

Invitation to tender N° EMSA/OP/15/2016
for
Development of the New European Marine Casualty Information Platform (NEW EMCIP)
Questions and Answers

Question 01 (20/07/2016 - 08h11)

Following the publication of the call for tender « 2016/S 138-249733 Development of the new European marine casualty information platform (new EMCIP)”, we would appreciate to receive the tender dossier.

Answer to question 01:

“The tender documentation related to procurement procedure EMSA/OP/15/2016 can be downloaded from the procurement section of EMSA’s website at:

<http://www.emsa.europa.eu/work/procurement/calls/item/2759-emsa-op-15-2016.html> “

Question 02 (20/07/2016 – 08h30)

With reference to the above invitation to tender I would appreciate it if you could send us the relevant documentation.

Answer to Question 02:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 01.”

Question 03 (22/07/2016 – 09h05)

Can we participate in this bidding process, as we have good portfolio of projects and Staff? We are from India.

Answer to Question 03:

“Please see point 19 of the invitation to tender:

‘In addition to economic operators established in the Member States of the Union, only economic operators from the following countries are eligible to participate in the present procurement procedure: Albania, FYROM, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.’ ”

Question 04 (22/07/2016 – 13h51)

Bitte schicken Sie uns die Unterlagen zu o. g. Ausschreibung an die hier genutzte E-Mail-Adresse xxx.

Answer to Question 04:

"Please refer to the Answer to Question 01."

Question 05 (25/07/2016 – 12h49)

Taking into consideration the impact of the summer holiday period, we would kindly like to request an extension of the deadline for the submission of tenders.

Answer to Question 05:

"As per point 2 of the invitation to tender, the deadline for submission of bids is 12 September 2016. The summer period having already been taken into consideration when establishing this deadline, no extension of the deadline for submission of bids will be granted on this criteria."

Question 06 (26/07/2016 – 17h16)

Our is a company based in Mumbai, India. We are interested in participating in the tender mentioned above hence want to get more information about the same.

Considering the geographical constraint of personally reviewing the document, I request you to provide us the following details before we buy the document:

- 1) List of Items, Schedule of Requirements, Scope of Work, Terms of Reference, Bill of Materials required.**
- 2) Soft Copy of the Tender Document through email.**
- 3) Names of countries that will be eligible to participate in this tender.**
- 4) Information about the Tendering Procedure and Guidelines**
- 5) Estimated Budget for this Purchase**
- 6) Any Extension of Bidding Deadline?**
- 7) Any Addendum or Pre Bid meeting Minutes?**

Answer to Question 06:

"In relation to the tender documentation, please refer to the Answer to Question 01.

In relation to the geographical location of the eligible tenderers, please refer to the Answer to Question 03."

Question 07 (02/08/2016 – 10h41)

I am looking at the tender Appendix A (Application Technical Landscape) where the software currently used in EMSA is stated.

In some case the versions of the software used in EMSA is not the latest (i.e. it is mentioned Liferay 6.2 while the Liferay latest version is 7, JDK 7 while the latest is 8 and so on).

As a general rule in proposals we always include the latest stable versions of software and libraries. Latest versions on one side bring bug fixing and new features but on the other side require the acquisition of additional know-how and the upgrade of the existing production environment.

If possible I would like to understand if, for this specific tender, it is better to consider sw versions already used in EMSA or it is better to consider the latest versions of software.

Answer to Question 07:

“Please see point 2.2 of the Tender Specifications:

‘The EMSA System and Application Technical Landscape, which documents the technical solutions used by EMSA at System level and provides directions on options and preferable technologies to be considered at Application Level, is provided in Appendix A.’

In light of this, bidders should consider the software versions already used in EMSA and specified in ‘Appendix A – ICT Architecture. System and Application Technical Landscape’ ”.

Question 08 (10/08/2016 – 17h55)

All documents related to the contract aka “EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-DraftFrameworkContractITSpecialConditions-Final.pdf”, “EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-DraftSpecificContract(FixedDeliverablesAndTime)-Final.pdf”, “EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-DraftSpecificContract(TimeandMeans)-Final.pdf” are provided to evaluation but they do not need to be sent signed at this time, Only if our bid is approved and we are awarded with the contract, correct? Or do we need to print out all the documents, signed them, and deliver them signed at this time?

Answer to Question 08:

“The draft contracts attached to the Invitation to Tender are published as part of the Procurement documents and are for information only. At this stage, bidders are not required to sign them nor to return them signed to EMSA”

Question 09 (10/08/2016 – 17h55)

On page 10 the descriptions of Part B refer to 13.3 and Part C refers to 13.4 and the following referral points are as follow:

- 13.3 Technical and professional capacity – Selection criteria
- 13.4 Evidence to be provided by the tenderers

This points don’t seem to meet the corresponding scope for Part B – should be Economic and Financial capacity according to page 10 and refers to 13.3 and Part C – should be Technical and professional capacity and refers 13.4. Can you please confirm the corresponding points for each part (A to E).

Answer to Question 09:

“There is a clerical error with the references in the text, namely Part B should not refer to point 13.3 but to 13.2.1 and 13.2.2, and Part C should not refer to point 13.4 but to point 13.3.

Also, the last paragraph of point 13.4 should read: ‘Bids that do not comply with the selection criteria under 13.4 13.2.1 & 13.2.2 and ~~13.5~~13.3 will not be taken into consideration for the award of the contract nor be evaluated for the award criteria.’ ”

Question 10 (12/08/2016 – 11h29)

On page 5 of “EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-Tender Specifications-Final.pdf” under the point “2.7. Service Levels” it’s specified the following:

- The New EMCIP shall comply at least with the availability criteria set under section 8.1 and with the integrity and reliability requirements set in section 8.2 of the “Technical Specification for the New EMCIP” (Appendix E).
- These sections don’t exist at Appendix E which finished at 7.5 - Other requirements.

Can you, please, confirm the correct document and/or section?

Answer to Question 10:

“There is a clerical error with the references in the text of the Tender Specifications, namely point ‘2.7 – Service Levels’ should not refer to sections 8.1 and 8.2 but to sections 7.1 and 7.2 of ‘Technical Specifications for the New EMCIP’ (Appendix E).”

