

**TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN**

**Call for tenders n. LISA/2014/OP/03**

**External Support**

**Questions and answers series 2 (to questions received until 14.08.2014)**

**Question 2.1**

Annex 3 page 15- Section 4.1. It is stated “In case of a joint offer, provide the information on behalf of the whole consortium, including subcontractors”

Our understanding is that the evaluation of this section will be done at consortium level. Nevertheless, each document has to be provided per each company individually, since each company has a different organisational structure, different training program, etc...

Could you please clarify our understanding? If our understanding is not correct, could you please explain the rationale behind for not requesting this information individually?

**Answer 2.1**

The information shall be provided on the whole consortium, mentioning the subcontractors (not the freelancers) as well. We do not expect separate documents per company, but one summary for all the companies.

---

**Question 2.2**

Annex 3. Page 18. Section 4.4.1.References. It is mentioned “Principal services provided in 2011,2012 and 2013”. On regards to that, we would like to clarify the following:

- (a) Can we provide PRFs that started on or after 01.01.2011 and which are still on-going but only with regard to the part executed until 31.12.2013?
- (b) Can we provide PRFs that started before the 01.01.2011 but only with regard to its part executed after 01.01.2011?
- (c) Our understanding is that on-going projects/services which delivered a System currently in maintenance phase are considered as valid references. Please confirm

**Answer 2.2**

We confirm that you can present references of projects that were ongoing in the period 2011-2013 (included), which may have started earlier or those that are still ongoing.

---

**Question 2.3**

The invitation to tender states: “The inner envelope must also contain two sealed envelopes, one containing all requested documents and the tender except the financial part of the offer, the other envelope shall include the financial bid. “Our understanding is that, due to confidentiality reasons, the connection table for the CVs should not go in the same envelope that all the requested documents and the tender. Could you please clarify where do we have to place in the final offer the connection table?

Answer 2.3

The connection table shall also be placed separately from the technical offer.

---

Question 2.4

Annex 1. Profile 2.1.3. Intermediate Quality Consultant. We understand this profile as someone oriented to quality control, applying standards and procedures, defining quality plans/tests all based on the market standards. Nevertheless, for profile 2.1.3. you request a profile to be able to “Maintain the quality of sharepoint webpage” and “Update & maintain Quality webpage sharepoint with all new & revised documents for each manual...”) Can you please further detail which will be the main function of this profile and explain the rationale behind the “Task description” of this profile?

Answer 2.4

Please disregard this task. Please find attached the updated Annex 1 with track changes.

---

Question 2.5

Could you specify what kind of work Lot 2 consists – is it more development and analyses of more support and administration services (what is the proportion, for instance)?

And what is the content of this work more exactly?

Answer 2.5

Lot 2 consists of ICT network and system administration, support, but there are profiles related to business analysis and quality assurance. See summary description in Section 2.1 of the Tender Specifications. Please refer also the profiles in Annex 1 for further information.

---

Question 2.6

The Framework Service Contract mentions a performance guarantee “in accordance with the terms set out in the tender specifications” (clause II.15.5 linked with clause I.4, a). When reading both clauses it is not clear that for the current tender a performance guarantee will be required and under which form (it appears that only a banking warranty is required as warranty of payment for pre-financing but according to I.4.,a of the FSC, there is no pre-financing). Thank you to confirm whether a performance guarantee is required and under which conditions.

Answer 2.6

No performance guarantee is foreseen.

---

#### Question 2.7

Clause II.3.3. of the template Framework Service Contract states a liability limitation of 300% of the “total amount of the contract”. As the tender documentation claims that there is no volume commitment under the Framework Service Contract (in principle no “amount/value”), we understand that this liability limitation/cap means “300 % of the total amount of the relevant Specific Contract” ? Thank you to confirm.

#### Answer 2.7

The total amount awarded will be based on the volumes foreseen in Section 2.3 of the tender specifications and on the prices per profiles provided by the winning tenderers. The amount awarded will be indicated in article I.3.1 of the Framework Contract and in the contract award notice. Therefore its actual amount will be known after the award decision. In clause II.3.3 the liability limitation is foreseen for the framework contract’s amount. See also Answer 1.34.

---

#### Question 2.8

In clause 4.6 (page 18/61) of the Service Agreement, a potential “warranty” and a to be agreed acceptance procedure are mentioned (all to be agreed in the order). So my understanding is correct that this will be agreed and discussed on a case by case basis and that we do not have a warranty of e.g. 6 months here ?

#### Answer 2.8

The mentioned article refers only to the acceptance of the deliverables. Indeed it will be agreed on a case by case basis, depending on the nature of the services (e.g. for a QTM acceptance per subtask is foreseen; for a fixed price instalments can be used). You can find also information on the acceptance and payments in Annex V Model Specific Contracts of the Framework Contract (Annex 4 of the Tender Specifications).

