**Clarification Questions and Answers:**

**JNCC Reference: C20- 0405-1495**

**Title: Determining Existing Potential Solutions for a Marine Recorder Replacement**

1. Does JNCC currently use Microsoft Office / 365 licences?
   1. If yes, what type of licences are held?
      1. E.g. E3, F1, or are licences allocated to devices, such as Desktop computer?

ANSWER: Yes JNCC currently uses Microsoft Office 365 licenses and I am currently Liaising with our IT staff to determine, which licenses we use at JNCC. **However**, as in the background of the tender document, the system is not only used by JNCC and we cannot confirm the O365 licensing status for all of the custodians/stakeholders. If O365 licensing is required for the suitability testing of any identified potential solutions, JNCC will work with the successful contractors to derive this information from the current custodians once the contract has commenced.

1. How many users currently supply data?

ANSWER: Data are currently supplied and managed by 10 custodian organisations. However as the current system is federated and desktop based, statistics on individual user inputting data in the systems are currently unknown. If required for any of the costings of potential solutions, JNCC will work with the successful contractors to derive this information from the current custodians once the contract has commenced.

1. What data formats are currently used to supply data?
   1. E.g. cvs, SQL, xhtml

ANSWER: Data are added into the current MS-Access based application either directly/manually via data-input forms or via Excel spreadsheet import. However, with the move to a spatial system, this may well change to more modern formats depending on the ability of the new solution. Ability to directly import open spatial formats (e.g. Shapefiles, geoJSON, GML) would be seen as a contribution towards the “Fully geospatial infrastructure for import, storage, export and direct interaction with GIS” key requirement.

1. Which version of MS-Access and Excel are currently used?

ANSWER: The current system operates on a isolated OFFICE11 access runtime.

1. How many users will need to add and edit data?

ANSWER: See question 2

1. How many users will need to view the data (but not have permission to add, edit or delete, etc.)?

ANSWER: As question 2 – however, it is likely to be both significantly higher and there are user stories which cover public access to publicly accessible data within the system (i.e. without login).

1. Do you intend for 3rd parties to have independent access to the data via their own infrastructure or via user-accounts to a ‘JNCC’ hosted solution?

ANSWER: As long as there is an ability to form a central collation/aggregation across all systems outside from the management infrastructure for composite data extraction and analysis, a solution with separated infrastructure would potentially be worthwhile raising as one of the potential solutions to be identified and explored by the successful contractor under this contract. A single multi-tenant solution vs (online) multiple instance solution (in effect could then be raised to the steering group for consideration.

* 1. View access for 3rd parties to data owned by a custodian within the system (e.g. JNCC) should be via the application.

1. Do you have reporting requirements, such as biodiversity comparisons?
   1. If so, are you looking for dashboards or other info-graphics?

ANSWER: We do have reporting requirements, currently dashboards and info-graphics are not part of the minimal-viable-product identified through consultation with the steering group, though they may form part of potential future development, if feasible. However due to reporting requirements, ease of access to the system for analysis and data extraction are key.

1. Is JNCC hoping to introduce web-based / reporting forms?
   1. If so, do you hope to use drop-down menus/data, with flexibility to add new species, etc?

ANSWER: A web-best GUI with the ability for users to enter and manage data in a “form” style for a particular data type (e.g. adding a new occurrence of a species within a sample), is currently envisioned to be a part of the replacement system.

1. Annex A states: “JNCC has worked closely with the stakeholder organisations in a steering group to produce a vision and set of objectives for the new system, and a suite of user-stories\* for a new system to fulfil. A user-centric conceptual data model has been drafted, representing the data structure and constraints with which the user should interact, and a provisional site/system map and wireframes of a user interface. The outputs comprise the scope of the potential new system”. Can we see this document?

ANSWER: The document does contain a very good and extensive suite of user-stories (avoiding the use of the word “complete” as I feel user stories are never complete). The full set of user stories (and the conceptual data model and indicative ‘site-map’) will be released to the successful contractor for use in their scoping on start of contract.