Question 11 (12/08/2016 – 16h13)

It is correct to assuming that all the tender documents (including the price offer):

- 1) must be scanned and submitted by e-mail before the deadline of 10 September 2016, 16.30 (Lisbon time) as per point 10 from “Tender specifications attached to the Invitation to Tender” and in accordance with specifications from the “Tenderer’s Checklist”**
- 2) the original hard copy of the offer including all accompanying documentation (one original and three copies) must be submitted no later than 16.30 (Lisbon local time) on 12 September 2016 in accordance with specifications from the “Invitation to Tender No. EMSA/OP/15/2016”**

Answer to Question 11:

“As per point 2 of the Invitation to Tender, ‘Bids can be submitted in three different ways:

‘(a) by post.

The bid should be posted no later than 12 September 2016, with the stamp of the post office acting as proof. Please note, if the bid is submitted by post it is recommended that it is sent by registered post.

(b) by hand-delivery.

The hand delivery should be made no later than 16.30 (Lisbon local time) on 12 September 2016.

A dated and signed receipt issued by an official of EMSA has to be requested by the person delivering the bid as proof of delivery.

(c) by private courier service.

The bid should be ‘deposited’ with the private courier service no later than 12 September 2016, with the slip issued by the private courier service acting as proof.’

Please note that there is a clerical error in the Tenderer’s Checklist. The sentence ‘before the deadline of 10 September 2016, 16.30 (Lisbon time)’ should read ‘before the deadline of 12 September 2016, 16.30 (Lisbon time)’ instead”.

Question 12 (16/08/2016 – 12h15)

Please let us know when you expect the terms of reference for this call for tenders to be published.

Answer to Question 12:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 01.”

Question 13 (22/08/2016 – 15h01)

Despite the deadline for submission of a proposal is the 12 September, by post/hand-delivery/private courier service, in the Candidate’s Checklist document is specified:

“The documents should be scanned and submitted by e-mail to the following address:

OPEN152016@emsa.europa.eu before the deadline of 10 September 2016, 16.30 (Lisbon time). Please note that an original hard copy of the offer including all accompanying documentation related to supporting the Declaration on Honour will be requested from the company to whom the contract is awarded.”

Do the Candidate’s Checklist, together with all listed documents, are to be delivered by email within the 10 September, two days before the deadline of the 12 September?

Answer to Question 13:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 11.”

Question 14 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

We refer to Q&A 11. Is it still necessary to send by e-mail the “Tenderer’s checklist” (only the document EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-Tenderer’s(Candidate’s)Checklist-Final.docx dated and signed, without attaching the documents referenced there) on 12/09/2016 by 16.30 Lisbon time?

Answer to Question 14:

“Please refer to the last two paragraphs of the Tenderer’s Checklist (as corrected pursuant to Q&A 11): ‘The Candidate’s Checklist and above mentioned documents (except those in Other) should be duly signed by the authorised representative.

The documents should be scanned and submitted by e-mail to the following address:

OPEN152016@emsa.europa.eu before the deadline of 12 September 2016, 16.30 (Lisbon time).’

The expression “The documents” at the beginning of the second paragraph refers to all the documents listed in the table, with the exception of those in ‘Other’. “

Question 15 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 14.2. Price Criterion, p. 19: “(P Module 3) The yearly fixed price of corrective maintenance and operational support (EMSA expects to receive maintenance for a period of 3 years) as described in Appendixes F and I. “

Price of the bid (formula): $W_{Price} = P_{Module\ 1} + P_{Scenario} + P_{Module\ 3}$

Our understanding is that in the formula to estimate the price of the bid, $P_{Module\ 3}$ will be the price for maintenance and support for three years and not one (i.e. 3 times the annual fixed price), since maintenance is expected to be provided for three years. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer to Question 15:

“In accordance with section 2.2 of the Tender Specifications, the final price for corrective maintenance and operational support ($P_{Module\ 3}$) will be calculated as three times the yearly fixed price quoted pursuant to section 14.2.c of the Tender Specifications.”

Question 16 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 14.3 Evaluation process, p. 21, formula for calculation of the price.

$$SP = \sum_i \frac{\text{lowest Price}_i \text{ of all bids}}{\text{Price}_i} * 100 * W_{Price_i}$$

a) We understand that i takes the values 1, 2, 3, which correspond to $P_{Module1}$, $P_{Scenario}$ and $P_{Module3}$, respectively. Please confirm or clarify.

b) W_{Price_i} for $i=1, 2,3$ is not specified, so we assume that all these weights are equal to 1/6 (1/3 * 0,5). Please confirm or specify the value of these weights, if different.

c) On page 20 the price of the bid is calculated as the sum of the three prices. On the other hand, the score for price (as on page 21, reproduced above) does not use the above sum; instead, it uses the three partial prices across bids. Please confirm that the above formula will be used and not, for example (and as it is more usual in public tenders), $SP = [(Lowest\ Price\ of\ all\ bids)/(Price\ of\ the\ bid)]*50$, where the ‘Lowest price of all bids’ and the ‘Price of the bid’ are sums of the three prices.

Answer to Question 16:

“The last formula provided under section 14.3 is used to calculate the score of each bid during the evaluation process.

The formula’s numerator ‘Price_i’ indicates the price of the bid. The index ‘i’ represents the number of the bid. Each bid is given a number upon opening of the bids.

The formula’s denominator ‘lowest Price_i of all bids’ indicates the price of the cheapest bid received.”

The following is an example of how the price of two different bids will be scored.

Suppose EMSA receives 2 bids, one of a price of 100 euro (Bid 1, quoting Price₁) and the second of a price of 75 euro (Bid 2, quoting Price₂).

The score for the price of Bid1 will be 37.5 points, as:

$$SP = \sum_i \frac{75}{100} * 100 * 0.50$$

The score for the price of Bid2 will be 50 points, as:

$$SP = \sum_i \frac{75}{75} * 100 * 0.50$$

Question 17 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 13.3.2.2. Evidence, p. 14: “The description should include detailed curriculum vitae of the team members who will be delivering the service under the proposed contract should be provided using the Template in Appendix G – Team, and the CVs in Europass format”
In Appendix G – 1. Team some additional information is requested for team members. Could we integrate this information into the CV (in Europass format, e.g. through a table at the end of the CV) or a distinct table is requested ?

