Question:

1. What specific investment decisions are currently manual or most painful? 2. What are the 2 or 3 use cases already identified that meet the target outcomes? 3. Which live decision-making forums should the Proof of Concept explicitly support, and who are the primary decision-makers we need to design the systems for? 4. In terms of success, what are the priority metrics for "confidence" and "time saved", and will qualitative evidence, for example leadership testimony, be acceptable? 5. Which datasets are currently assumed to be in scope? 6. In terms of priority datasets, are any known to be particularly sensitive or high-risk? 7. Are there any preferred or restricted Azure services? 8. Are there any constraints on external tooling, for example data build tool (dbt), Fabric (Saas), third-party APIs? 9. Is Power BI the assumed default, or would any other such tool be considered? 10. Are bilingual reporting requirements expected to be demonstrated at the Alpha stage or just designed for? 11. What is the highest data classification level expected in Alpha, and do any of these datasets involve personal or special category data? 12. Are cloud-native services acceptable if data residency is UK/EU? 13. Are there any known red lines on third-party tooling? 14. In terms of audit, what level of auditability is considered "Alpha-appropriate", and are there any existing logging or SIEM integrations we should align to? 15. Will the results of the draft data skills survey be shared at contract start? 16. Are there priority roles/directorates to focus on for the Alpha? 17. Which leadership team members are actively sponsoring this Alpha? 18. Will they participate in show-and-tell or decision sessions? 19. Is there an existing data ownership model we should adapt? 20. How much tolerance is there for lightweight vs formal governance? 21. In terms of delivery, is a sprint-based delivery preferred? 22. Are there fixed review points that Sport Wales expects? 23. In terms of travel expectations, is there any anticipated need for on-site presence? 24. Which locations are most relevant if required? 25. Post-Alpha stage, should scaling options include rough-order costings? 26. Would there be any interest in phased or modular scale-up models?

Answer:

1. There are no specific individual investment decisions that are currently considered problematic, however, developing a joined-up view of investment across sports, geographies, and programmes currently requires manual collation across multiple datasets, and limits the ability to query or analyse that data in a sophisticated or timely way. The Alpha proof of concept is intended to demonstrate how a more integrated and structured data pipeline could improve visibility, reduce manual effort, and support more confident and efficient investment-related conversations.

2. Sport Wales has not defined a fixed list of 2–3 use cases at this stage. An initial priority use case is being refined internally. The final use case(s) and priority questions will be confirmed and agreed collaboratively with the appointed supplier at the outset of Alpha, in line with the intended PoC outcomes set out in the ITT.

3. The Proof of Concept is expected to support investment-related conversations and decision-making across both operational and leadership levels of the organisation, rather than a single defined forum. Primary users are therefore expected to include colleagues within the Investment and Finance functions, alongside senior leadership engaged in reviewing investment evidence. The specific forum(s) used to evidence the PoC outcomes will be agreed during Alpha.

4. As set out in the ITT, the specific baseline measures and success metrics for outcomes such as "confidence" and "time saved" will be agreed collaboratively during the early stages of Alpha. Suppliers may propose appropriate measures, with final success signed-off by Sport Wales before the work begins. A combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence will be acceptable.

5. The datasets currently assumed to be in scope for the Alpha proof of concept are those outlined in earlier clarification responses: a small number of investment-related datasets (including Be Active Wales Fund, Community Investment, and Partner Investment data) alongside relevant contextual data such as Census data. Final dataset selection and scope will be confirmed and agreed collaboratively during Alpha in line with the defined use case and PoC outcomes.

6. Based on current understanding, none of the priority datasets anticipated for the Alpha proof of concept are considered inherently sensitive or high-risk (e.g. special category, healthcare, or national security data).

7.There are no prescribed or restricted Azure services for the Alpha phase. As the full technical stack has not yet been defined internally, suppliers are encouraged to propose the most appropriate services to support the PoC outcomes. All proposed services and architectural choices will be subject to review, governance approval, and technical scrutiny during Alpha mobilisation.

8.There are no predefined restrictions on external tooling for the Alpha phase (e.g. dbt, SaaS platforms such as Fabric, or third-party APIs). Suppliers may propose appropriate tools where they support the effective delivery of the PoC. All proposed tooling will be subject to security, data protection, procurement, and governance review, and must align with Sport Wales' requirements for transparency, knowledge transfer, and potential future replication within our Azure estate

9. Power BI is not assumed to be the default tool for the Alpha phase. The ITT references Power BI "or equivalent" as an example, and suppliers are invited to propose the reporting and visualisation tooling they believe is most appropriate for delivering the Alpha proof of concept, taking into account simplicity, maintainability, scalability, and future internal ownership.

