Invitation to tender MOVE/B2/2014-646 for a service contract regarding the "Development of a model and associated tools for the harmonization of data relative to the accessibility of railway stations"

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Latest update 25.06.2015

Question 1: Please confirm if the tenderer should include in his offer services for the hosting, initial installation, maintenance, operation and/or technical support of the website.

Answer: It is not necessary to include these services in the offer.

Question 2: Are there any requirements/specifications related to the hosting environment, such as (but not limited to): hardware specifications, software specifications, software compatibility requirements; storage/memory/CPU limitations; limitations regarding the software infrastructure licences or related to the available database management systems, web server, application server etc.?

Answer: There are no specific requirements related to the hosting environment.

Question 3: Section 3.1 of Tender Specifications (General Background) addresses that PRM-TSI applies to passenger rolling stock and to the stations of the Union's rail system, for which it defines accessibility requirements (section 3.1, first paragraph).

Following, it indicates that, in order to improve PRM TSI, it will be necessary to establish inventories of assets of European railway stations and units of rolling stock from the point of view of their accessibility (section 3.1, paragraphs 2 and 3).

In the next paragraph (section 3.1, paragraph 4), it addresses that “The inventories of assets will cover all railway stations of the Union's rail system”.

Further on, section 3.3 (Tasks), under the description of the Work Package 1, technical specifications, indicates that “The harmonized model shall cover all details of a STOP PLACE, including the STOP PATH LINKS and NAVIGATIONS PATHS with ACCESSIBILITY LIMITATIONS”.

In the context above, we understand that:
1) The term “Accessibility” refers exclusively to accessibility for persons with disabilities and persons with reduced mobility (PRM).

2) The inventory will include only assets from railway stations of the Union’s rail system but will not cover assets from rolling stocks.

Could you please confirm that our understanding is correct?

Answer: We confirm that your understanding is correct, i.e.

1) The term “Accessibility” in this context refers exclusively to accessibility for persons with disabilities and persons with reduced mobility (PRM).
2) The system to be developed under this contract will include only assets from railway stations; it will not cover assets from rolling stock.

Question 4:

We would like to have two companies A and B to be part of consortium. There is a legal link between companies A and B as:

- Company A holds 50% share in company C
- Company C holds 100% share in company B

Both companies A and B intend to do core work within the project.

As MOVE/B2/2014-646 is an Open Call, would you please advise on the 3 following scenarios?

1) One company is a direct partner and the other company is subcontracted by the first one.
2) Both companies are direct partners.
3) One company is a direct partner and the other company is a linked third party. In that case, how can we formalize the status of the linked third party company? Would the linked third party company need to fill the official documents (Annexes 1, 2, 3, legal forms, profit & loss account, etc.)?

Answer:

Scenario 1: There is no problem if one of the companies is a subcontractor of the other, but in this case the price would be higher. Both companies would be making profit "in cascade".

Scenario 2: Taking into account that both companies will carry out core tasks, it might be better that they both become contractors (members of the consortium).

Scenario 3: The 3rd party format does not exist in service contracts.
**Question 5:**

In relation to the contacts with national rail infrastructure managers, we would like to ask the following:

5a) Will the contacts with infrastructure managers be made in English? Or should the tenderer provision a budget for translations in the different national languages?
5b) Should the tools be developed in English, or should the tenderer adapt the tools to the different national languages?
5c) Will the European Commission and ERA facilitate the contact bridge between the tenderer and the responsible in the rail infrastructure managers?

**Answers:**

a) The contacts with station managers (= the infrastructure manager or another entity) should be made in English.
b) The tools should also be developed in English.
c) The European Commission and ERA will facilitate the contact between the tenderer and station managers by providing a list of entities to be contacted (see also Q11 and Q12).

**Question 6:**

In relation to the criteria related to the team delivering the service, the requested profile for the Project Manager states that the professional must have at least 10 years’ experience in project management in projects of similar size and coverage (geographical scope at least half of the one subject to this call of tenderers).

