MINISTERUL MEDIULUI,
APELOR ȘI PĂDURILOR

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

Registration no: UMPRAPID/79747/26.08.2026

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

CLARIFICATION No. 1 to the Request for clarification

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 the clarification request questions submitted so far under this above procedure.

Question 1: Having regard to the provisions of the Implementation Schedule, Section VII (§A — Implementation Schedule Table): *"Installation (weeks from T0)"* and *"Acceptance (weeks from T0)"*, together with SCC for GCC Clause 8.1, Section VIII: *"The Supplier shall commence work on the System within: 5 days from the Effective Date of the Contract"*, please confirm that T0, used as the reference point for all weekly milestones in the Implementation Schedule, corresponds to the Effective Date of the Contract as defined under GCC Clause 1.1(ix) of Section VIII (*"the date of fulfillment of all conditions specified in Article 3 of the Contract Agreement"*).

Answer to Question 1:

Confirmed. For the purposes of the Implementation Schedule, T0 shall be considered the Effective Date of the Contract, as defined under GCC Clause 1.1(ix). All implementation milestones expressed as "weeks from T0" shall be calculated from that date. The requirement for the Supplier to commence work within 5 days from the Effective Date remains applicable.

Question 2: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.4.7 — Hosting and Deployment Requirements): *"The final hosting option and deployment model shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase, based on institutional constraints and Beneficiary approval"*, and taking into account that Proposers are required to commit to specific COTS solutions for DMS-RAE and the Portal at proposal submission, including Manufacturer's Authorizations, please confirm that (a) a Proposer offering COTS solutions that support both IaaS and SaaS deployment models satisfies the submission requirements without prejudice to the final hosting decision, and (b) no substitution of the proposed COTS product will be required if the hosting model confirmed during the analysis phase differs from the model assumed in the proposal.

Answer to Question 2:

Confirmed. As specified in Section 1.4.7, both IaaS and SaaS deployment models are acceptable under the RFP, subject to Beneficiary approval and compliance with the applicable technical, security, operational, and contractual requirements.

Proposers shall identify and commit to the proposed COTS products at the proposal stage, including the submission of the required Manufacturer's Authorizations. The proposed COTS products are not required to support both IaaS and SaaS deployment models simultaneously. However, the proposed deployment model and the proposed product shall be compatible with each other and with the hosting option ultimately approved by the Beneficiary. Confirmed that no substitution of the proposed COTS product will be required if the hosting model confirmed in the analysis phase differs from the proposed one.

Question 3: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.7.3 — Key Expert requirements), which require, for positions PM, BA, SA, TL, DEV and CSE, demonstrated delivery of *"at least two IT systems of comparable complexity"* or *"at least 3 systems of similar complexity"*, please clarify the minimum objective criteria by which "comparable complexity" or "similar complexity" will be assessed during the technical evaluation of key expert CVs (e.g., contract value threshold, number of end-users, number of integrated external systems, or other measurable parameters).

Answer to Question 3:

The terms "comparable complexity" and "similar complexity" are not intended to refer to a single quantitative criterion such as contract value, number of users, or number of integrations. The assessment will be based on the overall nature, scope, and complexity of the referenced assignments in relation to the requirements of the proposed scope and the objectives of the project.

Relevant factors may include, as applicable, the complexity of the business processes supported, the number and diversity of stakeholders involved, the scale of implementation, the level of system integration, the volume and criticality of managed data, the use of cloud technologies, workflow automation, document management, reporting capabilities, security requirements, and other technical or organizational characteristics.

The Evaluation Committee will assess the relevance and comparable referenced assignments based on the information provided in the CVs and the supporting evidence documents submitted by the Proposer (e.g., contracts, acceptance certificates, client references, recommendation letters, or equivalent documents), in accordance with the requirements and evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP.

Question 4: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.2.3 — Dataset Management Component): *"The component shall allow the definition, configuration, and centralised management of datasets used in NARW's institutional activities, estimated at almost 350 distinct datasets"*, please confirm whether the figure of approximately 350 datasets constitutes a fixed contractual scope commitment or an indicative estimate subject to revision during the analysis phase, and whether a material deviation from this figure identified during the analysis phase would entitle the Supplier to request a contract variation under GCC Clause 39.

Answer to Question 4:

The reference to "almost 350 distinct datasets" represents the Beneficiary's current estimate and is provided for planning and proposal preparation purposes. The Dataset Management Component shall provide a configurable platform capable of defining, managing, and maintaining datasets and their associated workflows in accordance with the requirements of Section 1.3.2.3.

Proposers shall base their proposals on the information provided in the RFP, including Annex 1 – *ROwaterDATA - Catalog of Existing Datasets and Illustrative Samples*, which provides representative examples of dataset structures, attributes, relationships, and complexity levels. The complete list of datasets currently known and managed within NARW will be provided by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. The Consultant shall support the Beneficiary during the analysis phase in reviewing, structuring, classifying and rationalizing the datasets to be managed in ROwaterDATA. This may include, where applicable, structuring data currently available in unstructured or semi-structured formats, consolidating two or more existing datasets into a single coherent dataset, defining metadata, attributes, relationships, validation rules and workflows, and applying good practices for dataset governance.

Therefore, the identification of a different number of datasets (less or more) than the current estimate shall not, by itself, constitute grounds for a contract variation. Any other contract modification shall be subject to the applicable contractual provisions, including GCC Clause 39.

Question 5: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 12.1(g), Section VIII: *"Each module includes a technical support period of 12 months or until March 2028 (whichever occurs first), starting from Go-Live. One hundred percent (100%) of the total price [...] for all support services, will be paid after 30 March 2028"*, and the Portal Operational Acceptance milestone A1.18 in the Implementation Schedule, Section VII, which sets Portal Go-Live (R5) at *"March 2028"*, please clarify how the 12-month post-Go-Live support period for the Portal module will be applied if the R5 milestone is achieved in March 2028, and confirm whether the 30 March 2028 payment date will be adjusted if the Portal Go-Live occurs at or after that date.

Answer to Question 5:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

In accordance with the amended SCC Clause 12.1(g), each of the first three (3) subsystems (DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA and PORTAL) shall include a technical support period of four (4) months commencing from its respective Go-Live date and two (2) months technical support period shall apply to the fourth subsystem (SIGAR).

Accordingly, the duration of Technical Support Services is no longer linked to a uniform 12-month period and may differ between subsystems depending on the timing of their respective Go-Live milestones.

Payment for Technical Support Services shall be made based on the actual support services effectively provided. As specified in the amended Recurrent Cost Sub-Tables, payment for Technical Support Services shall be made only for the Technical Support Services actually provided and accepted by the Purchaser, based on the actual support period applicable to each subsystem and in accordance with the RFP provisions.

Therefore, the support payment mechanism is not dependent on any single subsystem reaching Go-Live before a specific calendar date, but on the actual support services delivered and accepted in accordance with the Contract.

Question 6: Having regard to the provisions of the Implementation Schedule, Section VII (§A): *"Details from Annex 15 shall be used by the Proposer when preparing the Preliminary Project Plan and shall* *serve as the authoritative reference for the detailed execution of both the custom-developed components and the configuration/customization activities required for the Portal subsystem"*, please clarify whether the Proposer's Preliminary Project Plan may propose alternative phasing, sequencing, or effort distribution that departs from the structure defined in Annex 15, and if so, what approval process applies and whether such deviations would affect the contractual milestone dates in the Implementation Schedule.

Answer to Question 6:

Annex 15 provides the reference implementation approach and the minimum activities expected by the Beneficiary for planning and execution purposes. Proposers shall prepare their Preliminary Project Plans considering the requirements, dependencies, milestones, and deliverables defined in the RFP.

The Preliminary Project Plan may propose reasonable refinements to the sequencing, phasing, resource allocation, or execution approach, provided that all contractual requirements, deliverables, dependencies, acceptance criteria, and milestone dates specified in the RFP are maintained.

Following contract award, the detailed Project Plan shall be reviewed and agreed with the Beneficiary during the project initiation and analysis phases. Any modification affecting contractual milestones, acceptance dates, or other contractual obligations shall be subject to the applicable contractual provisions and the Beneficiary's approval.

Question 7: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 29.4, Section VIII: *"The Warranty Period for the System and all Subsystems shall be twenty-four (24) months from the date of Operational Acceptance (Go-Live)"*, and noting that each subsystem (DMS-RAE, Portal, ROwaterDATA, SIGAR) has a separate Go-Live milestone in the Implementation Schedule, please confirm whether the 24-month warranty period applies independently per subsystem commencing from its respective Operational Acceptance date, or whether it commences from the date of Operational Acceptance of the complete integrated IWRACS system.

Answer to Question 7:

The warranty period shall apply independently to each subsystem and shall commence from the date of its respective Operational Acceptance (Go-Live) milestone, as defined in the Implementation Schedule.

Accordingly, DMS-RAE, Portal, ROwaterDATA, and SIGAR shall each have their own warranty period of twenty-four (24) months, calculated from the date on which the respective subsystem achieves Operational Acceptance. The warranty periods for the individual subsystems may therefore commence and expire on different dates.

The separate Go-Live milestones defined in the Implementation Schedule constitute the relevant reference points for calculating the warranty period applicable to each subsystem.

Question 8: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.7.5 — Replacement and Continuity of Key Experts): *"Any replacement proposed by the Proposer shall... receive prior written approval from the Beneficiary... ensure timely and complete knowledge transfer, without disrupting implementation activities"*, please clarify the maximum period within which the Beneficiary will review and respond to a key expert replacement request, and whether contractual obligations and milestone timelines are suspended during the Beneficiary's review period if the replacement is necessitated by circumstances beyond the Supplier's control.

Answer to Question 8:

Section 2.7.5 establishes the principles applicable to the replacement of Key Experts, including cases where the Beneficiary requests the replacement of a Key Expert whose performance is deemed insufficient. Any replacement shall be subject to the Beneficiary's prior written approval and shall comply with the requirements set forth in the RFP.

The Beneficiary will review replacement requests within a reasonable timeframe, taking into account the completeness of the supporting documentation submitted by the Proposer and the need to ensure continuity of project implementation. As specified in Section 2.7.5, the Proposer remains responsible for ensuring knowledge transfer and continuity of implementation activities, and the submission or review of a replacement request shall not, by itself, suspend contractual obligations or milestone dates, or other obligations under the Contract.

Question 9: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 12.1(c), Section VIII, which specifies that *"sixty percent (60%) of the total Contract Price allocated to [each] module... [is payable] against Installation"*, please clarify the definition of "Installation" for cloud-deployed components (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, DMS-RAE, Portal), specifically whether "Installation" corresponds to (a) successful deployment to the cloud environment and readiness for OAT commencement, or (b) completion and sign-off of Operational Acceptance Testing.

Answer to Question 9:

For the purposes of SCC for GCC Clause 12.1(c), "Installation" refers to the successful deployment, configuration, and operational readiness of the respective subsystem within the agreed cloud environment, as evidenced by the completion of the applicable Installation milestone(s) defined in the Implementation Schedule.
"Installation" does not correspond to the completion of Operational Acceptance Testing (OAT/UAT) or Operational Acceptance (Go-Live). These activities constitute separate implementation stages with their own deliverables, acceptance procedures, and milestones as defined in the RFP and the Implementation Schedule.
The Proposal shall include all licenses, subscription rights and other licensing entitlements required for the proposed solution to remain fully operational throughout the implementation period and the applicable warranty period.

Question 10: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 12.1, Section VIII, which states that currency conversion for evaluation uses the exchange rate *"the day before the deadline for submission of the Proposals"*, please confirm whether this same rate applies to the actual disbursement of recurrent cost payments under SCC GCC 12.1(g) scheduled for after 30 March 2028, or whether a different exchange rate mechanism applies at the time of payment.

Answer to Question 10:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

No. The exchange rate specified in ITP 36.2 is applicable exclusively for Proposal evaluation and comparison purposes and shall not apply to the actual disbursement of payments under the Contract.

Contract payments shall be governed by the payment provisions set forth in GCC Clause 12.1, SCC for GCC Clause 12.1 and the Contract Agreement, as updated through **Amendment No. 5**.

Where conversion into RON is required for payment purposes, the applicable exchange rate shall be the official exchange rate published by the National Bank of Romania and applicable on the date of the corresponding invoice.

Accordingly, recurrent cost payments under SCC GCC Clause 12.1(g), including recurrent cost payments shall not be linked to the exchange rate used for Proposal evaluation. Such payments shall follow the exchange rate mechanism applicable to Contract payments, namely the official exchange rate published by the National Bank of Romania and applicable on the date of the corresponding invoice.

Question 11: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 12.1(g), Section VIII: *"Each module includes a technical support period of 12 months or until March 2028 (whichever occurs first), starting from Go-Live"*, please confirm whether the Supplier is entitled to a proportional adjustment of the recurrent cost price if any subsystem's Go-Live occurs late due to Beneficiary-attributable delays, such that the resulting support period (measured as the lesser of 12 months and the period to 30 March 2028) is materially shorter than 12 months.

Answer to Question 11:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

In accordance with the amended SCC Clause 12.1(g), each of the first three (3) subsystems (DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA and PORTAL) shall include a technical support period of four (4) months commencing from its respective Go-Live date and two (2) months technical support period shall apply to the fourth subsystem (SIGAR).

Payment for Technical Support Services shall be made only for the Technical Support Services actually provided and accepted by the Purchaser, based on the actual support period applicable to each subsystem and in accordance with the RFP provisions, as specified in the amended Recurrent Cost Sub-Tables.

Accordingly, the amount payable for Technical Support Services shall be determined based on the actual support services delivered and accepted under the Contract. The payment milestone "R5 – Recurrent Cost Items – Support & Maintenance" is a contractual payment milestone and shall not be interpreted as modifying the applicable support obligations or support periods established for the individual subsystems.

Question 12: Having regard to the provisions of SCC for GCC Clause 13.3.1, Section VIII: *"The Performance Security shall be denominated in RON for an amount equal to 8 (eight) percent of the Contract Price"*, and noting that GCC Clause 13.3.4 provides for reduction of the security after Operational Acceptance of the entire System, please clarify whether the Performance Security will be reduced proportionally upon Operational Acceptance of individual subsystems (DMS-RAE, Portal, ROwaterDATA, SIGAR), or only upon Operational Acceptance of the complete integrated IWRACS system.

Answer to Question 12:

The reduction of the Performance Security shall be applied in accordance with GCC Clause 13.3.4, which expressly refers to the Operational Acceptance of the **System**.
Accordingly, the Performance Security shall be reduced from 8% to 2% after Operational Acceptance of the IWRACS System as an integrated whole. The Operational Acceptance or Go-Live of individual subsystems (DMS-RAE, Portal, ROwaterDATA, or SIGAR) shall not, by itself, trigger a proportional reduction of the Performance Security.

Question 13: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§3.0 — Technology Specifications): *"Computing resources shall be provisioned using Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) and/or Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) models"*, and noting that the Recurrent Cost tables in Section IV do not include a line item for ongoing cloud infrastructure subscription costs (compute, storage, networking), please confirm whether these costs are (a) to be included by the Proposer in the recurrent cost price schedule, (b) borne directly by the Beneficiary under a separate agreement, or (c) to be determined during the analysis and design phase.

Answer to Question 13:

The costs associated with the hosting infrastructure (e.g., cloud compute, storage, networking, and related platform services) are not included within the Recurrent Cost items defined in the RFP.
As specified in Section 1.4.7, the final hosting and deployment model will be confirmed during the analysis, based on the agreed target environment and Beneficiary approval. The Proposer shall define the required infrastructure sizing, architecture, and technical requirements, while the provision of the hosting environment and associated infrastructure services will be addressed separately by the Beneficiary.
Accordingly, Proposers are not expected to include ongoing cloud infrastructure consumption costs within the Recurrent Cost price schedule unless expressly required by the proposed licensing model of the offered solution.

Question 14: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.4.7 — Hosting and Deployment Requirements), which identifies the Government Private Cloud (ADR) and NARW's Azure Tenant as candidate hosting options, please confirm (a) whether the ADR Private Cloud environment currently supports container-based (Docker/Kubernetes) deployments as described in CS §2.2.6, (b) whether Proposers may propose alternative cloud providers (AWS, GCP) if neither ADR nor NARW's Azure Tenant is technically feasible for the proposed solution, and (c) what approval process would apply for an alternative provider.

Answer to Question 14:

(a) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm the detailed technical capabilities of the future hosting environment, including the availability of specific container orchestration technologies. Proposers shall prepare their proposals in accordance with the requirements set forth in the RFP. The detailed hosting architecture and deployment approach will be confirmed during the analysis.
(b) No. As specified in Section 1.4.7, the target hosting environments considered under this Contract are the future Government Private Cloud managed by ADR and/or the NARW Azure Tenant, subject to the hosting option approved by the Beneficiary.
(c) Any deviation from the hosting options specified in the RFP would require the Beneficiary's prior written approval and would be subject to applicable contractual provisions, technical assessment, security requirements, regulatory constraints, and institutional policies.

Question 15: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.6 — SIGAR Integration with External Systems): *"ECA-RO: Automatic retrieval of official data required for documentation analysis, through APIs or direct database connection"*, and Annex 13 of Section VII, which describes a phased integration approach: *"the system will include both direct data import mechanisms and secure API connections or direct database access, as applicable: Initial and controlled data import – in the first stage, data will be uploaded via Excel files"*, followed by API or direct database access, please clarify (a) which integration method (Excel import, REST API, or direct database connection) is required to be fully operational at the time of SIGAR Operational Acceptance, (b) whether the Excel-based import stage satisfies the OAT acceptance criteria or whether API/database integration must be demonstrated at Go-Live, and (c) whether technical documentation and a sandbox environment for ECA-RO will be made available to the Proposer prior to the start of development activities.

Answer to Question 15:

(a) The integration approach described in Annex 13 shall be implemented in accordance with the actual technical capabilities, interfaces, and access mechanisms available during the implementation period. The final integration method for each external system will be confirmed during the analysis phase in coordination with the relevant stakeholders.
(b) Where API or direct database connectivity is not available or cannot be established during the implementation period due to dependencies on third-party systems, the controlled data import mechanisms described in Annex 13 may be used as an interim operational solution. The applicable acceptance criteria for each integration will be agreed during the analysis phase, considering the technical constraints and capabilities of each external system.
(c) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm the availability of technical documentation, APIs, database access, or sandbox/test environments for ECA-RO. Where available, relevant documentation, technical specifications, access details, and testing arrangements will be made available during the analysis phase and further supported during the implementation phase, in coordination with the respective system owners.

Question 16: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.1.1 — Identity, Roles, Access Control): *"Integration/synchronization with Active Directory / Entra ID"* and *"Maintain institutional structure... synchronized with Entra ID and ASIS"*, please confirm (a) whether NARW holds an active Microsoft Entra ID (Azure AD) tenant, (b) the current license tier of that tenant, and (c) whether the Proposer will be permitted to register applications and configure SSO within the existing tenant or whether a dedicated tenant must be provisioned.

Answer to Question 16:

(a) Yes. NARW currently operates a Microsoft Entra ID as part of its existing IT environment.

(b) NARW currently maintains Microsoft Entra ID P1 licenses. Additional details relevant to the implementation of the proposed solution will be provided during the analysis phase, where required.

(c) The proposed solution is expected to integrate with the Beneficiary's existing identity and access management environment. The detailed integration approach, including application registration, SSO configuration, permissions, security requirements, and governance arrangements, will be agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 17: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.4 §B — DMS-RAE Email Capture): *"Support import, registration, and classification of e-mails... via integration with Microsoft Exchange Online"*, and Section VII (§1.3.4 §H): *"Teams/Exchange integration"*, please confirm whether NARW currently holds a Microsoft 365 / Exchange Online subscription covering all IWRACS users, and whether the Proposer is required to include M365 licences as a priced item in the proposal or only to integrate with an existing subscription.

Answer to Question 17:

NARW currently operates in a Microsoft 365 environment, including Exchange Online services, as part of its existing IT infrastructure. The proposed solution is expected to integrate with Beneficiary's existing Microsoft environment in accordance with the requirements set forth in the RFP.
Proposers are not required to include Microsoft 365 or Exchange Online user licenses as a priced item under this Contract.

Question 18: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.1.1): *"Maintain institutional structure... synchronized with Entra ID and ASIS (job positions table)"*, Section VII (§1.3.3.2): *"the existing financial system (ASIS, or ATHOS in one specific administration) notifies the SIGAR application, enabling the start of the analysis process"*, and Annex 13 of Section VII, which specifies *"ASIS/ATHOS – integration via secure APIs for transmitting results (e.g., financial data, invoicing, payment monitoring)"*, please confirm (a) whether ASIS and ATHOS currently expose documented, stable APIs covering both integration scenarios — organisational structure synchronisation per §1.3.1.1 and financial notification and results transmission per Annex 13 — and (b) whether API technical documentation and a sandbox or test environment will be made available to the Proposer before the start of development activities.

Answer to Question 18:

(a) At this stage, ASIS and ATHOS do not expose a single, fully centralized and documented public API covering all integration scenarios described in the RFP. It is envisaged as ATHOS information and the individual ASIS databases will be centralized into a single ASIS database at SCAR level. Currently, specific APIs are being developed in relation to existing operational needs.

For IWRACS, dedicated APIs will be made available for the agreed integration scenarios, including, as applicable, financial notification/payment-monitoring flows. The detailed scope, data structures, endpoints and security mechanisms of these dedicated APIs shall be defined and confirmed during the analysis phase.

The Beneficiary has internal competencies relevant to ASIS-related integrations and has an active contract with the provider of the ASIS solution, which will support the clarification and implementation of the required integration mechanisms.

(b) API documentation, data structures, access requirements and testing arrangements relevant to the agreed IWRACS integrations shall be provided or facilitated during the analysis phase, in coordination with the respective system owners, internal Beneficiary specialists and the ASIS solution provider, as applicable. The dedicated APIs made available for IWRACS are expected to be testable using standard API testing tools, such as Postman, as is currently the case for existing specific APIs. The exact availability of test endpoints, test data and testing procedures shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 19: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.2 — SIGAR Front-Office): *"The applicant can make the payment online via Ghiseul.ro"*, please confirm (a) whether NARW has an active operational account with Ghiseul.ro, (b) whether the integration credentials and technical documentation will be provided to the Proposer, and (c) who is contractually responsible for maintaining the Ghiseul.ro integration if the platform's API changes during the contract period.

Answer to Question 19:

(a) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm the operational status, technical configuration, or implementation arrangements associated with Ghiseul.ro across all relevant

organizational units. The applicable requirements and integration approach will be confirmed during the analysis phase.
(b) Where available and applicable, the Beneficiary will facilitate access to the relevant technical documentation, integration specifications, credentials, and testing arrangements required for implementation, in coordination with the respective stakeholders and platform operators.
(c) The Contractor shall be responsible for implementing and maintaining the integrations delivered under the Contract during the implementation period and warranty period, only if activities falling within the warranty coverage defined in Section 5.1.1. Any changes to external interfaces, services, or technical specifications introduced by third-party platform operators during the contract period shall be addressed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions and the scope of services defined in the Contract.

Question 20: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.6): *"Water Registry System: Upon issuance of a permit or authorization, the system shall automatically transmit the corresponding details to the Water Registry through a secure API"*, and Annex 13 of Section VII, which describes Water Registry integration as *"integration through APIs or direct database access, enabling the automatic retrieval of information on water resources, water infrastructure, and regulatory data"*, please (a) identify the owner/operator of the Water Registry System, (b) confirm whether a stable, documented API or direct database access interface is currently available for this integration, and (c) confirm who is responsible for facilitating the technical cooperation and providing access credentials required for implementation.

Answer to Question 20:

Note: *References to the **Water Registry System** shall be understood as references to the existing NARW **Water Cadastre** system. The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency.*

The integration with the Water Cadastre System referred to in Section 1.3.3.6 concerns the automatic transmission by SIGAR of permit or authorization details to the Water Cadastre upon issuance of the relevant regulatory act, to ensure traceability and alignment with national water records.

In this respect, the Consultant shall design and develop the required API or integration mechanism for transmitting the relevant permit or authorization details, based on the technical specifications to be confirmed during the analysis phase.

The Beneficiary will facilitate the necessary institutional and technical cooperation and will provide, or arrange access to, the required information, interfaces and credentials, subject to the approved integration approach and applicable security rules.

Question 21: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.6): *"ANMAP: Integration through a standardized API, allowing the exchange of data on requests, procedural steps, stages, and results, ensuring that environmental workflows (permits, agreements, authorizations) are natively correlated with water management workflows"*, and Annex 13 of Section VII, which defines the complete bidirectional dataset schema for NARW–ANMAP interoperability and states *"Implementation Method: Implementation of dedicated APIs to manage standardized metadata and automated intake/processing workflows"*, please confirm (a) whether ANMAP currently exposes a documented, stable REST API implementing the bidirectional exchange defined in Annex 13, (b) whether technical documentation and a sandbox environment will be made available to the Proposer before the start of development activities, and (c) whether delays caused by ANMAP (as an independent public authority outside NARW's direct control) in providing or maintaining API access would be treated as Purchaser-attributable delays under GCC Clause 40.

Answer to Question 21:

(a) There is an existing data-exchange protocol between NARW and ANMAP, establishing the institutional framework for interoperability between the two authorities.

However, at this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm that ANMAP currently exposes a fully documented and stable REST API implementing the complete bidirectional exchange defined in Annex 13. The specific technical mechanism, API scope, data structures, endpoints and operational arrangements shall be clarified during the analysis phase, based on the existing protocol and in coordination with ANMAP.

(b) Technical documentation, access credentials, test data and testing arrangements related to ANMAP interoperability shall be facilitated by the Beneficiary, where available, during the analysis phase. The availability of a dedicated sandbox or test environment on the ANMAP side cannot be formally confirmed at this stage.

(c) ANMAP is an external public authority operating independently from NARW, although the interoperability is supported by the existing data-exchange protocol between the two institutions. Any circumstances affecting implementation due to third-party systems, interfaces, access arrangements or delays shall be assessed based on their specific impact on contract performance and addressed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions.

Question 22: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.2 — GIS Integration): *"Display of affected water bodies... through queries concerning the existing ArcGIS Enterprise system"*, please confirm (a) the version and licensing model of NARW's existing ArcGIS Enterprise deployment, (b) whether REST API and/or feature service access is available for third-party applications, and (c) whether the Proposer will be granted access to a development/test environment during implementation.

Answer to Question 22:

(a) NARW currently operates an ArcGIS Enterprise environment based on version 11.x. An upgrade to a newer version is envisaged during the implementation period. The detailed technical configuration and licensing information relevant to the proposed integrations will be provided during the analysis phase.
(b) The existing GIS environment supports standard ArcGIS Enterprise integration mechanisms. Subject to the applicable security and access policies, the proposed solution is expected to integrate through the available ArcGIS services and interfaces, including REST-based services where applicable. The detailed integration approach will be confirmed during the analysis phase.
(c) Subject to the applicable security, operational and administrative requirements, the Beneficiary will facilitate the Proposer's access to the relevant ArcGIS Enterprise development or testing environment required for implementation, where such environment is available.

Question 23: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.3 — System Integration), which requires integration with nine external systems for SIGAR alone (DMS-RAE, ArcGIS Enterprise, ECA-RO, HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Registry, ANMAP, ASIS/ATHOS, Ghiseul.ro), please confirm (a) whether the Beneficiary guarantees that all required external system APIs will be available and technically documented at the start of the development phase, (b) whether delays caused by third-party system owners that are outside NARW's control qualify as Purchaser-attributable delays under GCC Clause 40, and (c) whether integration with any of the listed external systems may be deferred to post-Go-Live if the third party is not ready.

Answer to Question 23:

(a) No. At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot guarantee that all interfaces of the external systems referenced in the RFP will be fully available, mature, technically documented or ready for implementation at the start of the development phase.

Note: *References to the* ***Water Registry System*** *shall be understood as references to the existing NARW* ***Water Cadastre*** *system. The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency.*

The Beneficiary will facilitate access to available documentation, technical specifications, and relevant stakeholders during the analysis phase. For the Water Cadastre System, the integration concerns the automatic transmission by SIGAR of permit or authorization details upon issuance of the relevant regulatory act. The Consultant shall design and develop the required API or integration mechanism, based on the technical specifications and access arrangements to be confirmed during the analysis phase.

(b) External systems may be owned or operated by different institutions or organizations. Any circumstances affecting implementation that involve third-party systems, interfaces, access arrangements or dependencies shall be addressed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions and assessed based on the specific circumstances and their impact on contract performance.

(c) The final implementation approach, sequencing and acceptance criteria for individual integrations will be confirmed during the analysis phase. Where dependencies on external systems exist, the Parties shall cooperate to identify appropriate technical and operational solutions consistent with the Contract requirements, the capabilities of the respective systems and the approved implementation schedule.

Question 24: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§4.2.3 — Full IWRACS Cloud Environment Tests): *"Availability testing: minimum uptime (e.g. ≥99.5%)"*, please clarify (a) the measurement period over which the 99.5% availability threshold is assessed (e.g., calendar year, rolling 30-day window), (b) whether scheduled maintenance windows are excluded from the calculation, and (c) whether the threshold applies per subsystem independently or to the integrated IWRACS system as a whole.

Answer to Question 24:

The availability criterion referenced in Section 4.2.3 forms part of the pre-commissioning validation of the IWRACS cloud environment and is intended to verify that the proposed solution can operate within a highly available and resilient hosting environment.
As the final hosting and deployment model will be confirmed during the analysis phase, the detailed availability measurement methodology, applicable targets, treatment of planned maintenance activities, and validation approach shall be defined considering the characteristics, capabilities, and service levels of the agreed hosting environment.
As Section 4.2.3 relates to the **Entire System (IWRACS as Ecosystem)**, the availability testing applies to the integrated IWRACS environment rather than to individual subsystems in isolation.

Question 25: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.6.4 — Availability and Resilience), which requires graceful degradation and data integrity on reconnect, and Section VII (§1.5.6 — Backup and Disaster Recovery), which requires alternate environment restoration, please provide or confirm the required Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) targets that will be used as acceptance criteria at the pre-commissioning and OAT stages.

