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**Standard Contract for Goods and/or Services - Order Form**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Purchase Order Number** | *to be confirmed* | |
| 1. **Customer** | **Environment Agency National Peatland Team** | |
| 1. **Contractor(s)** | *To be confirmed* | |
| 1. **Defra Group Members** | The following Defra Group members will receive the benefit of the Deliverables:  Environment Agency  ***Guidance Note: This section is to make clear which Defra Group Members the Goods/Services are for the benefit of (if any) for the purposes of Annex 3 of the terms and conditions***] | |
| 1. **The Agreement** | This Order is part of the Agreement and is subject to the terms and conditions referenced at Appendix 1 and shall come into effect on the Start Date.  Unless the context otherwise requires, capitalised expressions used in this Order have the same meanings as in the terms and conditions.  The following documents are incorporated into the Agreement. If there is any conflict, the following order of precedence applies (in descending order):   1. this Order; 2. the terms and conditions at Appendix 1; and 3. the remaining Appendices (if any) in equal order of precedence. | |
| 1. **Deliverables** | **Applicable Deliverables** | **Goods Only:**  **Services Only:**  **Good and Services:** |
| **Goods** | None |
| **Services** | In Appendix 2 – Specification  *[*To be performed at ***[*Insert *description of premises (including whether they are the Customer’s premises, the Contractor’s premises and/or a third party’s premises and in each case the address****)].]*  Date(s) of Delivery: 31/03/2026 |
| 1. **Start Date** | *03/11/2025* | |
| 1. **Expiry Date** | ***31/03/2026*** | |
| 1. **Charges** | The Charges for the Goods and/or Services shall be as set out [below ***[insert details]*** / in [Appendix 3 – Charges]]. The Charges are fixed for the duration of the Agreement. | |
| 1. **Payment** | ***Payments will be made in pounds by BACS transfer using the details provided by the supplier on submission of a compliant invoice.*** | |
| 1. **Contractor’s Liability Cap (Clause 13.2.1)** | [A sum equal to £5,000,000]. | |
| 1. **Customer’s Authorised Representative(s)** | For general liaison your contact will continue to be  **Mary Berry** [Mary.berry@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:Mary.berry@environment-agency.gov.uk)  or, in their absence,  [NationalPeatland@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:NationalPeatland@environment-agency.gov.uk) FIO Emma Taylor, Mark Whiteman, Lily Woodward | |
| 1. **Contractor’s Authorised Representative** | For general liaison your contact will continue to be  [**Insert *contract manager name and contact details***]  or, in their absence,  [**Insert *secondary name and contact details***]. | |
| 1. **Optional Intellectual Property Rights (“IPR”) Clauses** | The Customer has chosen Option **B(Default)**] in respect of intellectual property rights provisions for the Agreement as set out in the terms and conditions.    ***Option B: Customer ownership of all New IPR with limited Contractor rights to all New IPR in order to deliver the Agreement.***  ***Option B reflects a more standard position on ownership of IPRs and should be considered the default option. This should be used where the Customer should retain ownership of any New IPR and ensure that the Contractor cannot use it outside of Agreement delivery.*** | |
| 1. **Progress Meetings and Progress Reports** | * The Contractor shall attend progress meetings with the Customer every month * The Contractor shall provide the Customer with progress reports every month, or as requested | |
| 1. **Address for notices** | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Customer:** | **Contractor:** | | Environment Agency National Peatland Team  Attention: Mary Berry, or Emma Taylor  Email: NationalPeatland@environment-agency.gov.uk | [**insert *name and address of Contractor*]**  Attention: **[insert *title***]  Email: [**insert *email address***] | |  | | |
| 1. **Key Personnel of the Contractor** | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Key Personnel Role:** | **Key Personnel Name:** | **Contact Details:** | |  |  |  | |  | | | |  |  |  | | |
| 1. **Procedures and Policies** | For the purposes of the Agreement:  The Customer’s security / data security requirements are: contained in the Request for Quote document.  [The Customer’s additional sustainability requirements are: Request for Quote document.  [he Customer’s equality and diversity policy/requirements and instructions related to equality Law [and] environmental policy are contained in the Request for Quote document.  [The Customer’s health and safety policy is: contained in the Request for Quote document. | |
| 1. **Special Terms** | NA | |
| 1. **Additional Insurance** | NA | |
| 1. **Further Data Protection Provisions** | The further data protection provisions contained within Annex 4 of the terms and conditions are applicable to this Agreement where indicated below:  **Yes:**  **No:** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Signed for and on behalf of the **Customer** | Signed for and on behalf of the **Contractor** |
| Name:  [**Insert** name]  [**Insert** job title] | Name:  [**Insert** name]  [**Insert** job title] |
| Date: | Date: |
| Signature: | Signature: |

