## Document Details: Clarification Questions – Smart glasses for mapping

Deadline for questions: 29/10/26

Publish Date: 5/11/26

# 1.0 Technical

| | Question | Answer |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | Some manufacturers' developer terms prohibit integrations that facilitate military or espionage activities, or recording in sensitive locations. Where a manufacturer's terms contain such a clause, will HMGCC regard development of a reconnaissance mapping proof of concept on that manufacturer's developer platform as a breach of the constraint? | It is the responsibility of the solution provider to ensure no terms and conditions are breached. As part of the project we do not require recording in sensitive locations. |
| 1.2 | If so, does HMGCC hold, or expect to obtain, any permission or exception from manufacturers on behalf of applicants? Or should applicants seek any such permission themselves? | HMGCC will not be seeking exceptions or permissions to breach terms and conditions. |
| 1.3 | Will HMGCC accept an approach in which the processing pipeline is built on one manufacturer's glasses, and a second manufacturer's glasses are used only within their consumer terms, for the data flow assessment and image quality comparison? In particular, | Yes. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | will this satisfy the desirable requirement to explore the essential requirements across multiple manufacturers? | |
| 1.4 | The brief states "We do not want to change the physical structure of smart glasses" and asks whether desirable requirements include "urban environment in low light conditions." Would a non-destructive, magnetically detachable micro-sensor clip (such as a miniature NIR/IR low-light camera module wired to the pocket edge processor) be permissible as a modular low-light enhancement, provided the core daytime 3D mapping PoC also functions using the unmodified glasses' native camera? Or is that out of scope? | "Can the sensor suite be leveraged to generate reliable 3-D models without additional hardware?" is one of the questions posed by the brief – That answer could be 'no' for low light conditions. The core aim of this work is to see what *can* be done with only the sensors on smart glasses, however if this desirable requirement cannot be achieved in that way, the use of a small external module can be permitted. |
| 1.5 | Edge device. Must the edge processing be body-worn, or may it be a portable unit carried by or near the operator? Is a smartphone acceptable as the link between the glasses and the edge device? | The edge device should be body-worn. |
| 1.6 | Real-time processing. Is a live, lower-fidelity 3D model during the mission acceptable, with a higher-fidelity model produced on the same offline equipment after the mission? | Preferably it would be a live higher-fidelity model, however this is an exploratory project so it may be that low-fidelity first is the only method with current technology. |
| 1.7 | Test data and GDPR. Should urban test footage be captured on private premises or with consenting participants only, or will a test site or dataset be made available? | There will be no test site or dataset provided by HMGCC. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.8 | Developer SDKs. Are manufacturer SDKs still in developer preview acceptable for the proof of concept, provided their terms of use are followed? | Yes, but under reasonable circumstances (ie, it is not a highly volatile SDK that is likely to very quickly become defunct) |
| 1.9 | Transmission during the mission. Our default design sends nothing during the mission: data is encrypted and stored on the operator's phone and downloaded at base. We also offer an optional mode that gives a live map over a local link (Wi-Fi or private 5G) to a nearby compute node. Is a live mode of interest, or should it be treated as out of scope for this phase? | It can be treated as a desirable requirement. |
| 1.10 | Commercial glasses. We plan to use off-the-shelf smart glasses (for example Mentra Live or Ray-Ban Meta) without the vendors' cloud services, so that all processing stays on equipment we control. Are there restrictions on the make, origin or connectivity of devices you would accept? | There are no restrictions, however one of the essential requirements asks, "A*ssess the data generated from smart glasses and provide a report on where the data may go and who may have access.*" |
| 1.11 | Test environment. Will HMGCC provide or suggest a representative test site for the final demonstration, or should we use our own? Are indoor areas, outdoor areas or both a priority? | We can provide a representative indoor test site for the final demonstration, but any outdoor area demo would need to be pre-prepared. Ideally, both would be a priority, but if that seems infeasible, there would be a slight preference on outdoor urban environments. |
| 1.12 | Output formats. Do you have preferred formats for the map and associated data (for example point cloud, mesh, or GIS-ready layers)? | No. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.13 | Accuracy. Is there a target positional or geometric accuracy you would expect at TRL 4? | We want the resulting models to be as accurate as possible. |
| 1.14 | When must mapping take place? Our proposed approach keeps capture and initial processing offline on the glasses or paired phone, with 3D reconstruction and mapping completed back at base. Is this acceptable, or must a 3D map be produced during capture? If mapping during capture is required, what minimum output would you expect? | In an ideal scenario, we would be looking to establish if the 3D modelling can be produced in real time.<br><br>For the sake of proving the concept if deemed not achievable, "back at base mapping" is acceptable. |
