Call for tenders' details

Title: Maintenance and Evolution of Core Service Platform Cooperation Mechanism for CSIRTs – MeliCERTes Facility – SMART 2018/1024

Start date: 13/05/2019

Time limit for receipt of tenders: 26/07/2019

Contracting authority: European Commission, DG for Communications Networks, Content and Technology (CONNECT)

Status: Closed

Call for tenders question list

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
1	17/05/2019 11:04	17/05/2019 11:07		software for MeliCERTes is available	the public via the two separate
2		05/06/2019 10:39		"Maintain the softwareof the open source tools(for example MISP)." Does this procurement	O5/06/2019 Yes, this procurement allows for the possibility of replacement of tools as implied in specific objective 3, namely the evolution of the MeliCERTes facility.

	#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
3	•	29/05/2019 11:52	05/06/2019 15:04		responsible for the development and integration of the existing tools under SMART 2015/1089 (referred to in section 2.1 under the heading SMART 2015/1089 & THE MELICERTES FACILITY of the Tender	O5/06/2019 The contractors to SMART 2015/1089 have various contractual requirements including handover of management and operation of MeliCERTes. The SMART 2015/1089 project is scheduled to finish in early November. It is presently planned that the contractor for SMART 2018/1024 will be in place before November.

	#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
	l	29/05/2019 11:11	05/06/2019 15:24		Specific Objective 3 in section 2.2.1 (Objectives) of the Tender Specifications document (2018/1024) refers to "providing for systems integrationof new tools". Task 3 in section 2.2.2 (Tasks) says the tasks is to "Integrate new open source tools". Does the procurement allow for integration of proprietary software in addition to open source tools? If yes, is it correct to assume that license fees outside the scope of this tender?	Yes, the procurement can allow for integration of proprietary software in so far as this is compatible with the EUPL license and relevant provisions of the model service contract. In such a circumstance, license fees are outside the scope.
5	5	31/05/2019 18:03	07/06/2019 14:46		In section 2.2.2 Task 4 in the Tender Specifications (SMART 2018/1024) it states that "Remote support is to be provided during working hours Monday to Friday" are those understood to be the working hours in the timezone of the Member State from which the support is provided and also do not include Public Holidays in that Member State?	O7/06/2019 Remote support is to be provided during working hours in all of the Member States, that have CSIRTs participating in the MeliCERTes facility. Public holidays that are common to all of the Member States (e.g. 1 January) that have CSIRTs participating in the MeliCERTes facility can be excluded.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
6	07/06/2019 10:55	07/06/2019 15:52		With regard to 1.4 of the Tender Specification, is it mandatory that the project manager has to be appointed from the resources of leader of the contract? What if the project manager is appointed by a member of the group?	O7/06/2019 In point 1.4. there is no mentioning of 'project manager' but contract management in operational level i.e. choosing the lead contractor for the joint tender and it states: Nevertheless, tenderers must designate one of the economic operators as a single point of contact (the leader) for the Contracting Authority for administrative and financial aspects as well as operational management of the contract.
7	03/06/2019 09:07	12/06/2019 13:26		Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Task 1 Instead of a hardware solution are Cloud computing environment solutions possible? If yes is there a limitation as to the type of solution – hybrid, public or private Cloud environment?	Mhile the tender specifications are explicit on the need for hardware, an equivalent solution involving use of cloud computing can be feasible under specific conditions. Such conditions would involve use of private cloud with infrastructure and data being located in the territory of the European Union and with the cloud service provider having its headquarters within the territory of the European Union. Furthermore the agreement of ENISA would be necessary along with specified assurances about the extent of control and of the security architecture involved.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
8		18/06/2019 08:51	Physical and logical architecture	On top of the software taking part of the platform, are there any other documents where the physical and logical architecture are described? Which HW elements need to be procured?	18/06/2019 Technical documentation is available, if you refer to the response to question 1, and section 2.1 of the tender specifications provides contextual information. This includes a schematic of the logical architecture. Objective 1 in Section 2.2.1. of the tender specifications includes example of hardware elements for hosting a mirrored hotsite.
