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

Brussels, 19/06/2013
taxud.r.1(2013) 2452121

Subject: **Call for tenders TAXUD/2013/AO-01 (CUST-DEV3) – replies to questions 1 to 74**

Dear Madam, dear Sir,

Please find enclosed the replies to all the questions received up to 19 June 2013.

This letter is being posted on our website at
http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm

Subsequent questions will be answered in further letters which will be posted regularly on the same website. Prospective tenderers are invited to monitor our website attentively.

Please note that the deadline for submission of tenders has been **postponed to 24 June 2013**. Therefore, requests for additional information received less than five working days before the closing date for submission of tenders, i.e. after 17 June 2013, will not be processed.

Yours sincerely,

(e-signed)
Theodoros Vassiliadis
Head of Unit

Enclosure: replies to questions

<u>Corrections to be applied to some of the annexes of the tendering specifications</u>

Following some questions below the following corrections have to be applied to some of the delivered annexes to the tendering specifications.

1. The file "Framework Quality Plan.zip" published on the baseline DVD ROM under the directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\ps" must be replaced with the newly published file "Framework Quality Plan v2.zip". The initially published file on the baseline DVD ROM does not contain all annexes to the main document (file "Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-FQP-v2.00_SfA.pdf");

2. The document "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.01.doc" is to be replaced with "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.02.doc". The new version v1.02 is published with the following correction with indication of track changes:

    a. Page 37, Attachment 3. The attachment is to be completed with a second table where the tenderers have to fill out the productivity rate expressed in number of man-days per IFP per software development category.

3. Annex II.D – List of Reference Documents.

    A new version v1.01 is published with the following corrections with indication of track changes:

    a. A new reference document is added: [R002]; title "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version"; filename "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version.xls"; version "1.00"; date "2012"; path/location on DVD ROM "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references";

    b. [R005]: the title has been corrected to "Function Point Counting Practices Manual";

    c. [R006]: the title has been changed from "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application" to "TAXUD Complexity calculator".

4. Document "TAXUD Software Development Categories" published on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references". A new version v1.01 is published with the following corrections with indication of track changes:

    a. On page 6, paragraph 1.6 "Reference Documents": "[R01]" is replaced with "[R005]";

    b. On page 6, paragraph 1.6 "Reference Documents": "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

    c. On page 10, paragraph 4 "IFPUG FSM Methodology applied to DG TAXUD", introduction text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

    d. On page 10, paragraph 4.2, title: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

    e. On page 11, paragraph 4.2.1.4, text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

    f. On page 20, paragraph 4.2.2.7, text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]".

5. The excel file "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version.xls" version 1.00 is published and is to be put on the baseline under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references".

Questions

Q1: What is the technical make-up of the existing solutions landscape?

Reply:

Please refer to Annex II.A – Terms of Reference

- Chapter 3 architecture and strategy background;

- Chapter 5 IT background of DG TAXUD;

- Chapter 8 Customs Central Applications – architectural aspects;

- Chapter 11 Hardware and software in use.

All documents providing more detailed information are referenced in Annex II.A – Terms of Reference and made available on the baseline DVD ROM.

Q2: What is the split in terms of bespoke solution versus COTS?

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 1.

Q3: What are the key challenges /pain point of DG TAXUD with the existing vendors?

Reply:

The Commission cannot and does not disclose appreciation on current contractors. All information which is required to provide an offer to this call for tenders is contained in the various annexes to the tendering specifications.

Q4: Please share who owns the source code for the existing customs IT application and systems?

Reply:

DG Taxation and Customs Union owns the source code of all customs IT applications and systems for which it has a mandate to develop software.

Q5: Does the present agreement with the vendors allow code change?

Reply:

Yes.

Q6: What kind of AMC /Licensing agreement does DG TAXUD have with the vendor?

Reply:

There is no such agreement in place with the incumbent contractor.

Q7: Please confirm the availability of the system documentation and the level of documentation (Thorough, incomplete, absent)?

Reply:

All information which is required to provide an offer to this call for tenders is contained in the various annexes to the tendering specifications.

Q8: Please share the current development, Staging and the Production environment details?

Reply:

For details concerning the development and testing environment please refer to

- "Annex II.A – Terms of Reference, Chapter 11 Hardware and software in use";

- The infrastructure management process as described in annex 32 of the existing Framework Quality Plan (FQP) applied by the incumbent contractor (file "Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-Annex 32-Infrastructure Management-v1.01_SfA.pdf" annexed to file "Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-FQP-v2.00_SfA.pdf" on baseline under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\ps").

For details concerning the production environment please refer to the Technical Infrastructure Plan (TIP) document as delivered on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references" with filename "TIP.pdf".

Q9: What change management procedure do DG TAXUD follow? On what basis would they accept the changes?

Reply:

For the change management procedure please refer to

- The change management process as described in the service management part of TEMPO. You may access TEMPO as described in Annex II.A – Terms of Reference chapter 0.5 "References";

- The change management process as described in annex 1 of the existing Framework Quality Plan (FQP) applied by the incumbent contractor (file " Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-Annex 01-Change Management-v1.01_SfA.pdf" annexed to file "Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-FQP-v2.00_SfA.pdf" on baseline under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\ps").

For the acceptance of changes please refer to Annex II.B – Technical Annex chapter 2.3.5 "Acceptance mechanism".

Q10: Who would take care of roles creation like Sys admin role for the applications?

Reply:

The required operational services are managed by the ITSM2 contractor and are not part of this call for tenders (please refer to section 5.6 "IT contractors of DG TAXUD" of Annex II.A).

Q11: Can we have an in flight projects list with business and system impact information?

Reply:

Please refer to

- "Annex II.A – Terms of Reference, Chapter 7 Future Perspectives;

- The "electronic customs Multi-Annual Strategic Plan 2012 revision" document and its annexes as delivered on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\eas" with filename "MASP - official.zip".

Q12: How is the Application recovery taken care?

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 10.

Q13: Planned projects for 2013- 2014 list with business and systems impact information?

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 11.

Q14 : Has DG TAXUD defined any testing process in the past, do you have any process documentations for them?

