

Clarification No 3

Related to Call for Proposals GSA/EEX.0030/2015 “EGNOS adoption in Aviation”

1. **Question:** May you clarify if for topics A, B and F the proposal may be submitted by only one ANSP without entering in consortium?

Answer: This Call does not require that proposals are only submitted by a consortium *per se*. However, for areas A and B, the proposal “must be submitted by at least one entity representing Air Navigation Service Providers (ANSPs) or Aerodromes/heliports/helipads and performing the core activities described in the proposal”. Thus, if a single entity is able to fulfil these requirements, it may individually submit a proposal. Otherwise, entities should team up in a consortium to fulfil the requirements together. As per area F, the requirement for an ANSP does not exist in the first place.

NOTE: Area F is further subject to a corrigendum. The corrigendum will eliminate any further requirement for area F aside from the entity requirements listed in section 6.1 (i) and (ii) of the Call for Proposals. Furthermore, it is clarified that for areas C, D, and E proposals may be submitted by any single airspace user listed under section 6.1, i.e. airlines, flight operators, pilots/aircraft owners, avionics, aircraft manufacturers performing the core activities described in the proposal. Interested entities should visit the GSA grants website for the updated version of the Call text).

2. **Question:** We would like to request officially the present clarification. On page 16 of the CFP document it is clearly stated that:

“Subcontracting, i.e. the externalisation of specific tasks or activities which form part of the action/work programme as described in the proposal must satisfy the conditions applicable to any implementation contract (as specified above) and in addition to them the following conditions:

a. it may only cover the implementation of a limited part of the action and shall in no case cover the core activities;

b. it must be justified having regard to the nature of the action and what is necessary for its implementation;

c. it must be clearly stated in the proposal.”

Considering the nature of the tasks we necessarily need to subcontract a higher percentage of the activities (at least 80%) foreseen in the project, while we’ll take care of the dissemination activity and the Project Management.

Could you kindly confirm us such possibility. It is for us fundamental in the evaluation of the feasibility?

Answer: As the call states: “*subcontracting must be justified having regard to the nature of the action and what is necessary for its implementation*”. Should the beneficiary lack the necessary experience or capability to undertake certain implementation (core) tasks, these could be subcontracted to external companies provided that a justification is given, which is considered acceptable. Such assessment is entirely subject to the GSA’s discretion on a case by case basis.

General Guidance: As a rule of thumb, if major elements of the proposed project may only be performed by other entities, these should be elevated to the level of beneficiary and perform alongside in a consortium. This would adequately reflect the purpose of the above mentioned restriction of subcontracting in grant projects. A request for extensive subcontracting should therefore also provide convincing arguments, namely on why it is objectively necessary to perform the tasks by subcontractors instead of beneficiaries.

3. Question: What are “enablers”?

Answer: “Enablers” within this call shall be understood as items, tools, methodologies, equipment, etc. that are *necessary to develop, or need to be in place to accelerate EGNOS adoption* and its operational use by civil aviation.

As described in section 6.2 of the Call text, proposals may include, but shall not be limited to hardware/software development, processes implementation and related trials. The proposals should demonstrate the need for such enablers by aviation stakeholders, and their short term with short term impact on acceleration of EGNOS adoption, as well as prove readiness of the applicant to accomplish the proposed tasks within the time of the project.

4. Question: If a proposal is submitted to fund the design of LPV procedures which are to be combined with an LNAV/VNAV design, would there be any restriction on funding for this additional LNAV/VNAV requirement?

Answer: Based on the area A –RNP APCH procedures to LPV minima, SBAS procedures are eligible for funding under this Call for Proposals. Therefore, as long as there is a LPV line in the chart along with a LNAV/VNAV one, common tasks and related costs leading to the publication of such a chart are eligible, such as airport obstacle survey or shared design costs.

Specific implementation of only Baro-VNAV procedures is not in the scope of the call.

5. Question: If a multi-airport proposal were to be submitted where some airports required LPV designs, and others required LNAV/VNAV designs would there be any funding restriction on the LNAV/VNAV airports?

Answer: Specific implementation of only Baro-VNAV procedures is not in the scope of the call (please also see Answer #4 above).

6. Question: For non-towered, used by GA, rescue helicopters and flying clubs, etc., we are developing our facility together with the city/community, to increase safety and accessibility and decrease the environmental impact (noise). In our plans are also GPS procedures including LPV. Can we cooperate with you in this or is it too early?



Answer: Based on the area A-RNP APCH procedures to LPV minima, proposals must ensure that the publication of the instrument flight procedures is achieved within the duration of the project. It is up to the applicant to define the appropriate duration of the project taking into account the implications for proper project implementation and the indicative programme duration. The proposal shall reflect the objectives of the call and shall aim to achieve the maximised result/impact within a short-term (in line with criterion no.2).

End of Document