



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
TAXATION AND CUSTOMS UNION  
Resources  
Taxation systems & IT compliance  
Customs systems & IT operations

Brussels, **06 FEV. 2012**  
TAXUD-R1/TA (2012) 145910

**Subject: Call for tenders TAXUD/2010/AO-13  
Provision of services to cover IT service management for the IT  
systems (ITSM2)**

**- Replies to questions**

Dear Madam, Dear Sir,

You will find in the Annex to this letter the replies to all the questions received up to 3 February 2012.

This letter is being posted on the website of the Directorate General for Taxation and Customs Union, at this URL address.

[http://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/common/tenders\\_grants/tenders/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm)

**Please note that Reply to question no. 54 has been amended.**

Questions received subsequently will be answered in further letters which will be placed regularly on the same website. Prospective tenderers are invited to monitor this site attentively.

**Please note that the deadline for submission of tenders has been extended until 10 February 2012. Therefore, requests for additional information received less than five working days before the closing date for submission of tenders, i.e. after 3 February 2012, will not be processed.**

Paul Herve Theunissen  
Head of Unit

Yours faithfully,

Theodoros Vassiliadis  
Head of Unit

**Question no. 1:**

There is an error in the date of your letter published yesterday: you mention 2011 and I think it must be 2012.

**Reply**

We confirm that there was a typing error in the initial letter of invitation to tender. The deadline for submission of tenders is indeed 27 January 2012 as stipulated in the Contract notice 2011/S 189-308057

(<http://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:308057-2011:TEXT:en:HTML>)

published in the Official Journal of the European Union on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.

The letter of invitation to tender was corrected on 6 October 2011.

**Question no. 2:**

We would like to thank you for the DVD-ROM, that we received last Friday.

After an analysis of its contents, we noticed that the following folders were empty:

- Lot 1:
  - o D:\Lot 1\SB3 – Tools supporting the Services Management
  - o D:\Lot 1\SB11 – Transition
  - o D:\Lot 1\SB12 – Other Deliverables\_Services
- Lot 2:
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.0 Contract OLA Management\WP.0.2 NA
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.0 Contract OLA Management\WP.0.5 Internal QA QC auditing NA
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.0 Contract OLA Management\WP.0.9 Cooperation with Commission during audits NA
  
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.2 Take Over Hand Over NA
  
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.7 Development of TESM tools NA
  
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.1 Service Support\WP.8.1.3\WP.8.1.3.1
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.1 Service Support\WP.8.1.3\WP.8.1.3.4
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.1 Service Support\WP.8.1.3\WP.8.1.3.5
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.1 Service Support\WP.8.1.3\WP.8.1.3.6
  
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.2 Service Delivery per business thread\WP.8.2.1\WP.8.2.1.3
  - o D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.2 Service Delivery per business thread\WP.8.2.2

- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.2 Service Delivery per business thread\WP.8.2.3\WP.8.2.3.1
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.2 Service Delivery per business thread\WP.8.2.3\WP.8.2.3.2\Excise
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.2 Service Delivery per business thread\WP.8.2.3\WP.8.2.3.2\Taxation
  
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.3 Business Perspective\WP.8.3.1\WP.8.3.1.1\Customs
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.3 Business Perspective\WP.8.3.3 NA
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.3 Business Perspective\WP.8.3.4\WP.8.3.4.2\Customs
  
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.1\Excise
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.2\WP.8.4.1.2.1\Excise
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.4\Taxation
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.5\Excise
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.5\Taxation
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.1\WP.8.4.1.6
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.2\WP 8.4.2.4
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.2\WP 8.4.2.5
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.3\WP 8.4.3.1 NA
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.3\WP 8.4.3.2\Excise
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.3\WP 8.4.3.3
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.4 Service Transition & Operation\WP 8.4.3\WP 8.4.3.4
  
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.5 Security Management\WP.8.5.2\Taxation
  
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.6 ICT Infrastructure Management
  
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.7 Planning to Implement Service Management
- D:\Lot2\BASELINE per WP\WP.8 TES Service Management\WP.8.8 Extended time coverage for TES Service Management

- Lot 3

- D:\Lot3

We assume that some folders were meant to be empty (those with a name finishing by NA, that we read as “not applicable”). However, we would like to be sure that it is also normal that the other ones are empty.

May we kindly ask you to confirm our assumptions are correct?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumptions are correct.**

**Question no. 3:**

We have the following question in relation to the potential conflict of interest, described in chapter 4 of the Tendering Specifications.

We are an international company with branches and subsidiaries in various countries. We have an interest in replying to Lot 2 and Lot 3.

One subsidiary A will reply to Lot 3 together with a partner specifically for the financial benchmarking.

Another subsidiary B, which is financially and operationally sufficiently independent from the subsidiary A, will reply to Lot 2 – possibly with a partner.

Subject to a clear description of the operational measures between both subsidiaries to avoid the conflict of interest, could DG TAXUD confirm that this does not imply a conflict of interest?

**Reply**

**DG TAXUD requests the applicants to read very attentively Section 4.2 (Impact on each lot) of the Tendering Specifications and, in particular, the first, third and last paragraphs of this section.**



**Question no. 4:**

In the document "Specifications.pdf" on page 6/18, the Commission states it "requires a strict segregation of duties between the services to be delivered under the ITSM2 contracts and the ones delivered under current contracts signed in the area of taxation and customs IT projects. The tenderers who are involved in the provision of services under any one or several of these current contracts are required to provide the measures that they commit to take in case they would be awarded the contract, in order to provide the Commission with the guarantee of absence of a situation of conflict of interest as specified under Article 94 of the Financial Regulation. The tenderers for whom the measures proposed to avoid the conflict of interest are considered to be, or proved to be, insufficient will be excluded from the award of the contract on the basis of Article 94.a of the Financial Regulation."

**(a)** With respect to the above, could the Commission clarify whether it sees a potential conflict of interest:

- If FITSDEV2 suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lots 1 and/or 2.
- If CUSTDEV2 suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lots 1 and/or 2.
- If CCN suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lots 1 and/or 2.
- If CCN-WAN suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lots 1 and/or 2.
- If TiMea suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lots 1 and/or 2.
- If QA2 suppliers would also be involved in ITSM2 lot 3.
- If ITSM2 Lot 1 and/or Lot 2 suppliers would also be involved in the future CCN2

**Reply**

**In order to guarantee the absence of a situation of conflict of interest in this respect, please, refer to Section 4.1 (Impact on other calls for tenders and/or current contracts) of the Tendering Specifications.**

**(b)** In order to avoid any doubt or ambiguity, could the Commission please clarify in detail the minimum criteria that the measures proposed by involved tenderers need to comply with, in order to be considered or proven sufficient and thus not being excluded on the basis of Article 94.a of the Financial Regulation.

**Reply**

**Refer to Section 4.1 of the Tendering Specifications. It is the tenderer's responsibility to describe in detail, clearly and factually, the compensatory measures he intends to take and explain how each compensatory measure is going to prevent any potential conflict of interest.**

**Tenderers are reminded that a conflict of interest could arise in particular as a result of economic interests, political or national affinities, family or emotional ties or any other relevant connection or shared interest.**

**Tenderers are also reminded that they will inform the contracting authority, without delay, of any situation considered as a conflict of interest or which could give rise to a conflict of interest.**

**Moreover, the Commission reserves the right to check the information related to the declaration of absence of conflict of interest.**

**Question no. 5:**

Is there any conflict of interest between any of the ITSM2 lots and the TIMEA framework contract? More specifically, can a contractor involved in the TIMEA contract take part and be awarded a lot under the ITSM2 contract (as leader or partner of a consortium)?

**Reply**

**Please see above the Reply to Question no. 4 (a).**

**Question no. 6:**

Lot 2 mentions that services are to be provided in compliance with ISO 20000 and ISO 27000. Do tenderers need to provide ISO 20000 and ISO 27000 certifications?

**Reply**

**It is compulsory for tenderers to provide services in compliance with ISO standards 20000 and 27000 or equivalent. It is not compulsory for tenderers to submit ISO 20000 and ISO 27000 certifications.**

**Question no. 7:**

Our company, XXXXXXXX, has got the intention to answer to the call for tenders "TAXUD/2010/AO-13 ITSM II. Under XXXX framework contract xx/xxxxx, XXXXXXXX, has executed a specific contract "SC x xx/xxxxxx" related to some activities linked to this call for tenders. We would like to ask you the express authorization for answering to this opportunity. Could you send us an official advice on this aspect?

**Reply**

**The exclusion and selection criteria provided for this call for tenders are those stipulated in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of the Tendering Specifications and in Sections 9.1 and 9.2 of the Guidebook for Tenderers (Annex IV), which foresee the applicable references regarding conflicts of interests. Refer to replies to questions 3 and 4 as well.**

**Question no. 8:**

Lot 2 - Section 5.5.1 of the technical evaluation asks for a description content of deliverable for 3 work packages (8.3.1.1, 8.2, and 8.4.1). Does this also include the deliverables of the sub-work packages of the three mentioned?

**Reply**

**We understand that you refer to Section 5.1.1 of the Questionnaire and not Section 5.5.1 (as this section does not exist). If that is the case, the description content needs to include the deliverables of the sub-work packages for work packages 8.2, 8.3.1.1 and 8.4.1.**

**Question no. 9:**

Can you please send us a word document or the password which is protecting all .pdf files part of the tendering documentation? For the moment even a search on a word in a file is not possible.

**Reply**

**Pdf documents will not be distributed as word documents. The search functionality in the pdf files functions as intended.**

**Question no. 10:**

For the 2 lots in the questionnaire technical and professional capacity “4.3 tenderer organization and manpower”, we understand that a consolidation of the data of each company needs to be provided for the consortium that will be evaluated as a whole.

**Reply**

**The selection criteria for technical and professional capacity will be assessed in relation to the tendering group as a whole as stipulated in Section 5.1.2 of the Guidebook for Tenderers (Annex IV to the Tendering Specifications).**

**All information to be provided under Section 4 of the Questionnaire is to be considered in relation to the tendering group as a whole.**

**Question no. 11:**

Is the question 4.4.2 about certification of staff to be replied by each company? Or is the reply at the consortium level?

**Reply**

**Question 4.4.2 does not exist in the Questionnaire - Selection of the tenderer - Technical and Professional capacity.**

**Please see second paragraph in Reply to Question no. 10.**

**Question no. 12:**

Is the question 4.5 about methods, process and automated tools to be replied by company? Same question for the 4.6 certificates and measurement.

**Reply**

**Please, see second paragraph in Reply to Question no. 10.**

**Question no. 13:**

Document: invitation.pdf Page 1, Bullet 3.

Tenderers must send their response "no later than 27 January 2011". Assumed is that the invitation should read "no later than 27 January 2012" or will DG TAXUD present another date for response submission?

**Reply**

**Please see reply to Question no. 1**

**Question no. 14:**

Document: annex3a.xls, P.5.2, P.5.3 and P.5.4, Page 1, line 18, 19 and 20.

P5.2, P5.3 and P5.4 seems to be not used in the totals calculation. Assumed math error in the sheet.

**Reply**

**We confirm that there was a mathematical error in the Annex III.A. The Annex III.A: Lot 1: Price table has been corrected accordingly.**

**Question no. 15:**

Document: annex3a.xls, P.OD.1, Page 2, line 79.

P.OD.1 seems to be not used in the totals calculation. Assumed math error in the sheet.

**Reply**

We confirm that there was a mathematical error. Price element P.OD.1 has been moved to the subtotal of on demand services and it is now taken into account in the totals calculation. The Annex III.A: Lot 1: Price table has been corrected.

As a consequence, the section 9.2.44 (page 95) of the Technical Specifications of Lot 1 (Annex II.A.2) must be read as follows:

***"9.2.44 Price Element P.OD.1 - Provision for additional On demand quantities of Continuous Services price elements***

*This is a provision, allocated by DG TAXUD for purchasing additional On Demand quantities of FP services. Price elements that will be purchased from this provision will be subject to management fee depending on the nature of the Continuous Services price element, i.e. management fee may be charged only to the price elements where management fee is to be calculated on the Continuous Service price element."*

**Question no. 16:**

Document: specifications.pdf, Paragraph 4.2, Page 7.

We would like DG TAXUD to confirm the below mentioned assumptions:

Paragraph 4.2, page 7 of the Tendering Specifications states in the last paragraph that tenderers from whom the measures proposed to avoid conflict of interest are considered to be insufficient, will be **excluded** from the award of the contract on the basis of Article 94.a of the Financial Regulation.

None of the questions of the questionnaires of lots 1, 2 and 3 refer to this assessment, so we would like to know in which part of the tender evaluation the assessment of this 'conflict of interest' and the related decision on the **exclusion** of the tenderer will take place.

May one assume that;

(a) the possible **exclusion** is assessed and decided during the award phase and so

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

(b) tenderers that submitted offers for multiple lots in combination with lot 3 (1&3; 2&3 or 1,2&3) and that proposed insufficient measures can still be awarded with a contract for either lot 1; lot 2; lot 1 & 2 or lot 3 alone?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

(c) Furthermore, we would like to better understand what DG TAXUD considers sufficient separation in this context. For example, is offering from a different organizational supplier entity and/or country considered sufficient? Will DG TAXUD please elaborate on this, to avoid misinterpretation?

**Reply**

**Please see reply to Question no. 4 (a)**

**Question no. 17:**

Document: annex3a.xls, Total, Page 3, line 120

Takeover cost seems to be an integral part of the Continuous Services. By comparing tenderers in this way, incumbent providers may have an advantage. Is this observation correct?

**Reply**

**We consider that your observation is not correct. The fact that an advantage may be conferred upon an existing contractor by a running-in phase is not the consequence of any conduct on the part of the contracting authority. The principle that tenderers should be treated equally does not place any obligation upon the contracting authority to neutralize absolutely all the advantages enjoyed by a tenderer.**

**Question no. 18:**

Can tenderers assume that all services to be provided for Lot 1, 2 and 3 should be provided from within the EU boundaries (with the exception of mandatory services that should be provided outside the EU boundaries by nature)?

If (operational) services are allowed to be provided outside the EU boundaries, will DG TAXUD support the shoring of works outside the EU boundaries?

**Reply**

**As stated in the prior information notice (2010/S 159-244931) published on 18.08.2010 in the Official Journal of the European Union, the services will be carried out essentially at the contractor's premises, in one of the 27 Member States, and at the Commission's premises.**

**Question no. 19:**

Document: annex2a2.pdf, Chapter 12.2, Page 116

(a) In 12.2 Languages and translation is stated that during meetings either French or English will be spoken. Can we assume that the selection for the meeting language of preference is a common decision taken by the meeting attendees?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

(b) If there is no agreement on the meeting language, can we assume that English will be spoken?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 20:**

Document: annex2a1.pdf, Chapter 6.4.1.2, Page 162

Volumetric data has been specified in table 19. Can DG TAXUD provide tenderers with a listing of actual ITSM service desk calls placed including the timestamp and selected severity level for one representative day?

**Reply**

**Yes, please refer to the enclosed list. The values should be interpreted according to the definitions outlined in section 6.4.1.1.2 of Annex II.A.1 –Lot 1: Technical Specifications.**

**Question no. 21:**

Document: annex2a1.pdf, Chapter 6.4.1.4, Page 173

Volumetric data has been specified in table 24. Can DG TAXUD provide tenderers with a listing of actual CCN service desk calls placed including the timestamp and selected severity level for one representative day?

**Reply**

**Yes, please refer to the enclosed list. The values should be interpreted according to the definitions outlined in section 6.4.1.3.3 of Annex II.A.1 –Lot 1: Technical Specifications.**

**Question no. 22:**

§6.3.5.3 of the "Guidebook for Tenderers" specifies that replies to the Questionnaire shall not exceed a total of two pages per question. Can you confirm that this limitation on the number of pages is not applicable to Lot 1, and that each response shall be in a single file?

**Reply**

**The tenderers are invited to respect the limitation of two pages per question to the most possible extent. Taking into account the complexity of some questions, in particular in section 5 of the Questionnaire, answers may exceed two pages per question, if deemed necessary by the tenderer.**

**Please note that this limitation does not concern either the supporting documents, as their length can be more than two pages.**



**Question no. 23:**

Annex 2c Technical Specification chapter 2.1. URL <http://www.ogc.gov.uk> given for ITIL reference does not exist anymore. Can you confirm we should use URL: <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/> instead?

**Reply**

**Yes, you should use <http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/> instead.**

**Question no. 24:**

Annex II.C Technical Specifications. Figure 6 includes CCN/WAN2 in Lot 1 "Systems Operation" and CCN/TC in systems development and maintenance. However, in the text underneath, it says CCN/TC will be in ITSM2 Lot1. This is contradictory. Could you confirm?

**Reply**

**There is no contradiction. As described in Annex II.C, Technical Specifications, Section 4 point a) and c) (pages 38 and 39), the future ITSM2 contract is the merge of the current ITSM contract and CCN-operations of the current CCN/TC contract.**

**Question no. 25:**

Annex III.C, Financial Sheet. When filling in the Price of the €/man/day (intramuros) and (extramuros) columns in the "profiles" tab, it only affects the calculations of Task 6.4 (Rows 44 and 45) of the TBP tab and not the calculations of Tasks 2.4, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2 and 6.2 which are also calculated per "man.day of averg. Profile". Could you confirm if this is how this sheet should behave? If yes, could you clarify why there is a difference?

**Reply**

**We can confirm that there was a mistake in the price table. The Annex III.C: Lot 3: Price table has been corrected accordingly.**

**Question no. 26:**

Is VoIP a part of the infrastructure related to BCM?