**Appendix 1: Terms and Conditions**

The Customer’s Standard Good & Services Terms and Conditions which can be located on the [Environment Agency Website](https://eur05.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.gov.uk%2Fgovernment%2Forganisations%2Fenvironment-agency%2Fabout%2Fprocurement%23conditions-of-contract&data=05%7C01%7Cdaniel.lavender%40dlapiper.com%7Ce61b389c5e15470f278e08dbcc060e37%7Ce855e7acc54640d299f7a100522010f9%7C1%7C0%7C638328098969691096%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=unzkH5WPQYjTjWw3SjQNZshbWnx2ajnZZ0TwQcK7Wxo%3D&reserved=0) and which are called ‘Standard Goods & Services Terms and Conditions (EA)’

**Appendix 2: Specification/Description**

Background to Environment Agency

The Environment Agency was established in 1996 to protect and improve the environment. We are an Executive Non-departmental Public Body responsible to the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Our principal aims are to protect and improve the environment, and to promote sustainable development.

We put the climate emergency at the heart of everything we do and help society adapt to environmental challenges such as flooding, drought, sea level rise and coastal change.

We improve and protect the quality of our air, land and water by tackling pollution. We work with businesses to help them comply with environmental regulations and believe a healthy and diverse environment enhances people’s lives and contributes to sustainable and resilient economic growth.

We know we cannot do this alone. We work together with local, national and global partners. This includes Defra group (the Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs), wider government, businesses, local councils, charities, civil society groups, local communities and international bodies.

We strive to make the right decisions today, for the people, wildlife and environment of tomorrow.

Peatland Water Quality and WFD

Background to the specific work area relevant to this purchase

The Environment Agency National Peatland Programme Team was set up to support the delivery of the England Peat Action Plan and the government's Net Zero: Build Back Greener strategy, which sets a target of restoring 280,000 hectares of peat in England by 2050. Understanding influences on peatlands which lead to degradation is key to halting decline. Additionally, recognising that degraded peatlands contribute to a reduction in natural capital benefits such as clean drinking water, healthy habitats and natural flood management is also important to help drive long term change. This project focuses on water quality issues arising from peatlands in headwater catchments (or upland peatlands), with an additional focus on the Water Environment Regulations (WFD).

This project aims to identify what connections there are between peatland degradation and water quality issues, how that relates to the Water Environment Regulations (WFD) and what best indicates water quality health in peatland dominated catchments through a Rapid Evidence Review. There may be evidence from different scales of peatland landscapes, which should be accounted for in outputs and there may be evidence gaps which need to be highlighted. Peatland areas in use for lowland agricultural purposes should not be considered within this evidence review.

Identifying the influence of peatland degradation on water quality and the WFD is a vital part of regulating water quality within upland peatland dominated catchments, as well as finding a solution. Monitoring of the WFD in England is undertaken at quarterly intervals via spot sampling and includes a specific set of criteria. The restrictions of sampling may not reflect the true status of peatland dominated water bodies within a catchment due to the flashy and sporadic nature of flow and distance from source the samples are taken. Additionally, water quality is a key driver of peatland restoration and understanding how best to approach ongoing monitoring efforts of water quality will help inform progress against targets.

