



MINISTERUL MEDIULUI,
APELOR ȘI PĂDURILOR

Unitatea de Management al Proiectului “Prevenirea și Reducerea Poluării din Spațiul Rural în România”

Registration no: UMPRAPID/79929/15.09.2026

Loan No./Credit No./ Grant No.: 9505-RO

Country: Romania

Name of Assignment: Design, Supply, and Installation of the Integrated Water Resources Analysis Center System (IWRACS)

RFP Reference No.: 01/RFP IT/2026

CLARIFICATIONS Letter No. 2 to the Requests for clarifications

Design, Supply, and Installation of the Integrated Water Resources Analysis Center System (IWRACS) - 01/RFP IT/2026

Dear Proposers,

Please find below our answers to clarification request questions submitted under this above procedure.

Request for Further Extension of the Proposal Submission Deadline

We refer to the Proposal submission deadline, originally established for 14 September 2026 and subsequently extended by the Contracting Authority by one (1) week, to 22 September 2026.

We are writing to formally request a further extension of the bid submission deadline by four (4) weeks, for the reasons set out below.

The one-week extension granted, while appreciated, does not adequately address the underlying issue: on 26 August 2026, the Contracting Authority issued Clarification 1, comprising 199 pages and responding to 496 questions submitted by prospective bidders. A clarification package of this volume and substance is not a minor procedural update – it materially affects the technical requirements, contractual conditions and pricing assumptions underlying our bid. Properly analysing 496 individual responses, assessing their impact, and incorporating the resulting changes cannot reasonably be accomplished within the additional week granted, nor before the revised 22 September 2026 deadline.

We would respectfully note that affording bidders adequate time to review and incorporate substantive clarifications is fundamental to the integrity and fairness of the procurement process. Issuing clarifications of this magnitude so close to the submission deadline, without a correspondingly adequate adjustment of that deadline, risks compromising both the

quality of the bids received and the equal treatment of all bidders — outcomes we are confident the Contracting Authority is equally committed to avoiding.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the bid submission deadline be extended by four (4) weeks from the current 22 September 2026 deadline, to allow all bidders sufficient time to properly review Clarification 1 and submit fully compliant, well-considered bids.

In addition, and in connection with this request, we are separately submitting a further set of clarification questions arising from our continued review of the tender documentation and Clarification 1.

Given the short time remaining before the current deadline, we would greatly appreciate your urgent consideration of this request and a prompt confirmation of the revised deadline.

Answer to the Request for Further Extension of the Proposal Submission Deadline

After careful review, we inform you that an additional extension of the proposal submission deadline cannot be granted.

The RFP was launched on **06 May 2026**, providing all prospective proposers with **more than four months** to prepare their proposals. While we recognize that the volume of clarifications issued on 26 August 2026 is considerable, these clarifications together with the amendments to the RFP do not substantially modify the scope, requirements, or structure of the assignment. They provide additional detail and guidance within the framework already established in the original RFP, and the modifications introduced through the amendment no. 5 to the RFP changed commercial aspects, (payment split, the Performance Security percentage, activation of NPV on recurrent costs) and not scope and does not require proposers to rework their technical solution as they do not alter the fundamental elements on which proposers have based their proposals during the past months.

Both clarifications and Amendment no. 5 to the RFP were issued on 26th of August, i.e. four weeks before the proposals submission deadline. As the clarifications mainly confirm rather than change the requirements, and considering that supplementary extensions of the submission deadline were already granted through Amendment no. 5 and subsequently through Amendment no. 6, proposers should have had sufficient time to incorporate them into their submissions.

In addition, the contract implementation calendar—together with the fixed closing date of the RAPID Project on **30 June 2028**—does not allow for any further extensions of the submission deadline without creating risks for timely contract execution and project completion.

We would also like to reassure you that maintaining the current deadline does not create any risk of breaching procurement principles, including the principle of **equal treatment** referenced in your message. All proposers have received the same documentation, the same clarifications, and the same timelines, and the procedure remains fully compliant with the applicable procurement framework.