Reply:

For the testing processes please refer to the testing and prototyping process as described in the application management part of TEMPO. You may access TEMPO as described in Annex II.A – Terms of Reference chapter 0.5 "References".

Q15 : Please share the User / Volumes i.e. concurrent users, avg. Peak users etc of the applications ?

Reply:

For operational information on the customs IT systems and applications refer to Annex II.A – Terms of Reference chapter 6 "The portfolio of Customs IT systems and applications".

For the specifications concerning non-functional requirements against which the various customs IT systems and applications have been developed, please refer to the different requirements specification documents delivered on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\cis\CIS".

Q16 : Are there any 3rd party contracts in scope for novation?

Reply:

No.

Q17 : Are there any compliance or regulatory requirements w.r.t. service transition?

Reply:

For the service transition specifications please refer to Annex II.B – Technical Annex

- chapter 2 "Work packages, deliverables and planning required", WP.2 Take-over and related deliverables;

- chapter 5 "Quality requirements", definition of SQI22 "Measure the delay in completing the Take-over within the foreseen Take-over period".

Q18 : How is current IT team structured in terms of either business functions/technology/any other areas ? And what is the number of FTEs in each?

Reply:

For the structure of the current IT team please refer to the organisation chart as described in annex 07 of the existing Framework Quality Plan (FQP) applied by the incumbent contractor (file " Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-Annex 07-Organisation Chart-v1.01_SfA.pdf" annexed to file "Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-FQP-v2.00_SfA.pdf" on baseline under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\ps").

The contract being a service contract, the number of FTEs can vary considerably depending on the services requested.

Q 19 : Annex 1, page 37, Attachment 3 : "The tenderer must fill out the following project productivity table for new IT projects and include it as part of the answer to question 2 of section 5.4 of this questionnaire". Question2 of section 5.4 requests the impact of the IT transformation on the productivity rates of the IT project lifecycle main activities for new IT projects. The table in Attachment 3 however, requests only a split of the productivity rate expressed in percentage per main activity. It does not request the new (improved) productivity rates themselves. Is this table the correct one?

Reply:

The document "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.01.doc" is to be replaced with "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.02.doc". The new version v1.02 is published with the following correction with indication of track changes:

a. Page 37, Attachment 3. The attachment is to be completed with a second table where the tenderers have to fill out the productivity rate expressed in number of man-days per IFP per software development category.

Q 20 : Annex 3, financial excel file, sheets "IFPUG prices for IT maintenance" and "new IT projects". Productivity Rates in number of man-days per IFP. Should we use the productivity rates without the proposed transformations, or with the proposed transformations? If we should use productivity rates with the proposed transformations, how should this be reflected in the sheet "new IT projects", since: (1) Some transformations may be implemented after the first year according to our proposed roadmap; (2) No variations of the productivity rates per year are foreseen in the "new IT projects" sheet.

Reply:

The productivity rates to be filled out in the financial excel file, sheets "IFPUG prices for IT maintenance" and "new IT projects", must be specified <u>without</u> the proposed transformations.

Q 21 : Annex 3, financial excel file, Sheet "IFPUG prices for IT maintenance". Productivity Rates in number of man-days per IFP <u>per year</u>. In case a new application is developed e.g. in Y4 of the project, then the maintenance of this application, which will start in Y5 of the project, will be calculated with the productivity rate of Y1 since this will be the 1st year of maintenance for this application. Is our understanding correct?

Reply:

Your understanding is <u>not</u> correct. The productivity rates for IT maintenance are applicable for IT applications/systems existing at the start of the Framework Contract <u>and</u> for new IT applications/systems developed during the lifecycle of the Framework Contract at the applicable year (Y1, Y2, etc.).

Q 22 : Regarding question 5.3.6 related to the validation of the IFP counting for the "Suspensions" and "RSS" applications, could you please provide clarification on the following questions ?

a) Do you confirm that this question is only related to the IFPUG function point counting of these two application and does not include the calculation of the complexity rating?

b) The document "Software Development Categories" refers as reference [R02] to the "TAXUD IFP Calculator - application_version.xls". The Baseline DVD only contains the "TAXUD_complexity_calculator.xlsm", which is limited to the calculation of the complexity rating. Could you please also provide the "TAXUD IFP Calculator - application_version.xls"?

Reply:

a) Yes, the question is only related to the IFPUG function point counting.

b) This is indeed an error in the referred document. The following corrections have to be applied:

1. Annex II.D – List of Reference Documents.
   A new version v1.01 is published with the following corrections with indication of track changes:

   a. A new reference document is added: [R002]; title "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version"; filename "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version.xls"; version "1.00"; date "2012"; path/location on DVD ROM "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references";

   b. [R005]: the title has been corrected to "Function Point Counting Practices Manual";

   c. [R006]: the title has been changed from "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application" to "TAXUD Complexity calculator".

2. Document "TAXUD Software Development Categories" published on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references".
   A new version v1.01 is published with the following corrections with indication of track changes:

   a. On page 6, paragraph 1.6 "Reference Documents": "[R01]" is replaced with "[R005]";

   b. On page 6, paragraph 1.6 "Reference Documents": "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

   c. On page 10, paragraph 4 "IFPUG FSM Methodology applied to DG TAXUD", introduction text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

   d. On page 10, paragraph 4.2, title: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

   e. On page 11, paragraph 4.2.1.4, text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]";

   f. On page 20, paragraph 4.2.2.7, text: "[R02]" is replaced with "[R002]".

3. The excel file "TAXUD IFP Calculator – application_version.xls" version 1.00 is published and is to be put on the baseline under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\references".

Q 23 : An offer is submitted by a consortium of 2 international service providers (i.e. the Companies C_A and C_B).

The 2 parties that will setup the consortium are the local entities of both Companies in country X (i.e. the Consortium Partners P_{A-X} and P_{B-X}).

Within the consortium, each party will participate with resources employed by the consortium partners in country X, but intends **also** to deploy resources of their respective Delivery Centers in country Y (DC_{A-Y} and DC_{B-Y}). Countries X and Y are member states of the EU.

a) Each Company will provide an endorsement letter from their respective headquarters to cover the services provided from the different countries.

How are the Delivery Centers DC_{A-Y} and DC_{B-Y} to be positioned for answering the Questionnaire, w.r.t. the description of the Tenderer in Sections 1 to 5 (i.e. the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity, technical evaluation)?

