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# Background

**The Climate Change Committee**

The Climate Change Committee (CCC) was set up as part of the Climate Change Act. The CCC is an independent body that advises both on reducing emissions in the UK and adapting to the climate changes in the UK.

The CCC’s full range of past reports are available here:

[http://www.theccc.org.uk/reports/.](http://www.theccc.org.uk/reports/.%C2%A0%20HYPERLINK%20%22http%3A/www.theccc.org.uk/reports/.%C2%A0)

**The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment**

Under the Climate Change Act 2008 (section 57), an assessment of the risks facing the UK from the current and predicted impact of climate change is required every 5 years. The CCC is responsible for providing independent advice to the UK Government to inform that assessment.

The Committee has recently provided its advice to the UK Government on the risks and opportunities facing the UK from current and future climate change as part of the third Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA3) – this was summarised in its Independent Assessment of UK Climate Risk which was published in summer 2021.

The fourth UK Climate Change Risk Assessment (CCRA4) is due for completion by June 2026. CCRA4 will assess climate change risks to the UK using a more spatially defined approach than previous CCRAs, giving an assessment of the spatial distribution of climate risks across the UK and a more localised view of adaptation needs.

To inform this programme of spatial analysis, the CCC are seeking to commission advice to help inform where taking an explicitly spatial approach to risk assessment would be the most valuable. This will inform the method design for CCRA4.

# Aims and Objectives

We are seeking to commission advice on where spatial climate change risk assessment can be most productive for understanding UK risk and adaptation effectiveness. This project is intended to inform the design of subsequent spatial research activities on quantifying climate risk (and its variably across the UK) and the effectiveness of adaptation (including costings). The assessment of productive focus areas for spatial risks assessment and the case studies and pilot modelling studies illustrating this will aim to better understand of where spatial analysis will be most useful and to the likely challenges associated with national-scale spatial risks assessments to deliver on the CCRA4 aims.

The key tasks are:

1. Assessment of CCRA3 risks for appropriateness of spatial analysis approaches

2. Case studies of spatial analysis of UK climate risks and adaptation potential

# Methodology

*Task 1: Assessment of CCRA3 risks for appropriateness of spatial analysis approaches*

This task should conduct a review of all the risks and opportunities considered within the [CCRA3 Technical Report](https://www.ukclimaterisk.org/) (chapters 3 – 6, with the chapter on 'International Dimensions’ excluded due to the UK specific focus of potential spatial risk assessment activities in CCRA4) and provide an assessment for which of these risks quantitative spatial analysis approaches could be most valuable to further strengthen understanding of the risks/opportunities of climate change.

* + Dimensions of the assessment should include: the added value of spatially disaggregated information for this risk (and the resolution at which spatially disaggregated information would be most valuable), the extent to which relevant aspects of hazard, exposure, vulnerability, and adaptive capacity are likely to vary across the UK, the extent to which the range (and effectiveness) of adaptation interventions is likely to vary spatially, and the expected challenge of conducting quantitative spatial analysis for each risk. Suggestions for other key dimensions to inform this assessment are encouraged, with a final list expected to be agreed with the CCC.
	+ Thought should also be given to the practical challenges of looking at multiple climate and socio-economic future scenarios and spatial modelling of adaptation for each risk area as part of this assessment.
	+ This assessment method should be robust, thoroughly documented and rely on both the published literature as well as the expert judgement of the contractors.
	+ An output of this task should be recommendations for a sub-set of risks for which spatial analysis is likely to be the most valuable. Similarly, where particular risk or opportunities are very poorly suited to spatial analysis this should also be reported. Where multiple types of spatial analysis could be conducted for a specific risk or opportunity the diversity of possible approaches should be noted.
	+ Recommendations are also sought for where multiple CCRA3 risks and opportunities could be considered together when an explicitly spatial approach is taken (for example the risks to the same assets from multiple hazards or business or risks to business from particular hazards integrated with non-business analysis).

*Task 2: Case studies of spatial analysis of climate risks and adaptation potential.*

For the risks assessed in Task 1, for which quantitative spatial risk assessment is deemed useful, several detailed case studies/pilot modelling studies should be produced which demonstrate the value of quantitative spatial assessment (in the UK) for these areas of climate risk. These can be based upon existing UK-focused spatial climate risk studies currently available or upon bespoke new modelling exercises undertaken as part of this project – we welcome both approaches. The number case studies/pilot modelling exercises should be included within the proposal and agreed with the CCC. Case studies should be chosen to ensure that there is a balance of areas and good coverage across all the sectoral chapters of the CCRA3 technical assessment.

