

- Are there ethical walls in place?

There is/are no ethical wall agreement(s) in place, but The National Archives is committed to fair and equal treatment of all bidders in line with Section 12 of the Procurement Act 2023 and to identifying and addressing any conflicts of interest throughout the procurement process.

- Are there any word or page limits for the technical stage 1 response (as per the social value response)?

As specified in Section 6 of the ITT document, a maximum word count only applies to the Social Value category (that max word count being 750 words). There is no maximum word count for any of the other categories.

- What are the current limitations with the editorial interface, underlying data model and infrastructure, and what does 'good' look like?

Please refer to Annex A of this document.

- Are links to external documents allowed in the response and will they be followed/clicked on?

Yes, links are permissible and will be clicked on if those links are clear and unambiguous within your submission.

- Regarding the subcontracting question "What subcontracting arrangements (if any) you would put in place; " If we do not intend to subcontract, how should we respond to this question?

If you do not intend to sub-contract, simply state that this is the case in your submission.

- Section 3.1 has 8 bullet points. Could we consider each of them as separate questions? Or does the authority expect the service providers to have one response/case-study covering all the 8 bullet points?

Yes, you may consider each as separate questions.

- If we consider all the 8 bullet points from Section 3.1 as separate questions, then what should be the word count limit for each question?

There is no word count limit, except for the response to section 6.3 (social value).

- Section 6.2 confirms that Service Providers can determine the format. We assume this covers providing diagrams for better representation of our solution and ease of understanding. Will the words in diagrams be counted into the words limit?

There is no word count limit for responses to section 6.2.

- The level of details expected to demonstrate Social Value would require more word limit. Could the authority kindly consider increasing the word count from 750 to 1000 words for Social Value?

No, the word count limit for responses to section 6.3 (social value) remains 750 words at Stage 1. It will, however, be increased for responses at Stage 2.

- Procurement document doesn't confirm CQ window in Stage 2. Given that the selected bidders from Stage 1 would be provided with more context/details on the procurement, will the authority be opening another window for CQ's in Stage 2?

Yes, there will be a further CQ window during Stage 2.

- Could we please have a view of the Functional & Non-functional requirements to better the responses in Stage 1?

These will be expanded upon at Stage 2. At Stage 1, we require bidders to describe their skills and experience in the areas specified in section 3.1 of the ITT document. Please also refer to Annex A of this document.

- To respond on UCD needs. Could the authority provide Process diagrams or user-journeys?

These will be expanded upon at Stage 2. Please also refer to Annex A of this document.

- Kindly provide a view on current technology and high-level solution overview to respond well on what innovation contributions could be made available for TNA?

This will be expanded upon at Stage 2. Please also refer to Annex A of this document.

- It would be highly appreciated if additional information or documentation could be shared.

At this stage, the only documentation published is the 'stage 1' invitation to tender document which is attached to the tender notice. This document gives an overview of the requirement, specifies what bidders need to submit at this stage and how those submissions will be evaluated, and also describes the criteria for how bidders will be shortlisted for the second stage of the procurement process.

- Please could you confirm if we are able to submit a joint bid (with another consultancy) for FCL?

We are happy to consider joint bids, but please ensure that in your submission you specify who would be the lead bidder (i.e. the organisation with whom we would contract if your bid were to be successful).

- For the Stage 1 Quality score, will there be any weighting applied to the bullet points within paragraph 6.2 to determine our score? Or will the Quality score reflect TNA's overall assessment of all elements of our response to paragraph 6.2?

The score will reflect an overall assessment of all elements of the response to paragraph 6.2.

- Will any of the Quality or Social Value scores from Stage 1 be taken forward and contribute to the Stage 2 score? Or will the Stage 2 scoring be determined solely on the basis of the Stage 2 questions?

No. Stage 2 scoring be determined solely on the basis of the Stage 2 questions.

- For stage 1 is there a word count restriction?

As specified in Section 6 of the ITT document, a maximum word count only applies to the Social Value category (that max word count being 750 words). There is no maximum word count for any of the other categories.

- We are a UK-based business partnering with an offshore consortium supplier in India for both technical execution and to provide examples of relevant past work. We will manage senior technical oversight and project/client engagement locally in the UK. Could you confirm if this arrangement is acceptable? Additionally, please advise on any specific information or documentation required from our offshore partner to support eligibility.

Yes, this is acceptable in principle at this stage. Please ensure that in your submission you specify who your proposed sub-contractor(s) is/are, and which aspects of delivery they would be responsible for and/or involved in.

- Are our offshore partners required to hold the same certifications and insurance as the main bidder? If so, is it acceptable for them to obtain these post-award but prior to project commencement?

