

Question/ Answer

Procurement procedure: EMSA/OP/12/2016- Contracts for Remotely Piloted Aircraft System (RPAS) services in support of the execution of Coast Guard functions

Question 01 (19 August 2016, 10:39):

Regarding the Tender n° EMSA/OP/12/2016, could the tenderer only answer to one of the three proposed lots, or the tenderer has to respond to every lots?

Answer to question 01 (23 August 2016, 16:00):

A tenderer/bidder can answer one or two or three lots for this tender. There is no obligation to submit a proposal for all the lots.

Question 02 (19 August 2016, 13:15):

I represent a company that is interested in placing a bid for the UAV contract. I am based in the UK but the aircraft would be American with no ITAR restrictions. Is there anyone I can contact reference this bid?

Answer to question 02 (23 August 2016, 16:00):

It is possible to subcontract part of the contract, please see section 16 of the tender specifications. Since your company is based in an EU Member State, you are eligible to provide a bid for this tender. Should you wish to subcontract a part of the contract you will need to be able to show the proportion of the contract which will be provided by a subcontractor. However it should be noted that the full responsibility for the performance of the contract remains with the tenderer.

Please note all questions and answers are published for all tenderers to view on the EMSA website. All communications will be made in this way and therefore it is not possible to communicate with EMSA during this public procurement period apart from through the questions and answers.

Question 03 (22 August 2016, 12:45):

I would like to request a clarification about the tender EMSA/OP/06/2016 in light of the recently published tender EMSA/OP/12/2016.

Since the recently published tender resembles EMSA/OP/06/2016 very closely, we would like to clarify if EMSA/OP/06/2016 is still valid and being considered, OR if EMSA/OP/12/2016 now supersedes EMSA/OP/06/2016 and we should submit our bid for EMSA/OP/12/2016.

Answer to question 03 (23 August, 16:00):

This tender procedure OP/12/2016 is an independent tender procedure and does not replace or impact the other tender procedure OP/06/2016. Both tenders are valid.

The evaluation period for procedure OP/06/2016 is currently being finalised and bids can no longer be submitted. Tender procedure OP/12/2016 is still valid and bids can be submitted until the deadline of 17 October.

Question 04 (23 August 2016, 14:01):

I would like to request a clarification regarding the Maritime Radar - requirements for all lots. In your tender you request a resolution of up to 50cm for the maritime radar as well as the SAR. Is this correct or is it a clerical error and you mean 50m instead? And if 50cm is correct is it an advantage or mandatory?

Answer to question 04 (24 August, 12:00):

A maritime radar generally provides a multitude of different modes and may include dedicated SAR modes. The latter provides high resolution imagery for which the 50 cm resolution requirement is applicable. If the single maritime radar does not include SAR modes with the requested resolution, then a dedicated SAR with a resolution of 50 cm is requested in the tables in section 7 of the tender specifications.

The resolution of 50 cm has to be achieved with at least one of the requested radar systems and is mandatory according to the tender specifications for Lots 1 and 2 (see table in section 7.2.3.1 and 7.3.3.1) and advantage for Lot 3 (see table in section 7.4.3.1).

Question 05 (25 August 2016, 04:05):

We have a few questions we are hoping you can address:

- 1) We are a U.S. Company. According to our reading of the RFP, non EU companies are allowed to bid on the project but would only be considered as an exception. We do have an EU based partner company with whom we can submit our offerings. Can you please clarify our best approach based on the requirements?
- 2) We have highly qualified UAS operators from all over the world. Are there any limitations as to what countries our operators (staff) are from?
- 3) We noted that ITAR is mentioned in the documentation. Can you please confirm to what you are referring? Is it the bidding companies that must be ITAR certified or the potential equipment utilized that must be cleared?
- 4) We noted that Security Clearances are a plus. From what country or countries would those originate?
- 5) Finally, we noted that the Command Centers are designated as Land Based. Would EMSA be open to receiving a proposal that would include water-borne vessel based Command and Control / Launch facilities?