**Reply**

**No, there is currently no VoIP implementation in DG TAXUD.**

**Question no. 27:**

annex1b.doc, Chapter 5.1.1, Page 18

Bullet 3. Assumption is that the two right columns should write Yes/No and Reference:

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**This document will be amended accordingly.**

**Question no. 28:**

annex1b.doc, Chapter 5.1.2, Page 18

Bullet 1. Assumption is that the two right columns should write Yes/No and Reference:

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**This document will be amended accordingly**

**Question no. 29:**

Please inform us on any contractual obligations concerning the employees who are currently performing the services in case a new provider will take over the contract?

**Reply**

**There are no such contractual obligations.**

**Question no. 30:**

annex1b.doc, Chapter 4.4, Page 15

Seems to be inconsistent. The header states for roles for contract, service, project and quality management. Project management is missing in the Role/CV Block. The Contract and Service Management role is not reflected in attachment 2 page 40 CV front page.

## Reply

Please consider that the following items should be added:

- In section 4.4 of Annex I.B:
  - A 'Project management' line in the Role/CV Block;
  - An additional line with the following question: "Do the CVs for the Project manager show that the proposed persons have the relevant certifications for their role?"
- In the attachment 2 CV front page: two additional boxes: "Project manager", and "Contract manager".

Annex I.B – Lot2: Questionnaire has been amended accordingly.

### Question no. 31:

annex1a.doc, Chapter 4.4, Page 15

The Contract and Service Management role is not reflected in attachment 2 page 35 CV front page.

## Reply

Please consider that the two additional boxes: "Contract manager" and "Service manager" should be added in the attachment 3 CV front page of Annex I.A – Lot1: Questionnaire.

Annex I.A – Lot1: Questionnaire has been amended accordingly.

<b>Annex IC – Lot3: Questionnaire has also been amended</b>
---

### Question no. 32:

annex1a.doc, Chapter 5.2.1, Page 20

Bullet 6. A description of the relationships between the tenderer and external 3rd parties involved in the delivery of the requested services. What is meant by external 3rd parties in this context.

## Reply

**External 3rd parties mean any of the parties the tenderer relies on when delivering the services to DG TAXUD according to the provisions of the contract (e.g. subcontractors, suppliers, etc.).**

**Question no. 33:**

In the 3rd bullet question 4.4. of Annex I.B for Lot2 you ask whether the CVs proposed for the Service manager role are ITIL, or equivalent, certified. Could you please clarify to which ITIL certifications you refer?

**Reply**

**Please note that ITIL is here referred as version 2 or version 3, as specified in Annex II.B.2, sections 0.3 and 2.2. The tenderer should report the ITIL v.2 or v.3 certification that it considers appropriate for the position of Service Manager.**

**Question no. 34:**

In question 4.2.3 of Annex I.B for Lot2 you ask for five recent service contracts in the area of the required services. Could you please let us know what the minimum acceptable contract value for those service contracts is?

**Reply**

**There is no defined minimum acceptable contract value.**

**Question no. 35:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3) and the Guidebook for Tenderers  
Page 11/19 Guidebook for Tenderers, point 6.3.5.3, we understand that we may add max 2 pages for each question to be answered in the Annex I.C. Please clarify if as technical offer we are expected to provide: A) the Annex I.C duly filled in with maximum 2 added pages for each bullet point/question; or B) a new full text file proposal where to answer to all questions of the Annex I.C. and to outline our proposed approach/strategy and organization/methods (and of course to add the Annex I.C filled with the page where each single issue is dealt with in the reference tab).

**Reply**

**Tenderers are invited to duly fill in Annex I.C– Lot 3: Questionnaire. Where it is deemed necessary, answers may be made on a separate sheet and annexed to the questionnaire. Offers must be limited to answers given to the questions in the questionnaire, as outlined in section 6.3.5.1 of Annex IV: Guidebook for tenderers.**

**As far as the limitation of 2 pages is concerned, please also see the reply to Question no. 22.**

**Question no. 36:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3)

Page 6/35 – Section 2 – Exclusion of the tenderer – At the third, eighth, ninth, twelfth bullet points an affidavit is mentioned.

- a) What exactly is meant by affidavit?
- b) Would a declaration on oath signed before a notary public be accepted?
- c) Is it possible to produce only one affidavit mentioning all the relevant points or shall we produce an affidavit for each of the relevant points?

**Reply**

- a) **An affidavit is a declaration in writing made upon oath before a person authorized by law to administer oaths in the country where the affiant is established. By means of an affidavit duly signed, the affiant makes a sworn statement through which he/she certifies that the information provided on it is truthful. A person authorized to administer oaths can be, for example, a notary public, an authorized magistrate, a public officer, a judicial or an administrative authority or a qualified professional body.**
- b) **Yes**
- c) **Please note that the third, eighth, ninth and twelfth bullet points of ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3) – Page 6/35 – Section 2 – Exclusion of the tenderer coincide respectively with sub-paragraphs (3), (6), (7) and (8) of point 9.1 (Phase 1: Exclusion) of the "Guidebook for Tenderers". As suggested in the referred "Questionnaire", please refer to the indications given the "Guidebook" (page 15, second bullet point) in this connection. Depending on who is taking responsibility for the affidavit and the person or body authorized in your country to issue it, you can either produce one affidavit for the whole relevant points or one affidavit per relevant point.**

**Question no. 37:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3)

Page 6/35 – Section 2 Exclusion of the tenderer – Sixth bullet point. In certain countries, extract from the judicial record generally refers to administrative offence, and there is no specific official document serving as evidence for judgments on fraud, corruption, etc. Would you still accept an extract from the judicial record as evidence of the sixth bullet point (which would be the same document as for bullet point two for this)? Or otherwise please specify.

**Reply**

**If, according to the law of the country where you are established, extract from the judicial record generally refers to administrative offence and there is no specific official document serving as evidence for judgments on fraud, corruption, the answer is yes. For more details, please refer to point 9.1 (Phase 1: Exclusion) of the "Guidebook for Tenderers".**

**Question no. 38:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3)

Page 8/35 – Section 3 Selection of the Tenderer – economic and financial capacity – fifth bullet point. Is the possibility to rely on the capacities of other entities only in consideration with the economic and financial capacity requested or is it also possible with regard to the technical and professional capacity?

**Reply**

**No. This possibility relates only to the economic and financial capacity.**

**Question no. 39:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3)

Page 9/35 – Section 4 Selection of the Tenderer – Technical and professional capacity – point 4.2.1

- a) The list of services provided in the past years should be one for the consortium as a whole or one for each member of a consortium?
- b) In case only one list can be provided, does the rule of the two pages apply? (i.e. should the list be on two pages max?)
- c) Can the two pages be printed on both sides or on one side only?

**Reply**

- a) **As per page 3 of Annex I.C – Lot 3: Questionnaire, sections 3 to 6 must be filled in on behalf of the group of tenderers, i.e. for the consortium as a whole.**
- b) **Yes**
- c) **Yes. the two pages can be printed on both sides of a single sheet or on one side only.**

**Question no. 40:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3) and the Guidebook for tenderers

Page 11/35 – Section 4.3.1 Description of your organization – first three bullets:

- a) Do these bullets have to be answered by each member firm of the consortium or by the consortium as a whole?
- b) In this latter case, the structured chart of the organization (bullet point 1) should be an explanation of how the consortium will work and therefore not an organisational chart of each of the companies in a consortium?

**Reply**

- a) Please see reply to Question no. 10.
- b) Yes, we can confirm that your understanding is correct.

**Question no. 41:**

ANNEX I.C Questionnaire (Lot 3) and the Guidebook for tenderers  
Page 14/35 – Section 4.4 Qualifications and experience of the managerial staff – In our understanding, the CV to be provided under this tender procedure are min. 3 – max 5 in total, covering three professional profiles (contract management, project management, quality management). Is our understanding correct? Or you meant minimum 9 maximum 15?

**Reply**

**The minimum 3, maximum 5 requirements refers to each role. Therefore, a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 20 CV references must be provided.**

**This reply also applies to Lot1 and Lot2**

**Question no. 42:**

annex2a1.pdf, Chapter 6.4.1.2, page 162

Thank you for providing tenderers with the requested ITSM incidents Volumetric data. Could DG TAXUD please add the first service desk intake message (problem statement) per logged request to the presented Volumetric data? Original question: Volumetric data has been specified in table 19. Can DG TAXUD provide tenderer with a listing of actual ITSM service desk calls placed including the timestamp and selected severity level for one representative day?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the enclosed list of incidents along with their description as requested in the service management tool. Please note that further information cannot and will not be disclosed for confidentiality and security reasons.**

**The referred file (Sample-ITSM-SC-24-10\_list.pdf) has been published on the website of Directorate General for Taxation and Customs Union**

**Question no. 43:**

annex2a1.pdf, Chapter 6.4.1.4, page 173

Thank you for providing tenderers with the requested CCN-TC incidents Volumetric data. Could DG TAXUD please add the first service desk intake message (problem statement) per logged request to the presented Volumetric data? Original question: Volumetric data has been specified in table 24. Can DG TAXUD provide tenderer with a listing of actual CCN service desk calls placed including the timestamp and selected severity level for one representative day?

**Reply**

**Please see above the Reply to Question no.42.**

**The referred file (Sample-CCNTC-SC-24-10\_list.pdf) has been published on the website of Directorate General for Taxation and Customs Union**

**Question no. 44:**

Annex 1.A "Questionnaire", section 4.4

Although a clear statement is made in section 4.4, a number of additional statements and references related to CVs are made later in the questionnaire. Can the Commission please confirm that only the CVs requested in section 4.4 (a maximum of 20 CVs) are required to be submitted by the tenderer?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 45:**

Could the Commission please clarify the apparent contradiction between Annex II.a.1, section 6.1.1.2 which indicates that the quoted staff numbers for Applications Management cover both Lots 1 & 2 and Annex II.a.2, section 10.1 which states that the quoted staff numbers concern only Lot 1.

**Annex II.a.1 – 6.1.1.2 VOLUMETRIC [AS IS ITSM] p. 95 Table 6: Staff distribution of the ITSM team**

Team Application Management (AM) & Testing

Members: 32

Notes: About 5 TAXUD FTEs are still providing services which should be delivered by the contractor

The above table lists the number of staff for the totality of incumbent ITSM activities. Their split between future ITSM2 Lot1, ITSM2 Lot2 cannot be provided.



**Annex II.a.2 – 10 ANNEX I / 10.1 Contractor Team size p. 97**

**Volumetric adjustments**

This section contains "corrections" to volumetric raw data provided in the "As is" document, [R1]. This "corrected" volumetric data is to be used by the **ITSM2 Lot1** contractor in its tender.

**10.1 Contractor Team size**

DG TAXUD considers that the **Application management team** within the incumbent ITSM organisation is **understaffed**, which leads to underperformance. DG TAXUD estimates that the headcount should be increased from the current **32 to 42 (+10)**.

**Reply**

**There is no contradiction. Section 6.1.1.2 of Annex II.A.1 lists the totality of the current ITSM functions. The volumetric adjustments applicable to "Application Management" (which is part of lot 1 only) apply fully.**

**Question no. 46:**

Annex 1b "Lot 2 Questionnaire", Question 4.4 "Qualifications and experience of the managerial staff"

- a) Can you please clarify whether it is mandatory the Service Managers to be ITIL certified?
- b) If yes, can you please confirm that any type of ITIL certification (foundation, practitioner, etc.) is adequate?

**Reply**

- a) **A relevant certification for the Service Manager is mandatory, being ITIL or equivalent.**
- b) **Please see above the Reply to Question no.33.**

**Question no. 47:**

Annex 1b "Lot 2 Questionnaire", Question 4.6.2 "Maturity level"  
Can you please confirm that the relevant CMMI maturity models for this contract are both CMMI for Services and CMMI for Development, thus a maturity level report in either model covers the requirements of DG TAXUD?

**Reply**

**The relevant CMMI maturity model for this contract is CMMI for Services.**

**Question no. 48:**

Annex2a2, section 4 Take-over Strategy

Is the Commission able to provide draft versions of the hand-over-plans from the incumbent ITSM and CCN contractors, in order to support tenderers in preparing their responses?

**Reply**

**These plans will not be available before the submission deadline. On the basis of the information provided in section 4 of Annex II.A.2, the tenderers are invited to prepare an offer.**

**Question no. 49:**

In the invitation letter it is mentioned that “the tenders must be signed by the tenderer or this duly authorised representative”. Could the commission confirm that it is sufficient to sign the last page of the technical and financial proposals, and the cover letter?

**Reply**

**We confirm, it is sufficient for the tenderer or his duly authorized representative to sign the covering letter, as indicated in point 6.4.2 of the document "Guidebook for Tenderers".**

**Question no. 50:**

We would like a couple of clarifications regarding the reply to question 22 in the document “replies to questions”.

- a). Does the reply also apply to Lot2?
- b). Do the supporting documents mentioned in the second paragraph of the reply only correspond to the supporting documents mentioned in section “6.4.3. *Elements to be separated from the rest of the offer*” (“(1) *Any financial quotation and its supporting documents*”) of the guide book and... therefore there are no other supporting documents in addition to the annexes allowed by section “6.3.5.3. *Your answers must be concise and clearly drafted*”?

**Reply**

- a). **Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**
- b). **No.**

**Question no. 51:**

Can the commission please provide the exact name and quantity of the MW's operated by ITSM, which are in scope?

**Reply**

Assuming that by MW's you mean middleware (or COTS – commercial off-the-shelf software as referred to in the tendering specifications), please find below the requested quantities.

<b>Adobe Acrobat</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>AIX</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Altova XMLSpy</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Apache Httpd</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Borland VisiBroker</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Checkpoint Management</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Citrix</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Crystal Reports Basic for Visual Studio</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HostMonitor 7.5 Enterprise</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HP Connect-IT</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>HP Service Manager</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>IBM XL C/C++ Enterprise Edition for AIX</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Jahia</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Java Development Kit</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Java Runtime Environment</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Linux</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Microsoft Exchange 2007</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Microsoft ISA Server</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Microsoft SQL Server</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Microsoft SQL Server Desktop Engine</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Microsoft Visual Studio</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Microsoft Windows Server</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>Microsoft Windows Server DHCP Management Pack</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Microsoft Windows Server DNS Management Pack</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>MKS Toolkit</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>mysql</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Networker</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Oracle RDBMS</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Oracle Web Tier</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>postgres</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Quest Management Pack Oracle Agent</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Quest MessageStats</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Rational Functional Tester</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Rational Test Realtime</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Redix AnyToAny XML Format Converter Engines</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Redix Server-Based Engine Client</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Solaris</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Sun Java System Directory Server</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Sun ONE Web Server</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Sun Solaris</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Sun Studio</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>System Center Operations Manager</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Tomcat</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Trend Micro OfficeScan</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Tuxedo</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Veritas Storage Foundation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>VM Ware ESX Server 3.5 Update 3 ENTERPRISE</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>VMWARE VirtualCenter Server</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Weblogic</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Windows 2003 Terminal Server</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>X1 Server Health Check</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>XMLSpy Suite</b>	<b>1</b>

**Full inventory hardware can be found in document R298 ITSM Tools of the Baseline (Annex XI).**

**Question no. 52:**

Can the commission please provide the exact name and quantity of the MW's operated by CCN/TC, which are in scope?

## Reply

Assuming that by MW's you mean middleware (or COTS – commercial off-the-shelf software as referred to in the tendering specifications), please find below the requested quantities.

### Quantities for the CCN Technical Centre site (production environment):

Microsoft win2k8R2	5
Microsoft win2k8R2 terminal server (10CALs)	1
Microsoft MS office	2
IBM tivoli 3 agent pack RVU	14
Juniper NSM	4
Oracle DB	4
Oracle msg svr	1
Trendmicro IMSS	1
Redhat rh6 enterprise	13
Atlassian Jira enterprise	1
VMWare (Virtual Center)	1
VMWare (VSPHERE)	3 hosts
BackupExec	1

### Quantities for 1 CCN gateway (see also Annex II.A.1, Section 6.5.1.4 for the number of gateways):

Tuxedo	1
WebSphere MQ	1
Apache	1
Curl	1
Expat	1
gzip	1
Apache Tomcat	1
Libapreq	1
Lynx	1
OpenLDAP	1
OpenSSL	1
Perl	1
PostgreSQL	1
Sudo	1

<b>C Compiler</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>xinetd</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Sun One Directory Server</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Java</b>	<b>1</b>

**Full inventory COSTS can be found in document R178 CCNTC of the Baseline (Annex XI).**

**Question no. 53:**

Can the commission please provide the exact number of the database instances which are in scope?

**Reply**

**Please find below the number and size (in GB) of databases. The names of the databases cannot and will not be disclosed for security reasons.**

<b>DB1</b>	<b>26,1</b>
<b>DB2</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>DB3</b>	<b>464</b>
<b>DB4</b>	<b>92,2</b>
<b>DB5</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>DB6</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>DB7</b>	<b>448</b>
<b>DB8</b>	<b>6,2</b>
<b>DB9</b>	<b>3,1</b>
<b>DB10</b>	<b>5,5</b>
<b>DB11</b>	<b>3,7</b>
<b>DB12</b>	<b>6,5</b>
<b>DB13</b>	<b>9,1</b>
<b>DB14</b>	<b>1,7</b>
<b>DB15</b>	<b>1,3</b>
<b>DB16</b>	<b>1,3</b>
<b>DB17</b>	<b>3,2</b>
<b>DB18</b>	<b>3,5</b>
<b>DB19</b>	<b>3,3</b>
<b>DB20</b>	<b>3,2</b>
<b>DB21</b>	<b>1,6</b>

DB22	9,1
DB23	2,4
DB24	7
DB25	10,2
DB26	8,5
DB27	9,7
DB28	5
DB29	87,8
DB30	143,6
DB31	69,3
DB32	176,3
DB33	499,4
DB34	465,4
DB35	159,7
DB36	163,9
DB37	146
DB38	202,6
DB39	64,6
DB40	75,3
DB41	79
DB42	79
DB43	219,8
DB44	211,5
DB45	29,6
DB46	35,8
DB47	179,9
DB48	485,5
DB49	81,5
DB50	92,3
DB51	28,2
DB52	337
DB53	337
DB54	129
DB55	133
DB56	18
DB57	23

DB58	15
DB59	17
DB60	56
DB61	48
DB62	53
DB63	46
DB64	200
DB65	296
DB66	45
DB67	63
DB68	74
DB69	53
DB70	240
DB71	24
DB72	104
DB73	103
DB74	10

**Question no. 54:**

Can the commission please provide the names, versions, and size of each database instances which are in scope?

