

Procurement procedure: EMSA/OP/16/2017

Question 01 (dated 09 August 2017, 16:28):

I have a question on the subcontracting. How much % may be subcontracted in this tender outside the European Union, in this case Argentina. May they be used for the 5 years of experience in the GIS application?

Answer to question 01:

There is no limit as to the share of subcontracting outside the EU. However it should be noted that the full responsibility for the performance of the contract remains with the tenderer.

The tenderer may rely on the capacities of subcontractors to fulfil selection criteria. In this case the evidence for the selection criteria must be provided on behalf of the subcontractors and it will be checked to ensure that the tenderer and its subcontractors as a whole fulfil the selection criteria (please see section 10 para. 2 of the tender specifications).

Published on: 16 August 2017

Question 02 (dated 18 August 2017, 11:55):

With respect to the ongoing invitation to tender n° EMSA/OP/16/2017 we would like to submit the following requests for clarification:

1) The compliance matrix provided in Appendix V seems to have some small errors that we would like to ask to be verified:

1. EODC_RVA_FUN_1050 – the identifier of this requirement is not given, but the description is there; this implies that the following requirements do not match with the description
2. EODC_CFG_FUN_0300 – the description of this requirement does not correspond to the text in the specification (Appendix A)
 - a. In the Excel - Matrix “*Resources - Tasking Type definition: main functionalities*” instead of “*Tasking type: attributes*” as given in Appendix A
3. EODC_ALE_FUN_0192 “Alert” – this requirement is not given in the Excel file
4. EODC_GEN_DOC_0060 – equivalent to EODC_RVA_FUN_1050 (see above)
5. EODC_GEN_MON_0040 – this requirement does not exist in Appendix A

2) In the tender specifications, Appendix A, on page 229/230, the requirement EODC_TEC_GEN_0050 asks for an high level assessment of existing cloud solutions and further requests that the price of the assessment be included in the offer. However, in Appendix T, *Template# 5 – Price table* on page 8, there is no item for this price.

Please clarify where exactly this price shall be quoted and if it shall be integral part of one of the work packages (corresponding price item) or under “Preparation of Project” or elsewhere.

Answer to question 02:

1) Corrections to Appendix V (Compliance Matrix):

1.1) EODC_RVA_FUN_1050 has been added to the compliance matrix;

1.2) CFG_FUN_0300 description was corrected.

1.3) EODC_ALE__FUN_0192 (Alert) was added to the compliance matrix;

1.4) EODC_GEN_DOC_0060 was added to the compliance matrix

1.5) EODC_GEN_MON_0040, which was duplicated in the matrix, was removed.

1.6) There was a misalignment between description and identifier in several requirements (including CFG_FUN_0300), that was also corrected

A new version of Appendix V (Compliance Matrix) implementing these corrections was published (0x_Encl_I_Appendix-V-Compliance Matrix_version2.xlsx)

2) We clarify that the price of the high level assessment of existing cloud solutions is to be considered included in item “Preparation of project”.

Published on: 22 August 2017

Question 03 (dated 25 August 2017, 10:41):

Regarding your solicitation for “Earth Observation Data Centre (EODC) ORCHESTRA”, invitation to tender No. EMSA/OP/16/2017, we hereby present a set of questions:

- **Regarding the User Interface and its requirements:**
 - **Should we consider that this solution will only be used in Desktop PC devices?**
 - **Do you require any level of responsiveness?**
 - **What is the basic screen resolution to consider?**
 - **May we consider the use of this solution in touchscreen devices or that will not happen?**
- **Tender Specifications attached to ITT EMSAOP162017 Section 5 – Timetable and deliverables > This indicative plan doesn’t consider an initial phase for a global analysis. Can we adapt the plan to include such block? In the price table, where should we include those efforts?**

Answer to question 03:

1) Regarding the User Interface and its requirements:

- 1.1) The main use is on desktop PC devices and the design should be geared towards this platform. This does not mean that the system should prevent/disable its usage on tablets / touchscreens (particularly in case of larger screens);
- 1.2) Responsive design is expected for the supported resolutions;
- 1.3) Please consider 1366x768 as the baseline resolution for wide screen; for full screen (4:3) please consider 1024x768 as minimum resolution - most common at EMSA is 1280x1024. Screens up to 4K or 5K shall be supported.
- 1.4) Although the main use will be in desktop PCs without touchscreens, the support of touchscreens shall be considered.