Answer to question 05 (29 August, 16:00):

- 1) As stated under point 19 of the invitation to tender, in case of economic operators from other non-EU member states than the ones mentioned there, EMSA may only in exceptional circumstances accept their participation in the present procurement procedure. Consequently, if your company would submit a joint offer together with your EU based partner, EMSA may, depending on its needs, exceptionally accept your company's participation without creating a precedent or obligation for future participation. In case your company would act as a subcontractor of an EU based company, please refer to the answer to question 2 above.
- 2) There are no limitations on where the operators and staff are from as long as the company bidding is eligible to participate in the procurement procedure.
- 3) As indicated in section 7.1.8.5 of the Tender specifications, the contractor must ensure that they comply with any restrictions and constraints which may be imposed on them from customs in the countries which they are operating or transporting their RPAS through, due to export licenses and also any regulations/restrictions imposed in terms of the International Traffic on Arms Regulation. There shall be no restrictions to operate the RPAS offered in any of the sea areas surrounding the European Union Member States, or the EFTA countries. The service could be extended outside EU adjacent seas upon common agreement. (see section 4.1.1.3 of Tender specifications).
- 4) The security clearances which are requested are from any country which the RPAS may have operated in for the RPAS being proposed for this public tender. Of course it is an advantage if the security clearance is accepted within the European Union.
- 5) EMSA is open to receive any proposals which comply with the minimum requirements indicated in the tender specifications. Should this be feasible with a water-borne vessel based Command and Control then this could be feasible.

Question 06 (29 August 2016, 15:25):

Could you please clarify the following?

- 1- Lot 1 and Lot 2 mention Large size RPAS and Medium size RPAS respectively while Lot 3 specifies Vertical Take-Off and Landing systems. **Do Lot 1 and Lot 2 exclude Vertical Take-Off and Landing Systems?**
- 2- In Clauses 7.2.2.2 and 7.3.2.2 of the Enclosure I – Specifications, **does the term 'multi-RPAS' mean various RPAS of the same kind and/or a combination of different RPAS?**

Answer to question 06 (31 August, 12:00):

- 1) Lot 1 and 2 are defined by the size of the RPAS and also the range of how far it can travel for operations. Lot 3 was specific to Vertical take-off and landing systems. This does not mean that a VTOL cannot be offered for Lot 1 or 2 as long as it meets the minimum requirements indicated in Sections 6 and 7 of the tender specifications.

- 2) In both these clauses it is up to the tenderer to define the most appropriate fleet of RPASs which could be of the same kind or a combination of different RPAS. In any case they must meet all the minimum requirements indicated in Sections 6 and 7.
-

Question 07 (29 August 2016, 18:54):

Please confirm if US companies can participate in the EMSA/OP/12/2016 “RPAS Services” tender. We are evaluating our participation and would like to know if we can participate or not.

Answer to question 07 (31 August, 12:00):

See the answer to question 5 part 1).

Question 08 (1 September 2016, 12:08):

We have the following questions:

5.2.1.5 With regards to the cascade system what guarantees (if any) are there that those companies listed on the framework will get an opportunity to provide work against the specific Lot they are listed on?

7.4.1.2 vessel based take-off and landing is referred to in this section and in the table in 7.4.2.1 under ‘environmental conditions / flight stability’ – can you expand on the type(s) of vessel it is envisaged that the RPAS will be flown from including scantling details and whether there is a designated helipad or otherwise?

7.4.3 With the mix of payload items listed as ‘advantage’ is there any preferred table of these advantage payloads or in other words are there different weightings for different ‘advantage’ payloads?

