



Memorandum of Information

Market consultation portal & viewer of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal (Satellietdataportaal)

Date: 16 October 2026

In this Memorandum of Information, the tendering authority provides answers to the questions asked in the context of the above-mentioned market consultation document (with our reference 202602094).

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the market consultation document	Question	Answer
1	3.4.4	Data location: Must all production data, metadata, backups and operational logs be physically stored in the Netherlands, or would storage and processing within another EU or EEA country be acceptable?	Storage and processing within the European Union (EU) or the European Economic Area (EEA) is acceptable. Production data, metadata, backups and operational logs do not need to be physically stored in the Netherlands. Storage or processing outside the EU/EEA is not acceptable.
2	3.3	Data size: Does the stated volume of approximately 365 TB include only original satellite products, or also replicas, backups, COG versions, tiles, previews, indexes and derived products?	The approximate volume of 365 TB covers all data currently stored for the Dutch Satellite Data Portal, including the raw satellite products as well as preprocessed products (e.g. Bottom of Atmosphere), backups, COG versions and tiles. The archive is expected to grow by approximately 150 TB per year.
3	3.4.1	Migration: Would a phased migration be acceptable, in which datasets are catalogued and activated collection by collection while the existing portal remains operational? Should migration also cover user accounts, saved Areas	Yes, a phased migration is acceptable. The new contract will include a development period during which datasets can be catalogued and activated collection by collection. The existing portal remains operational throughout this period. In question 11 of this market consultation, we ask market parties to indicate the length of the development period they consider common and realistic.

		of Interest, alerts, access rights and API client registrations?	The migration preferably also covers user accounts and user settings (such as alerts), saved Areas of Interest, access rights and API client registrations. Please indicate if you believe that this can have a big influence on the price.
4	3.4.1	GUI: Would NLSA accept a configurable and white-labelled viewer delivered as part of an existing geospatial platform, supplemented by customer-specific modules only where required?	NLSA is open to a configurable, white labelled viewer delivered as part of an existing geospatial platform, provided that the solution meets all the requirements set out in the tender documents. The viewer must be presented under the name and visual identity of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal (Satellietdataportaal) and NLSA (Rijkshuisstijl), and must remain accessible via the website satellietdataportaal.nl. The viewer and landing page must also meet the Digital Accessibility requirements (EN 301 549 / WCAG 2.1, level AA) described in section 3.4.1 of the market consultation document. We invite market parties to indicate in their response which elements of their platform can be restyled to comply with the Rijkshuisstijl and the Digital Accessibility requirements, and where their platform has limitations in this respect.
5	3.4.1	Could NLSA classify the following functions as mandatory at go-live, mandatory later or desirable: • saved AOIs and alerts, • side-by-side and overlay comparison, • time slider and timelapse, • band composition, • mobile access, • newcomer tour?	All of the functions listed are included in the minimum functionalities in section 3.4.1. They are available in the current portal and are overall actively used. NLSA therefore prefers all of them to be available at go-live. Market parties are asked to take this into account in their answer to question 11 on the development period. If a party expects that delivering specific functions at go-live would substantially extend the development period or increase costs, we invite them to indicate this in their response, this could affect the requirements of what functionality needs to be ready at go-live.
6	Question 3	IPR: Would the contracting authority accept a model in which: • pre-existing standard product software remains the supplier's intellectual property; • NLSA retains full ownership of its data and metadata; • NLSA receives appropriate operating and continuity rights;	Yes, NLSA is open to a model along these lines. The key principles for NLSA are that it retains full ownership of its data and metadata, and that the continuity of the portal is guaranteed when the contractor changes. Market parties are asked to describe their preferred model in more detail in your answer to question 3 of the market consultation document.