Answer to Question 25:

The RFP requires the proposed solution to support backup, recovery, business continuity, and disaster recovery capabilities appropriate to the operational needs of the IWRACS ecosystem.
At this stage, no specific contractual RTO and RPO values are prescribed in the RFP. The applicable RTO and RPO targets, together with the corresponding testing and acceptance criteria, will be defined and agreed during the analysis phase, considering the selected hosting environment, system architecture, operational requirements, and business continuity objectives of the Beneficiary.
The Proposer shall therefore design the solution in accordance with industry best practices for mission-critical public sector information systems and demonstrate the ability to meet the agreed recovery objectives during testing and acceptance activities.

Question 26: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§4.2.3 — Full IWRACS Cloud Environment Tests): *"Availability testing: minimum uptime (e.g. ≥99.5%)"*, and Section VII (§1.4.7 — Hosting and Deployment Requirements): *"The final hosting option and deployment model shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase"*, which defers responsibility for the underlying cloud infrastructure (ADR Government Private Cloud or NARW Azure Tenant) to the Beneficiary, please confirm (a) whether downtime or performance degradation attributable to infrastructure components managed by the Beneficiary — including compute, storage, networking, or cloud platform availability — is excluded from the measurement of the Supplier's SLA compliance, (b) whether such infrastructure-attributable failures are treated as Purchaser-attributable events under GCC Clause 40 and excluded from liquidated damages calculations under GCC Clause 28.2, and (c) what mechanism (e.g., shared monitoring dashboard, incident classification procedure) will be used to attribute the root cause of an availability breach to either the application layer or the infrastructure layer.

Answer to Question 26:

The availability testing referenced in Section 4.2.3 is intended to validate the operational readiness of the IWRACS solution within the agreed hosting environment.
As the final hosting and deployment model will be confirmed during the analysis phase, the detailed monitoring, incident management, availability measurement, and operational procedures will be defined considering the responsibilities of the respective parties and the characteristics of the selected hosting environment.
The identification and analysis of incidents, including the determination of their underlying causes, shall be performed based on the available technical evidence, monitoring information, logs, and operational records. The specific mechanisms and procedures for monitoring, reporting, and incident classification will be agreed during the analysis phase.
Any circumstances affecting contract performance, including events related to infrastructure, hosting services, third-party platforms, or application components, shall be addressed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions and assessed based on the specific facts and circumstances of each case.

Question 27: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.2 — Document Upload and Sharing): *"Support for simultaneous (bulk) document uploads... up to 5 GB+"*, please clarify the intended maximum single-file upload size, specifically whether "5 GB+" denotes a hard lower bound with no defined upper limit, or whether a specific maximum (e.g., 10 GB, 25 GB) is intended, and whether this requirement applies only to SIGAR or also to DMS-RAE.

Answer to Question 27:

The reference to “5 GB+” **shall not** be interpreted as a fixed maximum size for an individual uploaded file, nor as an unlimited upload requirement.
The requirement is intended to address large documentation packages associated mainly with SIGAR permit and authorization workflows, which may include multiple documents, studies, maps, drawings, images and other supporting materials.
At this stage, no specific maximum single-file upload size is prescribed. Given that much of the documentation is currently submitted in paper-based format, the Beneficiary cannot precisely determine a maximum electronic file size.
The proposed solution shall support large documentation packages through appropriate mechanisms, including bulk upload, chunked upload, progress indication and automatic resumption in case of interruptions.
The detailed upload limits, accepted formats, storage rules and operational constraints shall be defined during the analysis phase. This requirement applies to the SIGAR front-office and document submission processes.

Question 28: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.5 §B1 — Portal Content Migration): *"the Proposer... supports the Beneficiary in deciding what to keep/update/exclude; and migrates only validated content"*, please clarify (a) who within NARW holds final decision authority over content retention and exclusion, (b) whether the Beneficiary's content review and approval period is included within the contractual implementation timeline, and (c) whether Beneficiary delays in content sign-off qualify as grounds for extension of time under GCC Clause 40.

Answer to Question 28:

(a) The final decision regarding content retention, update, archival, or exclusion rests with the Beneficiary, through the designated business, communication, and content owner representatives identified during the implementation process.
(b) Yes. The content inventory, review, validation, and migration activities described in Section 1.3.5 form part of the implementation activities to be performed within the contractual implementation period and in accordance with the agreed project plan.
(c) The Parties are expected to cooperate in a timely manner to support the content review and migration process. Any circumstances affecting the implementation schedule shall be addressed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions and assessed based on the specific facts and circumstances of the case.

Question 29: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.5 §B4 — External User Identification): *"With compatibility for future integration with ROeID for single sign-on and identity mapping"*, please clarify whether ROeID compatibility constitutes (a) a mandatory architectural requirement that must be demonstrated at Operational Acceptance testing, or (b) a forward-looking design consideration with no acceptance test at Go-Live, and whether failure to demonstrate ROeID-readiness would affect the technical score under Category 1.

Answer to Question 29:

The requirement regarding ROeID should be understood as a future interoperability and architectural compatibility requirement.
The Extranet shall initially support user identification through verified e-mail registration, as expressly stated in Section B4. The RFP does not require the implementation, activation, or operational demonstration of a ROeID integration at Go-Live or during Operational Acceptance Testing.
Accordingly, Proposers are expected to propose a solution architecture that can accommodate future integration with ROeID through standard identity federation and authentication mechanisms, where applicable and when such integration becomes required by the Beneficiary.
Compliance with this requirement will be assessed as part of the overall technical compliance of the proposed solution with the RFP requirements. No separate Operational Acceptance Test related solely to ROeID integration is currently envisaged.

Question 30: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.5 §B5 — Virtual Assistant / ChatBot): which requires a *"knowledge base, intent guidance, status check, admin interface, conversation logs"*, please clarify (a) who is responsible for providing the initial knowledge base content, (b) whether knowledge base population is within the scope of Operational Acceptance criteria, and (c) what minimum number of intents/topics must be covered at Go-Live.

Answer to Question 30:

(a) The initial knowledge base content shall be provided by the Beneficiary, including existing public information, procedures, FAQs, and other materials considered relevant for citizen-facing services.
(b) Operational Acceptance will verify that the Virtual Assistant platform, knowledge base management functions, administration interface, search capabilities, guidance mechanisms, conversation logging, and integration features are fully operational as agreed in the analysis phase. The completeness and future expansion of knowledge base content shall remain a continuous activity of the Beneficiary.
(c) The RFP does not prescribe a minimum number of intents or topics. The final scope, structure, and coverage of intents and knowledge domains shall be defined and agreed during the analysis phase based on the selected use cases and available content.

Question 31: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.5 §A3 — Legal Module): *"Integrates with portal.just.ro for manual and/or scheduled synchronization of public case data (status, object, hearings, parties)"*, please clarify how contractual liability is allocated if portal.just.ro modifies or discontinues its public data interface during the contract period, and whether such a change would constitute a Force Majeure event or a Change under GCC Clause 39.

Answer to Question 31:

The Beneficiary cannot guarantee the long-term availability, stability, or continuity of interfaces provided by third-party systems outside its direct control. Any changes affecting integration with portal.just.ro shall be assessed in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions.

Question 32: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.3.3 — SEICA Subcomponent): *"Integration and use of data from the ECA-RO application and from the SEICA Framework Content, in accordance with the provisions of Order no. 828/2019"*, please confirm (a) when the complete SEICA Framework Content will be made available to the Proposer in machine-readable format, and (b) whether updates to this content during implementation would constitute a Change under GCC Clause 39.

Answer to Question 32:

At this stage, SEICA-related activity is carried out mainly through paper-based documentation, expert assessment, Commission meetings and professional judgement, supported by applicable regulatory documents and reference materials.

The relevant SEICA content, reference materials and regulatory documentation available to the Beneficiary, including those related to Order no. 828/2019, shall be provided during the analysis phase.

The Beneficiary does not confirm the existence of a SEICA Framework Content package in a fully structured, machine-readable format. During the analysis phase, the Consultant shall support the Beneficiary in identifying, structuring and configuring the relevant SEICA content, including templates, tables, parameters, thresholds, validation rules and workflow steps.

Any subsequent modifications during implementation shall be assessed in accordance with the contractual provisions.

Question 33: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.4 §D.1 — Mandatory Electronic Registry Workflows): *"Failure to deliver any of the workflows below in a fully operational manner... shall be considered non-compliance with the Electronic Registry functional requirements"*, please confirm whether the three mandatory DMS-RAE workflows (D.1.1, D.1.2, D.1.3) constitute hard pass/fail acceptance criteria at the DMS-RAE Operational Acceptance Test stage, independently from the overall 0–4 scoring methodology applied to other sub-factors.

Answer to Question 33:

The workflows identified in Sections D.1.1–D.1.3 constitute mandatory functional requirements of the DMS-RAE subsystem.

However, they do not constitute separate pass/fail evaluation criteria independent from the methodology set out in the RFP. The evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with the evaluation methodology, criteria and sub-criteria specified in the RFP.

Compliance with these workflows shall be demonstrated during the DMS-RAE implementation, testing and Operational Acceptance process. The detailed acceptance criteria, test scenarios and validation procedures shall be defined during the analysis phase and refined during implementation and testing, in accordance with the agreed testing methodology.

Question 34: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.4.2 — Training): *"A dedicated training environment and database shall be provided for instructional purposes"*, and Section VII (§1.4.6 — Hardware Architecture): *"Logical and/or physical separation of environments (e.g. production, testing, training, disaster recovery)"*, please clarify whether the training environment must be a separate cloud instance with its own dedicated compute and storage resources, or whether logical isolation within the shared cloud infrastructure is acceptable, and who bears the cloud infrastructure costs for the training environment.

Answer to Question 34:

The training environment shall be separate from the production environment. The RFP does not require a dedicated cloud instance with separate compute and storage resources exclusively for training purposes. Logical isolation within the agreed cloud infrastructure is acceptable, if training activities do not affect production operations, data integrity, security, or ongoing testing and acceptance activities.

The final approach, including the use of a dedicated training environment or an existing non-production environment (e.g., test/UAT environment), shall be agreed during the analysis phase. Any cloud infrastructure resources required for approved training activities shall be provided within the Beneficiary's hosting environment and shall not be separately priced by the Proposer.

Question 35: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.4.6 — Logistical Arrangements): *"For approved on-site training sessions, the Proposer shall provide agreed catering services. Accommodation and transportation for NARW personnel shall remain the responsibility of the Beneficiary"*, please clarify whether the provision of the training venue (room, AV equipment, internet connectivity) for on-site sessions is the responsibility of the Proposer or the Beneficiary.

Answer to Question 35:

For approved on-site training sessions, the Beneficiary is expected to provide suitable training facilities, including training rooms and standard onsite infrastructure normally available within its premises. The Proposer shall provide trainers, training materials, catering services where required by the RFP, and all resources necessary for delivery of the training program.

Question 36: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.5.1 — Data Migration Scope): which states that migration applies to ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, and Portal, please provide or confirm (a) the complete list of source systems from which data must be migrated for each subsystem, (b) approximate data volumes per source, and (c) whether the Proposer will be granted access to production or representative source systems for data profiling during the Data Migration Assessment Phase and on what timeline.

Answer to Question 36:

(a) Indicative information regarding existing datasets, thematic data domains, and potential migration sources is provided in Annex 1 – *ROwaterDATA Catalog of Existing Datasets and Illustrative Samples*, as well as in the relevant subsystem descriptions. The complete inventory of source systems, repositories, datasets, and migration scope for ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, and the Portal shall be further analyzed, validated, and finalized during the Data Migration Assessment Phase in collaboration with the Beneficiary.

(b) Indicative information regarding estimated data volumes and capacity planning is provided in Annex 12 – *Estimated Capacity Planning per IWRACS Subsystems*. Final data volumes, migration effort, migration priorities, and migration strategy shall be validated and refined during the Data Migration Assessment Phase.

(c) Existing source systems may include databases, file-based repositories, APIs, and semi-structured or unstructured data sources. Subject to applicable security, operational, and administrative requirements, the Beneficiary shall facilitate access to relevant systems, datasets, documentation, and technical information required for migration analysis and profiling activities during the analysis phase. The level of access and the timeline for such activities shall be agreed as part of the approved project plan.

Question 37: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.5.4 — Data Validation and Quality Assurance): *"completeness ≥99%, referential integrity, reconciliation"*, please clarify whether the completeness threshold of ≥99% is an Operational Acceptance hard pass/fail criterion or a target subject to exceptions agreed with the Beneficiary, and how completeness is to be measured for datasets where legacy source data quality is below this threshold.

Answer to Question 37:

The ≥99% completeness requirement represents a migration quality objective to be validated during migration testing and acceptance activities. The detailed measurement methodology, reconciliation procedures, validation rules, and any justified exceptions related to source-data quality shall be defined during the Data Migration Assessment and agreed with the Beneficiary. Legacy source-system data quality limitations shall be considered when evaluating migration results.

Question 38: Having regard to the provisions of Section III / PDS (§ITP 32.1 — Scoring Methodology): which defines scores of 3 as *"Slightly exceeds the requirement"* and 4 as *"Significantly exceeds the requirement and provides clear added value"*, please provide, for each scored sub-factor across Categories 1–4, the evaluation criteria that distinguish a score of 3 from a score of 4, so that Proposers can calibrate the depth and specificity of their technical responses.

Answer to Question 38:

The evaluation methodology, scoring scale, and evaluation criteria are defined in the RFP and shall be applied by the Evaluation Committee accordingly. No additional scoring guidance beyond the provisions of the RFP will be provided. Proposers should prepare their Technical Proposals in accordance with the requirements and evaluation criteria defined in the RFP and provide sufficient information to enable the Evaluation Committee to assess the Proposal against those requirements and criteria.

Question 39: Having regard to the provisions of Section III / PDS (§ITP 32.1): *"Failure to demonstrate compliance for any Key Expert shall result in rejection of the Proposal as non-responsive"*, please confirm that this pass/fail condition applies collectively to all six key expert positions simultaneously, such that a single non-compliant CV results in rejection of the entire Proposal regardless of compliance by the remaining five experts.

Answer to Question 39:

Yes. As stated in ITP 32.1, all proposed Key Experts must comply with the minimum qualification and experience requirements specified in Section 2.7.3 of the Purchaser's Requirements.
Compliance with these minimum requirements constitutes a pass/fail condition. Failure to demonstrate compliance for any proposed Key Expert shall result in rejection of the Proposal as non-responsive.
Only Proposals that demonstrate compliance of all proposed Key Experts with the applicable minimum qualification and experience requirements will proceed to the subsequent stages of technical evaluation in accordance with the RFP.

Question 40: Having regard to the provisions of Section III (§1.4.2 — Specific Experience): *"Participation as a prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, sub-contractor, in at least 3 contracts... similar to the proposed Information System"*, and the five minimum characteristics listed thereunder, please confirm whether ALL five characteristics must be demonstrated within a single qualifying contract, or whether each contract may qualify by meeting a subset of the five characteristics provided the aggregate across the three contracts covers all of them.

Answer to Question 40:

The requirement shall be interpreted as set out in Section III, §1.4.2.

For clarity, the Specific Experience requirement includes six minimum characteristics, not five. Each qualifying contract must individually demonstrate all six minimum characteristics listed under the Specific Experience requirement.

Accordingly, compliance cannot be established by aggregating different characteristics across multiple contracts. Each of the required qualifying contracts must meet the full definition of a similar contract, as provided in the RFP.

Question 41: Having regard to the provisions of Section III (§1.4.2 — Specific Experience): which requires at least 3 qualifying contracts with a minimum value of EUR 1,000,000 each, and noting that the IWRACS contract covers four functionally distinct subsystems, please confirm whether a qualifying contract may demonstrate experience in document management or portal platforms only (DMS-RAE / Portal scope), or whether each qualifying contract must demonstrate experience relevant to the full integrated multi-subsystem scope.

Answer to Question 41:

The requirement shall be assessed based on the criteria set out in Section III, §1.4.2. Each qualifying contract must demonstrate implementation of an Information System that meets the minimum characteristics specified therein.
The RFP does not require that each qualifying contract replicate the exact scope, architecture, or subsystem structure of the proposed IWRACS solution. The Evaluation Committee will assess compliance with the Specific Experience requirement, including the similarity and relevance of the referenced contracts based on the information and support documentation submitted by the Proposers.

Question 42: Having regard to the provisions of Section III (§1.4.1 — General Experience): *"Experience under Information System contracts in the role of prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, or subcontractor for at least the last 5 years"*, please clarify whether this criterion requires continuous

IT contract activity during the 5-year period, or whether at least one qualifying contract must have been active (started, in progress, or completed) within the 5-year window.

Answer to Question 42:

The requirement shall be interpreted as referring to the Proposer's experience gained under Information System contracts during the last 5 years. It does not require continuous contract activity throughout the entire 5-year period.
Compliance will be assessed based on the contracts and support documentation submitted by the Proposers in accordance with the requirements of Section III.

Question 43: Having regard to the provisions of Section I / PDS (§ITP 11.2(j)), which requires submission of (a) a SEA/SH Prevention and Response Action Plan (MSIP) and (b) a Cyber Security Management Strategy and Implementation Plan as part of the Technical Proposal — and noting that while the Code of Conduct form is prescribed in Section IV with explicit minimum content requirements, no equivalent template or minimum content specification is provided for either MSIP — please provide minimum content requirements or reference templates for these two documents, or confirm that Proposers may structure them in accordance with internationally recognised frameworks (IFC Performance Standard 2 for the SEA/SH MSIP and ISO/IEC 27001 for the Cyber Security MSIP).

Answer to Question 43:

The RFP does not prescribe mandatory templates for the SEA/SH Prevention and Response Action Plan (MSIP) or the Cyber Security Management Strategy and Implementation Plan (MSIP).

Proposers may structure these documents in a manner they consider appropriate, provided that they demonstrate a clear and credible approach for addressing the relevant requirements of the RFP and the obligations associated with the proposed implementation.

The use of internationally recognized standards, frameworks, or good practices, including but not limited to IFC Performance Standard 2, ISO/IEC 27001, or equivalent frameworks, is acceptable. However, compliance with such frameworks does not, by itself, exempt the Proposer from demonstrating compliance with the requirements set out in the RFP.

No additional mandatory content requirements, templates, qualification criteria, or evaluation criteria apply beyond those expressly stated in the RFP.

Question 44: Having regard to the provisions of Section I / PDS (§ITP 16.3 — Manufacturer's Authorization), which requires Manufacturer's Authorizations for proprietary commercial software that the Proposer does not itself manufacture, please confirm whether the Manufacturer's Authorization must be valid for the full contract period (including warranty) at the time of proposal submission, or whether it is sufficient to confirm at submission that the OEM relationship will be established prior to contract signing.

Answer to Question 44:

The requirement shall be interpreted in accordance with Section III, §1.5. Where Proposers propose proprietary commercial software that it does not manufacture itself, the Proposers shall provide the Manufacturer's Authorization required by the RFP as part of the Proposal.
The RFP does not prescribe a specific validity period for the Manufacturer's Authorization extending through the entire contract duration. However, the Proposer shall ensure that all necessary authorizations, licenses, rights, and support arrangements required for the successful implementation, warranty, and support of the proposed solution remain available throughout the applicable contract period.
Compliance will be assessed based on the documentation submitted with the Proposal and the requirements set forth in Section III, §1.5.

Question 45: Having regard to the provisions of Section I / PDS (§ITP 4.1): *"Maximum number of members in the JV shall be: 4"*, please clarify (a) whether there is a minimum equity/participation share for the lead JV member, (b) whether subcontractors count toward the JV member limit, and (c) whether a subcontractor performing a critical technical role (e.g., COTS deployment, system integration) must be disclosed and qualified at the time of proposal submission.

Answer to Question 45:

a) The RFP does not establish a minimum equity share, participation percentage, or minimum scope allocation requirement for the Lead Member of a Joint Venture.

b) The maximum number of four (4) members applies only to the members of the Joint Venture. Subcontractors are not considered Joint Venture members for the purposes of this limitation.

c) As specified in the RFP, subcontracting is not applicable for this procurement. Accordingly, the standard forms included in Section IV relating to subcontractors are not applicable and do not create any additional requirements regarding the nomination, qualification, or evaluation of subcontractors. The inclusion of standard forms for subcontractors in Section IV is for template completeness and shall not be interpreted as permitting or requiring subcontracting where the RFP expressly states that subcontracting is not applicable.

Question 46: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§3.0.1 — Language Support): *"All user interfaces, system messages, reports, notifications, documentation, and training materials shall be available in Romanian"*, and Section VII (§2.7.1): *"operational communication... ensured in Romanian"*, please confirm whether technical contractual deliverables (SRS, SDD, IT Architecture Document, Data Migration Assessment Report, Test Reports) must be submitted exclusively in Romanian, or whether English-language technical documents are acceptable provided that all end-user materials and stakeholder communications are in Romanian.

Answer to Question 46:

In accordance with Section 2.7.1, deliverables and operational communication shall be ensured in Romanian.
Accordingly, contractual deliverables submitted for review, approval, or acceptance by the Beneficiary shall be provided in Romanian. Where appropriate, supporting technical documentation may additionally be provided in English; however, the Romanian version shall prevail for contractual purposes.
All user-facing materials, training materials, reports, notifications, and communications with the Beneficiary shall be available in Romanian.

Question 47: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§2.2.4 — AI Usage Policy): *"development support tools only; no AI in core business logic or decision-making"*, please clarify (a) whether AI-assisted code generation reviewed, tested, and owned by the Proposer's developers is permitted for the implementation of business rules, and (b) whether the AI Usage Policy must be submitted as part of the proposal or as a post-award contract deliverable.

Answer to Question 47:

(a) Yes. The use of AI-assisted development tools for code generation, code completion, documentation, testing, static analysis, bug detection, remediation support, and code optimization is permitted, provided that all resulting deliverables are reviewed, validated, tested, and approved by the Supplier and that the delivered Information System does not rely on AI or ML models for core business logic, validation, or decision-making functions.

(b) Section VII §2.2.4 establishes requirements regarding the permitted use of AI during development. The RFP does not require submission of a separate AI Usage Policy as part of the Supplier. Proposers shall ensure compliance with these requirements throughout the implementation of the Contract.

Question 48: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§4.3 — Operational Acceptance Tests): *"Operational Acceptance Tests shall be performed by the Purchaser, with the assistance of the Proposer"*, please clarify the procedure in the event of OAT failure, specifically (a) the maximum number of retest cycles permitted per subsystem, (b) the maximum elapsed time allowed between initial OAT failure and completion of the final retest, and (c) whether retest periods are counted against the Supplier for liquidated damages purposes under GCC Clause 28.2.

Answer to Question 48:

The RFP does not prescribe a maximum number of Operational Acceptance Test (OAT) retest cycles, nor does it establish a fixed maximum period between an initial OAT failure and subsequent retesting. If deficiencies are identified during OAT, the Supplier shall correct the identified issues and support the execution of the necessary retesting activities in accordance with the agreed testing methodology, acceptance procedures, and Contract provisions.
Any impact on contractual milestones, implementation timelines, or the application of liquidated damages shall be assessed in accordance with the applicable Contract provisions and the specific circumstances giving rise to the delay.
The Operational Acceptance procedure shall be performed in accordance with SCC Clause 27.2.1, as amended, including the Technical Acceptance Testing, the Reception Commission procedure and the issuance of the Quantitative and Qualitative Reception Certificate (PVRCC), which constitutes the basis for the Operational Acceptance Certificate, in accordance with SCC Clause 27.2.1.

Question 49: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.6.2.6 — API and Interoperability Performance): *"≤2 sec standard queries, Swagger/OpenAPI auto-generated"*, please confirm whether "auto-generated Swagger/OpenAPI documentation" is a mandatory acceptance criterion at OAT, and whether the documentation must be maintained automatically with each API version release throughout the warranty period.

Answer to Question 49:

Yes. The requirement for automatic generation of API documentation (Swagger/OpenAPI) forms part of the API and interoperability requirements specified in Section 1.6.2.6 and may be verified as part of the relevant testing and acceptance activities.

As stated in the RFP, automatic generation of API documentation must occur upon API creation or update. Accordingly, the API documentation remains consistent with the implemented interfaces and API versions throughout the implementation period and any approved changes made during the warranty period.

The detailed verification procedures shall be defined during the analysis phase and reflected in the approved test documentation.

Question 50: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.3.2.6 — Reports and Statistics): *"Each report submitted by the Beneficiary for implementation shall be accompanied by a completion template and the corresponding set of validation rules, as provided in the relevant directives. These documents shall be delivered to the Proposer during the analysis phase"*, please confirm whether a change to EU directive reporting templates that occurs after the analysis phase deliverables have been approved would constitute a Change under GCC Clause 39 entitling the Supplier to a price and/or timeline adjustment.

Answer to Question 50:

The reporting templates, completion forms, and validation rules available at the time of the analysis phase shall form the basis for the design and implementation of the corresponding reporting functionalities.
Any subsequent modifications to reporting templates, validation rules, reporting formats, or regulatory requirements occurring after approval of the relevant analysis deliverables may be assessed in accordance with the applicable Contract provisions governing changes, including consideration of their impact on scope, effort, schedule, and implementation activities.

The contractual implications of any such modification shall be determined based on the nature and extent of the change and the applicable Contract provisions.

Question 51: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.4 — Licensing and Ownership): *"For custom-developed systems such as ROwaterDATA and SIGAR... All such licenses shall be procured and owned by the Beneficiary"*, and Section VIII SCC for GCC Clause 15.4: *"The Supplier shall deliver to the Purchaser the complete custom source code and related documentation for the solution specifically developed for the Purchaser... The Purchaser has full ownership rights for the custom developed code and shall have the unrestricted right to use, modify, and transfer such materials"*, and noting that the proposed solution uses COTS platform components (including workflow engine capabilities forming part of the DMS-RAE and Portal platforms) as internal service dependencies within the custom-developed subsystems (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR), please confirm that the following architectural approach satisfies the intellectual property and source code delivery requirements under the Contract: (a) COTS platform components required by custom-developed subsystems are exposed exclusively through documented REST APIs acting as a service layer, with no proprietary SDK or library directly embedded in the custom codebase; under this approach, the Proposer will not provide — and is not required to provide — the intellectual property or source code of any COTS module accessed through such APIs, as the pre-existing intellectual property of those modules remains vested in their respective owners per GCC Clause 15.1; and (b) all custom code constituting the integration and business logic layers of ROwaterDATA and SIGAR — including API client code invoking COTS services — is delivered to the Beneficiary as custom source code per SCC GCC Clause 15.4.

Answer to Question 51:

The ownership and licensing regime applicable to the delivered solution shall be governed by GCC Clauses 15, 16, and 34, together with SCC Clause 15.4.
The Purchaser shall obtain full ownership rights to all custom-developed source code, integrations, interfaces, business logic, workflows, configurations, and related documentation specifically developed under the Contract, in accordance with SCC Clause 15.4.
Ownership and intellectual property rights relating to pre-existing proprietary software, COTS platforms, frameworks, libraries, tools, and other third-party components shall remain with their respective owners and shall be governed by the applicable software license terms and the provisions of GCC Clauses 15 and 16.
The RFP does not require the transfer of ownership or source code for proprietary third-party software components that are not specifically developed under the Contract. However, the delivered solution shall comply with all contractual requirements regarding interoperability, data export, operational independence, transferability of usage rights, and avoidance of undue dependency on the Supplier, as set out in GCC Clause 16.
The specific technical architecture and integration approach proposed by the Supplier shall be assessed for compliance with the Contract requirements during the analysis phase.

Question 52: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.5.6 — Backup and Disaster Recovery): *"Ability to restore data and services within agreed recovery objectives"* and *"Support for disaster recovery procedures, including restoration of services in an alternate environment where required"*, Section VII (§4.2.3 — Full IWRACS Cloud Environment Tests): *"Disaster recovery: compliance with defined RTO/RPO targets, no data loss"*, and Section VII (§5.1.3 — Warranty Response and Resolution Times), which defines the P1 - Critical SLA as *"System down, data integrity at risk — Response ≤ 2* *hours, Resolution ≤ 4 hours"*, and noting that the RFP references "defined RTO/RPO targets" without specifying their values, please clarify

(a) the Recovery Time Objective (RTO) accepted by the Purchaser for a full failover of the Production environment to the Disaster Recovery environment — specifically whether it is aligned with the P1 resolution time of 4 hours or whether a different interval applies (e.g., 8 hours, 24 hours);

(b) whether RTO is measured from the moment of formal disaster declaration or from the moment of initial unavailability detection; and

(c) what level of service is expected immediately following DR failover — full operation of all subsystems (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, DMS-RAE, Portal) or only a defined subset of critical subsystems.

Answer to Question 52:

The RFP intentionally defines the requirement for disaster recovery capabilities and validation of recovery procedures but does not prescribe specific RTO or RPO values. The detailed recovery objectives, disaster recovery architecture, failover procedures, and service restoration priorities shall be proposed by the Supplier and finalized during the analysis phase, considering the agreed hosting model, business criticality, technical architecture, and operational requirements.

Accordingly:

(a) No specific RTO value is prescribed by the RFP, and it should not be assumed to be equivalent to the P1 incident resolution time defined in the SLA.

(b) The detailed methodology for measuring recovery objectives, including the recovery start point and validation criteria, shall be agreed during the analysis phase and reflected in the disaster recovery procedures and test documentation.

(c) The disaster recovery solution shall ensure restoration of the services and data required to meet the agreed recovery objectives. The detailed recovery scope, service prioritization, and failover strategy shall be defined during the analysis phase and validated through the disaster recovery tests specified in the RFP.