Answer to question 08 (8 September, 12:00):

5.2.1.5 There is no guarantee that all those companies with whom EMSA has signed a framework contract will get an opportunity to provide work/services. It is evident however that the higher the rank the more likely the company is to receive the work since the contractor ranked first will be the first to be requested by EMSA to sign a specific contract for the deployment (see section 5.2 of the tender specifications).

7.4.1.2 There is no specific vessel that is referred to due to the fact that these vessels should or may be offered by the government authorities in the Member States requesting the RPAS service. As indicated in the table in 7.4.2.1 under the “environmental conditions / flight stability”, please therefore indicate if the RPAS has specific requirements/needs in terms of a designated helipad, specific runway length, etc.

7.4.3 There is no preferred table of these advantage payloads and there are no fixed weightings for different ‘advantage’ payloads. Advantage payloads will be evaluated as part of the entire payload set. The entire payload is linked to an award criterion in section 21.2 of the tender specifications. Consequently, the more advantages a company can offer, the better scoring it will receive for the particular award criteria.

Question 09 (1 September 2016, 15:07):

Could you please clarify the following?

- 1- Should we have a common RPAS solution, which can be proposed for more than one Lot, could we make some synergies in terms of common assets and/or resources used for both Lots or a separate proposal for each Lot - with no synergies/commonalities at all - is preferred?

Answer to question 09 (8 September, 12:00):

A common RPAS solution can be offered for more than one Lot, however although synergies may be made by the company offering the system, each Lot will be evaluated separately based on the exclusion, selection and award criteria set out for this Lot in the procurement documents.

Question 10 (2 September 2016, 16:02):

LOT 3 mentions a VTOL. My company has a solution with a fixed wing RPAS that can be used on vessels at sea with a low footprint. Does Lot 3 explicitly exclude fixed wing RPAS even if the system fulfils the same requirements?

Answer to question 10 (8 September, 12:00):

Lot 3 must be an RPAS which has the ability to have a vertical take-off and landing (VTOL). It could be used on vessels and could be a fixed wing if it is capable to have VTOL functionalities and fulfils the requirements indicated in the tender specifications for Lot 3.

Question 11 (6 September 2016, 17:12):

In case a company is able to satisfy various Lots' requirements with the same or a different solution, could such Co. submit a unique proposal that satisfies various Lots or a separate proposal for each Lot is preferred?

Answer to question 11 (12 September, 12:00):

See the answer to question 9

Question 12 (7 September 2016, 16:51):

- 1) Can one company submit an independent bid as well as a bid within a consortium?
- 2) Can a UAS manufacturer submit the same UAS platform in other bids as a subcontractor as well in its own individual bid?

Answer to question 12 (12 September, 12:00):

- 1) Your company is free to submit two bids. One within a consortium and one independently. However, in order to avoid any distortion of competition and/or conflict of interest situation, a consortium

member who at the same time is going to submit an independent bid shall submit with its independent bid a duly signed confirmation of the other members of the consortium that they have been informed in good time about the intention of their consortium partner to submit at once an independent bid.

- 2) Your company is able to submit the same RPAS platform for your own bid as well as for the bid you provide as a subcontractor or part of a consortium.

Question 13 (9 September 2016, 11:30):

[...]

Currently we are actively working on a bid [...] which is due to be submitted in 4th October, and therefore would like to explore whether an extension to the ITT return date of 17 October 2016 is possible. We know that all leading RPAS service provider are working these days on this *[bid]* and an extension will allow all of us an opportunity to give EMSA's bid the attention it deserve.

Realistically we would need the bid return date to be extended by a further 45 days to the end of November.

Please can you consider and advise whether such an extension can be accommodated.

Answer to question 13 (15 September, 18:00):

EMSA already gave 69 calendar days for the bid preparation. Due to operational constraints in providing services the Agency cannot further extend the bid preparation period. Therefore the deadline for submission of bids remains to be 17 October 2016 20H00.

Question 14 (14 September 2016, 18:14):

We have two solutions for Lot 3. The two options would score very differently on technical advantages and on financial factors. Can we provide two different service options for consideration either as options in a single tender or as two separate tenders?