		- customer-specific source code is licensed or transferred separately; - continuity is ensured through open formats, STAC/OGC interfaces, documented APIs, complete data export, configuration export and transition support?	
7	Question 1	Combining parties on a single lot Q1 notes that a single party may be awarded more than one lot. Would the contracting authority also allow a combination of parties e.g. a consortium, or a prime contractor subcontracting a specialized partner to jointly tender for a single lot? For example, a party offering viewer/API development partnering with a dedicated storage/hosting provider for the storage component. Or must each lot be tendered and delivered by one party independently?	Yes. Tenderers may tender for one or more lots as a combination (consortium), and a tenderer may also engage one or more subcontractors, for example a specialised storage or hosting provider. A lot therefore does not need to be tendered and delivered by a single tenderer. Whether the tender will be divided into lots has not yet been decided (see question 1 of this memorandum of information).
8	3.4.5	On-site presence versus remote work Does the contracting authority expect the successful tenderer's team to be physically present on-site (e.g. in The Hague) for regular meetings, security reviews or similar, or can the work be delivered predominantly remotely? This would help market parties assess team composition and cost estimates accurately	The work can predominantly be delivered remotely. The team of the contractor is not expected to be physically present on-site on a regular basis, and most meetings, including the six progress meetings per year described in section 3.4.5 of the market consultation document, can be held online. NLSA would like to meet in person at least once a year.
9	3.1	Project description: NLSA is looking to procure the next phase of development and maintenance of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal. Could you provide some insight into your current thinking regarding the next phase of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal? Specifically, are you considering the continuation and further development of the existing platform, or are you exploring a more fundamental redesign or redevelopment of the	The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current contractor. NLSA does not hold the rights to make this software available to other parties, so a new contractor will need to develop a new solution. NLSA is open to different approaches, provided that the solution ideally improves usability for our users. NLSA has received feedback from users on how to improve functionalities that they would like to incorporate where possible. Scalability is also an important driver, given the expected growth of the archive and the expected increase in use due to automated

		solution? What are the main drivers behind this preference (e.g. technology, maintainability, scalability, security, costs, or user requirements)?	processing and agentic AI (section 3.3). Furthermore, the Satellietdataportaai needs to be developed in line with the most recent standards to enhance interoperability and connection with future national data spaces like FDS (Federatief Datastelsel).
10	3.4.2	3.4.2 User Support: To better understand the expected support effort, could you elaborate on the composition of the approximately 160 annual tickets/support conversations? In particular, we are interested in the distribution between functional questions, content-related inquiries, technical issues, and bug-related incidents.	A detailed breakdown of the approximately 160 support contacts per year is not available at this time. The current contractor has indicated that this information cannot be provided within the timeframe of this market consultation. NLSA intends to include the registration and periodic reporting of such a breakdown in the requirements for the new contract. For the purpose of this consultation, the contracting authority asks market parties to base their estimates on the figure of approximately 160 contacts per year stated in section 3.4.2, which also includes tickets resulting from bugs encountered by users.
11	Question 3	There seems to be a small error in the following text: "Continuity of the portal is important to us, including when the contractor changes. We see two possible directions: o Intellectual property rests with NLSA and is transferred to a new contractor at the end of the contract." Would the following sentence be viewed as the second possible direction: "The platform is built using open-source software and documented such that another party can continue to build on it"?	Yes, that is correct. The second direction is: "The platform is built using open-source software and documented such that another party can continue to build on it." Thank you for pointing out this omission.
12	Question 5	Could you provide more insight into the current product roadmap and the expected future developments of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal? In particular, are user needs, user stories, or feature backlogs already defined, and to what extent will the future supplier be expected to contribute to UX research, user journey design, and requirements?	User needs, user stories and features are defined by NLSA. Input for these decisions is collected through conversations with users and user surveys. The future contractor can contribute to this by sharing insights from the questions received through the helpdesk. The contractor is expected to design the user interface and keep in mind user journeys. In question 5 of the market consultation document, the contracting authority asks market parties how they would design and validate the user experience and user journey of the portal.