Outputs will enable better understanding of pressures on peatlands and the resultant impacts on water bodies. From this, a picture will be built of what can be described as a suspected, probable or confirmed Reason for Not Achieving Good (RNAG) Status which will help inform action from the Environment Agency and partners to support positive change in peatland catchments. The better represented these issues can be within WFD monitoring, the more likely peatland restoration will be included within River Basin Management Plans and therefore prioritised for action within a river basin.

Using rapid evidence review techniques this project will review current evidence with outputs that describe what is known about the links between peatland degradation, water quality and the WFD, whether the WFD is a suitable method of measuring peatland catchment health, and if not, what would be more appropriate. Where evidence does not include reference to WFD but is relevant to water quality parameters linked to the WFD, this should be included within the evidence review with caveats. The outputs will seek to identify trends and themes within the subject area, for example land management activities, water quality components, pressures etc. It is likely that a mixture of human derived and natural processes influence the subject matter for this review and that the interaction between these will be complex. We would welcome contractors to consider different scenarios of hydrological state and how drought and inundation may impact water quality within a peatland catchment. Outputs should be relevant across all 4 UK Nations.

The project will run from October 2025 through to March 2026, with reporting due by March 31st 2026.

Requirement

Specific Objectives:

* Provide an overview of current understanding of peatland catchment water quality health.
* Summarise evidence linking peatland degradation to Water Environment Regulations (Water Framework Directive) linked water quality parameters.
* Provide suggestions of best practice for monitoring water quality in peatland dominated catchments.
* Outline what ‘good’ status within the WFD looks like for peatlands.
* Collaborate with Peer reviewer to ensure relevancy across multiple UK nations.

Contractors are encouraged to create innovative and interactive ways of displaying the summaries, conclusions and thematic outcomes of the review.

Deliverables:

1. Summary of Most Recent Evidence.

A literature review focusing on water quality, the Water Framework Directive specific Biological and Physico-chemical components, and where relevant, priority substances, linked to peatlands will be undertaken to answer the questions:

What are the effects of upland peatland degradation on water quality within water bodies in peatland dominated catchments?

What are the effects of upland peatland degradation on Ecological Quality Standards and supporting chemical elements within the WFD on water bodies?

What causes peatland catchments to not achieve good?

* A literature review focusing on water quality, the Water Framework Directive specific Biological and Physico-chemical components, and where relevant, priority substances, linked to peatlands will be undertaken.
* The literature review will first aim to establish wider peatland degradation and water quality issues and links, then compare this to evidence for impact on WFD parameters.
* The review will highlight where there are known connections between degraded peatlands and WFD biological and physico-chemical components.
* The contractor will specify which Ecological Quality Standard components and which chemical components are most likely to reliably indicate condition of peatland catchment water bodies and which are less relevant.
* Associations of land use or pressures, such as management and interventions, or other actions influencing water quality will be highlighted or themes identified. It may be that some actions are positive and some are negative, this will be highlighted and weight of evidence noted within each theme.
* It is likely that a mixture of human derived and natural processes influence the subject matter for this review and that the interaction between these will be complex. We would welcome contractors to consider different scenarios of hydrological state and how drought and inundation may impact water quality within a peatland catchment.
* The review will indicate evidence gaps and areas which require more research to be able to draw conclusions.
* The review will contain narrative and visualisation of information.