Should these delivery centers be considered as 'subcontractors'?

Reply:

Yes

If <u>yes</u>,

b) On page 5 of 'Annex 1: Questionnaire', it is indicated that "tenderers <u>cannot rely</u> on the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity of the subcontractor when replying to Sections 3, 4 and 5". The same paragraph mentions that only Sections 1 and 2 need to be filled in for subcontractors.

Contradictory to this statement, Section 4.3.1. refers to subcontractor personnel as "**non-permanent**", and those figures can be included in the answers to questions 4.3.1. and 4.4.1. This would imply that subcontractor metrics <u>are part of</u> the technical and professional capacity.

Thanks to clarify this 'contradiction' with the statement on page 5 of the Annex 1: Questionnaire.

Reply:

The statement "tenderers <u>cannot rely</u> on the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity of the subcontractor when replying to Sections 3, 4 and 5", mentioned on page 5 of Annex I – Questionnaire, is incorrect and should read: tenderers <u>cannot rely</u> on the economic, and financial capacity of the subcontractor when replying to Section 3.

c) Question 4.4.2. (CVs) stipulates that **at least 1 CV per profile** should relate to **permanent** staff. Can we assume that (in addition to **minimum 1** CV of **permanent** staff of the consortium partners P_{A-X} and P_{B-X} – see above), we can also propose CVs from resources in our Delivery Centers DC_{A-Y} and DC_{B-Y}? These Delivery Centers are fully owned by the respective Companies C_A and C_B. Therefore, the inclusion of such CV's seems 'logical' (because part of the contract work would be performed by the resources belonging to these Delivery Centers). Thanks to clarify.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

d) Referring to the statement on page 5 of 'ANNEX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE', indicating that "tenderers cannot rely on the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity of the subcontractor when replying to Sections 3, 4 and **5**", could you please specify what exactly this statement implies for Section 5 (Technical Evaluation)

Reply:

Please refer to the Tendering Specifications, section 4.2 Subcontracting, alinea d.

Please also refer to the reply to question 23b

e) If the Delivery Centers are <u>not</u> to be considered as subcontractors, please clarify how to describe these entities in the context of Sections 1 to 5.

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 23a

Q 24 : As a subcontractor and to deliver services on a specific work package, we submitted with a consortium an offer to QA3 tender. Considering the conflict of interest aspects, can we join a different consortium as a subcontractor? If yes, what is the procedure if we are awarded in both contracts

Reply:

It is up to the tenderer to determine if there could be a potential conflict of interest.

If that is the case, the tenderer will have to provide the Commission with evidence of compensatory measures that they commit to take to segregate duties regarding the services and/or products to be provided under TAXUD/2013/AO-01 - CUST-DEV3, as opposed to the services and/or products to be provided under (an)other procurement procedure(s) launched by the Commission (namely, TAXUD/2012/AO-06 – Provision of Services for Quality Assurance, Quality Control and Project Management of IT Activities managed by DG TAXUD (QA3)).

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 and to the compensatory measures.

Q 25 : We are active within the tender number TAXUD/2012/AO-05

Considering the conflict of interest aspects, can we join a consortium as a subcontractor for the tender referenced TAXUD/2013/AO-01?

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 24

Q 26 : Regarding the baseline, the schema and figures in document **Baseline_2-EU_Customs_Reference_Architecture-v1 00-SfA.pdf** cannot all be read. The figure's resolution is not good enough to display all information contained in it. We believe the information in the figures may help us better understand the vision and to-be architecture. Can we have the diagrams or a more readable resolution?

Reply:

Indeed, the pdf conversion of the original document has resulted in a degraded definition of the diagrams. The word version of the document can be found on DG TAXUD's website
(http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 27 : In the baseline, according to document Baseline_0-README.pdf, there ought to also be a document **baseline_3-EU_Customs_Reference_Architecture_v1.00-SfA.xls** that should contain the "the models and glossary of the Reference Architecture". That document is missing from the baseline. Can we get it?

Reply:

The missing excel file can be found on DG TAXUD's website
(http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 28 : In the baseline, the **annex_2_consolidated_fiches_en.pdf** refers to BPM models that have been produced already. The BPM directory in the baseline however does not contain such BPM models. We believe the BPM models contain valuable information to better determine the scope and impact of the upcoming projects. Can the BPM models be made available?

Reply:

The BPM baseline on the Baseline DVD (CUSTDEV3_BL\BPM\BPM.zip) needs to be fully disregarded and is replaced with a new version (Q28-BPM.zip) available on DG TAXUD's website
(http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).
Tenderers having signed the non-disclosure agreement (Annex IX of to the tendering specifications) and having received the Baseline DVD will receive – by e-mail – the password to open the new baseline. Tenderers should in particular pay attention to the document "Guidance note for the CUSTDEV3 BPM Baseline.doc" describing the guidelines for exploring the BPM baseline. The BPM models can be accessed online using the URL and login/password indicated in the guidance note.

Q 29 : Regarding the eas.zip file from the Baseline DVD, two issues have been encountered.

a) The following ZIP files (within the eas folder) cannot be extracted, possibly they are password protected:

- \eas\SPEED2   1.0.3\Software\SPEED2\1.0.2\CUST-DEV2-[Removed]-DLV-7.9.1-z-2-SPEED2-v1.0.2.zip
- \eas\SPEED2   1.0.3\Software\SPEED2-STS\1.0.1\CUST-DEV2-[Removed]-DLV-7.1-2(2)-SPEED2_STS-v1.0.1.zip

Please provide new zip-files or provide the passwords.

b) It appears that the MD5 hashtags are not matching for those two files at least. Other ZIP files in the baseline are also not matching their related MD5 hashtags. Please provide updated MD5 hashtags and related zip files.

Reply:

A new zip file (Q29-SPEED2.zip) can be found on the DG TAXUD website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm). Tenderers having signed the non-disclosure agreement (Annex IX of to the tendering specifications) and having received the Baseline DVD will receive – by e-mail – the password to open these corrected zip files.