Answer to question 14 (16 September, 13:00):

If the bidder wants to offer two different solutions, then the bidder has to provide two separate bids.

However the following administrative documents as stated in section 18 of the Tender Specifications need only to be provided once if the validity of these documents for both bids is clearly mentioned in the cover letter:

- the signed cover letter (which has to clearly state that the below mentioned administrative documents are valid for both bids),
- the Financial Form,
- the Legal Entity Form,
- Part A, and
- Part B.

Question 15 (20 September 2016, 21:12):

Our EU based company is planning to form a consortium with two partners from the USA in order to form a consortium that fits the needs of EMSA in the best way possible. In order to do that our company has to execute Teaming Agreements with the USA based entities for the Department of State approval, which takes 90 days to get approved. With this, we ask you for extension of the tender submission deadline in order to be on time to submit our RFP.

Answer to question 15 (23 September, 10:00):

With regard to the extension tender submission deadline of, please see the answer to question 13.

With regard to Team Agreement, the Agency only accepts joint offers, where the agreements between the partners have been determined so that it is clear which companies form the consortium and which company will be responsible for which part of the project. That being said, please note that the tender has to be submitted on behalf of the entire consortium, therefore the person signing the Cover-letter of the bid has to be authorised by all members of the consortium to do so and to represent them in the tendering process. If this is not possible in order for the bid to be considered as submitted by all the members of the consortium, it has to be signed by each member individually.

In case the teaming agreement need further approval from governmental authorities, the Agency accepts that these remaining approvals from governmental authorities can be submitted at a later stage before the award of the contract. However this may not alter any element of the bid/s already submitted. The bid itself together with the teaming agreements between the partners has to be provided until the tender submission deadline of 17 October 2016 20H00.

However, should the above solution prove to be not workable, your companies may wish to look into a different type of cooperation for the purposes of the submission of the bid. Those types of cooperation may include but are not limited to the possibility of subcontracting. However, please bear in mind that the type of cooperation has to be clear and defined at the time of the submission of your tender.

Question 16 (21 September 2016, 10:23):

1. According to the definition of the LGCS in Annex A, it should be able to act as a CGCS. Is it possible to propose a single GCS (the LGCS) with the ability to perform all the requirements?
2. Para. 7.1.6.14 refers to para. 6.6.1.7 for the description of the relevant data formats; but the data formats are not described in 6.6.1.7 (maybe it should be 6.7.1.11?).
3. The RFP asks for Web services in order to visualize the products/data to the users. Is it required to be a private or a public service? Is it required to have user account management? Will the required service be an add-on to the current EMSA web-services (accessed via a specific link)?

Answer to question 16 (23 September, 10:00):

1. The Agency confirms that the LGCS could act as a CGCS as stated in Annex A, the Local Ground Control Station (LGCS) is “a deployed station, served by the service provider crew, capable operate the RPA including take-off and landing. (The LGCS) can also act as CGCS, depending on the set-up of the RPAS.”
2. The Agency confirms a clerical error in the tender specifications to OP/12/2016 in paragraph 7.1.6.14: The data formats to be provided by the contractor in the framework of module 6 are described in paragraph 6.7.1.11 and not in 6.6.1.7.
3. In section 7.1.6 (Data provision) the Agency requests the data visualisation and provision to the users directly from the contractor, preferably via web based video/GIS application (ref. 7.1.6.9). The solution offered shall be a private service to the defined users and not publicly available. Therefore an appropriate user account management is necessary.

Additionally section 6.7 (Module 6: interfacing) refers to web services for the direct interfacing between the contractor and EMSA applications which may be requested and defined during the course of the FWC and under the scope of Module 6. Here the EMSA applications will be the reference visualisation interface to the users. The connection between the contractor and EMSA will be in this case of private/secure nature and is not expected to handle user account management. These web services will provide the data, video streams and images to the EMSA application to combine and fuse the data with already available data in order to provide the user value added products.

