**Creation of a verified data layer of English historic parklands**

**Clarification questions: UPDATE 11/06/2024**

**Q1:** Additional costs – you mention that “You will need to factor in £20,000 - £25,000 to cover the following costs.” Could you please confirm whether this amount is in addition to the advertised contract value range of £10,000 - £49,999, or would the additional costs be included within this range?

**A1:** The additional costs are included in the contract value range and as such should be included in the budget.

**Q2:** Existing Natural England Historic Parkland layer – you mention that this can be used as a base for the mapping. Would it be possible for you to share a sample of this dataset so that we can review the existing data quality, consistency etc.

**A2:** A small subset of the existing NE Historic Parkland layer (ArcGIS layer package (.lpkx)) has been uploaded to this notice.

**Q3:** Would it be required to cover rural land only (ie excluding urban cemeteries etc)?

**A3:** The main purpose of the dataset is to help inform agri-environment schemes. If used as a base dataset all polygons on the Natural England layer should be verified regardless of urban/rural setting with updates for all historic parkland. Designed greenspace in urban settings such as cemeteries may be excluded from this project. Urban greenspace eligible for funding (e.g. parkland) should be included.

**Q4:** Could you possibly send me the subset as shapefiles.

**A4:** These files are available on request to louise.brown@naturalengland.org.uk

**Q5:** Obviously there is a major resource constraint with the budget available and the potential magnitude of rabbit holes re. undesignated parklands, So please can I check if you principally require a verification of all of the parklands in the NE dataset? I suppose I am wanting to be clear that this is the key intended output rather than scouting for additional sites?

**A5:** Yes, verification of the dataset including useful attributes, and updating this with additional sites where available and resource allows. You should outline your approach to this in your response to the brief.

**Q6:** Am I correct in thinking that the maximum for the project is in the region of £50,000 leaving about £25,000 for the GIS and interpretive work.

**A6:** Yes, the RFQ states £20k-£25k should be ring-fenced, leaving £25k-£30k for the GIS and interpretive work.

**Q7:** Is the current Parklands layer that Natural England holds available on line, or would it be possible for you to send us a copy so that we can make an estimate as to how many are likely to be missing from it, and hence overall final number of parks.

**A7:** The parklands layer is not available online. I can provide a small subset for you to look at and have attached this as an ArcGIS layer package (.lpkx)

**Q8:** All datasets necessary to successfully undertake the project will be provided by Natural England. This includes all datasets mentioned under ‘existing data’ in the RFQ and the historic Ordnance Survey Maps.

**A8:** The RFQ states: ‘It is assumed that you will have access to the necessary mapping including historic and current Ordnance Survey mapping.’ Many of the datasets listed are available through Open Data sources (links in the RFQ).

**Q9:** Please confirm if Natural England has an agreement with the Local County Councils regarding HER data and if the same would be made available/provided by the LPA free of cost to the selected project consultant.

**A9:** Natural England does not have an agreement with LAs regarding HER data for this project. The project outline and involvement has been shared with ALGAO members.

**Q10:** Please share the GIS format protocol under which the Historic Parklands layer is to be prepared. There are many different databases/portals onto which this layer is to be uploaded (e.g HEFER, NE Open Data etc.). Are there different format protocols for the different portals? It is further assumed that Natural England will provide access to all these portals. Please confirm.

**A10:** The RFQ states that the required output is an ArcGIS layer. The project steering group will work with the successful contractor to facilitate the upload to the HEFER portal. Natural England will be responsible for the upload to the Natural England Open Data Geoportal.

**Q11:** What are you trying to achieve through this project?

**A11:** To improve the information provided to land managers through the HEFER portal by separating out the parkland polygons from the SHINE dataset and supplying as a separate layer. The idea behind creating an 'opportunity' layer is to capture parklands as important historic landscape features, highlighting the potential for AES funding in developing integrated management plans and realising multi-objective outcomes.

**Q12:** What is the expectation for the HER searches?

**A12:** HERs hold information on parklands within their area. Some have carried out projects around parklands and as such hold more information than is shown on the NE parkland layer (and will be reflected in the SHINE records for their area).

**Q13:** What format should we expect to receive the data from the HERs?

**A13:** Digital GI output and pdf report.

**Q14:** The RFQ notes that “Separate submissions for each technical question should be provided and will be evaluated in isolation”. Would a single response document with clear separation of technical questions and associated responses be acceptable or will a series of individual documents be required. Also, is there a word limit to responses?

**A14**: I am happy to accept a single document with responses clearly defined. Each response will be scored in isolation. I believe there is no word limit.

**Q15**: Is it anticipated that the Contractor will be required to purchase historic mapping in support of the project, or would the use of online historic mapping resources such as National Library of Scotland and local authority heritage portals be sufficient.

**A15**: An assumption has been made on our part that the contractor will have access to the necessary mapping. If you feel that the NLS mapping is sufficient, please outline this in your response.

**Q16**: Can we assume that we can use Natural England Ordnance Survey licencing to access current Ordnance Survey data? We are ordnance Survey partners, but will need to sign a contractor licence with Natural England to access this information.

**A16**: I believe that we can do this through the Contractor Licence route.

**Q17**: Is there an expectation that the Contractor will be required to undertake in-person archive research as part of this project.

**A17:** There is no expectation that this project requires in-person archive research.

**Q18:** Please can you clarify which dataset is being referenced in the RFQ as ‘Natural England’s historic parkland layer’. Can you provide a link to an online portal or clarify where / by whom this data is held. Is this a separate dataset from the Wood Pasture and Parkland Priority Habitat?

**A18:** The refenced dataset ‘Natural England’s historic parkland layer’ is one that is held internally and is not available externally. It is separate to the Wood Pasture and Parkland Priority Habitat dataset though there may be similarities.

**Q19:** Are you able to provide any further information regarding the existing Historic Parkland dataset? We note potential licensing issues making a modified / validated version of this data publicly available as part of the project outputs if the original source / license is not known.

**A19:** As I understand it the boundaries were captured by hand from the OS popular series (1:63,360) mapping dating from 1918. The information was then digitised again, by hand. Information I have states that there are no restrictions on its use.

**Q20:** It is noted that the Historic Parkland dataset contains ~4,000 parklands represented by ~13,000 polygons. Is it expected that each individual parkland will be manually inspected and researched?

**A20:** Each parkland will need to be verified – but the level of research required to assign useful attributes need not be too detailed. Your approach to this, and the level of detail you feel resource allows should be outlined in your response.

**Q21:** The budget for ALGAO - how is this going to work?

**A21:** The RFQ states that the Steering Group will work with you to define appropriate payment bands for this work. The successful contractor will manage this and be responsible for paying the invoices.

**Q22:** With regards to the suggested attributes, how detailed are you expecting the summary to be?

**A22:** The attribute list in the RFQ is a suggestion. There should be enough information for the applicant / adviser to know what they are looking at – but not too much that they do not seek further, more in depth and bespoke information. The level of detail you feel is appropriate and can be resource should be outlined in your response.

**Q23:** You say that you would like the dataset to be available on the NE Open geoportal. Can you elaborate on your expectation for how available you want the dataset to be (e.g. downloadable)

**A23:** There is an expectation that the data should be available. You should include how you would see this working in your response.

**Q24:** In the RFQ you talk about defining the extent of the parklands, is this about refining the field boundary?

**A24:** As stated in the RFQ, the historic maximum extent of the parkland / designed landscape is required, taking in designed elements of the parkland that border it beyond the parkland represented on OS maps by the grey stipple.