9		18/06/2019 08:53		Non-functional requirements, including (non-exhaustive list) - Security - Storage capacity - Processing - Availabilty - Maintainability - Performance requirements cannot be found as part of the tender datapack. Are there any engineering documentation where this information can be found?	18/06/2019 Engineering documentation setting a minimum baseline set of nonfunctional requirements is not included with the tender pack. Offers should include stated objectives in regard to security of the central node and of the code, availability of the central node and of the helpdesk facility, responsiveness of the helpdesk, resilience of the central node, performance and stress testing and responsiveness regarding maintenance of the code.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
10	10/06/2019 17:31	18/06/2019 08:55	SLA hypothesis	To our understanding, SLA need to be developed with the CSIRTs and agreed with ENISA. This implies a high uncertainty for the proposal preparation, as long as SLA conditions have a direct impact on team distribution, location and prices. In addition to the max. 14 emergency calls, are there any other reasonable hypothesis we may use for proposal preparation (e.g. tentative maximum response times)?	18/06/2019 Task 4 of Section 2.2.2 of the tender specifications provides some basic boundary parameters to assist with proposal preparation such as minimum response objectives for resolving critical disruptions, number of on-site emergency visits, supports for up to 31 CSIRTs and phasing out of Helpdesk function.
11	12/06/2019 12:52	19/06/2019 08:38	Hardware to host a mirrored hot-site	Regarding the task of providing a suitable hardware to host a mirrored hot-site of the central instance of MeliCERTes (Task 1, page 15 of the tender specification). Could you please provide the appropriate technical details and units of the required hardware to be provided?	19/06/2019 It is a matter for the offer to include technical details based on the information provided in the Section 2.2. of the tender specifications. See also response to question 8; Question8.
12	12/06/2019 13:25	19/06/2019 08:40	Host of mirrored hot-site	Regarding the task of providing a suitable hardware to host a mirrored hot-site of the central instance of MeliCERTes (Task 1, page 15 of the tender specification) preferably in Brussels. Could you please confirm if the premises of the mirrored central instance of MeliCERTes are provided or the cost must be included in the proposal?	19/06/2019 The physical premises of the mirrored central instance will be provided. Offers do not need to include provision for such costs.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
13		19/06/2019 08:42	Specific objective 3	Given that the overall facility is an operational entity, what is the difference between the operational entity and the exercise/simulation elements of the facility?	19/06/2019 As set out in Task 1, exercising of the business continuity arrangements for the facility takes place at regular intervals in accordance with the tender specifications. Task 4 also requires exercises involving use of the facility by participating CSIRTs. Such exercises under Task 4 can involve simulations of cyber incidents and threats with a view to optimising use of the facility by CSIRTs.
14	13/06/2019 11:48	20/06/2019 08:34	Follow-up to Question 7 regarding Cloud solution	Specifically would Azure Private Cloud be acceptable as private cloud computing with a secure, dedicated environment that defined stakeholders can access and operate with layered permissions? (since such a solution would be in sync with the European Commission's use of cloud and give benefits of virtualized computing, scalability and flexibility, more control, privacy and security).	20/06/2019 It is a matter for the offer to set out the equivalent cloud focused solution based on the response to question 7. Any such offer would need to have due regard, where relevant, to the recently published European Commission Cloud Strategy from May 2019.
15		05/07/2019 07:52	Understanding of "European sourced hardware"	Regarding Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Task 1 (second paragraph) Could you please clarify how we must understand "European sourced hardware"? Must we understand it as assembled in Europe? If not, how?	O5/07/2019 The term "European sourced hardware" can mean assembled in Europe. If such suitable hardware is not available then a risk assessment of the security implications will be required.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
16		05/07/2019 07:55	Critical disruptions response time	Regarding Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Task 4. We would like to confirm that the helpdesk service is to be provided from Monday to Friday, during office hours, and thus the minimum response time for resolving critical disruptions of 48 are computable for office hours. I.e., if a critical disruption happens on Friday evening, it must be solved on Tuesday evening (48 working hours later) and not on Sunday evening (48 hours later).	O5/07/2019 The minimum response objective is stated as 48 hours in the tender specifications and not 48 office hours. In the example given, Sunday evening is the correct timeframe.
17		05/07/2019 07:58	Helpdesk handover	Regarding Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Task 4. Could you please clarify the extent of the functions, activities, etc. must be	As the Helpdesk function is handed over to ENISA by month 24, there is no requirement for support beyond this timeframe other than assistance to ENISA. Such assistance could be equivalent to level 3 support. The functions and activities of the Helpdesk are within the scope of the handover as is knowledge transfer to