Question 17 (27 September 2016, 5:58):

1. Do we start the counting of the two years from t0 (signature of FWC) or from t3 (first deployment)?
2. What is EMSA approach to the gap between t2 and t3? According to the diagram in 6.1.1.2 there is no availability fee before t3. What is the approach in case the gap (t2 -> t3) prolongs for months?

Answer to question 17 (29 September, 16:00):

1. The Agency confirms the counting for the minimum duration of the two years of the framework contract will start with t0, the signature of framework contract. However please take note that, as specified in the tender specification of OP/012/2016, the framework contract can be extended by the Agency twice for one year. The execution of tasks as contracted via the specific contracts and may last until the end of the framework contract plus 6 months.
 2. The Agency confirms that the availability fee will be paid with the start of the first deployment (t3_first Deployment) of the RPAS system. There is no availability fee before the first deployment because the system, only after it has been deployed **successfully** for the first time, should remain available for future deployments. The contractor is only bound to have the RPAS available when the specific contracts are signed. Therefore, in case of longer duration between the end of set-up phase (t2) and the signature of the first specific contract for deployment (t3_first Deployment), the contractor is free to use the RPAS for any other purposes. However please take note, that when the specific contract for the deployment has been signed by both parties, the contractor has to comply with the specific time-lines, as per section 6.3 in tender specifications, which also applies for the first deployment.
-

Question 18 (30 September 2016, 15:04):

We would like to clarify the conditions for the duration of payment of the availability fee. Assuming that the contractor is mobilized for a mission in April, 2017 and the mission has a duration of 4 months ending in August 2017.

- Would the contractor receive the availability fee plus the fee corresponding to the flight hours; SC (*specific contract*) availability?
- And if so, would the contractor receive the availability fee since April until August?
- After that he will only receive this fee if he has a new mobilization? If he doesn't get another deployment, during the 12 months of the SC for availability, will he receive the availability fee?

Answer to question 18 (06. October, 12:00):

As stated in point 6.6.1.4 of the tender specifications of OP/12/2016: "The availability fee will, in principle, apply during the entire duration of the contract from the moment of the first mobilisation for the first deployment. It will continue throughout the mobilisation, on-site activities and flights." Therefore a specific contract "Remotely Piloted Aircraft Service availability/reservation fees" (Module 5) will be concluded together with the specific contract "Mobilisation, On-site activities and Missions" (Module 2, 3, and 4) for the first mobilisation for the first deployment.

As illustrated in Figure 2 and in section 6.6 of the tender specifications of OP/12/2016, the payment of "availability fee" will start with the first mobilisation and will be paid in parallel to the mobilisation time and the time "on-site". This also means that the costs for the availability of the RPAS shall be included for Lot 1 and Lot 2 in module 5 and not in modules 2 and 3 (Mobilisation, On-site activities).

As stated in point 6.6.1.3 of the tender specifications: "The maximum duration for a specific contract to cover the service availability fees [Module 5] will be 12 months. However, the contracting authority has the intention to conclude specific contracts until the end of the FWC duration."

Please note that the availability fee will only be available for Lot 1 and Lot 2 (as stated in 6.6.1.1 of the tender specifications). Please also note that the Agency can stop paying the availability fee in cases as stated in points 6.6.1.5 to 6.6.1.8 of the tender specifications of OP/12/2016.

Applying this to the specific question, a contractor for Lot 1 and Lot 2 would

- Receive the availability fee (Module 5) plus the fees for Mobilisation, On-site activities and Missions (Module 2, 3, and 4) during the deployment phase of the RPAS.
 - When the specific contracts for module 2 to 5 are signed in April, then the contractor would receive the availability fee from April onwards.
 - The availability fee will be paid as long as the specific contract for Module 5 has been signed, with a maximum 12 of months. However as it is the interest of the Agency to have RPAS available for further deployments, the Agency has the intention to conclude new specific contracts to ensure continuation in the RPAS availability.
-

Question 19 (01 October 2016, 13:55):

Could you please provide additional clarifications on the following questions?