CLARIFICATIONS

QUESTION 497

We would like to draw the Contracting Authority's attention to the fact that we have not yet received a response to the clarification questions submitted below regarding the tender documentation for RFP 01/RFP IT/2026 (IWRACS).

These two questions were submitted to the Contracting Authority through the document entitled "Request for Further Extension of the Proposal Submission Deadline and Clarifications," transmitted by e-mail on 28.07.2026.

As the deadline for submission of the tender is approaching, we kindly request the Contracting Authority to provide its answers to the following questions, in order to allow us sufficient time to prepare our offer in full compliance with the requirements:

1. Regarding Section "7.2 Specific Experience," please confirm that by "Cloud-based or hybrid deployment" it is understood that the systems/applications from the contracts submitted as evidence of similar experience were developed using cloud or hybrid technologies.
2. Please confirm whether our understanding is correct, namely that the contracts submitted as similar experience must include workflow automation or document management functionality.

We would appreciate your prompt response, given that these clarifications are essential for the finalization of our technical and financial proposal.

Answer 1 to QUESTION 497

The requirement under Sub-Factor 1.4.2 refers specifically to a **"Cloud-based or hybrid deployment"** of the Information System implemented under the referenced contract. Therefore, the relevant similar contract must demonstrate that the Information System was deployed and operated under a cloud-based or hybrid deployment model.

The mere use of cloud-related technologies during software development, without demonstrating a cloud-based or hybrid deployment of the implemented Information System, would not by itself demonstrate compliance with this characteristic.

The RFP expressly requires each similar contract to demonstrate, among other characteristics, a cloud-based or hybrid deployment.

Answer 2 to QUESTION 497

Each qualifying similar contract must demonstrate **both workflow automation and document management functionalities**.

The wording "workflow automation and document management functionalities" constitutes one of the cumulative minimum characteristics under Sub-Factor 1.4.2. It is not an alternative requirement under which either workflow automation or document management alone would be sufficient.

QUESTION 498

Further to the Answers provided under Clarification No. 1 (Q46, Q332, Q407, Q408), confirming that supporting documents may be submitted in Romanian accompanied by a plain (non-certified) English translation, we kindly request that the Contracting Authority

go one step further and accept supporting documents originally issued in Romanian in their original language only, without any English translation.

Reasons:

A. The supporting documentation (CVs, diplomas, certificates, recommendation letters, acceptance certificates, financial and corporate documents) runs to several hundred pages;

B. Given that Romanian is the official language of the Client and many supporting documents originating from Romanian Contracting Authorities are issued exclusively in Romanian;

C. Translation of such volume creates a real risk of inconsistencies with the Romanian original on points that matter for compliance (values, dates, technical characteristics), which could unfairly disadvantage the Proposer.

We would appreciate your confirmation that Romanian-issued supporting documents may be submitted without an English translation.

Answer QUESTION 498

The request is not accepted.

In accordance with ITP 10.1, supporting documents that are submitted in a language other than the language of the Proposal must be accompanied by an accurate translation of the relevant passages into the language specified for the Proposal.

Accordingly, legal documents, supporting documents and evidence of qualifications issued in Romanian may be submitted in their original Romanian language, accompanied by an accurate English translation of the relevant passages necessary for the evaluation of the Proposal..

The English translation submitted with the Proposal is **not required to be certified or legalized**.

QUESTION 499

Category A. Hosting (CPG ADR / Azure Stack Hub) & Disaster Recovery

A1 – Guaranteed CPG capabilities for sizing.

Notwithstanding the answers to Questions 14 and 399 (final architecture confirmed during the analysis phase), for technical-proposal and sizing purposes please confirm which of the following are guaranteed available on the CPG ADR (Azure Stack Hub) environment at contract commencement: (a) container orchestration (Kubernetes / AKS on Azure Stack Hub); (b) a managed relational database resource provider (SQL / MySQL / PostgreSQL); (c) a Key Vault / secrets service; (d) a container registry; (e) an application-gateway / WAF service; (f) GPU-capable VM SKUs. Where a capability cannot be guaranteed, please confirm that a fully self-managed IaaS (VM-only) design is acceptable and that the Beneficiary will provision the corresponding compute and storage.