Re. insurance, it is for the lead bidder (i.e. the organisation with whom we would contract if your bid were to be successful) to ensure that the necessary insurance policies are in place to meet any and all obligations of the contract on both the primary contractor and any sub-contractors. Re. certifications (e.g. ISO) these would need to be held by the lead bidder and also by any sub-contractor (where that certification is relevant to the work being undertaken by the sub-contractor).

- Are there any financial criteria (e.g., minimum turnover) that apply to the main bidder and/or the offshore consortium supplier?

No, but The National Archives reserves the right to undertake credit checks on bidders during the procurement process and to raise related clarification questions with bidders if those checks raise any causes for concern.

- Is the use of public cloud hosting platforms (such as AWS, Azure, or Oracle) permitted for this project, or do you have a preferred or required hosting model?

Yes, this is permitted.

- We are interested in applying for the above opportunity and note that expertise of AWSS infrastructure and security expertise, is required, which we do possess. My question is that we also have expertise in Microsoft Azure, would this be relevant to you as part of our response?

We require bidders to demonstrate experience and expertise in AWS infrastructure and security. There is no need to make reference to Azure in your response.

- What TNA internal resources are currently dedicated to FCL (e.g. product owner, technical team members, user researchers), and will these remain in place during the new contract?

There is currently the following: Service Owner, Product Manager, Delivery Manager, User Researcher X2, Designer, Front End Dev, Lead Dev. We anticipate that most will remain in place, however this is subject to change as most team members also work on other services.

- What specific Python frameworks, libraries, and versions are currently in use (e.g. Django, Flask, FastAPI)?

Django 5.2.6

- What team size and composition does TNA anticipate for this contract?

We would anticipate something along the lines of 2 x Back End Devs, 1 x Front End Dev, and possibly a flexible 4th role depending on the work in hand and budget available.

- Are bidders required to make specific social value commitments at this stage or describe the overarching approach to delivering environmental benefits?

Please refer to section 6.3 of the Invitation to Tender document. Your response to this area should be specific, rather than generic.

- Please could you confirm if there is an IR35 determination with this work - i.e. inside or outside of IR35?

No, not assessed as yet as any determination will to some degree depend on how

- Are there any plans to include different types of materials except judgments (e.g. case summaries)?

We already publish press summaries for supreme court cases, we also have some orders and other annexes for judgments that we need to publish for other courts.

- Are there any future plans to integrate with the legislation (legislation.gov.uk) platform / data)?

We share a user base with legislation.gov.uk and we would like to make end to end user journeys much easier in the medium term, yes.

- What are the expected user types (internal staff, legal professionals, public users, research, commonwealth) and estimated traffic/usage volumes?

Our user groups are Legal Professionals, Non-Legal professionals (those that need to know the law in their area of work), Litigants in person/victims or families or advisors to those users, members of the public who have seen a case in the news, we also have data re-users who may be law tech companies, academic researchers or commercial legal publishers.

- What is the format of the materials (e.g. LegalDocML, other XML format (schema)) and what is the original format of the materials (e.g. doc, docx) ?

DOCX or PDF are the original source documents, we transform them into LegalDocML, HTML 5 and PDF for publication.

- Do the judgment documents include data enrichments like metadata or tagged information or are you looking to further tag information such as judges or courts?

As part of the data transformation process, we mark-up important metadata and we have a separate enrichment step to mark-up citations to other cases and/or legislation.

- What is the volume of data to be ingested?

It varies; usually we have around 10 - 15 cases uploaded per day, but it can be up to 50. We also bulk publish legacy judgments, sometimes these can be a handful or a few thousand at a time.

- Are there requirements around data redaction (e.g. high profile courts), encryption standards, or secure audit trails?

We do not redact data ourselves, the court is responsible for this, but we will check it is to a good standard before publishing. The receipt of documents from the court is handled by a separate product that ensures secure chain of custody.

- What are the envisioned use cases for data retrieval besides accessing via the platform (e.g. batch retrieval, API)?

Yes, we need to provide batch retrieval and are doing some user research into this at the moment.

- How should GDPR and data retention requirements be applied, given the nature of court and tribunal judgments?

The courts remain data controller for the publication of judgments, the principle of Open Justice means that personal information within judgments is generally open except in the case of children and other vulnerable groups.

- Are there plans to incorporate AI-driven enrichment like entity recognition, summarization, classification?

Yes, but this will likely start out as separate collaborative research projects.

- **Handover Process:** Given that this is a beta project and previous development has been partially completed by another team, could you provide information on any handover process? Specifically, we would like to understand the process for knowledge transfer from the previous development team to the new team, including any planned handover sessions or support during the transition period.

