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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Answer |
| Do you have a license of FME that we would be able to use, or should we incorporate this into our overall quote? | Natural England do have FME licenses but these are not transferable. Any use of FME to deliver the contract should be costed into the submission. |
| Can the scope of works be clarified? The full GI Mapping database is more extensive than the areas listed in the RfQ. | The Change Detection Exercise will only relate to the datasets listed in the Detailed Specification. The work will not cover any other content in the database. |
| Task 1 a - Greenness Grid, Accessible Greenspace Standards (Amounts). – would require extraction – please explain what is meant by extraction / data extraction spatial extraction/tabular extraction/digitisation/normalising to standard domains etc. | Extraction means that the statistical data will need to be derived directly from the spatial data to create spreadsheet style data tables for comparison with those for V 2.1 and 2.2. This especially relates to the statistics that will be required for V1 as whilst data tables have previously been created, changes that were made to the spatial data (corrections and amendments) may not have been picked up due to a mismatch between tables being created and amendments being made. We wish to ensure that the data used from V 1 is the final version as this will be the baseline for this and future assessments. |
| Task 1b – How detailed does the Quality Assurance check need to be? | The purpose of the QA check is to validate the content of the existing spreadsheet data tables for V 2.1 and 2.2. This will be a limited exercise to provide assurance that the previous data extractions are faithful with the spatial data before they are used for the Change Detection exercise. This is likely to involve some **limited** random sampling for the key data to ensure that the amounts in the data tables tally with the spatial data and checking figures in the data tables for arithmetical errors (for example, amounts adding up to more than 100% of areas etc). |
| Are separate responses to each of the technical questions required? Does this mean 1 response for Q1 including Q1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, then another response for Question 2 (Q2.1 and 2.2) and a 3rd response for Q3 etc....? | A response to each specific question should be submitted. Eg – one response for question 1.1, another for question 1.2 etc. The responses to each question are evaluated separately. |
| Is it possible to get an indication of available budget? | The only information that can be given is that opportunities advertised on Find a Tender have a minimum value of £10,000 and a maximum of £50,000 including VAT (Please note that commercial submissions should EXCLUSIVE of VAT). |
| For which versions was the Likely Accessible Waterside assessment undertaken? | This assessment was undertaken for Version 1 and version 2.1 only. |
| Could you please provide a Sample statistical data table to help better understanding of the expected structure and methodology for deriving statistics from the Version 1 spatial data in Task 1? | There is no set format for the statistical data tables. Statistical information extracted from the spatial data have previously been into simple spreadsheets. One of the aims of this project will be to publish both written and tabulated information and the precise format of the tables produced can be agreed during the project and will need to meet publication standards. |
| Is the statistical comparison expected to be conducted at the polygon-to-polygon level, or should the focus be on computing statistical summaries by typology level for Tasks 1 and 2? | The comparison between versions will involve comparison of the statistical information such as amounts and percentage differences between figures for typologies etc. The “Change Registry” has assessed change at a polygon level but exists as statistical information. However, for the “Change Causality” assessment the analysis will look at a limited sample of polygons for which change has been detected to assess why change may have happened. |
| What would be the expected outputs for the Change Registry analysis in Task 02, and in which format these outputs should be provided (e.g., shapefiles of change areas, QA issues, reports)? | Shapefiles should be retained for the polygons assessed for future reference but the main outcome will be an overall assessment of why change appears to have happened in report form. |
| Is there a specified percentage of assessment for the Change Task 3-Causality Assessment? | There is no specified percentage. Submissions should provide proposals regarding how this task might best be done. However, it is recognised that undertaking an assessment that would be statistical valid for the whole of England is beyond the scope of the project. The outputs of this task would focus on why change has happened and if any patterns can be detected. The size of sampling would be limited and any statistical information that could be gleamed would apply to the limited sample only. |
| Do all versions of the spatial polygon datasets (EGIMD-V1, V2.1 & V2.2) contains a unique identifier (e.g., feature\_id or UID) across versions? | All polygons do have unique ID for V 2.2. Other datasets would need to be generated for other versions. |
| Please clarify, whether delivery of reports of all tasks be provided separately for each administrative boundary (e.g., one CSV per Local Authority or MSOA), or combined into a single consolidated dataset? | The outputs for each dataset are specified in the table in the Detailed Specification. Each dataset will require an overall report with spreadsheet tables to accompany as for each reporting geography specified. |