A2 – Disaster-recovery topology.

Does the CPG ADR environment provide a second physical location / region / stamp suitable for disaster-recovery replication to meet the RTO 8h / RPO 4h baseline (Questions 347 and 488), and what inter-site connectivity (bandwidth, latency) will the Beneficiary provide between the Production and Disaster-Recovery environments?

A3 – Outbound connectivity to the Microsoft cloud.

Given that identity and access management brokers Microsoft Entra ID (P1) and the solution integrates with Exchange Online / Teams / Microsoft 365 (Questions 16 and 17, Amendment No. 5 Section 0.3), please confirm that the CPG ADR environment permits the required outbound HTTPS connectivity to Microsoft 365 / Entra ID endpoints for real-time federation, mail and Graph integration.

A4 – Object-storage provisioning and retention.

SIGAR technical dossiers (700 MB - 5 GB each) and approximately 275,054 DMS-RAE documents per year drive multi-terabyte storage growth (tens of terabytes over five years). Please confirm (a) that the Beneficiary provisions the required object/blob storage capacity, and (b) any storage tiering, retention, or archival-to-cold-storage constraints that the solution should be designed and sized for.

A5 – Platform-lifecycle risk allocation (follow-up to Question 398).

With reference to the answer to Question 398 (Clarification No. 1) and to Amendment No. 5, Article 12 (Section 1.6.0): Azure Stack Hub follows the Microsoft Modern Lifecycle Policy, under which continued support is contingent on the platform being kept on a current update version (N / N-1 / N-2); Microsoft has designated Azure Local as the successor platform, and certain Azure Stack Hub-adjacent capabilities are being retired (for example, monitoring support for AKS-Engine, effective 14 September 2026). Given that the hosting environment (CPG ADR) is selected, provided, operated and updated by the Beneficiary (Questions 13, 26 and 34), please confirm that: (a) keeping the underlying platform in a Microsoft-supported state - including applying platform updates and any future migration to a successor platform - is the Beneficiary's responsibility; and (b) any unavailability, security exposure or incompatibility arising from the platform being unsupported, un-updated or retired by its vendor is treated as a Purchaser-attributable event under GCC Clause 40 and excluded from the Consultant's availability/SLA and liquidated-damages obligations, consistent with Amendment No. 5, Section 1.6.0.

Supporting Microsoft references: (i) Azure Stack Hub product lifecycle (Modern Lifecycle Policy) - <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/lifecycle/products/azure-stack-hub> ; (ii) retirement of monitoring support for AKS-Engine, effective 14 September 2026 - <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/updates?id=azure-monitor-for-aksengine-will-not-be-supported-on-14-september-2026> ; (iii) retirement of IoT Hub on Azure Stack Hub (preview) - <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/updates?id=azure-iot-hub-on-azure-stack-hub-preview-will-be-retired-and-it-will-not-go-to-ga> ; (iv) Azure Local designated as the successor platform - <https://techcommunity.microsoft.com/blog/azurearcblog/introducing-azure-local-cloud-infrastructure-for-distributed-locations-enabled-b/4296017> .

Answer A1 to QUESTION 499 - Guaranteed CPG capabilities for sizing

The availability of the individual managed services listed above cannot be guaranteed at Proposal stage. The RFP provides that the solution shall support deployment within the ADR Government Private Cloud based on Microsoft Azure Stack Hub or equivalent, or alternatively within the NARW Azure tenant, using **IaaS and/or SaaS models**. The Proposer is responsible for defining and sizing the required CPU, memory, storage, network connectivity, availability and security requirements.

As further clarified, IaaS capabilities are expected to be available, while the availability of specific managed database, container, storage, security or other platform services shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Accordingly, where the required managed services are not available, the Proposer may propose a technically justified IaaS-based architecture using self-managed components on virtual infrastructure, provided that the proposed architecture complies with all functional, security, performance, availability, backup, disaster-recovery and interoperability requirements and is compatible with the approved hosting environment.

