European Environment Agency

24 April 2014

Clarification No 5

Reference: **Open call for tenders No EEA/MDI/14/001**

Title: *Copernicus Initial Operations 2011-2013 - Land Monitoring Service Local Component: riparian zones*

Question 1
Section 6.2.3. Of the Tender Specifications refers to hedgerows, group of trees, shoulders as examples of green linear elements.
- What kind of green linear elements are shoulders, as mentioned top of page 14 of tender?
- Do you expect us to propose more green linear elements than the examples proposed in the tender?

Answer 1
In general the term shoulder in a geomorphological context is used to indicate the line in a landscape that represents a distinct change in slope. These zones are sometimes covered with bushes or shrubs, or remain "unmanaged" and hence become interesting landscape elements from a biodiversity and ecosystem perspective.
The green linear elements as listed in the tender specifications indicate the minimum required. Any tenderer is free to propose more green linear elements, to the extent that they can be systematically and reliably detected and mapped.

Question 2
Concerning section 6.2.3. Of the Tender Specifications, please clarify "The green linear elements layer shall comprise as a minimum breakdown between trees and hedgerows/scrubs? What is the minimum mapping width between two objects for distinct mapping of these objects? 10m as the MMU?

Answer 2
In the green linear elements, a minimum distinction in 2 classes is required between at one hand (rows of) trees and at the other hand hedgerows/scrubs.
Minimum mapping width, similar as for the detectability of green landscape elements (see clarification nr. 1, question 6), the distinguishing characteristics and resolution of the VHR imagery that allow for individual detectability of parallel but distinct green linear elements shall guide the distinct mapping of such linear structures.

Question 3
Section 6.2.3. Of the Tender Specifications specifies MMU for green linear elements. Can you provide more details about the MMU.

- Patches of trees and scrubs of minimum 500m² and maximum 0,5ha.
- For linear elements of minimum 100m-long and maximum 10m-wide. When the linear element is "broken" (hole of x meters between aligned trees/scrubs), what is the maximum distance between trees/scrub admitted within a linear element for it to be considered as continuous or interrupted?
- What if a river or a road is bordered by trees? They are supposedly considered as distinct green linear elements as long as their canopy is distinct and within the maximum extent and considered as merged when their canopy is contiguous?
- Can linear elements be delivered in line shapefiles rather than polygons?

Answer 3

Section 6.2.3 sets the minimum requirements for mapping green linear elements. Within these minimal boundary conditions, the tenderer is free to propose a more elaborated approach. Important however is to ensure a robust and reliable method such that a coherent and operational mapping can be done throughout the full European area of interest.

Question 4

Concerning Section 6.2.1. For the LULC classification, do you have any detailed specifications concerning interpretation rules for overlapping objects (such as roads under bridges, rivers under tree canopy…)?

Answer 4

No detailed specifications for overlapping objects are provided. The tenderer is free to propose a set of rules. However, interpretation rules should take into account the use that will be made of the dataset, i.e. a base layer for ecosystem services assessment, monitoring biodiversity. In that sense, a few example considerations could be:

• fragmentation of natural habitats by artificial surfaces (e.g. road networks overruling other surfaces)

• permanent character of landscape elements (e.g. river under tree canopy: the (permanent) river should overrule (temporary) trees)

• hierarchy of objects in a category and/or intensity of use or of antropogenic impact on a landscape (e.g. highway overruling secondary roads)

Question 5

Concerning Section 6.2.1. As understood according to the tender, wherever the area to be mapped is covered by UA, UA classification should be considered in priority and turned into MAES classes. Does this imply all UA classes? What if wetlands or other classes have not been identified by the UA? Are we expected to make corrections to UA?

Answer 5

The conversion of UA into the MAES classes shall be done according to the table provided with the tender file. The rationale is to avoid duplication of effort. The tenderer is free to propose further detail that brings the parts covered by the converted UA data closer to the full MAES nomenclature. Corrections to the UA data only have to be considered to the extent needed to reach the required accuracy.

Question 6
Considering that the Framework Contract provided in the tender documents is a Draft, are the tenderers able to propose amendments to the Draft Framework Contract at all, and will these proposed amendments be considered by EEA?

Answer 6
The Draft Framework Contract is modelled on the template of DG Budget, in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the Union and its Rules of application. The EEA is therefore bound to it.
It is called "draft" because it has to be integrated with information, such as the Contractor's name and details, that are not available at the moment of publication.