Question 53: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.4.6 — Hardware Architecture Requirements): *"High Availability and Fault Tolerance: Redundant components and configurations to eliminate single points of failure and ensure continuity of service in the event of hardware or infrastructure component failure"* and *"Separation of Environments: Logical and/or physical separation of environments (e.g. production, testing, training, disaster recovery), ensuring that operational activities are not impacted by testing or maintenance operations"*, and Section VII (§1.5.6 — Backup and Disaster Recovery): *"Support for disaster recovery procedures, including restoration of services in an alternate environment where required"*, and noting that the DR architecture design — ranging from a full 1:1 hot standby replica to a reduced warm standby configuration scaled to full capacity only at activation — has a direct and material impact on cloud infrastructure costs, software licensing, and achievable RTO, please clarify

(a) whether the DR environment must be a full 1:1 replica of the Production environment in terms of compute, memory, and storage sizing, or whether a reduced warm standby configuration that scales to full capacity upon activation is acceptable;

(b) whether all software components (applications, databases, middleware, COTS platforms) must be permanently installed and pre-configured in the DR environment, or whether installation and activation of certain components only at the time of failover is acceptable;

(c) whether database replication to the DR environment is required to be synchronous (RPO = 0) or whether asynchronous replication with a near-zero RPO (e.g., ≤ 5 minutes) is acceptable; and

(d) whether COTS platform licences (DMS-RAE, Portal) must include separate licence entitlements for the DR environment, or whether Production licences cover use in the DR environment.

Answer to Question 53:

The RFP defines the required outcomes in terms of availability, resilience, fault tolerance, backup, and disaster recovery capabilities, but does not prescribe a specific disaster recovery architecture or technology implementation model.

Accordingly:

(a) The RFP does not require a specific DR deployment model (e.g., full 1:1 hot standby or reduced-capacity warm standby). The proposed DR architecture shall be designed to meet the agreed availability, recovery, performance, and operational requirements and shall be finalized during the analysis phase.

(b) The RFP does not prescribe the deployment status of individual software components within the DR environment. The proposed solution shall ensure that the agreed recovery objectives and continuity requirements can be achieved and demonstrated during the relevant testing activities.

(c) The RFP does not prescribe a specific database replication mechanism or RPO value. The replication strategy and recovery objectives shall be proposed by the Supplier and agreed during the analysis phase.

(d) Licensing requirements for the DR environment shall be governed by the licensing model of the proposed products and the applicable license terms. The Supplier shall ensure that the proposed solution agreed in analysis phase complies with all licensing requirements necessary to meet the Contract obligations regarding availability, resilience, disaster recovery, and operational continuity.

Question 54: Having regard to the provisions of Section VII (§1.4.7 — Hosting and Deployment Requirements): *"The Proposer shall design, configure, and deliver the solution to support deployment within the future Government Private Cloud managed by the Authority for the Digitalization of Romania (ADR), based on Microsoft Azure Stack Hub or an equivalent platform, or alternatively within the NARW Azure tenant"*, and Section VII (§1.6.4 — Availability and Resilience): *"The Information System shall be designed to ensure high availability and operational continuity, including in scenarios where external dependencies or connectivity are partially or fully unavailable"*,

and noting that data replication and automated failover between Production and DR environments require dedicated, low-latency network connectivity, the type of which (VPN site-to-site, Azure ExpressRoute, vNet peering across regions) directly determines the achievable RPO and associated operational costs, please clarify

(a) whether a dedicated network link (ExpressRoute, site-to-site VPN, or vNet peering) between the Production and DR environments currently exists or is to be provisioned by the Proposer as part of the Contract scope;

(b) whether the DR environment will be hosted in the same Azure region as Production (different availability zone) or in a geographically separate Azure region;

(c) if the DR environment is hosted on the ADR Azure Stack Hub, whether native connectivity exists between ADR and the public Azure tenant, or whether a separate connectivity solution must be designed; and (d) what network bandwidth is available or guaranteed between the Production and DR environments for ongoing data replication

Answer to Question 54:

The final hosting architecture, disaster recovery architecture, connectivity model, and associated infrastructure arrangements shall be defined and agreed during the analysis phase based on the Supplier's proposed solution, applicable industry best practices, and the technical and operational constraints of the selected hosting environment.

Accordingly:

(a) The RFP does not prescribe a specific connectivity model between Production and Disaster Recovery environments. The Supplier shall propose an appropriate connectivity architecture consistent with the agreed hosting model and recovery objectives.

(b) The location and deployment model of the Disaster Recovery environment shall be determined during the analysis phase, considering availability, resilience, security, operational requirements, infrastructure constraints, and applicable data protection requirements. The Disaster Recovery environment shall be hosted within the European Union in compliance with GDPR regulation.

(c) The Beneficiary cannot currently confirm the characteristics of future connectivity arrangements between ADR infrastructure and other hosting environments. Any required connectivity and integration mechanisms shall be analyzed and agreed during the analysis phase in coordination with the relevant infrastructure providers.

(d) The RFP does not prescribe specific network bandwidth, latency, or replication throughput requirements. The Supplier shall propose a solution based on industry best practices and the capabilities of the selected hosting environment, ensuring compliance with the agreed availability, resilience, backup, and disaster recovery requirements.

Cloud Infrastructure and Hosting

Question 55: — Cloud Platform Selection | RFP Reference: §1.4.7
The RFP states: *"The Proposer shall design, configure, and deliver the solution to support deployment within the future Government Private Cloud managed by the Authority for the Digitalization of Romania (ADR), based on Microsoft Azure Stack Hub or an equivalent platform, or alternatively within the NARW Azure tenant, using Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) and/or Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) models, as agreed with the Beneficiary."*
Clarification requested:
(a) Which of the two options (ADR Government Private Cloud or NARW Azure tenant) is currently preferred or more likely to be available at the time of system deployment?
(b) If ADR Azure Stack Hub is selected, can the Purchaser confirm the availability of the following managed services on the ADR platform: Azure Kubernetes Service (AKS), Azure Database for PostgreSQL, Azure Cache for Redis, Azure Blob Storage?
(c) Are there specific constraints or service limitations of the ADR platform that Proposers should consider when designing the solution architecture?

Answer to Question 55:

(a) At this stage, the final hosting option is not yet confirmed. The **preferred option** is deployment within the Government Private Cloud (ADR), while deployment within the existing NARW Azure tenant, already available, remains an alternative option. Consequently, Proposers shall design the solution architecture in a cloud-agnostic and deployment-flexible manner, capable of operating within either environment, subject to confirmation during the analysis phase and approval by the Beneficiary.
(b) The Purchaser cannot, at this stage, formally confirm the availability of specific managed platform services within the future ADR Government Private Cloud environment, including but

not limited to Azure Kubernetes Service (AKS), Azure Database for PostgreSQL, Azure Cache for Redis, or Azure Blob Storage. As specified in the RFP, the final hosting option and deployment model will be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on institutional constraints and Beneficiary approval.

(c) The ADR Government Private Cloud is currently envisaged to operate based on Microsoft Azure Stack Hub. At present, Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) capabilities are expected to be available, while additional cloud service models and capabilities may evolve over time. Therefore, Proposers should consider that the final hosting environment may differ from a standard hyperscale Microsoft Azure environment in terms of available services, deployment models, and operational constraints. Accordingly, the proposed solution architecture should ensure compatibility with the selected cloud environment and provide sufficient flexibility to support deployment and operation within the final approved infrastructure, as **confirmed during the analysis phase**.

Question 56: — Cloud Infrastructure Costs | RFP Reference: §1.4.7

The RFP states: *"Install, configure, and deploy all system components—custom-developed and COTS— within the Beneficiary's cloud infrastructure, ensuring full functional operation, secure integration between components, and readiness for testing, acceptance, and operational use."*

And: *"The final hosting option and deployment model shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase, based on institutional constraints and Beneficiary approval."*

Clarification requested:

(a) Can the Purchaser confirm that cloud infrastructure subscription costs (Azure compute, storage, networking, managed services) are borne by the Beneficiary and are NOT to be included in the Proposer's Price Schedules?

(b) If cloud infrastructure costs ARE to be included by the Proposer, please specify the expected scope: number of environments (development, testing, staging, production, disaster recovery), duration, and any cost ceilings.

(c) Is the Beneficiary responsible for provisioning the cloud environments (subscriptions, resource groups, networking), with the Proposer responsible only for deploying and configuring the application components within those environments?

Answer to Question 56:

(a) Cloud infrastructure subscription costs related to the Beneficiary's hosting environment are provided by the Beneficiary and **shall not** be included in the Proposer's Price Schedules.

(b) Not applicable, considering the response to item (a).

(c) The Beneficiary is expected to provide and approve the target cloud hosting environment, based on the agreed architecture and infrastructure sizing defined together with the Proposer during the analysis and design phase. The Contractor shall be responsible for the design, configuration, deployment, and integration of the proposed solution components within the approved environment.

Question 57: — Disaster Recovery Environment | RFP Reference: §1.5.6

The RFP states: *"Support for disaster recovery procedures, including restoration of services in an alternate environment where required."*

And: *"The architecture must include "availability" and a separate "disaster recovery" consideration."*

Clarification requested:

(a) Is a geographically separate DR site required (different Azure region), or is DR within the same Azure region (different Availability Zone) acceptable?

(b) Are the costs for the DR environment infrastructure included in the Beneficiary's cloud subscription,

or should the Proposer include them in the Price Schedules?

Answer to Question 57:

(a) The disaster recovery environment shall be designed as a separate recovery environment, preferably in a geographically separate location from the primary environment, while remaining

within the European Union territory, in compliance with GDPR, data residency and applicable institutional requirements.
The detailed disaster recovery architecture, including whether it will rely on a different Azure region, availability zones, an ADR Government Private Cloud setup, or another approved deployment model, shall be finalized during the analysis phase, based on the selected hosting environment, Beneficiary approval, technical feasibility and applicable security requirements.

(b) Costs related to the underlying cloud infrastructure, including disaster recovery hosting infrastructure, are expected to be borne by the Beneficiary and shall not be included in the Proposer's Price Schedules
The Proposer shall, however, include in its technical proposal the proposed DR approach, sizing assumptions, dependencies, required infrastructure resources and any related licensing or subscription assumptions.

Performance and Availability

Question 58: — Availability Measurement | RFP Reference: §1.6.4, §E
The RFP states: *"The Information System shall be designed to ensure high availability and operational continuity."*
And: *"Availability testing with minimum uptime >= 99.5%."*
Clarification requested:
(a) Is the ≥99.5% availability target measured on a 24/7/365 basis (including nights, weekends, and public
holidays), or during business hours only (e.g., Monday–Friday, 08:00–18:00)?
(b) Are planned maintenance windows excluded from availability calculations?
(c) Is the 99.5% target applied per subsystem individually, or to the IWRACS system as a whole?

Answer to Question 58:
(a) The ≥99.5% availability target shall be considered on a 24/7/365 basis for **production** environments supporting operational continuity of critical services.
(b) Planned maintenance windows agreed in advance with the Beneficiary may be excluded from availability calculations.
(c) The availability target applies to the operational availability of the IWRACS ecosystem as a whole, while ensuring that critical subsystems and core functionalities remain continuously available in accordance with the approved architecture.

Question 59: — P1 Critical Incident SLA | RFP Reference: §F
The RFP states: *"P1 Critical: 2 hours response time / 4 hours resolution time — P1 incidents are measured
on "24/7 calendar hours.""*
Clarification requested:
(a) Does this require the Proposer to maintain a 24/7 on-call support team (including nights, weekends, and Romanian public holidays) for the entire warranty and support period?
(b) Or is the intent that the response time clock runs on 24/7 calendar hours, but actual support operations are performed during extended business hours (e.g., 07:00–22:00)?

Answer to Question 59:
(a) For **critical incidents** (Priority P1), response and resolution times shall be measured in calendar hours (24/7 basis), as specified in the RFP.
(b) **No**. For Priority P1 incidents, both response and resolution times are measured on a 24/7 calendar-hour basis. For all other priorities (P2–P4), response and resolution times are measured during NARW working hours.

Question 60: — Recovery Point Objective (RPO) | RFP Reference: §1.5.6, §E
The RFP states: *"Ability to restore data and services within agreed recovery objectives."* And: *"Disaster recovery: compliance with defined RTO/RPO targets, no data loss."* **Clarification requested:**

(a) What are the specific RTO (Recovery Time Objective) and RPO (Recovery Point Objective) values expected by the Purchaser?
(b) The requirement for "no data loss" implies RPO=0, which requires synchronous database replication with significant cost and performance implications. Would a near-zero RPO (e.g., ≤5 minutes of potential data loss) be acceptable?
(c) Do different subsystems have different RTO/RPO requirements (e.g., stricter for SIGAR regulatory acts vs. ROwaterDATA reporting data)?

Answer to Question 60:
(a) The detailed RTO and RPO targets shall be established together with the Beneficiary during the analysis and design phase and documented within the corresponding technical and architecture deliverables required under Section 2.6.3.
(b) The reference to "no data loss" represents the target objective for critical operations and data integrity. Proposers may propose technically justified recovery mechanisms and achievable RPO values appropriate to the proposed architecture and hosting environment, subject to Beneficiary review and approval during the analysis phase.
(c) Yes. Different subsystems or business processes may require different RTO/RPO targets depending on their operational criticality, regulatory impact, and usage scenarios. The final recovery objectives shall be established together with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Database and Technology

Question 61: — Database Extensions | RFP Reference: §2.3.6.1
The RFP states: *"All integrations shall operate without reliance on proprietary or non-standard database extensions."*
Clarification requested:
PostGIS is an open-source, industry-standard geospatial extension for PostgreSQL, widely used in government and environmental systems worldwide. It is essential for the geospatial data management requirements of ROwaterDATA (river basin boundaries, monitoring station locations, spatial queries). Is PostGIS considered a "proprietary or non-standard extension" under this requirement, or is it acceptable given its open-source nature and industry-standard status?

Answer to Question 61:
PostGIS, as an open-source and widely adopted geospatial extension for PostgreSQL, is not considered a proprietary database extension within the context of this requirement. Its use is acceptable, provided that the proposed solution remains based on open standards, ensures interoperability, and does not introduce vendor lock-in or restrictions affecting portability, maintainability, or integration with the broader IWRACS ecosystem.

Question 62: — BI Tool Preference | RFP Reference: §1.6.2.3
The RFP states: *"Compatibility with BI tools (Power BI, Tableau, or equivalent) must be ensured."*
Clarification requested:
Does the Beneficiary currently use or plan to use a specific BI tool (Power BI, Tableau, or other)? This information affects integration design and testing scope for the Reporting component.

Answer to Question 62:
Currently, within NARW there are systems that already use reporting and analytics functionalities, including reports implemented in Microsoft Power BI.

Data Migration and Existing Systems

Question 63: — Source Systems for Data Migration | RFP Reference: §C.2.5
The RFP states: *"Requirements for "Data Conversion and Migration" including data from existing NARW systems."*
Clarification requested:

(a) Can the Purchaser provide an inventory of existing IT systems from which data must be migrated to IWRACS (per subsystem)?
(b) What data formats and technologies are currently used by these existing systems (databases, file formats, APIs)?
(c) Is technical documentation (data dictionaries, API specifications, database schemas) available for the existing systems?
(d) What is the approximate volume of data to be migrated per subsystem?
This information is critical for accurate estimation of migration effort, which can vary by a factor of 2x–5x depending on the complexity and quality of source data.

Answer to Question 63:

(a) Indicative information regarding existing datasets and thematic data domains is provided in **Annex 1** – ROwaterDATA Catalog of Existing Datasets and Illustrative Samples. The complete inventory of source systems, datasets, repositories, and migration scope shall be further analyzed and finalized during the Data Migration Assessment Phase in collaboration with Beneficiary.
(b) Existing source systems may include databases, file-based repositories, APIs, and semi-structured or unstructured datasets. The detailed technical characteristics, including data formats, structures, interfaces, and interoperability requirements, shall be further assessed during the Data Migration Assessment as part of the analysis phase.
(c) The availability and level of technical documentation for existing systems may vary depending on the respective source system. Where available, the Beneficiary shall provide the Consultant with relevant documentation and information during the analysis phase, including data structures, interfaces, schemas, and other available technical references.
(d) Indicative information regarding estimated capacity and datasets is provided in Annex 1 – ROwaterDATA Catalog of Existing Datasets and Annex 12 – Estimated Capacity Planning. Final data volumes, migration effort, and migration strategy shall be validated and refined during the analysis phase as part of Data Migration Assessment.

Question 64: — Existing Electronic Registry | RFP Reference: §1.3.4, DMS-RAE

The RFP states: *"DMS-RAE [...] providing electronic registry, document and records management [...] and full legal and audit traceability."*

Clarification requested:

(a) Is there an existing electronic registry (registratura electronica) system currently in use at NARW that must be migrated to the new DMS-RAE?
(b) If yes, what is the volume of existing records (number of documents, total storage size)?
(c) Are there data retention requirements beyond the 5-year minimum for audit logs mentioned in §1.6.2.7?

Answer to Question 64:

(a) At present, the Beneficiary does not operate a unified electronic registry system across the NARW institutional hierarchy. Existing registry workflows and document registration processes are primarily paper based, including physical signatures and approvals, while certain documents may also exist in digital form as scanned copies or locally stored electronic files.
(b) Not applicable.
(c) Not applicable
(d) Yes. In addition to the minimum audit log retention requirements specified in the RFP, the solution shall support configurable document retention and archival policies aligned with institutional procedures and requirements agreed with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Integration and Interoperability

Question 65: — External System Integration | RFP Reference: Annex 13

The RFP states: *"SIGAR Interoperability with Other IT Systems — listing several external systems for integration."*

Clarification requested:
(a) Can the Purchaser provide detailed technical specifications (API documentation, communication protocols, data formats, authentication mechanisms) for each external system listed in Annex 13?
(b) Are these external systems currently operational and accessible for integration testing during the implementation period?
(c) Who is responsible for providing test environments and test data for external system integrations?

Answer to Question 65:
(a) Annex 13 provides indicative interoperability requirements, datasets, and integration approaches for the identified external systems. Detailed technical specifications, including APIs, communication protocols, authentication mechanisms, data formats, and integration methods, may vary depending on each external system and shall be further clarified and agreed during the analysis and design phase in collaboration with the Beneficiary and relevant third-party system owners. Annex 13 defines the expected interoperability scope, indicative datasets and possible integration approaches for the external systems identified in the RFP. Detailed technical specifications, including API documentation, communication protocols, data formats, authentication mechanisms and integration methods, may differ from one system to another and shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase, in coordination with the Beneficiary and, where applicable, the relevant third-party system owners.
   (a) **Note:** *References to the* ***Water Registry System*** *shall be understood as references to the existing NARW* ***Water Cadastre*** *system. The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency.*
   At present, ECA-RO and ASIS provide certain REST API capabilities. The availability, maturity, documentation, access conditions and readiness for integration testing of the other external systems shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.
   For the Water Cadastre System, the required integration concerns the automatic transmission by SIGAR of permit or authorization details upon issuance of the relevant regulatory act, to ensure traceability and alignment with national water cadastre records. The Consultant shall design and develop the required API or integration mechanism based on the data structures, technical specifications, and access arrangements confirmed during the analysis phase.
(b) The operational status, accessibility, and readiness of external systems for integration testing may vary depending on the respective system and third-party stakeholders. Integration testing activities shall therefore be coordinated during the implementation phase with the Beneficiary and the relevant system owners.
(c)The Beneficiary shall facilitate coordination with relevant stakeholders regarding access to available test environments and test data, where such environments exist and can be made available. The Consultant shall be responsible for preparing, configuring, and executing the required integration testing activities within the agreed implementation framework, as defined following the analysis phase.

Question 66: — ArcGIS Integration | RFP Reference: §1.6.2.4
The RFP states: *"Interactions with ArcGIS, DMS-RAE, and other integration points shall not introduce delays exceeding 3 seconds in standard tasks."*
Clarification requested:
(a) Does NARW currently have an ArcGIS deployment? If so, what version and licensing model (ArcGIS Enterprise, ArcGIS Online)?
(b) Is the Proposer expected to provide ArcGIS licenses, or will ArcGIS be available within the Beneficiary's existing infrastructure?
(c) What specific interactions between SIGAR and ArcGIS are expected (e.g., map display, spatial queries, overlay analysis)?

Answer to Question 66:
(a) Yes. NARW currently operates an ArcGIS Enterprise 11 deployment, with the future option to

upgrade to ArcGIS Enterprise 12. In addition to the central ArcGIS Enterprise portal operated at NARW level, each River Basin Administration (ABA) maintains its own separate ArcGIS Enterprise 11 portal serving regional operational needs. The future SIGAR system is envisioned to be integrated with NARW's central ArcGIS Enterprise environment, while ensuring interoperability with the regional GIS infrastructures where required.
(b) ArcGIS capabilities are available within the Beneficiary's existing infrastructure. The Consultant shall ensure interoperability and integration with the existing ArcGIS environment, as further defined during the analysis and design phase.
(c) Expected interactions between SIGAR and the existing ArcGIS environment may include, as applicable, map visualization, identification and localization of water bodies and project sites, coordinate-based search and positioning, visualization of relevant GIS layers, and retrieval of spatial reference information required for permitting and authorization workflows. The detailed integration scope and functionalities shall be further defined and agreed during the analysis and design phase.

Implementation and Organization

Question 67: — Delivery Milestones and Liquidated Damages | RFP Reference: §Schedule, Table 70
The RFP states: *"Four Go-Live milestones (R1–R4) with Liquidated Damages clauses, starting with DMS- RAE Go-Live at Week 25."*
Clarification requested:
(a) Are the milestone dates firm or indicative? Can they be adjusted during the analysis and design phase?
(b) If delays are caused by the Beneficiary (e.g., delayed review or approval of deliverables), are the Liquidated Damages milestone dates adjusted accordingly?
(c) What is the formal mechanism for documenting and agreeing on Beneficiary-caused delays?

Answer to Question 67:
(a) The milestone dates defined in the RFP represent the initial contractual implementation schedule. Detailed planning, sequencing, and validation of activities shall be further refined during the analysis phase in agreement with the Beneficiary, provided that the contract milestone, overall contractual objectives and implementation constraints are respected, unless otherwise adjusted in accordance with the Contract provisions.
(b) Yes. Where delays are demonstrably caused by the Beneficiary, including delayed reviews, approvals, access provision, dependencies, or decisions required for implementation, the corresponding implementation schedule and associated milestone dates shall be adjusted accordingly, subject to formal agreement between the Parties and in accordance with the Contract provisions.
(c) Beneficiary-caused delays shall be formally documented through the project governance and contract management mechanisms, including meeting minutes, progress reports, formal notifications, change requests, issue logs, and written approvals or decisions agreed between the Parties.

Question 68: — Training Logistics | RFP Reference: §C.2.4
The RFP states: *"All training sessions shall be delivered in Romanian, by trainers with proven knowledge of the system."*
Clarification requested:
(a) How many training sessions are expected per subsystem and per site? What is the expected number of participants per session?
(b) Must all training sessions be delivered on-site at SCAR headquarters and 11 ABAs, or is remote/online delivery acceptable for some sessions?
(c) Should travel and accommodation costs for trainers be included in the Proposer's Price Schedules?

Answer to Question 68:
(a) The minimum training scope, delivery methods, and indicative participant groups are defined in Section 2.4 and Annex 9 of the RFP. The exact number of training sessions per subsystem and

per site will be determined during the implementation phase, based on the finalized role allocation, organizational structure, and rollout approach agreed with the Beneficiary.
For planning and estimation purposes, the Beneficiary currently anticipates the following indicative minimum training groups:

ROwaterDATA

- 15 IT/System Administrators (online – 2 sessions of ½ day each),
- 30 Dataset Administrators / Responsible Users (combined onsite training of 2 full days and online training of 2 sessions of ½ day each),
- 20 Report Administrators (combined onsite and online training equivalent to 2 full days),
- 50 Data Validators (online – 2 sessions of ½ day each),
- 150 Data Operators (online – 2 sessions of ½ day each).

SIGAR

- 15 IT/System Administrators (online – 2 sessions of ½ day each),
- 15 Coordinators / Managers (onsite at NARW headquarters – 1 full day),
- 15 SEICA Members (onsite at NARW headquarter – 1 full day),
- Approximately 110 Operators and Collaborators (online – 2 sessions of ½ day each).

Proposers should use the above figures as indicative minimum estimates for effort and costing purposes. Final participant allocation, session planning, delivery format, number of sessions, and logistics shall be agreed with the Beneficiary during the implementation phase.

(b) Yes. The majority of training sessions may be delivered remotely/online, depending on the subsystem, target audience, and training objectives, in accordance with the RFP and as agreed with the Beneficiary. Where the RFP explicitly requires on-site delivery, training is currently envisaged primarily at SCAR (NARW headquarters), including approximately 50 on-site participants for ROwaterDATA and approximately 30 on-site participants for SIGAR. For DMS-RAE and the Portal, the delivery approach shall follow the requirements specified in Section 2.4, including both in-person and online sessions, as applicable.

(c) Yes. The Proposer shall include in its Price Schedules all costs related to the delivery of training services, including trainer travel, accommodation, logistics, and associated operational costs, in accordance with the proposed training approach and the requirements specified in the RFP.

Question 69: — Key Expert Allocation | RFP Reference: §C.2.7

The RFP states: *“The RFP requires 6 Key Experts: Project Manager, Business Analyst, Solution Architect, Technical Lead, Senior Developer, and Cyber Security Expert.”*

Clarification requested:

(a) Must all 6 Key Experts be full-time dedicated to the project for the entire 60-week implementation period, or can some be engaged part-time during phases where their role is less active?

(b) Can a single person fulfill multiple Key Expert roles if they meet all qualification requirements for both roles?

Answer to Question 69:

(a) The Key Experts shall remain available and assigned to the project throughout the Contract implementation period in accordance with the agreed workplan and project activities. However, their level of involvement and allocation effort may vary depending on the implementation phase and the nature of the activities performed.

(b) No. As specified in Section 2.7.2 of the RFP, each Key Expert shall be assigned and evaluated for a single key position. Accordingly, the same Key Expert may not be proposed to fulfill multiple Key Expert roles.

Commercial and Qualification

Question 70: — Financial Qualification | RFP Reference: §III, Table 11

The RFP states: *“Minimum average annual turnover of EUR 6,000,000.”*

Clarification requested:

(a) What is the reference period for calculating average annual turnover (last 3 fiscal years or last

5 fiscal years)?
(b) For Joint Ventures, is the EUR 6,000,000 threshold applied to the lead member only, or to the combined turnover of all JV members?

Answer to Question 70:
The Financial Qualification requirement shall be assessed in accordance with the provisions of Section III, Table 1.3 Financial situation, sub-factor 1.3.2., respectively equivalent of EUR 6,000,000, calculated as total certified payments received for contracts in progress or completed, within the last 3 years.
The qualification criteria applicable to Joint Ventures. The reference period for calculating the average annual turnover is the period expressly specified in the RFP and the supporting financial documentation submitted by the Proposers.
Where the Proposers is a Joint Venture, compliance with the minimum average annual turnover requirement shall be for all members combined. The RFP does not establish a separate minimum turnover requirement for the Lead Member or for individual Joint Venture members.

Question 71: — Similar Experience | RFP Reference: §III, Table 12
The RFP states: *"At least 3 contracts of similar nature within the last 5 years."*
Clarification requested:
(a) What constitutes a contract of "similar nature"? Must a single reference contract cover all four subsystem types (DMS, Portal, BPM/workflow, Data Management), or is experience with a subset (e.g., DMS + Portal) sufficient?
(b) Is there a minimum contract value threshold for reference contracts?

Answer to Question 71:
(a) Each qualifying contract must individually demonstrate implementation of an Information System meeting the minimum characteristics expressly specified under the Specific Experience requirement, namely:
    1. a multi-module system (at least 3 functional components);
    2. integration with at least two external applications or systems;
    3. cloud-based or hybrid deployment;
    4. workflow automation and document management functionalities;
    5. role-based access control; and
    6. successful Operational Acceptance confirmed by an Operational Acceptance Certificate (or equivalent).
(b) Yes. As specified in Section III, Factor 1.4.2, each qualifying contract must have a minimum value of EUR 1,000,000 (or equivalent).

Question 72: — Estimated Contract Value | RFP Reference: General
The RFP states: *"The RFP does not specify an estimated contract value or budget range."*
Clarification requested:
Can the Purchaser provide the estimated contract value or indicative budget range? This information helps Proposers calibrate the scope and depth of their technical and financial proposals appropriately.

Answer to Question 72:
The Purchaser does not intend to disclose an estimated contract value or indicative budget range. Proposers shall prepare their Technical and Financial Proposals based on their own assessment of the requirements, scope, complexity, risks, resources, and deliverables set out in the RFP. The Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation methodology and criteria specified in the RFP.

Development and Testing Environments

Question 73: — Non-Production Environment Provisioning | RFP Reference: §1.4, Annex 14
The RFP states (§1.4): "Separation of Environments: Logical and/or physical separation of

environments (e.g. production, testing, training, disaster recovery), ensuring that operational activities are not impacted by testing or maintenance operations."
And Annex 14 recommends five environments for the CI/CD process: Local Environment, Integration Environment (CI), Testing Environment, Staging/Acceptance Environment, and Production Environment. **Clarification requested:**
(a) Can the Purchaser confirm that all non-production environments (Integration/CI, Testing, Staging/UAT) will be provisioned within the Beneficiary's cloud infrastructure (ADR or NARW Azure tenant), alongside the Production and DR environments?
(b) If the Proposer is expected to include the costs for non-production environments in the Price Schedules, please specify: how many environments are required (Integration, Testing, Staging as separate, or can some be combined), and for what duration (implementation period only, or also during warranty)?
(c) Who is responsible for providing anonymized production-like datasets for the Testing and Staging environments, as recommended in Annex 14?
(d) Is the Training environment expected to be a separate environment, or is it acceptable to conduct training sessions on the Testing or Staging environment as described in Annex 14?