Answer A2 to QUESTION 499 - Disaster-recovery topology

A specific second ADR physical location, region or Azure Stack Hub stamp cannot be guaranteed at Proposal stage.

For bid sizing purposes, the following baseline recovery objectives apply:

- ROWaterDATA: RTO 8 hours / RPO 4 hours;
- SIGAR: RTO 8 hours / RPO 4 hours;
- DMS-RAE: RTO 8 hours / RPO 4 hours;
- Portal / Intranet / Extranet: RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours;
- non-critical reporting, analytical and publication components: RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours.

Where a component is shared by several subsystems, the most stringent applicable RTO/RPO shall apply. The DR environment shall constitute a separate recovery environment, preferably geographically separated from the primary environment and located within the European Union. The detailed location, architecture and recovery model shall be finalized during the analysis phase.

The actual ADR DR topology, available second-site/stamp capability, inter-site bandwidth, latency and connectivity characteristics can only be provided by the Beneficiary/ADR once the target hosting environment is confirmed.

Answer A3 to QUESTION 499

The RFP requires interoperability with the Beneficiary's Microsoft Entra ID, Microsoft 365, Exchange Online and Teams environment. NARW currently operates an Entra ID tenant and Microsoft 365 / Exchange Online environment, and the proposed solution is required to integrate with this existing institutional environment.

At this stage, however, it cannot be confirmed that the final hosting environment will be the ADR Government Private Cloud. The final hosting option shall be confirmed during the

analysis phase, in accordance with the RFP provisions regarding deployment in the ADR Government Private Cloud or, alternatively, in the NARW Azure tenant.

Accordingly, the specific outbound connectivity requirements and technical arrangements, including HTTPS access to Microsoft 365 / Entra ID endpoints, application registration, SSO, permissions, firewall/proxy rules and other security configurations, shall be defined and confirmed during the analysis phase based on the hosting environment ultimately approved by the Beneficiary.

Answer A4 to QUESTION 499

The underlying cloud storage infrastructure required for the approved solution shall be provided through the Beneficiary's approved cloud hosting environment.

The original RFP specifies that data storage shall be provided through cloud-based storage services, while the Contractor is responsible for determining the detailed sizing and architecture required for the solution.

Annex 12 provides the currently available indicative sizing baseline. The final document volumes, growth assumptions, storage capacity, retention requirements and related sizing shall be validated and refined during the analysis phase.

Answer A5 to QUESTION 499

The requested confirmation cannot be provided in the form proposed. With respect to point (a), it is clarified that responsibility for maintaining the proposed solution in a supported, compatible and operational state in relation to IWRACS requirements lies with the Contractor. This includes identifying relevant platform-lifecycle dependencies, limitations and risks and implementing any solution-side updates, upgrades, configuration changes or adaptations required throughout the contractual period.

This responsibility does not extend to the operational administration of cloud infrastructure or services that are expressly provided or managed by the Beneficiary or other public authorities as ADR. Any platform-level actions that can only be performed by the operator of the hosting infrastructure remain with the respective infrastructure operator; however, the Contractor remains responsible for cooperating with such actions and for adapting its solution as necessary to ensure continued compliance with the Contract requirements.

At the same time, Amendment No. 5 expressly excludes from availability measurement outages or degradation caused by cloud infrastructure or other third-party infrastructure outside the Contractor's reasonable control, as well as failures of infrastructure, services or dependencies provided or managed by the Beneficiary.

Such an event is not, however, automatically classified in advance as a Purchaser default for purposes of GCC Clause 40. GCC 40 provides for extension of time where delay results from a Change, Force Majeure, Purchaser default or another matter specifically identified in the Contract. The entitlement and corresponding extension must therefore be assessed according to the circumstances and actual impact of the relevant event.

QUESTION 500

Category B. Identity, Security & Compliance

B1 – NIS2 applicability.

Please confirm whether NARW / the IWRACS system is classified as an essential or important entity under the NIS2 Directive (as transposed into Romanian legislation), since this materially affects the security controls, incident-reporting and audit scope to be designed and priced.

B2 – Multi-factor authentication scope.

