

Collaborative Research Programme On River Basin Management Planning Economics

Terms of Reference for Use and Access of Waterbodies in England and Wales

2007



Department of the
Environment
www.doeni.gov.uk



SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE



ENVIRONMENT AGENCY



DEPARTMENT FOR BUSINESS
ENTERPRISE & REGULATORY REFORM



SCOTLAND & NORTHERN IRELAND
FORUM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH



UKMPG
The United Kingdom Major Ports Group



Country Land &
Business Association
RURAL ECONOMY IS OUR BUSINESS

The Collaborative Research Programme, under which this report has been produced, is jointly sponsored by Defra, Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive, Department of Environment Northern Ireland, Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Scotland and Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research, UK Water Industry Research, the Joint Environmental Programme, UK Major Ports Group, British Ports Association, CC Water, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, National Farmers' Union and Country Land and Business Association (the "Collaborative Partners"). The Collaborative Partners have made their best endeavours to ensure the accuracy of the information contained in this report. However, the Collaborative Partners cannot assume responsibility for the content of this report or for any opinions or statements of fact expressed therein or for any actions taken as a result of consulting this report. The report does not necessarily represent the viewpoint of any individual organisation.

© 2006 Defra, Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive, Department of Environment Northern Ireland, Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, Scotland and Northern Ireland Forum for Environmental Research, UK Water Industry Research, the Joint Environmental Programme, UK Major Ports Group, British Ports Association, CC Water, Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, National Farmers' Union and Country Land and Business Association. All rights reserved.

Research Specification:

Use and Access of Waterbodies in England and Wales

CONTRACT NUMBER: CRP/SG PROJECT 4f

Competition Code:	
Date for return of tenders:	
Address for tender submission: (the Competition Code must be shown on the envelope and the tender submitted in line with the instructions in the attached guidance, otherwise your tender may not be accepted)	
Number of electronic & hard copies required:	1 copy on CD-ROM, plus 6 hard copies
Contact for information relating to this project specification:	Name: John Joyce Tel no: 07792822469 E-mail: wfdbenefits@gmail.com
Proposed ownership of Intellectual Property (contractor or Defra):	Collaborative Research Programme
Proposed start-date (if known):	October/November 2007
Proposed end-date (if known):	January 2008

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Background	1
3	Aim	3
4	Method and Key Sources of Information	3
5	Quality Assurance	4
6	Reporting Structure	4
7	Key Deliverables	4
8	Timetable	5
9	Costs	5
10	Travel and Subsistence	5
11	Contract Award Evaluation Criteria	5
12	Monitoring	6
13	Additional Issues	7

CONTRACT TITLE: Use and Access
CONTRACT NUMBER: CRP/SG PROJECT 4f

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) is promoting a collaborative programme of research on assessing the costs and benefits of options in river basin management for implementing the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD). This programme involves many of the major stakeholders in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. The total cost of the programme, which is already underway, is estimated to be £1.5 million. Six projects are included in the research programme, of which project 1, 2, and 3 are nearing completion and project 4 and 5 are current.
- 1.2 In addition to Defra, the Welsh Assembly Government, Scottish Executive, Environment Agency, English Nature, Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform, the Joint Environment Programme, CCWater and UK Water Industry Research are currently offering funding in support of the programme of work. It is anticipated that other organisations, including industry groups and Non-Governmental Organisations will also make financial commitments. Further organisations are contributing to the programme in kind, including Country Land and Business Association, UK Major Ports Group/British Ports Association and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB). Currently unassigned projects will be assigned by competitive tendering, wherever possible. The process of inviting tenders and appointing contractors for project 4 will be managed through Defra (hereafter referred to as [‘the Client’] using the Client’s procurement processes.