Answer to Question 17:

“The additional information requested in Appendix G, section 1, can be integrated in the CV Europass format, e.g. through a table at the end of the CV.”

Question 18 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 14.1.2 Quality criterion 1, p. 18, “c. Roles, tasks and responsibilities of each member of the proposed team and description of their involvement and interaction within the project;”

Our understanding is that the technical expertise of team members will not be evaluated under the award criteria, and therefore it is not necessary to include any such detailed information in the proposal for the award criteria (Part D of the bid, as defined in page 10 of the specifications), except, eventually, a summary of the person’s career and expertise. The relevant form and CVs should be submitted as part of the documentation for the selection criteria (Part C of the bid). Please confirm or clarify.

Answer to Question 18:

“As stipulated in section 13.3.2 of the Tender Specifications, the suitability of tenderer’s key persons will be evaluated as part of the Selection Criteria. However, within the first Quality criterion as per section 14.1.2 of the Tender Specifications, the bidder shall indicate roles, tasks and responsibilities of each member of the proposed team and shall describe their involvement and interaction, during the design, implementation, configuration, maintenance, improvement and enhancement of the New European Marine Casualty Information Platform (NEW EMCIP) in order for EMSA to be able to evaluate the quality of the team as a whole. The expertise of the team members is indeed part of the Selection criteria and is not subject to evaluation under the award criteria. However the types of profiles proposed and the tasks and overall involvement in the project attributed to each of those profiles is going to be evaluated under the award criteria announced in the Tender specifications. ”

Question 19 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 14.1.2 Quality criterion 1, p. 18-19, “a. Project plan for the implementation of the requirements described in Appendices D and E;

b. Work breakdown structure, description of work packages as well as the estimated effort for each task and a relevant schedule/timeplan;”

Our understanding is that point a. refers to the high level plan for the execution and point b. refers to the detailed approach. Please confirm or clarify.

Answer to Question 19:

“The project plan required under section 14.1.2, point a), of the Tender Specifications will be a formal document which will focus both on the project’s execution and control. It will be mainly used to document assumptions, decisions and communication strategies related to the project planning and execution. The work breakdown structure description of work packages as well as the estimated effort for each task and a relevant schedule/time-plan required under section 14.1.2, point b), of the Tender Specifications will describe how the project will be divided into smaller parts, how these parts will be organized considering the involvement of the key team’s members, to the sake of achieving project objectives and delivering project’s artefacts.”

Question 20 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 14.1.4 Quality criterion 3, point b, p. 19, “b. Functional and Technical Compliance Matrix The compliance matrix should indicate the degree of compliance of the proposed solutions with EMSA requirements (yes/no/partial compliance) and a justification and explanation for each requirement. ”

a) Can you please confirm that the functional requirements for which the compliance matrix should be provided are exclusively those in section 3.2 of Appendix C, and in particular those that refer to core functionalities? If not, please provide details regarding which additional functional requirements should be included.

b) Can you please confirm that the technical requirements referred above are exclusively within Appendix E? Furthermore, do you expect the compliance matrix to cover all of Appendix E or only specific sections?

Answer to Question 20:

“Please refer to section 14.1.4., point a) of the Tender specifications, where it reads: ‘The criterion will be assessed based on the technical proposal responding to the functional and technical requirements as provided in Appendices D and E.’;

and to section 2.2 of the Tender Specifications, which reads:

'Additional information about the current EMCIP taxonomy, data quality libraries, ship reference database and workflow processes are provided in further appendixes to this Tender Specifications (see section 18).'

In light of the above, the 'Functional and Technical Compliance Matrix' referred to in section 14.1.4, point b) should indicate the degree of compliance of the proposed solutions with EMSA requirements as per Appendix D and E, as complemented by the other appendixes provided under Appendix 18.'

Question 21 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Appendix D, RequirementFunctionalSpecs, section 2.1, page 12, “c) Interfaces with other maritime databases”.

Although we have found under section 3.2 descriptions for all the other enhancement modules / requirements, we have not found a section describing interfaces with other maritime databases. We have identified references to 'IMO GISIS' database (page 26 of Appendix D) and the 'EMSA MARINFO or national DBs' (page 28), Are there any additional databases to interface with?

Answer to Question 21:

“Please refer to 'Appendix D – New EMCIP, Requirement and Functional Specifications', section 3.2.13, and in particular:

- Section 3.2.13.1, Requirement 'IMA.003.M - Integration in the EMSA ICT Landscape';*
- Section 3.2.13.2, Requirement 'IMA.001.M – SOA oriented in/out streams';*
- Section 3.2.13.3, Requirement 'IMA.002.N - SOA oriented streams from/to other EMSA App.'* ”

Question 22 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

Tender Specifications, Section 2.3, p. 3, “Alternative combinations of core and enhanced modules could be suggested by the Contractor and accepted by EMSA, due to justified efficiency, cost and/or risk based criteria by the bidder, if considered more suitable for the better implementation of the project.”

and

Tender Specifications, Section 14.1.3 Quality criterion 2, point c, page 18. “c. proposing a different grouping of Core and Enhanced Application functionalities as part of its technical proposal for Module 1, provided that, within the context of this tender, the bidder will explain how this alternative setting will be more suitable for the better implementation of the project, in terms of user-friendliness, performance, reliability, cost efficiency, risk control and mitigation, etc..”

and

Tender Specifications, Section 14.1.4 Quality criterion 3, point c, p. 19. “The bidder shall provide an alternative proposal for the Enhanced Application functionalities that could be performed on the New EMCIP Core Application, taking into account the information provided in the Requirements and Functional Specifications (Appendix D) and Technical Specifications (Appendix E). The bidder may complement this proposal with a SWOT analysis.”

and

Tender Specifications, Section 14.2. Price Criterion, p. 19.

a) Do quality criteria 2c and 3c refer to the same thing, i.e. the implementation of enhanced functionalities as part of the core application? If yes, what exactly will be evaluated under each of the criteria 2c and 3c?

b) Should the fixed price for Module 1 be based exclusively on Appendices D and E or on the (eventually) different grouping provided by the Tenderer as described in point 14.1.3?