Please confirm whether multi-factor / strong authentication is required for (a) all users, (b) internal users only, or (c) privileged/administrative accounts only, across the public Extranet and the internal components.

B3 – Electronic Seal provision.

Further to the answers to Questions 437 and 438 (the Beneficiary provides certificates and trust services), please confirm that the Beneficiary will provide the organizational Electronic Seal certificate(s) and the associated qualified trust-service / seal-creation service, and whether remote (server-side) seal creation is required.

Answer B1 to QUESTION 500

At present, NARW had not been formally designated or officially registered as an Essential Entity under the national implementation framework associated with NIS2. The Beneficiary also stated that the relevant national institutional processes and analyses were ongoing.

The proposed solution shall nevertheless comply with the cybersecurity, resilience, access-control, auditability, monitoring and security requirements of the RFP and with the legislation applicable at the time of implementation.

Answer B2 to QUESTION 500

Strong authentication shall include MFA for internal and privileged users, implemented through Microsoft Entra ID or the agreed identity provider in accordance with the Beneficiary's security policies.

The current baseline requirements do not establish a blanket MFA requirement for every anonymous or registered public Extranet user.

Additional authentication requirements may be configured according to the approved security architecture, user category, risk level and applicable institutional policy.

Answer B3 to QUESTION 500

Confirmed with clarification.

The solution shall support qualified electronic signatures by authorized users and electronic seals applied on behalf of NARW.

Qualified certificates, trust-service arrangements, signing platforms and related subscriptions required for these functions shall be provided or facilitated by the Beneficiary and shall not be included as procurement costs in the Proposer's Financial Proposal.

The RFP does not prescribe at bidding stage that electronic sealing must specifically use a remote/server-side seal-creation model. The applicable signing/sealing method, workflow and validation approach shall be defined and configured during the analysis phase.

QUESTION 501

Category C. Licensing

C1 – COTS licence duration to be priced.

Further to the answer to Question 59 (all licences to remain operational throughout the implementation and warranty period), and given that the contract completion date has been amended to 25 June 2028 and the per-subsystem technical-support periods are four (4) / four (4) / four (4) / two (2) months, please confirm the exact end date that the priced COTS licences and subscriptions must cover.

Answer C1 to QUESTION 501

There is no single fixed calendar end date applicable to all COTS licences and subscriptions.

The SCC expressly provides that the Warranty Period for the System and all Subsystems is **twenty-four (24) months from the date of Operational Acceptance / Go-Live.**

For DMS-RAE and the Portal, the Proposal Price shall therefore provide licensing rights sufficient to allow the Beneficiary to continue using the proposed COTS solution without interruption and without additional mandatory licensing fees throughout the applicable warranty period.

The four-month Technical Support period introduced by Amendment No. 5 is a separate contractual support obligation and does not shorten the 24-month warranty/licensing requirement. Amendment No. 5 confirms four months of Technical Support for DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA and Portal and two months for SIGAR.

Accordingly:

- DMS-RAE licence end date = actual DMS-RAE Operational Acceptance date + 24 months.
- Portal licence end date = actual Portal Operational Acceptance date + 24 months.

Licences/subscriptions required before Go-Live for installation, configuration, testing or deployment shall also be included for the applicable pre-Go-Live period.

QUESTION 502

Category D. Integration & external systems

D1 – EU reporting platforms and formats.

Please identify the target EU reporting platforms and formats that ROwaterDATA must produce for each directive (for example WISE, Reportnet 3, EIONET, or national gateways), so that the reporting and data-export components can be scoped - or confirm that only file deliverables in Beneficiary-approved formats are required at Go-Live.

D2 – Existing external interfaces at the start of development.

Further to the answer to Question 23 (availability not guaranteed), for the systems SIGAR must integrate with (ANMAP, ArcGIS Enterprise 11.x, ECA-RO, HIDRA, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Cadastre, ASIS/ATHOS), please confirm which interfaces already exist and are documented today, so that integration effort and the interim Excel-import fallback can be correctly allocated per system.

Answer D1 to QUESTION 502

It is not confirmed that only generic file deliverables are required.