Q 30: Referring to ANNEX II.B-TECHNICAL ANNEX, Section 4.2, " Integration Developer" is mentioned in the table with all possible staff profiles while in section 4.2.20 the profile "Expert Developer (EXPDEV)" is analysed. In addition, in Annex I: Questionnaire as well as in other parts of the Tendering Specifications, the Integration Developer profile is mentioned.

Could you please confirm that it is the "Expert Developer" naming that we have to use in CVs, References as well as in other parts of our proposal as required?

Reply:

Your understanding is correct. The staff profile "Integration Developer" in ANNEX II.B-TECHNICAL ANNEX, section 4.2, table 4 "List of staff Profiles", row 20 is to be replaced with "Expert Developer". The profile code "EXPDEV" in the table is correct. Annex II.B-Technical Annex, section 4.2.20 contains the correct description of the profile.

Q 31 : About Annex 1 par. 4.4.1, 4.4.2 and Annex 2b par. 4.2.

Regarding Tenderer manpower of staff relevant to the required services, In Annex 1, points 4.4.1 and 4.4.2, and also in point 4.2 from Annex 2b TAXUD presents the code for "Integration Developer" as being "EXPDEV". Further in Annex 2b, at point 4.2.20 TAXUD presents the code for "Expert Developer" as being "EXPDEV".

Please confirm that the "Expert Developer" TAXUD mentions in point 4.2.20 from Annex 2b is in fact the "Integration Developer".

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 30 and apply the following:

- Section 4.4.1 of Annex 1 (Questionnaire) is to be applied as published;

- Section 4.4.2 of Annex 1(Questionnaire) : "Integration Developer" is to be replaced with "Expert Developer";

- Attachment 2, CV front page, "Integration Developer" is to be replaced with "Expert Developer" in the column with the "profile applicable to the services of the CUST-DEV3 framework contract".

A new version of the Questionnaire and Price Table with correct profile names can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 32 : About point 6.2.1 - Economic and financial capacity.

Regarding point 6.2.1 Economic and financial capacity TAXUD requests the following:

"b) Balance sheets for at least the last three financial years for which accounts have been closed;"

Considering that for some companies the balance sheets for 2012, audited according to IFRS standards, will not be available at the date of tender submission, please clarify which of the following they should present:

a) Balance sheets for 2010, 2011 and 2012 according to the Financial Regulations in the country where the company in this situation is registered

b) Balance sheets for 2010 and 2011, audited according to IFRS standards and Balance sheets for 2012 according to the Financial Regulations in the country where the company in this situation is registered

c) Balance sheets for 2009, 2010 and 2011, audited according to IFRS standards

Reply:

Please provide the balance sheets for the last three financial years for which accounts have been closed (i.e. not necessarily audited) in the country where your legal entity is registered.

Q 33 : About turnover and the turnover related to the scope of the contract.

In regards to TAXUD's answer for the question related to the balance sheets and also point 6.2.1 Economic and financial capacity where TAXUD requests the following:

c) A statement of overall turnover and the turnover related to the scope of the contract, during the last three financial years, which establishes that they are equal or superior to 60.000.000 EUR and 35.000.000 EUR respectively;

The thresholds will be verified based on the turnover figures for at least the three (3) last years (2010, 2011 and 2012). In case of consortium, these thresholds will be verified on the level of the consortium. "

Please clarify which of the turnover and the turnover related to the scope of the contract have to be presented:

a) The figures for years 2010 and 2011 according to the balance sheets presented and an estimated value for 2012 if the accounts have not been closed yet for 2012

b) Only figures that can be verified according to the balance sheets presented in point 6.2.1 b) according to the answer for the above question

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to question 33 and submit the turnover figures according to the relevant balance sheets provided.

Q 34 : About Baseline_CSRD2-Technical_Architecture-2.00-EN-SfA.PDF.

All figures in the document are blank. Please provide a new version of the document containing all diagrams.

Reply:

A technical error occurred in the conversion step to PDF format. The word version with filename "Q34-CSRD2-Technical_Architecture-2.00-EN-SFA.doc" can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 35 : EC CUSTDEV3 - annex2a Terms of reference.pdf – Section 11.

Our understanding: the software and hardware listed is used by the incumbent contractor to perform all the activities related to integration testing and factory acceptance testing. Activities preceding the integration phase as described in EC CUSTDEV3 - annex2b Technical Annex.pdf, section 6.1, last paragraph, last sentence, are not executed on the listed hardware and software.

Is our understanding correct?

Reply:

Your understanding is correct. Please note that the ANNEX II.B – TECHNICAL ANNEX, section 6.1, last paragraph, last sentence only specifies "programming and unit testing" as activities preceding the integration phase.

Q 36 : EC CUSTDEV3 - annex2a Terms of reference.pdf – Section 11.

Software such as the ARIS platform or Oracle software are not mentioned. Please clarify.

Reply:

For information concerning the ARIS tool environment please refer to the "Baseline_DLV-9.9-73_03 - ARIS Implementation Environment Manual - V1.10 - re-SfA.pdf" published on the baseline DVD ROM under directory "\CUSTDEV3_BL\eas\ARIS\guidelines\3.governance\3.Implementation Environment Manual". The required licenses are provided by the Commission.

All Oracle development licenses are free of charge and are consequently not part of the inventory listed in section 11 of ANNEX II.A – TERMS OF REFERENCE.

Q 37 : About Annex 1 – chapter 4 - criteria concerning technical and professional capacity

We understand that an endorsement letter from the parent company towards an affiliated company (tenderer) gives the affiliated company (tenderer) the possibility to use all technical and professional capacity <u>available at the parent company or at any other affiliated or sister company (different from the tenderer)</u>, to meet the technical and professional criteria as requested by TAXUD.

Please confirm if our understanding is correct.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

An economic operator may, where appropriate and for a particular contract, rely on the capacities of other entities, regardless of the legal nature of the links which it has with them. It must in that case prove to the contracting authority that it will have at its disposal the resources necessary for performance of the contract, for example by producing an undertaking on the part of those entities to place those resources at its disposal.

Under the same conditions, a consortium of economic operators, as referred to in Article 121 (5) of the Rules of Application of the Financial Regulation, may rely on the capacities of members of the consortium or of other entities.