2. Background

- 2.1 Project 4 of the Collaborative Research Programme (CRP) provides guidance on the methods and data to help assess the benefits of implementing the Water Framework Directive. Information on the benefits of making environmental improvements will inform decision-making on whether or not an alternative objective to aim of achieving good status by 2015 is appropriate on the basis that aiming achieving good status in this timescale would be disproportionately expensive.
- 2.2 The Water Framework Directive allows Member States to set an alternative objective to that of aiming to achieve good status by 2015 where, among other things, the achievement of good status in a water body by 2015 would be disproportionately expensive or technically unfeasible.
- 2.3 An alternative objective for a water body may be:

- Deadline extensions – aim to achieve good status by 2021 or 2027 rather than by 2015; or
 - Less Stringent Objectives - The improvements towards good status that can be made by 2015 which are technically feasible and not disproportionately expensive
- 2.4 Member States may also designate surface water bodies as heavily modified or artificial. For such bodies, the default objective is to aim to achieve good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status by 2015. However, analogous alternative objectives to those outlined in Paragraph 2.3 above can be set where achieving good ecological potential and good surface water chemical status by 2015 would be disproportionately expensive or technically unfeasible.
- 2.5 Justification for the use of an alternative objective has to be set out in the relevant river basin management plan. A key justification for an alternative environmental objective is that the benefits of the improvement in the status of a waterbody (in qualitative, quantified or monetary terms) are not sufficient to outweigh the costs. As such it is necessary to be able to estimate and use information on benefits within the objective setting process.
- 2.6 The Collaborative Research Programme (CRP) is developing the tools and techniques to put general river basin planning principles into practice. These principles are set out in the Defra/WAG consultation document of River Basin Planning¹. Following a strategic steer by the UK Economics Steering Group, the CRP members have decided to take a long term approach to benefits analysis for the WFD – relying on qualitative and quantitative information where possible for the first management plan, while working towards having robust monetary estimates of benefits for the second plan. In order to safeguard a proportionate and value for money first plan it has been decided to develop an estimate of the aggregate level of benefits, via a stated preference study. Tools and procedures will also be required to prioritise improvement programmes within this envelope. Any new benefits work must be based on an improved understanding of the human welfare impacts arising from meeting the Directives objectives and the context in which these benefits arise.
- 2.7 The CRPs long term approach to benefits equates to a number of principal projects (projects 4b -h) aimed at addressing major gaps and uncertainties regarding the assessment of benefits. Project 4f is a key project within the programme.

¹ <http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/wfd/consultation.pdf>

- 2.8 Understanding the link between physical waterbody attributes and user behaviour with account taken for access will assist River Basin Planners to focus the design and location of water quality and quantity improvements. The objective of Project 4f is to support River Basin Management Planning by providing waterbody use and access information and gap analysis. To-date, use and access information has been based on a small number of sites with uncertainty regarding the robustness of data. Limited amount of data exists, for example, on the number of bathers visiting bathing beaches and in particular, differentiating between different user types (immersive versus aesthetic/scenic) despite visitors at sites being counted during routine monitoring. In addition, access to water bodies is a key issue in realising benefits to be had from water environment improvements. Access is complex as different users require different levels of access.

3. Aim

3.1 The focus of the Project should be to

- To examine and list what information is available in the area of *use* and *access to water bodies*, per waterbody type. On use, questions include: What do people use water bodies for? How often do they use it? What determines their choice of use and location? Access here can mean: (a) access to the riverbanks, towpaths, lakesides and shores (e.g. walking, bird watching, viewing landscape) and (b) access onto and into water itself (e.g. swimming and boating). Key water body types include: rivers, canals, reservoirs, lakes, wetlands, estuaries and coastal waters.
- Produce a gap analysis of available data and assess what is required to close such gaps by suggesting concrete future (survey) work/research. It would be useful if this assessment would include, but not be limited to, an assessment of the extent to which the data lends itself to GIS analysis and possible added value of such work.
- Identify what work is necessary in this area to support implementation of the WFD keeping in mind that the approach taken to providing data and evidence tools is long-term and low-cost.

