



**WWF-UK**

*Registered office*

The Living Planet Centre  
Rufford House, Brewery Road  
Woking, Surrey GU21 4LL

[www.wwf.org.uk](http://www.wwf.org.uk)

## UK Triple Challenge Project: Question and Answers

Many thanks to all who have submitted expression of interest, and / or questions on the UK triple challenge call for proposals. In addition to replying to you individually, I include a record of Q&As below for the interest of all prospective bidders.

We have received requests to extend the deadline for submission of the proposal. In light of this, and given the holiday period, I have made the decision to issue an extension until 12pm on 5 January 2020.

As a general point, I also note that there have been a number of queries on the expected duration of the contract. I recognise that we have indicated a tight timeframe for the delivery of all outputs. This reflects the urgency in generating the UK triple challenge, and intention to delivery high impact policy advocacy within the 2020 'super year'; in the run-up to COP 26. As mentioned also below, please consider this the ideal time frame, and be assured we will not exclude (or penalise) bids which include a reasonable alternative delivery timetable. Our primary aim remains the delivery of relevant high-quality outputs with the given available budget.

For any final clarifications on the call please contact:

Shirley Matheson, Climate Change Specialist, WWF UK, [smatheson@wwf.org.uk](mailto:smatheson@wwf.org.uk)

Chris Howe, Head of Food and Landscapes, WWF UK, [chowe@wwf.org.uk](mailto:chowe@wwf.org.uk)

Many thanks,



**Shirley Matheson | Climate Change Specialist | WWF-UK**

Living Planet Centre T: +44 (0)1483 412 496 | M: 07541 928772

**WWF-UK***Registered office*

The Living Planet Centre  
Rufford House, Brewery Road  
Woking, Surrey GU21 4LL

[www.wwf.org.uk](http://www.wwf.org.uk)

1	Is this opportunity open to small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)? If the contract is not open to SMEs, please could you advise the reasons for excluding SMEs?	I can confirm this opportunity is open to SMEs / There is nothing to exclude SMEs from applying to this bid. Please refer to the TOR for the technical experience we seek to guide you in forming a bid for this tender. [note there was an error in categorisation which has been rectified]
2	Please could you confirm the time-frame of January 2020 - April 2020 is correct and the expected duration of the contract?	Our ideal contract duration is as stated in the TOR, January 2020 - April 2020. I suggest you make the timetable of delivery of individual outputs clear in the proposal – especially and even where you suggest an alternative duration for the contract. Providing an alternative delivery timetable would not exclude a bid for consideration. I am prepared to be flexible on timing in response to the range of activities proposed in the successful bid.
3	Could you advise whether the £50,000 budget to be allocated for the expert report and scenario development and report is a strict limit or whether some leeway will be acceptable? Does this budget allocation have to include all additional costs associated with stakeholder involvement in the scenario development process, such as expenses, facilitation and participation costs?	<p>We have put this direction within the TOR to give an indication on allocation of resources (including all additional costs) across the three outputs. This budget does not include costs associated with branding, design and print of the final reports. We did not anticipate a scenario where this would not be suitable, but we will consider proposals beyond this figure provided that there is adequate clarity in the response to show where costs have been allocated.</p> <p>As a point of clarification: in setting the scope of this bid I included the option for expert and stakeholder interviews as an example of activities which could be included. It is at the discretion of the bidder to consider how and where this would be of benefit to their proposed methodology. Recent contracts where this has proven beneficial have applied this strategy to gain greater insight from sector experts, safeguard against duplicating other research in progress, or verify proposed conclusions and analysis.</p>