ROwaterDATA shall support preparation, validation, transformation and export of datasets in the structures and formats required by the applicable national and EU reporting frameworks.

The RFP expressly envisages automated transformation to reporting formats and refers, among others, to WISE, DanubeGIS and ICPDR reporting requirements.

The following baseline has already been clarified:

- **Nitrates Directive:** standardized tabular reporting, currently mainly structured Excel-type templates together with GIS-related information;
- **Water Framework Directive:** datasets and exports compatible with applicable WISE reporting requirements and schemas, including XML-based structures where applicable;
- **EQS:** export structure and file format according to the reporting specifications applicable at the relevant reporting cycle;
- current reporting may involve manual web-platform upload, structured file exchange, GIS submission or other applicable mechanisms;
- where an officially supported API or automated submission mechanism is available and accessible, future interoperability and automation shall be supported where applicable.

The detailed platform, schema, template, version and submission method applicable to each individual reporting obligation shall be confirmed and approved during the analysis phase.

Answer D2 to QUESTION 502

A complete authoritative list of currently operational and fully documented interfaces cannot be provided during this stage.

The Beneficiary has expressly stated that it cannot guarantee that all external interfaces, schemas, endpoints, authentication arrangements, rate limits, sandboxes or test data will be available at the start of development. Available documentation and stakeholder access shall be facilitated during the analysis phase, and each interface contract shall then be defined and approved with the relevant system owner.

For ANMAP, Water Cadastre, HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar and ECA-RO, the API/file/database-access mechanism and test arrangements shall be confirmed during analysis. Where an API

is available it is the preferred mechanism; where no API is available, controlled import/export, direct database access or another approved fallback may be used.

Therefore, the Proposer shall price the required IWRACS-side interoperability capability in accordance with the RFP and shall accommodate the approved fallback mechanism where a target interface is not available.

QUESTION 503

Category E. Functional scope

E1 – SEICA rules effort basis.

Further to the answer to Question 32 (SEICA content structured during the analysis phase), for bid effort estimation of the SEICA rules/forms engine please provide an indicative count of project categories and validation rule sets under Order no. 828/2019 (Tables 1-4), or confirm that the effort is to be based on Annex 3 as-is.

E2 – Whistleblowing channel.

Please confirm the legal basis and confidentiality standard for the Portal whistleblowing channel (EU Directive 2019/1937 / Romanian Law no. 361/2022) and whether an anonymous two-way channel with case management is required at Go-Live or is a future capability.

E3 – Public Transparency Report.

Please confirm whether the SIGAR Public Transparency Report (marked as optional) is in scope for the initial Go-Live.

Answer E1 to QUESTION 503

For Proposal preparation, the Proposer shall use the RFP requirements, Annex 3 and the applicable legal framework as the baseline for estimating the required SEICA functionality.

SEICA validation shall be implemented through deterministic rules, decision tables and threshold validations.

The number of project categories, the complete thresholds and parameters, and the complete Tables 1-4 validation rules shall be provided or validated by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Answer E2 to QUESTION 503

The whistleblowing functionality shall comply with the applicable legal framework, including Romanian Law No. 361/2022.

The original RFP requires a secure and confidential whistleblowing form, attachment of supporting documents and secure subsequent communication of responses.

Clarification No. 1 further states that specific requirements regarding anonymity, confidentiality, retention, access restrictions, secure communication and procedural handling shall be provided or validated by the Authority and approved during the analysis phase.

Accordingly, secure confidential submission and secure subsequent communication form part of the baseline scope.

However, an anonymous two-way communication model and the precise case-management/procedural rules cannot be confirmed as mandatory at bidding stage; these shall be defined and approved during analysis.

Answer E3 to QUESTION 503

The Public Transparency Report is not a mandatory baseline requirement for initial Go-Live. The RFP expressly identifies the "Public Transparency Report" as optional, describing it as an annual report presenting anonymized statistics for public communication.

Accordingly, it shall not be treated as a mandatory Operational Acceptance criterion for initial Go-Live unless the Beneficiary subsequently expressly requires its implementation through the applicable contractual mechanism.