Answer to Question 73:
(a) The Beneficiary expects that at least Testing and Production environments be provisioned within the agreed hosting infrastructure (ADR Government Cloud and/or NARW Azure tenant), based on the architecture and deployment model agreed during the analysis phase.
(b) Cloud infrastructure costs related to the Beneficiary's hosting environments willbe borne by the Beneficiary. The recommended environments described in Annex 14 represent guidance and best practices for the CI/CD process. The final number, structure, separation, and lifecycle of non-production environments (e.g., Integration, Testing, Staging/UAT, Training) shall be agreed during the analysis and design phase based on operational, technical, and budgetary considerations. Depending on the agreed architecture, certain non-production environments may be logically separated and/or combined.
(c) The Beneficiary shall facilitate access to available datasets and relevant information required for testing activities. The Consultant shall be responsible for preparing, configuring, anonymizing, and managing test datasets in accordance with applicable security, confidentiality, and GDPR requirements.
(d) The Training environment does not necessarily need to be implemented as a permanently separate environment. Depending on the agreed implementation approach, training activities may be conducted using a dedicated Training environment or an appropriately configured Testing or Staging environment, provided that operational activities and testing integrity are not impacted.

Training

Question 74: — Training Sessions Scope | RFP Reference: §C.2.4, Annex 9
The RFP states (§C.2.4.5): ROwaterDATA requires 13 training sessions and SIGAR requires 6 training sessions, "combining on-site and online format, as specified in Annex 9."
Clarification requested:
(a) What is the expected duration of each training session (half-day, full-day, multi-day)?
(b) What is the expected number of participants per session for ROwaterDATA and SIGAR? The RFP specifies 15-25 per session for DMS-RAE but does not specify for the other subsystems.
(c) For ROwaterDATA, approximately 4,100 NARW staff are classified as "read-only users / report viewers." Is it acceptable to provide training for this group through self-service materials (recorded video tutorials, user manuals, in-application Help section) rather than live instructor-led sessions?

Answer to Question 74:
(a) & (b) The exact number of participants per session for ROwaterDATA and SIGAR may vary depending on the final allocation of roles and organizational responsibilities. However, for planning and estimation purposes, the Beneficiary currently anticipates at minimum the following indicative training groups for ROwaterDATA:

- 15 IT/System Administrators (online – 2 sessions ½ day),
- 30 Dataset Administrators / Responsible users (combined onsite 2 full days and online 2 sessions ½ day),
- 20 Reports Administrators (combined onsite and online for 2 full days),
- 50 Data Validators (online - 2 sessions ½ day),
- 150 Data Operators (online - 2 sessions ½ day).

For SIGAR, the indicative minimum training population is currently estimated at approximately:

- 15 IT/System Administrators (online – 2 sessions ½ day),
- 15 Coordinators / Managers (onsite in SCAR for 1 full day),
- 15 SEICA members (onsite in SCAR for 1 full day),
- approximately 110 operators and collaborators (online – 2 sessions ½ day).

Final participant allocation, session planning, delivery format, and logistics shall be agreed with the Beneficiary during the implementation phase.

(c) Yes. For general end-users and read-only/report-viewer roles, it is acceptable to provide training through self-service materials such as recorded video tutorials, user manuals, in-application Help sections, practical guidance materials, and recorded sessions, in accordance with the RFP requirements and subject to Beneficiary approval.

Question 75: — Training Delivery Format | RFP Reference: §C.2.4.5
The RFP states (§C.2.4.2): Training sessions shall be delivered "on-site or online, as agreed with the Beneficiary." For DMS-RAE, in-person training is specified at 5 physical hubs (Oradea, Arges, Colibita/Bihor, Bacau, Bucharest).
Clarification requested:
(a) For ROwaterDATA and SIGAR on-site sessions, must they be delivered at SCAR headquarters in Bucharest, or at multiple regional locations (similar to DMS-RAE)?
(b) Are the online training sessions to be delivered using the Beneficiary's existing platform (e.g., Microsoft Teams) or must the Proposer provide a webinar/e-learning platform?
(c) Must the Proposer provide presentation equipment (projector, laptop, internet access) at the 5 DMS- RAE training hubs, or will these be provided by the Beneficiary?

Answer to Question 75:

(a) For ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, onsite training sessions are currently envisaged primarily at SCAR (NARW headquarters) in Bucharest.
(b) Online training sessions may be delivered using the Beneficiary’s existing collaboration and communication platform – Microsoft Teams or through equivalent solutions proposed by the Consultant and agreed with the Beneficiary during implementation.
(c) The Beneficiary will provide the main logistical infrastructure required for training delivery within the designated NARW training hubs located in Oradea, Argeș, Colibița (Bistrița-Năsăud County), Bacău, and București, including meeting/training rooms, projector/display capabilities, internet connectivity, and standard presentation facilities.

Infrastructure Sizing

Question 76: — SIGAR Dossier Sizes | RFP Reference: Annex 12, §1.6.2.4
The RFP states (Annex 12, Table 157): Sample large project files range from 700 MB to 4 GB per submission. And (§1.6.2.4): "Access, preview, and processing of large files must remain available without timeouts." **Clarification requested:**
What is the average dossier size for a typical regulatory act submission (permit, authorization, endorsement)? The RFP mentions examples of 700 MB to 5 GB for large projects, but this may not be representative of the majority of submissions. The average dossier size directly impacts storage infrastructure sizing (a 10x difference in average size results in a 10x difference in annual storage requirements).
(a) What percentage of submissions are expected to be "large" (>100 MB)? Based on 2024 volumes (~15,670 regulatory acts per year), even a small percentage of large submissions can significantly impact storage planning.

(b) Are the files in the dossiers primarily PDF documents, CAD/GIS drawings, or other formats? This affects both storage requirements and processing capabilities (preview, indexing, OCR).
(c) See the Addendum no. 2 to the Request for Proposals (RFP).

Answer to Question 76:

(a) The examples of 700 MB – 5 GB referenced in the RFP represent complex infrastructure and development projects. In practice, large submissions (>100 MB) are expected to represent the majority of permitting and authorization dossiers, potentially up to approximately 90% of submissions, as each regulatory act application is typically accompanied by the complete supporting technical documentation related to the project (studies, plans, maps, CAD/GIS files, annexes, permits, and other supporting materials). However, the exact average dossier size may vary depending on the project type, complexity, and regulatory requirements.

(b) Submitted files may include PDF documents, technical studies, scanned documentation, CAD drawings, GIS-related files, images, archives, and other technical attachments associated with permitting and authorization workflows. The proposed solution should therefore support storage, upload, preview, indexing, and processing of heterogeneous document formats. However, the detailed approach regarding indexing, OCR processing, metadata extraction, and document processing rules for specific document categories shall be further analyzed and agreed with the Beneficiary during the analysis and design phase, taking into consideration technical complexity, operational needs, and budgetary implications.

Question 77: — Data Volume Growth Projections | RFP Reference: Annex 12, §1.6.3
The RFP states (§1.6.3): "The design shall take into account the indicative assumptions provided in Annex 12 - Estimated Capacity Planning, including expected data volumes, number of users, and projected growth rates." And: "The system shall maintain defined performance levels under projected growth scenarios (minimum 5 years)."
Clarification requested:
(a) The capacity estimates in Annex 12 (e.g., 50-100 GB operational storage for ROwaterDATA) — do these represent current volumes or 5-year projections?
(b) What is the expected annual growth rate for SIGAR submissions? Is the 2024 volume of ~15,670 regulatory acts expected to remain stable, or is growth anticipated due to digitalization of previously paper-based processes?
(c) Is there existing historical data (documents, datasets, regulatory records) that must be migrated into IWRACS at go-live? If so, what is the approximate total volume?

Answer to Question 77:

(a) Yes. The capacity estimates provided in Annex 12 represent indicative estimations based on the currently known and anticipated operational data volumes at the time of RFP preparation, intended to support infrastructure sizing and scalability planning for the proposed solution architecture.

(b) The future annual volume of SIGAR submissions may evolve over time, particularly considering the expected digitalization and standardization of currently paper-based workflows and regulatory processes. However, the overall annual volume of regulatory acts is generally expected to remain relatively stable, as many permits and authorizations are subject to periodic renewal processes. For estimation purposes, the Beneficiary currently anticipates that future volumes may remain at similar levels to the 2024 baseline figures or increase moderately, potentially by approximately 10% over time.

(c) Yes. For **SIGAR**, the historical data currently envisaged for migration mainly consists of Excel-based registries of active permits, authorizations, endorsements, and related regulatory acts, intended primarily for information, consultation, and traceability purposes within the future solution. For **ROwaterDATA**, historical information mainly consists of datasets and records currently maintained in formats such as Excel files, Access databases, SQL databases, GIS-related sources, and similar structured repositories. Based on the current estimations provided in Annex 12, the indicative operational data volume for ROwaterDATA is estimated at approximately 30–50 GB (excluding backups and logs). The detailed migration scope, historical coverage, data quality, and migration approach shall be further assessed during the analysis phase as part of

Data Migration Assessment.

Data Migration

Question 78: — WIMS (SharePoint) Volume and Structure | RFP Reference: §Background (p.283)
The RFP states (p.283): "Document and registry-related solutions, where registry and central document management functionality exists only to a limited extent" — referring to the current WIMS platform based on SharePoint 2007.
Clarification requested:
(a) How many documents are currently stored in WIMS (approximate number of records and total storage size in GB)?
(b) What types of documents are stored (correspondence, permits, internal memos, scanned documents, etc.)?
(c) What metadata is associated with each document (registration number, date, category, author, status)?
(d) Is WIMS accessible via API or direct database connection for data extraction, or will export files (CSV/XML) need to be prepared by the Beneficiary?
(e) Are all documents in WIMS required to be migrated, or only those from a specific period (e.g., last 3-5 years)?

Answer to Question 78:
(a) At this stage, no finalized or validated inventory regarding the exact number of documents and total storage volume currently stored in WIMS is available. The detailed assessment of document volumes, repositories, and migration scope shall be performed during the analysis phase.
(b) Based on the current understanding of the existing environment, the WIMS platform may contain various categories of institutional documents, including, but not limited to, correspondence, permits, authorizations, internal memoranda, scanned documents, technical documentation, reports, and other administrative records. The detailed inventory and classification of document types will be confirmed during the analysis phase.
(c) The metadata structure may vary depending on the document category, and the registration practices implemented within the existing system. Available metadata may include, among others, registration number, registration date, document type/category, issuer or author, document status, organizational unit. The complete metadata model and mapping requirements will be identified and validated during the analysis phase.
(d) No dedicated API interface is available for extraction from the WIMS platform. Subject to applicable security, access, and technical constraints, data extraction may be performed through direct database access.
(e) The detailed technical approach for extraction and migration from the existing WIMS platform shall be done during the analysis phase
(f) Not all historical documents are expected to be migrated. The final migration scope, including applicable historical periods, document categories, archival rules, and prioritization criteria, shall be established together with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Question 79: — Portal Content Migration (rowater.ro) | RFP Reference: §1.3.5 (p.167)
The RFP states (p.167): "The portal solution may include the adaptation or full replacement of the existing public portal." The current portal (rowater.ro) is built on WordPress.
Clarification requested:
(a) How many pages and documents are currently published on rowater.ro (approximate number)?
(b) Is a full content migration expected (all existing pages, documents, and media files), or will the Beneficiary provide a curated content inventory of what should be migrated to the new portal?
(c) Are there URL redirect requirements (preserving existing URLs for SEO and external links)?

Answer to Question 79:
(a) The current NARW public web presence consists of the central website (rowater.ro) and the

websites of the 11 River Basin Administrations (ABAs), which are managed as separate platforms. At this stage, no validated inventory regarding the exact number of pages, documents, media files, or other content items is available. A detailed inventory and content assessment will be performed during the analysis phase.

(b) A full migration of all existing content is not currently envisaged. The Consultant shall perform a content inventory and support the Beneficiary in identifying content to be retained, updated, archived, or excluded. Only content validated and approved by the Beneficiary will be migrated.

(c) Yes. The future portal shall support URL management and redirection capabilities to preserve public access, external references, and SEO considerations, as and where applicable. The detailed redirect strategy will be defined during the analysis phase.

Question 80: — SIGAR Historical Regulatory Acts | RFP Reference: §C.2.5, §Background (p.280)

The RFP states (p.280): "the reporting process [...] is largely performed through manual procedures." Figure 6 (p.282) shows the current workflow for permits and authorizations is partially manual.

Clarification requested:

(a) How many years of historical regulatory acts (permits, authorizations, endorsements) must be migrated into SIGAR?

(b) Which historical records currently exist in digital format (database, Excel, scanned PDF) and are therefore available for automated migration?

(c) Please confirm that the scope of data migration under this contract is limited to records that already exist in digital format, and that digitization of paper-based archives (scanning, OCR, manual data entry) is not included in the Proposer's scope of work.

(d) Is the historical data currently stored in WIMS, in separate Excel files, or in another system? If another system, please specify.

Answer to Question 80:

(a) At this stage, the migration of historical regulatory acts currently envisaged mainly consists of Excel-based registries containing basic information regarding submitted permits, authorizations, and other related regulatory acts. The detailed migration scope, historical coverage, structure of records, and applicable business rules shall be further analyzed and agreed with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

(b) The historical records currently envisaged for migration mainly consist of Excel-based registries and records of active permits, authorizations, and other related regulatory acts. Where associated digital materials already exist in locally maintained electronic formats, such documents may also be linked or integrated with the corresponding records, subject to the conclusions and decisions established during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

(c) Yes. The migration scope currently envisaged under this Contract is primarily limited to records and information already available in digital format. Large-scale digitization of paper archives, mass scanning, OCR processing of historical archives, and extensive manual data entry activities are not currently envisaged as part of the core migration scope unless otherwise agreed during implementation.

(d) Historical information may currently exist in multiple formats and repositories, including WIMS (SQL Server database), Excel-based registries, locally maintained databases, scanned documents, and other organizational repositories, depending on the specific process and territorial unit. The detailed inventory and extraction approach shall be further analyzed during the analysis phase.

Question 81: — Existing Datasets Quality and Documentation | RFP Reference: §C.2.5, Annex 1

The RFP references 350+ common institutional datasets (p.280) managed across multiple organizational units, currently collected through manual processes (Excel, email).

Clarification requested:

(a) Is technical documentation available for the 350+ datasets (data dictionaries, field definitions, validation rules, relationships between datasets)?

(b) In what formats are the datasets currently maintained (Excel files, database tables, CSV, XML, other)?

(c) Has any data quality assessment been performed on the existing datasets? What is the estimated

data quality level (complete and validated, partially complete, or largely unstructured)?
(d) Will the Beneficiary provide a designated contact person per dataset or per ABA to support data profiling and validation during the Assessment phase?

Answer to Question 81:
(a) Available documentation for existing datasets may vary depending on the dataset and responsible organizational structure. Existing information may include field descriptions, validation rules, Excel structures, GIS attributes, database schemas, reporting templates, and other related technical or business documentation where available. An **illustrative example** regarding the type, structure, and complexity of the datasets currently managed within ROwaterDATA is provided in **Annex 1** – "ROwaterDATA – Catalog of Existing Datasets and Illustrative Samples". The detailed assessment, validation, and consolidation of dataset documentation shall be performed during the analysis phase.
(b) Existing datasets are currently maintained in heterogeneous formats, including Excel files, Access databases, SQL databases, GIS repositories, and other structured or semi-structured formats depending on the dataset and source system.
(c) No centralized formal data quality assessment covering all datasets has been completed. Existing datasets may therefore present different levels of quality, completeness, structure, standardization, and validation maturity depending on the source and reporting process. Data profiling, cleansing, validation, and harmonization activities are expected to form part of the implementation and analysis activities.
(d) Yes. The Beneficiary is expected to facilitate collaboration with designated business representatives, dataset owners, and/or technical contacts from relevant organizational units to support dataset analysis, profiling, validation, and clarification activities during the analysis phase.

External System Integration

Question 82: - ANMAP API Availability | RFP Reference: Annex 13
Annex 13 describes a bidirectional metadata exchange between SIGAR and ANMAP (Tables 158 and 159), covering 12 inbound fields and 16 outbound fields for environmental regulation procedures (SEA, EIA, AM, AR).
Clarification requested:
(a) Does ANMAP currently have a functional REST API that supports the metadata exchange described in Annex 13? If so, can the Purchaser provide or facilitate access to API technical documentation (endpoints, authentication, data formats)?
(b) If ANMAP does not currently have a functional API, who is responsible for developing the ANMAP-side API - the Proposer under this contract, ANMAP independently, or another party?
(c) Is there an existing formal data exchange agreement or protocol between NARW and ANMAP governing this integration?
(d) Is a test environment available on the ANMAP side for integration testing during the implementation period?

Answer to Question 82:
(a) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm the availability, maturity, or technical specifications of APIs exposed by ANMAP. Where available, relevant technical documentation and integration details shall be facilitated during the implementation phase in coordination with the relevant stakeholders.
(b) The scope of this Contract covers the implementation of integrations from the IWRACS side. Development, modification, or enablement of APIs within third-party external systems remains the responsibility of the respective system owner unless otherwise formally agreed between institutions.
(c) At this stage, there is a protocol between NARW and ANMAP. However, the current status, technical arrangements, and applicability of the protocol to the proposed integration will be reviewed and clarified during the analysis phase.
(d) Availability of ANMAP-side test environments cannot currently be formally confirmed and shall

depend on the capabilities and arrangements established with the respective institution during implementation.

Question 83: - MMAP Integration Scope | RFP Reference: Figure 1
Figure 1 (End-to-End Logical Architecture) includes MMAP in the "External Systems" box with an "Ingest" arrow towards ROwaterDATA. However, the RFP text does not describe any specific data exchange or API integration between IWRACS and MMAP as an IT system.
Clarification requested:
(a) Is there a specific system-to-system integration expected between IWRACS and MMAP? If so, what data is exchanged, in what direction, and through what mechanism?
(b) Or does the MMAP reference in Figure 1 represent institutional reporting (e.g., NARW submitting reports to the Ministry through DMS-RAE or email), rather than an automated IT integration?

Answer to Question 83:
(a) Figure 1 illustrates high-level logical interoperability considerations and potential institutional information exchanges. At this stage, no detailed automated system-to-system integration scope with MMAP has been formally defined.
(b) Yes. The MMAP reference shown in Figure 1 should currently be interpreted mainly as an institutional interaction and reporting relationship, including the possibility of exposing or exchanging data through secure API-based integrations where applicable and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 84: - EU Reporting Export Formats | RFP Reference: Annex 4, 5, 6, 7
The RFP describes reporting under four EU directives with detailed dataset structures in Annexes 4-7. For ICPDR/DanubeGIS (Annex 7), export formats are specified: Shapefile, DBF, Excel. For Nitrates, WFD, and EQS, the RFP refers to "standardized format" without specifying the exact file format.
Clarification requested:
(a) For Nitrates Directive reporting (7 datasets in Annex 4): what is the required export file format - XML, CSV, Excel, or a specific European Commission schema? Can the Purchaser provide the current reporting templates?
(b) For WFD reporting (Annex 5): is the required format the WISE RBMP 2022 XML schema, or another format? Can the Purchaser provide the current schemas or template files?
(c) For EQS reporting (Annex 6): what exact file format is required?
(d) Is data submission to EU platforms (WISE, DanubeGIS) done via manual upload on web platforms, or is an automated API (e.g., Reportnet 3.0) available?
(e) Are EU reporting formats expected to change during the implementation period (2026-2028)?

Answer to Question 84:
(a) For Nitrates Directive reporting, the RFP currently envisages standardized tabular reporting formats, including tables, charts, maps, and statistical summaries, as described in Annex 4. Current reporting practices mainly rely on structured Excel-type reporting templates and GIS-related information. Additional technical details, templates, and applicable schemas shall be provided by the Beneficiary to the Consultant during the analysis phase, based on the reporting requirements in force at that time.
(b) For WFD reporting, the proposed solution should support generation of datasets and exports compatible with the applicable WISE reporting requirements and schemas in force at the relevant reporting cycle, including XML-based structures where applicable. The detailed schemas, templates, and technical specifications available at implementation time shall be further clarified during the analysis phase.
(c) For EQS reporting, the exact export structures and file formats shall be aligned with the applicable reporting obligations, technical specifications, and reporting mechanisms in force at the relevant reporting period. Additional details and available templates will be provided by Beneficiary during analysis phase.
(d) Current reporting activities involve manual uploads through web-based reporting platforms, structured file exchanges, GIS-based submissions, or other applicable submission mechanisms,

depending on the reporting framework and target platform. Where officially supported APIs or automated submission mechanisms become available and accessible, the proposed solution should support future interoperability and automation capabilities where feasible.
(e) Yes. EU reporting requirements, schemas, templates, technical standards, and submission mechanisms are expected to evolve over time. The proposed solution should therefore ensure sufficient configurability and adaptability to accommodate future regulatory and technical changes during the implementation and operational lifecycle.

Question 85: - Data Exchange Agreements | RFP Reference: Annex 13, Figure 1
IWRACS requires integration with multiple external entities (ANMAP, ANAF, WISE/European Commission, ICPDR/DanubeGIS). Successful system-to-system integration typically requires formal agreements governing data formats, access credentials, and responsibilities.
Clarification requested:
(a) Are there existing formal data exchange agreements or interoperability protocols between NARW and: ANMAP, ANAF, European Commission (WISE), ICPDR (DanubeGIS)?
(b) If such agreements do not yet exist, who is responsible for establishing them - the Purchaser or the Proposer?
(c) For ANAF: is the integration limited to publicly available open-data APIs, or is authenticated access required (e.g., taxpayer verification of permit applicants)?

Answer to Question 85:
(a) The existence and maturity of formal interoperability agreements or operational data exchange protocols may vary depending on the external institution and reporting framework. Certain institutional coordination mechanisms and reporting obligations already exist, while additional interoperability arrangements may still be under discussion or subject to future formalization during analysis phase.
(b) Institutional agreements, protocols, and governance arrangements between public authorities remain primarily the responsibility of the respective institutions and the Beneficiary. The Consultant shall support the technical implementation of interoperability requirements within the agreed project scope.
(c) For ANAF, automatic validation or direct authenticated integration is not confirmed as a mandatory requirement at this stage. NARW currently has access to CUI-related information through existing integrations available within its information systems.
The detailed approach for entity validation, including the possible reuse of existing NARW integrations, database views, APIs, public/open-data services, authenticated queries or other controlled access mechanisms, shall be discussed and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 86: - SIGAR Standard Forms Inventory | RFP Reference: Annex 2, Annex 10
The RFP states that for each type of request, the system must "automatically generate the standard form provided in Annex 1b of Order No. 828/2019, based on the data entered by the beneficiary in the application interface." Annex 2 of the RFP provides examples of current regulatory process forms, and Annex 10 describes 10 Use Cases (UC1-UC10).
Clarification requested:
(a) Can the Purchaser provide the complete set of standard forms from Order No. 828/2019 (Annexes 1a through 1f and any other applicable annexes) that must be digitized and auto-generated by SIGAR?
(b) How many distinct standard forms are required in total across all 10 Use Cases (UC1-UC10)? Is each Use Case associated with one form template, or are there multiple form variants per Use Case?
(c) Are the forms expected to be generated as PDF documents (for download and signature), or should they also be available as editable electronic forms with digital signature integration?

Answer to Question 86:

(a) Illustrative examples of currently used forms are already included in Annex 8, which includes standard templates under Order No. 828/2019 and related procedures. The proposed solution shall support the generation of the required forms and associated workflows, based on the functional and technical approach agreed between the Beneficiary and the Consultant during the analysis and design phase.
(b) In general, each Use Case is expected to be associated with a primary standard form corresponding to the applicable regulatory procedure. However, additional form sections, annexes, notifications, generated documents, endorsements, decisions, or workflow-specific variants may be required depending on the workflow stage, procedural conditions, legal requirements, and approval flow. The final inventory and mapping of forms to workflows shall be established during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.
(c) The proposed solution shall support, at minimum, the generation of official documents in PDF format suitable for downloading, archiving, printing, and signing. Depending on the applicable workflow and legal requirements, the solution shall support both electronic signature mechanisms and handwritten signature workflows, as well as editable electronic forms and online submission functionalities, in accordance with the RFP requirements.

Electronic Signatures

Question 87: - Electronic Signature Provider and Infrastructure | RFP Reference: Section 1.1, Section 1.3.4
The RFP states (Section 1.3.4): "Support electronic signing using qualified, advanced, or internal certificates depending on assurance levels." And (Section 1.1): the system must comply with eIDAS Regulation (EU) No. 910/2014 on electronic identification and trust services. The system must support "electronic issuance of regulatory acts with qualified digital signatures per legislative requirements."
Clarification requested:
(a) Does NARW currently have a contract with a qualified electronic signature provider (e.g., certSIGN, DigiSign, Trans Sped, or another provider)? If so, which provider and what type of integration is available (API, PKCS#11, cloud-based signing)?
(b) If NARW does not currently have a signature provider, is the Proposer expected to include the cost of qualified electronic signature services (certificates, licenses) in the financial proposal, or will the Beneficiary procure these independently?
(c) Are qualified electronic signatures required for ALL regulatory acts issued by SIGAR (permits, authorizations, endorsements), or only for specific categories? What is the estimated annual volume of documents requiring qualified signatures?
(d) For applicant submissions (front-office): are external applicants expected to sign their submissions with qualified electronic signatures, or is a simpler authentication method (e.g., username/password + attached scanned signature) acceptable?
(e) Is the signing infrastructure based on physical tokens (USB smart cards) or cloud-based remote qualified signatures?

Answer to Question 87:
(a) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm a single mandatory qualified electronic signature provider or a standardized integration approach applicable across all organizational units.
(b) The Beneficiary is expected to procure and manage the qualified electronic signature services, certificates, and associated licensing required for institutional operations. Such costs should not be included in the Consultant's financial proposal.
(c) The final inventory of regulatory acts requiring qualified electronic signatures, as well as the applicable signing approach and estimated annual signing volumes, shall be established during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary, based on the applicable legal, procedural, and operational requirements. Not all regulatory acts may require or be suitable for qualified electronic signatures.
(d) Based on current practices, simpler authentication methods (e.g., user account authentication

and submission of electronically uploaded documents) are considered acceptable for external applicants. However, the solution should support future adoption of qualified electronic signatures if required by future regulatory or institutional requirements.
(e) NARW currently utilizes both token-based qualified electronic signatures and remote qualified signature solutions. The latter are typically provided through dedicated client applications operated by authorized service providers. Therefore, the proposed solution should be capable of supporting both local token-based and remote/cloud-based qualified electronic signature mechanisms.

Portal Features

Question 88: - Virtual Assistant (ChatBot) Scope | RFP Reference: Section 1.3.5
The RFP states (Section 1.3.5, B5): "Virtual Assistant (ChatBot) for the Extranet portal, available on desktop and mobile across public pages and e-services."
Clarification requested:
(a) Is the Virtual Assistant expected to provide simple FAQ-based responses with keyword matching (rule- based chatbot), or intelligent conversational responses using Natural Language Processing / AI capabilities?
(b) What is the expected scope of the knowledge base (number of topics, languages, domains)?
(c) Should the chatbot support handoff to a human operator for complex queries, or is fully automated response sufficient?

Answer to Question 88:
(a) The Virtual Assistant is currently envisaged primarily as an FAQ-based and guidance-oriented solution for the public portal and e-services. However, the proposed solution may also include NLP-based, AI-assisted, or hybrid conversational capabilities, depending on the Consultant's proposal and the functional approach agreed during the analysis phase.
(b) At this stage, no finalized inventory of FAQ topics, domains, or knowledge-base content is currently available. The Consultant is expected to analyze the Beneficiary's public services, workflows, documentation, and user interaction needs, and propose an appropriate knowledge-base structure, topics, and supported functionalities during the analysis phase.
(c) Fully automated responses are currently considered sufficient as a minimum requirement. However, the proposed solution may include escalation, contact, or redirection mechanisms toward responsible personnel or institutional communication channels, depending on the Consultant's proposal and the agreed implementation approach.

Question 89: - portal.just.ro Integration | RFP Reference: Section 1.3.5
The RFP states (Section 1.3.5): "Synchronization of court case data from portal.just.ro, with logging of all synchronized information."
Clarification requested:
(a) Does portal.just.ro provide a public API or structured data export for court case synchronization? If so, can the Purchaser provide or facilitate access to the API documentation?
(b) If no API is available, what method of data access is expected (manual data entry, file import, web scraping)?

Answer to Question 89:
(a) Yes. portal.just.ro provides public programmatic access through a SOAP-based web service for retrieving publicly available court cases and hearing information. The technical approach and use of this service shall be analyzed during the analysis and design phase.
(b) The expected approach is to use the available portal.just.ro programmatic access, where technically feasible, to retrieve relevant court case information. If limitations are identified, alternative technical acceptable methods shall be proposed and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 90: – ASIS/ATHOS API Integration | RFP Reference: Section 1.3, General Architecture
The RFP describes the need to integrate with ASIS (Automated System for Insolvency) and ATHOS

(system for trade register operations). These systems are critical for cross-referencing debtor information and company status during enforcement proceedings.

Clarification requested:

(a) Do ASIS and ATHOS provide REST/SOAP APIs for data queries? If so, can the Purchaser provide API documentation or endpoint specifications?

(b) What specific data fields are required from each system (e.g., insolvency status, company registration data, debtor identification)?

(c) Are there rate limits, authentication requirements, or SLA guarantees for these APIs that the Contractor should account for in the solution design?

Answer to Question 90:

(a) The Beneficiary notes that ASIS is the ERP platform currently used within NARW for managing financial, accounting, and other administrative processes. At this stage, integrations with ASIS and ATHOS are expected to rely on the technical mechanisms currently available, which may include database views, tables, or other controlled data access methods. The available integration options and any related technical documentation will be clarified during the analysis phase.

(b) The specific data fields required from ASIS/ATHOS shall be defined during the analysis phase, based on the relevant workflows and business needs. These may include, as applicable, debtor identification data, company status, insolvency-related information, and other data required for verification and cross-referencing.

(c) Any authentication requirements, access restrictions, performance limitations, rate limits, or operational constraints shall be assessed during the analysis phase, based on the actual integration mechanism agreed with the Beneficiary.

Question 91: – Entra ID (Azure AD) Single Sign-On | RFP Reference: Section 1.4, Security Requirements

The RFP requires integration with the Ministry of Justice identity management infrastructure. Microsoft Entra ID (formerly Azure Active Directory) is the standard identity provider for Romanian government IT systems.

Clarification requested:

(a) Does the Ministry of Justice use Microsoft Entra ID (Azure AD) as the identity provider? If so, can the Purchaser confirm the supported SSO protocols (SAML 2.0, OpenID Connect, OAuth 2.0)?

