

OFFSHORE WIND ACCELERATOR S4Y7

Clarification Question Responses

TWG-C: CBRA 2.0

July 2026



#	Type	Question	Response
1		It is stated that “WP1 is proposed to be delivered in partnership by the Contractor and the Carbon Trust, with an appropriate proportion of the overall project budget allocated to the Carbon Trust to cover delivery of this work. The Carbon Trust will act as the neutral convenor, responsible for consortium development, stakeholder engagement, and scope governance. The Contra” It appears that the last sentence is incomplete. What should be stated here?	Please ignore the incomplete sentence. This was a drafting error and should have been deleted from the ITT.
2		Can the Carbon Trust clarify the amount of time it expects to need for its tasks (understood to be “neutral convenor, responsible for consortium development, stakeholder engagement, and scope governance.”), as we cannot estimate this?	The Contractor is not expected to estimate or budget for Carbon Trust time. The £110k-£115k budget is entirely for Contractor delivery. Carbon Trust activities relating to consortium development, stakeholder engagement and scope governance will be funded separately.
3		WP2 – are you considering the application and impact of non-traditional CBRA survey methods – e.g. Depth of Burial from sensors – we have a DOB and exposure model that delivers always on depth from DAS data, others estimate similar from DTS. We think this will have a strong potential feedback mechanism into CBRA assessment. Similarly, are you considering non-traditional sources for vessel movement – for example in the Eastern Baltic where AIS is jammed or not used, instead of radar and satellite they are also mandating DAS based sensing for vessel movement.	CBRA 2.0 is intended to consider relevant new evidence, datasets and industry developments where these help address identified gaps in the current methodology. The objective is not to exclude non-traditional approaches, but to assess whether there is sufficient evidence and industry support for their inclusion within updated guidance. Any changes should remain aligned with the project's objective of delivering a targeted update rather than developing an entirely new methodology.

4	Under point WP1 "3. Consortium building and stakeholder onboarding", can you please clarify if our proposal is expected to include a proposed consortium structure or if this will be addressed at the workshop and agreed then?	No. Consortium development and participant onboarding are being led by Carbon Trust. The proposal does not need to include a proposed project consortium structure. The Contractor's role is to support scope alignment and understand stakeholder priorities and expectations.
5	Apart from participation in workshops is there anything else expected in the proposal against WP1? How many days of workshops should we budget for and at what location?	Yes. The Contractor is expected to: • Review the existing CBRA methodology. • Facilitate and lead the technical scope-alignment workshop. • Engage with project participants as required. • Identify methodology gaps and update priorities. • Produce a kick-off report and recommendations to guide subsequent work packages. For pricing purposes, bidders should assume one WP1 workshop associated with Deliverable D1.1. The preferred location is the Carbon Trust London office with hybrid attendance available. The project will also include final dissemination activities later in the project.
6	"Confirm level of participation, funding contribution, and potential NDA arrangements." Is it expected that the Contractor will provide contributions? What type of contributions is this referring to?	No. The Contractor is being paid to deliver the work and is not expected to provide a financial contribution. References to contributions relate to project participants joining the consortium.
7	Is the intention that CBRA 2.0 remains fundamentally a guidance document, or is there an expectation that the underlying probabilistic methodology and equations may be modified where justified by evidence?	CBRA 2.0 is intended to remain fundamentally a guidance document and targeted update to CBRA 1.0. The project seeks to preserve the core probabilistic foundation while updating assumptions, guidance and methodology where there is sufficient supporting evidence and industry agreement to justify change.

