**Clarifications to Bidder’s Questions**

**Develop an Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land (OMH) GIS layer**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | | **Answer** |
| 1 | OS MasterMap.  We are OS Partners and so can supply the data but am I right in assuming that Natural England have OS MasterMap themselves and would be supplying the data? | Yes, we do have OS MasterMap and we would be able to share it with you. It may be difficult to send due to file sizes and various internal processes on our side, but if we need to, we’ll make it work. It would be quicker and easier to use your version of the MasterMap if possible, at least at the start of this project. |
| 2 | Aerial Imagery.  Is this the same assumptions as above?  Or do we have to look to source the imagery? | The previous work used Google / Bing Satellite Imagery etc., and we will get back to the successful supplier with other options that we are exploring internally. I have attached the 2024 report which outlines what has previously been used. |
| 3 | Part of the reason for asking these questions is this statement:  *The intention is for NE to publish the revised data on the open data portal. No data sources should be used where licensing requirements would prevent this from happening.*  Our understanding is that OS MasterMap cannot be published in the Public Domain unless there is a watermark.  Is this the case or do you have an arrangement with OS? | The PHI has been granted an exemption from Ordinance Survey because it is so heavily derived it would not be possible to reverse engineer their map; therefore, there’s no need to watermark your data. |
| 4 | The data capture rule base document (p.9 rfq) doesn't appear to be listed under the documents section of the find a tender page. I have found 'Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land Inventory Data Capture Rule Base v1.2.pdf' is that the correct document? | The capture rule base is outlined in the attached document – I am sorry for the confusion over this and not having including it before. |
| 5 | Are Natural England (NE) supplying the aerial photography imagery to review the polygons against or does the contractor need to source this? | The previous work used Google / Bing Satellite Imagery etc., and we will get back to the successful supplier with other options that we are exploring internally. More detail on this is also in the attached the 2024 report which outlines what has previously been used. |
| 6 | Are NE able to provide access to Ordnance Survey data under NE's license for use on the project by the contractor. Specifically Ordnance Survey Master Map and Ordnance Survey Master Map Imagery. | Yes, we do have OS MasterMap and we would be able to share it with you. It may be difficult to send due to file sizes and various internal processes on our side, so if possible it would be quicker if you had access to the MasterMap data, at least at the start of this project. |
| 7 | In the RFQ its says that the ‘capture rule base’ is attached, I can’t seem to find it. I can see the PHI data submission guidance, but I wondered if there was something else we should have access to? | The capture rule base is outlined in the attached document – I am sorry for the confusion over this and not having including it before. |
| 8 | There is reference to ‘Digitising Standards for Open Mosaic Habitats (OMH) Mapping – July 2025 (Annex 1)’, I cannot find this in the document or any of the links included. Could we have access to this before submitting our response? | I’m sorry for the confusion with this – it can be found at the end of the document ‘*RFQ - Develop an Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land (OMH) GIS layer.pdf*’ under the section titled ‘*Appendix 1 Priority Habitat Inventory: Data Submission Guidance*’. |
| 9 | Is there a report for the work undertaken in 2024 which we could have access to. | Yes, I have attached the report written in 2024 titled ‘*Review Rules Report FINAL.pdf*’. |
| 10 | Please could you provide the technical report from the previous contract? It will be valuable to understand how they approached the review—having inspected a sample of the data, we have some concerns about the validity of some of the decisions made that may be clarified by the report. | I have attached the 2024 report. |
| 11 | What are the arrangements for accessing OS MasterMap, given that altered boundaries should be snapped to MasterMap where possible? What format will this be supplied in? On average, how quickly is it provided? | If required by the contractor, OS data will be supplied through API services and will take up to eight weeks. |
| 12 | Please could you confirm that access to the latest APGB aerial photography will be provided? Please could you also confirm that this will be available as a WMS? | We are able to supply APGB aerial imagery – timescales and mechanisms for sharing can be discussed in kick-off meetings with the contractor. |
| 13 | Please could you confirm that the data capture rule base remains unchanged, as it was not included in the tender documents. | This can be found in the attached document. |
