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**Part A**

**Invitation to tender for the provision of services to review and update the UK agriculture**

 **MACC and to assess abatement potential for the 5th carbon budget period and to 2050**

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR Submission of TENDERS**

1. The CCC project manager will be Indra Thillainathan, Senior Analyst.
2. Address: 7 Holbein Place, London, SW1W 8NR. Tel: 0207 591 6247. Email: indra.thillainathan@theccc.gsi.gov.uk.

Indra Thillainathan should be contacted with any queries on the content of the project.

Further information and clarification about the tendering process can be obtained from:

Sean Taylor

e-mail: sean.taylor@theccc.gsi.gov.uk Tel 020 7591 6093.

1. Bidders are required to submit four copies of their bid. Three should include the number of days allocated to each member of the team, but contain no pricing information. The fourth must be costed and identified as **"PRICED"**. Quotations should be submitted in a sealed envelope, marked as follows:

“**INVITATION TO TENDER for the Provision of RESEARCH ON ABATEMENT IN AGRICULTURe’’**

1. Envelopes should bear no external indication of the sender's identity. All bids should be addressed to:

Business Manager

Committee on Climate Change

7 Holbein Place

London

SW1W 8NR

**Bids should be sent in time in time for receipt by 09:00 on Monday 30th March 2015. All bids should also be submitted by e-mail by this deadline to** **finance@theccc.gsi.gov.uk.**

1. If required, interviews will take place in London on the **2nd or 8th April 2015**. If you are invited for interview, you will be notified of the address and time in the letter of invitation, sent out by email.
2. In practice, we welcome suggestions from consultants around what is feasible within the available timescales (see section 6) and budget (around £35,000 - £50,000 excluding VAT). We emphasise that the project should draw on existing literature/data rather than primary research. We are looking for consultants’ expertise and experience to help us use and interpret this literature/data.
3. Please provide separate costing for tasks 1-5 as part of your bid.

**Part B**

**Invitation to tender for the provision of services to review and update the UK agriculture**

 **MACC and to assess abatement potential for the 5th carbon budget period and to 2050**

**SPECIFICATION**

1. **Preamble**

The Committee on Climate Change (CCC) was set up as part of the 2008 Climate Change Act. The CCC is an independent body tasked with providing advice to Government on climate change issues, and particularly the setting of carbon budgets, and the monitoring of progress towards meeting those budgets. CCC’s past reports are available from <http://www.theccc.org.uk/publications/>.

1. **Background**

Carbon budgets have been legislated for four five-year periods from 2008 to 2027, at levels recommended by the CCC. The budgets are based on a range of criteria, including the science of climate change, the international context and an assessment of what could economically and feasibly be achieved by 2027.

The Committee will provide advice regarding the level of the fifth carbon budget period (2028-2032) in December 2015. As part of this advice the Committee will consider the level of contribution that the UK agriculture sector can make towards reducing emissions, and an overview of how it can contribute to the longer-term 2050 target.

In our review of the fourth carbon budget[[1]](#footnote-1) in 2013, we assessed that agriculture could reduce non-CO2 emissions by 10 MtCO2 by 2030 based on cost-effective measures. Abatement opportunities after 2030 are more speculative, but we have previously considered that under a central scenario an additional 8 MtCO2e could be delivered by 2050[[2]](#footnote-2).

Since the publication of these reports however, emerging new evidence on non-CO2 abatement potential in agriculture suggests that the CCC should review the sector’s contribution to reducing emissions, and at the same time incorporate updated evidence into our analysis for the fifth carbon budget and the longer-term 2050 target.

1. **Context**
2. *Fourth carbon budget abatement*

As part of our advice on the fourth carbon budget in 2010, we commissioned the Scottish Agricultural College (SAC)[[3]](#footnote-3) to review and update the 2008 UK agricultural Marginal Abatement Cost Curve (MACC) and to assess abatement potential during the fourth budget period (2023-2027). The bottom-up MACC details abatement potential from a suite of technically feasible mitigation measures and defines their relative cost-effectiveness (i.e. ranking measures by their cost per tonne CO2 saved).

The SAC analysis considered a variety of on-farm measures to reduce non-CO2 emissions from soils and livestock. The analysis found technical emissions abatement ranging from 8.6 MtCO2e to 18.9 MtCO2e at a cost of less than £70/tCO2e (our projected carbon price for 2030) by the end of the third budget (see Appendix 1). The wide range reflected a pessimistic and optimistic set of assumptions, in relation to a number of uncertainties. These included:

* Baseline uncertainty as to the present state of farming practice. For example, the extent to which farmers are already implementing measures or the amount of additional land to which a measure can be applied.
* Technical uncertainty on the ability of measures to deliver identified potential given current evidence and/or timelines required to test and deploy options.
* Regulatory uncertainty. For example, the use of ionophores in livestock is illegal in the EU.

Taking these uncertainties into account, we excluded measures where we had a low degree of confidence in delivery. This identified a low scenario of non-CO2 abatement potential by 2030 of 8.3 MtCO2e and a high scenario of 11.6 MtCO2e. We selected the centre of the range, equivalent to 10 MtCO2e (Table 1). This abatement comprises:

* 4.5 MtCO2e – the ambition under the Low Carbon Transition Plan to reduce non-CO2 emissions in England by 3 MtCO2e by 2022 scaled up to the UK.
* 5.4 MtCO2e of additional abatement in the 2020s.

Our analysis suggested these abatement options are mainly cost-saving, with only three measures entailing a positive cost up to the carbon price by 2030 (e.g. new species of nitrogen fixing plants, anaerobic digestion on pig farms and the installation of covers on slurry lagoons and tanks on beef and dairy farms).

Our projection for emissions reduction under the fourth carbon budget excluded abatement of CO2 emissions, due to the paucity of evidence on the abatement potential of various mitigation options (e.g. use of efficient engine technology and alternative vehicle fuels). We also excluded abatement from demand-side measures (e.g. diet change and waste reduction).

| **Table 1: Non-CO2 annual abatement by mitigation measure by 2030** |
| --- |
| Category | Measure(s) | **MtCO**2**e** |
| Nutrient management | Improved timing of fertiliser application, avoiding excess application etc. | 2.6 |
| Use of more nitrogen efficient plants | Species introduction Improved nitrogen use plants | 2.40.4 |
| Livestock breeding | Improved genetics in beef and dairy; improved fertility in dairy | 1.5 |
| Livestock feeding | Propionate precursors for beef and dairyMaize silage for dairy | 2.00.2 |
| Anaerobic digestion | Pigs and poultry farm units | 0.6 |
| Manure management | Covering lagoons and slurry tanks | 0.2 |
| **Total abatement (includes 4.5 of LCTP scaled up to UK) 10** |

As part of our review of the fourth carbon budget in 2013, we concluded that there was no significant new evidence at the time to adjust our non-CO2 abatement potential or to include abatement from CO2.

1. *Abatement potential (2030-2050)*

For our 2012 *International aviation and shipping* report, we identified further abatement reaching 8 MtCO2e annually in 2050 from additional on-farm and demand-side measures:

* **On-farm measures:** The specific measures excluded from our fourth carbon budget scenario due to low confidence included drainage and nitrification inhibitors (NIs). However, we assumed that with time there could be increased confidence over their applicability by 2050, while a higher carbon price could support a more expensive measure such as NIs. On this basis, we included annual abatement of 1 MtCO2e for NIs and 2 MtCO2e for drainage by 2050 into our central scenario.
* **Demand-side measures:** we also included abatement from changing diets away from more carbon-intensive foodstuffs (3 MtCO2e) based on analysis we commissioned from Cranfield University[[4]](#footnote-4). Additional abatement from food waste reduction (2 MtCO2e) was also included into our central scenario.
1. *New evidence on abatement*

Our assessment of agricultural abatement was based on the best available evidence at the time. However, since then, a number of research projects commissioned by Defra, together with the emergence of the Farmscoper 3[[5]](#footnote-5) tool and on-going work to develop the Smart Inventory provide new evidence of abatement potential, both in terms of the measures and level of savings (Table 2). There are likely to be other sources of new evidence.