8	To what extent does Carbon Trust expect quantitative validation of revised assumptions (e.g., anchor penetration, fishing gear penetration) versus expert judgment and literature review?	The preferred approach is evidence-led and proportionate to the issue being considered. Quantitative validation should be provided where feasible and supported by available evidence. Expert judgement and literature review are also expected to play an important role where quantitative datasets are limited.
9	Is the project expected to deliver a fully updated CBRA calculation methodology/tool, or only an updated guidance document describing methodology updates?	The project is expected to deliver an updated CBRA 2.0 guidance package, including refreshed methodology sections, updated assumptions and supporting guidance. Whether this results in updates to associated calculation tools will depend on the outcomes of the methodology refresh work, but this could be the case.
10	Can Carbon Trust confirm whether any non-public reports, previous OWA studies, or research outputs relevant to cable burial risk assessment will be made available?	Yes. Available CBRA 1.0 documentation and anonymised stakeholder comments will be shared with the successful Contractor where relevant to support delivery of the project.
11	Regarding anchor penetration updates, does Carbon Trust expect development of new penetration models, or solely review and incorporation of existing industry research?	Recent industry research should be reviewed and incorporated where relevant. Development of new penetration models is not currently expected.
12	Is there an expectation to quantitatively assess multilayer soil effects and vessel-specific anchor behaviours, or provide guidance on their treatment?	The project should consider whether current guidance adequately addresses these issues and provide recommendations where justified. The level of technical development required should be proportionate to available evidence and the agreed project scope.

13	Are workshops expected to be held in person, virtually, or through a hybrid approach? If physical attendance is preferred, where are workshops likely to be hosted?	Workshops are expected to be delivered using a hybrid format, with physical hosting anticipated at the Carbon Trust London office.
14	Background IP and Core CBRA 1.0 Models: Section 5.2 lists "None" under input data and background IP provided by the Carbon Trust/OWA Partners. Given that the objective is a targeted update of the existing CBRA methodology, will the successful Contractor be granted full access to the original CBRA 1.0 source text, mathematical tool code, calculations, and stakeholder comment histories at contract award? If not, is the Contractor expected to independently reverse engineer the existing methodology from public domain text?	See Q10.
15	Volume Caps on Stakeholder and Advisory Panel Consultations: The ITT notes extensive stakeholder engagement across WP1, WP2, WP3, and WP4, including interacting with a non-OWA external Advisory Panel, insurers, certification bodies, and contractors. To allow for accurate man-hour estimation and avoid unchecked scope creep, will the Carbon Trust establish a predefined cap on the number of external workshops, Advisory Panel review cycles, and bilateral interviews required of the Contractor?	The project currently anticipates: • Two workshops (kick-off and final dissemination/review). • Two formal review cycles. • Bilateral engagement throughout the project as required. Carbon Trust recognises that precise stakeholder engagement requirements cannot be fully defined in advance and therefore some flexibility will be required.

16	Technical Scope Bounds for Geotechnical Modelling (WP2): WP2 specifies updating fishing gear penetration assumptions across various soil conditions. Will the TWG expect multi-layer soil trajectory modelling and advanced numerical/geotechnical simulations, or is a simplified, macro-level analytical profiling framework considered sufficient?	Existing research and analytical profiling are expected to be sufficient. The Contractor should also identify and discuss any limitations.
17	Shipping Traffic Data Provision (WP3): WP3 mandates design considerations for the shipping baseline and traffic redistribution. Is the Contractor expected to independently procure and fund commercial AIS/historical vessel traffic datasets, or will the OWA Partners provide clean, aggregated traffic density data for relevant offshore wind sectors?	Yes, the Contractor is expected to independently procure and fund commercial AIS/historical vessel traffic datasets
18	Can number of review comments be agreed upon? Or be charged as an additional work?	Two review cycles are planned. Carbon Trust would not normally cap the number of review comments. Bidders may propose alternative arrangements in their proposal if they wish, which would be considered as part of evaluation.
19	Does the client expect the workshop format will be in-person, online or hybrid.	See Q5.
20	Is the Client open to audio recording of the workshop that may facilitate later thematic analysis of discussion, providing informed consent is granted by participating stakeholders.	Yes. Audio recording is acceptable and recommended, subject to appropriate participant consent. Note that not everything may be captured accurately.