**Reply**

Please see above the Reply to Question no. 53. Names of databases cannot and will not be disclosed for security reasons. 95 % of all Oracle instances are 10.2.0.4; 5% are 11.2.0.2. Throughout 2012, all databases will be migrated to 11.2.0.2.

**Question no. 55:**

Can the commission please provide the number of running/defined jobs?

**Reply**

The estimated number of jobs managed by ITSM is 160 (covering both DIGIT and ITSM hosted systems). Another 80 jobs are application specific (e.g. extraction of data to public website, extractions of data for Member States, etc.). For CCN, each gateway runs approximately 33 jobs.



**Question no. 56:**

Can the commission please provide the number of the environments where the jobs are running?

**Reply**

**For ITSM, the majority of jobs (90%) are running in the Production and Conformance environment (to a lesser extent in PSAT and SAT environment). The CCN jobs run on both gateways (production and backup gateway).**

**Question no. 57:**

Can the commission please provide the number of incidents, changes and problems of the jobs?

**Reply**

**These quantities are unknown. It must nonetheless be noted that these jobs are stable and produce a low number of incidents.**

**Question no. 58:**

Can the commission please provide Attended operational time of the jobs?

**Reply**

**These quantities are unknown. Most of the jobs are automated and send reports to the ITSM or CCN/TC monitoring teams. The attended operational time for the management of the jobs is limited and mostly spent on the verification of jobs run by the applications.**

**Question no. 59:**

In the second set of the answers published by the Commission on the 9th of November, question n. 16 seems to be incomplete. Could the Commission provide us the full text of the question?

**Reply**

**We can confirm that the full text of question no. 16 has already been provided. The answers are given to each point of the question.**

**Question no. 60:**

Anex II.A.2 Section 4: Take Over Strategy

Can the commission please confirm that the incumbent suppliers will permit the physical presence within their premises of the new suppliers personnel for Knowledge Transfer during Take Over?

**Reply**

**Yes, for the activities that will be delivered at the incumbent contractor' premises. As indicated in the take-over strategy, the take-over phase will be achieved via training, information sessions, access to playgrounds, etc. Some activities will be delivered at the incumbent contractors' premises, some on the premises of the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor, some at DG TAXUD.**

**Question no. 61:**

ITS-IFQP-SC04-Framework Quality Plan v1.04\_TAXUD.pdf

The FQP available is from 22/03/2010. Is there a later version that the Commission can provide for bidders?

**Reply**

**The FQP provided in the baseline is the last version.**

**Question no. 62:**

Annex II.A.2, TO BE, p. 32, section 5.1.1. indicates that the current service window for CCN/TC is 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. However [R40] CCN SLA, indicates (sections 1.5.2.1 - Availability of Service Desk; 1.5.4.1, Availability of the Web Server; 1.5.4.2.1 - Individual CCN/CSI site availability; 1.5.4.2.2 Overall System Availability) that the availability is measured during the reporting period from Monday to Friday, i.e. 5 days a week. Can you explain this apparent contradiction?

**Reply**

**There is no contradiction. The current service window for CCN/TC is 7 days a week, while the SQI is based only on the working hours from Monday to Friday.**

**Question no. 63:**

Referring to Annex II.A.2, To-Be, pp 124 & 125, section 13.10.1, SQI-001 calculation, Step 3 reads first "The lowest daily value calculated in step 2 Is used to profile the SQI" and the second time "Calculate the average the results of Step 2,  $SQI = AVERAGE(\text{daily values calculated in step 2})$ ". What calculation method should be adopted at Step 3 of the SQI calculation, the lowest daily value or the average on all monthly values?

**Reply**

**We confirm that there is an error.**

**As a consequence, section 13.10.1 (page 125) of the Technical Specifications of Lot 1 (Annex II.A.2) must be read as follows:**

***"Step 3: Calculate the lowest of the results of Step 2***

***SQI = LOWEST(daily values calculated in step 2)"***

**Question no. 64:**

Annexe I.A Questionnaire

Can the commission please confirm that the client reference contacts to be entered into the table in section 4.2.1 (questionnaire page 10) should refer to the same Service References provided in section 4.2.3?

**Reply**

**Yes, we can confirm that your assumption is correct.**

<p><b>This reply also applies to Lot2 and Lot3</b></p>
--

**Question no. 65:**

Would the Commission be prepared to consider a limit of liability not only for consequential loss and/or indirect damage, but also for direct damages?

**Reply**

**No. Please refer to the General conditions of the framework contract for IT services and products (Article II.2. – Liability).**

**Question no. 66:**

Annex II.A.2, requirement 9.2.21, Page 87

Could you please elaborate on the Tier 4 requirement as specified in 9.2.21? A Disaster recovery site (Tier 4 level) should be provided to complement the Main and Backup data centre. Would a Tier 3 level be sufficient in the context of Disaster Recovery?

**Reply**

As described in Annex 1 of the DC Consolidation approach (baseline document R333), Tier 4 means the following:

**"Tier 4: Point-in-time copies**

Tier 4 solutions are used by businesses that require both greater data currency and faster recovery than users of lower tiers. Rather than relying largely on shipping tape, as is common on the lower tiers, Tier 4 solutions begin to incorporate more disk based solutions. Several hours of data loss is still possible, but it is easier to make such point in- time (PiT) copies with greater frequency than tape backups even when electronically vaulted."

And we confirm that a Tier 4 Disaster Recovery site is needed, as per section 9.2.21 of the Technical Specifications of Lot 1 (Annex II.A.2).

**Question no. 67:**

Annex I.A, questionnaire for lot 1:

In the question 4.2.1 it is requested to provide "evidence to be in the form of certificates issued or countersigned by the competent authority" – Do you consider that the publication of the award notice published in the TED or an official gazette is a valid evidence and can be considered as a certificate?

**Reply**

No, an award notice published in the TED or an official gazette are not considered as certificate as it does not constitute a valid evidence.

**This reply also applies to Lot3**

**Question no. 68:**

Annex I.A, questionnaire for lot 1:

In the question 4.2.3 can we use a project (PRF) of one of the General Directorate of the European Commission (we understand well that departments, divisions, directorates, etc. are regarded as the same customer)?

**Reply**

Yes. Note that the departments of the Commission are referred as the same and sole customer.

**This reply also applies to Lot3**

**Question no. 69:**

Annex I.A, questionnaire for lot 2:

Same question, for the question 4.2.1. can the award publication of the TED or an official gazette be considered as a certificate of the authority and be a valid evidence?

**Reply**

**No. Please refer to the reply to question no. 67.**

**Question no. 70:**

Annex I.A, questionnaire for lot 2:

In the question 4.2.3 can we use a service delivered (SRF) to one of the General Directorate of the European Commission (we understand well that departments, divisions, directorates, etc. are regarded as the same customer)?

**Reply**

**Yes. Please refer to the reply to question no. 68.**

**Question no. 71:**

We are considering a US based company as subcontractor. All services provided by this potential subcontractor will be delivered from EU member states. We would like to understand if the US Patriot Act would prevent us from using this potential US based subcontractor in operations that include the processing of DG TAXUD data.

**Reply**

**Given the general nature of the question, the Commission does not see, at this stage, any reason why the US Patriot Act should prevent a US subcontractor from participating in this call for tenders.**

**It is the responsibility of the contractor to ensure that confidentiality is observed with regard to all facts, information, documents, members of the contractor's staff or any other matter communicated to the contractor or which come to the contractor under the provisions of the contract (Please refer to Article II.16 – Confidentiality - of the Framework Contract for Informatics services and products).**

**Question no. 72:**

Annex II.A.2, requirement 9.2.23, Page 88

DG TAXUD requires services like Shipping, Translation as well as Mark-Up on COTS, HW, Maintenance and Decommissioning (Price Element P.5.16). To present DG TAXUD with the best pricing and services we may want to use our preferred service and/or reselling partners. Do we need to specify these service and/or reselling partners as subcontractors or is it sufficient to name our current partners of preference for these services?

**Reply**

**We confirm that reselling partners are not subcontractors; therefore their services do not have to be specified in the offer.**

**Question no. 73:**

Annex I.A "Questionnaire", Attachment 5

"the tenderer must use spreadsheet file "ITSM2 TAXUD-2010-AO-013-Price-Table-Lot1.xls".

The RfP does not include this file but includes a spreadsheet file "06\_annex3a-LOT1.xls".

Can the Commission please confirm that "06\_annex3a-LOT1.xls" is the pricing table that should be used?

**Reply**

**Yes we can confirm.**

**Question no. 74:**

Annex I.C. section 4.4: TAXUD asks for CV's to cover the profiles project management, quality management and contract management. Are the numbers (3-5CV's) meant per function or a total over the three listed functions (max 5 CV's or total of max 15CV's covering all three profiles)?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 41.**

**Question no. 75:**

Annex I.C. section 4.4: TAXUD requires to cover experience of all COTS used by TAXUD: Does this imply that the bidder needs to submit also CV's in addition to the managerial CV's (project manager, quality and contract management) covering the profiles like Senior Security Officer - (SSO), Senior Architect - (ARCH), Security Expert - (SEC) and other as outlined in the profiles tab of Annex III.C?

**Reply**

**The tenderers have to submit CVs for the managerial staff only. The CVs for the managerial staff have to demonstrate that the proposed persons have the required experience.**

**Question no. 76:**

Annex I.C section 4.2.1: TAXUD requires number of service contracts served: does TAXUD expect that in case of a joint bid between partners separate list of service contracts for each party or a total of service contracts covering all parties?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 39.a).**

**Question no. 77:**

Annex I.C section 4.2.2: TAXUD requires service contract sizes: Does TAXUD expect that in case of a joint bid that this numbers are broken down per party or as a total over all partners?

**Reply**

**All information to be provided under Section 4 of the Questionnaire is to be considered in relation to the tendering group as a whole.**

**Question no. 78:**

In the baseline documentation on the CD, the Lot 3 folder was empty but not marked as NA. Is this correct?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 2.**

**Question no. 79:**

Annex II.C, section 6.6.1: task 6.1 is listed as Fixed price. In section 6.6.2.2 of the same document, it is described as on demand. Which is correct?

**Reply**

**We confirm that section 6.6.2.2 is correct. Therefore, the Section 6.6.1 must be read as follows:**

*"The services covered under this section are:*

- *Task 6.1 - Trainings, Workshops and Demonstrations – (cf. Section 6.6.2.1.1) – (OD)*
- *Task 6.2 - Service improvement initiatives – (cf. Section 6.6.2.1.2) – (OD)*
- *Task 6.3 – Missions – (cf. Section 6.6.2.1.3) – (OD)*
- *Task 6.4 - Other ad hoc services and deliverables in the scope of ITSM2 Lot3 – (cf. Section 6.6.2.1.4) – (OD)"*

**Question no. 80:**

Annex II.C section 7.4 List of Deliverable Services: Some entries (for example Task ID 2.1) include term "Request + 2 working days, Mutual Agreement". Does this mean "Request + 2 working days, unless mutually agreed otherwise"? Or does it mean that the SLA of "request +2 working days" only applies if by mutual agreement?

**Reply**

**We confirm that it means "request + 2 working days", unless mutually agreed otherwise.**

**Question no. 81:**

Annex II.C section 8.11.2: the liquidated damages calculation due for the reporting months can only rise max of 20% of value with the exception of the final handover. However, further text indicates 100% as maximal cap (for Continuous Services and on demand delivery)? Is this correct?

**Reply**

**We confirm that section 8.11.2 of Annex II.C: Lot 3 – Technical Specifications is correct. The cap of 100% refers to the amount to be paid by the Commission only for the delivered continuous services, not to the value of the others services of the Specific Contract.**



**Question no. 82:**

Annex II.C Section 7.4: describes a planning for D.1.7.1 and D.1.7.2 of "at least twice a year" as section 6.1.2.1.7 describes it as "at least once a year". Which of both statements is correct?

**Reply**

**We confirm that section 6.1.2.1.7 of Annex II.C: Lot 3 – Technical Specifications, is correct, i.e. D.1.7.1 and D.1.7.2 have to be prepared *at least once a year*.**

**Question no. 83:**

Annex II.C Section 7.4: For D.1.9.1 (FQP), the planning states "SC01 T0 + 4 months for acceptance". For D.1.10.1 (CQP), the planning only states 'D.1.9.1'. Is it correct to assume that the planning for CQP's should be understood as "SCxx T0 + 4 months for acceptance"?

**Reply**

**Yes, we confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 84:**

Lot 3 of the tender

According to our understanding the services to be provided are 30% intramuros, meaning at the premises of DG TAXUD, and 70% extramuros, meaning outside the premises of DG TAXUD and possibly at the premises of the tenderer. Is our understanding correct? Or should the 70% extramuros services be carried out by Brussels (or surrounding area) based team experts, in order to allow meeting and contacts with the relevant experts from LOT 1 and 2?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your understanding is correct. Intramuros experts must work at the premises of DG TAXUD, while extramuros experts' work will be primarily performed at the contractor's premises, allowing to respect the contractor's obligation to be at the disposal of the DG TAXUD staff at half a day notification, as per section 5.1.1 of Annex II.C: Lot 3 – Technical Specifications.**

**Question no. 85:**

Lot 3 of the tender

Please clarify if the allocated budget of 13.000.000 (20% more or less) is in relation only to the three years duration of the framework contract. Or if it refers also to the 1 + 1 years of possible extensions.

**Reply**

**The total estimated value refers to the maximum duration of the framework contract, that is to say, five years.**

**Question no. 86:**

Lot 3 of the tender

Could you please confirm that the maximum possible budget allocated for this framework contract on which to base contractor's financial offer is 15.600.000?

**Reply**

**No, we do not confirm. As indicated in the Contract Notice, the total estimated value for Lot 3 is EUR 13 000 000 +/- 20%. Please note that estimated value does not correspond to budget allocated.**

**Question no. 87:**

Lot 3 of the tender

Could you please confirm that for the 10 profiles (described at point 9 "staff profiles" of the Technical Specification Annex II.C) we do not have to provide CVs, except for the 3 profiles mentioned at point 4.4 of the Questionnaire, Annex I.C. Otherwise please clarify.

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 75.**

**Question no. 88:**

I have a question on clause 5 of the ITSM Guidebook for tenderers.

Under clause 5.1.3 it is mentioned that partners can sign a "power of attorney" in order to give formal status to their collaboration. Can you please explain how that works and what actions need to be taken under Belgian law?

Is this something that the partners need to do prior to participating to the tender or can they formalise this at a later stage, prior to the signature of the contract?

**Reply**

**The power of attorney is not necessary at the tendering phase, even if it is possible. However, it is mandatory prior to the signature of the contract.**

**Question no. 89:**

Annex I.A Section 4.2.1

Where services have been provided to contracting authorities, would the Commission consider a "Contract Award Notice" to be a certificate issued or countersigned by the competent authority?

**Reply**

**No. Please refer to the replies to questions no. 67 and 69.**

**Question no. 90:**

Annex.II.A.2 Section 4.1.1 Table 3

Can the Commission please confirm that Stage 3 of Service Acceptance Criteria will occur after the new supplier has taken on live running of DG-TAXUD services and has demonstrated Steady State running of all Services?

**Reply**

**As indicated in section 4.1.1, the responsibility covered by each step is transferred from the incumbent to the new contractor. The readiness of the new contractor is assessed and accepted at the end of each step.**

**Question no. 91:**

Annex I.A Section 5.3.2 Strategy of take-over from the current hosting infrastructure

Can the Commission please advise whether the response to this section should describe the strategy to take-over an as-is service (i.e. assuming services are already running in the two new Luxembourg data centres), or whether it should describe the strategy to migrate services from the existing DIGIT & incumbent data centres to the two new Luxembourg data centres plus the new DR data centre?

**Reply**

**Referring to the reference document "R333 DC Consolidation approach" of the baseline and section 5.2.5 of Annex II.A.1 – Lot 1: Technical Specifications, the tenderer must describe his strategy for implementing phase 2 of the data centre consolidation project.**

**Question no. 92:**

R40 CCN TC SLA, 1.5.2.4 USER SATISFACTION, Page 27

The Service Quality integrator TC\_SQI\_004\_A User Satisfaction is set at 100% user satisfaction with a limit of one complaint. Can DG TAXUD please explain what the parameters are that will define a formal complaint?