- 1) The figure 1 shows RPAS sensing air pollution. There is no clear reference to measurements from ship exhaust gas in the following section. Could you please confirm if atmospheric pollution is part of the RPAS missions (as mandatory or advantage or not required) in any of the 3 lots?
- 2) The specifications for Lot 1 maritime radar says “detection and tracking of vessels (up to 200 km)” and “a range more than 80 km is an advantage”. Which is the mandatory range?

Answer to question 19 (06. October, 12:00):

- 1) Figure 1 depicts typical RPAS operation in the maritime domain in general. Your understanding is correct, that this tender does not focus on measuring of air pollution from ships. Therefore atmospheric pollution measurement capabilities are neither mandatory nor advantageous for any of the 3 lots.
- 2) The requirements on the maritime radar as laid down in the tender specifications should be read as follows:
 - For Lot 1: The mandatory range is 80 km; everything above 80 km is an advantage with the aim to reach up to 200 km.
 - For Lot 2: The mandatory range is 50 km; everything above 50 km is an advantage. with the aim to reach up to 100 km.
 - For Lot 3: The mandatory range is 40 km; everything above 40 km is an advantage. with the aim to reach up to 80 km.

Question 20 (04 October 2016, 18:27):

As indicated in Para 10 of the subject Invitation to tender, we kindly require clarifications about:

Mandatory Requirement of the Distress Sensor of Table 3 Sensor requirements Lot 1 and Table 5 Sensor requirements Lot 2: “Distress signal receiver with capabilities to relay the data (EPIRB)”.

In the above requirement is specified the needed of a EPIRB Distress Receiver as UAV sensor which is able to find the distressed Vessels and relay their position to LGCS/CGCS.

As far as we know, the distress signals identified as EPIRB: work at 406MHz, are received by satellites system only upon previous user registration and are routed through them to the LGCS/CGCS.

May be the requirement refers to a Search and Rescue Transponder such as Radar Beacon SART device or an AIS-SART (automatic identification system SART) as defined in the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS).

In this case the distress sensor could be part of the UAV asset and handled by LGCS/CGCS crew on ground.

Answer to question 20 (07. October, 12:00):

The mandatory requirement of the Distress Sensor of Table 3 shall address in general “Distress signal receiver with capabilities to relay the data”. In fact the following technologies are relevant:

1. EPIRB: EPIRB (406 and 121.5 Mhz) signals allow homing to itself being a significant aid to search and rescue activities. The RPAS shall be equipped with a sensor allowing the homing based on EPIRB signals.
2. RARAR-Search and rescue transponder (SART): X-band radar signals allow homing to itself. It is expected that the RPAS maritime radar already can detect and interpret these radar pulses..
3. EPIRB-AIS, AIS Man Overboard (MOB), AIS-SART: An AIS device is a mobile equipment mounted on an EPIRB, MOB or SART, to assist homing to itself (i.e. life boats, life raft) by transmitting a text broadcast. The reception and interpretation of the AIS messages should be supported by the RPAS by using and interpreting the messages received from the AIS receiver.

Question 21 (05 October 2016, 09:27):

As indicated in Para 10 of the subject Invitation to tender, we kindly require clarifications about:

Tender Enclosure II – Framework Service Contract:

1. Para II.15.1 Delay in Delivery: please clarify the application of the formula. The value “d” (period of delay) is at denominator and it seems that in case of long delay the Liquidated Damages are less than in case of a short delay.