| 1.15 | **Paired devices:** Does the requirement permit a paired smartphone for computation, connectivity and storage, or must processing take place entirely on the glasses themselves? | It permits a paired smartphone if required. |
| 1.16 | **Data security:** Am I correct in interpreting the requirement as preventing sensitive imagery or derived data from leaving a controlled environment, rather than prohibiting devices with wireless or cloud connectivity altogether? For example, would an entirely local workflow using commercial smart glasses and a paired smartphone, with cloud synchronisation disabled, be acceptable? | This would be acceptable. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.17 | **Two-Stage Body-Worn Edge Architecture (Hardened Companion Relay + GPU Compute Node)** Many commercially available smart glasses (such as Meta Ray-Ban AI glasses utilising the official Meta Wearables Device Access Toolkit) require a local mobile companion OS host to authenticate hardware sessions and extract raw camera, IMU, and multi-channel audio streams without modifying device firmware or breaching manufacturer Terms and Conditions. Can the Authority confirm that a two-stage body-worn edge architecture—comprising a network-isolated, hardened Android/GrapheneOS companion relay tethered via encrypted USB-C to a body-worn GPU compute node (e.g., NVIDIA Jetson Orin Nano)—is fully acceptable within the scope of an "edge device"? | A local mobile companion device is within scope. A body-worn GPU compute node was not considered in the original planning of the challenge; however, we would welcome that discussion in your proposal.<br><br>The upcoming xreal aura smart glasses for example come with an external puck for processing, so this could be the future of edge processing for smart glasses. |
| 1.18 | **Real-Time On-Mission Pre-Processing vs. Post-Mission 3D Map Finalisation** The challenge brief notes both processing in real time on an edge device and an example use case where data remains encrypted on-device during the mission and is inspected by an analyst ("Julie") after downloading back at base. Can the Authority confirm whether a hybrid computational pipeline—where real-time on-edge processing executes 6-DoF Visual-Inertial Odometry (VIO), motion-blur filtering, and keyframe/voxel buffering during the mission, followed by high-density 3D mesh/photogrammetry refinement upon base | In an ideal scenario, we would be looking to establish if the 3D modelling/refinement can be produced in real time.<br><br>However, for the sake of proving the concept if deemed not achievable, “back at base mapping” is an acceptable proof of concept. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | download—satisfies the TRL 4 proof-of-concept requirement? | |
| 1.19 | **. Preferred 3D Geospatial & Acoustic Output Formats for Analyst Inspection** For the post-mission analyst inspection workflow and TRL 4 demonstration, does the Authority mandate or prefer specific 3D geospatial file standards (e.g., .PLY / .OBJ textured polygonal meshes, 3D Gaussian Splatting .splat scenes, Open3D TSDF volumes, or ATAK/CivTAK GeoJSON overlays) for integrating visual and audio reconnaissance outputs? | No, we are interested in what is possible. |
| 1.20 | **Hardware Procurement Lead Times & "Sprint 0" Mobilisation Invoicing** Given the compressed 12-week delivery schedule kicking off in January 2027 and the desirable requirement to evaluate multiple smart glasses across different manufacturers, early procurement of COTS smart glasses and edge-compute hardware will be required immediately upon contract award. Following precedent from previous HMGCC Co-Creation challenges, will the contracting framework via Cranfield University permit an exceptional "Sprint 0" mobilisation payment or an early Week 1–2 hardware procurement milestone to mitigate supply-chain lead times and cash-flow barriers for SMEs? | Yes, we can add in a “Sprint 0” to accommodate procurement of equipment, but the project must finish before the end of this FY (March 2027). |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.21 | **Exclusion of System Architecture Schematics from the 6-Page Limit** The application guidance states that the strict six-page / six-slide limit excludes title pages, references, personnel CVs, and organisational profiles. May applicants include a 1-page high-resolution System Architecture Schematic within the Organisational Profile / Technical Annex, or must all system diagrams sit strictly inside the six-page core proposal? | System diagrams form part of the technical answer or proposal so should be included in the 6-page limit if they are relevant. |
| 1.22 | Could a project develop the SLAM and glasses integration during the funded period, or is a working mapping prototype expected at entry? | A working prototype is not expected at entry. |
| 1.23 | Could you please clarify whether the proposed edge device can be developed using an existing commercial computing platform, such as an NVIDIA Jetson board, integrated with our own processing and 3D mapping software?<br><br>Or is the development of custom electronic hardware or a bespoke PCB expected? | It can be developed using an existing commercial computing platform. |
| 1.24 | **Equipment and data:** Will HMGCC provide access to compatible smart glasses, or must applicants purchase their own devices? Are there any preferred or excluded manufacturers, and will test data or facilities be available? | No solution providers are responsible for providing everything required to complete their proposal |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.25 | **Edge device**: the summary asks for "an edge device that can process video and audio", and the gap statement asks for 3D models "without additional hardware". Is a body-worn companion compute unit (e.g. a smartphone or a small embedded compute module), with the smart glasses left unmodified, an acceptable interpretation? Or does the Authority prefer that processing stays on the glasses and/or a phone? | A local mobile companion device is within scope. A body-worn GPU compute module was not considered in the original planning of the challenge; however, we would welcome that discussion in your proposal.<br><br>The upcoming xreal aura smart glasses for example come with an external puck for processing, so this could be the future of edge processing for smart glasses. |