**Reply**

**A formal complaint is an issue or problem about a service not being provided according to the provisions laid down in the contract. It is reported by a service requestor (i.e. a person/organisation using one of the CCN/TC services; this can be an internal TAXUD user, a user in the Member States, etc.) and is to be duly formulated and substantiated by facts. Such issue/problem is considered as a complaint if it is mutually recognised and agreed as being a complaint by DG TAXUD and the Service Provider (CCN/TC in this case) during the bilateral monthly meeting.**

**Question no. 93:**

Annex II.A.2, Paragraph 5.2.12, Page 60

The ITSM Lot1 contractor is requested to exploit virtual training classes and/or e-learning tools/techniques to improve the training offer. The pricing list for Service Block 12 however does not contain elements that align with e-learning development and delivery. The paragraph suggests to define the services under 'other Framework and Specific contracts'. Please explain backgrounds and requirements of other Framework and Specific contracts, and the way exploitation of virtual training classes and/or e-learning tools/techniques should be captured there.

**Reply**

**Service Block 12 price element only covers classical classroom training with physical presence of the participants. E-learning trainings will indeed be developed with on demand services covered by the price element 13.1 – Provision for other services and deliverables not specified elsewhere. The online collaboration platform (PiCS) existing in DG TAXUD under other framework and specific contracts is based upon Dupal.**

**Question no. 94:**

Annex II.B.2, Paragraph 5.2.12, Page 53 and 54

In WP.8.3.2.5 the ITSM Lot2 contractor is requested to provide training/workshops on request. The description of the work package implies classroom delivery only, and leaves no room for leverage of learning services by means of virtual training classes and/or application of e-learning tools/techniques. Please explain how exploitation of virtual training classes and/or e-learning tools/techniques can be captured in the offering.

## Reply

**The scope of the WP.8.3.2.5 potentially includes training delivered in the format of virtual training, but it does not include e-learning.**

## Question no. 95:

Tendering Specifications 6.3.2

Section 6.3.2 of the tendering specifications states:

“Only the following prices may be subject to revision on the basis of indexation:

Annual software licences,

Product maintenance that is calculated at a fixed price expressed in an absolute,

Prices or fees related to *Services*.”

Can the Commission confirm that all prices provided in annex3a.xls may be considered to fall within the scope of point (3) and are therefore subject to indexation.

## Reply

**We confirm that your assumption is correct, except for the provisions set by DG TAXUD, i.e.**

- **Price element 12.5 – Provision allocated by DG TAXUD for transformations**
- **Price element 12.6 – Provision allocated by DG TAXUD for Infrastructure (hardware, software, maintenance), data centre renting and related services**
- **Provision to cover travel costs and subsistence**

## Question no. 96:

Page 10/35 – Section 4 Selection of the tenderer – Technical and Professional capacity  
For point 4.2.2 “Services contract sizes”, our understanding is that we should list all relevant service contracts covering 2009 and 2010 with a value of over € 0,5 Mio Euro.  
For point 4.2.1 “client references” our understanding is that we should provide, on a maximum of 2 pages, a selection of the most relevant services covering 2008, 2009, and 2010. If both assumptions are correct, could you please confirm that the details of all service contracts to be included for point 4.2.2 covering 2009 and 2010 can include a greater number of services than provided for point 4.2.1 “client references” for the equivalent years?

## Reply

**We confirm that your assumptions are correct.**

## Question no. 97:

Page 9/35 - Section 4 Selection of the tenderer – Technical and Professional capacity –  
point 4.2 References in relation to similar project/contracts  
Please confirm that in this sub-section all subcontractors’ references can be included.

**Reply**

**No, they cannot.**

**Please refer to Section 5.2.3 Subcontracting, third alinea of the Guidebook for tenderers.**

**Question no. 98:**

2. Annex I.C - Section 4.2.3. Service and Project References

You require 5 Service References (completed in 2009 and 2010) and 2 Project References (no limit in time). Can you explain the difference between a Service and a Project?

**Reply**

**A project is a temporary undertaking with unique objectives and a definite duration.**

**A service is repetitive and involves permanent functional activities.**

**Question no. 99:**

3. Annex II.C. Section 9 Staff Profiles

For the Integration Support Officer, you require in the table page 121 that he should have more than 5 years experience and on page 129 that he should have a minimum of 2 years of relevant professional experience. What is the correct minimum experience?

**Reply**

**We confirm that there is an error on page 129.**

**The Integration Support officer must have more than 5 years of professional experience.**

**Question no. 100:**

4. Annex II.C. Section 5.1.1 p 46

You mention that "During the contract and on the request from the Commission, mission or consultancy services could be organised inside or outside the Commission's premises e.g. in DG TAXUD, National Administrations, other contractors premises, other supplier premises, etc."

Should consultancy services be organised outside DG TAXUD, will the consultant still have access to TAXUD Information System? If yes, how?

## Reply

**Consultancy services outside DG TAXUD will not have access to TAXUD Information Systems, as it will not be necessary to have access to such systems. In the unlikely event that services outside DG TAXUD need access to such systems, DG TAXUD will guarantee access in order to perform the tasks.**

### Question no. 101:

5. Selection Criteria - Common Tendering Specifications and Guidebook for tenderers. The *Guidebook for tenderers* specifies that subcontractors will be assessed for Exclusion Criteria. For Economic and Financial capacity, it states that the assessment rules will be specified in the tendering specifications (p16 section 9.2.1.) and there is no mention of subcontractors in section 9.2.2 Technical and professional capacity. The Tendering Specifications mention subcontracting in Section 7.1 Exclusion Criteria on page 12 and not at all in the Selection Criteria. We assume that proof for selection criteria is not mandatory for subcontractors but that their references and CVs are taken into account in the evaluation process if provided. Can you please confirm?

## Reply

**No, we do not confirm. Proof for selection criteria is not requested for subcontractors. Subcontractors' references and CVs are not taken into account in the evaluation process.**

### Question no. 102:

Follow on from The Commission's answers to questions (question number 44).

a) In Annex II.A.2, page 26, there is a statement that reads: "The tenderer is requested to take the commitment that the proposed Take-over team (i.e. both in terms of number of staff and CVs presented in his initial tender) shall be made available except for 'force majeure' throughout the Take-over period. Two or three alternative CVs for the same positions may be presented in order to cover for possible unavailability of staff at the signature of the first Specific Contract."

Can the commission please confirm that tenderers should submit CVs for key members of its Take-over team in addition to the maximum of 20 CVs submitted in response to Annex 1.A "Questionnaire" section 4.4.

## Reply

**We confirm that only CVs of the managerial staff have to be submitted, as per section 4.4 of the Questionnaire of Lot1 (Annex I.A).**

b) Furthermore, in Annex II.A.2, page 100, there is a statement which reads: "The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor must ensure that technical expertise that is in line with DG TAXUD's technical development/operations environment is sufficiently available.

Expertise with all COTS used by DG TAXUD (e.g. ARIS, ORACLE, Solaris, Linux, HP SMT, IBM MQSeries, TUXEDO, WebLogic, Apache, and all other COTS - see [R8] and [R14]) is a must and shall be identified clearly in the proposed CVs."

Could the Commission please confirm that it does not expect a tenderer to submit CVs demonstrating the expertise required above as part of its submission, but would expect tenderers to provide such CVs during the resourcing phase post-award?

**Reply**

We do not expect a tenderer to submit CVs demonstrating the expertise required above as part of its submission. However, "DG TAXUD can at, any point in time, request the CVs of the assigned staff. DG TAXUD reserves the right to request replacements of staff not in line with the present resource requirements", as per section 12.1 of the Technical Specifications of Lot1 (Annex II.A.2).

**Question no. 103:**

ANNEX II.A.1: LOT1: TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS: - "As is description" section 6.3.1.4,

With reference to section 6.3.1.4, VOLUMETRIC [AS IS CCN], could the Commission please provide additional CCN volumetrics for the number of problems, changes and releases?

**Reply**

Please find below the requested quantities.

Number of:	2009-2011
<b>CCN releases deployed</b>	
- CCN major release	1
- Planned release (that deliver new or updated functionalities)	12
- "quick fix"	22
<b>CCN applications releases (i.e. BCP/DRP, ACT, Tivoli, CCN portal, LCMS)</b>	
- major	6
- planned release	4
- quick fixes	9
<b>CSI stacks releases</b>	



<b>Number of:</b>	<b>2009-2011</b>
- NJCSI stack	4
- C CSI stack	21
- Cobol stack	9
- JCSI stack	16
<b>FAT/(p)SAT test campaigns</b>	
- FAT - ATS (Acceptance Test Specification) and ITS (Integration Test Specification) for specific CCN component or a CCN features.	77
- FAT - Acceptance Test campaigns run on the integration environment.	71
- (p)SAT - to validate a new site installation, a site move or to validate the porting of CSI stacks.	45

**Question no. 104:**

Annex II.A.1 page 100 top: “CCN/TC contractor ensures the maintenance of the hardware and all third party software licenses”.

Could the Commission please confirm whether the requirement to ensure maintenance of the hardware indicates a requirement to deliver on-site support (e.g. IMAC/Break-Fix) for Data Centre locations and CCN remote sites?

**Reply**

**We confirm that the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor must deliver on-site support, if it cannot be delivered remotely (e.g. hardware replacement etc.).**

**Question no. 105:**

We refer to the Annex 1b “Questionnaire” for Lot 2, your answers in question no.33 and question no.46 regarding the ITIL or equivalent certification for the Service Manager.

The ITIL v.2 qualifications as written in the official ITIL website are:

- Foundation
- Service Manager
- Practitioner

The ITIL v.3 qualifications as written in the official ITIL website are:

- Foundation
- Service Lifecycle Modules (5 modules) or Service Capability Modules (4 modules) [Intermediate level]
- Expert

Since the ITIL or equivalent certification is mandatory, so it is not entirely at the discretion of the Tenderer to select the appropriate level of typical knowledge verified by a certificate required by DG TAXUD for the role of Service Manager, we kindly ask DG TAXUD to clarify the following:

- a. Is ITIL v.2 “Foundation” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- b. Is ITIL v.2 “Service Manager” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- c. Is ITIL v.2 “Practitioner” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- d. Is ITIL v.3 “Foundation” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- e. Is ITIL v.3 “Intermediate level” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- f. Is ITIL v.3 “Expert” certificate adequate for the Service Manager role?
- g. Which certificates and levels are considered “ITIL equivalent” by DG TAXUD?
- h. Is COBIT Foundation certificate considered equivalent?
- i. Is COBIT Foundation certificate adequate for the typical qualifications of the role of Service Manager?
- j. Is PMI-PMP certificate adequate for the typical qualifications of the role of Service Manager?
- k. Are other ISACA certifications adequate for the typical qualifications of the role of Service Manager?
- l. In the case where an individual has, for example, two or more certifications, e.g. ITIL Foundation and COBIT Foundation, and 15 years of experience as a Service Delivery Manager in multi-million contracts, taking into account only the typical qualifications of certificates, is this person considered adequate for the role of Service Manager?

## **Reply**

**Please refer to the replies to questions no. 33 and 46.**

### **Question no. 106:**

We refer to the Annex I.B “Questionnaire” for Lot 2 and your answer to question no.47 regarding the CMMI maturity model.

- m. Please confirm whether the possession of a recent and dated maturity model report is mandatory or not
- n. If yes, please clarify whether this report is mandatory to be for the “CMMI for Services”
- o. If the answer to (b) is no, please confirm that the possession of “CMMI for Development” capability and maturity level report is adequate

**Reply**

**Yes, the provision of a recent and dated maturity model report is mandatory. Since the relevant maturity model for this contract is for CMMI for Services, the maturity model report should be about CMMI for Services.**

**Question no. 107:**

Follow on from The Commission's answers to questions number 39.

Whilst we note the Commission's response with regard to the length of answer to question 4.2.1 for Lot 3, given the larger number of service elements required for Lot 1, would it be acceptable to extend this list to 4 pages to enable tenderers to better reflect delivered service catalogue items with relevance to the required Service Blocks?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to question no. 22.**

**Question no. 108:**

Thank you for your answer.  
However, my question has two parts.

*Under clause 5.1.3 it is mentioned that partners can sign a "power of attorney" in order to give formal status to their collaboration. Can you please explain how that works and what actions need to be taken under Belgian law?*

*Is this something that the partners need to do prior to participating to the tender or can they formalise this at a later stage, prior to the signature of the contract?*

**Reply**

***The power of attorney is not necessary at the tendering phase, even if it is possible. However, it is mandatory prior to the signature of the contract.***

Could you please also answer the first part of my question?: how do you understand a power of attorney under Belgian law? Does it correspond with "mandaat/lastgeving"?

**Reply**

**Yes, it does.**

**Question no. 109:**

Annex I.A section 5.2

Section 5.2 contains the following extract "... the infrastructure (tools & services) that he proposes to use for office automation...". Could the Commission please confirm that this refers to the office automation infrastructure at tenderer's own premises and designated for use by tenderer's own personnel?

**Reply**

**We confirm that this description refers to the office automation infrastructure at the tenderer's own premises and designated for use by the tenderer's own personnel.**

**Question no. 110:**

(Annex III.A) P.5.14, (R86) page 56, and Response to Question no.66

We understand that the Commission's response to Question no.66 is referring to the Lux1 and Lux2 data centre infrastructure being Tier level 4 as defined in document R86 page 56. Can the Commission please confirm that the reference to (T4 Hosting) in P.5.14 also refers to Tier level 4 as defined in document R86 page 56, and therefore the infrastructure (power, cooling, etc.) for the Disaster Recovery data centre to be provided by the tenderer must also be Tier level 4?

**Reply**

**We confirm that as per section 9.2.21 of the Technical Specifications of Lot1 (Annex II.A.2), the Disaster recovery site must be Tier level 4.**

**Question no. 111:**

Tendering Specifications, 7.3.2., p.15

Can the Commission please explain if, how and to what extent savings in secondary costs (floor space and energy consumption in Luxembourg 1 and 2 Data centre not considered in the price table Annex III.A) that are the result of a suggested transformational project will be considered in the financial evaluation process?

**Reply**

**We confirm that the suggested transformational projects are not part of the financial evaluation of the offers.**

**Question no. 112:**

Tendering Specifications, 7.3.2., p.15

Can the Commission please confirm whether the savings proposed in the transformational projects will be taken into consideration in the financial evaluation?

**Reply**

**No, we do not confirm. Please refer to the Reply to question no. 111.**

**Question no. 113:**

Annex III.A, Price Table, P.12.6 Provision

Can the Commission please confirm that the necessary network infrastructure requested to be provided by the tenderer (i.e. data centre interconnection, connection to the disaster recovery site, internet connections) will be funded out of the P.12.6 budget? [Provision allocated by DG TAXUD for Infrastructure (hardware, software, maintenance), data centre renting and related services]. If this is not the case, in which price position does, the Commission expects these costs to be included?

**Reply**

**As indicated in section 4 of the Technical Specifications of Lot1 (Annex II.A.2 - page 23 of 179), DG TAXUD will provide/finance the connectivity between the two data centres located in Luxembourg and the incumbent data centres (ITSM and CCN/TC). The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor however has to setup the necessary remote connections to the two data centres in Luxembourg. The cost for the latter connections is to be included in price element P.5.1 Infrastructure Management.**

**Question no. 114:**

Annex I.A Questionnaire section 2 Exclusion of the Tenderer

Could the Commission please confirm that if, in the Country in which the tenderer is established, there is not an authority to issue relevant extracts from the Juridical Record or any equivalent documentation, it is sufficient to present a notarised affidavit for the following items of the exclusion criteria?

- A relevant extract from a judicial record or equivalent documentation to confirm that you have not been convicted of an offence concerning your professional conduct
- Have you enclosed a relevant extract from a judicial record to confirm that you are not subject to a judgment on fraud, corruption etc...?

**Reply**

**Yes, Please refer to the Reply to question no. 37**

**Question no. 115:**

Annex I c:

Question 5.2.9 - 5.2.11 When you talk about Staff, do you mean staff of the tenderer for Lot 3 or all staff working on ITSM2 (Global training plan for the different Lots)?

**Reply**

**These questions refer to the staff of the tenderer for lot 3 only.**

**Question no. 116:**

Annex I c:

In question 5.2.10:

- a) Do you confirm that the bidder should both provide a detailed description and a summary for the same thing?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

- b) What is exactly the difference between “a detailed description of the approach” and a “summary of the understanding and approach”?

**Reply**

**A detailed description means an explanation of all elements of services as per the requested service level agreements.**

**A summary of the understanding and approach means a general overview of the tenderer's comprehension of the services and the methods he intends to apply.**

**Question no. 117:**

Annex I c:

The questions 5.3.3 and 5.2.10 are literally similar in the first part: "A detailed description of his approach to deliver the expected services according to the requested service level requirements". Is there a mistake?

**Reply**

**There is no mistake. The detailed description of the tenderer's approach to deliver the services is taken into account both in the evaluation of the fitness of the proposed organisation and of the fitness of the proposed methods, processes and services.**

**Question no. 118:**

Annex I c:

Question 5.1.5: Is it correct to assume that the question "his understanding of the status of the services to be provided" actually means "his understanding of the services to be provided"? Since these services are new, we assume that they have no status.

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 119:**

Annex I c:

Question 5.3.4.: "An overview of the proposed process to keep an up-to-date view of the organisations involved in ITSM2 delivery so that it is possible to identify at all times the right contact persons in the various organisation involved", we assume that the access of such a repertoire is limited to DG TAXUD and Lot 3 contractor, and is not accessible, for reading as for writing, to Lot 1 and Lot 2 contractors. Is this assumption in line with your requirements?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 120:**

Annex I c:

Could you please detail the interactions processes between Lot 3 contractor and DG TAXUD, will there be a Single Point of Contact (SPOC) with the appointment of a DG TAXUD Project Manager or several points of contact on R5 DG TAXUD side?

**Reply**

**As indicated in Article I.6.1 of the Model Framework Contract (Annex X.A), a person will be appointed in DG TAXUD to be contacted in all official administrative and financial matters. However, during the day-to-day implementation of the contract, the ITSM2 lot3 contractor will be required to contact several persons in DG TAXUD.**

**Question no. 121:**

Annex 2.c

Section 6.5.2.1.1.1.