Q 38 : Annex2b - Technical Annex.pdf - Section 2.2 – p. 34

"Work Package 4 refers to the Commission Enterprise Architecture Framework (CEAF), which in itself refers to a set of documents located at http://www.cc.cec/CITnet/methodo/

Please provide the documentation located at this address, specifically the integration of CEAF with the Rational Unified Process (RUP)"

Reply:

For further information regarding the Commission Enterprise Architecture Framework, please refer to http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/informatics/ecomm/doc/ceaf_guide_v1_1.pdf

Q 39 : About Annex 1 - Section 5.4 - p. 25

Please confirm that the document Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-Annex 26-CUST-DEV2_Tools-v1.01_SfA.pdf from the framework quality plan contains an exhaustive list of the tooling currently in use.

Reply:

The annex2a Terms of reference.pdf – Section 11 contains the hardware and software which have been acquired by the Commission and provided to the incumbent contractor. The document Baseline_DLV-0.1-1-Annex 26-CUST-DEV2_Tools-v1.01_SfA.pdf from the framework quality plan reflects this situation from a tools viewpoint. In addition to

these tools, the contractor has the flexibility to use tools he deems necessary to support his optimal internal functioning. The Commission does not request a reporting on the use of these tools from its contractors.

Q 40 : TO/HO Trainings

    i.   Could you confirm that TO/HO trainings will take place in Brussels? Otherwise, could you specify their location?

    ii.   Would there be any arrangements for remote access to these trainings, or physical presence is required?

Reply:

i. TO/HO trainings will take place in Brussels, Riga, or any other site of the DG TAXUD contractors.

ii. Physical presence is required.

Q 41 : Take-over of licenses from previous contractor

Is the new contractor expected to take over any hardware or software licenses from the previous contractor? If so, which ones?

Reply:

The Commission owns all acquired hardware and software licenses. For more information on the subject of the question, refer to Annex II.B Technical Annex, section 6 "infrastructure and tools requirements" and section 2.2 "Specifications of the Work Packages, WP.8.4.

Q 42 : Annex IIA, Section 8

Figure 8 "Overview of the TARIFF Application Technical Architecture" is missing from the specs, could you please publish an updated version of the document?

Reply:

A technical error occurred during the formatting of the document. A new version v1.10 of Annex II.A – Terms of Reference is published on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 43 : TO/HO Synchronisation

The CFT refers to a "synchronisation of TO/HO" between incumbent and new contractor. If such alignment to contractor's HO plan is required, can we have access to such plan so that a relevant TO plan can be prepared?

Reply:

The Hand-over plan does not exist yet in explicit terms and with explicit dates. DG TAXUD will request the incumbent contractor to perform the hand-over activity once the

CUST-DEV3 contract has been awarded and signed. The hand-over plan is an integral part of this activity. DG TAXUD will coordinate the consistency between the hand-over plan of the incumbent contractor and the take-over plan of the new contractor.

Q 44 : The table in Annex II.A on page 49 lists 39 applications. The table in the baseline document "Software Development Categories" on page 25 lists 39 applications, too. The sheet "Take Over and Hand Over prices" in Annex III provides numbers of applications per category, but sums up in total to 41 applications.

Could you please clarify, if any applications are missing in Annex II.A and the "Software Development Categories" document? If not, could you please explain the differing sum in Annex III or provide a corrected sheet?

Reply:

The lists referred to in the question are the lists of the existing applications and are correct. The sheet "Take Over and Hand Over prices" in Annex III provides quantities which will be used for the evaluation of the offer and cover <u>all</u> software development categories, not only the ones for the existing applications.

Q 45 : About Annex2b Technical Annex.pdf - Section 6.3 – Page 171 - "See also your answer to questions Q35 and Q36

What is meant by 'no additional cost'?

Is PE23 intended to cover the costs related to the setup and operation of the infrastructure (hardware and software) mentioned under section 6.3?"

Reply:

The infrastructure and tool requirements expressed in section 6.3 of Annex II.B – Technical Annex are to be satisfied by the CUST-DEV3 contractor at a local level (at their premises); 'at no additional cost' means that no price list element of the Annex III – Price table is covering any implied cost.

Price element PE23 is related to WP.8.4.1 and covers the cost of the 'set up, install, Operate and Maintain the IT infrastructure and Tools <u>at the DG TAXUD Data Centre</u>'.

Q 46 : About Annex 3 - Cell C54

Should this not be WP 8.4.2 instead of WP8.4.1?

Reply:

Indeed, cell C54 of Annex III – price table must refer to WP.8.4.2 and not to WP.8.4.1. The related WP description in cell D54 is correct. A new version of the price table can be found on DG TAXUD's website (<u>http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm</u>).

<u>Q 47 :</u> About Annex 3 – Worksheet CUST-DEV3-Services- Cell B55 and D55

Please explain why cell B55 mentions a datacenter at DG TAXUD, while cell D55 mention a datacenter at the CUST-DEV3 contractors premises.

Which costs is PE23 expected to cover? Operating the test environment in the DG TAXUD datacenter, or operating the development and unit test environment in the CUST-DEV3 contractor datacenter, or both?

Reply:

Cell D55 is not referring to a datacentre at the CUST-DEV3 contractors <u>premises</u>. Nevertheless, cell D55 must be replaced with the contents of cell B55 as this is the correct WP.8.4.1 description. Please refer to the reply to question 45 for the question related to PE23. A new version of the price table can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

<u>Q 48 :</u> About Annex2b Technical Annex.pdf - Section 6.3 – page 171

In order to complete our estimation for the required hardware and software licenses for the development and test environment to be installed and operated in our datacenter, please provide an exhaustive list of the hardware and software in the datacenter of the incumbent contractor.

Reply:

Please refer to the reply to questions 35, 36 and 39. The infrastructure and tool requirements expressed in section 6.3 of Annex II.B – Technical Annex are compliant to the existing situation which provides the incumbent contractor the flexibility to use his own infrastructure and tools (individual workstation, Integrated Development Environment, testing tools for unit testing, etc.). The Commission is not requesting from its contractors a reporting on the existence and use of these tools.