13	Question 5	How are end users currently involved in shaping the roadmap and prioritizing new features, and what role do you envision for the future supplier in this process?	End users are involved through user surveys and direct conversations between NLSA and users. NLSA uses this input to prioritise new features. The future contractor can contribute by sharing insights from questions received through the helpdesk.
14	3.4.1	Could you provide insight into the devices and platforms currently used to access the Dutch Satellite Data Portal? For example, what is the approximate distribution between desktop, tablet, and mobile usage? Are there any specific requirements or expectations regarding support for desktop, tablet, and mobile devices in the future evolution of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal?	Google Analytics figures for 2026 show the following distribution by device category: desktop approximately 70%, mobile phone approximately 28% and tablet approximately 2%. NLSA intends to keep the portal accessible on all three types of device. A native mobile app is not required. The viewer must be usable on desktop, tablet and mobile phone, in line with the minimum functionalities in section 3.4.1 of the market consultation document.
15	Question 2	To help market parties assess feasible solution approaches and delivery models, could you provide an indication of the anticipated budget range or expected contract value for the next phase of development and maintenance of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal?	NLSA will publish the estimated contract value in the tender documents. At this stage, the contracting authority would like to receive input from market parties, for example through the indicative cost ranges requested in question 2 of the market consultation document.
16	3.1	Is the assumption that the current viewer and API will be further developed, or is NLSA also open to a partial or complete rebuild?	The assumption is that the current viewer and API will be rebuilt.
17	3.4.3	Which technologies are currently used for the viewer, API and storage?	The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current contractor, so NLSA cannot share this information. As the portal will be rebuilt.
18	3.4.3	What technology does the current viewer use (framework, mapping library, build tooling)?	The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current contractor, so NLSA cannot share this information. As the portal will be rebuilt.
19	3.1	Is technical documentation, an architecture diagram, or a list of known issues available?	The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current contractor, so NLSA is not in a position to share the source code or the detailed technical design with third parties. No architecture documentation or list of known issues is held by NLSA itself.

			As the portal will be rebuilt, tenderers are not expected to base their offer on the current technical design. The tender documents will set out the functional requirements, the applicable standards and interfaces, the data volumes and the usage figures on which an offer can be based.
20	Question 3	Who owns the source code?	Under the current contract, the source code is owned by the current contractor. For the new contract, NLSA is considering other intellectual property models, see question 3 of the market consultation.
21	Question 3	Which handover assets and cooperation from the incumbent supplier will be made available at the start, including source code, configurations, Infrastructure as Code, architecture and operations documentation, test assets, user and authorisation data, and knowledge transfer; and what acceptance criteria will apply to the transition?	The following handover assets will be made available by the current contractor: user and authorisation data, breakdown and library of user support questions. The detailed handover arrangements and acceptance criteria will be agreed with the selected contractor during the transition phase, within the framework established by the contracting authority.
22	3.4.1	Which parts of the current portal are working satisfactorily and should be functionally preserved?	The following parts of the current portal are valued by users and should be preserved functionally: • The viewer: simple, fast location search, view. Keep it straightforward. • The WMTS service and deeplinking into external GIS and viewers (QGIS, ArcGIS, JOSM) and from other applications. • The STAC API as the basis for automated use of the data. • Download routes via the viewer and via FTP. • The helpdesk and support. In addition, the minimum functionalities listed in section 3.4.1 of the market consultation document are all available in the current portal and must return in the new solution.