4	The interactive tool is an important and interesting part of the project. Do you have any examples of best practice regarding how this interactive tool should be developed? Should we also understand from the budget allocation, that 50% of the budget should be spent on the tool development?	<p>We have anticipated that <u>up to</u> 50% of the budget can be allocated report and scenario development. There is no fixed expectation on the allocation of budget to the interactive tool development, though as implied above, at least 50% of the available budget would be available to be allocated to this.</p> <p>In setting the scope of this bid we wanted to provide opportunity to develop a creative way of disseminating and engaging on the dynamics of the triple challenge through our advocacy work. Example of interactive tools which came to mind when formulating this aspect of the bid includes <a href="http://www.mspchallenge.info/">http://www.mspchallenge.info/</a>; <a href="https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games">https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games</a>. However, I would like to note that we are open to creative ideas, including alternative methodologies and styles, which will also deliver the desired outputs (a means of disseminating / exploring benefits and trade-offs of the triple challenge in the UK).</p>
5	Would there be scope to develop [some activities] beyond the April 2020?	Our ideal contract duration is as stated in the TOR, January 2020 - April 2020. That said, we are prioritising high quality products within a suitable timetable, taking into account the importance of engaging throughout the 2020 'super year' and run up to COP 26. I am prepared to be flexible on timing in response to the range of activities proposed in the successful bid - providing an alternative delivery timetable would not be criteria excluding a bid for consideration and will consider an extension to the proposed programme.
6	Do you have any guidance around the length, format and content of proposal submissions?	We do not have a standard format for proposal submission; though recommend including a financial proposal, technical proposal (with project management) and a summary of qualification/expertise meeting the points set out in the Response to Calls for Proposals section (from which the assessment criteria has been formed). We do not have any constraints on length or format, but we would encourage a clear and concise approach.
7	For the interactive tool, do you expect to integrate the tool in an existing platform e.g. existing website, or to create a new self-hosted platform?	There is no expectation or constraint at this stage, thus either scenario could apply.
8	Are WWF expecting to host the interactive tool? If so, which technologies are preferred for the development of the application e.g., database, server, etc.?	WWF would not expect to host the interactive tool, unless there would be a particular benefit to doing so.

9	Do you hold any GIS licences? If so, can the content created and published be publicly available?	We host an up-to-date catalogue of over 3,000 datasets. Some are commercial / internal. We have an ESRI licence/licences and an on-site GIS team who can assist with facilitating access. We have the capabilities to handle/host the data, GIS outputs, and assist with creating interactive maps.
10	Do you provide or have licences to any spatial or socio-economic datasets needed for the project?	We are not directly licencing any commercial socio-economic datasets. We can host any freely available datasets not currently within the catalogue.
11	What is driving your completion date – are there events in the policy cycle you are keen to meet with the launch of the tool & report? Is there any scope for a longer completion deadline given the complexity and detail of the study and the need to pilot and test the online tool?	<p>Our ideal contract duration is as stated in the TOR, January 2020 - April 2020. This reflects internal expectations of developing an integrated approach on advocacy ahead of key moments occurring in throughout the 2020 super year; including providing time to roll out stakeholder engagement, sufficiently ahead of COP26.</p> <p>However, providing an alternative delivery timetable would not be criteria excluding a bid for consideration. I am prepared to be flexible on timing in response to the range of activities proposed in the successful bid.</p>
12	<p>Can you tell us more about your expectations for the tool, in terms of level of detail it should go into, and the data it should be based on? How many parameters would you be expecting? Some of the examples given were quite specific, e.g. reforestation with non-native tree species, suggesting the number of parameters is expected to be high.</p> <p>How do you envisage it being used, and by who? For example, something primarily public and media facing, to create discussion and focus attention on key policy issues, needs to be punchy, clear and acknowledge some of the uncertainties of the predictions in a simple way. While something you want to take to econometrics professionals might need to be based upon a statistically robust model underneath bringing together several forecasts.</p>	<p>The interactive tool should provide a means of disseminating the findings from the research and scenario development in a dynamic way. That is, we are interested in tools which can illustrated the complexity, and possibilities of the Triple Challenge in the UK. The high-level parameters are set out within the methodology section. We are looking for bids which suggest creative and best use of available funds to develop parameters within this. I am looking for the aspects/details of the triple challenge (climate, nature, food) as set out within the TOR to be treated with equal weight of importance.</p> <p>This is primarily an advocacy activity, and as such the focus should be primarily on policy and business stakeholders to create discussion and attention on integrated policy issues [any efforts to make the public and media focusing may feature in future contracts within the programme]. As such I would support your first suggestion but note it should be robust enough to drive practical policy discussions.</p>

	The scope of the timing and budget suggests you are looking more towards the first example; but we'd like to check with you where the balance of the investment should go.	
13	What would be the objectives for the expert and stakeholder interviews – is it to gain insight on multi-dimensional interactions which may not necessarily have received much treatment in previous literature? And/or would it be to better understand the scenarios to focus on when producing the outputs? Are there any experts, (individual academics, thought leaders, industry experts, policy) whose participation you see as crucial to the success of the study?	<p>In setting the scope of this bid I included the option for expert and stakeholder interviews as an example of activities which could be included. It is at the discretion of the bidder to consider if and where this would be of benefit to their proposed methodology. Recent contracts where this has proven beneficial have applied this strategy to gain greater insight from sector experts, safeguard against duplicating other research in progress or verify proposed conclusions and analysis.</p> <p>In terms of sector expertise, this list could be formulated at / prior to the inception phase through gathering inputs from relevant teams, and WWF could support the bidder in gaining access to these. I would highlight the work of FABLE, and the recent IDDR work as key starting points to review similar work to this.</p>
14	Do you anticipate this study engaging industry and policymakers when building recommendations, or is this something for a later stage?	As above, this would be at the discretion of the bidder to propose.
15	You mention case studies – would you want the online tool to be based on case study landscapes, or to encapsulate the systems across the whole UK?	For this to deliver the desired outputs, the interactive tool should encapsulate the systems across the whole UK.
16	Can you point us to examples of other tools, serious games etc that you would like yours to be similar to in style?	<p>In setting the scope of this bid we wanted to provide opportunity to develop a creative way of disseminating and engaging on the dynamics of the triple challenge.</p> <p>Example of interactive tools which served as inspiration for the bid includes <a href="http://www.mspchallenge.info/">http://www.mspchallenge.info/</a>; <a href="https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games">https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games</a>.</p>

