

Clarification Note #5

EUSPA internal reference: 325509

Procurement procedure: EUSPA/OP/19/26 (EUSPA/PRG/2026/OP/0011)

Title: 'Administrative support services to EUSPA'

Question #17: In LOT1-SC-ToR in the table on pp 4-8 the stated Place of Performance is "Contractor's premises - PRG". Elsewhere it is stated that any location within EU is acceptable for LOT1. The stated mission reimbursement policy also implies locations outside Prague are possible. Please clarify if premises must be strictly located in Prague, Czech Republic for LOT1.

Answer #17:

As identified in sections 2.1 and 2.2. of the Terms of Reference for Lot1 SC1(Annex I.J. 1), the place of performance for the tasks in Planned Deliverables Mode and in Deliverable on Demand Mode shall in principle be the Contractor's premises, which shall be identified by the Contractor in its offer. Exceptionally, the Agency may request provision of services from its premises – which is Prague. It is herewith confirmed that the Contractor's premises (the place of the service performance) may be any place in EU, in line with section 7.1.1 (b) of the Tender Specifications.

Question #18: Would it be possible to obtain the VPN type / software which will need to be installed on our workstations/notebooks for access to EUSPA assets, and a list of the other software that will need to be installed.

Answer #18:

The endpoint having remote access to the IT Systems of EUSPA requires that it shall be able to run an application for accessing IT Systems of EUSPA (e.g. RDP, VPN, ...). This requirement does not prescribe any specific VPN technology, VPN client, or other software product. It requires that the endpoint used for remote access to EUSPA IT Systems is capable of running the application(s) necessary to establish and use the authorized connection to the relevant EUSPA service, which may include, without limitation, a VPN client, Remote Desktop (RDP) client, web browser, and/or other software. No particular vendor, product, or software package is mandated by this requirement.

Question #19: There is no hand-over period specified. Can we get an indication of the foreseen hand-over period from the existing service providers for Lot1 to new service providers, or any other details of a hand-over process.

Answer #19:

The nature of the tasks does not require hand-over period, before starting the assignment,

Question #20: In Article 3.1.8 Communication with the Contractor (EUSPA-OP-19-26 Annex I - Tender Specification) you state: The Contracting Authority shall not issue direct instructions to individual Service Providers etc. This requirement seems relevant to us for Lot 1, where the service providers will work remotely, from the Contractor premises. For Lot 2, where the on-site presence of the service providers is required for security reasons, direct on-site communication between the contracting authority (EUSPA) and the service provider seems more effective, as is common practice at EUSPA when providing consultancy services. In the case of L2, it can be assumed that the Contracting Manager will be informed by the Contracting Authority about the assignment of a task to a service provider, but the direct instructions associated with the request and its acceptance will take place between the relevant EUSPA Admin officer and the dedicated service provider.

Answer #20:

No subordination/hierarchical relationship exists in between EUSPA and the service providers. Requests for services will be formulated to the Contractor. Without prejudice to the above, in the execution of the requests, according to the Contract, EUSPA will coordinate with the service providers deployed at EUSPA premises.

Question #21: In Appendix A – EUSPA-OP-19-26-LOT1-SC1_Deliverables (corrigendum after corrigendum 1), for the deliverables listed under SC Task ID 1.4 (Deliverable SC IDs 1.4.1 to 1.4.13) and SC Task ID 2.2 (Deliverable SC IDs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2), the value in Column M ("Total Effort for the SC duration (indicative), hours") is exactly twice the product of Column K ("Total Number of deliverables") and Column L ("Indicative effort for the Deliverable production, person-hours"). For the deliverables listed under SC Task IDs 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 (Deliverable SC IDs 5.1.1 to 5.1.10, 5.2.1, 5.3.1 and 5.3.2), Column M is exactly 1.5 times that same product. Could the Contracting Authority please confirm which figure — Column L (indicative effort per deliverable) or Column M (total effort for the SC duration) — reflects the intended workload for these 28 deliverables, and, if necessary, issue a corrected version of Appendix A?

Answer #21:

A clerical error was removed from Column M of Appendix A to the Terms of Reference EUSPA-OP-19-26-LOT1-SC1 Deliverables, to reflect the correct Total indicative effort for the SC duration, based on columns K and L. It is noted that there is no change in the Total Number of deliverables (column K) and in the Indicative effort for the Deliverable production (column L), therefore the Financial proposal template (Annex I.F.1) remains unchanged. Annex I.J.1 EUSPA-OP-19-26-LOT1-SC1 ToR is also updated accordingly. Please refer to Corrigendum 3.

Question #22: In Appendix A – EUSPA-OP-19-26-LOT1-SC2_Deliverables (corrigendum after corrigendum 1), Deliverable SC ID 8.1.4 ("Delivery Status Report Notes") carries an indicative effort of 208 person-hours per bi-weekly instance (13 instances, 2,704 person-hours total for the Specific Contract duration). Could the Contracting Authority clarify the scope and volume of work underlying this figure (for example, the expected number of data packages, deliveries or configuration items to be covered per bi-weekly period), so that Tenderers can correctly size the team required to deliver it within each two-week cycle?

Answer #22:

The implementation of the tasks relates to the preparation of outgoing documentation deliveries and acceptance of incoming deliveries. The terms of reference for Specific Contract EUSPA/OP/19/26/Lot1/SC2 provides: *“the implementation of the tasks related to the preparation of outgoing documentation deliveries and acceptance of incoming deliveries. This requires the preparation and review of Deliverables notes for each datapackage processed. This activity will be evaluated on the basis of a Delivery Status Report containing the metrics. It is expected that an average of 1800 Datapackage is processed every year, each datapackage containing an average of 20 documents”*.

Question #23: For certain deliverables in Appendix A (for example, SC1 Deliverable SC ID 4.1.1, "Report on processing of one standard mission", and 6.1.1, "Report on completed selection procedure"), the deliverable description refers to a single case, while the recurrence is Monthly and the indicative effort in Column L appears, on the figures given, to represent the aggregate monthly workload across all cases handled in that period rather than the effort for one individual case. Could the Contracting Authority confirm whether Column L, for these and similarly worded deliverables, is intended as the aggregate effort covering all instances processed within the stated recurrence period?

Answer #23:

The column L indicates the aggregate effort covering all instances processed within the stated recurrence period.

Question #24: Could the Contracting Authority confirm that the following approach is acceptable and consistent with Section 10.1.3:

- (i) at the time of tender submission, the Tenderer names, within the group / Prime, Core Team subcontractors, at least five candidates and provides evidence of their existing, currently valid PSC (obtained in another context) as evidence of their relevant capability and eligibility;
- (ii) for the candidates proposed for assignment under Specific Contract 1, the Tenderer initiates the clearance process specific to that assignment with the competent national authority once the Framework Contract has been signed, the signed Framework Contract itself constituting the concrete need required to start that process; and (iii) each candidate may commence work under Specific Contract 1



once their assignment-specific clearance process has been initiated by the competent national authority.

Answer #24:

The Contracting Authority cannot validate upfront any possible approach proposed by the tenderers for the delivery of services. This is part of the tender evaluation, which will be implemented in strict compliance with the applicable EU Procurement Rules and the Tender Documentation.