23	3.4.3	Do existing URLs, deep links, and shared links need to continue working (including redirects and SEO considerations)?	Yes. Continuity of access is an important requirement for the Satellietdataportaal. The current domain and the main pages of the portal must remain reachable after the transition. Particular attention is required for API and service endpoints. Users and partners access data through scripts, GIS software and other integrations, and changes to these endpoints would directly disrupt their workflows. These endpoints should therefore remain stable. If changes are unavoidable, a transition period is required in which old and new endpoints operate in parallel, with timely communication to users.
24	3.3	How many concurrent viewer users are expected during peak usage?	Google Analytics figures for the past two months show a busiest hour with 218 active users, 277 users in total and 386 page views within that hour. These figures relate to the viewer and the landing page and give an indication of use per hour rather than a measurement of strictly simultaneous sessions.
25	3.4.5	Are analytics data about current usage available (devices, browsers, most-used features, user drop-off)?	Yes, analytics data are available, partly through Google Analytics and partly through the statistics of the current contractor. Device categories (2026): desktop approximately 70%, mobile phone approximately 28% and tablet approximately 2%. Browsers (2026): Chrome 48%, Edge 28%, Safari 17%, Firefox 5% and Samsung Internet 2.5%. Statistics on the use of individual features are available in less detail.
26	3.4.5	Are analytics currently being collected? If so, which analytics solution or implementation is being used?	Yes. Analytics are currently collected in two ways: through Google Analytics and through a statistics module of the current contractor. For the new contract, the analytics solution must comply with the cookie requirements described in question number 51. In particular, no tracking, marketing or advertising cookies may be used and no personal data may be passed on to other companies.
27	3.4.1	Which browsers and browser versions must be supported, and what are the minimum supported mobile devices?	The viewer must be supported and usable with equivalent quality (i.e. the same functionality and quality requirements) on all common operating systems (Windows, macOS and Linux) and in all common

			browsers (Google Chrome, Mozilla Firefox, Microsoft Edge and Safari). At a minimum, the two most recent major versions of each of these browsers must be supported throughout the contract term. The viewer must also be usable with equivalent quality within a Citrix work environment. A native mobile app is not required. On mobile phones and tablets, the viewer must be available as a responsive web design with a quality equivalent to the desktop version, i.e. with comparable loading speeds and the same maximum zoom level. This applies at least to devices running versions of iOS, iPadOS and Android that are still supported by their vendors with security updates. These requirements are indicative and will be finalised in the tender documents.
28	3.4.2	Which languages are required (Dutch, English, others)? Should CMS content be translatable?	Dutch and English is sufficient for the webpage and viewer. Content should be available in both languages.
29	3.4.1	Is a CMS currently being used?	A content management system is currently only used for the landing page of satellietdataportaal.nl, namely WordPress. In the current contract a CMS was not a hard requirement but a wish, assessed as an award criterion on the ease with which the contracting authority itself can adjust content and page layout. The web pages and their content are the property of NLSA. NLSA will most likely not continue with WordPress. No decision has yet been taken on how the landing page will be arranged in future, and the landing page of satellietdataportaal.nl is therefore not included in the scope of this market consultation. This will be set out in the tender documents. The viewer itself is not part of the CMS.
30	3.4.1	Is full feature parity expected on mobile devices, or is a reduced feature set acceptable?	The minimum set of features on mobile devices are viewing of individual satellite images and country-wide mosaics, accessing and using the location data from the user's mobile phone or tablet in the

			mobile version of the viewer to adjust/centre the display to the device's current location and to use to search for images. Further, the viewer must be viewable and usable as a responsive web design on mobile phones and tablets, with a quality equivalent to that of a desktop, i.e. with comparable loading speeds and maximum zoom level.
31	3.4.1	Is a responsive web application sufficient, or is a PWA (Progressive Web App) or native app expected?	A responsive web application is sufficient. A native app or Progressive Web App (PWA) is not required.
32	Question 4	What requirements does NLSA expect for backup, disaster recovery and business continuity, including RPO, RTO, recovery testing and any geographic distribution of data and services?	The current contract sets the following requirements. All functionalities of the portal must be available for 99.9% of the entire contract period. A backup must be present of the available datasets. All data must be hosted from one or more file servers within the European Union. Reliability was also an award criterion: tenderers were asked to explain how they would meet the availability requirement, how the risk and impact of downtime would be reduced, and how the backup and hosting requirements would be met. In question 4 of the market consultation document we ask market parties which availability and performance requirements they consider common and realistic, and at what point costs rise noticeably.
33	3.3	Can NLSA share representative historical metrics for API and download usage, including peak profiles, response times, object sizes, error rates and seasonal patterns, so that performance requirements and scalability can be based on realistic workloads?	NLSA can share the following at this stage. Volume: measured download traffic over the period from 1 August 2025 to 31 July 2026 was approximately 422 TB. This figure covers downloads of the data only and does not include traffic resulting from WMTS transfers or website visits. The figure of approximately 500 TB stated in section 3.3 is an estimate of the total outbound traffic, including those components. Distribution across the access routes: see the answer to question 38.