What do you mean by setting up the FAT (Factory Acceptance Test)?

## Reply

**FAT in this context means a predefined and objective test/demonstration that the ITSM2 lot3 contractor has successfully finalised and is ready to perform the tasks laid down in the contract.**

### Question no. 122:

Annex II.A.2, 9.2.24 Page 90 (Price Elements P.6.1 to P.6.18); Annex 3a (Pricing table) and Document R185\_ITSM2 - Lot1 - Split of CIs and complexity classification-V.3.00.pdf

Could the Commission please explain the difference in the number of applications stated in Annex 3a and R185. The Pricing table Annex 3a refers to a number of 91, the R185 classification document lists 66 applications.

## Reply

**The R185 classification document indicates the current status, while the price elements P.6.1 to P.6.18 in the Price Table (Annex III.A) refer to the estimated total number of applications throughout the lifetime of the framework contract**

### Question no. 123:

Annex II.A.2, 9.2.8 Page 83 (Price Elements P.5.1 to P.5.15); Annex 3a (Pricing table)

Could the Commission please explain why the volumetric information provided in the table in Annex II.A.2, 9.2.8 page 83 is not consistent with volume price information in ITSM Lot 1 Annex 3a – the pricing sheet.

## Reply

**Section 9.2.8 of the Technical specifications of lot 1 (Annex II.A.2) indicates the current status, while the price elements P.5.2 to P.5.15 in the Price Table (Annex III.A) refer to the estimated volumetrics throughout the lifetime of the framework contract.**

### Question no. 124:

Questionnaire 4.4 considers Quality Management a 'role '

Questionnaire 4.3.2 defines Quality Manager as a 'profile'

Questionnaire 4.3.1 (fifth question) requires the tenderer to enumerate all 'functions' which are involved in provisioning the catalogue of services covering the scope of the contract, including the ones involved in quality control and quality assurance.

Does the Commission understand under question 4.3.1 (fifth question) that a tenderer has to list all the 'profiles' involved in provisioning the catalogue of services with their - function description. I.e. in the context of the above, provide the job (-function) description of the Quality Manager?



**Reply**

**"Function" - under section 4.3.1 - fifth question of Annex I.A (Lot 1 Questionnaire) means a series of related activities or tasks that are performed routinely in the organisation, i.e. it is not necessarily limited to the job description of the quality manager.**

**Question no. 125:**

The updated version of the Questionnaire for Lot 3 (Annex I.C) of 25 November includes under Heading 4.4 the role of "Service Management", which was not included in the original version. We have not seen any corresponding updates to Annex II.C (Technical Specifications) Heading 9 'staff profiles' or the profiles spreadsheet under Annex III.C (Price table) to include the profile for this role. As our understanding is that we are required to provide 3-5 CVs for this profile, could you please clarify if this role should be included in the pricing structure and what is the description of this profile, as provided for the other profiles?

**Reply**

**Service management – as described in Section 4.4 of Annex I.C (Lot 3 Questionnaire) - is a role for which there is no one-to-one mapping with a specific profile. It is up to the tenderer to identify which profile from the list of profiles described in Annex II.C Section 9 (Lot 3 Technical specifications) will be involved in the service management of the contract.**

**Question no. 126:**

According to our understanding of lot 3 (for example point 6.1.2.1.8 of the tendering specification), it is compulsory to provide services in compliance with ISO 20000 and 27000 standards, but it is not mandatory for tenderers to be certified ISO 20000 and 27000. Can you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your understanding is correct.**

**Question no. 127:**

In the questionnaire for lot 3, under point 3 'Selection of the tenderer – Economic and Financial Capacity', second bullet point, the balance sheets for the past two financial years are requested, while in the tendering specifications point 7.2.1 the balance sheets are requested for the past three financial years.

Can you please clarify if we have to provide balance sheets for the past 2 or 3 financial years?

**Reply**

You have to provide balance sheets for the past 3 financial years for which accounts have been closed.

Please note that the inconsistency that you have identified between these two documents has been corrected. Accordingly, the Questionnaire for Lot 3, point 3, second bullet point, has been put in line with the Tendering Specifications, point 7.2.1. You will find the new version of the Questionnaire for Lot 3 on our website.

**This reply also applies to Lot 1 and Lot 2 and therefore the questionnaires have been corrected accordingly.**

**Question no. 128:**

In the updated version of the Questionnaire for Lot 3 (Annex I.C) of 25 November, in the tender form on page 3, in case of joint offers it is stated that consortium members have to fill in sections 0 to 2 except bullet point 4 of section 3 on their own behalf. In our understanding there is a clerical mistake and consortium members should have to fill in sections 1 to 3 (except bullet point 4 of section 3) on their own behalf, while the leader of the consortium should fill in sections 1 to 3 (including the tender form) on its own behalf and sections 4 to 6 as well as bullet point 4 of section 3 on behalf of the whole tendering group. Can you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?

**Reply**

Your understanding is correct. You will find the new version of the Questionnaire for Lot 3 on our website.

**Question no. 129**

AS-IS page 212, bottom line

Please confirm that instead of ITS-IRPT-ARD-001-WP-8-4-1Architecture, [R108] it should be read ITS-IRPT-ARD-002 WP8.4.1-SC08, [R79]

**Reply**

This is indeed an error. Page 212 bottom line of Annex II.A.1 (Lot 1 - "Technical Specifications") should read "DG TAXUD Information Systems Architecture, [R79]".

**Question no. 130**

Document "R180\_CC\_CSI\_ACT.pdf", entitled <Executive Summary: New Application Configuration Tool (ACT)>, states on page 3

*“On-line help*

*A complete on-line help functionality has been included in the ACT application itself. This provides detailed information on all aspects of the ACT tool.*

*The CCN Application Configuration Guide remains valid and may be downloaded from the CCN/TC Portal”.*

Please provide us with the ACT on-line help.

**Reply**

**You will find on our website the CCN\_ACT.zip file containing the online help, the ACT brochure, the ACT flow diagrams, an extract from the relevant training, etc.**

**Question no. 131**

AS-IS page 217 – 221, Table 29

It appears that there is very extensive testing documentation (between 100 – 200 documents) which is not in the DVD.

Please provide any document used or produced by ITSM contractor for the purpose of testing the application in Pre-SAT/SAT env.

**Reply**

**It must be noted that the ITSM contractor (incumbent and/or ITSM2 Lot1 contractor) does not produce testing documentation. The test plans are produced by the development contractors and are delivered to the ITSM contractor (incumbent and/or ITSM2 Lot1 contractor) who executes the test plan as provided by the development contractor. The ITSM contractor only occasionally produces addenda to those test plans by documenting support-specific information (e.g. performance tests). Please note that the requested documents are not needed for the tenderers to be able to structure their bid. DG TAXUD has disclosed all relevant information needed to understand and estimate the testing effort, in particular :**

- **the size of the current application management & testing team (Annex II.A.1, Section 6.1.1.2);**
- **the adjustments to the team sizing (Annex II.A.2, § 10.1);**
- **the application test design specifications/test plan coverage (Annex II.A.1, Section 6.6.1.1.4);**
- **the number of PSAT/SAT, qualifications and hot-fixes (Annex II.A.1, Section 6.6.1.1.4);**
- **the complexity model (Reference Document [R332]) which includes an overview – per system – on the number of test cases and which indicates if tests are manual or automated;**
- **the IT Testing operational planning (ITOP) (Reference Document [R7]; we have noticed that the current table (which provides an overview of the duration of tests) was not completely readable. You will find a fully legible version on our website**

which increases the readability of the first few columns of the planning allowing to see the duration of each type of test.

For the sake of transparency, you will find on our website the test plan, the installation manual and the operations manual of a representative set of applications ranging from low (application TA) to medium (application TEDB v2) and high (TARIC 3) complexity as per complexity model classification (reference document [R332] of Lot 1).

**Question no. 132**

According to the TEMPO 2010 “Application Development Reference Manual” and for each application developed under the classic model, an Installation Manual and an Operations Manual are drawn up.

Please provide us with the Installation and Operation Manuals of the applications/tools referred to in Table 29 of the Lot 1 AS-IS Specifications.

**Reply**

Please see the Reply to Question no. 131.

**Question no. 133**

AS-IS, Reference R333, “Data Centre Consolidation - Approach and State of Play”

To what extent the contents of the document shall be interpreted as **binding commitments of DG TAXUD**?

**Reply**

**The referred document describes the current state of play regarding the data centre consolidation project. The information in this document is correct and up-to-date.**

**Question no. 134**

AS-IS document, page 135, “Definite Software Library” – DSL. Please provide us with:

- The directory structure of the DSL,
- The available documentation about the “operational steps” the incumbent ITSM1 contractor uses for (i) check-in/check out of the relevant software “assets” to/from the DSL (ii) their deployment from the DLS to the ITSM1 production environment.

**Reply**

As indicated in Annex II.A.2, Section 5.2.6 (Lot 1 technical specifications), the ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor will set up and maintain a DSL with at least the 2 last versions of all applications. The ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor shall hence define and set up the DSL according to his choice, tools, techniques and best practices.

**Question no. 135**

Please provide us with newly scanned version of the document [R226] DIGIT Product List, so that it is 100% legible.

**Reply**

You will find a fully legible version of document [R226] DIGIT Product List on our website.

**Question no. 136**

Please provide us with the Monthly Project Reports – MPR and the Monthly Service Reports – MSR (as well as their Annexes) covering the last 12-month period of the ITSM1 service (e.g. September 2010 – August 2011) of ITSM1 and CCN/TC. This will allow us to better understand the ITSM1.

**Reply**

Sample MPR/MRS documents have been provided in the baseline (reference documents [R154] and [R192]).

**Question no. 137**

What percentage of the currently DIGIT-hosted servers will be moved to the new DG-TAXUD Data Centres?

**Reply**

DG TAXUD has not yet defined a strategy regarding the move or not of DIGIT-hosted servers to the new TAXUD data centres. As defined in reference document [R333], the new TAXUD data centres will focus on consolidation of the current ITSM and CCN/TC data centres and will set up a disaster recovery site.

**Question no. 138**

The number of applications tools appears to be 66. On the other hand, the pricing table requests essentially the pricing of 99 applications.

Can you please explain this relatively significant increase in the number of applications that are to be priced?

**Reply**

**Please refer to Replies to Questions no. 122 and 123.**

**Question no. 139**

It appears that there is a mismatch in the application list in (a) R332\_ITSM2-Lot1-complexity-model-v3.00.xls and (b) R185\_ITSM2 - Lot1 - Split of CIs and complexity classification-V.3.00.xls. More specifically:

R185\_ITSM2 - Lot1 - Split of CIs and complexity classification-V.3.00.xls mentions:

- 32 EoF SCAC VAT eForms (VEF)
- 33 EoF DT Direct Tax eForms
- 34 EoF Recovery Recovery eForms

R332\_ITSM2-Lot1-complexity-model-v3.00.xls mentions:

- 32 CT Reporting Tool
- 33 EoF SCAC VAT eForms (VEF)
- 34 EoF DT Direct Tax eForms

EoF Recovery is no longer listed while CT Reporting Tool is listed.

Can you please specify which of the above two lists is to be used.

**Reply**

**There is indeed an inconsistency in the complexity model and split of CIs documents. You will find corrected versions of both documents on our website.**

**Question no. 140**

AS-IS, section 6.1.1.4 page 105. Table 8 presents the staffing allocation per work-area for CCN/TC. On the other had, table 6 on page 95 gives for ITSM1 the staff distribution per application area a more detailed breakdown.

Please provide the CCN/TC work distribution per work-area in granularity similar to that of the ITSM1.

**Reply**

Please find below a more detailed work distribution for the CCN/TC :

**1. Project management (Including quality management and security management) :  
12,5 Full TimeEquivalent (FTE)**

**Programme management: 1 FTE**

**Project, service & technical management: 3 FTE**

**Project methodology & project support office: 2 FTE, including 1 manager and 1 officer**

**Quality management: 3 FTE, including 1 manager, 1 senior consultant and 1 officer**

**Security management: 3 FTE, including 1 manager and 2 specialists**

**Contract management: 0,5 FTE**

**2. "Run" competence centre (includes operations, service desk, etc.) : 30 FTE**

**1<sup>st</sup> line helpdesk: 4 FTE, including 1 team leader and 3 agents**

**2<sup>nd</sup> line operation & support: 10 FTE, including 1 team leader, 3 CCN experts and 6 agents**

**Infrastructure & systems management: 9 FTE, including 1 team leader, 2 senior system engineers and 6 system engineers**

**CCN configuration: 4 FTE, including 1 team leader and 3 CCN experts**

**Incident resolution & reporting: 3 FTE, including 1 team leader, 1 CCN expert and 1 agent**

**3. "Projects" and "Inception" competence centres (Projects targeting short term improvements and inception phases thereof): 7,5 FTE**

**Development: 3 FTE, including 1 team leader and 2 senior software engineers**

**Tests & Integration: 3 FTE, including 1 team leader and 2 senior software engineers**

**Consultancy & Training: 1,5 FTE senior consultant & architect**

The FTEs associated to the "Projects" and "Inception" competence centres are occasionally involved in providing training as well as in 3rd level support for specific technical expertise in case of complex requests and/or call resolution.

**Question no. 141**

Are the uCMDB & HP SM 7, mentioned in section 6.3.1.1.3 page 128, hosted on DIGIT systems?

**Reply**

These systems are hosted on ITSM infrastructure (i.e. Commission owned infrastructure hosted at the ITSM data centre).

**Question no. 142**

Referring to Table 19 on page 162 second data row item "V4.2 #Calls received by the Service Desk", please provide us with a breakdown of the volumetric data in terms of telephone, e-mail, fax and user self-service user requests.

**Reply**

For 2010, before the introduction of Synergia (HP service manager implementation), the data available is as follows:

**Calls opened by**

**Mail : 99,78%**

**Phone : 0,06%**

**Fax : 0,16%**

Looking at the post-Synergia era (beyond June 2011), we can see that the number of self-service (self-registered) calls now represents up to 39% of the volume. Fax and phone continue to be used very rarely. Mail and self-service encoded requests are the main categories.

**Question no. 143**

Does DG-TAXUD have an asset management system, other than a CMDB (AS-IS, section 6.9.1.1.1 page 281) and, if yes, what system, who maintains it and manages the content?

**Reply**

Assets are indeed managed by a CMDB system. The incumbent ITSM contractor uses HP CMDB, the incumbent CCN/TC contractor uses the Assyst product from Axios Systems. Both teams maintain and manage their respective content. CI data not yet migrated may still exist in the form of MS-Office based lists (e.g. MS Excel, MS Access).

**Question no. 144**

On the one hand, in Annex I.A - Questionnaire ITSM2 Lot1 under 5.3.2, it is stated "Emphasis on the set up of the new high availability data centres", which may be interpreted that the Tenderer/Contractor has the liberty to select the technology of his choice. However, in Reference document "RD333\_DC consolidation - Approach 120909-EN0.12.pdf", it looks like the technology choice has already been made.

Can you please clarify which interpretation is correct?



**Reply**

As indicated in [RD333], Section 5, DG TAXUD has only made a technology choice for the network and security devices, the data centre cabling, the SAN, the VTL and backup tool. All other components can be selected by the ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor whilst bearing in mind the provisions laid down under Section 5 or [RD333].

**Question no. 145**

Please provide implementation details of the log & audit file policy (LAT policy v3.00-EN.doc) in terms of current CCN and ITSM provider responsibilities and activities

**Reply**

The implementation of this log and audit file policy is still ongoing. The implementation characteristics for both CCN and ITSM can be summarised as follows:

- Logs of the current month are kept online.
- Logs older than a month are kept for easy retrieval and/or are kept offline but ready for retrieval in less than 4 working hours.
- Logs older than 6 months are deleted unless a specific investigation would require to keep them longer.

**Question no. 146**

Where can we find referred European Commission documents like the ISS Policy (TMP-POL-ISP reference AD1) and many others?

**Reply**

The Information Security Policy of DG TAXUD and other documents concerning the security management can be found at the Security Management Section in TEMPO.

**Question no. 147**

Where can we find referred European Commission documents like the ISS Policy (TMP-POL-ISP reference AD1)?

**Reply**

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 146.

**Question no. 148**

Can the up-to-date inventory of all DG TAXUD systems “including processors, printers, storage systems networks and switches and all attached PCs, terminals and modems” as maintained by the Informatics Unit (TMP-POL-ISP section 3.5 penultimate bullet) be used by an ISTM2 Tenderer?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the inventories provided in the baseline of the present call for tenders (applicable and reference documents [R98], [R176], [R177], [R178] and [R298]).**

**Question no. 149**

(a) Is there currently a Contractor(s) assisting the Commission with the tasks of the Synergia initiatives(s)?

**Reply**

**Synergia is developed, maintained and operated by the ITSM contractor (incumbent and future ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor).**

(b) Are ITSM2 Lot 1 tenderers to assume that the Commission (perhaps via a Contractor) will continue the Synergia initiatives in a timeframe with significant overlap with the ITSM2 Lot 1 contract, and that assistance will be provided to the ITSM2 Lot 1 Contractor in using the Synergia tools?

**Reply**

**The responsibility will be handed over – alike any other system – in the scope of the hand-over/take-over process and should be completed by the end of the take-over. Throughout the hand-over, the incumbent ITSM contractor will provide training/coaching in using Synergia.**

(c) Referring to the PreSAT and SAT, we understand that performance tests, security tests, End-to-end tests are carried out. Which tools are used and which party provides the performance test scripts ?

