EUSPA/OP/04/25

"ICT SUPPORT SERVICES"

Annex I.J.2 – Simulation Exercise

After Corrigendum 3

Ref.: Annex I.J.2 – Simulation Exercise

Issue: 1 Rev ~~23~~ Corr.3

Date: ~~18/12/2025~~16/01/2026 Corr.3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

1 Acronyms and Abbreviations

Table 1 - Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
CRUD	Create, Read, Update, Delete
DR	Disaster Recovery
EU	European Union
FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
HQ	Headquarters
HW	Hardware
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MVP	Minimum Viable Product
RPO	Recovery Point Objective

Abbreviation	Definition
RTO	Recovery Time Objective
SLA	Service Level Agreement
UAT	User Acceptance Testing
UI	User Interface
US	United States
WP	Work Package

2 DISCLAIMER

The exercise work packages represent fictitious scenarios, and do not represent any commitment or base for future contract consumption. They are provided for the purpose of the tender evaluation.

3 INTRODUCTION

The simulation exercise is based on tasks described in I.J.1 – Technical Terms of Reference. For the purpose of simulation of a specific contract, the simulation exercise is divided into four work packages (the "WP").

The following table shows the mapping between tasks and the respective WP:

Table 2 Tasks and the respective WP

WP	WP Name, Description	Service Task
WP 1	First Specific Contract Simulation (Specific contract 1) (~~takeover task and~~[Corr.3] recurrent services with simulated duration of 12 months)	1~~,4~~ [Corr.3]
WP 2	ICT Infrastructure Project Exercise	3
WP 3	Developed exit strategy from US-controlled technologies	3
WP4	IT Software Development Questionnaire	3

The simulation exercise is designed to provide tenderers with a good overview of the range of activities they may be asked to perform under the framework contract, based on the tasks described hereto. Additionally, it is a likely scenario for the implementation of the framework contract through specific contracts for individual tasks. The simulation exercise will serve as a common scenario against which the quality and price of the submitted tenders will be assessed.

The tenderers are hereby informed that their offer as presented in the simulation exercise will be deemed relevant to be used as a basis for establishing specific contracts under the framework contract with the successful tenderer, if the request for services is identical.

4 Exercise Work Packages

4.1 WP 1: ~~Takeover task and~~ Corr.3 Recurrent services for 12 months

This exercise is designed to simulate the effort required for the ~~knowledge takeover task which will be necessary prior to entering a routine operating mode, and a~~ Corr.3 12-months of provision of services of recurrent nature.

The **ICT Systems Management service** team (as described as **SERVICE TASK 1** in the Technical Terms of Reference) considered for the purpose of the exercise contains the following principal ICT functions:

- ICT User support
- ICT Systems and Software Training
- ICT Systems maintenance
- ICT datacentre support
- ICT Systems administration and configuration
- ICT Systems architecture, design and planning
- ICT Systems testing and evaluation
- ICT Systems analysis
- ICT Project management
- ICT Security
- ICT Systems documentation and content management
- ICT supply chain management support
- Application development (On-prem, Cloud based, Hybrid, Containerized, PowerApps, etc.)
- Application maintenance
- Security risk assessment

▪ Software market survey

▪ Information management

▪ and other auxiliary ICT activities (i.a., support the Agency in audits and compliance services with IT related regulatory frameworks)

~~The takeover team and activities considered for the purpose of the exercise are identical to the description in SERVICE TASK 4 of the Technical Terms of Reference.~~ Corr.3

Due to the continuous and long-running character of the services as well as due to impossibility for the Agency to create a simulation exercise representative enough, the quantities related to the provision of services are already pre-defined.

4.1.1 Evaluation Criterion

~~The price of WP1 will be calculated automatically based on the man-day rates , stand by duty daily rate and mission travel prices provided by the tenderer for each specific profile and service.~~

~~The outcome of WP1 simulation will be used in the financial evaluation of the tenders.~~

Technical aspects:

For WP1 the tenderers shall deliver the services in compliance with all the technical requirements stipulated for SERVICE TASKS 1 ~~and 4~~ Corr.3 in the Technical Terms of Reference, constituting Annex I.J.1 to the Tender Specifications.

For the quality, adequacy and clarity of the approach to deliver the services under WP1, shall be considered when evaluating the proposal against qualitative award criterion Q1 pertaining also to the Framework Contract as a whole.