Tender Enclosure II – Framework Service Contract:

2. Para II.20 Price Revision: in the first sentence is indicated the Article I.5.2 that does not exist. This means that the prices will not be updated and must be considered firm and fixed for three or five years of the Contract period?
3. Para II.20 Price Revision: in case of price revision which indexes will be used? The formula indicated is general without references, inside the Article is named a “final index for the month”. Please clarify if the indexes can be proposed by the Contactor, will be commonly agreed or if and which standard indexes will be applied.

Answer to question 21 (07. October, 12:00):

1. The value “d” does not represent the “period of delay”, but as defined on page 19 2 of the “Tender Enclosure II – Framework Service Contract”, the value d stands for “the duration specified in the relevant specific contract for delivery of the relevant purchase or deliverable or, failing that, the period between the date specified in Article I.4.2 and the date of delivery or performance specified in the relevant specific contract, expressed in days”. This means in case of agreed longer delivery times, the penalty per day of delay is lower. The total penalty is always the product of the factor $0.3x(V/d)$ multiplied by the number of days in delay.

2. The assumption made in the question is correct; no price revision is foreseen during the lifetime of the framework contract. Please note that the duration of the framework contract is set to two years plus the possible renewal for one year and an additional renewal for another year. The text of Art.II.20 of the Contract is located in the General Conditions and is only triggered by the corresponding provision of Art.I.5.2 from the Special Conditions. Since the provision of Art. I.5.2 has been deleted the text of Art. II.20 shall not apply.
3. As no price revision is foreseen the question 3 asking for the index used is not applicable.

Question 22 (06 October 2016, 15:05):

We would like to clarify the following questions:

1. Regarding the award criteria for the pricing section (paragraph 21.1.1.5), it doesn't state the weight of each module in the total price score. As it appears now, all modules have an identical weight in the overall price score.
2. Regarding the award criteria for the pricing section (paragraph 21.3.2 Lot 1 to Lot 3),

Module 2 – Mobilization –

Scenario A – 2 mobilization with each deployment over 3 months

Scenario B – 2 mobilization with each deployment under 3 months

How does the period for each mobilization effects the value of the scenario? It is more reasonable that for each mobilization we will address same value regardless of the on-site mission activity period (which will be price under module 3)

Answer to question 22 (11. October, 18:00):

1. The word “weighting” in table 13 should not be present and is a clerical error and should be deleted. The weighting for each price scenario (A and B) is described in section 21.1.1.4 in table 10 which states that each scenario will contribute 15% (W_P_1 and W_P_2) to the overall score of the award criteria. The price scenarios therefore contribute with a total of 30% to the overall score as stated in the title of section 21.3. of the tender specifications.
2. There is only one price table applicable for both Scenarios A and B. Therefore the price for the mobilisation taken into account for the calculation of the value of the scenarios is the same for both scenarios. The duration of the deployment as given under “Module 2 – Mobilisation” is not relevant for the calculation of the scenarios.

Question 23 (07 October 2016, 14:36):

With reference to the captioned tender, could you please clarify the following?

Could a Company, which has been awarded, sign the FWC but decide to postpone the signature of the Specific Contract for the Initial Set-up (Module 1)?

Answer to question 23 (11. October, 18:00):

It is the intention of the contracting authority to conclude the specific contracts for the Initial Set-up (Module 1) immediately after the signature of the Framework Contract. If the bidder is not able to conclude the specific contracts for Module 1 immediately after the signature of the Framework Contract and thus proposes to start with the set-up activities later, the bidder is requested to state the time when he is able to start with the set-up activities clearly in the bid. The contracting authority will analyse the impact of the delay. This will have an impact on the evaluation and on the scoring of the "Availability - RPAS available for the service (also including those as backup and to extend continuous operations)" as stated in section 21.2.2.3.

Please be advised that additional information requests will not be processed anymore as the time limit to request information to OP/12/2016 has been reached (please see below).

Requests for additional information regarding this tender should be sent by e-mail to the following address **Open122016@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 **17 October 2016 20H00**.

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