			Peak profile: see the answer to question 24 of this memorandum of information. Use of the portal peaks in spring, summer and autumn, and is lower in winter. Object sizes: see the answer to question 35 of this memorandum of information. Metrics on response times and error rates are not available to NLSA at this time.
34	3.1	Can NLSA describe the operational chain with the radar and optical data suppliers in more detail, including interfaces, delivery frequencies, quality controls, error handling, SLAs and the allocation of responsibilities in the event of disruption?	As described in section 3.1 of the market consultation document, the work is divided across three separate contracts, each concluded directly with NLSA: the acquisition and processing of radar data, the acquisition and processing of optical data, and the portal itself. Timely delivery and the quality of the data are the responsibility of the two data suppliers, and quality control takes place with them. We expect pro-active communication between NLSA, the data suppliers and the portal contractor in case of a disruption. Optical data (responsibility of the optical data supplier). The entire Area of Interest is recorded six times per year, but for some areas within the Area of Interest multiple image acquisitions could be necessary in a single recording period, to meet cloud cover thresholds. These images will also be uploaded to the portal. Measured until the data are made available to the contractor of the portal, at least 95% of the raw data is delivered within 72 hours of acquisition, more than 95% of the individual processed images within 5 calendar days and the remaining 5% within 7 calendar days, both calculated from the recording of the raw data, and the country-wide mosaics within 15 calendar days from the end of the acquisition period. Each processed image is accompanied by a cloud mask, and

			each delivered product by metadata in XML format. This is all responsibility of the supplier of the data. Radar data (responsibility of the radar data supplier). Under the current arrangement the Netherlands is recorded every 24 days in 17 images, 7 in the ascending orbit and 10 in the descending orbit. The images are made available on the FTP server of the data supplier, where they remain available for 30 days. Four products are delivered: unprocessed SLC products, SGF 1 look at 5 m, DIP full resolution at 5 m, and downsampled GeoQuicklooks at 20 m. Availability through the portal (scope of the upcoming tender). Under the current contract, the individual datasets, both optical and radar, must become available through the required access channels within 1 working day of delivery by the data supplier. The country-wide mosaics must become available within 5 working days of delivery, as must the information products such as application examples and user stories. Access to the radar data (scope of the upcoming tender) Unlike the optical data, the radar data are available only to users to whom NLSA has granted access individually and who have subsequently accepted the licence conditions of the data supplier. The portal must therefore support this: NLSA grants access per user through the user administration, the user receives an email with a URL through which the licence conditions can be accepted, and the portal records whether this has been done. Users who have not been granted permission cannot view or download the radar data.
35	3.3	Can more information be provided about the current 365 TB of data, such as file types, number of files, average file size, and frequency of use?	The following information can be shared at this stage: The majority of the data is stored as GeoTIFF, some COG, and is additionally made

			available as tiles via WMTS, as described in section 3.3 of the market consultation document. File sizes differ per sensor and per processing product. For the current optical sensors, the average size of an individual product ranges from approximately 0.5 GB to 27 GB. The average file size per product is approximately 8.8 GB for SuperView-NEO3 and approximately 5.0 GB for SuperView-NEO. An overview of the datasets and products currently available, including the acquisition frequency, is published on satellietdataportaal.nl and is linked in section 3.3 of the market consultation document. For the other sensors in the archive, the average file size ranges from approximately 0.1 GB to 3.4 GB. In the period from 1 August 2025 to 1 August 2026, approximately 142,700 downloads were recorded, together accounting for approximately 422 TB. By volume, the distribution across sensors was approximately: Pleiades-NEO 41%, SuperView-NEO 29%, Spot-6/7 10%, SuperView-1 9%, Radarsat-2 7%, TripleSat 4%, and all remaining sensors together less than 1%. The two current optical sensors therefore account for approximately 70% of the download traffic. The raw products are downloaded most: for Pleiades-NEO and SuperView-NEO together, the raw data accounts for approximately 51% of all download traffic. The figure of approximately 500 TB stated in section 3.3 is an estimate of the total outbound traffic. The difference between that estimate and the measured download traffic is an approximation of the traffic resulting from WMTS and website visits.
--	--	--	---