Answer to Question 22:

“Quality criteria 2.c and 3.c refer to the Enhanced Application but from different perspectives, therefore the bids’ provisions under those criteria will be subject of a different type of evaluation:

- *Criterion 2.c will be evaluated as an advantage of the bid, meaning that the bidder may provide a better proposal for a different grouping of Core and Enhanced Application functionalities (better than that provided under section 2.3 of the Tender Specifications), which will result in a better scoring under quality criteria;*
- *Criterion 3.c will be evaluated as a mandatory requirement, meaning that the bidder shall provide an alternative proposal for the Enhanced Application functionalities (different than those provided under section 2.3, last numbered list, from a) to f), of the Tender Specifications) which could be performed after the New EMCIP Core Application is implemented.*

The fixed price for Module 1 will be based on the technical solution that the bidder will present pursuant to section ‘14.1.4 Quality criterion 3’.

Please also refer to the Answer to Question 20 for more information about the Module 1 functional and technical requirements. “

Question 23 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-RequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final, pg. 84, Table 7-38 EDB.CU.26 GIS Viewer

“Main success scenario: 1. The system shows the occurrences as overlay on over a GIS system. Additional overlays of other EMSA information system can be included. Search and filtering, including spatial queries can be done.”...“Priority: This use case is Mandatory” and

App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-RequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final, Section 3.2.12 Enhanced GIS interface, pg. 29, “EGI.001.N – Overlays”, “EGI.002.N – Spatial queries”

Although the requirements for some functionalities are marked as ‘Nice to have’, the respective use cases are mandatory, as in the example above. In which module should such requirements be implemented (module 1 or 2)?

Answer to Question 23:

“To the scope of Module 1 (EMCIP Core Application) the Use Case ‘EDB.CU.26 GIS Viewer’ is to be considered mandatory as long as the following requirements are respected:

- *Section 3.2.10.1 GIS.001.M – GIS Search & Filtering;*
- *Section 3.2.10.2 GIS.002.M – GIS Tool.*

The Use Case ‘EDB.CU.26 GIS Viewer’ should be considered under the scope of Module 2 (EMCIP Enhanced Application) as long as the following requirements are too respected:

- *Section 3.2.12.1 EGI.001.N – Overlays;*
- *Section 3.2.12.2 EGI.002.N – Spatial queries;*
- *Section 3.2.12.3 EGI.003.N – Vessel Position Playback/ Play-forward.*

Question 24 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecifications-Final, section 3.2.1 Use LifeRay CMS Database, pg. 12: “With this architecture decision the current EMSA LifeRay CMS should be used to store the Occurrences and all the information of the EMCIP database.”

Please clarify if this current CMS refers to the existing deployment of Liferay portal e.g. the EMSA MAP portal. If not, please provide details of this environment. In any case, please let us know what kind of customisations have been performed in the Liferay CMS.

Answer to Question 24:

“Bidders can find the technical solutions used by EMSA at system level and directions on options and preferable technologies to be considered at application level in the ‘EMSA System and Application Technical Landscape’ provided in Appendix A.”

Question 25 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecifications-Final, section 3.2.4 Conclusions, p.14. The conclusions do not clearly indicate a desired approach. Is one of the 3 architectural approaches that are described in sections 3.2.1 – 3.2.3 preferred by EMSA? If yes, is it mandatory to follow this approach?

Answer to Question 25:

“EMSA strongly recommends the use of LifeRay as CMS database since this is the current enterprise portal solution implemented by the Agency. Nevertheless, the bidder should take into account the architectural and technical solutions that will better fit his technical proposal.”

Question 26 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecifications-Final, section 3.3.1, p.14: “With this architecture decision the current EMSA LifeRay CMS will be used as the New EMCIP Portal.” Do you foresee that the new EMCIP portal will be integrated with the EMSA Maritime Applications Portal (e.g. as a new community inside MAP that will host EMCIP portal pages and functionalities) or should it remain a separate portal as it is now?

Answer to Question 26:

“The New EMCIP portal will be integrated within the EMSA Maritime Applications Portal”

Question 27 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecifications-Final, section 3.2.1 Use LifeRay CMS Database, pg. 13“LifeRay plugin installation restrictions (The installation of plugins must not affect the existing EMSA applications)” Please clarify whether this means that there are restrictions on the creation of ext and hook plugins.

Answer to Question 27:

“Currently there are not restrictions to the implementation of ext and hook plugins, although the impact on the other existing maritime applications shall be carefully assessed should such plugins be implemented”

Question 28 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-RequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final, section 4. User Profiles, p. 35: “Public: Registered and not registered users that are not directly involved in maritime investigations”...” PUB-DBPublic”...” PUB-DBResearch”
Please clarify whether the EMCIP Database and its functionality will be accessible by internet users or access should be restricted to EMSA/Member states users?

Answer to Question 28:

“Please refer to:

- *‘Appendix D – New EMCIP, Requirement and Functional Specifications’, section ‘4 – User Profiles’, where it reads ‘The New EMCIP user profiles can be differentiated in three main groups, Public, MS authorities and EMSA.*
- *‘Appendix D – New EMCIP, Requirement and Functional Specifications’, section 3.2.3.2, requirement ‘GUI.002.M – State of the art web application’, where it reads ‘The New EMCIP application shall be a state of the art web application (following the current standards for web forms and web user interfaces)’.*

In light of the above, the New EMCIP system will be accessible through the web (internet), by all registered or unregistered users, whether they are part of the Public, MS authorities or EMSA users’ groups”

Question 29 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecifications-Final, section 4.2 EMCIP IdM, pg. 20.
Please clarify whether the term “EMCIP IdM” refers to a client for the existing EMSA corporate IdM that needs to be integrated with the EMCIP core or the EMCIP IdM is a different IdM deployment.

