

Clarification Note #8

EUSPA internal reference: 321717

Procurement procedure: EUSPA/OP/16/25 (EUSPA/PRG/2026/OP/0003)

Title: 'Administrative support services to EUSPA'

Question #44: We kindly request clarification regarding Annex I.F.1 – Lot 1: Financial Table of Answers. In the Annex I- EUSPA-OP-16-25 TenderSpecifications_V1, Section 1.5, the estimated number of working days for Lot 1 is specified only for the Prague location. However, the above-mentioned annex also lists other destinations with estimated numbers of working days, similarly to Lot 2. At the same time, the annex states that entering a price of “EUR 0” constitutes grounds for exclusion. Would it be possible to publish a revised version of the annex without the other locations?

Answer #44: See Corrigendum No 1.

Question #45: For the purpose of ensuring the correct calculation and assessment of financial risk related to the transfer of obligations pursuant to Section 3.3 of the Annex I- EUSPA-OP-16-25 TenderSpecifications_V1, we kindly request information on the exact amount of the monthly invoicing for the most recent three months of services provided by the service providers. We further request information on the number of service providers, the outstanding leave balances, and all possible obligations of the current contractor towards the service providers.

Answer #45: See the information provided in the answer to question 19 (86280 in F& portal). The amount of monthly invoices would reveal commercially sensitive data of the incumbent. The contract award notices for contracts being currently implemented may be found here:

[446472-2022 - Result - TED](#)

[451643-2022 - Result - TED](#)

Information of the specific contracts issued is available in the annual list of contractors (see the bottom of the page):

[Procurement | EU Agency for the Space Programme](#)

Question #46: We kindly request that the tender submission deadline be extended by one week.

Answer #46: See Corrigendum No 1.

Question #47: For Award Criterion Q5, we are only bidding on Lot 1, therefore if a tenderer declares full compliance with the contractual baseline, we understand that the expected answer would consist only of a duly completed, signed and dated Statement of Compliance (Annex I.I), indicating “Full compliance” with the Draft Framework Contract and its annexes, without comments, explanations, assumptions or alternative wording. Could you please confirm that this approach is correct for tenderers declaring full compliance under Lot 1 and nothing else is required in our answer if we are fully compliant?

Answer #47: Yes. For Lot 1. where a tenderer declares full compliance with the contractual baseline, the expected submission is a duly completed, signed and dated Statement of Compliance using the template in Annex I.I, indicating “Full compliance”. In case full compliance is stated, tenderers shall avoid comments, assumptions and limitation, as they will not be taken into account for evaluation and shall not apply in case of award. Please note that Award Criterion Q5.1 includes the requirement for a duly filled in Background IPR Declaration. The declared compliance should be in line / demonstrated by the statements made in the other parts of the tender. See also the answer to question 19 (86280 in F&T portal).

Question #48: How many person days have been ordered in 2025 for profiles similar to Lot 1 (no security clearance).

Answer #48: The answer was already provided with the clarification note: #6, Question #19 (86280 in F&T portal).

Question #49: The answers to question 31 (ID #86635 in F&T platform), 30 (#86634, in F&T platform), 27 (#86631 in F&T platform indicate that different locations other than Prague should be included in the Financial file. On the contrary: - 1. "Annex I.F.1 LOT 1 Financial Table of Answers Template_after Corrigendum 1_V1" and "Annex I.F.2 LOT 1 Cost Sheets_after Corrigendum 1_V1" have only Prague in it. - 2. "Annex I- EUSPA-OP-16-25 TenderSpecifications_after Corrigendum 1_V1" considers only Prague as the location for services performance. Can you please indicate which information we should take as correct (i.e. are Service Providers under Lot 1 required to work in Prague only or also elsewhere? Should we consider correcting the excel files "[...]_after Corrigendum_V1" or the previous versions "[...]_V1"?

Answer #49: Following Corrigendum No 1, Lot 1 has been amended so that it concerns “Administrative support services to EUSPA HQ” and updated tender documentation expressly provides that, for Lot 1, the relevant location is Prague only. Accordingly, for Lot 1, tenderers shall rely on the updated documents issued after Corrigendum No 1, including revised Tender Specification and the revised financial annexes. The previous version of the documents has been superseded to that extent.