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| Question | Answer |
| Can the work be commenced from offshore? | Yes |
| We understand that all the input data will be provided by the client. | Most data is available to download as Open Government Licence data. Non-open data would be provided under Contractor and End User Licence agreements with Natural England. |
| We understand that no field work is required in this project. | No field work is involved. |
| The main software to be used for the urban habitat and Naturalness mapping workflow is Trimble eCognition 10.3. Can we use alternate methods like Machine learning or a combination of Trimble e cognition 10.3 and ML? Please clarify. | Machine Learning is already used in the methodology. Alternative software may be available. At the time of writing the specification we are not aware of alternatives but if they exist and can be demonstrated to be suitable they may be acceptable. The key issue is to ensure that all outputs from this phase of work are compatible with the outputs of the previous phase to ensure consistency. |
| Can we propose an alternate method and will this be considered as a minimum score – Pass? | The Urban Habitat Mapping work is being done in phases to create a Version 1 Urban Habitat Maps for the main urban conurbations of England. The outputs from all phases (including future ones) must be compatible with each other to ensure consistency. The previous phase of work established the method that we wish to roll out across the major urban conurbations of England. Suggestions for future methodological change may be developed but are not likely to be adopted until after Version 1 of the England Urban Habitat Maps have been produced. Subsequent versions may thus be undertaken with modified methodology. |
| In reference to the document” Annex 5 - User Guide - Urban Habitat and Naturalness Mapping Upscaling - Ver C1.0” the urban classification scheme has mentioned the detailed classification of grassland into Amenity Grassland and Undifferentiated Grassland. Please clarify the definition of undifferentiated grassland. | “Undifferentiated grasslands are all grasslands that cannot be identified as “Amenities Grasslands”. The class is “undifferentiated” because the method does not allow for the division of grasslands into formal habitat classifications (Neutral, calcareous, acid etc). It is therefore a general grasslands class. |
| In reference to the document” Annex 5 - Urban Habitat and Naturalness Mapping Upscaling - Ver C1.0” the urban classification scheme detail classification of Rough, Abandoned and Derelict Land including habitat mosaics. Please define the habitat mosaic class. | Whilst the classification system retains this class, it has so far proved to difficult to map in practice. It is retained in the system in case future methodological improvements enable better identification. Mapping of Habitat Mosaics would thus not be expected in this work. |
| Kindly provide the Area of Interest **in ESRI file** formats for the project area. | The exact areas of interest will only be confirmed with the project management at the start of the project. The exact locations of interest will be subject to suitable data being available. The suggest locations are thus provided as proposed and subject to change. |
| In reference to the document” Annex 5 - User Guide - Urban Habitat and Naturalness Mapping Upscaling - Ver C1.0”, the urban habitat classification scheme is defined. But there is no specification for capturing the feature size criteria. Please clarify the size criteria for broad and detailed classification for each class. | The output mapping has a minimum mappable unit of 5 square metres. |
| In reference to the document” Annex 5 - User Guide - Urban Habitat and Naturalness Mapping Upscaling - Ver C1.0” there was no existing shape file for grasslands. We have to create a grassland survey template and capture polygons for Amenities (A1) and Undifferentiated (A2) grasslands (Approximately 50 samples for each class). This will be used as training data set for the classification of grasslands for the total area of the project. Please confirm our understanding. | Correct. |
| Could you confirm what 2Excel’s involvement is in Phase 2 of the project?  | The RfQ is open competition. There are currently no contractors involved in this phase of the work.  |
| If errors are found in the existing methodology that require rectification or new circumstances are encountered that require modification, is there an expectation that these modifications are completed within the total budget of this project? | Error rectification (if found necessary) would need to be within scope of the project budget. |
| Who determines whether an error is an error with the methodology or user error?  | Decisions regarding the treatment of identified errors would be agreed with the Project Management Group. |
| If we need to ask a question around a problem with the methodology how quickly can we expect a response? | The successful contractor would be expected to liaise regularly with the Project Manager. Issues would be resolved as required. |
| Is the 6-month delivery programme based from time taken to run this methodology for Phase 1?  | The delivery programme is based on available time to deliver the project. We believe the total area of proposed mapping to be deliverable within the timeframe using the established method. |