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| **Question** | **Answer** |
| Is it intentional that your specified requirements exclude the existing functionality of general public data submissions? | We are not looking to engage directly now with general public providers, instead (through requirement 1) we wish to work with those who are better placed to collect that data and stream it into us through that route. This is linked to question 2. |
| You mention that business needs have changed, are you able to share how? What are your new business objectives for this capability? | Question 2 is around a change in the internal strategy away from direct public engagement and visualisation of the data and more towards a need to increase the volume of observations more broadly, in a more cost-effective way. This is to help the organisation with its internal customers who require ever increasing volumes of observations at increased spatial and temporal resolution. This then helps to produce more granular nowcasting and forecasting products as our modelling capability continues to develop with our new supercomputer. The new capability needs to be scalable to be able to benefit from 3rd party datasets that can be unlocked from other weather station and monitoring device providers e.g. other environmental monitoring providers networks. |
| We understand that SurfaceNet achieves at least some of requirements 2 and 3; is there a reason this hasn't been considered as an existing capability to scale? | That might be one potential avenue for consideration, but purpose of the early market engagement is to understand whether there is interest and capability beyond adapting existing solutions to meet the requirements. A more informed decision can then be made on business priorities/development plans. |
| Re. bullets 1 & 7 (Login/authentication): noted in current WOW there is a section for “Social Media Data” that indicates “WOW now supports logging in with Facebook, Google and Twitter. These integrations use OAuth 2.0, as it is the industry standard authentication/authorization protocol.” Is this part of the login requirement? | Ideally, we would like people to be able to login and access the forms through a variety of different routes and social media accounts would be one such avenue. Can you please let us know your thoughts on how you would potentially meet this requirement. |
| Re requirement 6 (comparing historical data):  Is this expected to utilise a map view as per current WOW, or is the design open to our choice/interpretation (e.g. table/chart views)? | We are open to ideas on this at this stage. In its most basic form this could be a table with their own site on and nearest neighbours displayed. The decision on a preference on this will ultimately depend on costs. |
| Re requirement 6 (comparing historical data):  Are you able to advise why a climate site might want to compare their data to that of other sites? | .As the site will be used by our voluntary climate network of observers and potentially other agencies who collect data from voluntary observers, we envisage that this would be an opportunity for these enthusiasts to compare readings with other nearest neighbour sites. |
| Re requirement 6 (comparing historical data):  Are there any restrictions on which other sites a user should be able to see/access the data for? (Should users be able to make their data available to other sites or is there a notion of rights/permissions between sites?) | The idea here is to give the person access to nearest neighbour data for a few sites, as these will be most relevant and of most interest. |
| Re requirement 6 (comparing historical data):  What, if anything, do the climate sites do with that comparison data once visualised/assessed? (Might they want to save or export these comparisons?). Any user context/expectations here would be useful. | We would see users saving and exporting only their own data, then keeping a record on say an excel spreadsheet. Any information they have seen for other sites would not be part of this export. |
| Is the “automated” update via Weather Stations part of requirement 1 and therefore not part of the replacement “WOW Next”? That is, the current WOW mentions current supported software for automatic uploading of observations, so is this not within the scope of this requirement? | Ideally, we would like to have AWS APIs queried every minute or at least 5 minutes to ensure we get steady flow of observations and not large volumes in one go that would cause a processing delay our side. The requirement for the capability that collects and transforms the data would have new data available at this frequency also. |
| There are additional features covered on the WOW, e.g. Weather impact, Map view/filtering, Weather 5-day Forecast, Webcams etc. Are these therefore out scope as they are not identified in the list of key requirements listed here? | Yes, these are out of scope and not required for this new requirement. |
| Requirement 2 - What is the anticipated data volumes for the cloud data hub?  Any metrics on numbers of sources, frequency, number of records and size will be helpful to ensure we understand the cloud/hosting requirements in order to give correct indications on pricing. | "This largely depends on a) how many sites are provided in requirement 1 in the main and b) how the capability/platform provider chooses to store and serve up this data. We would anticipate a daily volume of observations somewhere in the region of 1GB to 5GB.  Previous early market engagement leads us to believe the sources, frequency, number of records and size are likely to be in the following ranges- however as noted, there is an aspiration to bring in future data sources which would add to this:  1 main source likely and other 3rd party smaller networks to be added and managed in time as part of capability growth. Likely single figures at least for some time.  1 to 60 minute frequency with 5-15 minutes being most common.  Under 10 MB per update  Number of records dependant on number of reporting weather stations and their reporting frequency so difficult to provide much clarity at this stage. |
| For requirement 2, are you looking for a platform with the ability to ingest real time data from environmental sensor networks, display the data in a variety of formats in different layers (Graphs, individual data points, animations, etc), and alert users on different parameters, or are you looking more for something that takes in data, transforms data, and then exports data to another system? | We are looking for the latter option. |
| For requirement 3, Webform or interface webpage…Does this requirement include BOTH the webform interface to collect data points from individual users AND then display that data in a platform, or is it more about collecting the data and then sending that data in a standardized way to another system? | We are looking for the latter option. |