The implementation flexibility of these requirements is not applicable to the infrastructure and tools to be used at the datacentre of TAXUD. For the latter, section 11 of Annex II.A – Terms of Reference lists the acquired hardware and software by the Commission which is currently installed and in use at the premises of the incumbent contractor and for which an equivalence will be established at the datacentre of TAXUD.

<u>Q 49 :</u> About Annex2b Technical Annex.pdf - Section 8.1 – page 182

(1) Our understanding: any hardware and software required to be installed in the CUST-DEV3 contractor datacenter related to execution of IT Transformation projects will be covered by pricing element R1. Is this correct?

(2) Our understanding: any hardware and software required to be installed in any of the DG TAXUD datacenters related to the execution of IT Transformation projects will be acquired, installed and maintained by DG TAXUD (via the ITSM2 contractor). Is this correct?

Reply:

(1) Your understanding is not correct. The implementation of the infrastructure and tool requirements as expressed in section 6.3 of Annex II.B – Technical Annex is to be performed at 'no additional cost'. Please refer to the reply to question 45.

(2) Your understanding is not correct. The required hardware and software will be acquired by TAXUD but the setup, installation, operation and maintenance of the IT infrastructure and tools at the DG TAXUD Data Centre will be performed by the CUST-DEV3 contractor. Please refer to the services described under WP.8.4.1 in Annex II.B – Technical Annex for the latter.

Q 50 : About Annex 3 - Worksheet CUST-DEV3-Services - Pricing element R2

Our understanding: this pricing elements covers all services related to the IT Transformation projects, it does not cover hardware and/or software related to the IT Transformation projects. Is this correct ?

Reply:

Your understanding is correct. Nevertheless, please note that any impact of the transformation on the implementation of the infrastructure and tool requirements as expressed in section 6.3 of Annex II.B – Technical Annex is to be performed by the CUST-DEV3 contractor at 'no additional cost'.

Q 51 : While trying to download the Q28 (BPM baseline) we realised that this zip file was corrupted.

Now on your website this zip file is divided into two parts that we managed to download them (we opened them using the provided password).

Could you please confirm the contents of these files?

Part 1:
Management Report-Examples
L4 Functional Requirement BPM
L1-L2 Global and Interaction BPM
EU Customs BPM Guidelines

Part 2:
L2-L3 HL and Business Requirement BPM

Reply:

We are sorry for the previous technical inconvenience.

We confirm that the BPM baseline is composed of two folders: Q28-BPM-part1.zip and Q28-BPM-part2.zip. Furthermore, we confirm the content of these folders.

Q 52 : It looks like the baseline DVD does not include the source code of some central / supporting applications (COPIS, SPEED2). Could this source code be provided as part of the baseline?

Reply:

COPIS and SPEED2 are projects still under development; hence no source code is available to DG TAXUD.

Q 53 : Could you please specify if, the evidence that a company should provide regarding the affidavit mentioned in the exclusion criteria, is it sufficient to be signed from a legal representative of the company only or it should have a notary's stamp and signature, too.

Reply:

An affidavit is a written declaration or statement of facts, made voluntarily, and confirmed by the oath or affirmation of the party making it, in this case, the tenderer. There are two kinds of affidavit: notarized/authenticated and non-notarized/non-authenticated. If it is notarized/authenticated, then the affidavit is stamped and signed by a notary or by a person authorized to do so by law.

Points 6.1 of the Tendering Specifications, 9.1 of the Guidebook and 2 of the Questionnaire do not stipulate that the affidavit needs to be notarized. Therefore, both modalities (affidavit signed by the legal representative of the company and affidavit stamped and signed by a notary) are eligible, save if your national legislation, as the case might be, lays down that the affidavit has to be compulsorily notarized.

Q 54 : Questionnaire: 5.1.3 Hand-over

Question 1 seems to be copied from the take-over section and "take-over" is mentioned in it. Could you verify and correct the phrasing of the question?

Reply:

Your remark is correct. The text should read as follows: " His understanding of the status of the services to be provided at handover time, and of the business implications of risks associated with ~~take-over~~ hand-over, in less than 10 pages and 4.000 words".

Q 55 : In Annex 3, sheet "new IT projects", the average daily prices for "Programming/Development/Testing" have no influence on the total price. The sum in cell AO12 is not taken into account in any other formula.

We believe that this is a clerical mistake and that the sum should be taken into account for the calculation of the total price. Can you please clarify and correct?

Reply:

Your remark is correct. The sum in cell AO12 is to be taken into account in the formula of cell AO14 of the "New IT projects" sheet. A new version of the price table can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm)

Q 56 : In Annex 3, sheet "Profiles", the value in the cell E-P32 representing the "Multiplying factor to be applied to the daily rate for on-demand work to be performed outside normal working hours" is not taken into account in any formula. The price for PE36 instead takes only into account the value in cell P30, while its description reads

"Based on man-day profile prices provided in the sheet "Profiles" with multiplication factor adjustment for the option of working outside normal working hours".

We believe that PE36 should be based on the multiplying factor entered in the sheet "Profiles" and that the formula contains a clerical mistake. Could you please clarify and correct?

Reply:

Your remark is correct. The multiplying factor to be applied to the daily rate for the on-demand work to be performed outside normal working hours is to be taken into account in the formula of cell P30 of the "Profiles" sheet. A new version of the price table can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 57 : The baseline contains the latest release notes for most of the applications, but for some, e.g. TARIC3, no release notes are given. Could you please provide the latest release notes for all the applications to allow an analysis of the changes during the past 4 years?

Reply:

The missing release notes of the 'CIS' part of the baseline are provided in the file 'baseline missing release notes.zip' which can be found on DG TAXUD's website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).
All releases notes kept by the Commission since the beginning of the current CUST-DEV2 framework contract are delivered in the file 'history release notes.zip' which can also be found on DG TAXUD's website.

Q 58 : Questionnaire: 4.4.2 CVs.

Could you please confirm that the tenderers have to submit CVs only for the Key Profiles, as requested in section 4.4.2?

Reply:

CVs have to be provided for the profiles which are specified in section 4.4.2 of the questionnaire.