10. Bilingual reporting is not expected to be fully demonstrated during the Alpha proof of concept. However, suppliers should demonstrate how the proposed pipeline, data model, and reporting approach could support bilingual outputs in future phases, should the capability be extended beyond internal use.

11. The datasets anticipated for use within Alpha are expected to fall within standard organisational classifications (e.g. Official), rather than higher protective marking levels. Some datasets may contain limited personal data (for example, contact details associated with applicants or delivery organisations), but no special category data is expected to be required for the purposes of the PoC. All data handling during Alpha will be subject to Sport Wales' data protection, information security, and governance requirements, including appropriate access controls and minimisation principles.

12. Cloud-native services are acceptable for the Alpha phase, provided data residency is within the UK or EU as a minimum requirement. Suppliers must clearly set out data hosting locations and any cross-border data flows. All proposed services will be subject to security, data protection, and governance review prior to approval.

13. Sport Wales does not have predefined "red lines" on third-party tooling for Alpha; however, any proposed tools must meet our security, data protection, procurement, and governance requirements. Where tooling involves data hosting or processing, suppliers should ensure UK or EU data residency as a minimum expectation and demonstrate appropriate security standards (for example ISO/IEC 27001 certification or equivalent controls). Any risks relating to data residency, certification, licensing, or long-term dependency will be assessed as part of technical and commercial review, and any unacceptable constraints would be addressed prior to mobilisation.

14. For Alpha, auditability should be proportionate to a proof-of-concept environment. At a minimum, this would include clear logging of data ingestion activities, user access, configuration changes, and transformation logic sufficient to support transparency, traceability, and learning. There is no requirement at this stage to integrate with an enterprise SIEM platform; however, suppliers should describe how logging and traceability will be implemented and how this approach could scale appropriately in later phases

15. The draft data skills survey has not yet been administered, and therefore there are no results to share at contract commencement. The draft survey questions will be made available to the successful supplier and may be used as a starting point to inform capability assessment during Alpha, if appropriate.

16. There are no formally designated priority directorates for Alpha. However, particular focus is expected on roles linked to Investment and Finance, especially where colleagues control, manage, interpret, or use the datasets in scope for the proof of concept. The core project team will also be a key audience for capability uplift and adoption activity during Alpha.

17. Our Head of Sport System Institute Services and Data is the sponsor for this project.

18.Yes, the project sponsor will participate in show-and-tell sessions and review progress throughout the Alpha phase. They will take an active interest in the project as it unfolds, providing challenge and support, and helping to unblock obstacles where necessary. Where appropriate, the sponsor will also be available to make key high-level decisions required to support delivery and maintain momentum.

19. There is no existing formal data ownership or stewardship model in place that suppliers are expected to adapt. Establishing proportionate and practical data ownership and governance arrangements forms part of the scope of the Alpha phase, and suppliers are expected to propose an approach aligned to the technical pipeline and future scalability.

20. For the Alpha phase, governance arrangements are expected to be proportionate and pragmatic, providing sufficient clarity on ownership, accountability, and data quality without introducing unnecessary bureaucracy. The intention is to establish lightweight but clear foundations that support trust and scalability, rather than implementing a fully formalised or organisation-wide governance model during Alpha.

21. The ITT references sprints to reflect the expectation of an agile, iterative approach during Alpha; however, no specific agile framework or sprint structure is mandated. Suppliers are invited to propose the delivery methodology they believe is most appropriate to achieve the Alpha outcomes within the agreed timeframe and budget, provided it supports iterative learning, transparency, and active risk management.

22. The ITT does not prescribe fixed formal review points beyond the overall delivery timeframe and agreed milestones. However, regular progress reviews, show-and-tell sessions, and active risk management are expected to ensure transparency, maintain momentum, and provide appropriate sponsor oversight. Tenderers should propose a governance and review cadence appropriate to an Alpha phase, aligned with iterative delivery and clear visibility of progress and risk.

23. Sport Wales operates a hybrid working model and expects the majority of engagement during Alpha to be conducted virtually. Limited on-site presence may be beneficial at key points (e.g. project initiation or significant workshops), but any physical attendance would be agreed in advance and should not be assumed as a default requirement.

24. If on-site engagement is required during the Alpha phase, the primary and expected location would be Sport Wales' Cardiff office.

25. Yes, as part of setting out options for scaling beyond Alpha, suppliers are expected to include indicative or rough-order costings alongside implications for architecture, governance, capability, and resourcing. These costings should be proportionate and high-level, intended to inform future decision-making rather than represent detailed implementation budgets.