We would expect handover to be undertaken between the incoming supplier and the in-house National Archives team as needed, based on existing documentation. To note, the current delivery team is a combination of in-house resource and supplier resource – rather than being just the latter.

- **Documentation Levels:** Could you provide detailed information on the levels of documentation available for the project? We are particularly interested in the extent and quality of existing documentation. Additionally, are there any challenges or gaps identified in the existing documentation that we should be aware of that may if not planned for cause an issue or delay within the project?

Please see Github (code repos: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/repo-dashboard.md](https://github.com/nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs/repo-dashboard.md) at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub)

- **Pricing Model:** Could you please confirm if the pricing model for the project is based on a fixed price rather than a statement of work approach?

We expect it to be on a statement of work basis.

- What is the current tech stack? What front-end technologies, frameworks or toolkits have been used to make the current editor interface?

We work in the open, using open standards and encouraging re-use both of our code and of the case law collection as data.

Github (code repos: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/repo-dashboard.md](#) at main · [nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs](#) · GitHub)

AWS (the service is hosted in the cloud, see here for high level architecture: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/doc/arch/images/Deployment Diagram.png](#) at main · [nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs](#) · GitHub)

Python (main programming language)

Django (web app layer)

GDS design system (we re-use some components and patterns)

Marklogic DB (stores and indexes the XML for search)

XSLT (for transforming our XML into HTML 5)

Libre Office (for generating PDFs from DOCX)

LegalDocML (open standard XML for marking up legal documents, our data format of choice and where all our metadata, including what is used for search comes from)

Our bespoke judgment parsing tool: <https://github.com/nationalarchives/tna-judgments-parser>

- Is the entirety of the existing solution in scope for modernisation (frontend, backend, APIs, and ancillary services)?

Yes, within reason.

- Is the purchaser open to introducing new technologies into their tech stack, such as AI?

Potentially.

- What are the existing, and expected/aspirational data loads (in terms of size, and performance) that the solution does/must accommodate?

Relatively small. we currently have 70,000 judgments and decisions, the service grows incrementally publishing about 5000 new judgments a year currently, but we anticipate this yearly increase will grow and we will be adding batches of legacy judgments which vary in size from a few hundred to a few thousand.

- In the invitation to tender document you have specified 750 words in paragraph 6.2 is this the total word count for the entire 'Stage 1' tender submission or just in response to the social values would be met in paragraph 5.1?

The word count only applies to the social value category.

- Please can you share the current publication flow (as previously mentioned in priority1 from previous clarification)?

Please see [ds-find-caselaw-docs/doc/arch/document-flow.md at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub](#) Our more detailed diagrams are not publicly available as they have been done by our in-house UX and Designers to pinpoint current pain points and to inform future design iterations. These could be shared at stage 2 of the procurement process.

- Are you able to / please can you share the discovery/alpha reports?

N/A, as there was not enough time to carry out traditional Discovery and Alpha phases.

- How will the charging mechanism work? Will there be a sprint minimum spend commitment to ensure correct levels of resourcing are available?

We will work to an agreed forecast, invoicing will happen on a monthly basis

- Is infrastructure management, support and hosting in scope for this contract?

No

- C# .Net has not been mentioned as a skill to demonstrate, however the .docx parser to convert into LegalDocML is written in C#. Is it expected that there will be no changes to this transformation?

This is possibly an oversight, this has been covered in house to date, but we might require external development support for this too.

- A word count is specified for the Social Value element (750 words) but not for the Quality elements, presumably because the structure is left for the bidder to decide. Do TNA have any expectation of a word count for the Quality elements?

No

- Can you confirm if the 750 word count for the social value response includes any headings used to navigate the reader?

No, it does not

- Please can you share a system architecture diagram and details of the existing software in use?

We work in the open, using open standards and encouraging re-use both of our code and of the case law collection as data.

Github (code repos: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/repo-dashboard.md at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub](#))

AWS (the service is hosted in the cloud, see here for high level architecture: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/doc/arch/images/Deployment Diagram.png at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub](#))

Python (main programming language)

Django (web app layer)

GDS design system (we re-use some components and patterns)

Marklogic DB (stores and indexes the XML for search)

XSLT (for transforming our XML into HTML 5)

Libre Office (for generating PDFs from DOCX)

LegalDocML (open standard XML for marking up legal documents, our data format of choice and where all our metadata, including what is used for search comes from)

Our bespoke judgment parsing tool: <https://github.com/nationalarchives/tna-judgments-parser>

- Please can you supply content metrics (e.g. number of objects and total size)?