6a) Does this mean that the Project Manager must have experience in at least 14 EU member states?
6b) If yes, is this a mandatory request that, if not fulfilled, will result in the exclusion of the proposal?

**Answers:**

6a) The project covers 26 EU Member States since Cyprus and Malta do not have railway systems. The project manager should therefore have experience in managing projects with a scope of at least 13 Member States. The project manager does not need to have work experience in these Member States.

6b) Since this is a selection criterion, the proposal will be excluded if the requirement is not fulfilled.

**Question 7:** How can a University prove experience as it has no certificates of satisfactory execution? Is it enough to have some kind of document as a proof of evidence related to research projects implemented by the University?
**Answer:** We are looking for proof that the contractor has successfully performed a project that meets the requirements of the technical specifications, e.g. in terms of budget, geographical coverage, etc. A certificate of satisfactory execution is one means of proving this; other reasonable means are also acceptable.

**Question 8:** How can an expert prove 5 years' experience in mobile application development? In which operating systems and what kind of certificates are required? The criteria related to the tenderer mention 3 years of experience in mobile application development so why is it required to have 5 years' experience as an expert?

**Answer:** The experience in mobile application development can be proved by projects executed by the expert. These projects shall be mentioned in the CV of the expert. No restriction of the mobile operating systems will be applied.

The criteria related to the tenderer mention experience in the field of, among others, mobile application development with at least 3 projects delivered (or completed) in this field during the last three years. This requirement is not about the length of experience but it aims to ensure that the experience was acquired in the recent past.

**Question 9:** The tender mentions that the project manager shall have 5 years of experience related to software development projects. It is ok to have experience as a project manager in research projects in which there was a part that had to do with software development?

**Answer:** The experience as project manager in a research project with a part of software development is considered as sufficient.

**Question 10:** In WP3.2 you mention that optionally a couple of functionalities could be proposed. In this paragraph you mention the phrases “Optionally”, “should offer” and “could be proposed”. Can you be more specific whether these options are required? In any case, will these options count in the technical evaluation results?

**Answer:** These options are not required. The technical proposal shall show the extensibility of the proposed technical solution to add additional requirements in the future. The extensibility of the proposed technical solution will be taken into account.

**Question 11:** Can you specify how the survey (WP2) will be conducted? Is it required by the contractor to communicate with every single railway station or will it be handled by the European Railway Agency and every National Railway Association in cooperation with the contractor? This specification is critical in order to have a cost estimation for this WP.

**Answer:** The Agency will provide a list of contacts that the tenderer should contact. While it is not possible to give an exact number at this stage, the number of entities to be contacted is estimated at about 60 (see also Q12).
Question 12:

The specification states:

“WP2 includes the following tasks:

Elaboration of a questionnaire that will be addressed to station managers. The questionnaire will have the objective of getting a view of the existing situation regarding:

- the existence of local databases gathering accessibility information,
- the data model of these databases,
- the format of the information when it exists,
- the compatibility of the existing databases with the model defined in WP1.”

We would like to know if the European Railway Agency has, in the course of the PRM TSI preparation and follow-up, inquired on these subjects, and (if this is the case) whether the corresponding Agency report can be shared with the tenderers.

Answer: The European Railway Agency has not inquired on these precise subjects. However, it has inquired about the management of passenger railway stations in the Member States. The analysis of the replies is ongoing; the results will be shared with the successful tenderer, i.e. the Agency will provide a list of contacts that the tenderer should contact. While it is not possible to give an exact number at this stage, the number of entities to be contacted is estimated at maximum 60.

Question 13: How many train stations are considered in this tender? Will all of them be inserted in the central database?

Answer: All passenger train stations in EU Member States are concerned; the order of magnitude is twenty to thirty thousand. The central database will be populated gradually and should eventually cover all of these train stations.

Question 14: Do you have an estimate of how many types of different files and databases of train station information exist actually?

Answer: No, we do not have such an estimate.