2) The timetable for module 1 indicated in table 5.1.1 shall be followed by the contractor. If the contractor wishes to include a global assessment in the design phase of release 1 this can be discussed during the KOM. Efforts associated with a potential global assessment, as they are not strictly linked with any work package, shall be indicated in the "Preparation of project" category of Module 1.

Published on: 29 August 2017

Question 04 (dated 29 August 2017, 11:24):

With respect to the ongoing invitation to tender n° EMSA/OP/16/2017, we would like to request, if available, the document below in a searchable format with better readability.

2-Tender Specifications attached to ITT EMSAOP162017.pdf

The document is currently provided scanned as part of the tender documentation.

Answer to question 04:

For your convenience we have just published a searchable PDF version of the document:

2 - Tender Specifications attached to ITT EMSAOP162017 - searchable.pdf

Published on: 29 August 2017

Question 05 (dated 31 August 2017, 14:24):

Taking into account that a good part of the period for the proposal preparation of this ITT (Earth Observation Data Centre Orchestra) has been the month of August, traditionally holidays season in several countries of Europe including Spain, we kindly request an extension of at least two weeks of the delivery date of the tender.

Answer to question 05:

The European Maritime Safety Agency is not in a position to extend the deadline upon individual requests of tenderers. Such approach would impact on the timely execution of the Agency's planned activities and therefore affect its overall output. However, should the Agency decide to extend the deadline a notice will be published on the EMSA website.

Published on: 01 September 2017

Question 06 (dated 01 September 2017, 09:49):

Related to the Call for tenders N°. EMSA OP/16/2017, for Earth Observation Data Centre (EODC) ORCHESTRA, we would kindly like to ask for an extension of the closing date of the Proposal submission by 3 weeks if possible, to be allowed to better refine our proposal.

Answer to question 06:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 04 September 2017

Question 07 (dated 01 September 2017, 10:14):

Dear Procurement Office:

[The Company] is keen to respond to the subject tender because of its relevant strong expertise and state-of-the-art technologies (e.g., (...)).

However, as of the complexity of the proposal and the in-between summer vacation period elapsed, we would highly appreciate a proposal extension submission of 3 weeks if possible (i.e. submission on 10/10/17 if possible).

Answer to question 07:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 04 September 2017

Question 08 (dated 01 September 2017, 14:24):

Please find attached [Company's name] request to extend the submission date for Invitation to Tender No. EMSA/OP/16/2017 for Earth Observation Data Centre Orchestra.

Answer to question 08:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 04 September 2017

Question 09 (dated 01 September 2017, 19:41):

Regarding your solicitation for “Earth Observation Data Centre (EODC) ORCHESTRA”, invitation to tender No. EMSA/OP/16/2017, we hereby present a new set of questions:

- **Can you please share the figures displayed in Appendix A - Technical requirements with higher resolution, in order to allow a better understanding of the corresponding requirements?**
- **Can you please clarify how many mockups (minimum) should be delivered with the proposal?**
- **Regarding Appendix A - Technical requirements > ID EODC_GEN_FUN_0200: Can you please clarify the terms “ingestion”, “frame”, “segment”?**
- **Regarding Appendix A - Technical requirements > ID EODC_CFG_FUN_0090: What elements can be modified? Any, or just user imported/created? In case of the former, what does it mean, for example, to modify an Alert Area or EEZ?**

Answer to question 09:

- 1) We understand that the image requiring better resolution is Figure 3 (same as 9), which we now re-captured and published as “Appendix A - figure3_highres.png”;

2) Based on Requirement EODC_GEN_FUN_0060 (source: Appendix A to Tender Specifications EMSA/OP/16/2017), the bidders shall include in the proposal 1-2 potential general designs/approaches of the following (minimum) User Interfaces:

2.1) User Request Interface (EODC_ACQ_FUN_0020);

2.2) Journaling Interface (EODC_RVA_FUN_0160);

2.3) User Request configuration Interface (EODC_CFG_FUN_0670).

3) In this context:

3.1) **ingestion** refers to: upload planning file; retrieve of information contained in the planning file; and display of all the associated technical information in the Graphical User interfaces (including in the Map Display).

3.2) A satellite acquisition (also named **scene**) can be defined as:

- **Frame**: Standard size scene (defined for each satellite product specification)
- **Segment**: Variable size scene that may correspond to multiple (non-integer) number of individual scenes.

4) The following geographical elements can be updated by users in ORCHESTRA interfaces (source: EODC_CFG_FUN_0070):

4.1) Sensitive Areas;

4.2) Shoreline;

4.3) TSS/Shipping lanes;

4.4) Rigs/Offshores;

4.5) Known wrecks;

4.6) Traffic Density;

4.7) EEZ;

4.8) Territorial waters;

4.9) Tasking areas;

4.10) Ground Station visibilities.