**Reply**

**Concerning the testing, as highlighted in other questions, the test plans (and test scripts) are provided by the development contractors. Tests are done either manually, by means of the IBM Rational test suite, or by application-specific test tools/protocols.**

**Question no. 150**

Referring to conformance testing, it appears that incidents resulting from tests are to be communicated to the NA. Is there a central tool used by all NA for this, or is the communication with NA done by email?

**Reply**

**Results of the conformance testing are communicated to the National Administrations via Synergia.**

**Question no. 151**

Referring to the AS-IS situation, unlike the CCN case, the ITSM 1 description appears not to contain a list of trainings/workshops that are currently in scope.

- Please provide us with the list of currently deployed trainings/workshops/demonstrations within ITSM1
- Are we to assume that the currently provide ITSM1 training sessions will have similar character/content and volume in ITSM2 Lot 1?
- In case there are differences between the two cases above, please advise.

**Reply**

**Please find below the list of currently deployed training/workshops within ITSM1:**

**ART2**

**Certification of the EMCS National Excise Applications for Mb and overview of the CT campaign**

**CMDB**

**CRMS**

**CRMS RIF**

**CS/MIS**

**CS/RD**

**DEF**

**EBTI**

**EMCS Converter tool in Athens, Greece on 17/11/2011**

**EMCS Phase 3 Mc**

**EMCS Phase 3 Milestone Mc**

**EMCS Workshop on Phase 2 readiness for Mb 26/11/2010**

**Excise Readiness of EMCS Phase 3 Milestone Mc**

**Excise SMT Change Management Feasibility study #1**

**ITSM Portal usage by DG TAXUD/A**

**ITSM training to CUSTDEV2**

**ITSM training to CUSTDEV2 Application related activities**

**ITSM training to CUSTDEV2 MS**

**Monitoring of the EMCS**

**MSA readiness for EMCS Phase 3 Mc Conformance testing in Brussels**

**Recovery eForms**

SMT  
TEDBv2  
TTA Dry  
VIES

Workshop #1 on Excise change management integration into SMT  
Workshop #2 on Excise change management integration into SMT

We confirm that the ITSM2 Lot 1 training, workshops, demonstrations will be in continuity (and/or standard evolution) as the current ITSM1 training sessions.

**Question no. 152**

For the new DCs in Luxembourg (see paragraph 5.2.5 page 44): is the ITSM2 contractor responsible for DC operations, such as hands & eyes, cabling, installation of equipment, etc. If yes, can you give a definitive lists of activities that will be covered by TAXUD?

**Reply**

**The ITSM2 Lot 1 tenderer will indeed operate the new data centres in Luxembourg. TAXUD will provide the data centres initial cabling and set up, as well as access to the building.**

**Question no. 153**

The priority matrix in TEMPO is different than in the AS-IS description (paragraph 6.4.1.1.2 page 156), which is leading?

**Reply**

**The leading priority matrix is the one provided in Annex II.A.1, under Section 6.4.1.1.2 on page 156 (Lot 1 Technical specifications – As is description).**

**Question no. 154**

In Annex I.A - Questionnaire ITSM2 Lot1 under 5.3.2 "Emphasis on the set up of the new high availability data centres", it appears like the tenderer has the liberty to select the technology of his choice. However in Reference document "RD333\_DC consolidation - Approach 120909-EN0.12.pdf" it looks like the technology choice has already been made. Can you clarify which interpretation is correct?

**Reply**

**Please refer to Reply to Question no. 144.**

**Question no. 155**

The volumetric data for ITSM as-is on page 194, paragraph 6.5.1.2, annex II.a.1 is substantially different from the volumetric data on 83 of annex II.a.2. paragraph 9.2.8. On what volumetric data does the tenderer needs to base his price calculations?

**Reply**

**Please refer to Replies to Questions no. 122 and no. 123.**

**Question no. 156**

Annex II.A.1 – paragraph 6.4.1.4, page 173

What is the 2010 staffing in agents and teamleader(s) for the CCN Service Desk ? Unlike the ITSM volumetric data, this figure is missing for CCN.

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 140.**

**Question no. 157**

Annex II.A2 – page 63

TAXUD requests the bidder to provide the Hardware/Software/Maintenance Acquisition Channel. Can we assume that TAXUD will be the owner of the contracts with the HW/SW/Maintenance providers and that the bidder will act as a purchasing department acting on behalf of TAXUD (and as such manages the purchases, maintenance contracts, but is not the owner of these contracts)?

**Reply**

**The ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor will indeed act as purchasing department on behalf of DG TAXUD. The ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor shall establish/sign the required contracts and is therefore himself the party to those contracts. All hardware/software purchased via this acquisition channel will be the property of the Commission.**

**Question no. 158**

According to paragraph 9 'Clarifying the nature of the contract', we would like to ask the following urgent question:

After reading the answers DG TAXUD provided on questions 66 and 110, we conclude that for the Disaster Recovery datacenter floor capacity (Price Element P.5.14, as described in 9.2.21 of Annex II.A.2); the only viable datacenters are Tier IV as listed on the website of the Uptime Institute (page <http://uptimeinstitute.com/TierCertification/allCertifications.php?page=1&ipp=All&tierLevel=4>).

If we limit the results on this website to datacenter sites within the European Union, and also exclude the two sites within Luxembourg (i.e. distance of the DR site should be at least 100 Km away from Kirchberg in Luxembourg, so it has to be in another European country), we are limited to the remaining five Datacenter sites listed.

Can you please confirm this is the correct conclusion? If not, please clarify the exact requirements for the Disaster Recovery datacenter (e.g. datacenter tier level, DR tier).

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 66. As per sections 5.2.5 and 9.2.21 of Annex II.A.2 (Lot 1 - Technical Specifications), DG TAXUD requests the ITSM2 Lot1 tenderer to provide and operate a Tier IV disaster recovery site with initial capacity and expansion possibilities at a distance of minimum 100 km from the two other locations. Those are the requirements. Please note that the answer to this question only confirms the referred requirements.**

**Question no. 159**

Referring to our Question 3 (Question no. 131) and Question 4 (Question no. 132) submitted on Friday 16th of December, we did not yet receive the requested extensive set of documents that the incumbent contractor has and that represents fundamental input for the definition of a solution that best fits the needs of DG TAXUD.

We will obviously need to study these important documents and take them into account when answering to this Call for Tenders.

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Replies to Questions no. 131 and no. 132.**

**Question no. 160**

According to your answers to the Questions 66 and 110, we conclude that all the data Centres in Belgium are excluded! Indeed, due to the monopoly situation of the power grids by Electrabel, the Data Centres in Belgium can only offer a Tier 3 + solution.

Could you confirm your decision or is a Tier 3+ data centre an acceptable solution?

**Reply**

**We confirm that, as per section 9.2.21 of the Technical Specifications of Lot 1 (Annex II.A.2), the Disaster recovery site must be Tier level 4, irrespective of the location of the data centre.**

**Question no. 161**

Annex II.A.2 – Pricing element P.12.1 Translation

The text says: The human translation of an A4 size page with normal font (Times New Roman, 11 or similar) with single line spacing.

In order to avoid misunderstanding on the translation volume per page, could you specify per page the number of non-blank characters to be translated. This is parameter used by specialised translation entities. Usually, the number of non-blank characters per page is 1.500 (as also specified in other call for tender).

**Reply**

**We confirm that documents to be translated are standard, i.e. the estimated number of non-blank characters per page is approximately 1500.**

**Question no. 162**

Annex II.A.2 – Pricing Model section 9.

*The Commission will estimate, at each Specific Contract for continuous services, the volume of price elements (i.e. the number of quantities of price elements) to include in the Specific Contract. The resulting fixed price is the price that is due by the Commission even if over-consumed up to 10%. Should however an over-consumption of a price element of more than 10% occur, DG TAXUD will issue an RfA covering the additional anticipated quantity of this price element until the end of the current continuous services' Specific Contract. In this case, only the additional quantity effectively consumed at the end of the related continuous services' Specific Contract, will be paid on top of the initial fixed price amount included in the Specific Contract.*

In order to interpret correctly this text, we take the following example: if the ordered quantity is 100 at the signature of the specific contract and the real consumption will be 112, the additional quantity specified on the RfA will be 12.

Is our interpretation correct?

**Reply**

**Your interpretation is correct.**

**Question no. 163**

Annex II.A.2 Lot 1 - Service block 5 – Pricing Element P5.1 till P.5.15

Could you clarify what is the service window to be considered for the pricing of the service described under the service block 5.

**Reply**

**As indicated in Annex II.A.2, "all related services and processes must support the stringent service windows (Monitoring, Service Desk, Escalation process, Notification process, Service Level Management...)"**.

**It is up to the tenderer to size/price the P5.1 to P5.15 price elements to the level required to be able to respect the quality of service, the service window of applications (as per description in Reference Document [R185], "Inventory of CIs") and/or the availability and other provisions laid down in the Service Level Agreement.**

**Question no. 164**

According to our understanding, in case of a consortium, Annex V (bona fide statement), Annex VI (declaration on confidentiality and no conflict of interest) and Annex VII (Legal entity form) to the tendering specifications have to be filled in and signed by each member of the consortium, while Annex VIII (financial id form) has to be signed only by the leader of the consortium.

Can you please confirm?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your understanding is correct.**




**Question no. 165**

SQI-024 – Management Team Experience Safeguard” stipulates Direct Liquidated Damages.

Can you please define the mechanism / formula determining the amount of those liquidated damages?

**Reply**

We confirm that there is an error. The direct liquidated damages applicable to the SQI-024 – Management team experience safeguard is missing. Please find below the updated version:

<b>SQI Attribute</b>	<b>SQI Attribute description</b>
<b>SQI Name</b>	SQI-24 - <u>Direct Liquidated Damages</u>
<b>SQI Description</b>	Measure if the initial value of the "Total number of months experience in managerial roles of the management team that will be assigned full time to the project" remains at an acceptable level defined by the SQI Limit below.
<b>Unit of Measurement of the SQI</b>	%
<b>SQI Target</b>	95%
<b>SQI Limit</b>	85%
<b>SQI Calculation</b>	Total months of professional experience in similar functions for the management team staff assigned full time to the project.  /  Total months of professional experience in similar functions for the management team staff proposed in the bid
<b><u>Direct Liquidated Damages</u></b>	 Each month where the SQI limit is not reached will induce a direct liquidated damage of 50.000 € per month.
<b>Applicable services/deliverables</b>	All
<b>Minimum number of Measurements</b>	1 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> First calculation 8 weeks after the signature of the first Specific Contract.

**Question no. 166**

With regard to Framework Contract Article II.2 - Liability: Would DG TAXUD be prepared to consider to reduce the limit of liability for consequential loss and / or indirect damage to e.g. "no less than one time the total price/total amount of the Specific Contract(s) Order Forms (...)"?

**Reply**

**The liability provisions laid down in the General Conditions of the Model Framework Contract (Annex X.A Part II) will remain unchanged, i.e. " no less than three times the total price/total amount of the Specific Contract(s)/Order Forms (...)"**.

**Question no. 167**

Lot 1. Annex II.A.2. page 24. SQI-031. Meaning of "as of the signature of the first Specific Contract" in SQI-031 unclear? Is it the date of the start of the Take-Over, or the date of the start of the Continuous Services (after the Take-Over)?

**Reply**

**The signature of the first Specific Contract is the start of the Take-Over.**

**Question no. 168**

Lot 1. Annex II.A.2. page 148. SQI-031. "Event 1. The 20 key functions of the Take-over team are not staffed by full time staff 1 month after the start of the first Specific Contract". Take one of the key functions, a "Service Support Manager" just as an example. Assume one is incumbent and has already assigned a full-time Service Support Manager to its on-going continuous services.

Please confirm that in this case, the incumbent service provider does not need to assign an additional new Service Support Manager to its staff?

Note that if the incumbent tenderer is required to assign new full-time key staff, it also forces the incumbent tenderer --given "Event 2. The 20 key functions have a turnover of more than 20% (4 people) over a 12 months sliding window." -- to replace up to 20 of its current key staff / expertise.

**Reply**

**No, we do not confirm your assumption.**

**Question no. 169**

Lot 1. Annex II.A.2., page 26. "...The tenderer is requested to take the commitment that the proposed Take-over team (i.e. both in terms of number of staff and CVs presented in his initial tender) shall be made available except for 'force majeure' throughout the Take-over period." Can you please indicate where the tenderer has to include the above CVs in our proposal?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 102 (a).**

**Question no. 170**

Lot 1. Annex II.A.2., page 74. KPI 48. In which part of the questionnaire do we have to put the CVs of the "key personnel as proposed in the ITSM2 Lot1 tender"?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 102 (a).**

**Question no. 171**

Page 23 of the TO-BE, last paragraph stipulates: "The incumbent data centres from both the ITSM and the CCN/TC contractors will keep on providing the **full hosting services during at least the first 12 months of the start of the ITSM2 Lot1 activity**, until they are merged into 2 data centres, located in Luxembourg, that will be provided by DG TAXUD. The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor will set up the necessary remote connection to the two data centres located in Luxembourg. The connectivity between the two data centres located in Luxembourg and the incumbent data centres (ITSM and CCN/TC) will be provided/financed by DG TAXUD and are not to be included in the bid. The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor must provide the ICT infrastructure management services for all the data centres taking into account that the **incumbent contractors will only ensure a minimal onsite intervention capacity** e.g. to provide access to the incumbent data centre, to switch on/off servers. All tools used by the incumbent ITSM and CCN/TC contractors in order to provide the services as specified in the various service blocks in [R1] will be provided to the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor;"

As far as the above "full hosting services" is concerned, can you please confirm which party, either the incumbent or the new ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor, will be in charge of the following services: server monitoring, backup, system patches, etc. and this after the end of the Take-Over period which ends max. 12 months after the start of ITSM2 Lot contract.

**Reply**

**At the end of the take-over period, the ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor will be in charge of those services (server monitoring, backup, system patches, etc.).**

**Question no. 172**

Annex2a1', page 229; R66\_TR3-ISTR-015-2-4-0-v1-00.pdf; ITOP customs example.pdf; R7\_ITSM installation and testing operational Plan v0 185\_20110318.zip

Some of the volumetrics supplied in the RFP seem to be in contradiction with the information provided in the additional documentation. For example, in RFP doc 'annex2a1', page 229 is stated that TARIC3 application went through 30 PreSAT and 30 SAT during 2010. However the document 'ITOP\_customs\_example.pdf' shows no trace of those activities. Furthermore the TARIC3 SAT report provided as example shows that such a test takes 24 days to complete, which makes unlikely previous figure of 30 in a year.

(a) How are these figures supposed to be interpreted?

**Reply**

**You are referring to the wrong document. You referred to ITOP document linked to Lot 1, not to Lot 2.**

(b) How many TARIC3 SAT tests were performed in 2010?

**Reply**

**Throughout 2010, 30 PSAT/SAT tests occurred as indicated in the Annex II.A.1, Section 6.6.1.1.4 (Lot 1 Technical specifications – As is Description).**

(c) Could the commission please confirm what would be a baseline value for the duration of an SAT test?

**Reply**

**It must be understood that the SAT tests not always cover the complete functionality of the system. The SAT sometimes is limited for instance if only a patch occurred. The ITOP (IT Operational Planning) is indeed the correct baseline for duration of tests. Only the version that you examined is not linked to Lot 1 but to Lot 2. Please refer to the updated ITOP (reference document [R7] that you will find on our website).**

**For (a), (b) and (c), please also refer to the Reply to Question no. 131.**

**Question no. 173**

Annex 3a p4.1 and p4.2

a) Can the commission please confirm our assumption for what constitutes a service call - that a service call includes any contact with human interaction across all media, including email, chat and conference call set up?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

b) Can the commission also confirm that the P.4.1 only includes infrastructure and organization of automated services without any human interaction for the service desk?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 174**

Follow on to Question 113.

Could the commission please expand its answer to explain if the tenderer has to (and if: where exactly) include one of the following connectivities into his bid:

- (a) connection(s) between Luxemburg 1 and Luxemburg 2 datacentres
- (b) connection between Luxemburg 1 and Disaster Recovery Datacentre
- (c) connection between Luxemburg 2 and Disaster Recovery Datacentre
- (d) Internet Connection to Luxemburg 1 datacentre
- (e) Internet Connection to Luxemburg 2 datacentre
- (f) Internet Connection to Disaster Recovery datacentre

**Reply**

**As explained in our Reply to Question no. 113, DG TAXUD will provide the connections (a), (b), (c) referred to in your question as well as the connections between the incumbent data centres and data centres in Luxembourg. The ITSM2 Lot 1 tenderers have to include internet connections (d), (e) and (f) referred to in your question. Their cost – if any – should be included in price element P.5.1 Infrastructure Management.**

**Question no. 175**

Document Annex II.A.1 / Annex II.A.2: Paragraph 6.1.1.4 – page 105 – SB 1

There is an apparent contradiction between Annex II.A.1 p105/313 (stating that the incumbent contractor's team for CCN/TC is 50 FTE) and Annex II.A.2 p97/179 (stating that the CCNT/TC contractor's team is 42 FTE). Which of both is correct ?

**Reply**

**There is no contradiction. Annex II.A.1 (Technical specifications – As is description for lot 1) p. 105/313 lists all current CCN/TC resources – including those associated to non-production activities (i.e. including the 7,5 FTEs associated to the "Projects" and "Inception" competence centre), whilst Annex II.A.2 (Technical specifications – To be description for lot 1), p. 97/179, lists the headcount "related to operations".**

**Please also refer to the Reply to Question no. 140 for the breakdown of these figures, in particular, the last comment related to the "Projects" and "Inception" competence centre resources.**

**Question no. 176**

Document ITS-IMSR-SC08-2010-12-MSR Dec 2010 v1.00.pdf

The MPR/MSR examples detail the number of calls according to various criteria. However, can you provide a split by type of the cause of the call:

- \* Hardware related problems
- \* Application related problems
- \* Network problems \*

...