		However, I would like to note that we are open to creative ideas, including alternative methodologies and styles, which will also deliver the desired outputs (a means of exploring benefits and trade-offs of the triple challenge in the UK). Please include in your bid to what extent you could fulfil the contract within the given budget.
17	Do all consortium members need to sign the NDA?	We would request that all members signed the NDA unless you have an existing MOU whereas you can sign on their behalf. Regardless, please ensure all organisations are named within the signed NDA before sharing documents.
18	We wish to clarify the anticipated budget breakdown. The brief states: "WWF will accept proposals budgeted up to the value of £100,000 (excluding VAT). The combined budget for the expert report and the scenario development and report should not exceed £50,000 (excluding VAT.)" Does "expert report" and "scenario development report" relate to the first two outputs listed on page 3 of the brief? Therefore can we assume that you anticipated the remaining £50,000 would cover output three (i.e. the interactive tool)?	We have anticipated that <u>up to</u> 50% of the budget should be allocated to the desk research (expert report) and scenario development report. There is no fixed expectation on the allocation of budget to the interactive tool development, though as implied above, at least 50% of the available budget would be available to be allocated to this. WWF will consider proposals outside of these parameters provided that there is adequate clarity in the response to show where costs have been allocated.
19	Does the interactive tool need to be an online / web-based tool?	There is no expectation or constraint at this stage, thus is at the discretion of the bidder to propose this if they think suitable within the scope of the bid.
20	How does WWF envisage sharing the interactive tool with the audiences listed in the brief? (e.g. through workshops, with a guidance note)	<p>This would in part be dictated by the proposed methodology for the interactive tool. In setting the scope of the bid we had the expectation that there could be follow up activities such as workshops, for example.</p> <p>In setting the scope of this bid we wanted to provide opportunity to develop a creative way of disseminating and engaging on the dynamics of the triple challenge through our advocacy work. Example of interactive tools which came to mind when formulating this aspect of the bid includes <a href="http://www.mspchallenge.info/">http://www.mspchallenge.info/</a>; <a href="https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games">https://www.climatecentre.org/resources-games/games</a>. However, I would like to note that we are open to creative ideas,</p>

		including alternative methodologies and styles, which will also deliver the desired outputs (i.e. a means of disseminating / exploring benefits and trade-offs of the triple challenge in the UK).
21	Does WWF have any predetermined views about the spatial scales / resolution of land-use data that should be used to generate land-use change scenarios, or have you intentionally left this open for bidders to respond?	We would expect a reasonable resolution/spatial scale to meet the objective of the UK Triple Challenge.
22	Evaluation of tenders - what is quality / price split, weighting with respect to team and prior experience etc?	Our intention is to assign assessment weighting at 75% on qualitative factors; and 25% on cost.
23	Interactive tool - Where do WWF see the tool being hosted (i.e. is it for WWF internal use or will it be external on your website for example)?	In setting the task of the interactive tool we wanted to provide opportunity to develop a creative way of disseminating and engaging on the dynamics of the triple challenge through our advocacy work (i.e. externally). WWF would not expect to host it, unless there would be a particular benefit to doing so.
24	It would be very helpful to get some clarity as to whether they are expecting the project to develop an interactive tool, or provide data and specifications as to what a suitable tool could be.	<p>The intention is to develop an interactive tool to disseminate the UK triple challenge work. Please include in your bid the extent to which you can deliver this with the given budget (which may be as far as a prototype, data and specifications, etc.). Where we may come into a position to provide additional funds it would advantageous for bidders to give an indication of what resources would be needed to deliver the interactive tool in its entirety (if not within the current budget).</p> <p>At a minimum, bids must clarify they will deliver data which could provide the starting point of an interactive tool if, and when, this was covered by a separate contract (and potentially contractor).</p>