Consideration will be given to literature from the following sources:

* Academic and field-based evidence from temperate peatland systems (including UK, Western Europe and North America) and will exclude tropical peatlands.
* Grey literature

1. What does 'good' status look like for peatland catchments?

* Using WFD monitored [Ecological Quality Standards (EQS) and supporting elements](https://www.wfduk.org/), indicate what High, Good, Bad and Poor status looks like within a peatland catchment.
* Indicate where this differs from standard approaches to WFD EQS.
* Where the mechanisms, metrics, sampling style etc are not

1. How can we best monitor water quality within peatland catchments to provide a picture of overall health?

* Suggest a set of water quality parameters that can, in combination, indicate peatland health, even if those parameters fall outside of the WFD list.
* If there are different methodologies for different scales of interest, these should be outlined.
* If there are different methodologies which will best show a picture of overall health these will be highlighted.
* If there are different methodologies which would fit themes within water quality parameters or interest areas then those will be highlighted. For example ecological, chemical, drinking water, overall health etc.
* Pros and cons of each option should be included.
* Cost estimates, where possible, should be included.
* Suggestions will include justification and evidence.
* Information will be presented with visual supporting documents and be appropriate evidenced.

1. Identify available data which could be reanalysed within WFD metrics. Where previous research has collected data that could be reanalysed to indicate WFD water body status, undertake the reanalysis.

* Through the literature review, identify data that would be available to reanalyse using WFD metrics where possible.
* Reanalyse data available to show status of a water body within the WFD standards. Approaches could look at both the current WFD standards and the proposed 'good' status generated from this work.

Outputs:

* An evidence review outlining the answers to the questions listed above, including an evidence map/maps describing different themes identified through the review process. Themed groupings showing weight of evidence, credibility and other relevant information will be clear. The review will contain a narrative, but also innovative knowledge sharing to best demonstrate findings, preferably in a visual format to make the information useable and accessible.
* Well evidenced suggestions of how to approach water quality monitoring to measure catchment health.
* A description of what 'good' status looks like within a peatland dominated catchment, within the water framework directive.
* Reanalysed data with assigned status from WFD.

Created works such as reports, images, map layers, films, audio recordings, software, code, and datasets or databases are legally protected from certain types of re-use. Where you are acquiring an existing work or commissioning the creation of a new work which may incorporate a third party's work, you need to specify compatibility with your use, sharing and onward licensing requirements. See the guidance for more help.

Sustainability

The Environment Agency protects and improves the environment and is committed to reducing the sustainability impacts of its activities directly and through its supply chains. We expect the Contractor to share this commitment and adopt a sound, proactive sustainable approach in keeping with the 25 year environmental plan/our commitments compliant with all applicable legislation. This includes understanding and reducing direct and indirect sustainability impacts and realising opportunities, including but not restricted to; resilience to climate change, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, water use and quality, biosecurity, resource efficiency and waste, reducing the risk of pollution, biodiversity, modern slavery and equality, diversity & inclusion, negative community impacts.

As a delivery partner, the successful contractor is expected to pursue sustainability in their operations, thereby ensuring the Contracting Authority is not contracting with a supplier whose operational outputs run contrary to the Contracting Authority’s objectives. The successful contractor will need to approach the project with a focus on the entire life cycle of the project.

This project is unlikely to require site visits and use of vehicles and is intended to be a desk based exercise, however if the contractor sees the need to incorporate aspects away from the desk that should be described in their proposal and accounted for in sustainability commitments.

Meetings between the contractor and the Environment Agency will be conducted online via MS Teams unless otherwise stated. This will avoid unnecessary emissions from vehicle usage.

The Supplier/Contractor will provide such evidence of addressing its sustainability impacts and compliance with the contract requirements when the Authority reasonably requests.