Q 59 : Questionnaire: 4.2.1 Client References

(1) It is mentioned in section 4.2.1 that "An award notice published in Tenders Electronic Daily (TED) or an official gazette does not constitute valid evidences". However, it is not mentioned anywhere that evidences for the client references are required. Given that DG TAXUD can consult directly the specified clients, it is our understanding that no evidences are required to be submitted along with the client reference contacts. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

(2) With respect the completion of the table of the same section, we understand that the first column must be completed with the name of the client, while the last column must refer where applicable to the corresponding Project Reference Form of section 4.2.3, if the reference is provided. If there is / are not Project Reference Forms submitted in 4.2.3 for the Project Reference Contacts specified in 4.2.1, the field should specify "not applicable". Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

Reply:

Your understanding is not correct. Along with the references the tenderer has to provide a project reference.

Q 60 : Questionnaire: 4.2.3 Project References

To our understanding seven (7) Project References (no more and no less) in total, out of which five (5) covering the point 1 and two (2) covering the point 2, must be provided under the section 4.2.3. However, we understand that the same project can be submitted under both point 1 and point 2 and that it will count separately (e.g. Tenderers may submit five (5) Project Reference Forms in response to Point 1, while two out of these five Project Reference Forms may be submitted also in response to Point 2). Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

Q 61 : Annex 10a - Part 1 – Special Conditions, Article I.2 Duration and pricing sheet (Annex 3)

In the Framework Contract document (Annex 10a - Part 1 – Special Conditions, Article I.2 Duration), it is mentioned that the CUSTDEV3 Contract is a Contract for 5 years; with 3 possible extensions of 1 year each. So, in total, the contract duration can become 8 years (i.e. 5+1+1+1), or 96 months.

In the pricing sheet (Annex 3), a number of Price Elements (with an ongoing nature) are financially expressed in monthly fixed prices (PE2, PE11, PE21, PE23, (PE35)). The coefficient for these Price Elements is 102, which seems to indicate a duration of 8.5 years (i.e. 102 months).

- Price Elements 3 and 4 relate to the Take-over. It is indicated in Annex 2B, that the expected duration of the Take-over period is 6 to 9 months.

- Price Elements 5 and 6 relate to the Hand-over. Similarly as with the hand-over, it is mentioned that the hand-over period is estimated between 6 and 9 months.

- Price Element 7 relates to 'After hand-over support' (WP 3.3). This Price Element is valid during a period of 3 months after the successful hand-over.

- What explains the difference between the (maximum) duration of 96 months of the framework contract, and the 102 months used for the evaluation of monthly charges in the pricing sheet? Is there any rationale for this difference?

In order to avoid double counting or gaps in the resource model and the associated costing, can you please clarify the following:

(1)   Is it correct to assume that at the start of the Framework Contract, the various Price Elements with a fixed monthly price (PE2, etc… – see above) are launched together with the Price Elements for the Take-over (PE3 and PE4). This sounds logical, since e.g. the overall management (PE 2) has to be in place as of the start of the Contract. Thanks to confirm (or clarify otherwise).

(2)   Similarly, at Contract end, for the Hand-over Pricing Elements, is it correct to assume that the hand-over should start 6 or 9 months before the scheduled end date of the 8 year duration of the Contract (so that the hand-over phase is completed by the time that the 8 years Contract duration expires). Or does the hand-over period only start after the 8 years. In case of the latter situation, will the Price Elements with a monthly recurring charge continue to be ordered during this hand-over period (e.g. PE2 for Overall Management)?

(3)   During the 3 months period of Price Element 7 (i.e. the 'after hand-over support'), can you confirm that no other services belonging to other Pricing Elements will be required?

Reply:

Referring to article I.2.5 of the draft framework contract (Annex X.A), specific contracts shall be executed no later than six (6) months after expiry of the Contract; hence a maximum duration of 102 months (8 * 12 + 6).

(1)   Your understanding is correct.

(2)   The specific contract covering the hand-over activities must start before the end of the framework contract and finish no later than 6 months after the end of the framework contract.

(3)   Your understanding is correct.

Q 62 : Technical and professional capacity, Chapter 4.1, 4.2

In case 2 consortium members are a part of the same Group (Company), we assume that both consortium members can refer to the same documents 4.1 and 4.2.

Please confirm

Reply:

The 2 consortium members have to gather altogether the technical and professional capacity required by questions 4.1 and 4.2 (this may be done by referring to the same or to different documents).

Q 63 : It appears that the access to TEMPO is not available anymore (as described in Annex 2.a page 7). Maybe the account has expired as it was set for the initial tender timeframe. Could you please extend this to match the new deadline at the end of June?

Reply:

Please refer to the "how to connect to TEMPO" document that can be found on the DG TAXUD website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm)

Q 64 : Annex 10D – Agreement – Power of Attorney

Is TAXUD considering Annex 10D of the call for tenders as a mandatory document to be supplied at the submission date?

Reply:

Annex 10D is not mandatory at submission date.

Q 65 : Questionnaire 4.5.6: IFPUG

From the formulation of the question we understand that we need to provide a statement (i.e. a signed letter) where we endorse the IFPUG method and we commit to using it on the CUST-DEV3 contract (whenever possible). Could you confirm our understanding?

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

Q 66 : Annex II.B, p.30: Take-over

The take-over off all items and artefacts of NCTS, ECS, ICS and SPEED2 is included in WP2.1 (Annex II B p.30). However, in Annex3, the fixed price for take-over (corresponding to WP2.2) covers 6 applications of Category 10, meaning that the take-over of NCTS, ECS, ICS and SPEED2 items/artefacts is also included in WP2.2. Could you clarify?

Reply:

Your assumption that NCTS, ECS, ICS and SPEED2 are included in WP.2.2 is not correct.

As stated explicitly in the description of the workpackages in the Technical Annex (Annex II.B) these 4 applications are part of WP.2.1 and thus not of WP.2.2. The number of 6 applications of category 10 in the price table is for simulation purposes only and does not necessarily correspond to the actual situation at the time of the take-over (see also the reply to Q44). NCTS, ECS ICS and SPEED2 are not included in these 6 applications.

Q 67 : Annex 3

We noticed that the behaviour of cell H38 (PE11) is a bit "strange", as the effect of changes in rates (for the related profiles) seem rather limited (it looks like that the calculation does not consider full-time equivalents). Could you confirm that the calculation formula is correct?