QUESTION 504

Category F. Commercial / SLA

F1 – Definition of NARW working hours.

Please define the working-hours window (days, hours, time zone) used as the clock basis for the P2-P4 SLA response and resolution times (Section 5.1.3).

Answer F1 to QUESTION 504

The RFP and Clarification No. 1 establishes that:

- P1 response and resolution times are measured on a 24/7 calendar-hour basis;
- P2-P4 response and resolution times are measured during NARW working hours.

To calculating the P2-P4 SLA response and resolution times, NARW working hours shall be understood as follows:

- Monday to Thursday: 08:00-17:00;
- Friday: 08:00-14:00.

The applicable time zone is Romanian local time.

QUESTION 505

Regarding the requirement 1.4.2 Specific Experience

"Participation as a prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, sub-contractor, in at least 3 contracts within the last 5 years, each with a value of at least the equivalent of EUR 1,000,000, that have been successfully and substantially completed and that are similar to the proposed Information System. Each similar contract shall demonstrate implementation of an Information System that meets the following minimum characteristics:

- Multi-module system (at least 3 functional components);

- Integration with at least two external applications or systems;
- Cloud-based or hybrid deployment;
- Workflow automation and document management functionalities;
- Role-based access control;
- Successful Operational Acceptance confirmed by an Operational Acceptance Certificate (or equivalent).”

we kindly request the following clarification:

Could the Purchaser confirm whether Proposers are allowed to demonstrate compliance with these minimum characteristics cumulatively, across several of the presented similar contracts (i.e., each contract evidencing one or more of the required functionalities, with all functionalities covered collectively by the set of contracts submitted), rather than requiring that each single similar contract, individually, demonstrates all of the listed minimum characteristics simultaneously?

We would also like to note that, as currently worded, this requirement appears to unduly restrict competition. Requiring every single contract to individually satisfy the full set of functional characteristics is a very restrictive combination that few actual projects are likely to meet in practice, regardless of the bidder's genuine experience and capability. Furthermore, this restriction also undermines the very purpose of the joint venture mechanism: since, per the applicable footnote, only each JV member's own share/contracts are considered, and each such contract must still independently meet both the minimum value and all listed functional characteristics, a joint venture cannot effectively be used to combine complementary experience among its members either. We would appreciate the Purchaser's confirmation or clarification on this point, to ensure a level playing field and to avoid unnecessarily restricting competition.

Answer to QUESTION 505

No. The RFP expressly states that **each similar contract** shall demonstrate implementation of an Information System meeting all of the specified minimum characteristics.

Clarification No. 1 has already addressed this matter and expressly rejected the proposed cumulative approach.

Each qualifying contract must individually:

- meet the minimum value requirement of EUR 1,000,000;
- demonstrate all minimum similarity characteristics required under Sub-Factor 1.4.2.

The characteristics may not be distributed or aggregated across different reference contracts.

For a Joint Venture, the required number of qualifying contracts may be provided by different JV members, but every contract relied upon must independently satisfy the applicable minimum value and similarity requirements.

QUESTION 506

Regarding the minimum characteristic requiring "Workflow automation and document management functionalities", we kindly request the Purchaser to confirm that either of these two functionalities – workflow automation or document management – will be taken into consideration, and that the presence of either one shall be deemed sufficient for this requirement to be considered as met.

We consider that requiring both functionalities to be present simultaneously within the same similar contract may unduly restrict competition, as these are distinct functional capabilities that are not always implemented together within a single Information System, even where the system is otherwise comparable in scale and complexity to the proposed solution.

Answer to QUESTION 506

No. The requirement is cumulative.

Each qualifying similar contract must demonstrate **both workflow automation and document management functionalities**.

The expression "workflow automation and document management functionalities" is one of the cumulative minimum characteristics specified under Sub-Factor 1.4.2, and Clarification No. 1 expressly confirms that the characteristics are not alternative requirements.

Accordingly, a contract demonstrating only workflow automation without document management, or only document management without workflow automation, would not satisfy this specific minimum characteristic as currently defined in the RFP.

Mihai CONSTANTINESCU
PMU DIRECTOR