It would therefore be prudent to review whether the abatement we have assumed in the fourth carbon budget remains appropriate, and at the same time extend the analysis to cover potential in the fifth carbon budget period and beyond to 2050.

There is internal work currently being undertaken by Defra as to how this new evidence could feed into a revised MACC.

| **Table 2: Summary of Defra’s most recent evidence on abatement potential** |
| --- |
| Area of research/work (with sources) | Published or emerging results |
| 2012 Defra review of progress in reducing GHG emissions in agriculture<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2012-review-of-progress-in-reducing-greenhouse-gas-emissions-from-english-agriculture> | Using the Farmscoper tool, abatement focused on England only.(PUBLISHED) |  |
| **Farmscoper 3 model**Awaiting peer review. Final results due May 2015http://www.adas.uk/Services/Service/farmscoper-397 | New version will include updated costs. |  |
| **Nitrification Inhibitors** <http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/9/11/115006/article> (PUBLISHED)Also unpublished but emerging work from the GHG R&D Platform  | Results indicate a 19% reduction in N2O emissions from UK agriculture would be possible if all N sources used a suitable inhibitor. |  |
| **Soil drainage (GHG Platform work[[6]](#footnote-6))**Unpublished but emerging work from the GHG R&D Platform  | Drainage does not seem to effectively reduce emissions as previously thought |  |
| **Livestock (genetics)** (IF0207) <http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=18227>HGCA Project <http://www.eblex.org.uk/news-releases/eblex-carry-landmark-research-project-beef-feed-efficiency/> | * IF0207 has identified significant abatement potential for beef using estimated breeding value
* This would be increased if the Estimated Breeding Value was developed further to include data on feed conversion efficiency. A project in collaboration with HGCA is now under way to unlock this potential. Work only started and not expected to complete until 2019.
 |  |
| **Animal health (AC0120)**http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=17791 | Cost-effective potential from tackling endemic diseasesProject currently undergoing QA. |  |
| **Anaerobic digestion** (AC409)http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=17396#Description(AC410)http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=18631#Description | From Defra research projects seems that significant potential could be unlocked in the medium band (~500kw – predominantly pig and poultry manure with some food waste)* AC409 shows show that there is probably about 86Mw of generation potential in England with reasonable Internal Rates of Return (here defined as >6.5% as per DECC guidance). This translates to a total potential of 439kt CO2e
* AC410 Economic analysis and LCA project: seems to indicate that the most cost effective use of the FIT subsidy for the tax payer would be in the medium band, with a carbon cost in the region of £80/tonne CO2e.
 |  |
| 6 Programme of work to develop the Smart Inventory. <http://www.ghgplatform.org.uk/> |

1. **Aims of the consultancy project**

The main aim of this project is to review the latest evidence on non-CO2 abatement in agriculture, in order to assess whether the CCC’s assumptions about overall abatement potential remain appropriate.

The main focus should be on abatement potential for the fifth carbon budget period, but the assignment should also consider abatement options available for emissions reductions during the fourth carbon budget period (2023-27), and out to 2050. Inevitably, the 2050 assessment may be more speculative and qualitative. The measures should distinguish cost-effective options up to our assumed carbon prices; more expensive measures, where good abatement potential may exist and which may become cost-effective over time; and new more speculative options that could become feasible over time.

The work will provide for an updated MACC with new information: e.g. cost estimates, abatement potential, and additional mitigation options. We would like updated results disaggregated by devolved administrations, where possible.

Specific objectives include:

* Review the CCC’s fourth carbon budget non-CO2 abatement potential (based on the SAC MACC (2010) analysis) in light of the latest evidence on carbon abatement in the agriculture sector. In recognition of the uncertainties, the review should update the pessimistic/optimistic range and level of confidence (see Annex 1).
* Extend the analysis to cover the fifth carbon budget period.
* Provide an assessment of abatement potential on the path to 2050, which may be more qualitative.