Reply:

The calculation was indeed not correct and has been modified. A new version of the price table can be found on our website (http://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/common/tenders_grants/tenders/index_en.htm).

Q 68 : About Selection of the tenderer – technical and professional capacity - question 4.6.1

We refer to the question 4.6.1, part of which reads: *Have you provided certificates of compliance for each of the relevant organisational entities that you propose to be involved in the delivery and service provision for this contract:*

ISO/IEC 20000-1:2011 or equivalent

ISO/IEC 20000-2:2012 or equivalent

ISO/IEC 27001:2005 or equivalent

ISO/IEC 27002:2005 or equivalent

ISO/IEC 27005:2011 or equivalent

ISO/IEC 20926:2009 or equivalent

We note that for FITS-DEV3, in a related question – answer DG TAXUD stated:

Question no. 4:

Ref. to Annex 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE, question" 4.6.2. Maturity level": Please enumerate which standards you consider as being equivalent to CMMI level 2.

Reply

It is mandatory for tenderers to provide services in compliance with CMMI level 2 or equivalent. In his reply, the tenderer must demonstrate the equivalence of the standard he proposes to CMMI level 2, in the context of the services to be provided.

It is not mandatory for tenderers to submit CMMI level 2 certification.

Please clarify whether the tenderer is **obliged** to submit ISO/IEC certificates for items under (2) to (7) of question 4.6.1.

Reply:

It is mandatory for tenderers to provide services in compliance with ISO/IEC or equivalent. In his reply, the tenderer must demonstrate the equivalence of the standard he proposes to ISO/IEC, in the context of the services to be provided.

It is not mandatory for tenderers to submit ISO/IEC certification.

Q 69 : About Selection of the tenderer – technical and professional capacity - question 4.6.2

We refer to the question 4.6.2, part of which reads: *Have you provided a recent and dated CMMI (Capability Maturity Model Integration) or equivalent scan/measurement of*

the processes of relevance for the deliverables and services provision for this contract? (CMMI level 2 or above for development is required).

We refer DG TAXUD to the aforementioned answer to FITS-DEV3 call for tenders.

Please clarify whether the tenderer is **obliged** to submit a CMMi level 2 (or higher) certificate.

Reply:

It is mandatory for tenderers to provide services in compliance with CMMI level 2 (or above) or equivalent. In his reply, the tenderer must demonstrate the equivalence of the standard he proposes to CMMI level 2 (or above), in the context of the services to be provided.

It is not mandatory for tenderers to submit CMMI level 2 (or above) certification.

Q 70 : With regards to the response to question 23(b), we notice that the questionnaire which is uploaded, still mentions in page 5/38 the incorrect clause regarding the subcontractors "**NB: These companies must fill in Sections 1 and 2 of this questionnaire for assessment. Therefore tenderers cannot rely on the economic, financial, technical and professional capacity of the subcontractors when replying to Sections 3, 4 and 5.**"
Could you please upload a new one version with the corrected text?

Reply:

A new version of Annex I – Questionnaire, which reflects the reply to question 23b can be found on DG TAXUD's website.

Q 71 : ANNEX I: QUESTIONNAIRE, p.11-12

"Have you provided a list of IT services that you provided in 2010, 2011 and 2012 with the delivered service catalogue, related volumetric, pricing model (resource based, output based,), recipients, client type (public/private), financial amounts, dates and duration?

…

Provide compulsorily at least five (5) valid client reference contacts of customers that are making use of services similar to the service requirements of this call for tenders.

These references should be for different customers (departments, divisions, directorates, etc. are regarded as the same customer) and for services performed at the premises of the tenderer. Only provide client references that can be consulted by the Commission. An award notice published in Tenders Electronic Daily (TED) or an official gazette does not constitute valid evidences.

Company/Organisation	Surname, forename, title (e.g. Dr., Mr., Mrs…), function (e.g. Manager…) telephone and fax number, address, e-mail	Reference to Project Reference Form provided under section 4.2.3
1.		

2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

"

Our understanding regarding client references is:

a) The list may contain IT services under contacts not necessarily completed in 2010, 2011 and 2012, for example it may contain a project completed in 2012 that is now under maintenance.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

b) The list may contain IT services performed either at the tenderer's or at the client's premises.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

c) For at least 5 of the IT services in the list the Tenderer should provide contact details. These 5 contact details should be for different customers and for services performed at the premises of the tenderer.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

d) "Reference to Project Reference Form provided under section 4.2.3" is not mandatory.
Please confirm.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

Q 72 : ANNEX 4, Section 6.3.5 Formal aspects, Section 6.3.5.3, p. 12 of 21: "*Where possible, you should answer in the space provided on the questionnaire form. However, if you need additional space, your reply should be made on a separate sheet and annexed to the questionnaire. Such replies (which should not exceed two pages per question) must be **clearly referenced**, and the reference noted on the questionnaire in the space provided on the reply*".

Are we allowed to add to the two pages per question limit:

- A cover page?
- A Table of Contents page?
- Both?
- None if the total exceeds the limit?

Reply:

Tenderers are allowed to add a cover page and a table of content page to their replies; these pages will not count against the two pages limit.

Q 73 : ANNEX I Questionnaire, Section 4.6.1 Compliance with ISO standards or equivalent, page 17 of 38:

We understand that in the case of ISO/IEC 20000-1:2011, ISO/IEC 20000-2:2012, ISO/IEC 27002:2005 ISO/IEC 27005:2011 and ISO/IEC 20926:2009 "equivalent" means also a short account of the procedures used by the Tenderer to comply with the requirements of these certifications. Please confirm.

Reply:

Your understanding is correct.

Q 74 : I appreciate that within the last 5 working days before the deadline you are not supposed to answer requests for clarification, but I am still writing to you as I cannot find the updated Annex I as announced in Q&A to include the Productivity Rate Table:

The document "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.01.doc" is to be replaced with "CUST-DEV3 Annex I - Questionnaire v1.02.doc". The new version v1.02 is published with the following correction with indication of track changes

Would it be possible to provide us with this additional table?

Reply:

A new corrected version of Annex I – Questionnaire can be found on DG TAXUD's website.