**RSSB2725 - Trial of Automated Driver Competence Indicators using On Train Data Recorders, to support driver management - I.T.T**

Tender Questions Document

|  |
| --- |
| **Supplier Question 1**  The ITT references that the supplier must have worked on 2 projects for GB railway companies (SS1, p.10). We ask if London Underground counts, or if this refers specifically to ‘mainline’, rather than ‘metro’ companies. |
| **RSSB Answer 1**  The purpose of Selection Criteria S1: Experience in working in GB railway, is to ensure that the selected supplier has relevant railway expertise. Experience with London Underground (LU) could certainly show this but the tenderer provides a strong degree of confidence that the experience is relevant to the project. If for example, work is undertaken with systems/components of the LU that are the same or similar to mainline rail this will be considered relevant. |
| **Supplier Question 2**  We note the possibility that the fleets involved may be of multiple types, being operated by different TOC’s across different routes. As a consequence there may be differences in the types of data available, and the OTDR recorder may record different parameters depending on which fleet/route it comes from. On previous similar projects RSSB has provided data samples. Could it provide data samples for this project? |
| **RSSB Answer 2**  It is imagined that a good proportion of work package 1 will look into the specification of the ADCIs to be explored. As you have quite rightly suggested, one of the key determining factors of this will be the availability of data, and this will be a potential limiting factor. It is not expected that suppliers are to carry this exploratory work before awarding the contract, but the methodology given by the tenderer should explain how this exploration will be approached (potentially including provision for different datasets and structures). It is key to consider that this exercise will not only be driven by data availability but largely by the TOC’s requirements. However, *Railway* *Group Standard : GM/RT2472 (Issue 2, 2014): Requirements for Data Recorders on Trains* (available through RSSB’s standards catalogue), does specify, information to be recorded (i.e. parameters), as a minimum (although manufacturers may have additional recordings). |
| **Supplier Question 3**  Regarding RSSB 2725, we note the strong interaction with the University of Huddersfield.  Are we allowed to contact UoH prior to tender submission to discuss this interaction in more detail? |
| **RSSB Answer 3**  RSSB cannot advise either way as to whether a tenderer should or should not contact the University of Huddersfield. |
| **Supplier Question 4**  If a contractor uses their existing commercial software application(s) as the platform to develop and deliver the ACDIs can the RSSB confirm that the intellectual property for those applications and subsequent developments can remain that of the contractor? |
| **RSSB Answer 4**  The response to this question is in line with the published terms and conditions detailing Intellectual property (sections 12 and 13), Clause 15 where which outlines RSSB’s right to grant a license to the supplier and the ‘Project Structure’ section of the specification. As such all background IP of the “existing commercial software application(s)” will remain with the supplier, any subsequent developments to the “existing commercial software application(s)” for this project are foreground IP and will be the property of RSSB. RSSB will not seek to exert any restrictions over the use of subsequent developments made to “existing commercial software application(s)”. RSSB require the supplier to fully communicate the learning from any subsequent developments as part of the deliverables from the project. Under the award criteria the suppliers approach to making the findings fully available to the industry will be assessed and marked under criteria A4. |
| **Supplier Question 5**  Regarding Work Package 5 Is the expectation that those existing commercial software applications be disseminated as open source/ licence free? |
| **RSSB Answer 5**  The response to this question is in line with the published terms and conditions detailing Intellectual property (sections 12 and 13), Clause 15 where which outlines RSSB’s right to grant a license to the supplier and the ‘Project Structure’ section of the specification. Any pre-existing software and background IP used in the project will remain under the ownership of the originating party and RSSB does not require this to be disseminated as open source/licence free. The suppliers are asked to propose how the knowledge gained from the project will be made available to the industry. The supplier could choose to disseminate applications as open source/licence free if that model was suitable to them and was the approach selected to meet the project requirements. Under the award criteria the suppliers approach to making the findings fully available to the industry will be assessed and marked under criteria A4. |
| **Supplier Question 6**  Will we be able to provide video material as part of the tender response? If yes how and what are your preferred formats? |
| **RSSB Answer 6**  The tender may provide a video as ***part*** of their submission. The video can be submitted specifically for **S5 Strengths and key points of proposal.** But all other selection criteria and all of the award criteria will require a written submission. The video should be submitted as a web link. However, if the tenderer is awarded the contract, a copy will be required in a standard format for our permanent records. |
| **Supplier Question 7**  How long should we assume we need to leave for the stage gate review (i.e. between delivery of WP3 and authorisation to start WP4)?  Do you require the project to be completed within 12 months of start regardless of the length of time required for the stage gate review or is this added on to project timescales? |
| **RSSB Answer 7**  It is recommended that 4-6 weeks should be left available for the stage gate review. However, the tenderer may consider the progression of parallel activities during this period (for example, production and review of deliverables). |
| **Supplier Question 8**  How do you apply clause 2.4 in practice? |
| **RSSB Answer 8**  Clause 2.4 is applied on a case by case basis. |
| **Supplier Question 9**  Does clause 2.4 effectively preclude innovative tech firms in or  at the end of their start up investment phase,  who have just started rolling out their innovative software to the industry, from tendering? |
| **RSSB Answer 9**  No |
| **Supplier Question 10**  Is there any supporting information you would like us to supply? |
| **RSSB Answer 10**  Other than what is requested in the I.T.T, no. |
| **Supplier Question 11**  Would you recommend partnering with a larger company as sub-contractor or consortia member for example? |
| **RSSB Answer 11**  RSSB is unable to advise as to whether or not any potential should or should not partner with any organisation. |