21	Please confirm if the scope is also to revise the probabilistic formula for the anchor-impact risk or if this should be preserved to ensure CBRA 1.0 continuity?	The intention is to preserve the core probabilistic framework while reviewing assumptions and methodologies where justified by evidence. Any modifications should improve the methodology whilst maintaining continuity with CBRA 1.0 where possible.
22	Please confirm if exploration of probabilistic model development for other risks (e.g., fishing, seabed mobility) is within the scope of this WP allowing better standardisation of the risk register scoring.	The project should identify where additional guidance, or methodological development would improve consistency and decision-making. The extent of any new probabilistic model development should be determined through the agreed project scope.
23	Could individual Work Packages be awarded to different contractors, and, if so, who would be responsible for technical integration? Please clarify how time/resource will be split if only a part bid is accepted?	Carbon Trust does not currently intend to award separate work packages to different contractors. However, bidders are welcome to form consortia where complementary expertise is required. This is seen favourably.
24	Please provide indication of the minimum stakeholder-engagement (e.g., frequency/duration of meetings, anticipated number of stakeholders) expected from the Contractor to ensure this is well factored into the pricing and not underestimated.	The project expects engagement with relevant insurers, certification bodies and organisations involved in undertaking burial risk assessments. As a guide, each stakeholder group should ideally be engaged at least twice during the project, alongside ongoing communication to support review, understanding and industry buy-in.

25	Please confirm who will handle WP1 logistics in the form of a responsibility matrix including for example, scheduling, facilitation, minutes, and follow-up reporting.	Carbon Trust • Consortium onboarding • Stakeholder engagement • Scheduling • Workshop logistics • Scope governance Contractor • Technical leadership • Workshop facilitation • Scope alignment activities • Technical recommendations • Kick-off report
26	Please clarify if both route-intersection and spatial/cell-based vessel exposure methods be developed and tested, or should the guidance only establish criteria for choosing between them?	Both route-intersection and cell-based methods should be developed and tested, with guidance on when each method is most applicable.
27	Is the Contractor expected to define quantitative acceptable-risk thresholds and return periods?	The project includes improving the definition and communication of acceptable risk levels and return periods. The extent to which these are revised versus clarified should be determined through the technical work and stakeholder review process.
28	Please confirm if the expected outcome of revising the anchor penetration guidance is to provide a practical and generic approach that improves the CBRA 1.0 methodology?	Yes. The intention is to improve and update the methodology where justified by evidence whilst maintaining continuity with CBRA 1.0 and supporting practical application across projects.

29	Should the CBRA 2.0 guidance provide a framework for determining where a more project-specific approach is required?	Yes. One objective of the update is to improve clarity on applicability, limitations and circumstances where additional project-specific assessment may be appropriate.
30	A consortium is referred to within the documentation as being bidder derived. A further section refers to a consortium being Carbon Trust derived, of stakeholders such as insurers. Can the Carbon Trust confirm if the Carbon Trust derived Consortium could include other bidders?	No. The Carbon Trust consortium refers to participating asset owners/operators joining the project consortium. Bidders may form their own Contractor consortium separately (by including sub-contractors of their own), but other bidders will not form part of the participant consortium.

carbontrust.com

+44 (0) 20 7170 7000

Whilst reasonable steps have been taken to ensure that the information contained within this publication is correct, the authors, the Carbon Trust, its agents, contractors and sub-contractors give no warranty and make no representation as to its accuracy and accept no liability for any errors or omissions. Any trademarks, service marks or logos used in this publication, and copyright in it, are the property of the Carbon Trust. Nothing in this publication shall be construed as granting any licence or right to use or reproduce any of the trademarks, service marks, logos, copyright or any proprietary information in any way without the Carbon Trust's prior written permission. The Carbon Trust enforces infringements of its intellectual property rights to the full extent permitted by law.

The Carbon Trust is a company limited by guarantee and registered in England and Wales under Company number 4190230 with its Registered Office at: Level 5, Arbor, 255 Blackfriars road, London SE1 9AX.

© The Carbon Trust 2023. All rights reserved.

Published in the UK: 2023