Answer to Question 29:

“Please refer to the IdM (Identity Management) specified in the EMSA System and Application Technical Landscape’ provided in Appendix A, and in the ‘IdM Guide, Access and Identity Management Guide (Abridged Version)’ provided in Appendix O.”

Question 30 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.O-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-IdMGuideAbridged, Section 5. Provisioning Applications, pg. 20.
and
App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-RequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final, section 7.9 OIM Management, pg. 84-85.

According to Appendix O, our understanding is that the EMSA IDM will provide users, roles and groups to the EMCIP application. However the use case with ID: OIM.CU.01 describes the creation of users and the management of roles and organisations of the users. Please clarify if this use case refers to the functionalities that will be supported by IDM or if a user management component should be created in the EMCIP.

Answer to Question 30:

“A user management component should be implemented in EMCIP complementing the IdM implementation for the parts not supported by the latter.”

Question 31 (24/08/2016 – 13h49)

App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-RequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final , section 3.2.9.4 TAX.004.M – Migration of current taxonomy, pg. 27, “The use of LifeRay web content management should be assessed.”

Does EMSA have a specific idea as to how Liferay web content management could be used to support the migration of the existing taxonomy?

Answer to Question 31:

“ The bidders should assess the use of LifeRay web content management to support the migration of the current data from the existing database to the New EMCIP database.”

Question 32 (24/08/2016 – 16h11)

In the Tender Specification it is requested to offer a fixed price, up to 500K€, for the New EMCIP “Module 1”.

In the same document (table in pag 8) two releases fro the New EMCIP are defined:

Module 1, Release 1 (up to Prototype 3.0)

Module 1, Release 2 (Prototypes >3.0)

Does it mean that:

Module 1 to be offered with a fixed price for FDT is equal to the Module 1, release 1 &

Module 2 to be offered with a fixed price for TM is equal to the Module 1, release 2.

Right?

What reported in the table in pag14 of “Appendix I –Project Delivery” seems to confirm the above assumption. May I ask you to confirm?

Answer to Question 32:

“The table displayed under section 5 refers to Module 1 only. Depending upon budget availability, Module 1 may be implemented through the deployment of three or more releases.

Please refer to section 5 of the Tender Specifications, where it reads ‘The first Specific Contract(s) for Module 1 is expected to start shortly after the signature of the Framework Contract (IT) and will cover the design, development, configuration and implementation of the Core Application functionalities. The development of the Core Application may be covered in one or more consecutive Specific Contracts, depending upon budget availability.’

Question 33 (24/08/2016 – 16h55)

According to the document EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-StatementOfSubcontractingJointOffer-Final.docx we pretend to subcontract one or more specific profiles on the technical and professional side to complement the project team, what documents are necessary to deliver from the subcontractor?

On the same document the paragraph “Specify which selection criteria - financial and economic or technical and professional capacity - and be aware that the tenderer must provide the documents which make it possible to assess the selection criteria to the extent that the subcontractor puts its resources at the disposal of the tenderer.” – We have 2 questions:

- **Where do we specify the selection criteria? On this document only or in other?**
- **Which documentation do we need to provide to make it possible to assess the selection criteria to the extent that the subcontractor puts its resources at the disposal of the tenderer?**

Answer to Question 33:

“Please refer to the Tender Specifications:

- Section ‘9. Subcontracting’, where it reads:

‘If the tenderer intends to either subcontract part of the work or realise the work in co-operation with other partners he shall indicate in his offer which part will be subcontracted, as well as the name and qualifications of the subcontractor or partner. It should be noted that the overall responsibility for the work remains with the tenderer.

The tenderer must provide required evidence for the exclusion and selection criteria on its own behalf and, when applicable, on behalf of its subcontractors. The evidence for the selection criteria on behalf of subcontractors must be provided where the tenderer relies on the capacities of subcontractors to fulfil selection criteria. The exclusion criteria will be assessed in relation to each economic operator individually. Concerning the selection criteria, the evidence provided will be checked to ensure that the tenderer and its subcontractors as a whole fulfil the criteria.’

- Section 10 ‘Requirements as to the tender’, where it reads:

‘The tender must be presented as follows and must include:

[...]

Part A: All the information and documents required by the contracting authority for the appraisal of tenders on the basis of the points 13.2 of these specifications (part of the Exclusion Criteria).

Part B: All the information and documents required by the contracting authority for the appraisal of tenders on the basis of the Economic and Financial capacity (part of the Selection criteria) set out under point 13.3 of these specifications.

Part C: All the information and documents required by the contracting authority for the appraisal of tenders on the basis of the Technical and professional capacity (part of the Selection Criteria) set out under point 13.4 of these specifications.

Part D: All the information and documents required by the contracting authority for the appraisal of tenders on the basis of the Award Criteria set out under point 14 of these specifications.

Part E: Setting out Prices in accordance with point 14.2 of these specifications.’ ”

In light of the above statements made in the Tender Specifications, the bidder/s should provide evidence for the subcontractor/s only if the bidder/s rely on the capacities of the subcontractor/s to fulfil (some or all) of the selection criteria. In this case the bidder/s shall provide the same type of documents required for tenderers also for the envisaged subcontractor/s. The evidence for the capacities of the subcontractors shall be presented with the tender by the deadline indicated below.

Question 34 (26/08/2016 – 15h04)

Please clarify if Appendix B.2 has to be submitted by the candidate Contractor during the submission procedure or after the contract award.

Answer to Question 34:

“Please refer to the ‘General Terms and Conditions for Information Technologies Artefacts’, article II.2.2.8, and ‘Appendix B.1 – Conditions of Use, Remote access to EMSA IT Network’, section 2.. The obligation to accept and observe the above mentioned Conditions of Use applies only to contractors after the contract’s award.

Question 35 (26/08/2016 – 15h04)

As the designated authorised staff of the Contractor will be obviously several persons, is the single token will be provided by EMSA enough to ensure the conditions described in Appendix B.1 “CONDITIONS OF USE REMOTE ACCESS TO EMSA IT NETWORK”?