**Reply**

**We confirm that the majority of calls relate to application problems, while the number of hardware and network problems remain limited.**

**Question no. 177**

Document ITS-IMSR-SC08-2010-12-MSR Dec 2010 v1.00.pdf (part of R192 on the DVD): paragraph 2.2.2, table 15 – page 33 – SB 4

The referred to table mentions 14.000 incoming mails per month, which is a huge amount to be handled.

(a) Who is handling these mails ? Service Desk only or is another entity involved as well?

**Reply**

The MSR document referred to in your question dates from the period prior to the introduction of Synergia. At that time, all incident management related communication was handled – indeed essentially by the service desk – via e-mail. As explained in Annex II.A.1 (Technical specifications – As is description for lot 1), one of the reasons to set up Synergia, was to reduce the mass of e-mails. As it can be witnessed by the breakdown of calls provided in our Reply to Question no. 142, 39% of calls are now self-encoded (hence handled from within the tool and no longer via e-mail).

(b) Can you give an idea of the actual workload associated with the handling of these 14.000 monthly mails (expressed in hours per month)?

**Reply**

**This information is not available to the Commission.**

(c) Does Taxud currently have any tooling at its disposal (automated mail analysis) to automate the handling of these mails?

**Reply**

**No, the Commission does not currently have any automated mail analysis tools. The only automation currently implemented within Synergia is the sending of e-mails in the context of the incident management.**

**Question no. 178**

Document annex II.A.1 ITS-IMSR-SC08-2010-12-MSR Dec 2010 v1.00.pdf: Paragraph 6.6.1.1 – page 212 – SB 6

Can you provide us with the number of conformance test campaigns executed in 2010 for each application, split by mode 1, mode 2, and mode 3?

**Reply**

**Such information is not available per application. Please find below an overview of total number of conformance tests.**

<b>Category 1 conformance tests</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Category 2 conformance tests</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Category 3 conformance tests</b>	<b>121</b>
<b>Category 4 conformance tests</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Total in 2010</b>	<b>324</b>

**Question no. 179**

Document annex II.A.1 ITS-IMSR-SC08-2010-12-MSR Dec 2010 v1.00.pdf: Paragraph 6.6.1.1 – page 212 – SB 6

On average, how often does an application go through the PSAT/SAT cycle before it is installed in production?

**Reply**

**Taking into account the different level of complexity of applications and the different scope of releases and/or pSAT/SAT cycles, the number of cycles before production is too variable to be able to produce a meaningful average.**

**Question no. 180**

Document R176 CCN Inventory:

Document "R176 CCN Inventory" shows - beside the equipment in the NA's - also a long list of equipment installed at the CCN/TC. Can you clarify for the CCN/TC which equipment and environments are in scope for ITSM2 and which equipment will stay under the responsibility of the CCN1-DEV contractor. The volumetric in Annex II.A.1 (p. 210 and p.264) doesn't consider the equipment in the CCN/TC and the answer to Question 52 suggests that only a small portion of the CCN/TC equipment is in scope of ITSM2.

**Reply**

**All equipment/software not specifically labelled as "development" in reference document [R98] is to be considered in scope for ITSM2.**

**Question no. 181**

Is there in the scope of the ITSM2 RFP any source code or technology to which the successful bidder will have intentional or coincidental access to that would restrict or prohibit the bidder from using resources from within the European Union to deliver the services to you?

**Reply**

**We have no knowledge of any source code or technology to which the successful ITSM2 contractor would have access to, which would lead to a situation where the contractor would be restricted or prohibited to use resources from within the European Union to deliver the services to the Commission.**



**Question no. 182**

Your answer to Question n°41

As we understand, we should provide a minimum of 3 and maximum 5 CVs per profile. As there are 3 profiles required for Lot 3, we should provide between 9 and 15 CVs (and not 12 and 20 as stated in your answer). Can you confirm that our understanding is correct ?

**Reply**

**Please refer to Questions no. 30 and 31. The Questionnaire of lot 3 (Annex I.C) has been amended. Therefore there are 4 profiles required for lot 3. The statement in the reply to the question no 41. is correct, i.e. minimum 12, maximum 20 CVs have to be provided.**

**Question no. 183**

Page 11 of the Questionnaire ITSM2 Lot3, Question 4.2.3 - point 2:

We are required to provide 2 project references regarding the implementation and deployment of ITSM tools.

(a) We assume that ITSM refers to IT service management tools, can you please confirm whether our assumption is correct?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

(b) Furthermore, we would like to understand the need for such project reference in the context of Lot 3, since the scope of the lot does not cover such services (i.e. the implementation and deployment of ITSM tools).

**Reply**

**We confirm that there is an error. As a consequence, the second bullet point of the section 4.2.3 (page 11) of the Questionnaire of Lot 3 (Annex I.C) must be read as follows:**

*"For each of two projects in the area of  
- advice for IT architecture, service management and service control or  
- service improvement, change management and benchmarking,  
each done for a **different customer** (departments, divisions, directorates, etc. are regarded as the same customer)"*

**The Annex I.C: Lot 3: Questionnaire has been corrected accordingly.**

**Question no. 184**

Page 120 of Lot 3 - Technical specifications:

It is specified that all profiles must have knowledge of SMT.

(a) We understand that it refers to the IT service management tool used by DG TAXUD, is it correct?

**Reply**

**The Lot 3 profiles must indeed have the broadest possible knowledge on service management tools which indeed includes the DG TAXUD used service management tool.**

(b) Can you specify in which context or for which tasks of Lot 3 we would have to use the tool?

**Reply**

**The ITSM2 Lot 3 contractor must have the necessary expertise and experience to evaluate/benchmark the SMT implementation, guide/advise DG TAXUD on best practices, benchmark offers/technical proposals concerning Synergia evolutions, etc.**

(c) Can you also specify, for our information, which processes are supported by this tool in your organisation (e.g. change management, configuration management, incident management, etc.)?

**Reply**

**The tool supports all ITIL processes currently implemented by DG TAXUD and its contractors.**

**Question no. 185**

Annex II.A.1, point 6.7.1.2.1, first & second sentence of this paragraph say:

"In its day-to-day operations, the CCN.TC contractor is responsible together with DG TAXUD to manage contact lists in which all application support centres, external contractors and national technical representatives are registered. This list is used ...to notify the CCN community about CCN events."

(a) CCN community stands for CCN user community?

**Reply**

**Yes.**

(b) Is the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor supposed to maintain contact lists of the internet users of CCN CSI gateways?

**Reply**

**No.**

(c) Is the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor expected to take initiative to contact the internet user community of CCN events that have relevance for them?

**Reply**

**No.**

**Question no. 186**

Annex II.A.1, point 6.7.1.2.4, first attention point (exclamation mark) says:

"The CCN.TC contractor is responsible for ...maintenance of the community infrastructure deployed at ..."

Annex II.A.1, point 6.7.1.2.4, information point at the end of 'phase 3 Hardware & Software Deployment' point says:

"it must be highlighted that, whilst maintenance remains outside the scope of the ITSM2 Lot1, ..."

We would like some further clarification about both statements, as they seem in contradiction with each other?

**Reply**

**There is no contradiction. The sentence "it must be highlighted that, whilst maintenance remains outside the scope of the ITSM2 Lot 1, all deployment duties for new CSI stacks are..." refers to the maintenance of the CSI stacks which will remain with the incumbent CCN/TC contractor. Only the operational CCN activities are within the scope of ITSM2 Lot 1.**

**Question no. 187**

Annex II.A.2, point 5.2.7, last bulleted point of the paragraph says:

"The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor is requested to ... act as TAXUD CCN local system administrator, including user management duties and all other system administration tasks. These roles are known as ....Local Security Administrator ...and LSYA - Local System Administrator ..."

Annex II.A.1, point 6.7.1.2.5, last table with "Roles and Responsibilities" for National Administration, gives 4 NA job roles : Technical Project Manager, Administrative Project Manager, Local Security Officer/administrator, and Local System Administrator.

(a) Does this mean that the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor is expected to take responsibility for part of the activities now done by the National Administration team?

**Reply**

**No. DG TAXUD has to assume the management of its CCN gateways as identified in [R51] and Section 5 of Annex II.A.1 and therefore, will entrust the future ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor with these tasks.**

(b) If yes, which of the 4 NA roles mentioned in Annex II.A.1 is involved? For example : are the NA Technical Project Manager and the NA Administrative project manager roles meant to be moved to the responsibility of the ITSM2 Lot1 contractor?

**Reply**

**Given the reply to (a), the question is not applicable/relevant.**

**Question no. 188**

We refer to Lot 1 - Financial Model - Service Block #6. In the financial model, the Service Block #6 indicates in the components P.6.1 to P.6.18 a total of 91 "management of applications" per month. However in the Technical specifications document (Annex II.A.1 / Lot 1 / "As-is description) page 231/313 (table 30), the current number of installations is 288 per year or in average (taking into account holiday periods) about 30 per month. Could you please clarify the difference between those two numbers (30 and 91 respectively)?

**Reply**

**The table 30 on page 231 of Annex II.A.1 (Technical specifications – As is document for lot 1) indicates that the number of applications in 2010 was 66, while the price elements P.6.1 to P.6.18 in the Price Table (Annex III.A) refer to the estimated total number of applications throughout the lifetime of the framework contract.**

**Question no. 189**

Question related to §4.6.1 of Annex I.A – Questionnaire ITSM2 Lot 1 ‘Compliance with ISO standards or equivalent’ lists ISO standards and requests that the relevant organisational entities provide certificates. The list includes:

- ISO 20000-2-2005
- ISO 27001-2005
- ISO 27002.2005

ISO/IEC 27002 is a code of practice - a generic, advisory document, not truly a standard or formal specification such as ISO/IEC 27001 which, formally defines the mandatory requirements for an Information Security Management System (ISMS). ISO/IEC 27002 acts like a precursor to ISO/IEC 27001 certification but is not a standard in itself whereby certification can be attained.

The same applies to ISO 20000-2-2005. ISO 20000-1 is the specification for Service Management. It defines the processes and provides assessment criteria and recommendations for those responsible for IT Service Management. Organizational certification uses this section. ISO 20000-2 documents a “code of practice” that explains how to manage IT with regards to ISO 20000-1 audits. ISO 20000-2 acts like a precursor to ISO 20000-1 certification but is not a standard in itself whereby certification can be attained.

With the above in mind, we do not understand why DG TAXUD requests certification status in relation to:

- ISO 20000-2-2005, and
- ISO 27002.2005

since the standards are:

- ISO 20000-1-2005
- ISO 27001.2005

We are, therefore, cautious about replying ‘No’ to clarification status on a ‘non-standard’. We would appreciate further clarification from DG TAXUD on desired certification in relation to this question and appreciate confirmation of our understanding in relation to ISO 20000-2-2005 and ISO 27002.2005.

**Reply**

**We confirm that ISO 20000-1:2005 is accepted as equivalent of ISO 20000-2:2005. Similarly, ISO 27001.2005 is accepted as equivalent of ISO 27002.2005.**

**Question no. 190**

The Questionnaire for Lot 3 (Annex I.C), Heading 5.1, bullet point 4, requests the tenderer to provide a summary proposal for the contractual OLA. According to our understanding OLAs would seem to be applicable to Lot 1 and Lot 2, therefore we understand that for Lot 3 they correspond to a description of contractual SLAs.

(a) Can you please confirm whether our understanding is correct?

**Reply**

**No, your understanding is incorrect.**

(b) If not, could you please clarify how this should be understood? Could you provide some further specifications of elements which you deem necessary to be included in the description of OLAs?

**Reply**

**Description of contractual OLA referred to in Section 5.1 of Annex I.C (Questionnaire for lot 3) means a description of how the tenderer will organise, implement and meet the SLA outlined in Section 8 of Annex II.C (Technical specifications for lot 3).**

**Question no. 191**

Your tendering specifications contain as annexes the Legal Entity Form (Annex VII) and Financial Identification Form (VIII).

Usually these documentation needs to be introduced at contract award.

(a) Can you please confirm that these documents need to be introduced at tender phase?

**Reply**

**Yes**

(b) If affirmative, is this input required only for the leader of the consortium, or also for the consortium members?

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 164**

(c) If affirmative need subcontractors to introduce these documents as well?

**Reply**

**No**

(d) If affirmative, can you indicate the exact location where these documents needs to be put in the tender?

**Reply**

**Please find a suitable section in your offer where to include such documents.**

**Question no. 192**

I refer to “guidebook of tenderers” - Page 16: under point 9.2.2. – Technical and professional capacity

⇒ Proof of registration in a professional or trade register must be included.

(a) Need subcontractors to introduce this document as well?

**Reply**

**No**

(b) Can you indicate the exact location where these documents needs to be put in the tender?

**Reply**

**Please find a suitable section in your offer where to include such documents.**

**Question no. 193**

We have the following questions regarding ITSM2 Lot 3;

**Annex Ic. section 4.2.3:** Following text “For each of five (completed in 2009 and 2010) recent service contracts in the area of the required services,..” states a different number of the to be provided service references than written in section 4.2.1 where the text reads: “Provide at least three (3), but no more than five (5), **client reference** contacts...”.

Also, 4.2.1 talks about references provided in 2008, 2009 and 2010, where 4.2.3 only refers to 2009 and 2010.

Can we assume that the text should be “For each of three to five (completed in 2008, 2009 and 2010) recent service contracts in the area of the required services...”

**Reply**

**Your assumption is not correct. Section 4.2.1 of Annex I.C (Questionnaire for lot 3) requires to provide client references (at least three but no more than five), while section 4.2.3 requires to provide five service references, using the Service Reference Form.**

**Question no. 194**

We have the following questions regarding ITSM2 Lot 3;

**Annex Ic. section 4.4** In the last update of the questionnaire (25/11/11), the role of Service Management has been added to the list of the to be provided CV's. However, no profile description is present in chapter 9.1 of Annex 2c.

(a) Can we assume that this role should be filled in by any of the defined roles in chapter 9.1.

**Reply**

**Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 125.**

(b) If not, could you please provide the Service Manager profile description?

**Reply**

**Further to the reply to the previous question, this question is not applicable.**

**Question no. 195**

When comparing the quantities for some of the price elements P5.x (x=2 to 15) as found in the Pricing Table of Q6 and the quantities found in Annex II.A.2 §9.2.8 where the meaning of those price elements is explained, we notice quite a big difference between both. When making a similar comparison for the price elements P6.1 to P6.18, differences exist but are far less pronounced (see tables below).

As the quantities for those P5.x in the pricing table would imply a much higher TCV, we would like to understand how DG TAXUD sees the evolution of these quantities over time.

	Pricing Element	Quantity from Pricing Table	Quantity from Annex II.A.2 §9.2.8
<b>P.5.2</b>	Infrastructure Management - Logical Server @ ITSM2 Lot1	300	98
<b>P.5.5</b>	Infrastructure Management - Logical Server @ DIGIT	20	10



<b>P.5.6</b>	Infrastructure Management - Application Server @ ITSM2 Lot1	50	0
<b>P.5.10</b>	Infrastructure Management - Database Server @ ITSM2 Lot1	50	13
<b>P.5.15</b>	Online disk storage space allocated @ ITSM2 Lot1	6	1

	Pricing Element	Quantity from Pricing Table	R185 Inventory of CIs and split between the ITSM2 Lots
<b>P.6.1</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Low" with a QoS of N-5/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	21	18
<b>P.6.2</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of N-5/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	21	18
<b>P.6.3</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of N-5/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	8	6
<b>P.6.4</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Low" with a QoS of X-5/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	4	0
<b>P.6.5</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of X-5/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	2	0
<b>P.6.6</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of X-5/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 5d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0
<b>P.6.7</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Low" with a QoS of N-7/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service	1	3

	Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)		
<b>P.6.8</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of N-7/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	2	1
<b>P.6.9</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of N-7/13 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	2	0
<b>P.6.10</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Low" with a QoS of X-7/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0
<b>P.6.11</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of X-7/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0
<b>P.6.12</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of X-7/13 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-13h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0
<b>P.6.13</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Low" with a QoS of N-7/24 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0
<b>P.6.14</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of N-7/24 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	1
<b>P.6.15</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of N-7/24 - (Normal Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	1
<b>P.6.16</b>	Management of one application with a	14	12

	complexity "Low" with a QoS of X-7/24 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)		
<b>P.6.17</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "Medium" with a QoS of X-7/24 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	8	6
<b>P.6.18</b>	Management of one application with a complexity "High" with a QoS of X-7/24 - (Extended Quality of Service, 7d-24h Service Window) - (Including updates, hotfixes, patches, data patches, monitoring, decommissioning, BCP/DRP exercise...)	1	0

**Reply**

The increase of P5.x price elements is indeed proportionally higher than the P6.x price elements. It must be understood that for each new application (for which P6.x price elements apply) there will be multiple P5.x price elements as indeed, every new application will require multiple infrastructure components to host the new application.

As far as the evolution over time of P5.x and P6.x price elements is concerned, such information is not available.

**Question no. 196**

Annex I c - Question 5.3.2.

We would like to make sure that the term "Office automation" used in this question actually refers to what is described in page 130 of Annex IIc.  
Could you please confirm?

**Reply**

**We confirm that your assumption is correct.**

**Question no. 197**

Thank you for the replies to the questions posted on your website.  
So, to be 100 % sure we understood the Commission's answer to question 157 (Annex II.A2 - page 63): the lot 1 contractor will establish/sign the required contracts in its own name but on behalf of the Commission. Is this understanding correct?"

