

Corrigendum No. 4

Procurement procedure: GSA/OP/05/20 – SUPPORT SERVICES FOR THE EU SPACE PROGRAMME

(WFID: 262531)

- 14. Work package WP03.02.04** is now added in table 3 of document “11.23 Annex I.F.3 - Template Financial Table of Answers_Lot 3 – corrected”, as **attached**.
- 15. On “Expected Missions” in Table 1 of Section 2.3 in 11.09 Annex I.9 - Lot 9 - TTOR and Simulation Exercise** it shall read **8** consultants (instead of 18) with regard to 2 x 2 days in HQ (change identified **in red**).

Lot	Task #	Title	PSC/SAB Authorisation Category*	Language skills**	Location***	Expected effort (#FTEs) ****	Expected missions	Current effort (#FTEs)
9	1	PA, QA & RAMS support	Up to S-UE / EUS	English	- GSA HQ Prague (11 FTEs) - Contractor’s premises (3 FTEs) - GSMC-FR (1 FTE)	15 FTEs	2 x 2 days in GCC-D for 6 consultants 2 x 2 days in GCC-I for 6 consultants 1 x 2 days in GSC and 1 x 2	2 FTEs (1 F1, 1 F3)

							days in GRC for 8 consult- ants 2 x 2 days in HQ for 8 consult- ants 2 X 10 days in GSMC-ES for 1 con- sultant *	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

16. Table 2 – Qualitative award criteria in documents “11.# Annex I.# - Lot # - TTOR and Simulation Exercise (#= 1 to 11) are replaced with the following Table 2 for Lots 1 through 11:

	Qualitative award criteria	Minimum Points	Maximum Points
Q.1	<p>Adequacy of the proposed approach and methodology of the simulation exercise per task with the following sub-criteria with their elements of equal weighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of best practices and methodologies proposed; • adequacy of the identification of key challenges, related risks and proposed means for their mitigation; • quality of deliverables provided with the tender; 	18	42

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall adequacy of the core team (organisation, structure, size) to provide the services ; • individual suitability of the proposed consultants (core team); • In case of deviations from the FTE-estimates provided in table 1, credibility of the underlying reasoning in view of achieving high quality services. 		
Q.2	<p>Quality and adequacy of the back-up team Quality and adequacy of the back-up team for all Tasks, evaluated based on the following elements with equal weighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • suitability of the proposed consultants; • In case of deviations from the FTE-estimates provided in table 1, credibility of the underlying reasoning in view of achieving high quality services. 	3	8
Q.3	<p>Quality of the contingency plan and measures to ensure stability and continuity of services with the following sub-criteria of equal weighting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and adequacy of the measures for service continuity to be detailed in a contingency plan for the duration of the FWC; • Appropriateness of the response times indicated by the tenderer to provide or replace personnel in both urgent circumstances (e.g. long-term sickness of the consultant) and during internal re-organisation (e.g. resignation) vis-à-vis the needs of the Agency. 	15	40
Q.4	<p>Adequacy of proposed measures to deal with conflicts of interest issues arising during the contract execution evaluated on the basis of quality of methodology to implement measures against conflict of interests during the duration of the contract.</p>	4	10



Total Min/Max technical score	40	100
--------------------------------------	----	-----

End of document