Within this, we would also expect:

* Review the evidence on more expensive measures, which might be necessary to provide significant abatement in future and might become more cost-effective against a rising carbon price, and novel abatement measures, which over time could become feasible options.
* Review the latest research on diet-change and how this can feed into agricultural on-farm abatement beyond the fourth carbon budget.
* While this project should mainly focus on non-CO2 abatement, some consideration should also be given to CO2 abatement, where new evidence exists with regards to the type of technology which could remove the need to use fossil fuels on farm in stationary and mobile machinery.
* Outputs should include a written report, and also a simple transparent MACC model in excel that has a user-friendly ‘control panel’ where some key assumptions agreed with the CCC can be varied. The model should be easy to up-date with new data/information and be able to split out costs and carbon savings per measure. We will provide our existing MACC model which you can use as a template.

The objectives described above will be met through multiple tasks as described below.

1. **Description of work for consultants**

We expect this work will involve drawing together a wide range of the latest evidence in order to update the CCC’s assumption on non-CO2 abatement in the fourth carbon budget and to extend the analysis to the fifth carbon budget. We consider that a literature review of recent evidence and an assessment of this evidence are likely to form the core of this work, with a small amount of modelling involved.

Due to the tight timescales involved, consultants will have to demonstrate strong expertise in this field on which they can draw upon for this project.

We will provide our existing MACC model which you can use as a template.

Please provide separate costing for tasks 1-5

**Task 1. Develop an updated view of cost-effective abatement potential by 2025 and 2028-32 (exact periods to be confirmed)**

Conduct a rapid evidence assessment of new academic, government and industry literature on agricultural GHG mitigation. Controlled search strings should be implemented along with a set of assessment criteria to ensure all evidence considered is robust and fit for purpose. The review should consider the scope of the existing MACC and identify any gaps in the existing assessment.

Review the CCC’s fourth carbon budget abatement potential and costings in light of the latest evidence, and extend the analysis to cover the fifth carbon budget period (2028-32). The review should include:

* Familiarisation with the SAC MACC (2010) analysis that underpinned our fourth carbon budget abatement assumptions. We will provide the SAC MACC model, which you can use as a template.
* An assessment of the Defra research projects listed in Table 2.
* Unpublished but emerging work from the GHG R&D Platform (see Table 2).
* The results from Defra’s Farmscoper 3 tool, which will incorporate updated costs on new and existing mitigation practices. Initial results from this are unpublished but will be made available to the appointed consultant and final results are due by May 2015.
* Defra’s *emerging* MACC: Defra has been working on a revised MACC based on the new evidence. Completion of the project is expected in May.
* An assessment of other new work, where relevant.

Please note that Defra has assured us that all of the above work will be shared in confidence with the appointed consultant. Some of these pieces of work are not yet complete (e.g. Farmerscoper 3 and the *emerging* MACC), and therefore you may be only working with draft results to begin with. Therefore, you will need to build in flexibility to be able to accommodate a potential change in evidence etc. which may happen late in the timescale of this project.

It would also be helpful if you could indicate flexibility to accommodate up to three days of additional work, should further evidence emerge to be accommodated beyond the project completion date indicated here.

**Task 2. Develop a view on cost-effective abatement by 2050**

Extend the analysis in Task 1 to cover abatement to 2050. This could be in the form of a qualitative assessment of the types of measures that could be deployed by 2050 and the associated abatement.

**Task 3. Review more expensive / novel on-farm measures**

We expect that a revised MACC will prioritise measures based on cost-effectiveness, technical feasibility and acceptability, which will form the basis of a central abatement scenario.

However, we would also like to consider a maximum abatement scenario where costs are not constrained by the carbon price, or where further cost reductions are delivered over time, and uncertainties have been resolved. This requires an updated view of more costly measures (that could decrease), in addition to looking at new options that could become available over time as a result of targeted research and technological development, for example.