For each case study the following should be clearly documented in a detailed case study write-up:

* + Methodology details: Metrics used to summarise projected climate impacts, climate and socio-economic futures explored, the spatial-resolution of the analysis and the rationale for choosing this resolution, the spatial-extent of the analysis, treatment of adaptation.
	+ For these case studies/pilot studies, the spatial extent does not have to be the full UK. We welcome case studies focused on analysis demonstrating the value of a spatial approach at a smaller spatial extent (e.g. across a city or region).
	+ The write-up should document how and why a spatial approach added utility to the insights generated for the target audience compared to alternative non-spatial approaches. Case studies on where spatial analysis has directly been used to inform specific policy questions are particularly desirable.
	+ Case studies should be chosen to focus on those that include spatial modelling of enhanced adaptation ambition. The case study write-up should include a section looking at the spatial treatment of adaptation options. This section should document how packages of adaptation actions have/should be implemented in this risk area and how the costing for the adaptation implementation was undertaken (where costing is not considered a discussion on how this could be achieved and the challenges of doing so should be included). Where this has been done on a sub-national spatial extent, thought should be given to the barriers to modelling adaptation implementation (and costing) on a national scale within the case-study write-up.
	+ The limitations of taking a spatial approach should also be clearly acknowledged where identified within the case study/pilot. These could be both practical (spatial approaches can be resource and data intensive) as well as strategic (there may be instances where spatial assessment serves the needs of target audiences less well than non-spatial approaches).

The proposed list of case studies is expected to be agreed with the CCC during the project. We acknowledge the potential variation in required work for this task depending on whether these case studies draw on existing evidence or conduct new bespoke pilot studies. We expect this to be reflected in the costings associated with each bid depending on the approach taken. We encourage bids that take either of these approaches or a combination of existing evidence case studies and bespoke pilot analysis.

# Outputs Required

The outputs of the work should include:

* **A report,** setting out the scope of work, assumptions, methodology and findings for all tasks.
* **Data sets** of quantitative spatial outputs for the case studies/pilots for Task 2, provided in an open and accessible format.

Where excel workbooks are used these should be shared, fully unlocked and linked to rest of the excel workbook deliverable above, allowing future capability to update assumptions.

We envisage that bidders may need to make use of pre-existing knowledge to enable delivery and welcome this. However, this should not limit the transparency of approaches used in this project and all outputs should be provided in a publishable format. In the event of any limitations on sharing (e.g. in wider sharing beyond the CCC), these should be specified as part of the tender.

In addition to the above, we also expect interim deliverables to be required, including slide packs for the purposes of milestone meetings.

# Ownership and Publication

The key deliverables will be handed over to the CCC, who may choose to publish these as supporting evidence on their website. Spreadsheets should be open access and unrestricted, to enable full QA of results and assumptions.

# Quality Assurance

This project must comply with the ‘CCC – Quality Assurance of Evidence and Analysis’ guidance1 and bidders must set out their approach to quality assurance in their response to this ITT.

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),
* Allow for a meeting with CCC staff to run through QA performed.

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.

# Timetable

The proposed timetable for the project is set out in the following table. Ability to start work in early January is highly desirable for this project.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date**   | **Action**   |
| Early Jan 2023 | Kick-off meeting   |
| w/c 20th Feb 2023 | First interim presentation/report on progress |
| By 28th March 2023   | Latest date for delivery of final report, analytical outputs and assumptions log   |

In addition to the formal reporting points, the CCC would expect to have regular scheduled discussions (meetings or calls) to ensure the work is progressing as expected. It is expected a more detailed timeline would be proposed in bids documents and agreed with the CCC at the kick-off meeting.

We welcome alternative suggestions for a credible timeline for this project as part of the response to the ITT – under the constraint that a large fraction of the budget for this project must be spent this financial year (to end of March).

# Challenges

The specific challenges that the CCC envisage with this project include:

* Data availability for spatially disaggregated case studies/pilot studies.
* Ensuring consistency of approach across the project, including across the risks assessed in Task 1.

Bids should set out how these risks will be managed alongside any

other risks and challenges to successfully undertaking this work.

The successful contractor will be expected to identify one named point of contract through whom all enquiries can be filtered. A CCC project manager will be assigned to the project and will be the central point of contact.

# Ethics

All applicants will need to identify and propose arrangements for initial scrutiny and on-going monitoring of ethical issues. The appropriate handling of ethical issues is part of the tender assessment exercise and proposals will be evaluated on this as part of the ‘addressing challenges and risks’ criterion.

We expect contractors to adhere to the following GSR Principals:

1. Sound application and conduct of social research methods and appropriate dissemination and utilisation of findings
2. Participation based on valid consent
3. Enabling participation
4. Avoidance of personal harm
5. Non-disclosure of identity and personal information

# Working Arrangements

The successful contractor will be expected to identify one named point of contract through whom all enquiries can be filtered. A CCC project manager will be assigned to the project and will be the central point of contact.

# 11 Skills and experience

CCC would like you to demonstrate that you have the experience and capabilities to undertake the project. Your tender response should include a summary of each proposed team members experience and capabilities.

Contractors should propose named members of the project team, and include the tasks and responsibilities of each team member. This should be clearly linked to the work programme, indicating the grade/ seniority of staff and number of days allocated to specific tasks.