1. Annex A states “Should an existing system not be found, an estimated cost for a bespoke build would be required.” – is that expected within this contract or is that simply a statement that if as a result of this contract no viable off the shelf system is found then at some point in the future costs of a bespoke build will be required ?

ANSWER: An estimated cost of a fully bespoke build is outside of the scope of this contract.

1. Do recommendations / suggestions for a bespoke build form any part of this contract – or is it entirely about looking at existing systems?

ANSWER: The contract is in regard to existing systems – recommendations or suggestions for a fully bespoke build is outside the scope of the contract.

1. Does the listed contract value include or exclude VAT?

ANSWER: the value as listed is including VAT

1. Given that many of the items could be done at varying levels of detail are we to assume that the budget gives an indication as to expected input?

ANSWER: Yes, as long as the output satisfies the detailed objectives

1. How wide a range of users to consult for user stories.  Agencies, contractors, volunteers?

ANSWER: The user-stories were collected from the stakeholder group comprised of the custodians of the current system from workshops and subsequent questioning. However, the custodians were asked to consider the full suite of users when providing user-stories.

1. How much emphasis to be placed on data formats currently collected vs what might be collected in the future?

ANSWER: There is the distinct possibility that data requirements could change into the future and, if possible, identified potential system should provide some futureproofing for this (e.g. addition of parameters/measurements)

1. Are there systems that you know you want included in the review?

ANSWER: There are a small number of key systems of interest that we would highlight to the successful bidder on award/start of contract.

1. Are you open to collaborative bids?

ANSWER: Yes, as long as the lead partner is clearly identified and all other partners in the collaborative bid are identified, and expertise/skillset/value identified as would be the case for a single-partner bid.

1. The NBN data model that underpins the existing marine recorder application is complex and doesn’t entirely fit the data that marine recorder contains.  However, it also has functionality that is perhaps no longer used (such as taxon versions).  Do the user stories / functionality requirements you have gathered cover hidden elements of marine recorder.

ANSWER: Taxon versions are not required under the current user stories, only the taxon identifier/term as originally recorded and the currently accepted term (as defined by WoRMS). It is the aim that all functionality of the current marine recorder that is still required is captured within the user-stories.

1. Similarly, what the NBN model did bring was the ability to record almost any attribute and thereby make the data model relatively future proof to changing requirements.  How important is this element going forwards?

ANSWER: As question 16, there is the possibility that new measurement types are identified by users in the future. The futureproofing/flexibility of a potential solution should be indicated as part of the contract.

1. Given that most species recording systems or data warehouse solutions could be adapted to store the data (as the NBN data model was) but the more the data is shoe horned to fit the harder it gets to put data in or analyse it coming out generally meaning more effort has to be put into developing custom UI for data entry and reporting.  Are all elements of this equally important going forward (i.e. data entry, validation, reporting tools etc) or is the hope to arrive at a system where data could be bulk imported and perhaps standard tools used for analysis and querying.

ANSWER: As it stands, whilst bulk-import is an aim for the new system, the requirements currently identify both manual data entry/checking/management and data output in an “analysis ready” format. If a system is identified under the contract that partially meets these requirements, it should be initially raised with JNCC to determine if it is worth investigating in more depth. However, further solutions to satisfy the remaining requirements would need to be identified.

1. Is the migration of data from the current system to new solution expected to be without data loss?

ANSWER: That is the preferred outcome, however if an identified potential solution would result in partial data loss, the area of partial data loss should be flagged/highlighted as part of this scoping contract for consideration by the steering group as part of its decision making process.

1. Is the intention for the data contained within the new system to go into the NBN and MEDIN archive centres?

ANSWER: Yes, the intention is for the data contained to feed into MEDIN (via the DASSH data archive centre hosted by the Marine Biological Association), who would then distribute the data further (e.g. to NBN) if requested by the custodian. DASSH currently accept Darwin Core as an interchange format / data structure.