**Task 4: Review latest evidence on CO2 abatement and from diet-change**

While the main focus of this is work should be on non-CO2 on-farm abatement, some consideration, where new evidence exists, should be given to:

* CO2 abatement from on-farm stationary and mobile machinery.
* Impact of diet-change on emissions reduction on-farm. Suggested sources include:
	+ The IPCC’s fifth impact assessment (2014).[[7]](#footnote-7)
	+ Defra’s work on the environmental sustainability of the ‘eatwell plate’[[8]](#footnote-8). This is still an on-going piece of work with Cranfield University, but where available, data will be shared.[[9]](#footnote-9)
	+ WWF’s work on the ‘eatwell plate’.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Task 5: Update the MACC**

Based on the above tasks, provide an excel spreadsheet tool with data (e.g. abatement volume, cost per tonne of abatement, GHG saving, upfront costs and uptake) that will enable us to revise our MACCs for 2025, 2028-32 (exact periods to be confirmed). This needs to allow for interactions between measures (i.e. reduced savings per measure where multiple measures are installed). Disaggregate, where possible, updated results by devolved administrations

Consideration will have to be given to what extent we can adopt the results from the *emerging* Defra MACC (or an amended version of it) once a review of it has been completed under Task 1.

**Deliverables**

The deliverables from this project are:

* A report setting out the findings of Tasks 1-5. **Please note that we would expect tasks to run at least in part concurrently.**
* An Excel spreadsheet tool to provide trajectories and costs of measures.
* Presentations of the interim and final results of the project to the CCC secretariat and other interested parties.

**Quality of analysis and outputs**

All research tasks and modelling must be quality assured and documented. Contractors should:

* Include a quality assurance (QA) plan that they will apply to all of the research tasks and modelling
* Specify who will take lead responsibility for ensuring quality assurance and ensure that this responsibility rests with an individual not directly involved in the research, analysis or model development,
* Provide QA log to demonstrate the QA undertaken, including who undertook the QA and the scope, type and level of QA that has been undertaken (e.g. a log entry only stating ‘the data was checked’ will not be sufficient)

Sign-off for the quality assurance must be done by someone of sufficient seniority within the contractor organisation to be able take responsibility for the work done. Acceptance of the work by the CCC will take this into consideration. The CCC reserves the right to refuse to sign off outputs which do not meet the required standard specified in this invitation to tender.

The successful bidder will be responsible for any work supplied by sub-contractors and should therefore provide assurance that all work in the contract is undertaken in accordance with the quality assurance expectation agreed at the beginning of the project.

For primary research, contractors should be willing to facilitate CCC research staff to attend interviews or listen in to telephone surveys as part of the quality assurance process.

The consultant must demonstrate their ability to produce deliverables of quality, in particular following best practice regarding economic analysis and presentation of results.

To this end, the CCC expects that:

* Economic analysis must be delivered in a simple, transparent Excel (or similar) spreadsheet, where key assumptions (agreed with the CCC) can be varied. All assumptions and figures should be adequately referenced, and include any supporting workings. This spreadsheet will be the property of the CCC.
* Existing analysis and work regarding technical challenges and deployment constraints should be reviewed (e.g. including technology options and barriers developed by the CCC) and incorporated into this assignment.
* Analysis should appropriately reflect uncertainty regarding model inputs, and in particular costs, by specifying ranges on uncertain figures. Where appropriate, a sensitivity analysis of key parameters should be conducted.
1. **Timeline**

The proposed timetable for the project is set out in the following table. The project is expected to run until 19 June, although we ask that you separately confirm readiness to set aside up to five days after this period, if required, in order to accommodate any change in results from research projects etc. that had not been finalised within the timescale of this project. Therefore your costing for the project should set out the daily rate for these additional days.

In addition to the formal reporting points, the CCC would expect to have regular scheduled discussions to ensure the work is progressing as expected.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Action** |
| 30 March 2015 | Deadline for response to ITT |
| 2 or 8 April 2015  | Interviews |
| 13 April 2015 | Kick-off meeting |
| 7 May 2015 | Interim meeting (present and discuss initial findings for Tasks 1-3) |
| 4 June 2015 | Final project meeting (present and discuss results and findings) |
| 11 June 2015 | Circulate full draft report |
| 19 June 2015 | Final report  |
| Beyond 19 June  | Work to accommodate final results from projects etc., if required. |

**Appendix 1**

The SAC MACC (2010) analysis identified technical potential ranging from 8.6 MtCO2e to 18.9 MtCO2e at a cost of less than £70/tCO2e (our projected carbon price for 2030) by the end of the third budget. This range indicates a pessimistic and optimistic set of assumptions, which reflect a number of uncertainties (see table below).