Answer to Question 35:

“Please refer to the ‘Appendix B.1 – Conditions of Use, Remote access to EMSA IT Network’, section 7, ‘Authentication and identification’ for information about the distribution of multiple physical protection devices (tokens) by EMSA.”

Question 36 (26/08/2016 – 15h04)

If the Bidder holds an ISO 27001:2013 certification and other security certifications eg. NATO SECRET certification is it still required a copy of the actual documents that constitute the contractor’s Security Policy to be attached to the Bidder’s offer? In what extent the contractor’s Security Policy has to be described?

Answer to Question 36:

“Please refer to section 2.6 of the Tender Specifications, where it reads ‘The bidder shall describe its ICT Security Policy applicable in case of remote access to EMSA IT network, by filling in the form provided in Appendix B.3.’”

Question 37 (26/08/2016 – 15h04)

Please clarify if the price PModule1 (paragraph 14.2.a of the Tender specifications) must be offered by the Bidder includes tasks 20 to 31 described in the paragraph 5 of the Tender specifications.

Answer to Question 37:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 32.”

Question 38 (26/08/2016 – 15h04)

Please clarify if the price of 500.000 euros estimated by EMSA for Module 1 (paragraph 6 of the Tender specifications) includes tasks 20 to 31 described in the paragraph 5 of the Tender specifications.

Answer to Question 38:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 32.”

Question 39 (26/08/2016 – 16h16)

- A. On section 13.3.2.2 of the Tender Specifications when referring to the CV’s for the SA and SAD is requested that these resources have "experience in at least two database application projects related either to transportation safety or casualty information sectors". Are references in the life insurance sector or insurance claims reporting considered valid for the "Casualty Information" sector?"**
- B. In section 13.3.2.2 of the Tender Specifications when referring to the CV’s for the SA, SAD AND AD is requested "Minimum 3 years of experience in the software technologies described in the Appendix A.". If a bidder presents resources with experience in the same products but with different versions are these still valid or you want the specific versions listed in Appendix A?**

C. In section 13.3.2.2 of the Tender Specifications when referring to the CV's for the SA, SAD AND AD is requested ""Minimum 3 years of experience in the software technologies described in the Appendix A."" Is it allowed for the bidders to present resources with experience in products that are similar in functionality to the ones mentioned in Appendix A?

Answer to Question 39:

"Concerning point A., the wording 'casualty information' can be considered an equivalent to 'incidents' information' or to 'accidents' information'."

Concerning point B., experience with the same kind of technology contained in the Appendix A but with previous versions will be accepted.

Concerning point C., only experience with the same kind of technology contained in the Appendix A will be taken into account."

Question 40 (26/08/2016 – 16h16)

In section 13.2 of the Tender Specifications regarding to the list of requirements demanded we would like to confirm that the following documents are sufficient to fulfil your criteria or if the bidders are required to present additional documentation:

- Certificate of no debt to the Social Security (Certidão de não dívida à Segurança Social in Portuguese)
- Certificate of no debt to the Tax Authority where the bidder is registered (Certidão de não dívida à Autoridade Tributária e Aduaneira in Portuguese)
- Criminal Records Certificate for the bidder (Certificado de Registo Criminal da Empresa in Portuguese)

Answer to Question 40:

"The listed documents fulfil the requirement under section 13.2 of the Tender Specifications."

Question 41 (26/08/2016 – 16h16)

In section 13.2.1 of the Tender Specifications you require information about the "Financial statements or their extracts for the last three years for which accounts have been closed." and "Statement of the overall turnover and, where appropriate, turnover relating to the relevant services for the last three financial years available."

Can you please confirm that if the bidder provides the Enterprise Simplified Information for the last 3 years (IES - Informação Empresarial Simplificada dos últimos 3 anos in Portuguese) is sufficient to fulfil this requirement?

Answer to Question 41:

"The listed document fulfils the requirement under section 13.2.1 of the Tender Specifications."

Question 42 (26/08/2016 – 16h16)

The CV's of the project resources should be included in Part C or Part D of the bidders response? You expect the CV's in the Europass format plus the information from the template provided in Appendix G together or in separate parts of the bidder's response?

Answer to Question 42:

"In accordance with section 13.3.2.2 of the Tender Specifications, the CV of the tenderer's key technical and management persons shall be provided as part of the Technical and Professional Capacity – Selection Criteria' (Part C). Please refer also to the Answers to Questions 17 and 18."

Question 43 (29/08/2016 – 10h28)

We already have the document entitled "Tender specifications attached to the Invitation to Tender", but we do not have the Appendixes. Could you please indicate where we can find the remaining documents?

Answer to Question 43:

"Please refer to the Answer to Question 01."

Question 44 (05/08/2016 – 13h02)

The requirement POR.012.M - Notification Form states that Liferay's Notification Portlet will be in charge of this functionality, but this portlet only provides notifications to users and does not process data entered by portal users, does it refer to data processing or that the process should be treated elsewhere and it should generate a notification to relevant users through the notifications portlet?

Answer to Question 44:

"According to requirement POR.012.M, users will fill-in the notification form through a PDF form or through a HTML form (input interface) and the receiving organization will be notified accordingly through the Liferay's Notification Portlet (output interface)."

Question 45 (05/08/2016 – 13h02)

The technical specifications detail the current EMSA Liferay system, does the current EMSA Liferay Portal include hooks that could modify the new EMCIP portal behaviour or appearance? Is Social Office deployed to this portal?

Answer to Question 45:

"EMSA's Liferay Portal uses hooks. However, without knowing how the New EMCIP application will be designed and what Liferay's functions it will be using, it is impossible to know exactly if the behaviour or appearance will be modified. Please note that hooks implemented into EMSA's Liferay Portal may only change specific core functions and should not affect any of the applications."

Social Office is not deployed in the EMSA's Liferay Portal. Please refer also to the Answer to Question 27."

Question 46 (05/08/2016 – 13h02)

The requirement EAA.001.M - User Authentication Management states that "the new EMCIP users will be authenticated using the SSO mechanism provided by the EMSA ICT Landscape", though there is a current Liferay Portal used by EMSA, is any part of this integration done at the current EMSA Liferay portal? is the Liferay user system being used? Must the current Liferay users be migrated?