## Reply

**Your understanding is correct.**

### **Question no. 198**

ANNEX II.A.2: LOT1, p. 40, last paragraph, stipulates on the one hand: “The ITSM2 Lot1 contractor will merge the ITSM and CCN portal into a single service portal; this should include the future CCN ACT tool...”. On the other hand, ANNEX II.A.2: LOT1, p. 65, last paragraph, defines the 4<sup>th</sup> business case: “Merge and harmonise tools (e.g. call handling system, portals, event management system, monitoring, provisioning, etc);”

Our understanding is thus that the ITSM2 Lot 1 contractor has to merge the ITSM and CCN portal into a single service portal via the 4<sup>th</sup> business case. Secondly that this merger of the ITSM and CCN portal has to be completed within 24 months following the start of the Take-over services.

Please confirm?

## Reply

**We confirm that your understanding is correct.**

### **Question no. 199**

ITS-IMSR-SC08-2010-12-MSR Dec 2010 v1.00.pdf (part of R192 on the DVD) and R1 on DVD (ITSM FQP-Annex 11) – pages 11 and 33

In Annex 11 (p.12) to the ITSM FQP (R1 on the DVD), the SD team consists of 14 agents. Assuming that this was the staff in place in 2010, it is difficult to understand how these 14 agents were able to "handle" the 14.000 mails in the ITSM Monitor mailbox in december 2010 (see table 15, page 33 of the MSR). Moreover, there were also 29160 mails received in the ITSM Support Mailbox, and 29512 mails sent from that same ITSM Support Mailbox (see table 1, page 11 of the MSR). Although you stated in response to Q177 that mail quantity has decreased since the progress in the Synergia progress, we feel that we lack the required insight to understand the workload associated with these mails, especially since you stated that no automated mail analysis tools are in use. 1° Can you elaborate on the mail activity by the SD Agents and describe with some detail what they are doing with these mails, and what concrete actions they take on ? 2° Do you confirm our understanding that with the current state of Synergia, at least the sending of mails has been automated, with no intervention of SD Agents anymore ? 3° Can you give us the mail quantity of ITSM Monitor and ITSM Support Mailboxes that the SD has handled in e.g. October 2011 ? 4° Can you give us the actual SD Staffing in the same period ?

## Reply

It must be understood that –as indicated in the MSR [R192]– the ITSM Monitor mailbox is collecting all possible monitoring information (related to infrastructure, applications, availability, alerts, etc.). This particular mailbox is used by the entire ITSM organisation (infrastructure management, application management, business monitoring, etc.) and not just by the service desk.

As per our Reply to Question no. 177, Synergia automates the sending of mails. When a service desk agent updates an object in Synergia, the system automatically sends an email to the issuer.

The service desk indeed continues to receive and send e-mails. Not all service desk users are using the self-service incident logging facilities as can be seen from the key figures table in the MSR (section 2.1.1.1). These incidents or service requests are sent by email to the service desk. The service desk agent opens an interaction (or another object) based on these mails. From then onwards, updates to the object in Synergia (e.g. reassigning a ticket, escalating an interaction to an incident, setting a cluser status, etc.) gives rise to an automated mail (the service desk agent doesn't have to send this mail manually). Requests for further information however are still triggered manually as those are based on a human decision.

As per your request, you will find on our website the MSR of October 2011 allowing to check the October 2011 figures. The service desk –at the time of writing– still consists of 14 agents.

## Question no. 200

annex II.A.2 – Par. 13.10.28 – page 145

The question pertains to how undue service calls are being defined. 1° Can you please provide us with an ubiquitous definition; 2° If no definition is available at this stage, do you agree we will define the term in common agreement during the takeover?

## Reply

Undue service calls are the ones that cannot be counted as per definition in section 9.2.7 of Annex II.A.2: "service calls opened and resolved by automatic means without human intervention between are not to be counted (e.g. password reset with a self-service web page, download of documents, calls related to quality review cycles, etc)".

**Question no. 201**

In the answer to question 174 TAXUD states that Internet Connection in the Lux1, Lux2 and D/R data centre needs to be provided by the ITSM2 contractor. Does this mean that the ITSM2 contractor should become the ISP (Internet Service Provider) for Taxud? Isn't this something provided by TAXUD's WAN provider? Or does this only mean that the ITSM2 contractor needs to provide the VPN concentrators he needs for his own service delivery?

**Reply**

As indicated in the Reply to Question no. 174, the ITSM2 tenderer only needs to foresee –for his own ITSM2 service management needs– an internet connection (1) between his premises and both data centres in Luxembourg and (2) between his premises and his proposed disaster recovery site. All other connections will be provided by DG TAXUD.

**Question no. 202**

What is the status of the upgrade of HP SM 7 to HP SM 9 that was planned in Q4 2011 as described in the documentation?

- (a) Can you verify that the version in scope for the upgrade of HP SM is still 9.30?
- (b) Can we assume that this upgrade is successfully implemented at the start of the cutover?
- (c) What is the status of the implementation of the uCMDB? Is it still at the requirements gathering and functional analysis phase?

**Reply**

- (a) **The scope of the upgrade is indeed HP SM version 9.30.**
- (b) **Unless there is a major/unforeseen event, this version will be deployed before the start of the take-over from the incumbent contractor.**
- (c) **There are currently no deployment plans regarding uCMDB.**

**Question no. 203**

Business hours is contiguous period during a Working Day that the employees of the Commission are available for normal appointments and meetings and can be contacted via telephone, email, chat or SMS.

Can you specify the official business hours of the Commission in Central European Time zone in order to ensure the availability of ITSM2 contractor's resources?

Are these business hours applicable to the locations of DG TAXUD in Belgium and Luxembourg or also on other locations? Please specify.

## Reply

**Business hours in the European Commission mean 8:30 (8:45 on Mondays) – 13:00 and 14:15 – 17:30 (16:30 on Fridays). These hours are applicable to the premises of the European Commission in Belgium and Luxembourg.**

### Question no. 204

Lot 1:

Our company is headquartered and registered in EU Member State A and has fully owned and controlled subsidiaries in the four EU Member States B, C, D and E. Company A intends to submit a tender.

For the purposes of answering section 4 of the Questionnaire "SELECTION OF THE TENDERER - TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY", can company A use the technical capacity of its subsidiaries **without including any of B, C, D and E as joint tenderers or subcontractors?**

## Reply

No.

**In conformity with Section 5 of the Tendering Specifications (page 8) and with Section 5 of Annex IV to the Tendering Specifications (Guidebook for Tenderers, pages 7 to 9):**

*"Companies can consider two ways of collaborating in an offer: either as joint partners in the offer or through subcontracting. Offers may even combine both approaches. In the case of joint offers, one of the companies has to be designated as the primary contractor."*

**In any case, your file must specify very clearly whether each company involved in the offer is acting as a partner in a joint offer or as a subcontractor (this also applies where the various companies involved belong to the same group, or even where one is the parent company of the others).**

**For more details on the implications of these two models of collaboration, please see Section 5.1 (Joint offers) and Section 5.2 (Subcontracting) of Annex IV (Guidebook).**

**Please see also pages 3 and 4 of the Questionnaire ITSM2 – Lot 1. According to the Questionnaire:**

- **Companies taking part in the joint offer shall fill in Sections 1 to 3 of this Questionnaire (except bullet point 4 of section 3)**
- **Subcontractors shall submit a letter of intent to collaborate as subcontractors in this call for tenders.**

**This reply also applies to lots 2 and 3.**

**Question no. 205**

Lot 1

Our company is registered in EU Member State A and fully belongs to Group of Companies G (headquartered also in EU). The Group has fully owned and controlled subsidiaries in the four EU Member States B, C, D and E. Company A intends to submit a tender on behalf of the whole Group G.

Group G intends to make a formal and binding commitment (laid down in a dully signed *support letter* addressed to DG TAXUD) to provide all necessary resources (staff, know-how, financial facilities, technical facilities) to company A for the provision of the Lot 1 services, including resources from companies B, C, D and E.

For the purposes of answering section 4 of the Questionnaire "SELECTION OF THE TENDERER - TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY", can company A, by way of relaying on the said *support letter*, use the technical capacity of its sister companies B, C, D, and E **without including any of B, C, D and E as joint tenderers or subcontractors?**

**Reply**

**Please see the reply to Question no. 204.**

**Question no. 206**

Question Related to Lot3-ITSM2

In Page 48 of the Technical Specifications, On Demand services is estimated to be about 5 persons. "*The on demand activities would be roughly estimated to be around 5 FTE's.*"

In the Annex III C, spreadsheet, TBP worksheet, On Demand service pricing is based on 9300 man days, plus some unit priced On Demand items. This indicates that On Demand services are 8+ FTEs over five years. Could you please confirm which of the above figures is correct? Which is the closer estimation of the On Demand services over the five years of the contract? Thank you very much for your clarification,.

**Reply**

**We confirm that the maximum number of on-demand quantities that may be ordered over the period of the framework contract are the quantities listed in the price table (Annex III.C).**



**Question no. 207**

According to paragraph 9 'Clarifying the nature of the contract', XXXXXXXX would like to ask the following question:

Further to your reply to Question 157 we wish to bring to the Commission's attention that it is not always possible or allowed contractually nor beneficial for the Commission that contracts for the purchase of hardware and software are entered into by the winning tenderer and the ownership transferred to the Commission.

We therefore suggest that the winning tenderer facilitates such purchases by acting as the purchasing department but that the contracts resulting from such purchases are entered into by the Commission and that thus the Commission is the owner of the hardware and software (licenses). Do you agree with this suggestion? If not please clarify how you would envisage the transfer of ownership.

**Reply**

**No, we do not agree with your suggestion.**

**The question of the transfer of ownership is based on Article II.17 (Ownership) of Part II (General Conditions) and, more particularly, on sections 3, 4 and 5 of Part III (General Terms and Conditions for Information Technologies Contracts) of the Standard Contract.**

**Question no. 208**

Annex I.C. Question 4.3.1.5

It is not clear what a function is compared to a role or a profile.

a) Can we assume that a function is an organisational entity?

**Reply**

**No, a function is not necessarily an organisational entity.**

**As for the definition of a function, please refer to the Reply to Question no. 124.**

b) If not, can you please explain what kind of list you expect in the table?

**Reply**

**Under section 4.3.1 - fifth question of Annex I.C (Lot 3 Questionnaire), the tenderers are requested to list all functions they see fit for the delivery of the services covered by the contract.**

c) What is the difference with the list of roles?

**Reply**

**A function can be performed by multiple roles; a role can be involved in multiple functions.**

**Question no. 209**

Annex I.C Question 4.4.1

You ask for the CVs of the staff we "commit" to assign. What do you exactly mean by "commit"? Indeed, we are required to provide between 3 and 5 CVs per profile and at this stage, we cannot commit to have these 3 to 5 person working 100% on the project. Can you please explain?

**Reply**

**Commitment means that tenders may only propose CVs of personnel that can effectively be assigned to the contract at signature time.**

**Question no. 210**

Annex II C P 113 section 8.9.6

a) We need to make sure that the initial value of the total number of months experience in the core team that will be assigned full time remains at an acceptable level , i.e. above a limit of 80% of the SQI, which is calculated with the months of experience of the core team staff proposed in the tender.

In this context, does the word "tender" refer to our proposal for the Framework Contract-Lot 3 or to each tender for specific contracts?

**Reply**

**It refers to the tender for specific contracts.**

b) If it relates to our offer for the framework contract, how do you calculate the total months of experience of the core team since we do not necessarily provide all CVs for the core team (e.g. ISO) and since we provide more CVs than necessary for the execution of the work (i.e. 3 to 5 per profile).

**Reply**

**Given the Reply to question no. 210 a), this is not applicable.**

**Question no. 211**

Annex II C P 113 section 8.9.6

Could you please clarify what you mean by "core team in the tender"? In which question are we supposed to define it and how do you calculate the number of "months of experience".

**Reply**

As per section 5.1.2 of Annex II.C (Lot 3 Technical specifications), core team means project management, contract management, quality management, integration office support, architecture expertise, security expertise, IT operations expertise, technology expertise.

The initial months of experience of the core team will be calculated on the basis of the CVs of the core team. The tenderer will assign this core team to the first specific contract that will cover the continuous services.

**Question no. 212**

We noticed that the Tendering Specifications – common for the three lots- refer in page 17 to a list of annexes; of which the **annex X. B - Part III General Terms and Conditions for IT service contracts.**

These Terms and Conditions, especially chapters 3 to and including 8 are specifically applicable for the delivery of hardware, software and IT services. To our understanding these Terms and Conditions are not relevant for lot 3, which has a different nature than lots 1 and lots 2.

Could you please confirm that our understanding is correct and thus Annex X.B, especially chapters 3 to and including 8, is not applicable to lot 3 contract?"

**Reply**

**Your understanding is not correct.**

**Annex X.B (Framework Contract – Part III: General Terms and Conditions for IT Service Contracts) to the Tendering Specifications is also applicable to Lot 3 of the contract as the Tendering Specifications are applicable to the whole contract.**

**Question no. 213**

**In relation to Q&A No 86.** DG TAXUD does not confirm that the maximum budget allocated for the ITSM Lot 3 is 15.600.000 euros. In the answer given DG-TAXUD state that the estimated value of the FwC for the 5 years is 13.000.000 euros (+/- 20%). In order to clarify, we would like to ask a clear statement from DG-TAXUD to the following question giving a **Yes/No** answer.

Would a tenderer be disqualified if they present a financial offer (Annex3c) over 13.000.000 euros but less than 15.600.000 euros?

**Reply**

**We cannot give a yes/no answer to this question.**

**We have already replied to this question through the reply to question no. 86. A tender needs to comply with the exclusion, selection and award criteria altogether as stated in the tendering specifications not to be disqualified.**

**Question no. 214**

**In relation to the Exclusion Criteria:** One of our Consortium members based in Netherlands is having some difficulties to identify the correct official document to be provided in order to answer bullet 2.6 of the exclusion Criteria (Have you enclosed a relevant extract from a judicial record to confirm that you are not subject to a judgment on fraud, corruption etc...?.)

- a) Could DG-TAXUD inform us which document could be used to fulfill this requirement under the Netherlands Law?
- b) In case not document is issued by the public authorities, would be enough an affidavit signed in from of a Public authority like a Notary?

**Reply**

**Please see the Replies to Questions no. 36 and no. 37. Similarly, if according to the Dutch Law, the affidavit, in the Netherlands, is not issued by the public authorities, we consider that such a document could therefore be issued by a Notary.**

**Question no. 215**

- a) What is the exact split between the Lot1 contractor and the Lot 2 contractor in terms of applications supported? Can we assume that Lot1 will be responsible for the applications listed in grey in the tables in Annex 1 of the document Annex II.B.2?

**Reply**

**The split of responsibilities between the Lot 1 and the Lot 2 contractors is defined on the basis of the respective CI tables for Lot 1 (see reference documents [R185] and [R332]) and Lot 2 (table in annex 1 of the document Annex II.B.2), and also according to their respective responsibilities defined in the technical specifications of Lot 1 and Lot 2. Application management will always be done by the Lot 1 contractor.**

**Regarding the applications listed in grey in the tables in Annex 1 of the document Annex II.B.2, please refer to page 16 of the Technical Annex for Lot 2. According to the scope envisaged at the start of the ITSM2 contract, these applications are in the scope of Lot 1.**

- b) Additionally, how are the responsibilities divided between the Lot 1 and Lot 2 contractor for the following activities:
- Execution of the PSAT
  - Execution of the SAT
  - Maintenance of the ATP, and execution of functional tests as part of the PSAT/SAT
  - Conformance testing

### **Reply**

**The split of responsibilities is defined in the technical specifications of Lot 1 and Lot 2.**

**- Execution of the PSAT and SAT is the responsibility of the Lot 1 contractor (section 6.6.1.1.4 of Annex II.A.1)**

**- If by ATP you refer to the Acceptance Test Plan, then the maintenance is done by the Developments contractors. If by ATP you refer to the Addendum to Test Plan, then the maintenance is done by the Lot 1 contractor.**

**Concerning the execution of functional tests as part of PSAT/SAT: the Lot 2 contractor executes the functional tests for all applications listed in the table in Annex 1 of document Annex II.B.2, except for the applications listed in grey in this table for which the functional test are executed by the Lot 1 contractor.**

**- Concerning the conformance testing: similar to the functional tests, the Lot 2 contractor executes the conformance tests for all applications listed in the table in Annex 1 of document Annex II.B.2, except for the applications listed in grey in this table for which the conformance tests are executed by the Lot 1 contractor.**

### **Question no. 216**

Pricing element 5.14 – Data centre floor capacity. Could you confirm that the price per M<sup>2</sup> must include the electricity consumption of the servers? Usually the electricity consumption is generally invoiced base on the real consumption and not on fixed price per M<sup>2</sup>. Please advice

**Reply**

**We confirm that the price per m<sup>2</sup> must include the electricity consumption of the servers.**

**Question no. 217**

Annex II A2 chapter 5.2.1 page 35 – CFT says “As for the organisation of the meetings, operational and ad hoc meetings could be held not only at DG TAXUD premises, but as well via (Video) Conference calls. Following our understanding the Video conference is not part of the requirement. Is our understanding correct?”

**Reply**

**Your understanding is correct.**

**Question no. 218**

Toll-free "800" line – We understand the this number will be used to reach the service desk from the E.U countries but as well to be used for all the conference calls with all the EU countries. Is our understanding correct?

**Reply**

**No, the toll-free "800" line only concerns the number to reach the service desk.**