The SAC MACC (2010) report can be found here.

<http://www.theccc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/pr_supporting_research_SAC_agriculture.pdf>

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | **Pessimistic MACC** | **Optimistic MACC**  |  |  |
|  | **Category** | **Measure** | **Confidence** | **Cost-effective** | **Abatement****potential** | **Cost-effective** | **Abatement potential** |  |  |
| **Crops/soils** | Nutrient management | Mineral N Timing | M | -103.6  | 357.6 | -105.7 | 2345.9 |  |  |
| Nutrient management | Organic N Timing | M | -55.9  | 427.2 | -64.2 | 1040.3 |  |  |
| Nutrient management | Avoid N Excess | M | -196.0  | 4.7 | -259.6 | 142.9 |  |  |
| Nutrient management | Full Manure | L |   |   | -159.3 | 192.0 |  |  |
| Nutrient management | Using Composts | M | 0.0  | 237.1 | 0.0 | 272.7 |  |  |
| Nutrient management | Slurry Mineral N Delayed | H | 0.0  | 172.0 | 0.0 | 172.2 |  |  |
|  | Drainage | L |   |   | -31.2 | 4202.2 |  |  |
| Soil management | Reduced Tillage | L | -153.0  | 314.8 | -170.2 | 283.0 |  |  |
| Nitrification inhibitors | Nitrification inhibitors | L |   | 0.0 | 59.1 | 2240.5 |  |  |
| Using more N-eff plants | Improved N-Use Plants | M |   |   | -204.7 | 737.3 |  |  |
| Using more N-eff plants | Species Intro | M | 52.4  | 2703.0 | 69.7 | 2032.8 |  |  |
| **Livestock** | Breeding | BeefAn-Improved Genetics | H | -3,602.9  | 102.9 | -3602.9 | 102.9 |  |  |
| Breeding | DairyAn-Improved Fertility | H | -85.8  | 764.8 | -100.8 | 975.8 |  |  |
| Breeding | DairyAn-Improved Productivity | H | -143.7  | 456.5 | -143.7 | 684.8 |  |  |
| Feeding | BeefAn-Ionophores | L |   |   | -1747.8 | 772.0 |  |  |
| Diet manipulation | DairyAn-Ionophores | L |   |   | -48.6 | 1643.7 |  |  |
| Diet manipulation | DairyAn-Maize Silage | M | -262.6  | 213.3 | -262.6 | 213.3 |  |  |
| Diet manipulation | BeefAn-Propionate Precursors | M | -1,017.2  | 565.9 |   |   |  |  |
| Diet manipulation | DairyAn-Propionate Precursors | M | -14.6  | 1468.8 |   |   |  |  |
| **Anaerobic digestion** | Anaerobic digestion | CAD-Poultry-5MW | H | -0.3  | 487.4 | -0.3 | 487.4 |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Pigs Large | H | 17.0  | 106.1 | 17.0 | 106.1 |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Pigs Medium | H | 32.7  | 35.7 | 32.7 | 35.7 |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Beef Large | H |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Dairy Large | H |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Beef Medium | H |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| Anaerobic digestion | OFAD-Dairy Medium | H |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| **Manure Management** | Manure management | BeefManure-Covering Lagoons | M | 8.6  | 23.1 | 8.6 | 23.1 |  |  |
| Manure management | BeefManure-Covering Slurry Tanks | M | 23.8  | 26.6 | 23.8 | 26.6 |  |  |
| Manure management | DairyManure-Covering Lagoons | M | 25.2  | 74.4 | 25.2 | 74.4 |  |  |
| Manure management | DairyManure-Covering Slurry Tanks | M | 69.5  | 76.9 | 69.5 | 76.9 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | **8,619** |  |  **18,885**  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | **above LCTP** |  ***4,119***  |  |  ***14,385***  |  |  |