Question 15: Regarding data collection via files (XML or CSV) is it feasible that the train station manager chooses the data fields in the new model to where he/she wishes import the file data?

Answer: The station manager should be able to configure a specific profile for a mapping between the internal data representation and the new model. This can be done with a specific mapping tool or widely accepted technologies (e.g. XSLT).
Question 16: After the solution implementation has ended do you expect that the train station manager can create new information file types or, do you expect a unique file with a flexible enough structure to accommodate all data in the new model?

Answer: The station manager should be able to create new information types and to import them into the database, until they are supported by the new model. We assume, that the standard proposed in the “WP3.1. Development of a tool for the conversion, validation, storage and transfer of existing data ” – “3. Provide an external interface that will enable station managers to exchange their data according to the harmonized model. The external interface has to be based on XML according to the standard CEN/TS 16614-1:2014 (NeTEx).” supports a flexible file structure to cover the needed requirements.

Question 17: Concerning the profile of the project manager the TORs (p. 7) state that he/she must have, among other skills, project management experience in projects of a similar size and “geographical scope of at least half of the one subject to the call of tender”. Clarifications issued on June the 10th specify that “The project manager should therefore have experience in managing projects with a scope of at least 13 Member States”.

Could you clarify/define what is intended with scope in this context? For instance: do you mean projects involving partners from at least 13 member states, or projects that have encompassed activities carried out in at least 13 member states?

Answer: The scope refers to projects which have encompassed activities carried out in at least 13 member states.

Question 18: Could you specify the minimum number of projects responding to the requirements of size and geographical scope that should be present in the CV of the proposed project manager in order to be in line with the selection criteria?

Answer: The criteria refer to projects of a similar size and coverage, i.e. it should be more than one. Otherwise, there is no requirement regarding a minimum number of projects. On the other hand, the proposed project manager must have, as a minimum, 10 years of experience in the field of project management, at least 5 years of which must be related to the projects of software development.

Question 19: In case the proposed project manager has carried out technical coordination activities in projects that had another expert as general coordinator, are these technical coordination experiences eligible in the framework of the tender’s selection criteria?

Answer: This experience would only be eligible if it is clearly demonstrated that it involved all aspects of project management mentioned in the criteria, such as project delivery, quality control of delivered service, client orientation, conflict resolution experience and team management.
Question 20: Administrative question: in the framework of the tender are freelance consultants to be considered as subcontractors?

Answer: This is up to the tenderers how to compose the team: the freelance consultants can very well be sub-contractors.

Question 21: The requirements in WP3 make several references to the TAP TSI technical document B.60. Our understanding is that the Software to be developed in WP3 has to have all functionalities listed in the specification plus the overall peer-to-peer based communication functionality (i.e. Registration, Subscription, Notification, File Exchange, Transactional Services, etc.).

a) Is this correct?

Answer: Yes, this is correct.

b) Do API and Interface have to implement all formats/concepts (file, Web Services, etc.) or just some of them?

Answer: No. The functionalities to be implemented are those to register and to inform other parties about the available data (i.e. Registration, Subscription, Notification). For the peer-to-peer based communication only the file transfer has to be implemented.

Question 22: We understand that WP3 asks for a Web based software that is to be installable by the station managers, one instance per country/organization.

a) Does the Operation Manual (Deliverable) have to cover both, installation and operation?

Answer: Yes.

b) Who is the target audience for the document?

Answer: The target audience are the administrators (for the installation of the software) and the users (Users manual).

Question 23: Are there any technology preferences for the software, for example open source based?

Answer: There is no preference for any technology.

Question 24: In the tender invitation it is not clear the procedure of submitting the tender by courier. When is the final date the tender can be dispatched by courier? Can a tenderer send the tender by courier on 30rd of June?
**Answer:** Yes. The tender has be dispatched, that is, posted or delivered to courier, at the latest on 30rd June. The postmark or date of deposit slip would serve as evidence that the tender was dispatched on that day (at the latest).