(b) Should IWRACS support role-based access control (RBAC) mapped to Entra ID groups/roles, or will role management be handled entirely within the application?

(c) Is Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) enforced at the Entra ID level, or should the application implement its own MFA mechanism as a fallback?

Answer to Question 91:

(a) At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot confirm the identity provider, authentication protocols or internal identity-management arrangements used by the Ministry of Justice.
The reference to integration with Ministry of Justice systems shall be understood in relation to the use public available data and/or open-data mechanisms, where applicable, such as access to public case information from portal.just.ro, and not as an integration with the Ministry of Justice identity-management infrastructure.

(b) The Beneficiary expects the proposed solution to support interoperability with Microsoft Entra ID (Azure AD) and standard enterprise authentication protocols such as SAML 2.0, OpenID Connect (OIDC), and OAuth 2.0, where applicable within the institutional infrastructure.The proposed solution shall support role-based access control in accordance with the security and access-control requirements of the RFP. The Consultant shall collaborate with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase to assess the existing identity-management setup, security policies, operational workflows and user-role model, and shall propose the most appropriate RBAC implementation approach. This may include mapping roles and permissions to Microsoft Entra ID groups/roles, managing roles within the application, or applying a hybrid model, depending on what best supports security, maintainability and operational efficiency.

(c) MFA is currently enforced at the identity-provider level within NARW infrastructure. The proposed solution should therefore support interoperability with the institutional authentication and MFA mechanisms in place, while allowing additional application-level security controls where required by the agreed security architecture.

Registry and document workflow

Question 92: What is the internal procedure for handling incoming correspondence from external parties? Is there a formalized procedure document? *1.3.4D D.1.1/ p.185*

Answer to Question 92:

Yes. NARW operates documented procedures for document and correspondence management within its Quality Management System, implemented in accordance with ISO 9001 requirements. These procedures define the general rules for registration, routing, processing, approval, and archiving of incoming correspondence.

The minimum required workflow and functional requirements are described in Section D.1.1 of the RFP. During the Analysis Phase, the Consultant shall review the applicable procedures and working practices at SGA, ABA, and SCAR levels and implement their electronic workflow equivalent within the proposed solution, including routing rules, approval flows, responsibilities, and other operational requirements agreed with the Beneficiary.

Question 93: What is the internal procedure for drafting and circulating internal notes? Is there a formalized procedure document? *1.3.4D D.1.2/ p.186*

Answer to Question 93:
The minimum required workflow for internal notes (“Notă internă”) is defined in Section D.1.2 of the RFP. Existing procedures and approval flows may differ depending on the organizational structure and document type. The detailed operational procedures, routing, approval hierarchy, and workflow configuration shall be further analyzed and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 94: The CS defines the D.1.3 workflow structure (leave request). How many approval levels exist at NARW and who is the final management approver? *1.3.4D D.1.3/ p.186*

Answer to Question 94:
The exact number of approval levels and the final approval authority may vary depending on the employee role, organizational unit, and internal HR procedures. As described in Section D.1.3 of the RFP, the workflow shall support endorsement by replacement personnel, HR verification, supervisor approval, and final approval at the applicable management level. The detailed approval hierarchy and routing rules shall be configured during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Question 95: How many documents are registered daily on average at national level (incoming + outgoing + internal), per level SGA, ABA, SCAR? *1.6.2.5 / p.215*

Answer to Question 95:
Based on the 2025 registry closure figures currently available, the total number of registered documents at national level, covering SCAR, ABA and INHGA, was approximately 275,054 documents/year.
This corresponds to an indicative average of approximately:

- 754 documents/day, calculated over 365 calendar days; or
- 1,100 documents/working day, calculated over an indicative of 250 working days/year.

By institutional level, the indicative averages are as follows:
SCAR

- 2025 registered documents: 35,237
- Average per calendar day: approx. 97 documents/day
- Average per working day: approx. 141 documents/day

ABA level, aggregated

- 2025 registered documents: 232,213
- Average per calendar day: approx. 636 documents/day
- Average per working day: approx. 929 documents/day

INHGA

- 2025 registered documents: 7,604
- Average per calendar day: approx. 21 documents/day
- Average per working day: approx. 30 documents/day

The exact figures, including the detailed distribution by SGA, ABA, SCAR and other relevant institutional levels, shall be evaluated, confirmed and provided during the analysis phase, based on the detailed registry data made available by the Beneficiary.

Question 96: Is automatic CUI validation via the ANAF API required when adding a new sender? *1.3.4F / p.197*

Answer to Question 96:
The proposed solution should support mechanisms for preventing duplicate external entities and maintaining the consistency and accuracy of sender/beneficiary information. NARW currently has access to CUI-related information through existing integrations available within its information systems. The detailed approach for entity validation, including the possible reuse of existing integrations and services, shall be discussed and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 97: Withdrawal or cancellation of an already registered document – in what situations is it required and who has the right to do it? *1.3.4D / p.181*

Answer to Question 97:
Withdrawal, return, or cancellation of registered documents may be required in situations such as duplicate registration, registration errors, incorrect classification, withdrawn submissions, invalid documents, or procedural corrections. Such actions shall be performed only by authorized personnel according to the Beneficiary's organizational rules and permissions model. As required by the RFP, all such actions must remain fully traceable, auditable, and recorded within the workflow history.

Document flows and routing

Question 98: Are there formalized rules that define which type of document goes to which level (SGA vs. ABA vs. SCAR) and under what conditions? *1.3.4D / p.181*

Answer to Question 98:
Yes. NARW currently operates based on institutional competencies and hierarchical responsibilities across SGA, ABA, and SCAR levels. The proposed solution shall support configurable routing rules based on document type, organizational competence, workflow stage, and approval requirements. The detailed routing matrix and business rules shall be further analyzed and configured during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Question 99: Are there situations where a user needs to annotate an archived or finalized document directly, after the workflow has been closed? *1.3.4A / p.178*

Answer to Question 99:
Yes. In certain operational or legal situations, authorized users may need to add comments, resolutions, references, or additional annotations to finalized or archived documents, while preserving document integrity, auditability, and version history. The detailed permissions and operational rules shall be configurable within the proposed solution.

Question 100: What are the standard response deadlines per document type? Are there mandatory legal deadlines? *1.3.4D / p.181*

Answer to Question 100:
Response deadlines may vary depending on the document type, workflow category, and applicable legal framework. Certain document categories are subject to mandatory legal deadlines established by applicable legislation, while others follow internal institutional procedures. The detailed deadline management rules, reminders, escalation mechanisms, and notification thresholds shall be configured during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Question 101: When a user is absent/on leave, who takes over their responsibilities? Is there a formalized delegation procedure with a pre-assigned substitute? *1.3.4H/ p.200*

Answer to Question 101:
Yes. NARW currently applies organizational delegation and replacement mechanisms during leave or absence periods, including the possibility of predefined substitute persons depending on the organizational structure and workflow type. The proposed solution shall support configurable delegation rules, transfer of responsibilities, temporary reassignment, and automatic restoration of responsibilities, ensuring full traceability and audit logging.

Question 102: How many NARW users work simultaneously in DMS-RAE at national level? Are there estimates for peak hours? *1.6.2.5 / p.215*
Answer to Question 102:
The proposed solution should support concurrent operation across the entire NARW institutional hierarchy. At this stage, no finalized centralized statistics regarding simultaneous usage and peak-hour concurrency are currently available.

Electronic signature

Question 103: How many NARW employees require a qualified eIDAS electronic signature for issuing official documents? *1.3.4E / p.196; SIGAR/ p.167*

Answer to Question 103:
Qualified electronic signatures are currently used by a significant number of NARW employees, including management personnel, heads of organizational units, financial and accounting staff, personnel involved in EU-funded projects, and other designated employees. Based on current estimates, approximately half of the administrative staff have access to qualified electronic signatures. The final categories of users, roles, and workflows requiring qualified electronic signatures within the proposed solution will be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 104: Does NARW already have active contracts with a Qualified Trust Service Provider (certSIGN, DigiSign or another eIDAS-accredited QTSP)? *1.3.4E / p.196*

Answer to Question 104:
NARW does not currently operate under a single centralized institutional contract with one Qualified Trust Service Provider (QTSP). Different organizational units may use qualified electronic signature services provided through various arrangements. For example, some River Basin Administrations have cooperation agreements with STS, enabling the use of both token-based qualified electronic signatures and remote qualified electronic signatures. Therefore, the proposed solution should support interoperability with commonly used eIDAS-compliant signature services.

Question 105: Are handwritten signatures still used in NARW workflows, or has the institution fully transitioned to electronic signatures? *1.3.4E / p.196*

Answer to Question 105:
Handwritten signatures continue to be used in a number of NARW business processes. At the same time, qualified electronic signatures are increasingly used, supported by applicable systems, procedures, and legal requirements. Consequently, the proposed solution should support the coexistence of both paper-based and electronic-signature workflows, while facilitating the gradual digitalization of document approval and issuance processes.

Electronic archiving:

Question 106: Are NARW's archival nomenclatures approved by the National Archives? Can they be made available to the technical team? *1.3.4G / p.198*

Answer to Question 106:

NARW operates based on archival nomenclatures and document retention rules established in accordance with the internal procedures. Relevant archival nomenclatures, retention rules, and available procedures may be provided to the Consultant during the analysis phase, where applicable and available.

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised through Amendment No. 5 to the RFP. Integration with, or controlled transfer to, the National Archives is not included in the current scope of the project.

Question 107: The CS requires both automatic and manual archiving. Does NARW want automatic archiving implemented in phase 1, or is manual archiving sufficient initially? *1.3.4G / p.198*

Answer to Question 107:
The proposed solution shall support both automatic and manual archiving mechanisms, in accordance with the RFP requirements. The detailed operational approach, including the extent of automation implemented during the initial phase, shall be analyzed and agreed together with the Beneficiary during the analysis and design phase.

Question 108: Is there a formalized procedure for transferring documents to the National Archives? In what format? *1.3.4G / p.198*

Answer to Question 108:

At this stage, DMS-RAE archiving is mainly envisaged as an institutional electronic storage and document management capability, allowing structured storage, categorization, retrieval, consultation, and lifecycle management of documents within the operational environment.

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised through Amendment No. 5 to the RFP. Integration with, or controlled transfer to, the National Archives is not included in the current scope of the project.

Question 109: Must archived documents be kept in both formats (original + non-editable PDF copy), or is the original format sufficient? *1.3.4G / p.198*

Answer to Question 109:
As specified in the RFP, the proposed solution should support preservation of archived documents both in the original format and, where applicable, as a non-editable PDF version intended for consultation, controlled distribution, and long-term readability purposes. The detailed retention and preservation rules shall be further agreed during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Integrations with external systems

Question 110: Is the NARW organizational structure (SGA/ABA/SCAR/INHGA/ECSC) already configured in Microsoft Entra ID with groups and attributes per unit? *1.4.3A / p.207*

Answer to Question 110:
At this stage, the detailed configuration and governance model of the NARW organizational structure within Microsoft Entra ID, including groups, organizational units, and associated attributes, shall be further analyzed together with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Question 111: Does NARW manage leave balances in ASIS or another HR system? If so, does the system expose an externally accessible API? *1.3.4D D.1.3 / p.186*

Answer to Question 111:
Currently, leave requests are managed using paper-based forms with handwritten signatures and are manually registered. The availability of APIs or externally accessible integration mechanisms with HR systems shall be further detailed during the analysis phase based on the actual technical environment and available integration capabilities.

Question 112: Does NARW require automatic email capture into the registry (without human intervention), or is a semi-automatic mechanism acceptable? *1.3.4D / p.181*

Answer to Question 112:
The detailed approach regarding automatic versus semi-automatic e-mail capture and registration shall be analyzed and agreed during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Question 113: Does NARW have an active Service Desk platform? *Section 5.1.2 / p.245*

Answer to Question 113:
At this stage, NARW does not yet have an operational Service Desk platform in place for this purpose. The implementation of a Beneficiary Service Desk platform is currently envisaged under another separate project. Accordingly, the specific platform, access model, configuration requirements and integration approach shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the Service Desk solution available at that time. If the Service Desk platform is not available within the IWRACS implementation timeline, an alternative support and incident-management mechanism shall be agreed with the Beneficiary.

Question 114: Does NARW's IT policy allow configuring an authenticated SMTP relay through Exchange Online for third-party applications? *1.3.4D / p.181*

Answer to Question 114:
The proposed solution should support integration with Microsoft Exchange Online for notifications, correspondence handling, and workflow communications. The detailed SMTP relay configuration, authentication model, and applicable security policies for third-party applications shall be validated and agreed during the analysis phase together with the Beneficiary.

Reports and Manager View

Question 115: Centralized Manager View – must the visibility of in-progress documents be real- time, or is a periodic report sufficient? *1.3.4F / p.197*

Answer to Question 115:
The proposed solution should support real-time or near real-time visibility of in-progress documents, workflows, statuses, and routing information within the centralized Manager View, in accordance with the operational and reporting requirements defined with Beneficiary during analysis phase.

Question 116: Is in-platform document editing required to be done through Microsoft 365, or is a compatible alternative solution supporting Office formats (e.g. OnlyOffice) acceptable? *1.3.4A / p.178*

Answer to Question 116:
The proposed solution should support integration with Microsoft 365 applications where feasible. However, compatible alternative solutions supporting common Office document formats may also be considered acceptable, if they comply with the requirements defined in the RFP.

Question 117: Are there standard registry report formats currently used at NARW? Can they be made available as a reference? *1.3.4F / p.197*

Answer to Question 117:
Yes. NARW currently uses standard incoming and outgoing correspondence registers maintained primarily in paper format. These registers typically contain tabular information such as registration number, registration date, sender/recipient, subject, and related references. Sample register formats and templates may be made available to the Consultant during the analysis phase. The proposed solution is expected to support the electronic management and generation of equivalent registers and reports in accordance with the Beneficiary's requirements.

Question 118: Considering the complexity of the project and the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference, in order to prepare a competitive and advantageous offer for the Contracting Authority, we kindly request the extension of the submission deadline by 15 working days.

Answer to Question 118:

The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

Question 119: With regard to the requirement for specific experience, "...in at least 3 contracts within the last 5 years, each with a value of at least the equivalent of EUR 1,000,000",
in order to avoid the unjustified restriction of participation of relevant economic operators, we kindly request that the requirement be considered fulfilled also through contracts with lower individual values, whose cumulative value reaches the minimum threshold of EUR 3,000,000.
We believe that this approach more accurately reflects the actual experience of economic operators and is in line with the principles of proportionality, non-discrimination, and promotion of competition, while avoiding unjustified restrictions on participation in the procedure.

Answer to Question 119:
The requirement under Sub-Factor **1.4.2 – Specific Experience** remains unchanged. Each of the three similar contracts submitted must individually have a value of at least **EUR 1,000,000 equivalent** and must be successfully and substantially completed.
For contracts performed as a JV member or subcontractor, only the Proposer's own share, role and responsibilities shall be considered. In the case of a JV, contract values completed by different members shall not be aggregated to meet the minimum value of a single contract.
Aggregation of several lower-value contracts up to EUR 3,000,000 is therefore not accepted, as it would not demonstrate equivalent experience in delivering individual contracts of the minimum scale and complexity required for IWRACS.

Question 120: With regard to the requirement for specific experience, “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)..”

in order not to limit the capacity of interested economic operators to participate in the procedure, we kindly request confirmation that, for meeting this requirement, it is sufficient for the submitted projects to fulfill at least one of the requested characteristics.

Answer to Question 120:
The minimum characteristics listed under Sub-Factor **1.4.2 – Specific Experience** are cumulative and must be demonstrated by each similar contract submitted for this criterion. They are not alternative requirements.
Therefore, it is not sufficient for a submitted project to fulfil only one of the listed characteristics. Each qualifying contract must demonstrate implementation of an Information System meeting all the minimum characteristics specified in the RFP and must be supported by an Operational Acceptance Certificate or equivalent documentation.
For Joint Ventures, only contracts successfully and substantially completed by the members, which individually satisfy the minimum contract value and similarity requirements, shall be counted toward the total number of required contracts.

Question 121: With regard to the key experts team, concerning the requirement to hold a Bachelor’s degree in Computer Science, Information Security, Engineering, or a related field, we kindly request that Bachelor’s degrees in other fields, accompanied by relevant IT professional certifications, be accepted, in order not to limit the participation of economic operators and access to specialists who, although coming from other fields, possess the necessary competencies demonstrated through experience and relevant certifications.

Answer to Question 121:

Accepted with **clarification**.

For **Key Expert** positions where the RFP requires a **Bachelor’s degree in Computer Science, Information Technology, Information Security, Engineering, or a related field**, the requirement may also be considered fulfilled by a Bachelor’s degree in another field, provided that the proposed expert demonstrates **relevant IT competencies** through professional experience and/or relevant professional certifications.

The acceptability of such equivalent qualifications shall be assessed by the Evaluation Committee based on the CV and evidence documents submitted, including diplomas, certifications, recommendations, or other proofs of relevant experience.

Question 122: With regard to the key experts team, concerning the requirement to hold a Bachelor’s degree in Computer Science, Information Security, Engineering, or a related field, we kindly request confirmation that the requirement may also be fulfilled by presenting a Master’s degree in the requested fields.

Answer to Question 122:

Confirmed.

Where the RFP requires a Bachelor's degree in Computer Science, Information Security, Engineering, or a related field, the requirement may also be fulfilled by presenting a **Master**'s degree in one of the requested or related fields, provided that the diploma and supporting documents clearly demonstrate relevance to the corresponding Key Expert profile. The professional experience and other minimum requirements applicable to each Key Expert remain unchanged.

General and bidding process

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
123	Section IV – Proposal Forms	Price Schedule Forms	The forms 3.4 (Supply and Installation Cost Sub-Table), are composed of sections for „Unit Prices / Rates" and „Total Prices". However, there is no section for Quantities (i.e. „Unit of Measure" and „Quantity"). Please clarify if the Quantity information should be provided, and therefore adjust the forms 3.4, or otherwise please specify what should be the correlation between „Unit Prices / Rates" and „Total Prices" in the current version of the 3.4 forms.	The Form 3.4 **already includes** a Quantity column, together with columns for Unit Prices / Rates and Total Prices. Proposers shall complete the form as provided in the RFP, indicating, for each applicable line item, the relevant quantity, unit price/rate and total price, in accordance with ITP 17 and ITP 18. The Total Price for each line item shall correspond to the applicable quantity multiplied by the relevant unit price/rate, or, where the item is priced as a lump sum, to the total lump-sum amount proposed for that line item.
124	PDS, 1 Qualification, page 65	Nationality in accordance with ITP 4.4.	Please point out the requirement ITP 4.4, as there is no evidence of it in the document. Please specify explicitly the nationality for the eligibility.	ITP 4.4 is included in the Instructions to Proposers (ITP). The Particular Data Sheet (PDS) supplements or modifies only those ITP provisions that are expressly referenced therein. As ITP 4.4 is not modified by the PDS, the provisions of ITP 4.4 apply as set out in the RFP. Accordingly, a Proposer may have the nationality of any country, subject to the restrictions set out in ITP 4.8 and Section V – Eligible Countries.
125	PDS, 1 Qualification, page 65	Conflict of Interest No- conflicts of interests as described in ITP 4.2.	Please specify / point out the requirements described in ITP 4.2, as there is no evidence of it in the document.	ITP 4.2 is included in the Instructions to Proposers (ITP) and is not modified by the Particular Data Sheet (PDS). The reference under Sub-Factor 1.2 (Conflict of Interest) therefore refers to the conflict-of-interest provisions set out in ITP 4.2 of the RFP, which remain fully applicable. Proposers shall demonstrate compliance with the requirements of ITP 4.2 through the Letter of Proposal and the documentation required

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				under the RFP.
126	GCC 15.4 Page 378	In addition to Clause 15.4, the Supplier shall deliver to the Purchaser the complete custom source code and related documentation for the solution specifically developed for the Purchaser and has no right to distribute to third parties this specific set of source code. The Purchaser has full ownership rights for the custom developed code and shall have the unrestricted right to use, modify, and transfer such materials.	Please confirm that the ownership transfer and the right to use/modify/transfer apply only to the bespoke code developed specifically for the Purchaser under this contract, and do not extend to COTS products, open-source components, third-party libraries / frameworks, or the Supplier's pre-existing / background IP, the intellectual property of which remains with the respective licensors/owners.	Confirmed. The ownership transfer and the Purchaser's unrestricted right to use, modify and transfer apply only to the **bespoke/custom code and related documentation specifically developed for the Purchaser under this Contract**. The Supplier's obligation to deliver source code and the no-distribution restriction **apply** only to the custom-developed code. The Supplier is not required to deliver source code for COTS or third-party components beyond what is provided or permitted under the applicable licenses.
127			Please confirm that such COTS, third-party, open-source and background-IP components are provided to the Purchaser under their respective license terms (with the corresponding licenses procured and owned by the Purchaser per Section 1.4.7), and that the Purchaser's rights in those components are as granted by those licenses rather than by this clause.	Confirmed. These components are provided under their respective license terms, and the Purchaser's rights are those granted by those licenses. For any COTS components, platforms, tools, libraries or other third-party software proposed as part of the solution and required for the proper operation, maintenance or support of the delivered system, the Proposer shall ensure that the corresponding licenses, subscriptions or usage rights remain valid for at least for the entire warranty period. The ownership clause applies only to the bespoke/custom code developed specifically for the Purchaser under this Contract.
128			Please confirm that the Supplier's obligation to deliver source code and the no-distribution restriction apply to the custom code only, and the Supplier is not required to deliver source code for COTS or third-party	Confirmed. The obligation to deliver source code and the no-distribution restriction apply only to the custom code specifically developed for the Purchaser under this Contract. The Supplier is not required to deliver source

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			components beyond what their licenses provide.	code for COTS, open-source or third-party components beyond what is provided under their applicable license terms. For any COTS components, platforms, tools, libraries or other third-party software proposed as part of the solution and required for its proper operation, maintenance or support, the Supplier shall ensure that the corresponding licenses, subscriptions or usage rights remain valid for at least the entire warranty period, unless otherwise explicitly agreed in the Contract.
129	NA	Estimated value of the contract	Pursuant to the principles of transparency and equal treatment (art. 2 of Law no. 98/2016) and the bidder's need to prepare responsive and comparable financial offers, please disclose the estimated value of the contract, without VAT, including its breakdown by lot/component where applicable. We note that the estimated value is necessary for economic operators to (a) construct a financial offer within the available budget, (b) avoid having an otherwise compliant offer rejected for exceeding the estimated value / available funds, and (c) correctly substantiate their pricing, including in relation to any assessment of abnormally low tenders. The absence of the estimated value prevents economic operators from preparing offers on an equal and informed basis. Should the Authority consider the estimated value confidential, please indicate the specific legal basis for withholding it, and, at	The request is not accepted. The estimated value of the contract shall not be disclosed at this stage. Proposers are required to prepare their financial proposals based on the scope, technical requirements, implementation schedule, price schedules and contractual provisions included in the RFP. Financial proposals shall be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation methodology and rules set out in the RFP and the applicable World Bank Procurement Regulations. The absence of a disclosed estimated value does not prevent Proposers from submitting competitive and comparable offers, as all Proposers are subject to the same requirements and price schedule structure. No additional budget ceiling or component-level breakdown is provided.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			a minimum, please confirm the maximum available budget against which offers will be evaluated and above which an offer would be declared unacceptable.	
130	Page 2 / ii of the document	Proposals must be delivered to the address below on or before 18th June 2026, 12:30 (local time).	Pursuant to the principles of transparency and equal treatment (art. 2 of Law no. 98/2016) and in order to enable the submission of complete, compliant, and comparable offers, we respectfully request an extension of the offer submission deadline by at least 30 days (until 18th of July 2026), for the following reasons: ➢ Volume and complexity of the documentation. The Terms of Reference and annexes describe a large, integrated information system comprising four distinct applications (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, DMS-RAE, and the Portal), shared cross-cutting services, multiple external integrations, and detailed functional, architectural, performance, and security requirements, supported by numerous technical annexes. A responsible technical solution, implementation approach, and pricing require thorough analysis across all of these elements. ➢ Outstanding clarifications materially affect the offer. A significant number of clarification questions have been submitted, several of which concern the scope, technical requirements, integration responsibilities, licensing, and commercial conditions of the contract. The answers will directly affect	The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			the design, effort estimation, and pricing of the offer. Economic operators cannot finalize responsive offers while requirements that bear on scope and cost remain under clarification. ➢ Time needed to incorporate the answers. Given the expected volume of clarification questions from all interested operators and the integrated nature of the requirements, bidders require sufficient time after the publication of the consolidated answers to revise their technical and financial offers accordingly. An extension ensures that all operators can incorporate the clarifications into their offers on an equal and informed basis. Accordingly, we request that the offer submission deadline be set at least 20 days, calculated from the date on which the Authority publishes its responses to all clarification requests. This extension would support broader and higher-quality competition and reduce the risk of incomplete or non-comparable offers.	

Technical requirements

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
131	PDS, Chapter 2.1, No. 2	Checks completeness of mandatory documents automatically.	Please confirm that this requirement relates to the existence of the mandatory documents in the permits/authorizations file / case, and is not related to the automatic analysis of the attached document content.	Confirmed. The requirement **"Checks completeness of mandatory documents automatically"** refers to automated verification of the **existence and formal completeness** of the mandatory documents required for the relevant permit/authorization file or case, based on the applicable configurable checklist. It does **not** require automatic analysis, interpretation, or validation of the content of the attached documents. Review of the document content remains under responsibility of the authorized users/experts within the workflow.
132	PDS, Chapter 2.1, No. 2	Complies with Water Law 107/1996, Law 292/2018, Orders 828/2019 & 3147/2023.	Given the complexity of the normative acts / legislation quoted in this requirement, please specify the exact normative acts sections that SIGAR should comply with or confirm that the requirement is related to the fact that SIGAR should support the types of permits / authorizations requests that are subject of the normative acts mentioned in the requirement.	Confirmed. The requirement refers to the fact that SIGAR shall support the types of permits, authorizations, SEICA procedures, workflows, documents, deadlines, approvals and controls that fall under the referenced normative acts. SIGAR is not required to implement or interpret every provision of Water Law no. 107/1996, Law no. 292/2018, Order no. 828/2019 and Order no. 3147/2023. The authoritative interpretation of the legal requirements remains the responsibility of the Beneficiary.
133	PDS, Chapter 4, (b)	Recurrent Costs	Please clarify what recurrent costs (for both warranty service period and	For evaluation and comparison purposes, Proposers shall include in their Financial

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		Recurrent cost items for post- warranty service period if subject to evaluation shall be included in the main contract or a separate contract signed together with the main contract. Such costs shall be added to the Proposal price for evaluation.	post-warranty service period) should be included in the financial offer that will be compared between the offers submitted.	Proposers shall include in their Financial Proposal only the recurrent costs explicitly requested under the Recurrent Cost Sub-Tables and corresponding to the Technical Support period defined in the RFP and Amendment No. 5. These costs may include, as applicable: • Technical Support Services (user support, operational incident analysis, patch deployment support, configuration and integration assistance, support reporting, etc.) during the technical support period, where applicable; • Software licenses, subscriptions, certificates or update entitlements required during the technical support services, where applicable; • Telecommunications costs, during the technical support period, where applicable; • Any other recurrent costs necessary for providing the requested Technical Support Services. As clarified in Amendment No. 5, all warranty obligations, including corrective maintenance, defect correction and bug-fixing activities during the 24-month warranty period, are included in the Supply and Installation scope and shall not be priced separately as Recurrent Costs. No post-warranty services are required. Recurrent Costs shall be limited to the Technical Support Services defined in the Contract and any recurring licenses,

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				subscriptions, certificates, update entitlements or similar items that are required by the Proposer to perform its contractual support obligations during the applicable technical support period. Where such licenses, subscriptions or entitlements are procured for the purpose of delivering the required Technical Support Services, they may be included in the Recurrent Cost Tables even if their validity period extends beyond the end of the applicable support period. Any operation, maintenance, support, license renewals, subscriptions or other services required after expiry of the applicable technical support period and not necessary for the performance of the Contract shall be outside the scope of the Financial Proposal and shall not be considered for proposal evaluation purposes. Proposers shall complete the Recurrent Cost Tables in accordance with Amendment No. 5 and the applicable support periods specified therein.
134	Section VII, Chapter 1.1.2, page 160 - 161	ROwaterDATA shall support compliance with the European Union legal framework for water management, monitoring, and reporting, including the following key directives and their implementing acts, as	The requirement refers to "the following key directives." Please confirm that the eight directives listed constitute the complete and exhaustive set in scope, and that no further directives (whether characterized as "key" or otherwise) are within scope unless added	**Confirmed with clarification.** The directives listed in the RFP represent the baseline scope for ROwaterDATA. Any additional directive or reporting obligation not specified in the RFP shall be addressed only if formally agreed through the applicable change-control mechanism.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		applicable:	through formal change control.	
135			Please provide the definitive list of implementing acts, delegated acts, and Commission Implementing Decisions to be supported under each directive (for example, the Commission Implementing Decisions governing reporting formats and schemas for WISE/Reportnet). Can the Authority confirm that only the secondary legislation expressly enumerated in this list is in scope?	WISE is not a separate legal act in scope, but a reporting and information framework/platform relevant to the implementation of EU water reporting obligations, in particular those deriving from the Water Framework Directive and other applicable water-related directives listed in the RFP. ROwaterDATA shall support preparation, validation, transformation and export of datasets in formats required for the applicable WISE / Reportnet reporting flows, to the extent such flows correspond to the directives and reporting obligations specified in the RFP and confirmed during the analysis phase.
136			Can the Authority confirm that the baseline obligation is limited to the directives and implementing acts as in force at the date of contract signature (or a defined cut-off date), and that any subsequent amendment, repeal, recast, or new implementing act will be addressed through the change-control / maintenance mechanism rather than within the original scope?	Confirmed with clarification. The baseline obligation shall be understood as referring to the directives, implementing acts, reporting requirements, schemas and templates applicable at the time of contract signature and/or confirmed during the analysis phase. Any subsequent amendment, repeal, recast, new implementing act or new reporting obligation that materially changes the agreed scope, functionalities, datasets, formats or implementation effort shall be addressed through the applicable maintenance or change-control mechanism, in accordance with the Contract.
137			Please clarify the intended meaning of "as applicable." Does it mean	The expression **“as applicable”** means applicable to Romania, to NARW’s legal and