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
18		05/07/2019 07:59	Overall handover to ENISA	Regarding Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Is the scope of handover to ENISA already defined, and milestones set up?	05/07/2019 It is a matter for the offers to set out how handover is to take place to ENISA in accordance with objective 5 and task 5 of the tender specifications.
19	27/06/2019 12:20	05/07/2019 08:16	Jira system	Regarding Section 2.2.1 Objective 1) Section 2.2.2 Task 4. We would like to confirm if the Jira system mentioned is already deployed and ready for its use.	05/07/2019 The Jira system has been deployed and is presently in use.
20		05/07/2019 08:19	Task1 in section 2.2.2 of the Tender specifications	The six-month indication, is it a relative value to the handover date or an absolute value (e.g. what is the expectation in case the central instance is ran faster than 6m?	05/07/2019 The 6 month period is an approximate duration with two dependencies, namely hardware and readiness of ENISA.
21	27/06/2019 17:18	05/07/2019 17:21	Specific objective 5 in section 2.2.1 of the Tender specifications	What is the scope of the maintenance requirements and does it include the central instance and Helpdesk after handover to ENISA and before end of the contract?	O5/07/2019 In addition to maintenance of the code and associated management and in addition to support provided during the 6 month period after handover of the Helpdesk, the contractor will be expected to provide some assistance to ENISA for a limited period after running the central instance and provision of the enabling hardware.

	# Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
2	2 27/06/2019 17:33	05/07/2019 17:24		what is the purpose of the multiple exercises associated with business continuity?	O5/07/2019 The service level agreements are intended to cover both code maintenance and further evolution of the MeliCERTes facility. This could include, but not be limited to response objectives for availability of updates to the central instance operator for distribution to participating CSIRTs. Multiple exercises involving activation of the business continuity planning arrangements are required so that the business continuity plan remains fit for purpose after its compilation and for the duration of the contract.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
23	02/07/2019	10/07/2019 10:05		Regarding Section 4.2.4, Criterion and Evidence A4: i) Could you please clarify this statement? "In addition, the tenderer must prove that it has contacts in the EU countries not covered by its project experience in order to ensure the required geographical coverage; for this purpose, the tenderer must provide letters of intent from the contact points." Does it mean that the tenderer must prove that it has contacts in the rest of the EU Member States (e.g., 19 countries, 28 minus 9) where the previous project references did not cover? Or that if the project references did not reach the 9 Member States it can be completed by letters of intent of third parties? ii) In both cases, letters of intent from third party contact points can be replaced by tenderer's previous reference projects?	Yes the tenderer must prove that it has contacts in the rest of the Member States (i.e. other than the 9 Member States where the previous project references did not cover). Yes, letters of intent can be replaced by the tenderer's previous reference projects.

#	Submission date	Publication date	Question subject	Question	Answer
24		11/07/2019 09:17	Criterion and Evidence A4	Regarding Section 4.2.4, Criterion and Evidence A4: Would it be possible to provide more than two reference projects delivered in the last three years to cover the required geographical scope, capacity to work in 9 out of 28 Member States?	11/07/2019 The requirement in the tender specifications is for 2 projects to cover the required geographical scope. Allowing 3 or more projects would amount to a change of the criteria.
25		19/07/2019 09:04	Regarding Section 4.2.4, Criterion and Evidence A4:	Is this criterion met, when tenderer provides two reference projects covering 6 out of 28 Member States and 3 letters of intent? Or the correct understanding is that proving capacity to work in 9 out of 28 countries, means that when 2 reference projects cover 6 out of 28 countries still 22 letters of intent are necessary?	19/07/2019 The criterion is met when a tenderer, which can be a consortium, provides references for 2 projects, the combination of which must cover the required geographical scope of 9 Member States along with letters of intent for the remaining Member States. As stated in the answer to question 23, letters of intent can be replaced by the tenderer's previous reference projects. If the tenderer is a consortium comprised of different legal entities, each of these entities which have had projects and has contacts, can contribute to meeting this criterion. See also the response to question 24 for further clarifications. Question23, Question24

Generated on the 18/09/2024 03:43:28 - Generation time 12 ms