Contractors should identify the individual(s) who will be responsible for managing the project.

# Consortium Bids

In the case of a consortium tender, only one submission covering all of the partners is required but consortia are advised to make clear the proposed role that each partner will play in performing the contract as per the requirements of the technical specification. We expect the bidder to indicate who in the consortium will be the lead contact for this project, and the organisation and governance associated with the consortia.

Contractors must provide details as to how they will manage any sub-contractors and what percentage of the tendered activity (in terms of monetary value) will be sub-contracted.

If a consortium is not proposing to form a corporate entity, full details of alternative proposed arrangements should be provided. However, please note CCC reserves the right to require a successful consortium to form a single legal entity in accordance with Regulation 28 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.

CCC recognises that arrangements in relation to consortia may (within limits) be subject to future change. Potential Providers should therefore respond in the light of the arrangements as currently envisaged. Potential Providers are reminded that any future proposed change in relation to consortia must be notified to CCC so that it can make a further assessment by applying the selection criteria to the new information provided.

# Budget

The budget for this project is up to £70,000 excluding VAT.

Contractors should provide a full and detailed breakdown of costs (including options where appropriate). This should include staff (and day rate) allocated to specific tasks.

Cost will be a criterion against which bids which will be assessed.

Payments will be linked to delivery of key milestones. The indicative milestones and phasing of payments can be adjusted and agreed with the contractor and Project Manager. Please advise in your tender response how this breakdown reflects your usual payment processes:

In submitting full tenders, contractors confirm in writing that the price offered will be held for a minimum of 60 calendar days from the date of submission. Any payment conditions applicable to the prime contractor must also be replicated with sub-contractors.

The Committee on Climate Change aims to pay all correctly submitted invoices as soon as possible with a target of 10 days from the date of receipt and within 30 days at the latest in line with standard terms and conditions of contract.

# Evaluation of Tenders

Contractors are invited to submit full tenders of no more than 20 pages, excluding declarations and CV’s. Tenders will be evaluated by at least three CCC staff.

CCC will select the bidder that scores highest against the criteria and weighting listed below, see the ITT for further information.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING METHODOLOGY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Description | Weighting |
| 1 | RELEVANT EXPERIENCE / DEMONSTRATION OF CABABILITY | 20% |
| 2 | MANAGING YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CCC | 5% |
| 3 | QUALITY ASSURING THE SERVICES YOU PROVIDE | 10% |
| 4 | MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE | 5% |
| 5 | PROJECT TEAM – SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE | 15% |
| 6 | METHOD, ABILITY AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY | 20% |
| 7 | UNDERSTANDING OF REQUIREMENTS | 15% |
| 8 | RISK AND CHALLENGES | 10% |
|  |  | 100% |

**Scoring Method**

Tenders will be scored against each of the criteria above, according to the extent to which they meet the requirements of the tender. The meaning of each score is outlined in the table below.

The total score will be calculated by applying the weighting set against each criterion, outlined above; the maximum number of marks possible will be 100. Should any contractor score 1 in any of the criteria, they will be excluded from the tender competition.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** |
| 1 | Not Satisfactory: Proposal contains significant shortcomings and does not meet the required standard |
| 2 | Partially Satisfactory: Proposal partially meets the required standard, with one or more moderate weaknesses or gaps  |
| 3 | Satisfactory: Proposal mostly meets the required standard, with one or more minor weaknesses or gaps. |
| 4 | Good: Proposal meets the required standard, with moderate levels of assurance |
| 5 | Excellent: Proposal fully meets the required standard with high levels of assurance |

**Scoring for Pricing Evaluation**

Price will be marked using proportionate pricing. Please see the example below.

Marking proportionate to the lowest price.

Price will be scored as set out below.

There will be a maximum of e.g. 20 marks

The lowest priced bid will receive the full 20 marks, all other bids will then be marked as set out below.

Proportionate Pricing scoring example

If 20% = 20 marks

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Price | Marks |
| 1 (lowest bid) | £50,000 | 20 |
| 2 | £55,000 | 50/55 \* 20 = 18 |
| 3 | £60,000 | 50/60 \* 20 = 17 |

**Structure of Tenders**

Contractors are strongly advised to structure their tender submissions to cover each of the criteria above and supply a price schedule specifying the daily rates (ex-VAT) you will charge for each level of your staff.

**Evaluation for Interviews, if held**

CCC reserves the right to award the contract based on applicants’ written evaluation only if one candidate emerges from the evaluation stage as significantly stronger than the others.

Should interviews go ahead, CCC will shortlist the top suppliers with the highest marks from the written proposals. Interviews are provisionally expected to be held in the week of 12th December 2022 or soon after. If this date changes, CCC will notify applicants.

The areas to be covered in the interview, and markings allocated to each topic area will be sent to the shortlisted supplier prior to interview.

Further details of interviews will be sent to successful applicants on selection.

**Feedback**

Feedback will be given in the unsuccessful letters or emails.