Financial aspects:

The estimated effort for WP1 has been considered and included accordingly in the ~~Tables B1 and B2,~~ Corr.3 tab B, of Annex I.F. Corr.2

4.1.2 Instructions to fill in the exercise Annex I.F.1

The price of all WPs will be calculated automatically in tab B of Annex I.F, based on the man-day rates, stand by duty daily rate and mission travel prices provided by the tenderer for each specific profile and service in tab A of Annex I.F. Corr.2

To complete this exercise, the tenderer must:

- fill in the tables A1 in ANNEX I.F.1, tab A. This table must be filled in fully and unreservedly, without any conditions as “depending on”, “will be determined after”, etc. Such incomplete exercise will be base for disqualification from the tender.
- Verify the outcome on tab B. (note: there is nothing to fill on tab B) The following section describes in detail the process of filling in the exercise.

Table A1~~, ICT Specialist profiles and Mission travel prices~~[Corr.2]

The standard daily rates (Unit Price) for each profile shall be filled in by the tenderer. For the purpose of simulation exercise, these Unit Prices will be multiplied by the indicated number of FTEs for each row, and by the required number of man-days (MD) to be delivered per FTE.

The standard daily rates (Unit Price) for stand by duty service shall be filled in by the tenderer. For the purpose of simulation exercise, this Unit Price will be multiplied by the indicated number of days.

The mission travel prices for each country shall be filled in by the tenderer. For the purpose of simulation exercise, these prices will be multiplied by the indicated number of days of mission for each location.

All conditions as per the referenced Annex must be met and included in the price, meaning all-inclusive daily rates, specified in Articles I.4.1.3and I.4.1.8.

4.2 WP 2: ICT Infrastructure Project Exercise

This exercise is designed to simulate a procurement of ICT infrastructure project. This may amongst others include:

- Requirements gathering process
- Knowledge and orientation of the technical environment of the Agency
- Proposed technical concept(s)
- System design
- Throughout resource management
- Project lifecycle and methodology use, and adherence to it
- Proposed technical solution

With particular focus on:

- Adherence to common standards (ISO, PM, etc.)
- Handling of sensitive, classified or other information protected by the GDPR regulation (if any)

These are the suggested focus topics, however the tenderers are encouraged to follow up on best practices, and use any methodology fundamentals they believe represents the best and complete set of steps, processes and documents for given scenario and project scope.

4.2.1 Scenario Description

The Agency operates its main unclassified ICT system in the Prague HQ datacentre. The recovery approach in a case of disaster is to restore the workloads in Azure from backup sets.

As both RTO and RPO achieved by this approach are not sufficient, the Agency wants to improve disaster resilience. One of the options considered is to build a standby ICT system in the second Agency datacentre in Paris.

Provisional Title

Building geo-redundant ICT solution to increase disaster resiliency

Current System Condition

- The ICT system running in Prague is characterized by the following:
- The key IT services are running on Microsoft platforms like Sharepoint, Exchange, .NET applications with MSSQL backend.
- The majority of the infrastructure is virtualized using the MS HYPER-V.
- The hardware used are standard HPE, DELL, CISCO servers, storages and network boxes.
- Between Prague and Paris, the Agency has 2gbps network circuit that can be dedicated for the data replication.
- The backup is performed by VEEAM B&R product with replication datasets to MS AZURE.
- The current failover RPO is in an extent of hours, and the current failover RTO is in an extent of days. The failback capability is also in an extent of days.

Requirements

The solution shall achieve the following business objectives:

- Improving the current disaster RPO by engaging some form of data replication between sites.
- Improving the current RTO by semi-automatic switching operations from one datacentre to another in a case the disaster is declared.
- Improving the failback capability to normal operation in primary datacentre in a case disaster is no longer declared.

4.2.2 Notes and Conditions

Notes

- It is understood an investment in new hardware/solution may be necessary
- It is preferred to remain within the software portfolio/vendor the Agency is already running.
- For management and monitoring the Agency works predominantly with Microsoft System Centre family products.
- As a rule of thumb, while achieving the objectives a proper consideration must be given to cost effectiveness of the proposed solution.
- For additional information about the Agency technology portfolio, and geographical allocation, refer to information in Annex I.E

Conditions

Unless specified otherwise, the tenderer shall build assumptions based solely on the information listed here, or in other tender documents.

Example:

No specific information about the vendor of HW components, disk, tape libraries, is given. If some specific information is missing, and it cannot be directly assumed or deduced from the provided documentation, the tenderer ***is free to make assumption****, given that it will be* ***described clearly and in detail in the provided project documentation****.*

Technical assumption that is correctly documented will not be subject to penalization during the tender evaluation.

Further exercise scenario details will not be given, as the rudimental sum of information provided is deemed sufficient for the exercise. If necessary, apply the "assumption" principle described above.

4.2.3 Deliverables

To answer this exercise correctly, the following documentation shall be supplied. The level of detail and an actual content lay within the expertise of the tenderer.

It shall in minimum provide clear answers to and description of requirements and notes listed in this exercise scenario. Additional level of valid and relevant detail will be an asset; however the supplied documentation shall not be congested by technical and procedural details with no direct bearing to the scenario.

