

Clarification Note #1
EGNSS Service Demonstrator (ESD)
EUSPA/OP/17/24
(EUSPA internal reference: 312783)

Question #1: Topic: E5b dissemination

The ESD System Requirements Document [AD.201] specifies in [ESD-SRD-FUNC-04210], [ESD-SRD-FUNC-04220], and [ESD-SRD-FUNC-04230] that non-SIS dissemination means shall support L1 SBAS and L5 DFMC SBAS signals, and that these shall be upgradeable to E5b.

At the same time, the “SBAS authentication service test” use case described in both the FWC SoW and the SC3 SoW explicitly refers to E5b dissemination.

Could the Contracting Authority confirm that:

- The uplink infrastructure must be upgradeable to support E5b dissemination, as part of its architectural design, but
- E5b signal generation and broadcast are not required in the current baseline of SC1 through SC4?

Answer: It is confirmed that, as requested in requirement [ESD-SRD-FUNC-04230] of the ESD System Requirements Document [AD.201], the ESD shall be designed to be upgradable to broadcast via E5b signal.

E5b signal generation and broadcast are not required in the current baseline of SC1. However, the Contractor is required to propose E5b signal generation and broadcast or alternative methods of dissemination as part of its proposal for Evaluation Scenarios SC2, SC3 and SC4.

Question #2: topic: Contractor responsibility after on-site deployment of ESD module infrastructure and until AR.

According to the SC1 SoW, deployment of ESD module infrastructure occurs immediately after in-factory qualification, while custody remains with the Contractor until the corresponding AR ([ESD-SC1-SOW-0110]). Given that the infrastructure will be physically hosted in sites not under the Contractor’s control during this interim period, we would appreciate clarification on what specific responsibilities the Contractor retains during this period.

Answer: As outlined in article 5.17.3 of the draft Contract (Annex II to the Invitation to Tender), for the period between successful QR to successful AR, the Agency shall be responsible for any damage to the Solution, caused by its use not in line with the presented Contractor’s documentation. During this period all other responsibilities remain with the Contractor.

Question #3:

In [ESD-SC1-SOW-0060], it is stated: “Note that during the KO meeting all the PDR deliverables provided as part of the proposal shall be presented and updated if needed, since for SC1 there is no PDR milestone expected.” However, other requirements state that the SC1 PDR milestone does exist, although it is collocated with the SC1 KO. Please clarify.

Answer: It is confirmed that, as per requirement [ESD-SC1-SOW-0060] of the Statement of Work for the EGNSS Service Demonstrator Specific Contract #1 (annex I.I.b to the Invitation to Tender), during the SC1 KO meeting all the PDR deliverables provided as part of the proposal shall be presented and updated if needed, since for SC1 there is no PDR milestone expected.

Question #4:

The SC1 SoW specifies that:

- CFI.02 (ESD GEO broadcast information and uplink facility hosting site ICDs) and
- CFI.03 (Next Generation EDAS User Interface Document)

are to be provided by the Contracting Authority at CDR#1.

However:

- Requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-0120] indicates that PDR is the milestone by which external ICD compliance should be demonstrated.
- The stated objectives of the CDR (e.g. finalisation of the detailed design) assume that external interface definitions are already known and integrated.

Could you please confirm:

- Whether CFI.02 and CFI.03 can be made available before PDR, or
- If not, what the intended working approach is for meeting the ICD compliance and design freeze objectives under this timeline constraint?

Answer:

It is understood that the question refers to CFI.02 and CFI.03 of SC1. In the case of SC1, there is no dedicated PDR milestone (as per requirement [ESD-SC1-SOW-0060] of SC1 SoW and in line with the answer to Question #7 above). It is clarified that demonstration of compliance of the deployed ESD module infrastructure to the applicable requirements and interface requirements must be fulfilled at QR, as per [ESD-SC1-SOW-0090], not at PDR nor at CDR.

Question #5:

Several FWC-level requirements (e.g. reporting, risk assessment, asset custody, configuration management) imply continuous activities throughout the contract's duration. However, it is unclear whether these regular tasks are expected to be maintained during periods when no Specific Contract(s) are active.

Could the Contracting Authority clarify whether:

- These activities should be suspended during SC gaps, and only resumed when a new Specific Contract is signed, or
- The Contractor is expected to quote and perform them continuously throughout the entire FWC duration, as part of SC1?

This question arises particularly in light of:

- The timeline shown in FWC Figure 5-1, which limits SC1 to a defined timeframe,

- The expectation that some development or support equipment may remain at the Contractor's premises beyond SC1 AR (e.g. for reuse in future SCs).

Answer: All activities to be performed by the Contractor are defined within Specific Contracts. If during the course of the FWC there is no SC in place then no activities shall be performed by the Contractor.

Question #6:

Requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-1740] ("Coordination of Deployment") appears to imply activities related to coordination with hosting sites, operators, and potentially other contractors. However, it is unclear whether these activities fall within the scope of Specific Contract #1 (SC1) or are intended to be covered through separate contracts or future specific contracts under the FWC.

Could the Contracting Authority clarify whether:

- The Contractor is expected to include resources and effort for [ESD-FWC-SOW-1740] and similar support tasks (e.g. site availability coordination) within the scope and costing of SC1, or
- These coordination tasks will be addressed via separate contractual arrangements?

If the former, we note that this would likely require:

- A significant extension of SC1's duration (potentially to the full term of the FWC),
- Reassessment of impacts on other requirements such as progress reporting, asset custody, and warranty coverage.

Answer: The Coordination of Deployment activities for SC1 are expressed in the requirements in section 5.5 WP5 - Deployment Tasks of Specific Contract 1 SoW (e.g. [ESD-SC1-SOW-0500], [ESD-SC1-SOW-0510], [ESD-SC1-SOW-0520]). Should during the execution of the FWC the Contracting Authority see the need to have these activities performed in another timeframe than the one of SC1, they will be requested as part of another specific contract.

Question #7:

Requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-1380] refers to the design of "any ESD module" in a way that suggests a narrower scope (e.g. a core) than the definition provided in Section 1.5 of the FWC SoW, where an ESD module is defined as the entire group of components procured within a specific contract (e.g. central facility, uplink subsystem, cores, etc.).

Could you please clarify whether [ESD-FWC-SOW-1380] refers to individual functional elements (e.g. cores) within a module, or it maintains the broader definition provided in Section 1.5?

Answer: As per the definition of ESD module in section 1.5 of the FWC SoW, the ESD module encompasses all the components procured within a specific contract. In requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-1380], the Contractor is requested to minimise the use of physical space when designing the architecture of any ESD module. It is up to the Contractor to decide whether/which individual

functional elements need to be minimised in order to meet the requirement.

Question #8:

Is the Contracting Authority planning to provide the user requirements as an initial DOORS module to serve as the anchor point for requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-1570] (“DOORS Module Delivery to the Contracting Authority”)?

Answer: As per requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-1570] of the FWC Statement of Work (annex I.I.a to the Invitation to Tender), the Contractor shall deliver all DOORS Modules / Databases to the Contracting Authority. The Contracting Authority will not deliver the user requirements as an initial DOORS module.

Question #9:

There appears to be a lack of consistency in the FWC Statement of Work regarding the location of the Qualification Review (QR):

- Requirement [ESD-FWC-SOW-0140] is titled “In-factory Qualification Review (QR)”, but its body does not explicitly state that the QR must occur in-factory.
- Requirements [ESD-FWC-SOW-1720] and [ESD-FWC-SOW-1730] refer specifically to “in-factory QR”.
- [ESD-FWC-SOW-1650] distinguishes between in-factory and on-site QRs, and [ESD-FWC-SOW-1550] refers to an "on-site QR".
- The milestone list in [ESD-FWC-SOW-2230] only refers to in-factory QR.
- The Table 4.1 of Specific Contracts SC1 to SC4 assumes that the QR is conducted in-factory.

Could you please confirm whether a Qualification Reviews under the FWC are to be held exclusively in-factory, or there is an expectation of both in-factory and on-site QRs (and if so, under what conditions each applies)?

Answer: Whether the QR is conducted on-site or in-factory is specified in each Specific contract Statement of Work. For SC#1 and evaluation scenario for SC2, SC3 and SC4 the QR is conducted in-factory, whilst AR is conducted on site.

End of document