Outputs and Contract Management

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reference | Deliverable | Responsible Party | Date of completion |
| D1 | Summary of latest learning (Literature review and visual knowledge sharing) | Contractor | 31st March 2026 |
| D2 | Based on current evidence, suggest guidelines for monitoring water quality of blanket bog dominated catchments.  Review of gaps and cost to define parameters or roll out monitoring. | Contractor | 31st March 2026 |
| D3 | Define parameters for High, Good, Poor and Bad status for both biological and chemical for upland peatland dominated catchments. | Contractor | 31st March 2026 |
| D5 | Review of data within the peatland research community and re-analysis of data if sampling techniques meet standards | Contractor | 31st March 2026 |
| D6 | Work with Peer Reviewer to ensure multi-nation relevance. | Contractor and Peer Reviewer |  |

The Environment Agency Peatland Team will be available via email and MS Teams when needed. The planned approach to review progress will be steering board meetings to be held every 4-6 weeks after the initial start-up meeting.

Reports will be presented in Word format with appropriate glossary of terms and abbreviations.

Startup meeting will commence W/B:

03/11/2025

A draft report is expected to be sent by February 4th 2026 to enable the Environment Agency to read, review and make comment before the final report is delivered on March 31st.

A wash-up meeting will be held a month after the final report deadline to consider next steps, dissemination and any further discussions as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meeting | Description | Week Beginning |
| Startup | Contractors and steering group meeting to discuss project outline, contractor approach and to clarify any outstanding questions.  The contractor will also outline the timeline for expected delivery to the steering group. | 03/11/2025 |
| 1st check in | Progress update. | 24/11/2025 |
| 2nd check in | Progress update. | 15/12/2025 |
| 3rd check in | Progress update. | 19/01/2026 |
| 4th check in | Progress update. | 16/02/2026 |
| 5th check in | Draft reports/outputs to be shared for comment prior to meeting.  Feedback and progress update. | 02/03/2026 |
| 6th check in | Draft reports/outputs to be shared for comment prior to meeting.  Feedback and progress update. | 09/03/2026 |
| 7th check in | Final drafts to be shared ahead of meeting. At this stage minimal feedback would be expected from the steering group and contractors will be nearly ready to give final report. | 23/03/2026 |
| Wash up | A month to 6 weeks post deadline to check in and see how best to use the information. | 11/05/2026 |

Additional information

The Production of Quick Scoping Reviews and Rapid Evidence Assessments. A How to Guide : [Production\_of\_quick\_scoping\_reviews\_and\_rapid\_evidence\_assessments.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a7f3a76ed915d74e33f5206/Production_of_quick_scoping_reviews_and_rapid_evidence_assessments.pdf)

Search Strategy suggestion - to be built upon by the contractor.

* Water Quality AND
  + peatlands, blanket bog, Raised bog, upland peatland, Moorland
  + Land management activities: drainage/drained, grazing, burning, cutting, forestry/afforestation/deforestation etc
* Water Framework Directive, WFD, AND
  + peatlands, blanket bog, Raised bog, upland peatland, Moorland
  + Land management activities: drainage/drained, grazing, burning, cutting, forestry/afforestation/deforestation etc
* Peatland Degradation AND…
  + Ecological, invertebrate, fish, macrophyte, plant, diatom, algae.
  + Physico-Chemical: pH, acidity, metals, heavy metals, DOC, POC, sediment, nutrients, phosphorus, nitrogen, Biological Oxygen Demand, Dissolved Oxygen, plus any other components relevant to WFD or wider water quality.
* Literature from - UK, Europe, North America.
* Appropriate combinations of those above.

Out of Scope:

Evidence from systems vastly different to the UK, including tropical peatlands are out of scope of this review. Evidence from similar climates and peatland types from the UK, Europe and North America can be included.

Peatland areas in use for lowland agricultural purposes are out of the scope of this evidence review. The review should not include evidence from Lowland Agricultural Peatland areas but may consider raised bogs in headwaters, or different peatland types within headwaters.

Grey Literature can be used but with caution and appropriate recognition of weight within the overall review.