**Part C**

SUPPLIER QUESTIONAIRE

**The evaluation of the following Supplier Questionnaire will be the basis for selecting the short list of potential contractors to be interviewed.** Each question is allocated points based on its relevance for this Contract. Each respondent should submit all the information requested in the order presented. Failure to do so may result in their total score failing to reach the initial threshold and therefore subsequent elimination. **Sections C4 and C5 give bidding organisations the opportunity to explain in detail how they would provide the services requested.**

All information supplied will be treated as **Strictly Private and Confidential**. The information will be reviewed by the Evaluation Panel only and will not be divulged to other parties during the de-briefing stage, or at any other time.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supplier QuestionnaireConcerning the provision of consultancy service to identify realistic potential for reducing carbon emissions in buildings and industry over time |  |
| **Name of Company:** |  |
| **Address:** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **Contact Name:** |  | **Telephone Number:**(Including STD Code) |  |
| **Contact Title:** |  | **Facsimile Number:**(Including STD Code) |  |
| **Email and website Address:** |  |
| **Signed:** |  | **Dated:** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION C1 : ORGANISATION, MANDATORY AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION** |
| **Note: This section A is intended to assist the CCC in the evaluation and scoring of later sections of this ITT and will not itself be scored.** **Where a consortium bid is proposed, please present the information for each consortium member individually.** |
| GENERAL INFORMATION**A. Please enclose details of your organisation’s internal structure. A diagram would be helpful to support your answer.**  |
| **B. Please provide certificates of your organisation’s Employers and Public Liability Insurance; Professional Indemnity Insurance cover and Professional Indemnity Insurance cover for sub-contractors. (Certificates must accompany your answer, refer to condition 17 of the Terms and conditions of contract for liability levels and requirements).**  |
| 1. **Is your organisation: (Please tick a box)**
 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | i) a public limited company; |  | Registration No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | ii) a limited company; |  | Registration No: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | iii) a sole trader; |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | iii) a partnership; |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | iii) other, please specify; |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |
| 1. **Please state:**
 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | i) The date of your organisation’s formation: |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | ii) The date of incorporation in U.K. [other country] if different from 2 (i): |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | iii) Your organisation’s VAT registration number: |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Is your organisation a subsidiary of another organisation? If so, please provide the name and registered office address of the holding or parent organisation and the ultimate parent (if applicable):**
 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes |  | No |  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION C2: MANDATORY INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS** |
| Note: The information required in this section is a mandatory requirement for this quotation. Failure to provide the information may result in your bid being eliminated. Where a consortium bid is proposed, please present the information for each consortium member individually. |
| **FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS**1. **Please enclose a set of the last year’s audited accounts (if these accounts are required under the law of the state in which your organisation is established) for your own organisation and the holding and/or ultimate parent and your organisation’s subsidiaries (if applicable). If you cannot provide the last year’s audited accounts, please provide a copy of your most recent business plan, budget or similar document.**