Relatively small. we currently have 70,000 judgments and decisions, the service grows incrementally publishing about 5000 new judgments a year currently, but we anticipate this yearly increase will grow and we will be adding batches of legacy judgments which vary in size from a few hundred to a few thousand.

- Will the delivery partner join the existing TNA team, or replace the existing TNA team?

Supplement the existing TNA team

- How do TNA expect to work with the supplier on a day-to-day basis? Are you expecting supplier staff to fully join your team, participating in all agile ceremonies, or are you looking for a more flexible model?

Fully joining the team and participating in ceremonies.

- How big is TNA's existing team on this project? What skills do they have?

In house team includes 1 x Lead Back End Developer, 1 x Mid-Level Front End Developer, 1 x Service owner, 1 x Product Manager, 1 x Delivery Manager, 2 x User Researcher, 1 x Interaction Designer, 1 x Data analyst, Editorial team (x7). With the exception of the editorial team all internal staff work across other services/products.

- Please can you elaborate on the kind of enhancements in scope?

Our upcoming high level priorities include improving search journeys on the main website, improving case management elements of our editorial interface and improving our service off for data re-users (API, feed, bulk access).

- Can the chosen delivery partner propose commercial-of-the-shelf products that can be configured to meet TNA's specific needs?

Yes

- Will the proposed user research be part of the ITT?

No - we have in-house user researchers

- Is the anticipated expenditure just for development, or does it include infrastructure, data management, etc?

Just for development, there is a separate contract for support and maintenance.

- How much of the work could be done remotely?

Most of the team work remotely and only come onsite for occasional workshops.

- Do remote workers have to be in the UK?

Not necessarily but we do have occasionally face-to-face workshops, and the workers would need to keep UK working hours to collaborate and meet online with the rest of the team which is UK based.

- What platform or technology currently underpins the editorial interface, and are there any plans to replace or enhance it?

As above, see here: [GitHub - nationalarchives/ds-caselaw-editor-ui: Editors' frontend to the National Archives Find Case Law service](https://github.com/nationalarchives/ds-caselaw-editor-ui)

- Which frameworks or libraries are currently used in the back-end and front-end of the service?

As above Django 5.2.6

See also: <https://github.com/nationalarchives/ds-caselaw-public-ui/blob/main/requirements/base.txt>

- Are you able to provide a high level architecture diagram detailing how the various layers of the service interact?

System diagrams here: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/doc/arch/images at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub](#)

- Can you confirm which AWS services are currently deployed as part of the infrastructure?

System diagrams here: [ds-find-caselaw-docs/doc/arch/images at main · nationalarchives/ds-find-caselaw-docs · GitHub](#)

- Do the WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility requirements apply solely to public-facing components, or are internal/editorial interfaces also expected to comply?

Internal services are also expected to comply.

- What level of on-site presence is expected from the supplier during the contract period?

A few onsite visits for workshops /planning sessions. Perhaps 1 per quarter / every 6 months.

- Are there specific on-boarding procedures or restrictions?

No, we have a standard onboarding process to get Devs access to everything they need.

- Are there any specific requirements around gaining physical access to the Kew site?

No, contractors have visitor passes and are escorted when onsite

- Are there any specific clearances required regarding access of data, applications and network/infrastructure?

SC is not required for working on this service

- Will the supplier work as part of TNA's existing Agile teams, or operate as an independent delivery unit?

As part of an existing team

- What tools and platforms are currently used to support Agile delivery (e.g. sprint planning, backlog management, documentation)?

Jira & Confluence

- Can you outline any existing service obligations, including SLAs, maintenance windows, and deployment schedules?

There is a separate support and maintenance contract for this service. Deployment is not fully automated but we deploy regularly, usually weekly.

Annex A

The below are the current, top five priority areas for improvements.

1. Allow editors to edit more metadata fields

Summary: The ability for editors to correct and update additional metadata fields has become more pressing. We need to open up the possibility for editors to edit more metadata fields. This should be a minimal intervention, that does not change the current publication flow.

User need: As an editor, I need to be able to edit metadata before and after publication including judge name, party, category, and other fields added to FCL.

Considerations: Screen real estate - how can we do this without disrupting the ability for editors to review the documents that come in through the regular publishing pipeline.

Met by:

ability to edit the following

- o judge name
- o category
- o parties involved
- o other fields added to FCL (e.g. sub-category)

Success:

Editors are able to edit and update the above fields.

2. Improve Search for editors

Summary: Editors need a flexible, accurate search, which is easy to use and provides the speed and confidence users need to do complete their tasks.

User Needs:

? As an editor, I need to search for judgments using any kind of reference, including partial matches and varying formats, so I can quickly find what I need.