3.2 The aim of the Project

- Review and analyse existing use and access datasets and surveys, including monitoring site information (including visitor data), per water use/activity and water body types, to obtain an initial judgment of use and access of waterbodies in England and Wales, including gap analysis. This information should be disaggregated to River Basin District Scale where possible.
- Identify water quantity and quality factors affecting water use per activity and per water body type. This should include an assessment and prioritisation of the importance of those factors. In classifying the factors the study should make use of, but not be restricted to, related work carried out under CRP P4B/C and CRP 4D.

- Identify and prioritise other (non-water quantity and quality) factors that influence use (per water body type): e.g. congestion; access fees; parking substitutes; complements; weather; going with friends etc.
- Distinguish user groups that are likely/unlikely to be affected by changes in water quality and/or quantity resulting from WFD implementation. Likewise distinguish user groups likely/unlikely to be affected by non-water quantity and quality factors.
- Identify factors that determine (positively and negatively) access per waterbody type, per use type.
- Assess the overall relative importance of both water quantity and quality factors and non-water quantity and quality factors in determining use of the water environment, including access.
- Identify and suggest possible changes/additions (including development of specific alterations/additions) to existing England and Wales based surveys and monitoring sites, per water use type, and per waterbody type.
- Develop recommendations for new data collection and surveys, per water body type, per use type, to support WFD implementation.

4. Method and Key Sources of Information

4.1 This project shall make use, as relevant, of

All listed references in this section are to be obtained by the Contractor.

- The Brighton Study and <http://www.brighton.ac.uk/waterrecreation/reports.htm>
- Environment Agency reports, including the Strategic Review of Recreational Use.
- River Remediation projects – including Mersey Basin and Manchester Ship Canal.
- Water Companies Water Resource Plans.
- Academic literature and policy reports.
- Existing relevant outputs from the CRP programme, in particular studies CRP 4B/C and CRP 4D.

The Contractor should:

- Consult where necessary with key use and access staff in relevant agencies/companies, using a mutually agreed approach/format. It is expected that the contractor will propose approaches relevant to the task.
- Consult where necessary with user group representatives, using a mutually agreed approach/format. It is expected that the contractor will propose approaches relevant to the task.

And make full use of:

- Views expressed by key stakeholders, Collaborative Research Programme partners, Project Executive, Project Manager and Project Steering Group.
- Peer review comments; outstanding issues in the “issues log” (see details under section 6, 2nd bullet).

4.2 The source of any data included in the outputs of the project shall be identified together with information on the robustness of such data, including methodology, confidence, precision and limitations of that data. It is suggested this is supported by, but not limited to, delivery of an annotated list of references.

5. Quality Assurance

- The draft final report/outputs will be peer reviewed by a panel selected by the Project Board from the Programme's peer review pool.
- The comments received from the peer reviewers on the draft products shall be fed back to the Contractors for consideration prior to the delivery of each output. There are normally multiple rounds of comments from PSG members and contractors must consider in detail each round of comments prior to each delivery stage.

6. Reporting structure

- The Project Manager (PM) will be John Joyce of the Collaborative Research Programme. The Steering Group (SG) will be drawn from the Collaborative Research Programme and the successful tenderer will present to this group.
- The prospective contractor need to provide and maintain an issues log and a risk register throughout the project and provide updates at each steering group meeting.
- There is likely to be ad hoc meetings requiring presentations by the consultants regarding progress (reasonable costings should be budgeted for such ad-hoc requests in the proposal).
- Fortnightly e-mailed progress reports must be reported as a minimum: Progress on key activities; project risks and issues and how they are being managed; and the resources employed to date.
- The contractor will be expected to write the minutes of Steering Group meetings and deliver these minutes within 4 working days of the meeting.
- CRP shall hold the intellectual property rights of the project and all its outputs. CRP holds copyright and will publish as appropriate.