The tenderer is encouraged to exercise their expertise to deliver the following documentation:

D-2-1 Relevant non-technical project management documentation

(i) Project plan

(ii) Project timeline including milestones, cut-over plans, testing scenarios, hand-over to live operation plans

The extent of the project management documentation is max three A4 pages (i.e. 500 words per page). Submissions exceeding the mentioned maximum length may result in a deduction of points during evaluation.

D-2-2 System Architecture

The description of the proposed technical solution like tools and technologies used, capacity planning, data replication approach, operation switching strategies etc. The proposal is expected to be properly argued and supplemented by calculation where necessary.

The extent of the System Architecture is max four A4 pages (i.e. 500 words per page). Submissions exceeding the mentioned maximum length may result in a deduction of points during evaluation.

4.2.4 Evaluation Criteria

Technical aspects: Corr.2

The answer and associated documentation to be provided by the tenderers for WP2 as per requirements described above is to be evaluated against qualitative award criteri~~a~~on Corr.2 Q2. ~~No financial offer shall be submitted for WP2~~.

Financial aspects:

The estimated effort for WP2 has been considered and included accordingly in Table B1, tab B, of Annex I.F. Corr.2

4.3 WP 3: Exit strategy from US-controlled technologies

4.3.1 Scenario Description

The scenario involves the development of a proposed exit strategy for transitioning from technologies currently provided by US-controlled companies to alternatives fully controlled by EU-based entities. While the scenario is hypothetical, it reflects real-world considerations of strategic autonomy, regulatory compliance (GDPR), and data sovereignty within the EU context as well as information security standards (ISO/IEC27001).

A representative list of affected services and technologies is provided. Based on this information, tenderers are requested to outline a high-level exit strategy that demonstrates their understanding of the key challenges, potential transition paths, and the critical factors that must be addressed—technical, operational, legal, and commercial.

4.3.2 The list of services in scope of this simulation exercise:

- M365: Exchange Online Teams, OneDrive for Business
- On prem: SharePoint 2019

4.3.3 Deliverables

D-3-1 Proposed Methodology and Approach

Request:

- Submit a high-level methodology outlining your approach to designing and executing such a transition, covering phases such as assessment, planning, migration, testing, and handover.
- Highlight how you would ensure business continuity, data integrity, and regulatory compliance during the transition.
- Describe your approach to stakeholder engagement, governance, and change management.

Purpose: Demonstrate structured thinking, familiarity with complex transitions, and awareness of risks and constraints.

D-3-2 Team and Capabilities

Request:

- Provide profiles of key personnel proposed for this type of engagement, including relevant certifications, experience, and roles in past comparable projects.
- Describe the solutions you propose and access to EU-based technology partners or solutions, particularly those compliant with GDPR and information security standards (ISO/IEC27001).

Purpose: Confirm availability of qualified resources and the ability to operate within EU regulatory boundaries.

D-3-3 Risk Analysis and Mitigation Strategy

Request:

- Identify key risks associated with the transition from US- to EU-controlled technologies and describe your proposed mitigation measures.
- Include legal, technical, operational, and supply chain-related risks (e.g., data portability, vendor lock-in, licensing constraints).

Purpose: Assess foresight, pragmatism, and capacity to manage complexity under regulatory pressure.

4.3.4 Evaluation Criteria

The goal is to assess the supplier's capability, credibility, and readiness to deliver a transition from US-controlled to EU-controlled technologies.

Technical aspects: Corr.2

The answer and associated documentation to be provided by the tenderers for WP3 as per requirements described above is to be evaluated against qualitative award criteri~~a~~on Corr.2 Q3. ~~**No financial offer shall be submitted for WP3.**~~

Financial aspects:

The estimated effort for WP3 has been considered and included accordingly in the Table B1, tab B, of Annex I.F. Corr.2

4.4 WP 4: Delivery of SW development services

4.4.1 Scenario Description

~~The answer and associated documentation to be provided by the tenderers for WP4 as per requirements described below is to be evaluated against qualitative award criteria Q4. No financial offer shall be submitted for WP4.~~ Corr.2

The objective is to assess the supplier's speed, commitment, and process maturity across different project scopes and complexities.

The responses shall be deemed binding delivery dates for the purpose of milestone planning in software development projects, if requested by the Agency. The corresponding SLA metric (Milestone Timelines) shall apply.