---

#### Question 2.9

In case of joint-tenders, can eu-LISA confirm that for Standard Submission Form 4.4.2 the number of project reference forms is limited at least with 4 different projects (max 6) for the whole consortium?

#### Answer 2.9

We confirm.

---

#### Question 2.10

On page 3 of Annex 1 “Description of services”, it is mentioned that one year of experience is equivalent to one year of education in which case, these years can not be taken into account in the experience.

Is the contrary also accepted?

For a young resource with more years of relevant education than required by the profile, can these “additional” education years be considered as experience years to reach the minimum threshold?

Answer 2.10

No, professional experience is not replaceable by years of education.

---

Question 2.11

As numerous resources will be deployed in Strasbourg on lot 1 for intra-muros services, can we provide their CVs with descriptions in French in the English CV form provided in attachment 1 to the Standard Submission Form in order to avoid unnecessary translations?

Answer 2.11

It is possible. Nevertheless, the working language of our Strasbourg site is also English.

---

Question 2.12

The profile 2.1.7 “Junior SharePoint Enterprise Content Management (ECM) Specialist” (page 9 of the Annex 1 – Description of services) lists the competences of a SharePoint Developer, a SharePoint Designer and a SharePoint Administrator all together. Can you confirm that you consider such a broad profile as Junior?

Answer 2.12

Development is not needed, but customisation/ modification of the current structure can be included. Basic know-how on design and administration of SharePoint are required.

---

Question 2.13

For the Senior Network Analysis Expert (page 45 of the Annex 1 – Description of services), the CCIE certification or equivalent is requested. Which equivalent certification would you take into account for this profile?

Answer 2.13

Any certification that would prove high level network expertise. Please also refer to Answers 1.9 and 1.11.

---

Question 2.14

Can we add appendixes to the answers to present additional information (e.g. examples)?

If yes, is there a size limitation for these appendixes?

Answer 2.14

Yes, answers can be provided in a separate Annex, but page limitation applies.

---

Question 2.15

Section 5.2.4 Annex 3 proposed offer structure based on SLR: No case is provided for this question, what are the assumptions to be made? To ensure fair treatment, could eu-LISA provide a scenario for FP and QTM request?

Answer 2.15

Fixed price request: Elaboration of enterprise architecture charter for the Agency.

QTM: Assistance on SharePoint platform collaboration with HR and Finance tools .

---

Question 2.16

Section 5.3.1 of Annex 3: Are tenderers supposed to use a real example, or can they invent a case to illustrate the response? Also, can the example description be provided as annex to the answer (and therefore that text would not count towards the maximum length of the document) or does it have to be part of the main document?

Answer 2.16

The tenderers can decide. The answer can be provided as an annex, but the page limitation applies. See answers 1. 14. And 2.14.

---

Question 2.17

“Standard Submissions Form- All Lots Sections 1-6 final updated.docx”, section 4.4.2: The RFP says: “You must include full description (using the Project Reference Form attached in Attachment 1) of at least 4 different projects (and maximum 6) for at least 3 different customers for projects/contracts executed in the field of the present lot and of similar scale (min 60% of the total man/days estimated for this lot).” As far as lots 1 and 2 are concerned, the “min 60% of the total man/days estimated for this lot” threshold is equivalent to 36,000 man-days (60% of 60,000 man-days per lot). Is the threshold of 36,000 man-days applicable to (a) the total of ALL references per lot or (b) PER reference?

Answer 2.17

The total of all references per lot; (a) solution.

---

Question 2.18

Certification equivalence: In Q&A series 1 you refer to question 1.11 whenever a question of equivalence on certifications appears.

- a. Can you confirm that any certification can be covered by relevant specific expertise in the domain for a period of 1 year?
- b. Furthermore, could you confirm that that 1 year can also be counted toward the overall professional and relevant experience?

Answer 2.18

a.-b. We confirm.

---

Question 2.19

I would like to receive some clarifications regarding the above-mentioned tender LISA/2014/OP/03 External Support

- a. Are there any means by which we can be informed of other potential supplier organisation interest in the various lots for the purpose of assessing partnering and or synergies
- b. Can the tenderer only bid for one lot?
- c. Can the tenderer only bid for some profiles within a lot?
- d. Can the tenderer be a Prime tenderer for one lot (single company) and a sub-contractor for another lot?

Answer 2.19

- a. eu-LISA does not provide such means. You might consult awarded calls for tenders of other EU Institutions and bodies having similar scope.
  - b. No, tenderers can bid for more than one lot and for any combination of lots.
  - c. No, one tenderer shall bid for the whole lot covering all profiles.
  - d. Yes.
-