climatexchange

Scotland's centre of expertise connecting climate change research and policy

**Clarification Questions on Invitation to quote - (IQ26-2023) – evidence assessment for the applicability of the carbon calculator tool for windfarm development on Scottish peatlands and other carbon rich soils.**

**Please see below responses to clarification questions received on the above tender:**

**20 November 2023**

Q. **Does CXC require the appointed consultant to test and check the coding of the calculator? Are investigations to be carried out around the coding or is our validation/assurance/analysis only concerned with the formulas used and the methodology applied?**

A. We do not expect validation of the coding, rather an analysis of the underlying evidence base, and its accuracy and validity within the calculator.

Q. **The bid document says that CXC would contact the successful bidder by 17th November - based on the project timetable, is this date meant to be 17th December?**

A. This is a typo. We hope to let the successful bidder know by the 17th December.

**14 November 2023**

Q. **For the purposes of technical assessment - What format will the tool be provided in? (I.e. excel**

A. Yes -excel

Q. **Will the steering group meetings, presentation, and expert group presentation proposed in the project timetable be in person or online?**

A. The meetings for this project will be online. Should there be a request for in-person attendance, reasonable travel expenses will be met by CXC.

Q. **The In relation to project scope and aim - point 1.b re high resolution (~10 m) spatial data:**
   a. **is the scope of this evidence review specifically looking at digital imagery (e.g. 10m Sentinel data), or does it include any other geospatial data?**

The scope is broad and could include use of open data such as Copernicus (sentinel 1, sentinel 2), commercial satellite data (e.g. Planet), airborne lidar surveys (cm resolution), and existing map products for peat distribution and condition, among others. A key point for the analysis is to quantify the value of higher resolution data over current practice of peat depth mapping on grids typically of ~100 m.

**b. is ~10m the preferred image pixel resolution, minimum mapping unit (MMU) or other metric (e.g. positional accuracy)?**

A preferred resolution is not precisely defined in the specification (see previous answer). The optimal resolution might range from 0.01 m to 20 m or more, and may vary by region. The natural length scales of peat depth heterogeneity are probably the best definition of the resolution required, and so the scales of spatial variability should be discussed and identified if possible.