36	3.3	Does the entire existing dataset need to be migrated to the new environment?	Yes, the entire existing dataset needs to be migrated to the new environment.
37	3.3	Do existing GeoTIFF files need to be converted to Cloud Optimized GeoTIFF? If so, should the original files also be retained afterward?	NLSA expects to make new data available as Cloud Optimized GeoTIFF. Whether the existing archive will be converted at all, how much of it, and with which party the responsibility for carrying out such a conversion would lie, has not yet been decided. Where data are converted, the original GeoTIFF files do not need to be retained afterwards, provided the conversion is carried out properly, with thorough quality assurance and without any loss of information. A transition period in which both the original and the converted files are available is possible. Question 4 of the market consultation document asks which data formats and protocols you would recommend for efficient use and data transfer. We ask you to state the assumptions you apply in your answer to that question.
38	3.3	How is the current outbound data traffic of approximately 500 TB per year distributed across the viewer, API, FTP, and direct downloads?	The approximately 500 TB refers to outbound data transfer per year. Based on the download records, the distribution across the access routes is as follows. Over the whole period since 2018: approximately 60% via the v1 API, 35% via FTP, 4% via the STAC API and 1% via the portal. For 2026 only: approximately 51% via the v1 API, 45% via the STAC API, 4% via the portal and close to 0% via FTP. The trend is therefore a sharp decrease in the use of FTP and a sharp increase in the use of the STAC API.
39	3.3	Can NLSA share multi-year projections for growth in users, API traffic, storage volume, and data transfer so that suppliers can make a realistic architecture and cost estimate?	NLSA does not have formal multi-year projections available, and the historical figures are not fully consistent and continuous. The figures that are available are set out in section 3.3 of the market consultation document. NLSA expects the use of the portal to increase in the coming years due to the rise in automated processing and developments around

			agentic AI. We ask market parties to base their architecture and cost estimates on these figures and to state the assumptions they apply.
40	Question 4	What exactly is meant by a minimum speed of 1 Gbit/s? Does this refer to the capacity of the entire platform or to the speed per user or download session? How is this requirement measured?	The current contract sets two separate requirements: a minimum download speed from the contractor of 1 Gbit/s, and a minimum network speed for loading imagery of 1 Gbit/s. Both refer to the capacity to be delivered by the contractor and not to a guaranteed speed per user or per download session. No measurement method is prescribed in the current contract. Market parties were, however, asked to substantiate that the speeds offered would be sufficient for the various scenarios of simultaneous use. In question 4 of the market consultation we ask market parties which performance requirements they consider common and realistic, and which requirements they would advise us to set.
41	Question 4	How many concurrent users, API requests, and bulk downloads must the platform support during peak load?	NLSA has not yet set requirements for the number of concurrent users, API requests and bulk downloads to be supported during peak load. In question 4 of the market consultation document we ask market parties which performance requirements, including concurrent use, they consider common and realistic. For current peak use of the viewer, see the answer to question 24 of the market consultation document. Figures on the number of API requests and bulk downloads during peak load are not available to NLSA at this time.
42	3.4.2	Can the current number of approximately 160 support contacts be broken down into user questions, account issues, incidents, bugs, and data-related questions?	See the answer to the question 10 of the market consultation document.
43	Question 6	Should NDVI be calculated only for new satellite imagery, or also retrospectively for the entire historical collection?	NLSA has not taken a decision on this and is not yet committed to adding derived products. The purpose of question 6 of the market consultation is precisely to gather advice on the best way to do this:

			generating these layers on the fly with caching of results, or pre-calculating them as standard across the acquisition. To give an indication of the scope under consideration, an NDVI product could for example be made available for the imagery acquired from 2026 onwards, rather than for the full historical collection. We ask you to state in your answer to question 6 which scope you have assumed and what the consequences are for costs, storage and performance.
44	Question 6	In what form should NDVI and other derived products be made available: as a map layer, downloadable file, API result, or a combination of these?	Most likely, if NLSA decides to make NDVI available, it will be made available in the same way as the satellite data. We believe that if the dataset is generated, that making it available as map layer, API, downloadable file will not make a big difference as these services already exist for the satellite data. Please indicate in your answer if you believe this to be otherwise.
45	3.4.4	Are there any requirements regarding digital sovereignty or cloud sovereignty? If so, what are these requirements?	Yes. Data storage and hosting must take place within the EU or the EEA. See also the answer question 1 on data location, which describes this requirement in more detail.
46	3.4.1	Is a recent accessibility assessment of the current portal (including the viewer) available?	Yes. An accessibility statement for www.satellietdataportaal.nl is published in the Dutch national register of accessibility statements and can be consulted at https://www.toegankelijkheidsverklaring.nl/register/21550 .
47	3.4.1	How does the client expect accessibility requirements for map interactions to be addressed (e.g., keyboard navigation for AOI drawing, textual alternatives, comparison features)? Would an equivalent non-map alternative be acceptable?	NLSA does not prescribe how the accessibility requirements are to be met for specific map interactions. The requirement is that the viewer and the landing page comply with EN 301 549 and WCAG 2.1 level AA, see also the answer to the next question. How this is achieved is left to the contractor, as long as the solution meets these requirements.
48	3.4.1	Is it mandatory to comply with WCAG 2.1 level A, AA, or AAA for the viewer and landing page?	WCAG 2.1 level AA.
49	3.4.1	Is there a mandatory visual identity or branding guideline (e.g., the Dutch Government Design	Yes. The portal must comply with the Rijkshuisstijl, the visual identity of the Dutch central government, including the prescribed use of

		System / Rijkshuisstijl)? Is alignment with the NL Design System expected?	colour, logos and typography. The previous tender contained requirements on this for both the viewer and the landing page. NLSA does not prescribe the use of the NL Design System at this stage. The applicable requirements on visual identity and branding will be set out in the tender documents.
50	3.4.1	Is there an existing design system or component library that should be reused?	There is no existing component library that must be reused, and the contractor is free to propose its own, new approach to the design of the user interface. The design must comply with the Rijkshuisstijl, the visual identity of the Dutch central government, and the portal must be presented under the name and visual identity of the Dutch Satellite Data Portal (Satellietdataportaal) and NLSA. The viewer and landing page must also meet the Digital Accessibility requirements described in section 3.4.1 of the market consultation document. NLSA has a preference for the use of open source software and libraries, in view of the continuity of the portal when the contractor changes (see question 3 of the market consultation document).
51	3.4.4	Which analytics tool is permitted? Does the portal need to function without requiring a cookie consent banner?	The previous tender set the following requirement, which NLSA intends to maintain. No tracking cookies, marketing cookies or advertising cookies may be used, and no personal data or privacy sensitive information may be passed on to other companies. Analytical cookies and functional cookies are permitted, insofar as they are necessary for collecting the requested anonymised user statistics and for the proper functioning of the viewer and the landing page. NLSA's starting point is therefore that the portal functions without a cookie consent banner. No specific analytics tool is prescribed. See also the answer to the question on the analytics solution currently in use.
52	3.4.1	Gebruik van een bestaand softwareplatform: Is het toegestaan om voor de portal en viewer gebruik te maken van een bestaand en operationeel softwareplatform dat voor deze opdracht wordt geconfigureerd en waar nodig	Yes, the use of an existing and operational software platform is permitted. See also the answer to question 4 of this memorandum of information. NLSA does not expect a completely new application to be developed. Tenderers may configure an existing platform for the portal and the viewer and extend it where necessary, provided that