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			applicable to Romania as transposed into national law, applicable to the data/functions managed by ROwaterDATA, or applicable in some other sense? The qualifier currently leaves the obligation undefined.	institutional responsibilities, and to the datasets, workflows, reporting obligations and functionalities managed through ROwaterDATA.
138			Please confirm that "support compliance with the EU legal framework" means providing the data-management, transformation, and reporting functionality that enables the Authority to meet its obligations, and that the Contractor is not required to implement the substantive (non-data) obligations of these directives, nor to warrant or guarantee the Authority's actual legal compliance, which depends on data quality, organisational processes, and other factors outside the system.	Confirmed. "Support compliance with the EU legal framework" means that ROwaterDATA shall provide the data management, validation, transformation, traceability and reporting functionalities needed to support the Beneficiary's reporting obligations. The Contractor is not required to implement non-data legal obligations, nor to warrant the Beneficiary's overall legal compliance, which depends on data quality, institutional processes, decisions and responsibilities outside the system.
139			For each directive in scope, please specify the concrete system functions, datasets, and reporting outputs expected, so that the abstract reference to a directive can be translated into verifiable, testable requirements and acceptance criteria.	The concrete system functions, datasets and reporting outputs are defined in the RFP requirements and supporting annexes, including, where applicable, **Annex 4, Annex 5 and Annex 6**, which provide reference structures for specific EU reporting obligations. During the **analysis phase**, these requirements shall be further detailed and validated with the Beneficiary, including the applicable templates, validation rules, transformations, reporting outputs and acceptance criteria.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
140			Directive 98/83/EC has been repealed and replaced by the recast Drinking Water Directive (EU) 2020/2184. Please confirm which instrument is in scope. We also note the parenthetical "(and subsequent reductions, as applicable)" and assume this is intended to read "subsequent revisions" — please confirm.	We confirm that the applicable instrument within the scope is Directive (EU) 2020/2184 (the recast Drinking Water Directive), which replaced and repealed Directive 98/83/EC. We also confirm that the reference should be understood as “subsequent revisions”, as applicable.
141			Directive 2013/39/EU amends 2000/60/EC and 2008/105/EC (the Environmental Quality Standards Directive on priority substances). As 2008/105/EC is referenced only indirectly through the amendment, please confirm whether it is in scope and to what extent.	We confirm that Directive 2008/105/EC, as amended by Directive 2013/39/EU, is the relevant instrument considered within the scope. Accordingly, all provisions of Directive 2008/105/EC, including the amendments and additions introduced by Directive 2013/39/EU, are taken into account.
142			The list includes the Marine Strategy Framework Directive (2008/56/EC). Please confirm the specific marine datasets and reporting functions expected of ROwaterDATA, and confirm whether marine reporting is genuinely within the system's remit or included by reference only.	Confirmed. Directive **2008/56/EC - Marine Strategy Framework Directive** is included in the ROwaterDATA baseline scope to the extent relevant to NARW’s responsibilities for water management, monitoring and reporting. ROwaterDATA shall support the definition, collection, validation, consolidation and reporting of the **marine**-related **datasets** and reporting flows that are applicable to NARW and confirmed during the analysis phase.
143	Section VII, Chapter 1.1.2, page 161	ROwaterDATA MUST support the preparation, transformation, and delivery of datasets in	Please disclose whether the Authority (or any related public body) has obtained, applied for, or planned any other funding — EU or	The Beneficiary is responsible for defining and managing the scope of this procurement and ensuring its consistency with the applicable financing arrangements.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		accordance with European Commission reporting obligations, including applicable formats, structures, and templates required for submission to EU-level platforms and reporting mechanisms.	national — for the implementation of systems, modules, or functionalities that overlap, in whole or in part, with the EU reporting and data-management requirements specified for ROwaterDATA. If so, please identify the overlapping functionalities and the corresponding requirements in this RFP.	The RFP scope reflects the functionalities required under IWRACS/ROwaterDATA. Based on the Beneficiary's current planning, no EU or national funding has been requested, obtained or planned for the implementation of systems, modules or functionalities that would overlap, in whole or in part, with the EU reporting and data-management requirements specified for ROwaterDATA. ROwaterDATA is intended to serve as an integrated platform for data collection, consolidation, management and reporting, supporting the Beneficiary's EU reporting obligations. Where the Beneficiary has financed or envisaged other IT systems or modules, these concern specific sectoral or thematic reporting areas and do not replace the integrated data collection, consolidation, validation, management and EU reporting functionalities required for ROwaterDATA. Any necessary interfaces or data exchanges with such systems are addressed within the interoperability and integration requirements of the present RFP.
144			Please confirm that ensuring the absence of double funding / double financing — including the demarcation of scope between ROwaterDATA and any other funded system, and compliance with the funding conditions of all relevant financing sources — is the exclusive responsibility of the Authority, and	Confirmed. Ensuring the absence of double funding or double financing, including demarcation with other funded systems or projects, is the responsibility of the Beneficiary.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			that the Contractor bears no responsibility or liability for any overlap, since the Contractor has no visibility of, or control over, the Authority's other funding arrangements.	
145			Please confirm that the Contractor's sole obligation is to implement the requirements as specified in this RFP, and that the Contractor shall not be held liable for any financial correction, ineligibility of expenditure, repayment obligation, audit finding, or other consequence arising from any actual or alleged double funding, regardless of whether the overlap concerns requirements specified in this RFP.	Confirmed. The Contractor's obligation is to implement the requirements specified in the RFP and agreed during contract implementation. The Contractor shall not be responsible for financial corrections, ineligible expenditure, repayment obligations or audit findings resulting from the Beneficiary's funding arrangements, except where caused by the Contractor's own breach of contract.
146			In the event the Authority identifies an overlap with another funded system during implementation, please confirm that the affected functionality will be removed from the Contractor's scope through the change-control mechanism, with a corresponding equitable adjustment to price and timeline, and with no penalty, liability, or claim against the Contractor for the descoped functionality.	If an overlap with another funded system is identified during implementation and results in a change of scope, it shall be addressed through the applicable contractual change-control mechanism, including any corresponding adjustment to deliverables, timeline and price, where justified.
147	Section VII, Chapter 1.1.2, page 161	The subsystem MUST embed legally relevant controls by design, including: • structured intake of	Please confirm that "mandatory documentation checks" refers to verifying the presence, completeness, and formal attributes	Confirmed. "Mandatory documentation checks" refers to automated verification of the presence and formal completeness of the required

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		applications and mandatory documentation checks,	of required documents (e.g., that each mandatory document type has been uploaded, is in an accepted file format, is within size limits, and that mandatory metadata/form fields are filled), based on a configurable checklist defined per permit type. Please confirm this does not require automated analysis or validation of the substantive content of the documents themselves.	documents, based on a configurable checklist per permit/authorization type. This may include checking that the required document types are uploaded, accepted file formats and size limits are respected, and mandatory metadata or form fields are completed. It does not require automated analysis, interpretation or validation of the content of the uploaded documents.
148	Section VII, Chapter 1.2, page 164	Access to the IWRACS ecosystem is provided through NARW's internal and external portal, implemented or modernized using a configurable Content Management System (CMS)-based COTS solution.	Please confirm that the intent of requiring a "CMS-based COTS solution" is to ensure the portal is built on a configurable, market-proven, ready-made CMS platform (as opposed to a bespoke CMS developed from scratch), rather than to mandate a particular licensing model. On that basis, please confirm that established open-source/FOSS CMS platforms (e.g., WordPress, Liferay, Drupal) are eligible, provided they meet the functional, security, and support requirements. To enable an equivalent assessment of candidate platforms, please confirm the actual criteria by which the CMS will be judged acceptable (e.g., configurability without custom code, maturity/market adoption, security certifications, availability of commercial/vendor support, maintainability, total cost of	Confirmed. The requirement for a **CMS-based COTS solution** is intended to ensure the use of a configurable, mature and market-proven CMS platform, not a bespoke CMS developed from scratch. Open-source/FOSS CMS platforms may be accepted, provided they meet all functional, security, interoperability, maintainability and support requirements of the RFP. The acceptability of the proposed CMS shall be assessed based on the Proposer's technical proposal, including configurability, maturity, security, support/maintenance arrangements, compliance with RFP requirements and total suitability for the IWRACS portal scope. Licensing model alone is not a ground for exclusion.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			ownership). We propose that any CMS — proprietary or open-source — meeting these criteria be considered compliant. If the underlying concern behind "COTS" is the assured availability of vendor support, maintenance, and security patching, please confirm that this concern is satisfied where an open-source platform is provided with a commercial support/maintenance arrangement (whether from the Contractor or a third-party vendor), so that licensing model alone is not a basis for exclusion.	
149	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.1.4, pages 173 – 174	Reporting & Statistics (Common Requirements)	Regarding "real-time visualizations": please specify the acceptable data-refresh latency for dashboards (e.g., live/streaming, near-real-time within minutes, or periodic refresh such as hourly/daily). We assume periodic or near-real-time refresh is acceptable, as genuine streaming visualization would impose disproportionate architectural cost relative to the oversight purpose described.	Near-real-time or scheduled refresh is acceptable, depending on the data source, report type, business need and proposed technical solution. The Proposer shall propose the appropriate refresh approach based on relevant good practice. The final refresh frequency and technical approach shall be reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
150			Regarding "anomaly identification" and "trend detection": please confirm these refer to enabling users to visually identify trends and anomalies through appropriate visualizations and threshold-based	Confirmed. Trend detection and anomaly identification shall be supported through statistical reports, dashboards, visualizations, filters, configurable thresholds and highlights, as shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			highlighting, and do not require automated/statistical anomaly-detection algorithms or machine-learning models. If automated detection is required, please specify the metrics and methods expected.	Automated statistical anomaly detection or machine-learning models are not mandatory, unless proposed by the Proposer and agreed by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
151			Regarding "consolidated reports with automatic summaries": please clarify whether "automatic summaries" means automatically computed aggregate/summary sections (totals, subtotals, key figures, summary tables), as opposed to natural-language narrative generation. We assume the former; please confirm that AI-generated narrative text is not required.	Confirmed. "Automatic summaries" means automatically computed summary sections, such as totals, subtotals, key indicators, grouped values, summary tables and charts. Natural-language or AI-generated narrative text is not required, unless proposed by the Proposer and agreed by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
152			Please confirm whether it is acceptable to deliver this component using an embedded reporting/BI platform (commercial or open-source) integrated into the system, including access via that platform's interface for analytical functions, or whether all reporting and dashboard functionality must be rendered natively within the main application UI.	Confirmed. The Reporting & Statistics component may be delivered using an embedded or integrated BI/reporting platform, whether commercial or open source, if it meets the RFP requirements. The Proposer shall propose the most appropriate technical approach based on relevant good practice. The final reporting architecture, user access model and integration approach shall be reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
153			Please confirm the expected division between (a) end-users consuming predefined, parameterized reports/dashboards and (b)	The system shall support the predefined reports and outputs required for the applicable EU directives and reporting obligations.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			authorized users authoring entirely new reports/dashboards ad hoc. This determines whether self-service report authoring for business users is required or whether a catalogue of predefined configurable reports suffices. If the latter, please specify a number of reports and dashboards that are in the scope of the implementation.	In addition, for statistics, trends, dashboards and management analysis, the Reporting & Statistics component shall provide self-service/configurable reporting capabilities for authorized users, within their access rights. The final reporting catalogue, dashboard structure and level of self-service functionality shall be defined, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
154			Regarding role-based visibility: please confirm whether differentiation is at the level of which reports/dashboards each entity can access (report-level), or whether row-level data filtering is required within shared reports so that each entity (SGA, ABA, SCAR, etc.) sees only its own data. If row-level filtering is required, please confirm the attribute(s) that define each entity's data scope (e.g., administrative basin, territorial unit).	Role-based visibility shall ensure that each user or entity accesses only the reports, dashboards and data relevant to its scope of competence. This may include both report/dashboard-level access and row-level data filtering within shared reports, based on organizational and territorial attributes such as SGA, ABA, SCAR, SEICA Commission. The detailed access model, filtering attributes and visibility rules shall be defined, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
155			Regarding "PDF with optional digital signature": please specify the signature standard required (e.g., PAdES qualified electronic signature), whether a qualified certificate / signing service or HSM is to be provided by the Authority, and whether signing is applied automatically by the system or	The solution shall support PDF export with optional digital signature, in accordance with the RFP requirements. The applicable signature standard, signing workflow and use cases shall be defined, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. Qualified certificates, signing services or related signing infrastructure shall be provided by the

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			initiated by an authorized user. We assume the signing certificate/qualified trust service is provided by the Authority.	Authority, where required.
156			Regarding map-based visualizations: please confirm whether these may reuse the system's existing GIS/geospatial component and base maps, and confirm the expected map functionality in the reporting context (thematic display of report data) versus full interactive GIS analysis, which we assume is provided by the dedicated geospatial component rather than duplicated here.	Confirmed. Map-based visualizations in the Reporting & Statistics component may reuse the existing GIS/geospatial components, base maps and relevant spatial layers available within the IWRACS ecosystem. In the reporting context, map functionality is expected to support thematic visualization of report data where geospatial data is available. Full interactive GIS analysis is not required to be duplicated within the Reporting & Statistics component. The detailed map visualization approach shall be proposed by the Proposer and reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
157			Please confirm that the Authority provides the email/SMTP infrastructure and maintains the distribution group definitions, and confirm the expected handling where a generated report exceeds email attachment limits (we assume notification with a secure download link, as the requirement suggests, rather than large attachments).	Confirmed. The Authority shall provide the email/SMTP infrastructure and maintain the relevant distribution groups or recipient lists. Where a generated report exceeds email attachment limits, the system may send a notification containing a secure download link instead of attaching the report directly. The detailed distribution rules shall be agreed during the analysis phase.
158			Regarding export to Word: please confirm the purpose (editable document for further processing) and that pixel-perfect reproduction of complex dashboard visuals in Word is	Confirmed. Word export is intended to provide editable report content for further processing, mainly tabular data, summaries, indicators and narrative sections where applicable.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			not required, since chart-heavy layouts translate poorly to editable Word format. We assume tabular and summary content is the primary target for Word export.	Pixel-perfect reproduction of complex dashboards or highly graphical layouts in Word is not required.
159			Please confirm whether reporting and analytics are expected to run against the transactional database directly, or whether a dedicated reporting data store / data warehouse is anticipated. This affects both performance isolation and the feasibility of the requested refresh frequency, and is closely linked to the "real-time" clarification in question 1.	The reporting and analytics architecture shall be proposed by the Proposer based on relevant good practice, considering performance, data volumes, security, access control and refresh requirements. A dedicated reporting data store or data warehouse is acceptable where justified by the proposed solution. The final architecture shall be reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
160	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.1.5, pages 174 – 175	Integration Support (Functional Scope)	Regarding configuration of integrations "through the application interface": please confirm whether it is acceptable for integration administration to be performed via a dedicated administrative console of the integration component (accessible to authorized administrators through the system), or whether a purpose-built configuration interface embedded within the main application UI is specifically required.	Confirmed. Integration and publication administration may be performed through the API Gateway / integration platform administrative console, provided it supports governed configuration of exposed datasets, exchanged objects, formats, direction, frequency, triggering conditions, access control, versioning, rate limiting, monitoring, logging and audit. The detailed configuration model and responsibilities of business and technical administrators shall be proposed by the Proposer and reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
161			Please confirm the expected level of configuration to be performed by business administrators versus technical staff. Specifically, is the	Business administrators may activate, schedule and parameterize predefined integrations, within their access rights. The creation of new integration types or complex

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			creation of new integration types expected to be a no-code/low-code activity for business users, or is it acceptable that defining a new integration involves technical configuration, with business users limited to activating, scheduling, and parameterizing pre-defined integrations?	interface definitions may involve technical configuration by authorized technical staff.
162			Please provide the list of specific external and internal systems with which integration is required within this contract, including the interface specifications/standards each exposes. We assume that integrations with systems not enumerated, or systems that do not expose a documented interface, are outside the baseline scope and handled via change control.	The integrations in scope are those specified in the RFP and its annexes. The detailed interface specifications, standards, access conditions, technical responsibilities and implementation approach for each integration shall be reviewed, defined and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
163			Please confirm the approximate number of distinct integrations to be delivered and configured within the contract scope, to enable accurate effort estimation, distinguishing those delivered as part of implementation from the generic capability to configure further integrations later.	The approximate number of integrations shall be derived from the RFP and annexes.
164			Please confirm that, for each integration, the counterpart system's owner is responsible for providing and maintaining a stable, documented interface and a test	Confirmed. For each integration, the counterpart system owner shall provide the available documentation, access, test environment and test data, where applicable and available. The Contractor shall be

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			environment, and that the Contractor's responsibility is limited to the SIGAR/IWRACS side of the integration plus the agreed transformation/mapping.	responsible for the IWRACS side of the integration and the agreed mapping, transformation and testing.
165			Where a counterpart system lacks a modern API, please confirm the acceptable integration mechanism (e.g., file-based exchange, database staging) and confirm that adapting or modifying the counterpart system is out of scope.	Where a counterpart system does not expose a modern API, file-based exchange, structured import/export, database staging or another agreed mechanism may be used. Modification of counterpart systems is outside the Contractor's scope.
166			Regarding anonymization/pseudonymization: please specify the datasets/fields requiring it, the technique expected (masking, pseudonymization, tokenization), and whether reversibility is required. We assume this applies to data in transit during specific integrations as configured, and does not require a separate enterprise-wide data-anonymization or key-management platform unless specified.	Anonymization or pseudonymization shall be applied where required by data protection rules and the approved integration design. The relevant datasets, fields, techniques and reversibility requirements shall be defined during the analysis phase.
167			Please confirm the source systems, formats, data volumes, and data-quality baseline for the historical migration, and confirm whether data cleansing/remediation of poor-quality source data is in scope or is the Authority's responsibility. We assume the Contractor migrates data "as is" from agreed sources, with	Historical migration sources, formats, volumes and data quality shall be assessed during the analysis phase. The Contractor shall migrate agreed data from agreed sources. Data cleansing or remediation of poor-quality source data shall remain the Authority's responsibility unless expressly included in the agreed migration scope.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			cleansing handled separately.	
168			Please confirm whether reconciliation/sign-off of migrated data is the Authority's responsibility, and the acceptance criteria for migration completeness.	Reconciliation and sign-off of migrated data shall be performed with the Beneficiary. Migration completeness and acceptance criteria shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
169			Please confirm whether the required transformations (mapping, format/unit conversion, aggregation, filtering) are expected to be configurable through standard mapping tools, or whether complex business-rule-driven transformations are anticipated. If the latter, please provide representative examples so the complexity can be assessed.	Transformations may be implemented through configurable mapping and transformation tools, including field mapping, format/unit conversion, aggregation and filtering. For complexity reference at this stage, Proposers shall consider the reporting structures and examples provided in **Annexes 4-7**. Any complex business-rule-driven transformations required for implementation shall be further defined, documented and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
170			Please confirm the source of the "reference values" against which pre-integration validation is performed (i.e., are these maintained within SIGAR/IWRACS as managed nomenclatures, or fetched from external registries?), as this affects whether validation is a local lookup or a dependency on an external system's availability.	Reference values may be maintained within ROwaterDATA/IWRACS as managed nomenclatures or fetched from external registries, depending on the relevant data source and approved integration design. The authoritative source, update mechanism and validation approach for each reference dataset shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
171	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	The component shall allow the definition, configuration, and centralized management of datasets used in NARW's	Please confirm the division of responsibility for configuring the ~350 datasets: how many are to be defined and configured by the Contractor as part of implementation	The assumption is not confirmed as stated. The Contractor shall deliver the dataset-management capability and configure the datasets required under the Contract, based on the final dataset inventory agreed with the

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		institutional activities, estimated at almost 350 distinct datasets, corresponding to operational and administrative domains.	(including field structures, validation rules, formulas, relationships, and workflows), versus configured by the Authority's administrators using the platform's tools after delivery? We assume the Contractor delivers the dataset-management capability plus configuration of an agreed, enumerated subset, and that the Authority configures the remainder using the provided no-code/low-code tools. Please also confirm whether the list of datasets, with their field-level structures, will be provided by the Authority.	Beneficiary during the analysis phase. As stated in **Annex 1**, the complete list of datasets currently known and managed within NARW will be provided by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase, including available field-level structures and content-level information, where such data is already collected in tabular format. The Contractor shall analyze, validate and propose the final dataset structures, validation rules, formulas, relationships and workflows, in line with relevant good practice and Beneficiary requirements. These shall be reviewed, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. The solution should also enable authorized Beneficiary administrators to configure, adjust and maintain datasets post delivery using the provided tools.
172	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	o Management of relationships between datasets without requiring advanced technical knowledge	Please confirm the expected user profile for dataset structure definition (fields, data types, validation rules, calculation formulas, and especially inter-dataset relationships such as primary/foreign keys). Defining referential relationships is inherently a data-modelling activity; please confirm whether business users are expected to author entirely new relational structures unaided, or whether business users parameterize and populate structures while the initial relational design is performed	Business users are not expected to define complex relational structures unaided. Dataset structures, fields, data types, validation rules, formulas and inter-dataset relationships shall be configured by authorized and appropriately skilled users, including data/technical administrators where required. Business users may parameterize, populate and maintain datasets within their assigned permissions. The detailed user profiles, configuration rights and governance model shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			by appropriately skilled administrators/technical staff during configuration.	
173	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	o Storage Source Localization	Please confirm that "Storage Source Localization" and the highlighting of redundancies / overlaps / conflicts are based on descriptive metadata manually maintained within the platform (i.e., administrators record each dataset's storage location and the system flags conflicts among the registered metadata), and that the Contractor is not required to perform automated discovery, scanning, profiling, or schema-matching of external/third-party databases to detect such conflicts. If automated cross-system detection is required, please specify the systems in scope and provide access to their schemas, as this constitutes a distinct capability with significant additional effort.	Confirmed Storage Source Localization may be based on descriptive metadata maintained within ROwaterDATA/IWRACS, including dataset location, responsible unit, source system and related attributes. Automated discovery, scanning, profiling or schema-matching of external databases is not required, unless specifically agreed during the analysis phase for identified systems.
174	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	API Integration Visualization and Associated IT Applications Inventory	Please confirm whether the API and IT-application inventory is descriptive metadata (type of access, usage mode, exposing/consuming systems, recorded by administrators), or whether live usage telemetry (actual call counts, caller identity) is required. If live telemetry is required, please confirm it may be sourced from the platform's own API	The API and IT-application inventory shall include descriptive metadata such as type of access, usage mode, exposed/consumed datasets, systems involved and responsible owners. Operational monitoring and usage statistics shall be provided for integrations managed through the IWRACS/API Gateway layer. Usage metrics for integrations operated outside this platform are not required unless technically available and agreed during the

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			gateway/management layer, and that usage of integrations operated outside this platform is out of scope (those metrics not being observable to this system).	analysis phase.
175	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	Hierarchical semantic scheme	Please clarify the relationship between the semantic version label (e.g., 2.1.5 / 1.0.0) described in 1.3.2.2 and the workflow states (Draft / In progress / Published) in 1.3.2.3. Specifically: is the semantic version number a single label applied at the dataset level, and are the workflow states the transitions a given version passes through? Please confirm a single, coherent versioning model rather than two parallel mechanisms.	The semantic version label and workflow states shall be implemented as part of a single coherent versioning and traceability model. The semantic version identifies the dataset or dataset configuration version, while workflow states such as Draft, In progress and Published represent the lifecycle stages through which that version passes. The detailed model shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
176	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	Dataset versioning	Please confirm the object of versioning. Does versioning apply to (a) the dataset structure/schema, (b) the collected data values, or (c) both independently? The text ("from definition and value collection to data publication") suggests both; please confirm whether structure and values are versioned together under one label or on separate tracks, as this materially affects the data model and storage design.	Dataset versioning shall apply to dataset structures, validation rules, access permissions and dataset values, where relevant, as required by the RFP. The detailed versioning approach, including whether structures and values are versioned together or on separate tracks, shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on reporting, audit and traceability requirements.
177	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	Automatic calculation formulas	Regarding "automatic calculation formulas": please confirm the expected scope. We assume formulas operate on fields within the same	Automatic calculation formulas may include arithmetic, conditional and simple derivation rules, as well as aggregations or transformations required for dataset

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			dataset record (arithmetic, conditional, simple derivations). Please confirm whether cross-dataset, cross-period, or aggregate calculations are required, and if so provide representative examples, as these substantially increase complexity.	processing and reporting. Cross-dataset, cross-period or aggregate calculations may be included where required by the agreed datasets and reporting obligations. The exact formulas and representative cases shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
178	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2, pages 175 – 178	Dataset relationships	Where inter-dataset relationships (primary/foreign keys, functional dependencies) are defined, please confirm the expected enforcement level: documentary/descriptive (relationships recorded and displayed), validation-level (warn or block on violation at data entry), or full database-level referential integrity. In a user-configurable, metadata-driven model, enforcing strict database-level integrity across user-defined structures is considerably more complex; we assume validation-level enforcement is acceptable.	Inter-dataset relationships may be enforced through descriptive, validation-level or technical mechanisms, depending on the dataset and approved design. Validation-level enforcement, including warnings or blocking rules, is acceptable where appropriate. The enforcement level for each relationship shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
179	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	the system shall automatically generate a template file (.xlsx, .xslm, .shp) for each data collection source involved, based on the assigned rights and datasets	Regarding automatic generation of collection templates in .shp (shapefile) format: please confirm the scope. Specifically — (a) for how many of the in-scope datasets is geospatial/shapefile collection actually required; (b) how is the offline shapefile expected to be completed by local users, given that shapefiles require GIS software	Tabular formats such as XLSX/XLSM are expected to be the primary collection mechanism. SHP templates shall apply only to datasets requiring geospatial collection. The relevant datasets, geometry type, coordinate reference system and user workflow shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on Beneficiary requirements and available GIS data.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			rather than a spreadsheet editor; and (c) please confirm that defining the geometry type and coordinate reference system per geospatial dataset is provided by the Authority. We assume tabular formats (.xlsx/.xlsm) are the primary collection mechanism and that geospatial collection, if required, applies to a limited, enumerated set of datasets.	
180	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Automatically associates the appropriate validation rules	Please confirm who authors the validation rules (logical, consistency, structural) for each dataset and reporting domain. We assume the Contractor delivers the rule-authoring capability and configures rules for an agreed, enumerated subset of datasets, with the Authority providing the rule definitions (the "minimum quality and completeness requirements" referenced in Annex 1) and configuring the remainder using the provided tools. Please confirm whether Annex 1 contains the complete, formal rule specifications or illustrative examples only.	Annex 1 provides indicative dataset examples and quality/completeness references, not the complete formal validation-rule catalogue. The Contractor shall provide the rule-authoring capability and configure the validation rules agreed with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. The Beneficiary shall provide the relevant business and reporting requirements, while the final rules, responsibilities and configuration scope shall be defined and approved during that phase.
181	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Value correlations	Regarding consistency checks / "value correlations": please confirm whether these are limited to correlations within a single submitted file/record set, or whether cross-dataset, cross-period,	Value correlations may include checks within a single submission and, where required, cross-dataset, cross-period or cross-level checks. The applicable correlation rules shall be defined and approved during the analysis

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			or cross-level correlations (e.g., validating this month's submission against historical or against another source's data) are required. We assume within-submission validation; cross-dataset/historical validation should be enumerated, as it substantially increases complexity and creates runtime dependencies on other data being present.	phase, based on the datasets, reporting obligations and comparative analysis requirements.
182	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Data entry and validation rules and that on upload the system will apply automatic validations in the interface.	Please confirm authoritative validation is performed server-side on upload, with any in-spreadsheet validation limited to basic best-effort hints (not a full replication of the central rule engine in offline macros). Please also confirm consistency checks ('value correlations') are within a single submission unless cross-dataset/historical checks are enumerated.	Confirmed. Authoritative validation shall be performed server-side upon upload/import. In-spreadsheet validation may be used as a supporting aid for users, but is not required to replicate the full central validation engine. The scope of consistency checks and value correlations shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
183	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Partial and repeated submissions	Please clarify the expected behavior for partial and repeated submissions: may multiple local users contribute to the same dataset/period concurrently; how are corrections/re-uploads after rejection handled (full replacement vs. merge); and is there a locking or "submission window" model tied to the deadline? We assume file-level replacement on re-upload and that a submission belongs to a single	The detailed behavior for partial and repeated submissions shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. The system shall support controlled correction and re-submission mechanisms, including audit traceability of submitted, rejected, corrected and re-uploaded data.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			responsible source, unless specified.	
184	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Submission deadlines	Regarding submission deadlines: please confirm the system's expected behavior when a deadline passes (e.g., flag as overdue and notify, versus hard-lock preventing submission), and whether deadline extensions/reopening by authorized users are required. We assume soft enforcement (overdue flagging and notification) with authorized reopening, rather than automated hard cut-off.	The system shall support deadline monitoring, overdue flagging, notifications and escalation mechanisms. Whether deadlines result in soft enforcement, hard blocking, extensions or reopening by authorized users shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the applicable dataset workflow and institutional rules.
185	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Data corrections	Regarding the "correct" action available to higher levels (e.g., ABA/INHGA editing data submitted by SGA/SHI): please confirm whether higher levels edit values in place, or whether correction means returning the submission to the originator for amendment. If in-place editing is required, please confirm that the original submitted values and the identity of the corrector are retained for audit, and confirm the permission model permitting a higher level to alter a lower level's data.	The system shall support controlled correction mechanisms within the hierarchical workflow. Corrections may be implemented either by returning the submission to the originator or by allowing authorized higher-level users to correct data directly, depending on the approved workflow. In all cases, original values, corrected values, user identity, timestamp and reason for correction shall be retained in the audit trail.
186	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	EU-directive association	Please confirm that the EU-directive association ("Nitrates, WFD, EQS, as applicable") means tagging a collection cycle with its reporting domain and applying the corresponding pre-configured validation rule set, and does not by	Confirmed. EU-directive association may be used to tag a dataset, collection cycle or reporting flow with the relevant reporting domain, such as Nitrates, WFD or EQS, and to apply the corresponding validation rules and processing logic. Generation of EU submission outputs is