| 14 | The specification suggests that it is anticipated to run until 27 February, which suggests that this is not a hard deadline. Is there any flexibility around the timetable? | The contract will only run until 27th February 2026. |
| 15 | Is there a possibility of seeing a data sample from the 2024 study, for polygons marked for removing / amending / retaining? Is there a field in the dataset containing reasoning for the changes being proposed for each OMH polygon? If there is no reason for removal / amendment given, this would broaden the scope of any work to action the comments, with a more detailed change log including reasoning for decisions made for each item. | These documents can be found here: [Develop an Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land (OMH) GIS layer - Find a Tender](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.find-tender.service.gov.uk%2FNotice%2F060396-2025&data=05%7C02%7CFTS%40naturalengland.org.uk%7Cbbdeefa2e6464076416b08de002537de%7C770a245002274c6290c74e38537f1102%7C0%7C0%7C638948357039633634%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=lGu1ru33x0%2FjWqECCeOy6vHXsc2t9uyEmff9IQj7l9E%3D&reserved=0) under the Documents section towards the bottom of the page called ‘GIS files OMH.zip’. |
| 16 | We would intend to write Python code to enable this work. The document states that "If machine learning/R/Python is used to deliver the outputs then details of this and any coding should be provided". We are not clear if we would just send details, or if we would send the codebase itself. In the event of the latter, what would the licencing be for the code - would we retain the licencing, or would it become Natural England's IP? This would have implications for timing as handover of scripts would require further documentation before delivery. | We would need the codebase as part of this work for any coding. Anything that is produced for this would become Natural England’s IP as is stated in section 14 of the [OMH - Order Form NE Standard Goods & Services Terms and Conditions.docx](https://eur03.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.find-tender.service.gov.uk%2FNotice%2FAttachment%2FA-5402&data=05%7C02%7CFTS%40naturalengland.org.uk%7Cbbdeefa2e6464076416b08de002537de%7C770a245002274c6290c74e38537f1102%7C0%7C0%7C638948357039667773%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJFbXB0eU1hcGkiOnRydWUsIlYiOiIwLjAuMDAwMCIsIlAiOiJXaW4zMiIsIkFOIjoiTWFpbCIsIldUIjoyfQ%3D%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=rPu2%2B9FxqJty3jt4z0Y2ezv3K9PhTnTazcT3S5npH%2FY%3D&reserved=0) as found in the Documents section on the Find a Tender page. |
| 17 | It is observed that the supplied “GIS files OMH” sample dataset does not contain the Priority Habitat attributes. Could you please clarify, whether the input dataset that will be supplied during the project stage would contain the Priority Habitat attributes? | Please find attached the draft OMH inventory published in 2013. All features in this dataset were identified as Open Mosaic Habitat priority habitat. As per the project specification, the attribute table of Task 5, Output A should follow the structure of the draft inventory. The attribute table of Task 5, Output B should follow the structure of the ‘revised with notes’ layer produced in the 2024 contract. |
| 18 | As per our understanding, the digitising standards - such as overlaps, slivers/gaps, spikes and bowties, holes, etc., checking of attribute structure and align with OSMM will be carried out in Task 1- Initial exploratory investigation of the datasets, before proceeding with the remaining tasks. Please confirm our understanding is correct. | The geometry of Task 5, Output A and Task 5, Output B should adhere to the standards defined in Digitising Standards for Open Mosaic Habitats (OMH) Mapping – July 2025 (previously included as Annexe 1). |
| 19 | Could you please send the attachment (the draft OMH inventory published in 2013) mentioned, which seems missing. |  |
| 20 | Please advise if sub-contracting is allowed for this RFQ and if yes please advise what are the additional documents to be included at this stage of submission? | In the event a supplier is proposing to use sub-contracting to deliver the project, any arrangements must be in compliance with Natural England’s Standard terms and conditions for good and services. Tenderers wishing to propose the use of sub-contractors must provide full details of the sub-contracting arrangement and explain how the supplier intends to manage sub-contractors throughout the delivery of the project. The supplier must be able to demonstrate that sub-contractors have the expertise, previous experience and capabilities relevant to the tender requirements. Natural England may ask the supplier to provide clarification on specific sub-contracting arrangements proposed during the tender evaluation period.  Please note the details of the subcontracting arrangement must be included as part of your “Technical criteria” response to question 1.1 Methodology, this information will be evaluated as per the “Evaluation criteria” section of the RFQ. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |