Ref. Ares(2013)77546 - 22/01/2013

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

Brussels, 22/01/2013
TAXUD.R1/TA (2013) 88653

Subject: **Call for tenders TAXUD/2012/AO-03**
Provision of services to cover specification, development, maintenance and support of trans-European IT services in the areas of taxation and excise (FITSDEV3) – 2012/S 195-319963

- 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 21 January 2013.

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

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 is 25 January 2013.

Yours faithfully,

(e-signed)
Paul Hervé Theunissen
Head of Unit

<u>Question no. 1</u>:

1. Regarding question ”4.2.1. Client References” from Annex I: Questionnaire

“Have you provided a list of IT services that you provided in 2009, 2010 and 2011 with the delivered service catalogue, related volumetric, pricing model (resource based, output based,), recipients, client type (public/private), financial amounts, dates and duration?”

and question 4.2.3. Project References from Annex I: Questionnaire:

“1.For each of five (no more and no less completed in 2010, 2011 and 2012) recent projects for new or extended information systems in the area of the required services, each done for a different customer (departments, divisions, directorates, etc. are regarded as the same customer).

2.For each of two (no more and no less completed in 2010, 2011 and 2012) projects where the IFPUG (or equivalent) methodology was used.”

a) Please clarify if the referenced period of time should be the same for both questions or not.

Reply

We confirm that the reference period must be the same for both questions.

b) Please clarify if the reference period is 2009, 2010 and 2011, or 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Reply

The correct timeframe is 2010, 2011, 2012.

<u>Question no. 2</u>:

Ref to Annex 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE, question ”4.2.3. Project References”:

Please confirm that ”the area of the required services”, for which 5 Project Reference Forms must be provided, is the specification, development, maintenance and support for existing and future IT applications, not necessarily in the field of Taxation and Excise.

Reply

We confirm that the references must not exclusively be in the field of Taxation and Excise.

<u>Question no. 3</u>:

Ref. to Annex 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE, question ”4.6.1. - Compliance with ISO standards or equivalent”:

a. Considering that this question is not marked as mandatory, please confirm that the ISO certifications are not mandatory.

Reply

It is mandatory for tenderers to provide services in compliance with ISO standards or equivalent. In his offer, the tenderer must demonstrate his compliance to the ISO standard or equivalent in the context of the services to be provided.

It is not mandatory for tenderers to submit ISO certifications.

b. Please confirm that the selection criterion „Compliance with ISO standards or equivalent” is considered fullfilled if the bidder presents reliable evidence for implementing and respecting the standards and guidelines presented, such as the internal Quality Manual and Procedures.

Reply

Yes

c. If the answer to question b) above is No, please confirm that the selection criterion „Compliance with ISO standards or equivalent” is considered fullfilled if the bidder presents evidence for implementing and respecting the guidelines ISO 20000-2:2012, ISO 27002:2005, ISO 27005:2011, ISO 20926:2009, for which a 3rd party certification is not possible and/or not customary.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (b).

d. Due to the fact that ISO/IEC 20000-2:2005 represents an industry consensus on guidance to auditors and offers assistance to service providers planning service improvements or to be audited against ISO/IEC 20000-1, please confirm that this request, ISO 20000-2:2012 certificate, can be fulfilled by the ISO 20000-1:2011 certification.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

e. Due to the fact that ISO/IEC 27002 is an advisory standard that is meant to be interpreted and applied to all types and sizes of organization according to the particular information security risks they face. The only certifiable standard is ISO 27001. Please confirm that this request, ISO 27002:2005 certificate, can be fulfilled by the ISO27001 certification.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

f. Due to the fact that ISO 27005:2011 ISO/IEC 27005:2011 provides guidelines for information security risk management; it supports the general concepts specified in ISO/IEC 27001 and is designed to assist the satisfactory implementation of information security based on a risk management approach. Please confirm that this request, ISO 27005:2011 certificate, can be fulfilled by the ISO27001 certification.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

g. Due to the fact that ISO/IEC 20926:2009 specifies the set of definitions, rules and steps for applying the IFPUG (International Function Point Users Group) functional size measurement (FSM) method. Please confirm that this request, ISO 20926:2009 or equivalent, can be fulfilled by attaching our internal procedure for applying the IFPUG functional size measurement (FSM) method.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

h. If the answer to any of the questions c), d), e), f) or g) above is No, please clarify what is the evidence that should be presented to fulfil the mentioned criterion.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

i. Please confirm that if one of the consortium members has all the ISO certificates the evaluation commission will consider that the entire consortium covers the ISO requirements.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

<u>Question no. 4</u>:

Ref. to Annex 1 – QUESTIONNAIRE, question" 4.6.2. Maturity level":

a. 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.

b. Please confirm that if one of the consortium members has the CMMI level 2 certification, the evaluation commission will consider that the entire consortium covers the CMMI level 2 certification requirement.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 4 (a).

<u>Question no. 5</u>:

Regarding annex "A Guidebook for Tenderers", where you mention:

"*6.3.5.3. Your answers must be concise and clearly drafted.*

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 for the reply."

Please clarify if the limit of 2 pages refers the separate sheet and annexed to the questionnaire or the answer that can be inserted in the space provided on the questionnaire form.

Reply

The limit of 2 pages refers to the separate sheet.

<u>Question no. 6</u>:

Regarding annex “A Guidebook for Tenderers”, where you mention:

“6.3.5.3. Your answers must be concise and clearly drafted.

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 for the reply.”

and question 5.1.2.Take-over from Annex I: Questionnaire, where your request is:

“1.His understanding of the status of the services to be provided at take-over time, and of the business implications of risks associated with take-over, in less than 10 pages and 4.000 words;”

a) Please clarify if the limit of 10 pages and 4.000 words for the answer refers only and exclusively to this specific question in the questionnaire.

Reply

We confirm.

b) Please clarify what is the limit for the answers to all the other questions in the technical section of the questionnaire.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 5.

c) Please clarify if, while the answers will respect the page-limit, the bidder may add annexes to these answers.

Reply

Further information may be supplied, providing evidence to the statements in the answers given within the page limit and must be clearly referenced there.

Question no. 7:

Regarding Tendering Specifications, section 4.1 Joint offers: point b) The selection criteria; requirement: “3rd and 4th indents (section 6.2.1) will be applied to the tendering group as a whole”.
There are only 3 indents in section 6.2.1. Please clarify which is the 4th indent.

Reply

We confirm there is no 4th indent in section 6.2.1 of Tendering Specifications.

Question no. 8:

Regarding the questionnaire Annex 1, selection criteria, question 4.6.2: please clarify if ISO/IEC 15504 is accepted as a method to measure the processes of relevance.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 3 (a).

Question no. 9:

Regarding the questionnaire Annex 1, selection criteria, question 4.6.2: please confirm that ISO 9001:2008 certification is accepted as acknowledging a capability maturity level of minimum CMMI level 2.

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 4 (a).

Question no. 10:

I am writing to enquire about any identified conflict of interest in the participation to the FITSDEV3 call for tenders. In particular, - is the participation in the tender allowed to a contractor who is involved in two other contracts within DG TAXUD, namely xxxxxxx and xxxxxxxx, in both cases as partner in a consortium?

Reply

Tenderers' attention is drawn to the fact it is their own responsibility to determine whether there is any potential conflict of interest between the services and/or products to be provided under the present call for tenders and services and/or products being (to be) provided under any existing contract they have signed with the Commission.

In case of any identified potential conflict of interest, tenderers need 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 the present call for tenders, as opposed to the services and/or products being (to be) provided under any contract they have signed with the Commission.

<u>Question no. 11</u>:

Could you please confirm that it is allowed to present one project reference for a project/contract performed for the European Commission in question 4.2.3?

Reply

We confirm.

<u>Question no. 12</u>:

Could you please confirm that you expect in total 7 project references in question 4.2.3?

Reply

We confirm.

<u>Question no. 13</u>:

In Question 5.2.1.15 you write: "... description of the ***infrastructure*** *(****tools*** *and services) that he proposed to use for ... the* ***overall administration and follow-up of the contract*** *..."*
In Question 5.2.2.5 you write: "... description of the ***infrastructure*** *(including the* ***tools****) that you propose to use for the* ***overall administration and follow-up of the contract****;"*

There seems to be an overlapping between these two questions regarding the tools to be used for the overall administration and follow-up of the contract.

Could you please clarify, what is exactly requested in these two questions regarding the tools to be used for the overall administration and follow-up of the contract and how the separation between these questions should be seen?

Reply

Indeed, there is an overlapping between the two questions (namely, 5.2.1.15 and 5.2.2.5). Therefore, the reply to the Question 5.2.1.15 is enough as it covers by itself the reply to Question 5.2.2.5.

<u>Question no. 14</u>:

Relating to your clarification provided on 13/11/2012 to questions 5 and 6 and especially regarding the following extract of the Tendering specifications page 8:

"As far as the limitation of length of answers is concerned, the following rules are to be applied:

• Some questions set an absolute limit of length of the answer. In case this limit is exceeded, the answer will not be taken into consideration when evaluating the offers.

• In all other cases, the limitation of two pages per question has to be applied, as defined in Annex IV – Guidebook for Tenderers, section 6.3.5, ***unless it is deemed necessary by the tenderer to exceed this limit.****"*

a) Could you please confirm our understanding that it is up to the tenderer to decide to extend its replies to questions to more than 2 pages, if deemed necessary.

Reply

We confirm. Please also refer to the Reply to Question no. 6 (c).

b) Could you please additionally confirm that exceeding 2 pages in our replies will not have any negative impact on the evaluation of our offer and that the complete answer will be taken into account?

Reply

We confirm. Please also refer to the Reply to Question no. 6 (c).

<u>Question no. 15</u>:

The sheet "Price List - Specifications WP" in Annex III "Price Sheet" does not cover all required BPMN or UML/FESS artefacts, i.e. for UML only behaviour diagrams are listed, but no structural diagrams.

The "Guidelines for the output based measurements pricing" in Annex I "Questionnaire" in chapter 6.1 mention the following:

"The creation and modification of any other BPMN or UML/FESS artefact (not listed in the Annex III-Price Table) in the system and application specifications are covered by those BPMN or UML/FESS metrics listed."

a. Could you please confirm that the UML structural diagrams, e.g. to represent a logical data model, are intentionally left out of the price sheet? If not, could you please provide a corrected price sheet?

Reply

The listed metrics are representative of the majority of the artefacts to be ordered. An additional set of four metrics (*€ per Other BPMN Diagram, € per Other BPMN Diagram Constituent, € per Other UML Diagram, € per Other UML Diagram main element*) with associated quantities are added in the revised published price sheet (version 2.02) to cover the case where other BPMN and UML diagrams would be needed. The unit price of each of those other metrics is set to the average unit price of their relevant metrics.

b. Could you please clarify, which rules the tenderer should apply to choose the correct metric from the price list in case of a diagram not covered?

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 15 (a).

c. Could you please clarify, how the tenderer should estimate and cover activities that do not have an equivalent metric from the price table (e.g. a change of specifications that does not affect any diagrams)? Will these changes be charged using the resource based pricing?

Reply

In the case where there is a change in the specifications that do not lead to the creation / deletion / modification of one of the listed metrics, the resource based pricing will be used.

d. Could you please clarify, if a combination of output based and resource based pricing will be possible for one deliverable within one request?

Reply

No, a combination of output based and resource based pricing is not possible for one deliverable within one request.

Question no. 16:

In Annex III "Price Sheet" in the sheet "Price List - Main Sheet", there is a discount rate to be defined in cells G85 to G87. This discount rate seems to be not taken into account in any formula in the sheet. It would have been our understanding that this discount rate would be taken into account in cell M85 to M87.

Could you please clarify on the correct usage of this discount rate or provide a corrected price sheet?

Reply

The discount rate in cells G85 to G87 in the Excel worksheet 'Price List – Main sheet' is taken into account in the worksheet 'Price List – Specifications' column G, the total of which is reflected in the cell M85 to M87 of the 'Price List – Main sheet'.

<u>Question no. 17</u>:

In Annex III "Price Sheet" in the sheet "Price List - Main Sheet", a "% of specifications cost/month" and a "% of build and test costs/month" is asked in cells G21 and G22. Unfortunately, the formatting of this cell does not allow any decimal places. As the sheet is protected, we cannot change the formatting. Could you please provide a reformatted version of the price sheet allowing up to 3 decimal places?

Reply

A revised price sheet (version 2.02) correcting this display problem has been published.

In addition, this new release contains also the following changes:

1) **Corrections of other display or formatting issues;**
2) **WP.7.1.2 and WP.7.3 rows are merged in the 'Price List - Main sheet' to avoid double accounting of the prices;**
3) **Existing prices under WP.7.2 and WP.7.4 from the 'Price List - Testing WP' sheet have been added to the 'Price List - Main sheet'.**

<u>Question no. 18</u>:

Regarding Annex 1 page 24, question 13. Could you please clarify what should be understood as “technical support team”? Is it referred to the team our company that should be performing the software work package 8 or; we should understand the technical support team of other third parties that is already set up like ITSM FWC?

Reply

Technical support team refers to the team in your company that will be in charge of WP.8.

<u>Question no. 19</u>:

Regarding WP1.6. In annex 2B Technical Annex page 16 under point WP.1.6. it is written that *“…Excise and Taxation systems will be rented on a monthly basis for an initial duration of **<u>12 months</u>**…”* and in annex 3, row 24 of the Main Sheet; it is specify that “*this initial proposed infrastructure will be rented on a monthly basis for a duration of **<u>36 months</u>**, possibly followed by a maximum extension of 66 months”*

Could you please clarify which is the initial duration period (36months or 12 months)?

Reply

Annex 2B Technical Annex page 16 under point WP.1.6 last paragraph should read:
The proposed infrastructure will be rented on a monthly basis for an initial duration of 36 months, possibly followed by extensions for a maximum duration of 60 months.

Annex 3, row 24 of the 'Price List - Main sheet', cell D24 should read:
Set up, install, operate and maintain the IT and Telecom infrastructure (this proposed infrastructure will be rented on a monthly basis for an initial duration of 36 months, possibly followed by extensions for a maximum duration of 60 months).

Question no. 20:

In Annex 1 and Annex 2a of the call for tenders, you mention:

The IFPUG derived metric is then the Function Point, which must be used to measure some parts of the application development lifecycle as detailed in the Annex III - Price Table and the Annex I - Questionnaire. The Function point calculations must be done with the IFPUG v4.3 standard.

The IFPUG v4.3 standard considers the use of adjustment factors to be optional. In addition, it says that "Any discussion of "unadjusted" or "adjusted" is now included in the appendices in order to comply with the ISO FSM Standard, which does not recognize the GSCs or VAF to be part of the FSM."

Can you clarify/confirm that the function point calculations must be done with the IFPUG v4.3 standard, that is, based on unadjusted function points?

Reply

We confirm.

Question no. 21:

Referring to the CV template, CV Front Page:

a. What kind of information should be entered in the "Certification" section (CV Front Page) in the rows "Scope", "Certificate obtained and date of issue" and "Certification Authority" ? An example would be appreciated.

Reply

Scope: a short description of the subject matter to which the certification pertains.
Certificate obtained and date of issue: respectively the title and the date of issuance of the certificate.
Certification Authority: the name of the Authority having delivered the certificate.

b. If an expert has 10 certifications, should they all be included on the front page?

Reply

Yes.

c. What is the difference between the information provided in the "Certification" section (CV Front Page) and the information that needs to be provided in "CV Training Record page"?

Reply

Training does not always lead to a Certification.

<u>Question no. 22</u>:

Regarding Technical Annex 2B - WP 6.9.

Is it possible to get clear indication of the actual change rate (expressed as a global percentage or detailed per application) in the specifications, development and testing software on annual basis for the Taxation and Excise domains?

The baseline documentation does not contain this information and the software code does not include enough comments to estimate the change rate of the code and test tools.

Reply

On average on a yearly basis, corrective maintenance leads to the modification of 1% of the system specifications under WP.6.9 and 1% of the build and test software and applications specifications under WP.7.9.

<u>Question no. 23</u>:

Regarding Annex 2A - the Terms of Reference - page 104/119 (table 20). The line "e-Forms Elements" refers to a "Method Avg Lines of Code (LOC)" of 0,2. It seems difficult to have 585 methods and 142 Method LOC in total. Could you confirm the correctness of the data in the table?

Reply

The values in the corresponding row are incorrect and should read:

	Metric									
Configuration Item (CI)	McCabe Cyclomatic complexity per	Number of Methods, Total	Number of Classes, Total	Number of Attributes, Total	Number of Packages, Total	Method total lines	Method lines of code	Method avg lines of code	Efferent Coupling, Avg per Package	Afferent Coupling, Avg per Package
e-Forms Elements	2.6	585	86		12	8669	5203	8.9		

<u>Question no. 24</u>:

Regarding Technical Annex 2B - WP 8.5. The Technical Annex 2B indicates that the WP 8.5 is managing the "*alignment of the applications to a newer version of a COTS (same product/family range) for which the end of support has been notified"*. Does this alignment includes the upgrade of the existing applications following the whole life-cycle of software specifications, development and testing? In other words, is the WP 8.5 responsible for the follow-up of the alignment or of the alignment itself (which will include the software adaptations)?

Reply

WP8.5 concerns only the management of the alignment of the applications to a newer version of a COTS. If changes are needed in the specifications, build and test software, these activities are performed under WP.7.

<u>Question no. 25</u>:

Regarding Technical Annex 2B - WP 8.4. Regarding WP 8.4 (Change Management), have you an indication of the number of average subjects submitted per year and the average duration of a typical CAB meeting inside TAXUD?

Reply

The questionnaire "Price List- Main Sheet" contains an estimate of the number of CABs (cell L108) and Requests for Change (cells L109 and L110) for the duration of the contract.
The average duration of a typical CAB is two hours.

<u>Question no. 26</u>:

Annex 3 - Pricing sheet (v2.02)

a. Cell G21 & G22: Could please confirm these cells should be formatted in 'percentage' and that the current formatting should indicate a number between 0 and 1?

Reply

For convenience, the cells have been formatted as percentage in revised price sheet (version 3.00)

b. Cell M21 & M22: could you explain the reasoning behind the division by 2 in this formula?

Reply

The pricing model assumes a linear increase in time of the cumulated costs of the deliverables falling under the scope of WP.6.9.3 and WP.7.9.3. The "Estimated Budget" for both entries (cells M21 & M22) is therefore calculated as the total value

over the duration of the contract of all deliverables falling in their respective scope, divided by 2 to account for the linear increase in time, multiplied by the monthly corrective maintenance percentage, multiplied by maximal number of months of the contract.

c. Row 21 & 22: is this a one-time cost per month (in function of percentage) or is this an amount somewhere to be multiplied by 96 months?

Reply

The "96" factor was missing in cells M21 and M22 in the price sheet up to version 2.02. This omission has been corrected in a revised version of the price sheet (version 3.00).

d. Cell M24: WP1.6: In this cell a single price is requested for the (36+60) months of the contract. For economic reasons and to the profit of the Commission, could this Work Package be splitted in 2 parts, one for the initial period (36 months) and one for the extensions (60 months)?

Reply

No

<u>Question no. 27</u>:

In Section 4.1 of "Annex I: Questionnaire", Tenderers are asked to provide the requested information "*for each company*" participating in a consortium/joint offer.

On the other hand, sections 4.5 and 4.6 of the questionnaire do not include any similar "*per company*" presentation approach. It is therefore our understanding that the replies to the questions of section 4.5 and 4.6 should be provided for the consortium organisation as a whole and not for each one of the companies participating in the joint offer. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

Reply

We confirm that your understanding is correct, as section 4.6.1 mentions that the information has to be provided *"for each of the relevant organisational entities that you propose to be involved in the delivery and service provision for this contract"*.

<u>Question no. 28</u>:

Section 4.2.3 of "Annex I: Questionnaire" requires the provision of "*five (no more and no less completed in 2010, 2011 and 2012) recent projects...*".

Our understanding is that recent projects which have been concluded within the last three years (2010, 2011 and 2012) with regards to their implementation part (i.e. information system delivered, accepted and is currently in production) but they are currently under maintenance and/or warranty services (for example the contract includes the provision of maintenance services for 3 years following the delivery of the system) will be acceptable references for the above criterion. Can you please confirm?

Reply

We confirm.

<u>Question no. 29</u>:

Regarding Annex 1 - Questionnaire: Q 5.2.1.7 A mapping between the tender's roles and the Pqa, Pho, Pspec, Pdev, Pproto, Parch and Pcons... Can you confirm that this question is there to support (only) pricing for all other roles except the ones (such as Pqa, Pho, Pdev,...) provided in the call for tender?

Reply

We confirm.

<u>Question no. 30</u>:

Regarding Annex 1 - Questionnaire : Q 5.2.1.7 A mapping between the tender's roles and the Pqa, Pho, Pspec, Pdev, Pproto, Parch and Pcons...Could you provide an explanation on how to interpret the question in the context of the technical evaluation (this topic being, in our interpretation, part of the financial evaluation under tab "Price List - Pi Roles")?

Reply

Please refer to the Reply to Question no. 29.

<u>Question no. 31</u>:

Can you provide more details about the metrics you consider to measure legacy specification? Can you provide guidance/example in order to understand better the meaning of the question above and details about what you consider to be ”legacy specifications”.

Reply

Legacy specifications are specifications as taken over by the contractor.

For details about the metrics, see section 3.8 of the Terms of Reference, Annex III - Price Table and the Annex I – Questionnaire (in particular section 6.1 has detailed guidelines for the output based measurements pricing).

<u>Question no. 32</u>:

In Annex 2B, page 16 and in the description of WP 1.6 we can find the following statement: *"The infrastructure used for development must be in line with DIGIT Data Centre hosting guidelines [Annex XI – Baseline: Information System Hosting Guidelines]."* But this document is not present on the received DVD. Could you please make it available?

Reply

The document is made available by email as a complement to Annex XI - Baseline, following the same terms stipulated under Annex IX - Non-disclosure declaration.

<u>Question no. 33</u>:

<u>In section 3.8</u> of the Terms of Reference "OUTPUT BASED MEASUREMENT & PRICING" it is written: "*The contractor will provide the measurements to DG TAXUD of specification, development and testing in the form of a report…*
… The contract defines a specific work package for the measurement"
Whereas the only work packages that relate to measurement are WP.6.10 "Transformation of System and Applications Specifications" and WP.7.1.0 "Function Points Measurements".

<u>For WP.6.10</u> "Transformation of System and Applications Specifications", the activities under this work package also include the measures of the system using the output based elements

a. Can you please confirm/clarify that there is no specific work package for the measurement of new specifications (WP 6.1) and evolutive maintenance of specifications (WP 6.8)?

Reply

We confirm

b. If that is the case, can you please confirm/clarify that the effort to provide the counting has to be included in the price of the specification development (WP 6.1) and evolutive maintenance (WP 6.8)?

Reply

We confirm

c. If not, can you please clarify in which work package the effort to provide and maintain the measurement will be included

Reply

See reply to question 33.a

<u>Question no. 34</u>:

In section 3.8 of the Terms of Reference "OUTPUT BASED MEASUREMENT & PRICING" it is written: "*The contractor will provide the measurements to DG TAXUD of specification, development and testing in the form of a report…*
… The contract defines a specific work package for the measurement"
Whereas the only work packages that relate to measurement are WP.6.10 "Transformation of System and Applications Specifications" and WP.7.1.0 "Function Points Measurements".

<u>For WP.7.1.0</u> "Function Points Measurements", this work package covers the measurement of application in Function Points.

a. Can you please confirm/clarify if this work package will be used for the measurement in function points of both **new** application technical specifications and development (WP 7.1, WP 7.2) **and evolutive** maintenance of technical specifications and developed applications (WP 7.3, WP 7.4)?

Reply

We do not confirm. The measurement for new applications will be done under WP.7.1.1 and the measurement for evolutive maintenance of applications under WP.7.3.2.

b. If that is not the case, can you please confirm/clarify if this work package will be used for the evolutive maintenance of the measurement report produced under WP.7.1.0 "Function Points Measurements" (following evolutive maintenance of the application functional specifications)?

Reply

We do not confirm. The evolution of the measuring report will be done for new applications and evolutive maintenance of applications, respectively under WP7.1.1 and WP.7.3.2. To this aim, the footnote 21 on pg. 56/83 of the "Annex II.B - Technical Annex" has to be amended by adding:

"s=4 Function Points measurement document"

In addition, on pg. 57/83 of the same document, in the WP7.3 row, the reference to footnote 20 in DLV-7.3-2-s[20] has to be changed to a reference to footnote 21.

c. If that is not the case, can you please clarify in which work package the effort to maintain the measurement reports produced under WP.7.1.0 "Function Points Measurements" (following evolutive maintenance of the application functional specifications) should be included?

Reply

See reply to Question 34.b.

Question no. 35:

In section 3.8 of the Terms of Reference "OUTPUT BASED MEASUREMENT & PRICING" it is written: "*The contractor will provide the measurements to DG TAXUD of specification, development and testing in the form of a report…*
… The contract defines a specific work package for the measurement"
Whereas the only work packages that relate to measurement are WP.6.10 "Transformation of System and Applications Specifications" and WP.7.1.0 "Function Points Measurements".

Can you please confirm that there is no work package to measure the Testing metrics and that the effort for counting these metrics is included in the price of the relevant work packages (WP 7.1.2, WP 7.3, WP 7.2 and WP 7.4)?

Reply

We confirm that the effort to count and maintain the metrics is to be done under WP.7.1.2 and WP.7.3.3. To this aim, the footnote 22 on pg. 56/83 of the "Annex II.B - Technical Annex" has to be amended by adding:

"t=3 Test measurement document"

In addition, on pg. 57/83 of the same document, in the WP7.3 row, the reference to footnote 21 in DLV-7.3-3-t[21] has to be changed to a reference to footnote 22.

Question no. 36:

In reply to question 27, you have confirmed that sections 4.5 and 4.6 of the questionnaire should be provided for the consortium organisation as a whole and not for each participating company.

However, the questions in 4.5 relate to the methods, processes and automated tools for the provision of the service catalogue of each company. A consortium is usually built for one specific call for tenders and therefore does not have a set of methods, processes and automated tools in place for a common service catalogue. Such a consortium and its processes, methods and tools are defined specifically to address the requirements of the call for tenders, while their description is presented in the response to the award criteria questionnaire.

Could you please let us know whether you will accept (as proof of sufficient technical and professional capacity) responses to questions under 4.5 that present the methods, processes, and tools used individually by each company/ member of the consortium for the delivery of the services in its catalogue?

Reply

Yes.

Question no. 37:

a. If a candidate has more than 10 years of experience but it obtained its university degree three years ago, Should we take into account all its path career in order to ensure that it fulfil the profile requirements? (e.g. a prototype developer who obtained its university degree in 2010 but has more than 10 years of experience would fulfil the profile?)

Reply

Yes.

b. If a candidate fulfil all the profile requirements, but it doesn't have university degree (which it doesn't appear as mandatory in the profile description) and more years of experience, would be counted as valid?

Reply

Yes.

Question no. 38:

Regarding question 5.2.2. Proposed infrastructure, bullet 4: "*The list of COTS ICT infrastructure products and services that you proposes, (HW, SW, telecom) with options as you see fit, to provide to the Commission to fulfil the terms of the contract, with no ambiguity regarding what is included/excluded from the products and services, with URLs pointing to functional and technical specifications, with their purpose in the framework of the contract"*,

please confirm if you expect the answer to include also the infrastructure products, tools and services (HW, SW, telecom) that we will use internally, on our own premises; that will not be delivered to DG Taxud; that will NOT be transferred to DG Taxud during the hand-over process.

Reply

We confirm.

Question no. 39:

Regarding question 4.2.3 "Project References":

Could you please confirm that it is fully compliant to the rules set out in the FITSDEV3 call for tenders to present a project reference from a sister company, if we present an endorsement declaration from the parent company, which fully owns both the tendering company and the sister company?

Reply

We confirm.

<u>Question no. 40</u>:

Regarding the output based pricing, could you please clarify the following?

a. In order to avoid any misinterpretations regarding the counting for output based pricing, could you please unambiguously define the precise elements that should be counted as “UML Use Case Component”?

Reply

The precise elements that should be counted as "UML Use Case Component" are the use cases and the actors present in a use case diagram.

b. Could you please provide a sample counting of “UML Use Case” and “UML Use Case Component” for one example found in the baseline?

Reply

In ECP1-ESS-FESSv3.32-2-SECTION II CORE BUSINESS.pdf, figure 15 “*Participants of <UC2.01> Submission and registration of e-AD*” has six components: one use case and five actors.

<u>Question no. 41</u>:

As part of the understanding of the requirements of the Take Over (Annex 1, 5.1.2) could you please provide us the Release Calendar for all applications which will be applicable at contract start and the work in progress that is foreseen?

Also could you please specify the average frequency and size of releases for Taxation?

Reply

Releases of applications are not provided at fixed intervals but according to business needs. A detailed planning is therefore not available.

It is estimated that on a yearly basis, in average, 1 or 2 releases of each application are produced, each of them changing in average between 10 and 20% of the functionality.

Question no. 42:

Regarding Annex 3 Price table DG TAXUD asks to give a Price per function point for several items. In the current price table, it is only possible to provide 1 price per function point per work package.

a. Since it is our experience that productivity decreases (drastically) when the number of fonction points is low, and increases when the number of function points is high(er), would DG TAXUD consider to have a more differentiated price per FP approach? This will lead to higher predictability and a more consistent price model. For instance using the following setup:

Work Package	Unit of Quotation	Unit Price Size < 300 FP	Unit Price Size 300 - 1000 FP	Unit Price size > 1000 FP
WPx	Fixed Price in FP			

Is DG TAXUD willing to change the price model accordingly?

Reply

DG TAXUD will not change the pricing model.

b. In the case DG TAXUD will not change the model, what should be considered as the average size of function points (bandwidth) that the tenderer should apply for its pricing per function point?

Reply

It is estimated that all existing applications count between 300 and 600 FP. The evolutive maintenance of an application consists in average in changing 10 to 20% of its functionality.

Question no. 43:

Regarding the Annex 3 - Pricing sheet (updated on 21 DEC 2012), the question 26c has introduced a mechanism which, we believe, is introducing an inconsistency in calculation.

Your answer: The “96” factor was missing in cells M21 and M22 in the price sheet up to version 2.02. This omission has been corrected in a revised version of the price sheet (version 3.00).

You calculate a percentage of effort based on 8 years of contract, and again multiply it by 96 (months). If we estimated that the 8 years development and specifications is valued 40M€, a 1% corrective maintenance (which is the actual rate as per question nr 22), it will imply a corrective maintenance amount of 19.2 M€.

Could you confirm the correctness of the 96 factor?

Reply

We confirm. We draw your attention on the fact that the percentage in cells G21 and G22 is per month.

<u>Question no. 44</u>:

In Annex_2a it is described (page 52 section Vies-on-the-web) the following: '*Furthermore from 2014 onwards the window during which application support is available will be extended to cover 7 days per week, 24 hours a day'*. In annex_3 Pricing Model we can only give prices for 1 year.

Can you please indicate where in the pricing sheet we should add the costs for the extension of the service window?

Reply

The service described in Annex_2a (page 52 section Vies-on-the-web) does not refer to a service that will be requested to the FITSDEV3 contractor.

The Commission may issue ad hoc requests to FITSDEV3 for support outside working hours under WP8.8.1 and WP8.8.2. For this, the pricing model in Annex 3 allows to enter a price in €/person.day of Pspec and Pdev roles for WP8.8.1 and WP8.8.2 respectively. These prices will be valid for the duration of the contract.