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| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Clarification Questions** | **Answers** |
| 1 | * **Ludham and Potter Heigham Marshes** - The clarification response indicates that costs for **only using high-accuracy gps** are required.   Does this only apply to this site or also the other 5 NNR sites? | Yes, this only applies to Ludham & Potter Heigham Marshes. For the other sites, we would like two quotes – one with and one without using high-accuracy gps. |
| 2 | * **Ludham and Potter Heigham Marshes** - The clarification response indicates that new feno markers will not be required for this site.   Does this only apply to this site or also the other 5 NNR sites? | Yes, this only applies to Ludham & Potter Heigham Marshes and not the other 5 sites.  We hope that new feno markers won’t be needed at the other sites but that varies with habitats, disturbance and efficient use of high-accuracy gps; in other words some replacements may be necessary. |
| 3 | * Is the cost of Feno markers to be included in the quotations? Or are these costs to be refunded by NE separately. It is also noted that there are different lengths of Feno markers – please confirm exact requirements | As it is unknown at this stage, whether or not any new feno markers will be needed, the cost can be added later to the items in the invoice. |
| 4 | * Will NE pay for the feno marker installation equipment – should the costs of these be included in the returned quotation? | Yes, we will pay for any feno marker blocks, tools and accessories if these are needed. As these must be purchased from the known supplier and we know the costs, it does not need to be included in the returned quotation. |
| 5 | * In the proposed costing tables this only show staff day rates. Presumably a separate row can be added for expenses? | Yes, that’s fine. |
| 6 | * Can NE provide an example of both a LTMN site plot tracker and LTMN vegetation data input spreadsheet | OK, attached. |
| 7 | * Would the use of TABLEFIT be a suitable alternative for MAVIS for NVC analysis? | Yes, that’s fine – would need stating in the final short report. |
| 8 | * The **Dark Peak** clarification response indicates there is some flexibility in survey windows (three weeks either side for subsequent survey)   Is there any flexibility in the proposed survey periods for the other sites, can they be moved slightly earlier/later? | Yes, we generally say three weeks either side of the previous survey dates – but if a wide window has already been given in the project specification, then the most appropriate time for surveying the particular habitat(s) must be taken into account. |
| 9 | * **Lullington Heath** – with regards the woodland survey methodology it is mentioned that the percentage cover of trees and shrubs is required for the 10 x 10 m plots for each species and for each crown class. Do we calculate the widest point of the canopy for this for each species and within each crown? How do we calculate cover where trees and shrubs may overlap with each other? Can the calculations collectively go over 100% for example because of overlap? | Yes, the % cover of each shrub and tree species, and for those each crown class, can amount to more than 100%.  Similar to % cover estimates for plant species in the 2m2 plot, the shrub and tree % covers are estimates, based on an overview of the 10m plot and ideally reached through consensus with another surveyor(s). |
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