



Clarification Note #8

(non-Proprietary Information)

GSA internal reference: 251677

Procurement procedure: GSA/OP/09/18

High Accuracy Data Generator (HADG)

Question #32: Can you please clarify the expected scope of the Option 5 “User Ranger Accuracy (URA)” concept, described in section 1.4 of the Tender Specifications?

Answer #32: As indicated in section 1.4 of Tender Specifications, this option, if activated, would request from the winning bidders a URA (User Range Accuracy) concept definition and its technical implementation in the HADG. Moreover, as set out in this same document’s section, Option 5 will not be considered and scored against the award criteria.

Question #33: Can you please provide more details on formatting, page numbering and assembling of the tender (section 4.5 of Tender Specifications)?

Answer #33: The tender shall be presented clearly in a cohesive manner. There shall be consistency in formatting and sections shall be identified by an appropriate title and numbered consecutively. Furthermore, each document shall include continuous page numbers (no need common consecutive page numbering of all documents included in the bid). The page numbers shall begin by the first page of the first section of each document, and continue until the last page of it, making it clear that no page is missing.

Regarding the requirement that the tender must be assembled in a coherent fashion, the styles mentioned in the Tender Specifications (bound or stapled) are not exhaustive. In this context, tenderers are allowed to use different ways to present their tender, as long as they ensure that they are easy for readers to use.

Question #34: In section 3.3.1 of the Tender Specifications document under GSA-OP-09-18 HADG procurement procedure, the award criterion Q2, sub-criterion c) reads: “Level of performance above the required for compliance with the Technical Requirements (attached to SoW, Annex I.1) , section 3.3 - critical analysis and justification (max 5 points)”. In section 4.5.4 of the same document, item 3.a. is read: “The tenderers may propose a level of performance that is higher than that required for compliance with the Technical Requirements, section 3.3”. Considering that both statements refer to a level of performance higher than that required for compliance, how tenderers will be transparently ranked against performances evaluated under the Q2-c sub-criterion?

Answer #34: Tenderers will be evaluated according to the award criteria as described in the Tender Specifications. Concerning the sub-criterion (c) of the award criterion Q2, the GSA may allocate a maximum of 5 points to these bidders justifying in their proposal that their solution provides a level of performance higher than the required for compliance by the Tender Specifications. For the allocation of these 5 points the GSA will evaluate the performance result, quality and credibility of the required critical analysis and justification.

Question #35: In the section 2.4.3 of the Tender Specifications it is stated: “The deliverables under the contract shall be ITAR-free.” Continuing, it is stated: “Together with their tender, tenderers are required to provide a statement of full compliance with the above requirement and the relevant national export control laws and regulations together with a description of the export control procedures and structures.” These two statements seem to be contradicting. Could you please clarify if, regardless the fact that deliverables are ITAR free, an export control organisation needs to be described?

Answer #35: The deliverables under the contract shall be ITAR-free (US export regulation) and tenderers are required to provide a statement of full compliance with the above requirement. Apart from this they have to provide statement of full compliance to the **relevant** national export control laws and regulations with a description of the export control procedures and structure. These two requirements do not contradict each other as they are complementary.

-End of document-