Tender and accepts the various terms and conditions and other requirements of participating in the exercise.
“Information”	means the information contained in the Bidder Pack or sent with it, and any information which has been made available to the Tenderer by the Authority, its employees, agents or advisers in connection with the procurement.
“Involved Person”	means any person who is either working for, or acting on behalf of, the Authority in connection with this procurement and/or the Contract including, without limitation, any officer, employee, advisor, agent, member, partner or consultant”.
“Pricing Schedule”	the form accessed via eSourcing system in which Tenderers are required to submit their pricing information as part of a Tender.
“Regulations”	the Public Contracts Regulations 2015.

“Relevant Body	means any other organisation, body or government department that is working with or acting on behalf of the Authority in connection with this procurement and/or the Contract including, without limitation, its officers, employees, advisors, agents, members, partners or consultants.
“Response”	means the information submitted in response to the Bidder Pack via the online response forms on eSourcing system including the Tenderer’s formal Tender.
“Specification of Requirements”	the Authority’s requirements set out in Section 2 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements.
“Tender”	the formal offer to provide the goods or services 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.
“Tenderer”	anyone responding to the Bidder Pack and, where the context requires, includes a potential tenderer.
“Timetable”	the procurement timetable set out in Section 1 of the Bidder Pack Procurement Specific Requirements.

2. Form of Tender

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

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

3. Specification

For information – this is embedded below and will form part of the Bidder Pack which will also be located on the Authority's eSourcing system.



20221021_OAK%20S
PLASH_Overview%20(

4. Conditions of Contract



Defra%20Terms%20
and%20Conditions.1

For information.

Located on the Authority's eSourcing system.