4.11) Areas of Interest.

The remaining Geographical elements can only be updated by Central Geographical Database (CGD).

Published on: 07 September 2017

Question 10 (dated 05 September 2017, 09:10):

[Company's name], together with a very experienced and highly qualified team of European Earth Observation Industry representatives, is preparing to submit a proposal in respect to the on subject tender of your esteemed Entity. Considering the fact though that the tender was published in the middle of the summer vacation period, we kindly request an extension of the deadline for submission for at least 2 weeks, which will provide us the needed time to prepare the best possible proposal for EMSA. We thank you in advance and look forward to your positive reply on this, which by the way, will increase the competition among the participants and will of course prove to the benefit of EMSA itself and furthermore to the COPERNICUS user community.

Answer to question 10:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 08 September 2017

Question 11 (dated 05 September 2017, 16:32):

[Company's name] intends to submit a proposal for the above-mentioned subject. Taking into consideration the importance and complexity of this tender and involvement of different disciplines, we kindly request from you to extend the deadline for submission of tenders for at least 2 weeks in order to give sufficient time to tenderers to define their technical solutions and prepare their competitive offers.

Answer to question 11:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 08 September 2017

Question 12 (dated 06 September 2017,10:41):

Can you please send us the full package of EMSA Data Visualization font (Fort typeface)?

Answer to question 12:

The fort typeface is a paid font. EMSA cannot provide paid fonts. For demonstration purposes and samples bidders are free to use their own fonts.

Published on: 11 September 2017

Question 13 (dated 08 September 2017, 09:56):

Concerning the alerting via SMS/MMS messages as described in the requirements ID EODC_ALE_FUN_0100, ID EODC_ALE_FUN_0150, ID EODC_ALE_FUN_0210, we would like to know if EMSA has particular service interfaces (APIs) from local telco operators or equivalent. If not, we understand that such an external interface will not be at the charge of the contractors. Please clarify.

Answer to question 13:

EMSA does not have Service interfaces with local telco operators. The charge of buying any external interface is not at the charge of the contractors.

Published on: 13 September 2017

Question 14 (dated 08 September 2017, 18:34):

Due to vacation period that we have been through we face some absences in our teams. Having said that, we hereby kindly ask you to postpone the deadline to the next 26th September 2017 (one week later).

Answer to question 14:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 13 September 2017

Question 15 (dated 11 September 2017, 11:25):

We would appreciate if you could help us with an answer to the attached clarification question regarding Call for tenders No. EMSA/OP/16/2017 for Earth Observation Data Centre Orchestra.

Considering that the requirements regarding the content of the tender are very complex:

We are required to analyse thoroughly and respond to each of the lines - 825 lines total - the compliance matrices (692 lines in Appendix-V-Compliance Matrix.xlsx and 133 lines in Appendix-W-Security_Compliance_Report.xlsx), The responses, according to the award criteria “should not only indicate “yes/no/partial compliance” for each requirement, but provide clear information on the fulfilment of the requirement, justification of any decision or assumption and explanation on the approach.”

This detail of information requires a significant volume of work in order to identify the exact context of the requirement, the implementation layer and to document in the tender the implementation solution

Moreover multiple lines in the mentioned matrices requests for additional materials to be presented as proof of our understanding (such as business rules examples/proposals,). Examples:

Bidder shall propose a mechanism that avoids the duplication of IDs.

Bidder shall include in the proposal 1-2 potential general designs/approaches for the User Interfaces

Bidders shall include mock-ups of the proposed user interfaces

Bidder shall demonstrate, in the proposal, the understanding of the rules and demonstrate with additional examples.

The first 2 criterias also have to take into account the exact detailed requirements in order to be able to present customised details about the implementation of the requirements presented in Appendix A:

Management/ Planning perspective: We are required to present a detailed project plan for the implementation of the requirements described in Appendix A, including detailed WBS, Project Team, Allocation of tasks/team member and effort per work package,

Technical solution – this must be detailed in order to present how the Proposed solution covers each requirement presented in the 237 pages of Appendix A and also take the EMSA IT context documents into consideration

While we would like to congratulate EMSA for the degree of details and the clarity of the tender documentation, we consider that the total duration available to any contractor – less than 2 months (24 Jul – 19 September) in order to respond completely to the request with a high degree a quality a contractor must involve numerous resources that will have to synchronise in order to deliver a value proposition to EMSA.