Scoring mechanism:

- Questioner has 3 scenarios
- Each scenario has 7 questions
- Each question can be scored Low, Satisfactory or High
  - High – 1 point
  - Satisfactory - $^2/_3$ of a point
  - Low – $^1/_3$ of a point

Minimum score is 7 points

Maximum score is 21 points

Scoring example:

Category 1 – Small Scope | Complexity 1

Platform: No-code/low-code (e.g., PowerApps Canvas, Nintex, K2)

1. How soon can you initiate preparatory work after formal request?

Next working day = High
During next 5 working days = Satisfactory

More than 5 working days = Low

Common Definitions (apply to all categories):

- Initial request intake meeting: Includes initial request intake interview, basic application complexity identification, initial indication of roles. Basic outline of the process.
- Preparatory work: Includes analysis, stakeholder interviews, process mapping, user stories.
- MVP Prototype: A minimum working version with basic user flow or UI mockup.
- First Iteration: A deliverable suitable for UAT or production testing.
- Business Days: Please express all durations in business days.

- T0: time of the initial request

Complexity:

1. The platform of choice is no-code/low code, i.e.: Microsoft Power Platform, Nintex or K2 or similar, or any scripting language.
2. The platform of choice is no-code/low code, i.e.: Microsoft Power Platform with Canvas or Model Driven App, Nintex or K2 or similar.
3. The platform of choice is full stack combination (.Net, JavaScript, Python, Ruby, etc.) with full scope 3-tier architecture and web or thick client developed interface.

4.4.2 Deliverables

D-4-1 Category 1 – Small Scope | Complexity 1

Platform: No-code/low-code (e.g., PowerApps Canvas, Nintex, K2, Scripting Languages)

Examples (To demonstrate the scope and complexity only. As per disclaimer in Section 2 above, the examples are not to be taken literally):

- Request that requires a configuration of Power Automate flow. This will save attachments from shared mailbox to SharePoint library once a day.
- Script snippet that will modify Active Directory description attribute with username during logon process.
- Simple canvas app to register notes of individual users for later analysis (into SharePoint list)

Questions (answer all in context of the Category and complexity scope):

1. How soon can you initiate the initial request intake meeting after formal request?
2. Typical duration of preparatory work (analysis, use cases, etc.)?
3. Time to start building MVP after analysis approval?
4. Time to deliver MVP prototype?
5. Time to deliver first iteration for testing or deployment?
6. Typical composition of the documentation for this scope of development?
7. How do you manage communication and progress reporting (tools used, frequency, formats)?

D-4-2 Category 2 – Medium Scope | Complexity 2

Platform: No-code/low-code (PowerApps Canvas or Model Driven)

Examples (To demonstrate the scope and complexity only. As per disclaimer in Section 2 above, the examples are not to be taken literally):

- Time-sheeting System that enables employees to log work hours daily, submit timesheets for approval, and track project/task allocation. Managers should review and approve the timesheets. The

system must support role-based access, notifications, and reporting.

- Build a Desk Booking System that allows employees to reserve desks in the office. The system should show real-time availability, support recurring bookings, provide role-based access, send notifications, and include basic usage reporting.

Questions (answer all in context of the Category and complexity scope):

8. How soon can you initiate the initial request intake meeting after formal request?
9. Typical duration of preparatory work (analysis, use cases, etc.)?
10. Time to start building MVP after analysis approval?
11. Time to deliver MVP prototype?
12. Time to deliver first iteration for testing or deployment?
13. Typical composition of the documentation for this scope of development?
14. How do you manage communication and progress reporting (tools used, frequency, formats)?

D-4-3 Category 3 – Large Scope | Complexity 3

Platform: Full Stack app (i.e.: .Net based) with web or Thick Client, Tiered Architecture, dedicated database

Examples (To demonstrate the scope and complexity only. As per disclaimer in Section 2 above, the examples are not to be taken literally):

- Build a full-stack 3-tier Learning Management System with a presentation layer (frontend UI), an application layer (backend logic), and a data layer (database). The system should include user authentication, role-based access for admins, instructors, and students, data CRUD operations for courses, content, and assessments, and a responsive UI. Use modern frameworks and ensure the application is scalable, secure, and well-documented.

Questions (answer all in context of the Category and complexity scope):

15. How soon can you initiate the initial request intake meeting after formal request?
16. Typical duration of preparatory work (analysis, use cases, etc.)?
17. Time to start building MVP after analysis approval?
18. Time to deliver MVP prototype?
19. Time to deliver first iteration for testing or deployment?
20. Typical composition of the documentation for this scope of development?
21. How do you manage communication and progress reporting (tools used, frequency, formats)?

4.4.3 Evaluation Criteria

Technical aspects:

The answer and associated documentation to be provided by the tenderers for WP4 as per requirements

described above is to be evaluated against qualitative award criterion Q4.

Financial aspects:

The estimated effort for WP4 has been considered and included accordingly in the Table B1, tab B, of Annex I.F. Corr.2

End of Document