

date/date 13 March, 2015  
10

ref./réf. IPL/MOS/2015

page/page 1

2

from/de Margaret O'Sullivan – IPL-PLH

tel./tél. +33 1 53697535

fax/fax +33 1 53697775

visa/visa

e-mail/mail [Margaret.OSullivan@esa.int](mailto:Margaret.OSullivan@esa.int)

To Mr. J. Duro/Ms. M. Garcia  
Altamira Information SLU  
Corsega 381-387  
E-08037 Barcelona  
SPAIN

e-mail : [javier.duro@altamira-information.com](mailto:javier.duro@altamira-information.com)  
[maite.garcia@altamira-information.com](mailto:maite.garcia@altamira-information.com)

fax: + 34 93 183 5759

copy/copie Mr. Philippe Bally (ESRIN)

e-mail [Philippe.bally@esa.int](mailto:Philippe.bally@esa.int)

Subject/ohjet AO/I-8130/14/F/MOS

**Disaster risk reduction using innovative data exploitation methods and space assets**

Dear Sir,

Subsequent to the evaluation of the different proposals, please be informed that ESA intends to enter into Clarification with your Company, in view of placing a Contract for the above-mentioned subject.

The proposed date for this clarification/kick-off meeting is the 9 April, 2015, and will be held in ESRIN from 9.30 to 14.00. ESA also requests the participation of the team partners involved with ICT and Landslides that are Terradue and CNR IRPI. Please confirm as soon as possible that this date is suitable for you and provide the names of participants and their coordinates.

The following topics will be addressed:

1. ESA Work Statement and Technical Specifications, Contractor's Technical Proposal and other technical matters;
2. Management and Financial proposal;
3. Schedule;
4. Draft Contract.

A detailed list of clarification points is attached in Annex. Please provide your written reply by 24 March, 2015 close of business.

Kind Regards,

Margaret O'Sullivan  
Contracts Service

Philippe Bally  
Technical Officer



date/dat 13 March, 2015  
e 16

ref./réf. PFL/PLH/MOS/2015

page/pa 2  
ge 3

#### Clarification Points:

The bidder is requested to clarify the following points:

1. Concerning the list of processors, object of the trial cases, please describe in detail who owns them, the EO sources they can ingest and whether they are Open Source.
2. The four trial cases are clearly defined however for seismic hazards it is not clear how the planned trial case in Cephalonia & Zakynthos goes beyond the state of the art (the site was studied in various projects including Terrafirma and recently by INGV in the framework of the CEOS Seismic Pilot). This should be clarified.
3. The EO data sources and EO processing s/w for the intended trial cases need to be defined with sufficient detail in the form of a first/preliminary procurement plan. For instance what Optical data and associated VA s/w are intended to be exploited by CNR IRPI is not detailed enough. If VHRO is required the procurement plan should be indicated at least in the form of a draft.
4. Explain how this activity is taking further the findings of the WAP over Greece that concerns the automated generation of terrain motion maps over wide extent area
5. Explain how open is the system behind the trial cases and if it is possible to use resources from outside the team (such as e.g. Helix nebula) in order to demonstrate the exploitability of an open and federated cloud platform. This is going further than simply doing a paper assessment of PICSE and HNX as presented in the proposal. That should reflect the IaaS for resource sharing that is described in the proposal; concerning precursor activities led by ESA, more clarifications are required on the platform(s) intended to be used to support the trial cases and whether the ESA precursor activities will be considered (GPOD, TEPs, etc.). For instance trial cases on geohazards could be executed on the Geohazards TEP (GEP) in the Validation activity that ESA is preparing (and similarly with the new Hydrology TEP for flood hazards), but it is retained by the Contractor that option needs to be assessed.
6. The activity of Altamira and DLR in Task 5 does not seem to be well connected to the rest of the programme of work and it is unclear when they are implicated in the activity at a later stage. DLR staff are only involved in Task 5 and not at the start of the activity which implies a risk that they do not take input from the other activities. The role of DLR in the total programme of work should be clarified.
7. In WP3000 it is not clear how much effort is put on organising a user workshop. Please clarify the resources put so as to estimate if they are sufficient to achieve this goal.

8. In the Table in 4.1 it is unclear what is the impact on project deliverables i.e. whether there will be permission issues associated to deliverables.
9. The programme of work shall be complemented by an additional Workshop, not focused on users but specifically concerning Task 5 and that will be open to industry. ESA expects industrial organisations of the space sectors to have an interest in discussing the definition of EO missions to support DRM. ESA intends to host this Workshop and have it back to back with a progress meeting to be held at ESA premises. Please accommodate the proposal to integrate it and confirm your agreement.
10. Please provide a complete list of the Background IPR which will be used for this activity.