7. Key Deliverables

The key deliverable is a full report that at a minimum contains:

- A full report, written in plain English with an executive summary. The executive summary should be no more than 6 pages long. The report should explicitly address all items listed in section 3.
- Policy brief written in a concise and non-technical language (maximum of 4 pages)
- Relevant data collected (if applicable).
- An annotated reference list that briefly describes key content of reference including methodology applied, data sources used, scope of data and its robustness.
- Recommendations for further research based on gap analysis in the context of WFD (see for example section 2 and 3.1)

8. Timetable

A set of milestones for the research is given below, together with dates by which each milestone must be reached. The successful tender will have included a detailed timetable of events that will ensure these milestones are achieved to schedule, with definite dates for each milestone. Any subsequent variations to the Contractor's timetable are subject to the Client's prior written agreement.

Milestones:	To be completed no later than:
Tender interviews (if necessary)	Late October/Early November 2007
Inception Meeting	Early November 2007
Interim Report	December 2007
Draft Final Report	January 2008
Final Report	January 2008
Peer Review Process	October 2007- January 2008

9. Costs

The tenderer must list separately staff costs, including individual rates and estimated man-day inputs, travel and subsistence, materials, sub-contracts, meetings, and reports. Man-day inputs must correspond to key tasks and daily rates. This information must also be provided in respect of any sub-contractors who will be employed for the purposes of this contract. Although all costs will be evaluated exclusive of VAT, the tenderer must state whether VAT is applicable. Please note that a full and detailed breakdown of fees and costs with explicit links to key tasks must be included.

10. Travel and Subsistence

All travel and subsistence costs must be included in the total cost of the proposals.

11. Contract Award Evaluation Criteria

Prospective Contractors must supply the Client with details of how they will undertake the proposed programme of work, including a breakdown of the content of the work. Prospective Contractors must provide a timetable for the completion of the contract, preferably in the form of a GANTT chart, and should include an initial risk assessment, identifying the key risks to non-delivery and potential mitigation strategies. Prospective Contractors must provide CV's of all staff who will be engaged in the contract. In particular please provide information on your interviewers: how they have

been selected and trained for the job. Also, please provide information and evidence of accomplishments in related areas.

It is anticipated that the prospective Contractor will need to deploy a team of staff that can demonstrate knowledge and experience of the following subjects:

- Recent and relevant multi-disciplinary project management experience;
- Recent and relevant experience in use and access studies and/or water use studies.

Importantly, contractors must supply details of the quality control procedures (see also item 5 above), together with details of past work undertaken in this area. This information must be provided in respect of any sub-contractors who will be employed for the purposes of this contract.

All bids will be evaluated against the following criteria:

- the research methodology employed/Inventiveness of approach;
- data collection methods;
- understanding the issues involved;
- understanding the tasks involved;
- feasibility of the approach suggested;
- methods to ensure confidentiality;
- methods to ensure quality;
- ability to deliver key outputs on time;
- clarity in descriptions of milestones;
- credibility of personnel;
- track record;
- value for money;
- Clarity of tender;

12. Monitoring

Client's Contact Point

The Contract Project Manager will be John Joyce (wfdbenefits@gmail.com). The Contract Project Manager will be the point of contact for the Contractor during the course of the contract. He may elect to meet a named representative of the Contractor as and when

necessary to discuss any issues which may have arisen during the provision of the service¹.

Tenderer's Personnel

Tenderers should provide the names of personnel to be assigned to the contract, their status in the organisation and their previous experience of dealing with contracts of a similar nature. Tenderers should also give details of a nominated contact point.

Upon award of the contract, provision for regular progress reports to the Client will be made. Weekly written progress reports should be used to raise any issues that may arise and actions that need to be taken to resolve problems. More frequent verbal contact may be required at certain stages of the contract.

13. Additional Issues

Prospective Contractors must declare in their tenders any conflict of interest in this area of activity.

All tender queries should be forwarded by email to: wfdbenefits@gmail.com

If tenderers make queries, responses will be circulated to all tenderers.

¹ The Contract Project Manager is an appointed member of the Programme Steering Group (PSG), who will be advised by a small board of PSG members, in association with the CRP Programme Manager.