Answer to Question 46:

“Concerning the first part of your question ‘is any part of this integration done at the current EMSA Liferay portal?’, there are examples of EMSA applications entirely based on Liferay (i.e. implemented as Portlets to be deployed in Liferay, like e.g. Thetis or STCW), where Liferay takes care of the authentication and top-level authorization. Whether EMCIP will make use of such implementation depends upon the final system’s architecture that will be agreed between EMSA and the contractor.

Concerning the second part of your question ‘is the Liferay user system being used?’, Liferay user system is currently integrated within Identity Management (IdM) in that both authentication (single-sign-on) and user provisioning are already handled by the existing portal. Only if the new application has specific user management needs will it have to be interfaced directly with IdM (for example, whether specific user attributes are needed within the application).

Concerning the third part of your question ‘Must the current Liferay users be migrated?’, we assume that none of the current Liferay users will need to be migrated as they are already inside the existing portal. However, this will depend upon the applications’ specific needs for user management (if any).”

Question 47 (05/08/2016 – 13h02)

Appendix O states that the EMSA is currently using Liferay Community but the Enterprise edition will be used in production environment, does the contractor need to participate in this installation or migration somehow or will the needed architecture be ready in order to start implementing the new EMCIP? Would the EMSA use version 6.2 or would it switch to version 7 DXP as it’s the latest stable release?

Answer to Question 47:

“The EMSA’s Maritime Portal is currently using the Liferay 6.2.10 SP14 Enterprise Edition in all its environments (test, pre-production and production) and no upgrade to version 7 is currently foreseen.”

Question 48 (05/09/2016 – 15h40)

As specified in the Candidate’s Checklist all the documents have to be scanned and sent by e-mail. Do you mean that also the technical proposal and the offer (containing prices) has to be sent by e-mail, or only the administrative documents?

Answer to Question 48:

“Along with the Tenderer’s (Candidate’s) checklist, only administrative documents shall be scanned and sent by e-mail”.

Question 49 (05/09/2016 – 17h09)

Regarding Tender No. EMSA/OP/15/2016, we kindly request for a one (1) week extension for proposal submission due to the complexity of the technical requirements and the respective effort needed in addressing adequately all points of interest.

Answer to Question 49:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 05”.

Question 50 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document “App.I-EMSAOP152016-New EMCIP-ProjectDelivery-Final.pdf” top of page 14 it is defined that milestone “Prototype 1 - Human Machine I/F Design, Acceptance of design documentation” is due on T0 + 2 weeks where T0 is signature of contract milestone.

In the same document, next page, chapter “4.2. Documentation” it is defined “In the case of Design Documentation, EMSA will provide comment and/or reservations which will be transmitted to the contractor within three weeks of the date of delivery. Based on this comment and/or reservations EMSA will either accept or reject the deliverables. In the case of rejection the contractor will be requested to provide a new appropriate revision.”

Above mentioned constraints are contradictory because EMSA will have 3 weeks time to review design document and on the other side contractor must arrange everything to get acceptance of design document 2 weeks after contract signature. This means, that under perfect circumstances contractor must submit design documentation 1 week before contract is signed. Not to mention the fact that it takes time to prepare such documentation and EMSA might have comments to submitted design document that will require rework.

We propose to postpone all milestones and delivery times for additional 6 weeks and make enough buffer for initiation phase and EMSA review times.

Answer to Question 50:

“The timetable provided in section 3 of the Project Delivery document is to be considered only indicative as dates of delivery and planning will be defined and agreed during the kick-off phase. Please refer to the text at page 13, where it reads ‘The table below lists the milestones of the project. Dates of delivery and planning will be defined during the initiation phase and recorded in the project plan.’ ”.

Question 51 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document App.B.3-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIPGC_DescriptionContractorSecurityPolicy.docx It is written:

„The following table details the list of attachments that constitute the contractor’s Security Policy. A copy of all listed documents is included in this appendix“.

It is obvious that bidder is required to provide list of contractor’s Security Policy documents. Is bidder also required as part of its proposal to attach real content of those documents related to company’s Security Policy. If answer is yes, can we attach those documents in German language or some other official EU language? Please clarify.

Answer to Question 51:

“Please refer to section 10 of the Tender Specifications, and to the Answer to Question 36.”

Question 52 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document „“ it is defined that „The contractor shall provide operational support according the SLA specified in the requirements REQ-8 for an unlimited number of issues. However in case of defect at maximum the following effort is taken into account:

- High = 2 days of work;
- Medium = 1 day of work;
- Low = half hours of work. „

How should REQ-9 be interpreted?

What is the definition of “defect” in this specific case?

Why is “effort time” taken into account while the contract if fixed price?

What is the difference between defect and incident?

Please provide real-life scenario showing impact of this requirement to support activities.

What is the correlation between “max. effort” and „time to solve“ and „time to acknowledge“?

Answer to Question 52:

“REQ-09 shall be considered in the case where a defect was detected. Depending upon the seriousness and impact of the defect on the system, EMSA will classify it as high, medium or low effort. Based on this classification, and considering the SLA stipulated in REQ-08, the contractor will be expected to fix the defect according to EMSA’s classification. Please refer also to REQ-08 for the general classification requirements of the SLA.

The term ‘defect’ is used in the Appendix F – ‘Corrective Maintenance and Operational Support’ as a synonym of shortcoming, fault or imperfection (so called ‘bug’).

‘Effort time’ is a condition to evaluate possible non-compliances with the Service Level Agreement stipulated in REQ-08 of the Appendix F – ‘Corrective Maintenance and Operational Support’, and for the application of the other special conditions under Article 13 – ‘Other Special Conditions - Reduction of Payment for Service Noncompliance’, of the Draft Framework Contract and IT Special Conditions.

The term ‘incident’ used in the Appendix F – ‘Corrective Maintenance and Operational Support’ refers an unplanned interruption to an IT Service or reduction in the quality of an IT service (ITIL2011) which may (or may not) be due to the presence of one (or more) bug(s).

Please refer to section 2 of Appendix F – ‘Corrective Maintenance and Operational Support’ document for definitions about ‘Time to Solve’ and ‘Time to Acknowledge’ terms.”