? As an editor, I need to quickly locate and update tickets to keep momentum and maintain audit trails.

? As an editor, I need to reduce time spent cross-referencing emails and internal systems just to find a ticket, so I can focus on meaningful tasks.

? As an editor, I need to know with certainty whether a ticket exists, so I can work quickly and with confidence.

? As an editor, I need search to work without relying on workarounds and experience, so everyone can find what they need efficiently.

Met by:

A search interface in the EUI that allows for editors to search for judgments based on a flexible range of criteria, including:

? identifiers (TDR ref, NCN, FCL identifiers)

? case name

? metadata keywords

? (possibly) content keywords

This includes partial matching and flexibility in characters allowed in search. The search results should clearly indicate all the top-level information about a judgment.

Success: Editors are confident they are able to locate the judgments they need.

3. Create a robust allocation system

Summary:

Editors need a system that provides visibility so they can prioritise and coordinate work in the team and minimise duplication and errors.

User Needs:

? As an editor, I need be certain of which judgments already have tickets, so I don't waste time duplicating them.

? As an editor, I need to know if a ticket is already being worked on, so we don't duplicate effort.

? As an editor, I need real-time ticket assignments and statuses, so I can coordinate smoothly with the team.

? As an editor, I need to see how many new or in-progress judgments there are, and their (editable) priority levels, so I can help manage team workload and decide what to tackle first.

? As an editor, I need better integration between Outlook, Jira, the EUI, and Teams, so I can stay focused without jumping between tools.

? As an editor, I need to reduce manual copying of judgment info and rely on accurate, consistent ticket creation, so I save time and reduce mistakes.

Met by:

A mechanism to assign judgments to a particular editor, including self-assignment) and the ability to display that in summary pages and on the judgment pages.

A mechanism to assign and update priorities to judgments.

A mechanism to assign and update statuses to judgments.

Statuses, priorities and assignments to be visible on a dashboard page, and judgment pages.

The ability to filter by status, assignment (including unassigned), and priority.

The ability to sort by date.

Success: All editors are able to log into the EUI, view a filterable/sortable summary of judgments, and assign judgments to themselves or each other.

We are not at this time considering this action to be restricted by hierarchy.

4. Allow editors to display a history of judgment actions and communication

Description: Editors need to be able to create and view text entries on each judgment, so they can record communication history, track updates and leave enough information for any other editor to view the status of a judgment.

User need:

? As an editor, I need all emails and case-related communications recorded in one CMS, so I don't have to switch between platforms.

? As an editor, I need to leave detailed, visible notes and comments in the ticket (such as reasons for on-hold or actions taken), so colleagues have full context.

? As an editor, I need a timeline of updates (communications, status changes, comments) with timestamps, so I can track progress and maintain accountability.

? As an editor, I need to record and view notes, decisions (e.g. why a case was put on hold), and all communications within the ticket, so everyone has full context.

? As an editor, I need to see if someone updated a ticket while I was away and be able to leave clear handover notes, so no time is wasted catching up.

? As an editor, I need to review who made changes and when, so I can follow up or hand over confidently.

? As an editor, I need to track follow-up activity, so I know next actions and when to escalate.

? As an editor, I need to see all revisions and versions of a judgment with reasons, so we have a full history.

Met by:

? Timestamp list including

- o versions of a judgment (updates etc)

- o reparse/enrichment actions

- o status update - i.e., on hold. published etc. extensible for other potential statuses

- o contexts of comment text field

? Display at a glance of status, assignee, timestamps, document.

? Filterable? (i.e., show me only comments/only updates)

Success: Editors are able to navigate to a page in which they can see a timeline of all events that have happened to a judgment.

5. Allow editors to create a history of communications/notes

Summary: Editors need to be able to create and view text entries on each judgment, so they can record communication history, track updates and leave enough information for any other editor to view the status of a judgment. related to

User need:

? As an editor, I need all emails and case-related communications recorded in one CMS, so I don't have to switch between platforms.

? As an editor, I need to leave detailed, visible notes and comments in the ticket (such as reasons for on-hold or actions taken), so colleagues have full context.

? As an editor, I need a timeline of updates (communications, status changes, comments) with timestamps, so I can track progress and maintain accountability.

? As an editor, I need to record and view notes, decisions (e.g. why a case was put on hold), and all communications within the ticket, so everyone has full context.

Met by:

? Timestamped record of all actions and status updates in.

? Free text box allowing editors to record communications, saved against a timestamp (and possibly a version of the judgment, or reference thereof?)

Success: Editors are able to submit information about their communication with the clerks and judges, and any notes required for update.