| 1.26 | **Eligible devices**: must the glasses be generally available to buy (consumer or enterprise), or are developer and research editions with restricted availability also acceptable? | Developer and research editions are acceptable. |
| 1.27 | **Real-time expectation**: for the TRL 4 proof of concept, is the Authority's priority real-time on-device 3D reconstruction, or high-fidelity reconstruction available by the end of the mission (when the data is downloaded)? Should solutions assume that nothing is transmitted during the mission, or is optional live transmission also of interest? | Real-time on device 3D reconstruction is the priority and assume nothing is being transmitted. Optional live transmission can be treated as an optional requirement. |
| 1.28 | **Test environment**: will the Authority provide, or expect the provider to arrange, an urban test site and any ground truth (e.g. survey data) for evaluating map accuracy? | We expect the provider to arrange. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.29 | **Device terms**: where a manufacturer's developer-toolkit terms restrict defence or national-security use but its consumer terms do not, does the Authority consider use of the consumer product, through its standard export features only, acceptable? | It is the responsibility of the solution provider to ensure no terms and conditions are breached. |
| 1.30 | Can the solution use a connected smartphone (required by most current smart glasses) as part of the edge processing chain? Or must all processing and map storage happen on the glasses themselves? | A connected smartphone is acceptable. |
| 1.31 | What latency is expected for map generation? Is true real-time (constantly updated during recording) required? Or is a finished map delivered shortly after recording ends, for analyst review, acceptable? Example use case suggests post-mission review. | In an ideal scenario, we would be looking to establish if the 3D modelling/refinement can be produced in real time, updated during recording.<br><br>However, for the sake of proving the concept if deemed not achievable, a map delivered shortly after recording ends is an acceptable proof of concept. |
| 1.32 | Is live map viewing by the wearer during recording required? Most commercial glasses have no display capable of this. | Not required. |
| 1.33 | Is it a key requirement that all computation and processing is carried out solely on the smart glasses themselves, or will the glasses be paired / connected to another edge device (e.g. smartphone) that the data will | We are interested in seeing what is possible to do just on the glasses themselves, however as many smart glasses require some kind of tether to a companion device to be used, we will accept solutions that use a companion device to share the processing load. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | be streamed to and processed on, to generate the 3D mapping? | |
| 1.34 | **Industrial versus consumer smart glasses:** Would commercially developed industrial or safety-certified smart glasses be considered equally eligible alongside consumer smart glasses, particularly where the devices are designed for regulated or security-sensitive working environments? | Yes. |
| 1.35 | **Early-access hardware**: Would an industrial smart-glasses platform supplied through a manufacturer's early-access programme be acceptable, provided it requires no physical modification and can be demonstrated within the project period? | Developer and research smart glasses are acceptable. |
| 1.36 | **Processing arrangements**: Is it acceptable for sensor information to be captured locally and subsequently processed on a companion edge device, rather than requiring the complete 3D reconstruction to take place on the glasses in real time? | In an ideal scenario, we would be looking to establish if the 3D modelling/refinement can be produced in real time, updated during recording.<br><br>However, for the sake of proving the concept if deemed not achievable, a map delivered shortly after recording ends is an acceptable proof of concept. |
| 1.37 | **Acoustic information**: Is the desirable audio requirement intended to encompass supplementary acoustic information presented alongside a reconstructed environment, or is there an expectation | There are two different desirable aims that cover both scenarios you have presented: |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | that acoustic sensing must directly improve the reconstruction process? | *- Demonstrate a proof of concept using audio sensor information to add to reconnaissance information.*<br><br>And<br><br>*- A stretch goal is to combine audio and visual data to overcome common mapping hurdles, such as reflections (which confuse cameras) and solid walls (which block sight).* |
| 1.38 | **Demonstration environment:** Would a representative outdoor built environment be acceptable for demonstrating the essential daytime mapping requirements, or must testing be carried out within a specified urban setting? | A representative outdoor built environment is suitable for prototyping purposes. |
| 1.39 | What form of 3D mapping output does HMGCC expect, and what degree of mapping accuracy or fidelity is required? | There is no preferred output file type, and we want the resulting models to be as accurate as possible. |