Example themes within visualisations could be: water quality parameters/measuring components (ie pH, sediment, turbidity etc), land management activities, geography

Peatland dominated catchments, for the purposes of this review, can be defined as: 'Operational Catchment' boundaries within surface water [Cycle 2 WFD data](https://www.data.gov.uk/dataset/41cb73a1-91b7-4a36-80f4-b4c6e102651a/wfd-classification-status-cycle-2) for England, which contain greater than 50% peatland (Peaty Soils Layer 2008). This is not to say this is likely to be described in literature, but more an indication of the types of areas likely to be impacted by peatland degradation.

Suggested software/ example for visualisation:

[Rapid Evidence Map: Promoting Agricultural Resilience in the Middle East, Sahel, and Horn of Africa](https://developmentevidence.3ieimpact.org/egm/rapid-evidence-map-on-promoting-agricultural-resilience-in-the-middle-east-and-sahel-and-horn-of-africa-regions)

Example papers:

* Brown, L.E., Aspray, K.L., Ledger, M.E., Mainstone, C., Palmer, S.M., Wilkes, M. and Holden, J., 2019. Sediment deposition from eroding peatlands alters headwater invertebrate biodiversity. Global Change Biology, 25(2), pp.602-619.
* Cummins, T. and Farrell, E.P., 2003. Biogeochemical impacts of clearfelling and reforestation on blanket peatland streams I. phosphorus. Forest Ecology and Management, 180(1-3), pp.545-555.
* Daniels, S.M., Evans, M.G., Agnew, C.T. and Allott, T.E.H., 2012. Ammonium release from a blanket peatland into headwater stream systems. Environmental Pollution, 163, pp.261-272.
* Donahue, T., Renou-Wilson, F., Pschenyckyj, C. and Kelly-Quinn, M., 2022, January. A Review of the Impact on Aquatic Communities of Inputs from Peatlands Drained for Peat Extraction. In Biology and Environment: Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy (Vol. 122, No. 3, pp. 145-160). Royal Irish Academy.
* Edokpa, D.A., Evans, M.G., Allott, T.E., Pilkington, M. and Rothwell, J.J., 2017. Peatland restoration and the dynamics of dissolved nitrogen in upland freshwaters. Ecological Engineering, 106, pp.44-54.
* O'Driscoll, C., O'Connor, M., de Eyto, E., Brown, L.E. and Xiao, L., 2016. Forest clearfelling effects on dissolved oxygen and metabolism in peatland streams. Journal of Environmental Management, 166, pp.250-259.
* Olsson, T.I. and Persson, B.G., 1986. Effects of gravel size and peat material concentrations on embryo survival and alevin emergence of brown trout, Salmo trutta L. Hydrobiologia, 135, pp.9-14.
* Pschenyckyj, C., Donahue, T., Kelly-Quinn, M., O’Driscoll, C. and Renou-Wilson, F., 2023. An examination of the influence of drained peatlands on regional stream water chemistry. Hydrobiologia, 850(15), pp.3313-3339.
* Ramchunder, S.J., Brown, L.E. and Holden, J., 2012. Catchment‐scale peatland restoration benefits stream ecosystem biodiversity. Journal of Applied Ecology, 49(1), pp.182-191.

**Appendix 3: Charges**

[***Guidance note: Include a clear breakdown of the charges in as much detail as necessary***]

**Appendix 4: Processing Personal Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **[XXXX]** |
| **Contract:** |
| **Date:** | **[XXXX]** |
| **Description of authorised processing** | **Details** |
| Identity of Controller and Processor for each category of Personal Data |  |
| Subject matter of the processing |  |
| Duration of the processing |  |
| Nature and purposes of the processing |  |
| Type of Personal Data |  |
| Categories of Data Subject |  |
| Plan for return and destruction of the data once the processing is complete UNLESS requirement under law to preserve that type of data |  |
| Locations at which the Contractor and/or its subcontractors process Personal Data under this Agreement |  |
| Protective Measures that the Contractor and, where applicable, its subcontractors have implemented to protect Personal Data processed under this Agreement against a breach of security (insofar as that breach of security relates to data) or a Personal Data Breach |  |