Maintaining the deadline will not allow any contractor to deliver a good technical offer to EMSA and in consequence this will present EMSA with issues regarding it's activities:

- Fewer (if any) Bidders – this will force EMSA to select from a reduced pool of bidders with potential quality/price/competition problems –delays in project start/project execution**
- Low quality offers with the risk of not receiving an acceptable offer – with immediate impact on project start date**

As a note, we would like to highlight the fact that EMSA received 8 clarification questions and 50% of them (4) were requests for delay.

Taking all this into account we kindly request an extension of at least 5(five) weeks of the delivery date of the tender (i.e. submission on 24/10/17)

Answer to question 15:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 13 September 2017

Question 16 (dated 12 September 2017, 18:34):

Relatively to your reply to the request for extension of the deadline for submission of the on subject tender, we kindly ask you to reassess your position as it seems that the same request is made by 6 (six) different entities/companies and is not any more an “individual request”.

We take the opportunity to reconfirm our position that, a positive decision on this will increase the competition among the participants and will of course prove to the benefit of EMSA itself and furthermore to the COPERNICUS user community.

Answer to question 16:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 13 September 2017

Question 17 (dated 14 September 2017, 14:34):

[Company's name] is seriously committed to prepare an excellent technical and commercial offer to the procedure EMSA/OP/16/2017 because we strongly believe to have the skills and experience to fulfill the required services.

In order to have more time to carefully analyze all the requirements and prepare the best possible technical offer, we kindly request you an extension of the deadline for submitting the Tender.

We look forward to your reply

Answer to question 17:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 15 September 2017

Question 18 (dated 14 September 2017, 15:36):

With respect to the ongoing invitation to tender n° EMSA/OP/16/2017 we would like to submit the following requests for clarification:

On Page 20 of the *Tender specifications attached to the Invitation to tender*, the table for the price evaluation differs slightly from the table in *Appendix T – Template for the bidder*, page (Template#5 – Price Table), i.e. the multipliers for some profiles are different. We assume that the Template in Appendix T prevails over the Table in the Tender specifications. Please clarify.

Answer to question 18:

Please consider that the table for the price evaluation presented in the Tender Specifications prevail over the table in Appendix T – Template for the bidder.

Published on: 15 September 2017

Question 19 (dated 13 September 2017, 15:11):

We are very keen to participate in the Invitation to Tender no. EMSA/OP/16/2017.

In order to prepare a competitive offer, we kindly request for an extension of time for tender submission by at least 5 days.

Answer to question 19:

Please refer to the answer to Question number 5.

Published on: 18 September 2017

Question 20 (dated 13 September 2017, 17:00):

20. 1 With respect to the ongoing invitation to tender no EMSA/OP/16/2017, we would like to request a clarification regarding the "Planning and Ordering" process described in requirement ID EODC_ACQ_INF_0020.

This "Planning and Ordering" process is never clarified anywhere else in the Requirements document.

20.2 Furthermore, upon reading "Appendix-E-CSNDC-EOP Lot1 Integration - ICD" where an API is provided in regards with communicating with the Lot1 Module (the location where the "Planning and Ordering (POR)" module in the existing Lot1 implementation seems to be doing the work before, in p.3 of "2 - Tender Specifications attached to ITT EMSAOP162017.pdf" document) we only see a read only interface towards the Lot1 Module with GET only access and no ability to post orders there.

20.3 If a Service Request successfully completes the "Approval Workflow", the provided documentation of the tender is NOT clear on how the Service Request is to be submitted to the Service Providers neither as a textual description or even programmatically with an API call to an external system.

Is this something that will be decided upon project implementation?

Answer to question 20:

20.1 "Planning and ordering" refers to the Service Acquisition that is further clarified in section 4.2 of Annex A- Technical requirements EODC ORCHESTRA.

20.2 EODC LOT-1 does not include a planning and ordering interface. EODC LOT-1 connects to the existing EODC Planning and ordering component via a read-only interface.

*20.3 Please refer to EODC_ACQ_FUN_1000 where it is stated the following:
"After approval by the Authorising officer the system shall issue a notification that the service request was approved. The Service Providers and License Providers will receive this notification that shall include*

Signed Task forms. Additionally there should also be a link to the system where this information can be downloaded.”

Published on: 18 September 2017

Requests for additional information regarding this tender should be sent by e-mail to the following address OPEN162017@emsa.europa.eu. Requests for additional information received less than six working days before the closing date for submission of tenders will not be processed.

The deadline for submission of the bids of this tender is 19/09/2017. The responsibility for monitoring the Agency's website for replies to queries and/or further information remains with potential applicants.