		uitgebreid? Of gaat NLSA uit van de ontwikkeling van een volledig nieuwe applicatie? ----- Use of an existing software platform: Is it permitted to use an existing, operational software platform for the portal and viewer, configured for this assignment and extended where necessary? Or does NLSA expect a completely new application to be developed?	the solution meets all requirements set out in the tender documents. These include, among others, the requirements regarding visual identity and design, and regarding digital accessibility. As a Dutch government organisation, NLSA is bound by the accessibility standards that apply to government websites and applications (WCAG 2.1 level AA).
53	Question 3	Broncode en intellectueel eigendom: In vraag 3 wordt genoemd dat het intellectueel eigendom bij NLSA kan komen te liggen. Betekent dit dat ook de volledige broncode van het onderliggende softwareplatform overdraagbaar moet zijn? Of kan worden volstaan met overdracht van data, databases, configuraties, documentatie en specifiek voor NLSA ontwikkelde onderdelen, waarbij het intellectueel eigendom van een bestaand generiek softwareplatform bij de leverancier blijft? ----- Source code and intellectual property: Question 3 mentions that the intellectual property may be vested in NLSA. Does this mean that the complete source code of the underlying software platform must also be transferable? Or is it sufficient to transfer data, databases, configurations, documentation and components developed specifically for NLSA, with the intellectual property of an existing generic software platform remaining with the contractor?	No, transfer of the complete source code of the underlying software platform is not required. It is common for the intellectual property of existing, generic software to remain with the contractor, and NLSA is open to this approach. In that case, NLSA expects at a minimum the transfer of data, databases, configurations, documentation and components developed specifically for NLSA. We ask market parties to explain their proposed approach to intellectual property in their answer to question 3 of this memorandum of information, including which components would be transferred to NLSA and which would remain with the contractor.
54	3.3	Migratie van de bestaande omgeving: Welke onderdelen van de huidige omgeving moeten door de nieuwe opdrachtnemer worden gemigreerd? Betreft dit naast de satellietdata ook gebruikersaccounts, opgeslagen AOI's, alerts,	In addition to the satellite data and associated metadata, the migration includes user accounts, saved Areas of Interest (AOIs), alerts, authorisations and API client registrations. The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current

		autorisaties en configuraties? En welke ondersteuning en technische documentatie wordt hiervoor vanuit de huidige opdrachtnemer beschikbaar gesteld? ---- Migration of the existing environment: Which components of the current environment must be migrated by the new contractor? In addition to the satellite data, does this also include user accounts, saved AOIs, alerts, authorisations and configurations? And what support and technical documentation will the current contractor make available for this?	contractor, so the source code and the internal design and configuration of that platform cannot be made available. The migration is therefore a migration of data and user information to a newly built portal, not a handover of the existing system. It can be carried out in phases, see also the answer to question 3 of this memorandum of information. For the support and the documentation that the current contractor will make available, see the answer to question 21 of this memorandum of information.
55	3.4.3	Huidige technische architectuur en overdrachtdocumentatie: Kan NLSA inzicht geven in de huidige technische architectuur van het portaal, waaronder de gebruikte technologieën, hostingomgeving, API-architectuur en documentatie? En zal deze informatie beschikbaar worden gesteld aan inschrijvers om een realistische inschatting van ontwikkel-, migratie- en beheerkosten mogelijk te maken? ---- Current technical architecture and transition documentation: Can NLSA provide insight into the current technical architecture of the portal, including the technologies used, hosting environment, API architecture and documentation? And will this information be made available to tenderers to enable a realistic estimate of development, migration and maintenance costs?	The intellectual property of the current portal software rests with the current contractor, so NLSA cannot share this information with tenderers. See also the answer to question 17 of this memorandum of information. A new portal will be built, and the migration concerns data and user information only, not the existing system. See also the answer to question 54 of this memorandum of information.