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			itself require generation of the EU submission outputs (which we treat under the separate EU-reporting requirement). This keeps the directive reference here scoped to validation tagging, not report production.	addressed under the separate reporting and transformation requirements.
187	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.4, pages 178 – 180	Responsive design for mobile use	Regarding "responsive design for ... mobile use": please confirm that mobile support targets the review, approval, and status-tracking actions (which suit mobile), and that the offline-template download/fill/upload data-entry cycle is expected primarily on desktop. We assume bulk data entry via spreadsheet is not required to be optimized for mobile devices.	Confirmed with clarification. Responsive design shall support access to relevant functions on mobile devices, especially review, validation, approval, monitoring and status-tracking actions. Bulk data entry through offline templates such as XLSX/XLSM/SHP is expected primarily on desktop devices and is not required to be optimized for mobile use.
188	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.5, pages 180 – 182	Data Processing, Transformation and Publication Validation rules bullet: per-report completion templates and validation rule sets 'as provided in the directives' are delivered to the Proposer during the analysis phase for implementation as configurable rules.	Please confirm this applies to ALL reporting frameworks in scope (not only those named), that they are delivered in usable, documented form at the start of analysis, that frameworks not so provided are out of scope until provided (change control), and that the Authority is responsible for authoritative interpretation where rules are ambiguous.	Validation rules, templates and reporting structures shall apply to the reporting frameworks in scope under the RFP and its annexes. The detailed templates, rule sets and authoritative interpretation of reporting requirements shall be provided, reviewed, agreed and approved during the analysis phase. Any additional framework not specified or not sufficiently defined shall be addressed through the applicable contractual mechanism.
189	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.5, pages	Data Processing, Transformation and Publication	Please provide the definitive, exhaustive list of reporting frameworks/target platforms with	The reporting frameworks and target platforms in scope are those specified in the RFP and its annexes, including the relevant

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
	180 – 182	Transformation/publication for EU/national frameworks; examples expanded to WISE, DanubeGIS, ICPDR ('…or other mandatory reporting obligations', 'etc.').	output format/schema per framework, and confirm the delivery mode per framework (compliant files for Authority upload vs. automated machine-to-machine submission; if M2M, Authority provides credentials/API/test environment).	EU and national reporting obligations. For the purposes of the current RFP, the required scope shall be understood as the preparation, validation, generation and export of compliant reporting datasets/files in the formats and structures agreed with the Beneficiary. Exported reports are not expected to be submitted directly to international or external reporting platforms through automated machine-to-machine integration as part of the baseline scope. The submission/upload of the exported reports to the relevant external or international platforms shall be performed by the Beneficiary's authorized key users, after validation and approval in accordance with the applicable institutional procedures. The final list of reporting frameworks, output schemas, file formats, validation rules and export requirements shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the applicable reporting obligations and Beneficiary-confirmed needs.
190	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.5, pages 180 – 182	Data Processing, Transformation and Publication 'Automatic alignment of sections, monitoring points, and other entities' across reporting cycles, with justification for renamed / removed / added entries.	Please confirm alignment is by matching on stable unique identifiers (water body codes, monitoring point IDs), with changes flagged for human review/justification, and that the system does not perform probabilistic/fuzzy entity-matching where identifiers differ or are absent.	Alignment across reporting cycles shall primarily rely on stable unique identifiers, such as water body codes, monitoring point identifiers or other agreed reference codes. Where identifiers are changed, missing or inconsistent, the system shall flag the case for human review and justification. Probabilistic or fuzzy matching is not mandatory unless proposed by the Proposer and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
191	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.5, pages 180 – 182	Data Processing, Transformation and Publication Automated transformation (aggregation, concatenation, field mapping, restructuring); reference data for historical/threshold checks.	Please confirm transformations are configurable mappings/rules per reporting type driven by the Authority-supplied templates (not bespoke software per report), and that reference data (historical series, thresholds, directive parameters) is provided and maintained by the Authority.	Transformations shall be implemented through configurable mappings and rules per reporting type, including aggregation, concatenation, field mapping and restructuring. For complexity reference at this stage, Proposers shall consider the reporting structures and examples provided in Annexes 4–7. Reference data, including historical series, thresholds and directive parameters, shall be provided or validated by the Authority and defined during the analysis phase.
192	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.5, pages 180 – 182	Data Processing, Transformation and Publication Publication via 'the API Gateway'; audit / monitoring / notifications; comparative / ad-hoc reports.	Please confirm the API Gateway here is the single shared gateway (1.4.3.D / 1.3.1.5); audit/monitoring reuse the shared services; and comparative/ad-hoc reports are delivered by the shared Reporting capability (1.3.1.4). Please also confirm public dissemination 'where applicable' is limited to an enumerated dataset set, with INSPIRE / licensing / anonymization obligations specified if public exposure is required.	Confirmed. Publication through the API Gateway shall use the shared IWRACS integration/API layer, with authentication, authorization, versioning, monitoring, logging and audit. Audit, monitoring, notifications and reporting shall reuse the common/shared services where appropriate. Public dissemination shall apply only to datasets agreed and approved during the analysis phase, with applicable access, licensing, anonymization and data-protection rules.
193	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.6, pages 182 – 184	Reports & Statistics (specific requirements) Directive reporting structures/formats defined in Annexes 4 (Nitrates), 5 (WFD), 6 (EQS), 7 (ICPDR);	Please confirm these annexes contain the complete structural/format specifications; that completion templates and validation rules are delivered during analysis (per 1.3.2.5); and that any directive report named only as	Annexes 4–7 provide reference reporting structures and examples for the relevant reporting domains. They shall be used as the basis for defining the detailed templates, formats, validation rules and standardized reports during the analysis phase. The final number of reports generated from

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		Annex 12 provides indicative report volumes.	'among others' / 'etc.' without a technical annex (e.g., the EDL Inventory; NEC Directive 2016/2284) is out of scope until specified. Please confirm the total count of distinct standardized EU reports per Annex 12, and whether per-RBA reports (e.g., 11 RBMPs) are generated from shared logic.	shared logic shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase based on Annex 12, reporting obligations and Beneficiary requirements.
194	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.6, pages 182 – 184	Reports & Statistics (specific requirements) Custom reports must use 'all data available in the database, not just predefined or implicitly filtered subsets'.	Please confirm this means users may filter/report across datasets within their access rights (no hidden technical limitation on reportable fields), not an override of role-based/row-level visibility; and confirm whether report authoring is self-service or parameterized (consistent with 1.3.1.4).	Confirmed. Custom reports may use data available in the database only within the user's access rights. This requirement does not override role-based access control, row-level filtering, confidentiality or data-protection rules. The reporting component shall support configurable and/or self-service reporting for authorized users, as defined and approved during the analysis phase.
195	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.6, pages 182 – 184	Reports & Statistics (specific requirements) Nitrates reporting requires data for the entire four-year reporting period (Art. 10).	Please confirm the historical four-year data is provided by the Authority via the initial historical import, and that the Contractor is not responsible for sourcing/reconstructing historical data not held in those sources; the system generates the report from data made available.	Confirmed. Historical data required for the four-year Nitrates reporting period shall be provided by the Authority through the agreed initial import or available data sources. The Contractor is not responsible for sourcing or reconstructing historical data not available in the agreed sources. The system shall generate reports based on data made available and validated within ROwaterDATA.
196	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.6, pages 182 – 184	Reports & Statistics (specific requirements) Directive-compliant file generation; version history / traceability; pre-filling	Please confirm directive file generation reuses the 1.3.2.5 transformation capability; version / traceability / audit reuse the shared mechanisms; and 'automatic pre-filling' means deterministic carry-	Confirmed. Directive-compliant file generation shall reuse the data processing, transformation and publication capabilities. Versioning, traceability and audit shall reuse the applicable shared mechanisms. Automatic pre-filling means deterministic

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		from historical values.	forward of prior values for user review, not inference / prediction.	reuse or carry-forward of available historical values for user review and validation, not inference or prediction.
197	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.7, page 184	Notifications & Alerts (specific requirements) Notifications & Alerts including 'monitoring of system availability'; list is 'but not limited to'.	Please confirm the implemented notifications are those enumerated (plus 1.3.2.4 status changes); that system-availability monitoring is satisfied by the system-wide observability stack (1.5.3); and that the dataset notifications and periodic reports reuse the shared notification and reporting / scheduling services.	The system shall implement the notifications and alerts required by the RFP, including dataset deadlines, validation issues, upload errors, rejections, workflow progress, version conflicts and periodic dataset reports. System availability monitoring may be supported by the system-wide observability/monitoring capabilities. Dataset notifications, scheduled reports and distribution mechanisms shall reuse shared notification and reporting services where appropriate.
198	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.8, page 185	Audit Trail (specific requirements) 'Ability to restore prior versions if necessary' for datasets, validation rules and access permissions.	Please confirm restore semantics: which objects (structure / values / rules / permissions); that restore is a non-destructive administrative action creating a new version (preserving history / audit); and that restoring across structural changes that would invalidate later data is blocked / flagged for human resolution, not performed automatically.	The restore capability shall apply to relevant versioned objects, including dataset structures, values, validation rules and access permissions, as agreed during analysis. Restore shall preserve audit history and traceability. Where restoration could conflict with later data or structural changes, the system shall block or flag the case for authorized review rather than perform an uncontrolled automatic restore.
199	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.8, page 185	Audit Trail (specific requirements) 'Semantic validation of values' on import; configuration of authentication / protocols 'through the system	Please confirm 'semantic validation' means rule-based validation against reference values/code lists (not NLP / meaning-based); that business users parameterize pre-defined integrations while connection /auth / protocol setup is by administrators; that anonymisation is in-flow per	Confirmed with clarification. Semantic validation means rule-based validation against reference values, code lists, formats and configured business rules, not NLP or meaning-based interpretation. Business users may parameterize predefined integrations, while authentication, protocols and technical connection settings shall be

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		interface'; export-side anonymization; 'real-time' APIs.	integration; and that 'real-time' means synchronous request/response APIs.	managed by authorized administrators. Anonymization may be applied per integration where required. “Real-time APIs” means synchronous request/response exchange, unless otherwise agreed during analysis.
200	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.9, page 185	Integration with External Systems (specific requirements) Access to official external sources 'if public' (ANAF, INS, ANRSC, ANCPI, national open-data, 'or other water-related thematic databases'); 'but not limited to'.	Please provide the definitive enumerated list of external sources with the specific interface each exposes and whether access is genuinely public or requires credentials / agreements; and confirm the Authority secures access /credentials / agreements for non-public sources. Sources named illustratively are out of baseline scope until enumerated with a defined interface.	The system shall support access to official external sources where such access is public or made available to the Authority. The definitive list of external sources, interfaces, access conditions, credentials and responsibilities shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. For non-public sources, the Authority shall provide or facilitate the necessary access, agreements or credentials, where applicable.
201	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.2.9, page 185	Integration with External Systems (specific requirements) 'Semantic validation of values' on import; configuration of authentication / protocols 'through the system interface'; export-side anonymisation; 'real-time' APIs.	Please confirm 'semantic validation' means rule-based validation against reference values / code lists (not NLP / meaning-based); that business users parameterize pre-defined integrations while connection / auth / protocol setup is by administrators; that anonymisation is in-flow per integration; and that 'real-time' means synchronous request / response APIs.	Confirmed. Semantic validation on import means rule-based validation against reference values, code lists and configured validation rules. Business users may parameterize predefined integrations, while authentication, protocols and technical setup shall be performed by authorized administrators. Export-side anonymization and real-time API behavior shall be configured per integration and approved during the analysis phase.
202	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3	Back-Office must 'capture and automatically retrieve relevant sections from the technical documentation	Please confirm the source of auto-populated template data is the structured data the applicant entered into the electronic forms	The auto-population of templates shall primarily use structured data entered by the applicant in electronic forms and structured workflow data.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		submitted by the applicant' into issued-act templates.	(and structured workflow data), NOT extraction from the content of uploaded free-form documents; and that the system performs no OCR /NLP / automated content extraction of uploaded files. If document-content extraction is required, please specify document types and fields.	Automated extraction from uploaded free-form documents through OCR/NLP is not mandatory, unless specifically proposed by the Proposer and agreed by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
203	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.2	Front-Office 'structured intake of applications and mandatory documentation checks'.	Please confirm 'mandatory documentation checks' means presence / completeness / format checks against a configurable per-permit-type checklist plus validation of structured form-field entries, and does NOT require automated analysis of the substantive content of uploaded documents; substantive verification remains with the Authority's reviewers.	Confirmed. Mandatory documentation checks refer to presence, completeness and format checks against configurable checklists per request type, together with validation of structured form fields. They do not require automated substantive analysis of uploaded document content. Substantive verification remains the responsibility of the Authority's reviewers.
204	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.2 / Annex 12	'Submission without restrictions on file volume or format'; files 2–5 GB or more; malware scanning; chunked / resumable upload; storage in a 'future' DMS.	Please confirm a defined maximum package size (aligned to the observed ~5 GB upper range, e.g., a stated ceiling) and an enumerated accepted-format list ('no restriction' conflicts with malware scanning and format validation); that multi-GB malware scanning is asynchronous with quarantine; and the storage target/interface, with a fallback if the future DMS is unavailable in the project timeline. Overwise, please confirm that „future DMS" is referring to DMS-RAE of this RFP.	The system shall support large file upload, malware scanning and resumable/chunked upload in accordance with the RFP and Annex 12. The accepted formats, maximum package size, scanning workflow, quarantine rules, storage target and fallback approach shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. The reference to the future DMS shall be understood as DMS-RAE or another storage solution designated by the Beneficiary.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
205	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.2	Automatic mapping of affected water bodies to the competent ABA / SCAR; display of water bodies via existing ArcGIS Enterprise; manual transfer on misallocation.	Please confirm the auto-mapping relies on spatial queries against the existing ArcGIS Enterprise (with authoritative territorial / water-body layers maintained by the Authority), that the Contractor consumes rather than creates this data, and that the documented manual-override path is the accepted safeguard for edge cases (auto-mapping is decision-support, not unsupervised authoritative routing).	Confirmed. Automatic mapping shall rely on spatial queries and authoritative territorial/water-body layers available through the existing ArcGIS Enterprise and related Beneficiary-managed data sources. The Contractor shall consume and integrate such data, not create the authoritative layers. Manual transfer/reallocation remains the safeguard for misallocation or edge cases, with full traceability.
206	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3 (SEICA) / Annex 3	SEICA validation of Tables 1-4 against thresholds from Order 828 / 2019; Annex 3 provides a work-classification table (categories → mandatory / decide / not-required, with parameters / thresholds).	Please confirm the SEICA-necessity determination is implemented as a deterministic decision table plus threshold validations exactly as in Annex 3, with the complete threshold set (including values not in the extract, e.g., the fishery 10 ha / 3.5 m / 50 m / dike-bank limits) provided by the Authority from the Order; and that the Tables 1-4 validation rules are an Authority-defined input delivered during analysis (Annex 3 states they are 'agreed during analysis'). Please provide the full Tables 1-4 structures.	SEICA necessity shall be supported through configurable deterministic rules, decision tables and threshold validations based on Annex 3, Order no. 828/2019 and Beneficiary-provided inputs. The complete thresholds, Tables 1-4 structures and validation rules shall be provided, reviewed and approved during the analysis phase.
207	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3 (SEICA)	SEICA 'verification and analysis of submitted technical documentation'; review of summaries, monitoring programmes, correlations.	Please confirm SEICA validation is deterministic checking of the structured Tables 1-4 entries (presence, consistency across tables, conditional requirements) and that the Commission performs substantive	Confirmed. The system shall support deterministic checks of structured SEICA data, including presence, consistency, conditional requirements and correlations. Substantive expert judgement on technical documentation remains the responsibility of

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			expert judgement on documentation; the system presents documentation and structured data for human review and does not automatically analyze document content.	the SEICA Commission. The system shall present documentation and structured data for review and shall not be required to automatically interpret free-form document content.
208	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3	Unique registration number 'automatically generated or manually entered'; configurable assignment method.	Please confirm the configuration is a defined, parameterized set of numbering schemes (format, sequence, prefix per unit, annual reset), not arbitrary free-form per-user logic.	Confirmed. Registration-number configuration shall be based on defined parameterized numbering schemes, such as format, sequence, prefix, competent unit and annual reset. It is not intended as arbitrary free-form logic per user. The final numbering rules shall be approved during the analysis phase.
209	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.6 / Annex 13	Integration with ~12 external systems; Annex 13 specifies ANMAP at field level only; all others stated as 'integration through APIs or direct database access, as applicable' with no interface spec.	Please confirm, for each non-ANMAP system (ArcGIS, HIDRA, ECA-RO, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Registry, ASIS/ATHOS), whether a documented API exists and provide its specification; and confirm that any system without a documented interface at signature has its interface provided by the Authority during analysis, with integration scoped / priced once defined (change control if it exceeds a standard API integration).	**Note:** *References to the **Water Registry System** shall be understood as references to the existing NARW **Water Cadastre** system.* The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency. The integrations in scope are those specified in the RFP and Annex 13, including ArcGIS, HIDRA, ECA-RO, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Cadastre, ASIS/ATHOS and ROwaterDATA. Annex 13 defines the expected interoperability approach, including initial controlled data import via Excel files, API-based integration, direct database access where applicable, and secure notification mechanisms for issued regulatory acts. The detailed interface specifications, protocols, authentication mechanisms, access conditions, data mappings, and responsibilities for each system shall be

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				reviewed, defined and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. Where a documented API is not available, the integration approach may rely on controlled file-based import/export or other agreed mechanisms, subject to Beneficiary approval. Any material changes beyond the integration scope defined in the RFP and Annex 13 shall be handled in accordance with the applicable contractual provisions.
210	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.6 / Annex 13	Recurring fallback 'direct database access' for external systems.	Please confirm whether direct DB access is genuinely expected for any system (implying no API), and if so that the Authority provides schema, read access and a stability commitment. Direct coupling to a third-party schema is contrary to loose coupling (1.4.4); we assume API integration is preferred and DB access is a last resort at the Authority's direction and risk.	API-based integration is preferred where available. Direct database access may be used only where agreed with the Beneficiary and where the relevant system owner provides the schema, access rights, security conditions and stability assumptions. The final mechanism for each integration shall be defined during the analysis phase.
211	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.6 / Annex 13	Annex 13 provides a complete field-level dataset exchange for ANMAP (both directions), procedure types and stage statuses; initial intake 'via Excel files'.	Please confirm the remaining ANMAP transport parameters (protocol, authentication, push/poll sequencing, error / retry) are agreed during analysis against the supplied field contract; and confirm that Excel-based manual import is the accepted interim integration for systems whose APIs are not yet available, with API integration introduced later via change control.	The ANMAP data exchange shall be implemented based on Annex 13 and the detailed transport parameters agreed during the analysis phase, including protocol, authentication, sequencing, error handling and retry mechanisms. Where APIs are not available, interim file-based or Excel-based exchange may be used if agreed by the Beneficiary. Any later API integration shall be addressed according to the applicable contractual provisions.
212	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3,	Online payment via Ghiseul.ro; payment	Please confirm the Authority provides Ghiseul.ro onboarding /	The Authority shall provide or facilitate Ghiseul.ro onboarding, access, credentials

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
	pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.2 (payment) / 1.3.3.6	confirmation from ASIS (or ATHOS in one administration) notifies SIGAR to start analysis.	credentials / spec; that payment confirmation reaches SIGAR via ASIS / ATHOS and adapting those systems to emit it is the Authority's responsibility; and whether ATHOS (one administration) constitutes a second distinct financial integration. We assume SIGAR consumes a payment-confirmation event and does not integrate with banking / settlement.	and technical specifications, where applicable. SIGAR shall receive payment confirmation from **ASIS and/or ATHOS**, as the agreed financial integration channel. The detailed integration flow, exchanged data, authentication, timing and error-handling mechanisms shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. Adaptation or modification of the external financial systems remains outside the Contractor's responsibility, unless expressly agreed under the Contract.
213	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3	Electronic issuance 'with qualified digital signatures'; official correspondence and financial documents generated from configurable templates.	Please confirm the qualified-signature standard and that certificates / qualified trust service / signing hardware are Authority-provided, consistent with the single shared signing approach.	The system shall support electronic issuance with qualified digital signature where applicable and required. The applicable signature standard, signing workflow and use cases shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. Qualified certificates, trust services or signing hardware shall be provided by the Authority, where and when required.
214	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 Annex 10 (UC1-UC10)	Use-case scenarios describe legal procedures; process-flow diagrams are referenced; UC4–UC6 (authorizations) and UC7 (suspension) are defined in text only as 'similar to permits but more complex' and rest on diagrams not included.	Please provide the process-flow diagrams for all use cases (notably UC4-UC7). Please confirm the specification basis is Annex 10 + the cited legal Orders + Annex 8 (illustrative forms, non-binding), and that the Contractor produces the detailed system workflow definitions (states, transitions, role-action permissions, timeouts/escalation) for Authority validation/sign-off during analysis.	The specification basis shall include the RFP, Annex 10, the applicable legal orders and Annex 8 illustrative forms. All available diagrams, illustrated forms and supporting workflow references shall be provided by the Beneficiary to the Contractor during the analysis phase. Based on these inputs, the Contractor shall detail the system workflow definitions, including states, transitions, role-action permissions, deadlines, escalations and exceptions, for Beneficiary review and

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				approval during the analysis phase.
215	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 Annex 10 (UC1)	Annex 10 notes (red-font) steps excluded from the current phase: Environmental Authority (AM) e-collaboration; General Registry integration described as a future mechanism (manual registration is the current-phase baseline).	Please confirm these current-phase exclusions: (a) AM electronic collaboration is a later phase; (b) General Registry integration is future, with manual registration in SIGAR as the current baseline.	Current-phase exclusions shall be confirmed based on the RFP and annexes during the analysis phase. If AM electronic collaboration is not included in the current baseline scope, the system shall support the agreed current workflow without such integration. The reference to General Registry integration shall be understood in correlation with **DMS-RAE**, where applicable.
216	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 Annex 10 (UC9, UC10)	UC9 Crossing Permit involves ministerial (MMAP) approval and multi-recipient distribution; UC9/UC10 governed by separate Orders (3.404/2012; 2/2006) with their own forms and deadlines.	Please confirm whether MMAP receives documents via a built system integration or via generated documents with secure recipient access/notification (we assume the latter), and that the specific forms/rules for UC9/UC10 (Annex 8 / the Orders) are available so these simplified workflows are configured against actual requirements.	For UC9 and UC10, document transmission to MMAP or other recipients may be performed through generated documents, secure access and notifications, unless a specific system integration is agreed. The applicable forms, rules, deadlines and workflow details shall be defined based on the relevant Orders, Annex 8 and Beneficiary validation during the analysis phase.
217	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.4 / 1.3.3.5	SIGAR Reports & Statistics (eight defined report types + KPIs); SIGAR Notifications & Alerts (request- and SEICA-oriented; periodic workflow reports).	Please confirm SIGAR reporting is delivered by the shared Reporting capability (1.3.1.4) configured with these reports/KPIs (with the same role-based / row-level access model), and that SIGAR notifications reuse the shared notification service and reporting scheduling / distribution.	Confirmed. SIGAR reports and KPIs may be delivered through the shared Reporting & Statistics capability, configured for SIGAR-specific reports and role-based visibility. SIGAR notifications and periodic workflow reports may reuse the shared notification, scheduling and distribution services, where appropriate.
218	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 1.3.3.3 /	Centralized Dashboard with traceability / version control; permitting workflows (issuance /	Please confirm the permitting workflows run on the common configurable workflow engine; dashboard traceability / version	Confirmed with clarification. Permitting workflows may be implemented using the common configurable workflow engine or another integrated workflow

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
	1.3.3.6	amendment / suspension / transfer / withdrawal, SEICA, hierarchical approvals); integration on the gateway.	control and audit reuse the shared versioning / audit mechanisms; and SIGAR integration uses the shared integration / API-management platform.	capability proposed by the Proposer, provided all RFP requirements are met. Dashboard traceability, version control, audit and integration shall reuse shared IWRACS services where appropriate, including the shared API/integration platform.
219	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.3, pages 185 – 197 Annex 8	Standard request forms (Order 828/2019 Annex 1.b; Order 3147/2023 Annex 1.a) and issued-act templates are 'illustrative' and 'may be subject to adaptations and extensions during implementation'.	Please confirm the Annex 8 forms/templates constitute the baseline and that final layouts/field sets (including SEICA-table integration) are agreed and frozen during analysis, not open-ended redesign.	Annex 8 forms and templates constitute the baseline and illustrative reference for implementation. Final layouts, field sets, SEICA-table integration and template adaptations shall be defined, agreed and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. This does not imply open-ended redesign beyond the agreed scope.
220	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 / 1.4.7	Enterprise document / records management, registry, archiving, e-signature and workflows; 1.4.7 designates DMS-RAE a 'mature, cloud-ready COTS solution'.	Please confirm DMS-RAE may be delivered by configuring an established ECM platform (commercial or open-source) integrated into IWRACS, rather than custom development, with the platform's native capabilities satisfying corresponding requirements.	Confirmed. DMS-RAE may be delivered by configuring an established ECM/document management platform, commercial or open-source, integrated into IWRACS, which shall meet all RFP functional, security, interoperability, audit and support requirements. Custom development is not required where the selected platform’s native or configurable capabilities satisfy the requirements.
221	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (A, B, H)	Many capabilities hedged 'where feasible' (M365 editing, PDF conversion, in-app preview, template generation with OCR-derived content, duplicate / near-duplicate detection, email capture, contextual	Please confirm these are delivered to the extent natively supported / reasonably configurable in the selected ECM platform and are not absolute acceptance criteria where the product lacks them natively; the offer will state coverage.	Confirmed with clarification. Capabilities marked as **“where feasible”** shall be delivered to the extent natively supported or reasonably configurable in the selected ECM/DMS platform. The Proposer shall clearly state the level of coverage in its proposal. The final implementation approach shall be reviewed

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		chat, Teams integration, link sharing, hidden-metadata removal).		and approved during the analysis phase.
222	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (D.1.3)	Mandatory 'Rest Leave (Concediu de Odihnă)' workflow with HR verification 'via internal logic and/or integration with HR/Payroll systems if available'.	Please confirm the workflow is implemented on the DMS workflow engine; that leave-balance verification uses the HR/Payroll system where an Authority-provided interface exists and is otherwise a manual HR step; and whether an HR/Payroll interface is in scope.	The Rest Leave workflow shall be implemented by using the workflow capabilities of the DMS-RAE system. Verification of the leave balance may be performed through integration with the HR/Payroll system, provided by the Beneficiary. In the absence of such an interface, HR verification may be carried out as a manual step within the workflow. The scope, requirements and technical approach for any HR/Payroll integration shall be defined, validated and approved during the analysis phase.
223	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (A, D)	OCR for digitization, search in OCR content, and OCR-derived template population.	Please confirm OCR is applied to scanned documents to produce searchable text (native/standard platform OCR), in the required languages (Romanian + diacritics), and that OCR-derived population means inserting recognized text/zones, not AI interpretation of content.	Confirmed. OCR shall be used to convert scanned documents into searchable text, including Romanian language support and diacritics, where supported by the selected platform. OCR-derived population means using recognized text or configured zones/metadata to support template completion. It does not require AI-based interpretation of document content unless proposed and approved during the analysis phase.
224	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (A)	'Detection and management of duplicate or highly similar documents' (where feasible).	Please confirm this is satisfied by the platform's native deduplication / similarity features (e.g., hash-based duplicates, built-in similarity where available), not a custom near-duplicate / semantic-similarity build.	Confirmed. This requirement may be satisfied through native or reasonably configurable platform capabilities, such as hash-based duplicate detection or built-in similarity features where available. A custom semantic near-duplicate detection

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				engine is not required unless proposed by the Proposer and approved during the analysis phase.
225	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (D.1.1-D.1.3)	Three mandatory Electronic Registry workflows are minimum acceptance criteria (incoming external correspondence; internal note; rest-leave).	Please confirm the Authority provides the authoritative process definitions (routing, roles, numbering rules, deadlines, approval levels) during analysis and the Contractor configures them; that there are exactly three mandatory workflows; and that other registry workflows are configured by the Authority post-delivery using the no / low-code tools.	The three workflows listed in the RFP — incoming external correspondence, internal note and Rest Leave request — are mandatory minimum acceptance requirements. The Beneficiary shall provide or validate the detailed process definitions, including routing, roles, numbering rules, deadlines and approval levels, during the analysis phase. The Contractor shall configure and /or develop these workflows accordingly. Other workflows may be configured later using the no/low-code tools, where applicable.
226	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (D, F)	Highly configurable registry numbering per level; interoperable registries at SCAR/ABA/INHGA/ECSC plus local SGA/SHI registries; number reservation.	Please confirm numbering configuration is a defined parameterized scheme set (format, sequence, prefix per level, annual reset, reservation) provided by the Authority, and confirm the number of distinct registries to be configured (SCAR, ABA × N, INHGA, ECSC, SGA/SHI × N) for effort sizing.	Registry numbering shall be based on defined parameterized schemes, including format, sequence, prefix per level/entity, annual reset and number reservation, according to Beneficiary-defined rules. The number of distinct registries and registry levels to be configured shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the NARW institutional hierarchy and operational needs.
227	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (G)	Electronic archiving aligned to national archival legislation / nomenclature; 'controlled transfer to National Archives according to legal procedures'.	Please confirm the archival nomenclature and retention schedules are provided by the Authority for configuration, and whether 'transfer to National Archives' requires integration with a specific system / format or the generation of compliant export packages.	The Beneficiary shall provide or validate the archival nomenclature, retention rules and applicable institutional recordkeeping requirements during the analysis phase. To this Contract, DMS-RAE electronic archiving shall be understood as the controlled storage and preservation of electronic records within the DMS-RAE repository/database, including metadata, retention rules, access control and