| Will the quality assurance checks (such as removing slivers, spikes, bowties, or filling small holes) and topological validation (e.g., checking for overlaps, duplicates, and gaps) be applied to all versions of the datasets, or only to the latest version prior to comparison? | Validation will be required for Version 1 spatial data. No statistical data extraction will be required from the spatial data for other versions as these data tables will be provided.  Some polygons in the data overlap because the same space is described differently in different source data. This is a factor that will require being taken account off when statistical data is aggregated.  Quality assurance tasks are purely to check if there are any obvious errors in the statistical data and to check by random sample that the statistical data accurately reflects what’s in the spatial data. |
| Will the input datasets be topologically cleaned, or will there be a need to perform validation and cleaning before starting Task 1? | We recommend that the data is cleaned, for example geometry check and repair; although we don’t anticipate any major issues. |
| According to the “Annex 2 - Digitising Standards for Urban Habitat Mapping” document, the specified quality checks and topological validations & Corrections are only performed. There is no need of other edits (revision) or modifications to the spatial polygon datasets levels? Please confirm. | Annex two has the wrong title and should not refer to “Urban Habitats”. Annex 2 is a general digitisation standards document. The spatial polygons will not require modification.  The only spatial data expected as an output relates to the polygons assessed in the Change Causality assessment so that they can be identified for future reference. |
| Please confirm whether the methodology should be designed to support repeatable change tracking for future dataset versions (e.g., V2.3).? | Recommendations for the future methodological development and improvement of the Change Registry are not specified as an output but would be received if made and fed into future improvements for change detection. |
| Is the use of ArcGIS is mandatory for this project, or are open-source tools like QGIS and standalone Python scripts are also acceptable? | Any spatial file outputs from the work need to be compatible with ArcGIS. The use of other software is OK if it produces ArcGIS compatible outputs.  The use of such as Python scripts to interrogate spatial data is fine but the scripts used will need to be supplied along with the outputs at the end of the project. |
| Please confirm statistical review techniques required. | This will be the first exercise of its kind and there are no fixed or preferred approaches or techniques. Methods to be used should form part of the proposal. |
| Could you please provide an example change capture table to the specification you require. | At this time, the Change Registry purely identifies if a polygon is the same as in the previous version, appears to have been removed or is new. The exercise to assess change has not been done before and there is no specification for any table as yet. |
| Would it be possible to have a structure for the change registry accounts spreadsheet please. | See above. |
| Could you please provide an example on the size of the limited random sampling, in terms of spatial area coverage or volumes of data to include. | Proposals should set out how the sampling is proposed to be done. There is no set specification for this. It is recognised that sampling will need to be limited to fit project budget and will not be a statistically valid sample for all England. The limits of sampling will be a recognised constraint of the statistical validity of outputs and conclusions etc will only be valid for the samples themselves. |
| Are there any example reports similar to this or a framework structure for the report. | This is the first Change Detection exercise that will have been done for the database and there are no frameworks etc. These will be developed as part of the project. |
| What format will the reports need to be delivered in pdf with charts – will accompanying csv or spatial data deliverables also need to be included. | All reports will need to be supplied in word format to permit editing etc. Statistical data outputs should be in csv files. The only spatial data outputs will relate to the Change Causality assessment polygons which should be provided compatible with ArcGIS – this data is purely for future reference. |
| **Spatial data geometry validation** can you please confirm this relates to Boundary Harmonisation i.e. all historical statistics must be spatially joined and aggregated to align with 2025 Local Authority boundaries. Is this envisaged to be an automated process with agreed spatial tolerances for snapping features or a manual more applied process? **Annex 2 1.3** Where a boundary does not follow an OS MasterMap feature, such as where the boundary follows a feature on an aerial photograph, scanned and geo-rectified map (maybe field or historical), the digitised boundary should be captured with sufficient nodes that the digitised feature takes on the shape of the feature on the source material at a scale of 1:2500. Do you have any understanding as to the volume of these cases and the scope of effort? Will OS MasterMap data be shared.  Please could some example aerial photography, scanned and geo-rectified maps also be provided. | Local Authorities used in V 1 were those as at Census 2011. For V 2.1 and V 2.2 they are as at Census 2021. For this exercise, Local Authority areas used for reporting should be as at 2025 with statistics for (2011 or 2021) previous authority areas amalgamated into 2025 Local Authority geographies. Reporting should thus provide information for one consistent Local Authority areas system as at the start of contract in 2025.  Use of MSOA and LSOA. Version 1 of the EGIMD uses the 2011 LSOA system whereas Versions 2.1 and 2.2 use the 2021 system. Reporting for each version will use the respective LSOA systems and report on the range and averages (mean and median) values. No direct comparisons or assessments at MSOA of LSOA level are required and values at these levels are generated purely to provide the Local Authority level statistics.  The data to be used in this project will be supplied as polygon data for each version and will not require these detailed treatments. OS Mastermap will not be required. AP may be consulted for the Causality Assessment but can use that which is easily available. |
| **Metadata template** could this please be shared for review. | A template will be provided at project inception. |