Question 53 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document “App.I-EMSAOP152016-New EMCIP-ProjectDelivery-Final.pdf” (page 3) six project phases are defined.

Based on statement in the same document “If one deliverable is not accepted by EMSA during one phase no acceptance of any deliverable of the following phase can be done” - seems like contractor is discouraged to execute some phases in parallel; and this limits area for optimization during project execution.

Additionally, in chapter 4 (same document) there are milestones defined.

T4 milestone (T0+12) name implies that it involves phase “Development and test” and phase “Deployment”.

However, milestones T5 (T0+14w), T7 (T0+30w) and T9 (T0+49w) obviously involve “Design”.

This means that milestones T5, T7 and T9 are returning project into earlier phase (“Design”) once the project reached “Deployment” phase. Can you loosen constraint “If one deliverable is not accepted by EMSA during one phase no acceptance of any deliverable of the following phase can be done” by removing it?

Answer to Question 53:

“Depending upon the development and delivery plan that will be discussed and agreed during the project, different levels of iteration and acceptance will be possible. Please refer also to the Draft Framework Contract and IT Special Conditions’, article 5 – Payment Arrangements, for the possibility of partial site acceptance or delivery.”

Question 54 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In appendix F it is defined “The contractor shall support the delivery of the New EMCIP in 5 different environments: Training, Test, Pre-Production, Production and Business Continuity Facilities (BCF).”. In appendix I it is defined “The objective of the deployment phase is to configure, migrate the data and make the final version available and fully running on its environments:

- Test;
- Pre-Production/Quality;
- Production.”

Please confirm which environments should be supported by contractor and if there are any specifics about some environment provide details (difference in environment, infrastructure, SW versions, security policies, ...).

Answer to Question 54:

“Please refer to REQ-4 about New EMCIP Full Installation in any platform compliant with EMSA Technical Landscape. Further details on specific EMSA’s IT environments will be provided to the contractor on a case by case basis depending on the needs for the development and implementation of the New EMCIP platform.”

Question 55 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In appendix E 3.2.4.10 POR.012.M - Notification Form it is defined “Processing: Liferay’s Notification Portlet will be in charge of this functionality.” Please confirm that DynamicDataList portlet or custom portlet can be used for this functionality.

Answer to Question 55:

“Please refer to the Answers to Question 25 and 44.”

Question 56 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document “App.E-EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIP-TechnicalSpecificationsFinal.pdf” in chapter 7.3 Scalability

/ Performance it is define that “The New EMCIP must be designed and developed so as to ensure that it can accommodate rapid and unexpected increases in transaction volume through the increasing of end users.”

Please, could you specify how many registers users are in EMCIP now and how many anonymous users usually using EMCIP during one day? Do you expect big increase of register users and anonymous users in new EMCIP system?

Answer to Question 56:

“The existing EMCIP platform has 360 registered users. It is not possible to estimate how many registered or public (unregistered users) visits the restricted or public site every day, nor which will be the future projections once the New EMCIP platform will be in use. Nevertheless, the tenderer’s solution must consider rapid and unexpected increases in transaction volume, in order to ensure the appropriate level of scalability and performance.”

Question 57 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

In document “App.D- EMSAOP152016-NewEMCIPRequirementFunctionalSpecs-Final.pdf” In chapter “3.2.10.1 GIS.001.M – GIS Search & Filtering” it is defined:

...

- **Outputs: Occurrences displayed over the maps.**

- **Processing: The new EMCIP will show all the occurrences that match with the search criteria and filters in the map. ”**

Please, could you specify which maps will be used for displaying GIS data?

Answer to Question 57:

“EMSA’s existing applications employ ENC maps as well as other formats (e.g. Open Street Map, Google Map) and these formats shall be considered for the design and implementation of the New EMCIP.”

Question 58 (02/09/2016 – 14h38)

Because there are many open questions in this bid that have significant impact on final proposal, we are kindly asking extension of due date for proposal submission for additional 2 weeks (from 12th September to 26th September). This would enable proper preparation of quality solution after important questions are clarified.

Answer to Question 58:

“The deadline for submission of tenders has been extended until 19 September 2016, 16.30 Lisbon time.”

Question 59 (07/09/2016 – 15h33)

In the Candidate’s Checklist the Tenderer’s Offer document is included. Do you mean the document with the economical offer or with the technical one?

Answer to Question 59:

“Please note that a corrected ‘Tenderer’s Checklist’ has been published on the EMSA website under <http://www.emsa.europa.eu/work/procurement/calls/item/2759-emsa-op-15-2016.html>.”

Question 60 (09/09/2016 – 16h42)

Regarding the section 2.5 “Licensing policy” of the Tender document, please clarify the following:

- 1. What products are included in the term “proprietary”?**
- 2. Shall we include in our IPR description all technologies of section 7 of the Appendix A (pages 31-32)? Or just new ones that may be proposed in our technical solution?**

Answer to Question 60:

“The term ‘proprietary products’ refers to computer software for which the software's publisher, or another person, retains intellectual property rights or patent rights over the source code. The IPR description shall be provided only for the new types of software included in the bid, since the ones mentioned in section 7 of Appendix A are already implemented by EMSA.”

Question 61 (09/09/2016 – 23h18)

In case of an sent email, how does EMSA provides the delivery receipt of email? In case of an sent email, what is the size limit of attachments received by email? In case of email small size limit and due to the size of the final scan documents we want to know if instead of sending by email we can provide an electronic version on CD, DVD or USB Key or similar paper added to the bid?

Answer to Question 61:

“Please refer to the Answer to Question 11 and to the corrigenda, for the modalities of submission of the bids and for the up-to-date deadline, respectively.”

Requests for additional information regarding this tender should be sent by e-mail to the following address: OPEN152016@emsa.europa.eu . Requests for additional information received less than **six** working days before the closing date for submission of tenders will not be processed.

The deadline for submission of the bids of this tender is 20/09/2016, 16h30 (Lisbon time).

Responsibility for monitoring the Agency's website for replies to queries and/or further information remains with potential applicants.