| 1.40 | Can additional sensor information be used alongside the smart-glasses camera data to support reconstruction and improve accuracy? | "Can the sensor suite be leveraged to generate reliable 3-D models without additional hardware?" is one of the questions posed by the brief – That answer could be 'no'. Some smart glasses have more than just camera data available as well.<br><br>The core aim of this work is to see what *can* be done with only the sensors on smart glasses, however if this cannot be achieved in that way, the use of a small external module can be permitted. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.41 | What information-security requirements or constraints are expected to apply to the proof-of-concept system? | One of the essential requirements for this challenge is to "*Assess the data generated from smart glasses and provide a report on where the data may go and who may have access.*"<br><br>Also, we would like for the data captured to remain on the device/s until downloaded for example, to eliminate transmission risk. It is the responsibility of the solution provider to ensure no terms and conditions of the glasses manufacturers are breached. |
| 1.42 | What evidence or demonstration criteria will HMGCC use to establish that the solution has achieved TRL4? | It is down to the solution provider to provide the evidence and demonstration to what they believe is TRL 4 (as defined in the link in the challenge form) whilst taking into account the essential and desirable criteria detailed in the challenge form |
| 1.43 | To what extent may supplementary hardware be used with commercial smart glasses, without breaching the challenge's restrictions on modifying or redesigning the glasses? | A local mobile companion device is within scope. A body-worn GPU compute node was not considered in the original planning of the challenge; however, we would welcome that discussion in your proposal.<br><br>The upcoming xreal aura smart glasses for example come with an external puck for processing, so this could be the future of edge processing for smart glasses. |
| 1.44 | Will HMGCC provide any representative datasets for development or testing, and what responsibilities will apply concerning personal data contained within those datasets? | There will be no test site or dataset provided by HMGCC and it is the responsibility of the solution provider to ensure no terms and conditions are breached. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.45 | If access to a selected smart-glasses platform, its sensors or manufacturer development facilities is delayed or restricted, what flexibility is available to substitute alternative devices or research approaches? | The project must finish before the end of this FY (March 2027). The project requires the use of smart glasses to complete. |
| 1.46 | Does HMGCC envisage a particular minimum scale, complexity or spatial extent for the representative urban environment used to demonstrate the TRL4 proof of concept? | Preferably it would be a higher-fidelity model of an urban environment, however this is an exploratory project so it may be that low-fidelity first is the only method with current technology. |
| 1.47 | Does HMGCC expect any quantitative minimum performance thresholds for image quality, geometric accuracy, model completeness or reconstruction repeatability, or may bidders propose and justify their own? | Bidders may propose and justify their own. |
| 1.48 | Are there any prescribed data formats, geospatial standards or interoperability requirements for the reconstructed 3D output? | No. |
| 1.49 | Glasses terms of use. Meta's developer terms for its Wearables Device Access Toolkit prohibit using glasses data for law-enforcement, national-security or intelligence surveillance, and the brief says the glasses' terms must not be breached. Would HMGCC accept a solution that uses only the glasses' built-in recording with offline processing, or one that depends on a written exception from the manufacturer? | It is the responsibility of the solution provider to ensure no terms and conditions are breached. HMGCC will not be seeking exceptions or permissions to breach terms and conditions. We will accept solutions that follows the above conditions. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.50 | Smartphone in the data path. Some consumer glasses can only offload footage through a paired phone and the manufacturer's app, which needs an account. Is a dedicated phone acceptable in the data path, and are there restrictions on accounts or apps on project devices? | A dedicated phone is acceptable. No restrictions, however documenting on where the data may go and who may have access to it is a part of the challenge. |
| 1.51 | Edge device. Should processing be worn, carried, in a vehicle or at base? Are there size, weight or power limits, and is a phone-only setup with an optional edge device acceptable? | Worn. The objects should be discrete. There must be smart glasses involved, and a phone can be linked. |
| 1.52 | Real time. Is real-time feedback to the wearer expected in phase 1, or is mapping after the mission enough to meet TRL 4? | In an ideal scenario, we would be looking to establish if the 3D modelling/refinement can be produced in real time, updated during recording.<br><br>However, for the sake of proving the concept if deemed not achievable, a map delivered shortly after recording ends is an acceptable proof of concept. |
| 1.53 | Ground truth. Will you provide a test site, a reference survey or ground-truth data, or should bidders arrange their own? | Bidders are to arrange their own. |