**OR** **If the audited accounts are available online, please provide details of the web page address where the accounts are held so that the Authority can access the information.**  **Web address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (your organisation)**  **Web address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (holding / ultimate parent company)**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION C3: FINANCIAL INFORMATION** |
| **Note: The information supplied in this section will be evaluated to assess the longer-term financial viability of your organisation.** Where a consortium bid is proposed, please present the information for each consortium member individually. |
| 1. **Please provide details of the overall turnover, profit and, if possible, [contract-related] work of the business in the previous three financial years.**
 |
|  | Overall Turnover (£000) | Profit (£000) | Specific contract-related Work (£000) |
| Financial Year ending2013/14 |  |  |  |
| Financial Year ending2012/13 |  |  |  |
| Financial Year ending 2011/12 |  |  |  |
| 1. **Please describe any post balance sheet events or contingent liabilities noted in the accounts submitted and their effects, if known, which should be considered when reviewing any financial information you have submitted. (Note: Any UK organisation should declare material post Balance Sheet events, e.g. events which would have required disclosure if they had been known when the accounts went to print. Other organisations should advise any facts which would require disclosure as if they were a UK organisation.)**
 |
| **3. For your organisation, its subsidiaries, and, where relevant, your group and your organisation’s subsidiaries, give a statement of any contracts where the contract was not completed or where there were claims for damages or where damages have been deducted or recovered within the last 5 years and where the value of the contract or damages was greater than £20,000 pounds sterling.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION C4: SERVICE DELIVERY**  |
| **RELEVANT EXPERIENCE****1. Please describe the relevant principal areas of business activity of your organisation and the number of years you have been involved in this activity. Describe in detail, giving dates of your current and previous experience of comparable projects you have been awarded by public and private sector Clients and undertaken by your organisation in the past 5 years.** |
|  |
| **MANAGING YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CCC****2. Please describe how your organisation will manage its relationship with the CCC, including attendance at meeting and/or provision of progress reports and how communication between all levels of staff will be maintained.** |
|  |
| **QUALITY ASSURING THE SERVICES YOU PROVIDE****3. Please provide a brief plan of how you would monitor and maintain the quality of the services delivered (e.g. relevant Key Performance Indicators, risk management arrangements), including a statement of how you would ensure the key dates and deliverables are met. Please indicate whether in your opinion our timescales can be achieved.** |
|  |
| **MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE****4. Please briefly describe your proposed management and organisational structure for providing the services.**  |
|  |
| **PROJECT TEAM****5. Please provide details of the full project team, including a team structure, with an outline of roles and responsibilities and copies of proposed project team CV’s. Please also confirm whether project team members would be full time or part time on this contract and if part time, please specify time contributed to this project.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION C5: METHOD, ABILITY AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY** |
| **Note: The purpose of the Method Statement is to enable us to evaluate your understanding of our requirements and the quality of your proposals for meeting them.** |
| **UNDERSTANDING OF REQUIREMENTS****1. Please provide a detailed statement of your understanding of the CCC’s requirements for this contract.** |
|  |
| **APPROACH TO MEETING REQUIREMENTS** **2. Please provide a detailed statement and how you would meet the CCC’s requirements for this contract.**  |
|  |
| **CHALLENGES****3. What do you consider are the specific challenges for this project over the life of the contract and how do you propose to overcome these?** |
|  |
| SECTION C6: SIGNATURE AND DATE |
| I hereby declare that the information provided herein is complete and accurate: |
| Signature: |  |  | Date: |  |  |  |
| Name (PRINT): |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Job Title: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |

# Part D

# Pricing Information to be provided by bidder

Please provide costings for the following:

1. Consultancy Charge per day - Please indicate here staff level (i.e. junior consultant, partner etc), rate per day, the number of days the individual would be allocated to the contract and the number of hours worked per day.
2. Any other costs – (please specify).
3. Any discounts offered.
4. Total cost of the Contract.

Notes:

1. Please note that all Travel and Subsistence will be as per the Civil Service Standard i.e. standard class.
2. V.A.T. will be separately indicated

# Part E

# CCC CONDITIONS OF CONTRACT FOR SERVICES

(see other attachments)

1. *‘Fourth Carbon Budget Review – part 2’* (2013), CCC http://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/fourth-carbon-budget-review/ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The 2050 target – achieving an 80% reduction including emissions from international aviation and shipping (2012), CCC http://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/international-aviation-shipping-review/ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Now called Scotland’s Rural College (SRUC) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. *‘The effect of changes in UK food consumption patterns on land requirements and greenhouse gas emissions’* (2010), Cranfield University [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Farm Scale Optimisation of Pollutant Emission Reduction (Farmscoper) decision support tool evaluates the impacts of specific mitigation methods on a wide variety of environmental pollutants [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://www.ipcc.ch/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The ‘eatwell plate’ is a policy tool that defines the Government’s recommendations on healthy diets. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. [Defra/Cranfield](http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=17389) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. [WWF, Livewell (2011)](http://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/livewell___healthy_people_healthy_planet.pdf?_ga=1.18905339.2112476543.1424862749) [↑](#footnote-ref-10)