| 1.54 | Cloud processing. During development, may unclassified test footage be processed on UK-hosted cloud GPUs, or must all processing stay on local hardware? | All processing should stay on local hardware. |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.55 | Multiple manufacturers. For the multi-manufacturer desirable, does a second pair with a lower-resolution camera count if it shows the same approach working end to end? | Yes. |
| 1.56 | Are we free to select the relevant Smart glasses of our choosing or do you have a pre-approved list we need to work from? (noting your constraint statement that you "*are open to a wide range of smart glasses on the market.*") | Bidders can choose. |

## 2.0 Delivery

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1 | Eligibility. Is a UK-registered company with a parent company in a non-sanctioned country eligible to lead? If BPSS or equivalent checks are requested, how are team members based outside the UK handled? | Please see the challenge form for information regarding countries and nationals living and working in countries with restrictions. If the parent company is not in a country subject to embargoes and restrictions then this will be fine |
| 2.2 | Team nationality and clearance. Some of our team are non-UK nationals and will work from Cambridge for the duration of the project. Are there nationality, residency or security clearance requirements for people working on this challenge? | Please see the challenge form for information regarding countries and nationals living and working in countries with restrictions. There are no clearance requirements |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.3 | Budget. Is the £60,000 maximum inclusive or exclusive of VAT? | Ex VAT |
| 2.4 | Is further application guidance available? Beyond the challenge brief and “Challenge- Smart glasses for mapping.pdf”, is any additional guidance or questionnaire available? | No the challenge form has all the guidance required |
| 2.5 | I’d also welcome a steer on whether any funding is available at project start. | Funds for purchasing of equipment pre 12 weeks can be discussed at onboarding but can be incorporated into the contract with agreement from the sponsor and contracting authority |
| 2.6 | **Individual applicants:** Can an individual apply and contract directly in their own name without first establishing a limited company or other registered organisation? The application requirements mention organisation details and a registration number, so I would appreciate confirmation of what is required for a sole innovator. | HMGCC Co-Creation accepts proposals from sole innovators. Applicants intending to contract as a sole trader or self-employed individual are encouraged to provide their Unique Taxpayer Reference (UTR), or equivalent identifier, at the application stage. Should an application progress to award, the appropriate contracting and onboarding arrangements will be discussed and confirmed as part of the standard due diligence and award process. |
| 2.7 | **Payment schedule:** How is the available project budget allocated across the 12-week project? Are milestone payments made throughout delivery, and is any initial payment or advance available to cover equipment and development costs? I understand invoices are subject to the contract's milestone and acceptance requirements. | That is determined by the solution provider and the project plan and sprint durantion. Payments are made on completion of each sprint. There is no advance payment but lead times for purchase of equipment can be incorporated into the contract to avoid delays to the 12 weeks of work for the challenge |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 2.8 | **Budget:** Is the £60,000 maximum available to one solution provider, or is it a total budget shared between successful providers? What typical budget range should an individual applicant propose? | The maximum budget is £60k regardless of the number of solution providers in each consortia. It is up to the solution provider to propose the costs within the budget for completing their work |
| 2.9 | **Intellectual property:** Could you clarify the relationship between the solution provider's ownership of Project IP under clause 10.2, the licence granted to the Funding Party, and the assignment of rights in deliverables under clause 10.5? I would like to understand how reusable software, algorithms and underlying technology are treated compared with challenge-specific reports and outputs. | IP ownership remains with the Solution Provider in accordance with clauses 10.1 and 10.2. Clause 10.5 is included solely to clarify that the licence granted under 10.4, is to the Authority and not to Cranfield University. Upon completion of the Services, Cranfield University has no ownership or licence rights in the Solution Provider's Background IP or Project IP. |
| 2.10 | **Follow-on work:** If the proof of concept meets the requirements, is there a defined process for further paid development or procurement, or would this require a separate decision and contract? | A separate decision and contract if required. It is not guaranteed |
| 2.11 | **Format**: for a slide-based submission, may we include a short link to a demonstration video, and does it count towards the six-slide limit? | It will count towards the 6 slide limit if it is on a slide of its own |
| 2.12 | **Budget**: is the up to £60,000 ex VAT available to each funded solution provider? | The maximum budget is £60k for the challenge regardless of how many solution providers there are in each consortia |
| | | |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |


© Crown Copyright HMGCC 2025

OFFICIAL This information may be exempt under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA) and may be exempt under other UK information legislation. Refer any FOIA queries to the originating department.