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				auditability. The provisions referred to in the question have been revised through Amendment No. 5 to the RFP. Integration with, or controlled transfer to, the National Archives is not included in the current scope of the project.
228	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (A, B, H)	M365 editing, Exchange Online capture, Teams integration throughout.	Please confirm the M365/Exchange Online/Teams environment, licensing and administrative access are Authority-provided, and that integration depth is bounded by the Authority's tenant configuration and licensing.	Confirmed. The Microsoft 365, Exchange Online and Teams environment, licensing and administrative access shall be provided by the Authority. The depth of integration shall depend on the Authority's tenant configuration, licensing, security policies and approved technical design.
229	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (E)	Electronic signing with qualified / advanced / internal certificates; mixed handwritten / electronic flows.	Please confirm qualified certificates and any qualified trust service are Authority/signatory-provided and that one consistent signing approach serves SIGAR and DMS-RAE.	Confirmed. Qualified certificates, qualified trust services and any required signing infrastructure shall be provided by the Authority, where applicable. A consistent signing approach should be defined for DMS-RAE, SIGAR and other IWRACS components during the analysis phase.
230	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 (D, I, F)	DMS-RAE workflow engine; native REST APIs / webhooks; bordereau reporting; Manager View drill-down (SCAR→ABA→SGA) with strict data isolation; SIGAR registration - number requests via API.	Please confirm DMS-RAE may use the platform's native workflow engine for D.1.1–D.1.3 and routing (rather than the common engine) provided interoperability/audit are met; that bordereau/Manager View reuse native reporting plus the shared Reporting capability and the same role-based/row-level access model; and that the DMS-RAE↔SIGAR	Confirmed. DMS-RAE may use the selected platform's native workflow engine for registry workflows, routing and approvals, provided interoperability, auditability and traceability requirements are met. Bordereau reporting and Manager View may use native reporting capabilities and/or the shared IWRACS Reporting component, while maintaining the required role-based and data-level access controls.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			integration is delivered once via the shared integration approach.	The DMS-RAE ↔ SIGAR integration shall be implemented through the shared integration/API approach, including registration-number.
231	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.4, pages 185 – 203 1.3.4 / Annex 12	Long-term preservation (original + non-editable PDF), permanent-retention records; no DMS-RAE storage volume stated in Annex 12.	Please confirm the total expected storage volume and document counts and the maximum retention horizon, and whether immutability/tamper-evidence (append-only/WORM) is required, as these drive storage and archival-format design.	The expected storage volume, document counts, retention horizon and any immutability/tamper-evidence requirements shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on Annex 12, existing document volumes and Beneficiary requirements. Where permanent-retention or legally protected records are in scope, the solution shall support appropriate preservation and audit mechanisms in accordance with the approved archival rules.
232	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B5)	Virtual Assistant (chatbot): intent identification, guidance to forms, status checking, KB management, conversation logs, satisfaction / resolution-rate reports.	Please confirm whether a rule / intent-based chatbot over a curated knowledge base is acceptable, or a generative / LLM-based assistant is required; if generative, confirm constraints on data residency, hallucination control and restriction to the curated KB; and confirm required languages and that the Authority maintains the KB content.	A rule-based or intent-based Virtual Assistant using a curated knowledge base is acceptable, provided it meets the functional requirements of the RFP. A generative/LLM-based assistant is not mandatory. If proposed by the Proposer, it shall be subject to Beneficiary approval during the analysis phase, including requirements on data residency, restriction to approved knowledge sources, logging, security and mitigation of incorrect or unsupported answers. The knowledge base content shall be provided, validated and maintained by the Authority. The expected languages are Romanian and English, with final language requirements to be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
233	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B5)	Assistant 'request status checking using minimal identification data'.	Please confirm this reuses the Extranet status-lookup (registration code), surfaced through the assistant, and confirm the security controls (e.g., code plus a second factor) to prevent unauthorized disclosure.	Confirmed. Status checking through the Virtual Assistant may reuse the Extranet request-status lookup mechanism, based on the unique registration code or equivalent identifier. The required security controls, including whether an additional verification factor is needed, shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase to prevent unauthorized disclosure.
234	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B1)	Content migration: inventory of SCAR / ABA / SGA portal content, support keep / update / exclude decisions, migrate only validated content.	Please quantify the migration scope: number of portals/subsites (SCAR + N ABA + N SGA), volume (pages/documents/news), and current platform(s). Confirm migration covers an enumerated, Authority-validated set from identified source platforms; that the Authority owns keep/exclude decisions and editorial validation; and that bulk re-authoring of new content is out of scope.	Content migration shall be based on an inventory of the existing SCAR/ABA/SGA public portal content and on the Beneficiary's keep/ update / exclude decisions. In this context, the Contractor is expected to: • inventory existing portal content; • help the Beneficiary decide what to keep, update or exclude; • migrate the validated content to the new portal structure; • preserve integrity, metadata and consistency where applicable. The migration scope, including number of portals/subsites, pages, documents, news items, source platforms and validated content to be migrated, shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. Bulk re-authoring of new content is not included unless expressly agreed.
235	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (A3)	Legal Module: administrative files and court cases, sync with portal.just.ro, structured case data, dashboards,	Please confirm the Legal Module is delivered as a configured case-management capability on the portal/forms platform per the A3 fields/functions, with detailed case	Confirmed. The Legal Module may be delivered as a configured case-management capability within the Portal platform, based on the functions specified in Section 1.3.5 A3. The detailed case structure, workflows,

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		win/loss indicators.	structure/workflow agreed during analysis, and that there is no additional annex specifying it beyond A3. Confirm 'win/loss' and dashboards are computed from structured case data entered by staff, not derived from document content.	fields, responsibilities, dashboards and reports shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase. Win/loss indicators and dashboards shall be based on structured case data entered or validated by users, not on automated interpretation of document content.
236	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (A1) / 1.4.3.A	Intranet SSO via Microsoft Entra ID with user/group-to-role mapping.	Please confirm the Entra ID tenant is Authority-provided and administered, and the Contractor integrates against it.	Confirmed. The Microsoft Azure (Entra ID) tenant is provided and administered by the Authority. The Contractor shall integrate the Intranet with the Authority's Entra ID tenant and configure user/group-to-role mapping based on the agreed access model.
237	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B4)	External identification: initially verified email; 'compatibility for future integration with ROeID'.	Please confirm ROeID integration is NOT in current scope (design-for-compatibility only; initial identity via verified email), with actual ROeID integration a separate later change.	Confirmed. Actual ROeID integration is not included in the current baseline scope unless expressly agreed. The current requirement is to support initial identification through verified e-mail and ensure compatibility for future ROeID integration. Any future ROeID integration shall be addressed through the applicable contractual mechanism.
238	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (A2) / 1.3.4 (D.1.3)	Intranet CMS + Extranet public portal; no / low-code internal forms (leave, travel, approvals); overlap with the DMS-RAE rest-leave workflow.	Please confirm Intranet/Extranet are one CMS platform (open-source eligible) and the forms / workflow engine is the platform capability or the shared engine; and confirm whether the single leave-request workflow belongs to the Portal forms engine or DMS-RAE, so it is built once.	The Intranet and Extranet may be implemented on one CMS/Portal platform, including commercial or open-source solutions, provided the RFP requirements are met. Forms and workflow capabilities may be provided by the Portal platform, the shared workflow engine, or DMS-RAE, depending on the approved architecture. The Rest Leave workflow shall be implemented once,

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				avoiding duplication, and its final placement and integration with DMS-RAE shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
239	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B3)	Whistleblowing reporting (secure, confidential, with secure response communication).	Please confirm the compliance basis (Law 361/2022 transposing the EU Whistleblower Directive) and any specific anonymity / confidentiality / retention / access-restriction obligations, with procedural rules provided by the Authority.	The whistleblowing functionality shall comply with the applicable legal framework, including Law no. 361/2022, where applicable. Specific requirements on anonymity, confidentiality, retention, access restrictions, secure communication and procedural handling shall be provided or validated by the Authority and approved during the analysis phase.
240	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B2)	Integration with a web analytics tool for traffic/behavior monitoring (GDPR-aligned).	Please confirm whether a specific tool is mandated or the Contractor proposes a GDPR-compliant (e.g., privacy-preserving/self-hosted) analytics tool subject to Authority approval.	No specific analytics tool is mandated, unless otherwise decided by the Beneficiary. The Proposer may propose a GDPR-aligned analytics solution, including privacy-preserving or self-hosted options, subject to Beneficiary review and approval during the analysis phase.
241	Section VII, Chapter 1.3.5, pages 203 – 207 1.3.5 (B3, B4)	Electronically signed PDF responses to citizens; signing of requests where required.	Please confirm one shared signing capability and Authority-provided qualified trust service/certificates, consistent with SIGAR and DMS-RAE.	Confirmed. A shared electronic signing capability should be used where applicable across Portal, SIGAR and DMS-RAE. Qualified certificates, qualified trust services or related signing infrastructure shall be provided by the Authority, where required. The detailed signing flows and use cases shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.
242	Section VII, Chapter 1.4, pages 207 – 213 1.4.3.E	Shared 'Common Master and Reference Data' service (water bodies, cadastral objects, organizational	Please clarify: which reference datasets are in scope and the authoritative source for each; whether a dedicated MDM capability	The common master and reference data service shall cover the shared reference datasets required by the IWRACS applications, including water bodies,

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		units, codifications) with 'controlled synchronization and governance'.	with active synchronization is required or governed reference lists mastered in an authoritative application and consumed via the shared APIs; and who provides the initial authoritative content. Please confirm spatial/cadastral reference data remains mastered in ArcGIS / ROwaterDATA and is consumed, not re-mastered.	cadastral objects, organizational units, codifications and other agreed reference lists. The authoritative source for each reference dataset, the synchronization mechanism and the governance responsibilities shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase. Spatial and cadastral reference data shall remain mastered in the relevant authoritative systems, such as ArcGIS and/or ROwaterDATA, and consumed through governed APIs or synchronization mechanisms, rather than being re-mastered unnecessarily.
243	Section VII, Chapter 1.4, pages 207 – 213 1.4.3.D vs 1.3.2.5	API Gateway lists 'data transformation and aggregation'; functional chapters place transformation in ROwaterDATA's processing component.	Please confirm authoritative reporting transformations occur in ROwaterDATA's processing layer, while the gateway performs lightweight presentation-level transformation/aggregation (format conversion, field minimization) at exposure time, not duplicating the reporting transformation engine.	Confirmed. Authoritative reporting transformations shall be performed in the ROwaterDATA data processing and reporting layer. The API Gateway shall support controlled exposure of data and services, including lightweight transformation, aggregation, format conversion, field minimization, access control, versioning, rate limiting, logging and audit, without duplicating the ROwaterDATA reporting transformation engine. The detailed allocation of transformation responsibilities shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase.
244	Section VII, Chapter 1.4, pages 207 – 213 1.4.6, 1.4.7 / Annex 14	CI/CD, secure repositories and deployment automation 'in accordance with Annex 14 - Recommended	Please confirm whether Annex 14 mandates specific tools or recommends them, and whether the Beneficiary or Contractor provides the CI/CD tooling/repositories; and	Annex 14 shall be treated as the reference for recommended development and testing environments. The Proposer shall propose the CI/CD approach, repositories, deployment

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		Development and Testing Environments'; four environments (prod/test/training/DR).	please confirm the four environments and their RPO/RTO/DR targets for sizing.	automation and environment configuration, considering the selected hosting model and relevant good practice. The final tooling, responsibilities and deployment model shall be agreed and approved during the analysis and design phase. The solution shall support separated environments, including production, testing, training and disaster recovery, as required by the RFP. The detailed sizing, RPO/RTO targets and DR model shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the agreed architecture and hosting environment.
245	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.3, 1.5.6	Operational monitoring / diagnostics / alerting and backup / disaster recovery.	Please confirm these may be satisfied using the hosting platform's native capabilities (Azure/Azure Stack Hub monitoring, backup, DR) and the COTS products' native administration, complemented by the shared observability stack, rather than custom-developed admin tooling per subsystem.	Confirmed. Operational monitoring, diagnostics, alerting, backup and disaster recovery may be implemented using the native capabilities of the selected hosting platform, including Azure / Azure Stack Hub monitoring, backup and disaster recovery services, together with the native administration capabilities of the proposed COTS products and the shared observability / monitoring stack. Custom-developed administration tooling per subsystem is not required, provided that the proposed approach meets the RFP requirements for monitoring, logging, alerting, backup, recovery and operational traceability.
246	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.4	Centralized user / role administration, RBAC, multiple roles per user, audit trails, usage	Please confirm user / role administration and access control are delivered by the shared IAM service and audit trails by the shared Audit	Confirmed. User and role administration, authentication and access control shall be delivered through the shared Identity and Access Management capability, configured

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
		monitoring.	service, configured per subsystem, not re-implemented per application.	per subsystem according to the agreed roles and access model. Audit trails shall be delivered through the shared or logically unified Audit service, configured consistently across the IWRACS subsystems. The requirements do not imply separate re-implementation of IAM or audit mechanisms in each application.
247	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.6 / 1.4.6	Restore 'within agreed recovery objectives'; DR 'in an alternate environment where required'; RPO/RTO unspecified.	Please specify the required RPO and RTO per subsystem / service tier and whether DR requires hot / warm standby in an alternate site / region or restore-from-backup is acceptable; we assume targets and DR model are fixed during analysis and the Contractor sizes accordingly.	The required RPO, RTO and disaster recovery model shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase, per subsystem and service tier, based on the criticality of the relevant functions, data volumes, hosting model and Beneficiary requirements. The Contractor shall propose the appropriate DR approach, which may include restore-from-backup, warm standby or another justified model, and shall size the solution accordingly after Beneficiary approval.
248	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.2	Versioning and 'rollback or restoration of previous configurations'; 'clear separation between configuration changes and operational data'.	Please confirm rollback applies to defined configuration artifacts (parameters, workflow definitions, roles / permissions, integration configs) as a controlled action restoring a prior configuration version without affecting operational data, with conflicts against newer data flagged for human resolution (distinct from data-level restore, 1.3.2.8); and that config / data separation is an architectural principle, not a separate product.	Confirmed. Rollback or restoration of previous configurations applies to defined configuration artifacts, including parameters, workflow definitions, roles and permissions, notification rules and integration configurations. Such rollback shall be performed as a controlled administrative action restoring a prior configuration version without altering operational data. Where a restored configuration may conflict with newer operational data, the system shall flag the situation for authorized human review and resolution. The separation between configuration and

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
				operational data is an architectural and implementation principle, not a requirement for a separate product.
249	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.2 vs 1.5.7	Apply updates 'with minimal service interruption'; 'maintenance windows and planned downtime notifications'.	Please confirm planned maintenance windows with advance notification are acceptable for updates, and 'minimal service interruption' does not mandate zero-downtime deployment for all updates (rolling / zero-downtime where the platform reasonably allows).	Confirmed. Planned maintenance windows with advance notification are acceptable for updates, patches and functional enhancements. "Minimal service interruption" does not require zero-downtime deployment for all updates. Rolling, blue/green or zero-downtime deployment approaches may be used where reasonably supported by the selected platform and architecture.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
250	Section VII, Chapter 1.5, pages 213 – 214 1.5.7	'License and resource usage monitoring'; capabilities prefaced 'where applicable'.	Please confirm license monitoring means visibility into usage to support the Beneficiary's license management (not Contractor responsibility for compliance of Beneficiary-owned licenses), and that 'where applicable' items are best-effort per platform/shared-service capability.	Confirmed. License monitoring means visibility into license and resource usage to support the Beneficiary's license management and operational planning. It does not transfer responsibility to the Contractor for ongoing compliance management of Beneficiary-owned or Beneficiary-procured licenses, unless expressly provided in the Contract. Capabilities marked "where applicable" shall be delivered to the extent supported by the selected platform, COTS products and shared administration services.
251	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 – 219 Annex 12 1.6.1 vs 1.5.7/1.4.6/1.6.4	'Uninterrupted service availability' (1.6.1) vs. maintenance windows (1.5.7), DR (1.4.6) and graceful degradation (1.6.4).	Please confirm the target availability as a measurable SLA (e.g., 99.5%/99.9% monthly), measured excluding scheduled maintenance and outages caused by external dependencies or Authority-provided infrastructure. 'Uninterrupted'/100% is not achievable and conflicts with the RFP's own maintenance/DR provisions; please specify the figure (or confirm it is set during analysis).	"Uninterrupted service availability" shall be understood as a high-availability objective, not as a requirement for absolute 100% availability. The measurable availability target, measurement period, exclusions and service tiers shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase. Scheduled maintenance windows, outages caused by external dependencies and failures of Authority-provided infrastructure shall be excluded from the availability calculation, unless otherwise agreed.
252	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 – 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.2	Conflicting dataset KPIs: '≤10 seconds per 10,000 records' (load + validate) and 'validations within 2 seconds per 1,000 records' (= 20s/10,000).	Please reconcile these into a single non-contradictory target per operation (e.g., whether 10s/10,000 covers load + structural validation and 2s/1,000 a separate rule-	The dataset processing KPIs shall be interpreted by operation type and validated during the analysis and performance testing phase. The target of 10 seconds per 10,000 records may be considered applicable to loading

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			based pass, or one supersedes the other).	and structural validation of large datasets, while the 2 seconds per 1,000 records target may apply to specific automatic validation passes, depending on rule complexity and agreed representative datasets. The final measurable KPI definitions, test datasets and acceptance scenarios shall be agreed and approved during the analysis phase.
253	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 – 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.2 / Annex 12	KPI specifies datasets ≥100,000 rows and 'hundreds of parallel cycles', while Annex 12 shows at most a few thousand records per entity/year.	Please confirm the realistic maximum single-dataset size for KPI testing and that per-record latency KPIs apply to individual operations under normal load while bulk/parallel processing is asynchronous and measured by throughput, not interactive latency.	The realistic maximum single-dataset size, representative file sizes and number of parallel cycles for testing shall be confirmed during the analysis phase based on Annex 12 and Beneficiary-provided workload assumptions. Interactive latency KPIs shall apply to individual operations under agreed normal-load conditions. Bulk imports, large-volume processing and parallel processing may be executed asynchronously and measured through throughput, stability, recoverability and completion time, rather than interactive response time only.
254	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 – 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.1, 1.6.2.3, 1.6.2.6	Latency KPIs (≤3s UI/search, ≤2s API, ≤3s/≤10s reports) stated without an associated concurrency level (except ≥1,000 external users) or data-volume bounds.	Please confirm each latency KPI holds at an agreed normal-load concurrency profile (defined in analysis) over agreed representative data volumes (Annex 12) within defined complexity bounds, with peak behavior validated by the peak/stress tests; very heavy ad-hoc analytics may	Confirmed. UI, search, API and reporting latency KPIs shall be measured under an agreed normal-load concurrency profile and against agreed representative data volumes and complexity levels, to be defined during the analysis and design phase. Peak-load and stress behavior shall be validated through dedicated load and stress tests. Very heavy ad-hoc analytics or

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			run asynchronously.	complex consolidated reports may be executed asynchronously, if users receive clear status feedback and results are made available when completed.
255	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 - 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.3/1.6.2.4/1.6.2.5 / Annex 12	Large files (100 MB–5 GB; SIGAR dossiers 700 MB–5 GB) referenced alongside ≤3s upload/download/preview targets.	Please confirm ≤3s targets apply to standard documents (within a defined size) and multi-GB files are governed by 'remain stable / available without timeouts' (progress-tracked, chunked, resumable), not the ≤3s interactive target — which is not physically achievable for multi-GB transfers.	Confirmed. The 3-second upload, download or preview targets apply to standard documents within an agreed size range and under normal-load conditions. Large files, including 100 MB to multi-GB technical documentation packages, shall be handled through stable, progress-tracked, chunked and resumable mechanisms. For such files, the applicable requirement is stability, availability, recoverability and absence of timeouts, not completion of the full transfer within 3 seconds.
256	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 - 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.4	'Interactions with ArcGIS, DMS-RAE, and other integration points shall not introduce delays exceeding 3 seconds'.	Please confirm this applies to the Contractor-controlled portion of the interaction (request construction, transport, response handling) and excludes processing time within external/third-party systems the Contractor does not control.	Confirmed. The 3-second target for interactions with ArcGIS, DMS-RAE and other integration points applies to the Contractor-controlled part of the interaction, including request preparation, routing, transport handling and response processing within IWRACS. Processing time, latency or unavailability of external systems or third-party services outside the Contractor's control shall be excluded, provided that the IWRACS component handles such cases through appropriate timeout, retry, logging and user-feedback mechanisms.
257	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 - 219 Annex 12 1.6.2.6	APIs via 'REST/GraphQL'; GraphQL mentioned only here, not in 1.3.1.5/1.4.3.D (which specify REST).	Please confirm whether GraphQL is mandatory or REST is sufficient; we assume REST satisfies the requirement and	REST APIs are sufficient to meet the API interoperability requirement, if they are documented, secured and governed in accordance with the RFP.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			GraphQL is optional/illustrative unless explicitly required.	GraphQL is not mandatory unless expressly required and approved during the analysis and design phase. It may be proposed by the Proposer as an additional or complementary approach where justified.
258	Section VII, Chapter 1.6, pages 215 – 219 Annex 12 1.6.4	Core functionalities remain available during external outages, with queuing, retry, reconciliation; graceful degradation.	Please confirm the enumerated set of 'critical / core' functionalities that must remain available during external outages (full offline operation of integration-dependent features is disproportionate), and that automatic reconciliation means replay of queued outbound transactions, with conflicting-state cases surfaced for human resolution.	The critical or core functionalities that must remain available during external outages shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase, based on the business criticality of each subsystem and the dependency on external services. Graceful degradation does not require full offline operation of all integration-dependent functions. It requires that the system remain usable to the extent possible, prevent data loss, queue or cache eligible transactions, retry failed communications and provide clear user feedback. Automatic reconciliation shall mean replay or synchronization of queued transactions once connectivity or external services are restored. Cases involving conflicting states or inconsistent external responses shall be flagged for authorized human review and resolution.
259	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220 1.7.2	Compliance with 'recognized cyber security standards or accreditation frameworks required by the Beneficiary', none enumerated.	Please specify the exact standards/frameworks in scope (e.g., ISO/IEC 27001). Please confirm whether the Contractor implements to standard, or must also obtain formal certification /	The system shall be designed and implemented in line with recognized cybersecurity standards and good practices applicable to the Beneficiary's institutional context, including, where relevant, ISO/IEC 27001 principles and other standards or frameworks required by the Beneficiary.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			accreditation of the system / organization within this contract (a separately-scoped activity).	Formal certification or accreditation of the Contractor's organization or of the implemented system is not included in the current scope unless expressly required elsewhere in the RFP or agreed under the Contract as a separate activity. The specific standards, controls and evidence required for acceptance shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase.
260	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220 1.7.2	NIS2 / national critical-infrastructure obligations not addressed explicitly though water management may be in scope.	Please clarify whether NIS2 / national critical-infrastructure obligations apply to NARW and this system, and if so which obligations translate into system requirements; we assume applicable regulatory obligations are provided by the Beneficiary.	Any NIS2-related or national critical-infrastructure obligations applicable to the Beneficiary and to the Information System shall be provided or confirmed by the Beneficiary. The Contractor shall implement the system requirements derived from such obligations, as approved during the analysisphase. The Contractor is not responsible for determining the Beneficiary's institutional legal classification or for fulfilling organizational compliance obligations outside the system implementation scope.
261	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220 1.7.5, 1.7.7	Security monitoring, anomaly detection, incident investigation and recovery.	Please confirm the Contractor provides system capabilities (security event logging, audit trails, alerting hooks, log access, SIEM integration), and that security operations (SOC/SIEM operation, 24/7 monitoring, incident response, threat hunting) are the Authority's operational	Confirmed. The Contractor shall provide the system capabilities required to support security monitoring and incident investigation, including security event logging, audit trails, alerts, log access, administrative reports and integration hooks for monitoring or SIEM tools. Operational security services, including SOC operation, SIEM operation, 24/7 monitoring, incident response, threat

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			responsibility, not a managed service under this contract.	hunting and ongoing security operations, remain the responsibility of the Authority, unless expressly included as managed services under the Contract.
262	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220 1.7.5	'Detection of abnormal or suspicious activities shall trigger alerts'.	Please confirm this is satisfied by rule/threshold-based detection and event forwarding to the Authority's monitoring/SIEM (plus platform-native threat detection, e.g., Azure Defender), not a bespoke behavioral/AI intrusion-detection build.	Confirmed. The requirement may be satisfied through rule-based or threshold-based detection, platform-native security monitoring capabilities and event forwarding to the Authority's monitoring/SIEM environment. A bespoke AI-based or behavioral intrusion-detection system is not required, unless proposed by the Proposer and approved by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.
263	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220 1.7.3, 1.7.4, 1.7.6	Strong authentication / authorization / logging; encryption / integrity; secure integration.	Please confirm these are satisfied by the shared IAM, Audit and integration/gateway services and the cloud platform's native security (configured to policy), not separate per-subsystem security builds; that 'strong authentication' means MFA for internal/privileged users via Entra ID (Authority owns MFA policy); and that encryption keys are managed in the platform key vault under Authority governance.	Confirmed. Strong authentication, authorization, logging, encryption, integrity protection and secure integration shall be implemented through the shared IAM, Audit and Integration/API Gateway services, together with the native security capabilities of the selected cloud platform and COTS products. Strong authentication shall include MFA for internal and privileged users, implemented through Microsoft Entra ID or the agreed identity provider, according to the Authority's policies. Encryption keys shall be managed through the approved platform key-management service, such as a cloud key vault, under Authority governance and in accordance with the agreed security model.
264	Section VII, Chapter 1.7, pages 219 – 220	'Restriction or suspension of integrations in response to	Please confirm this is an administrative capability	Confirmed. Restriction or suspension of integrations may be implemented as an

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
	1.7.6	detected security risks'.	(authorized admins disable/suspend a specific integration via the gateway/admin interface), not automated threat-triggered suspension (which is provided by platform-native security services where available).	administrative capability allowing authorized administrators to disable, suspend or restrict a specific integration through the gateway or administration interface. Automated threat-triggered suspension is not mandatory, except where available through platform-native security services and agreed during the analysis phase.
265	Section VII 1.3.2.3 / Annex 12	Lista_seturi_date_ANAR.xlsx — the complete ~350-dataset list (structures, directive-inclusion, integration method, volumes), referenced by Annex 12 but not provided.	Please provide Lista_seturi_date_ANAR.xlsx. It is the authoritative basis for scoping the dataset-configuration workstream and the directive-mapping work; without it, dataset-configuration effort cannot be firmly estimated.	The list of datasets, including structures, directive mapping, integration method and indicative volumes, shall be provided by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase. This list shall serve as the authoritative input for confirming the dataset configuration workstream, directive mapping and detailed implementation planning. The Contractor shall analyze the list, validate assumptions with the Beneficiary and configure the agreed datasets within the approved implementation scope.
266	1.3.3.2 / Annex 12	SIGAR document-storage projection: Annex 12 gives act counts (~17,000/year) and example dossier sizes (700 MB–5 GB) but no total storage estimate.	Please provide the expected annual and 5-year document-storage volume for SIGAR, including whether historical dossiers are migrated, as this is the dominant storage/backup/DR sizing driver and is currently unquantified.	The expected annual and five-year document-storage volume for SIGAR, including assumptions on dossier size, number of cases, retention period and any historical dossier migration, shall be confirmed during the analysis and design phase. The Contractor shall size the storage, backup and disaster recovery architecture based on the validated capacity assumptions, Annex 12 and Beneficiary-provided information.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
267	Section VII 1.4.7, page 312	Licensing and Ownership (Custom-Developed Systems): For custom-developed systems such as ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, prepare and submit a comprehensive inventory of all required software licenses, excluding pricing information, specifying at a minimum the product name, version, edition or model, quantity, license duration, and intended purpose. All such licenses shall be procured and owned by the Beneficiary.	To enable accurate pricing and an efficient infrastructure design, please confirm: a. whether the Beneficiary's SQL Server licenses (existing and/or those procured under the 1.4.7 inventory) may be used as the shared database platform for all three subsystems — ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, and the DMS-RAE COTS product (deployed as separate databases on the same SQL Server instance/server) — such that the Supplier is not required to include any SQL Server database license in its offer, including for DMS-RAE; b. that the license inventory required under 1.4.7 may therefore be prepared on a consolidated, solution-wide basis for the shared database platform (covering the database needs of ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, and DMS-RAE together), rather than only for the two custom systems, given that the database licensing	The current NARW SQL Server licenses are used for existing systems and should not be assumed by Proposers as automatically available for IWRACS. The database licensing approach for IWRACS shall be defined during the analysis phase, based on the approved technical architecture, the selected hosting environment, the requirements of ROwaterDATA, SIGAR and the DMS-RAE COTS product, and the applicable licensing conditions. The license inventory required under Section 1.4.7 shall identify all database licenses required for the proposed solution, including production, test, training, high-availability and disaster-recovery environments, as applicable. Where a shared database platform is proposed, the inventory may be prepared on a consolidated, solution-wide basis, provided that the components covered and the related assumptions are clearly indicated. At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot confirm that existing SQL Server licenses may be reused for IWRACS. Proposers shall clearly state in their offers any database licensing assumptions and any dependencies on licenses to be provided by the Beneficiary. Database licenses required for Beneficiary-owned components shall be procured and owned by the Beneficiary in accordance with Section 1.4.7.

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			requirement is shared across them; c. the edition, licensing metric, available quantity, and license-mobility/Software Assurance status of the SQL Server entitlement, so the shared-database design fits within the available licenses and is deployable in the target hosting environment (ADR Government Private Cloud / NARW Azure tenant), including the required test, training, high-availability, and disaster-recovery instances; and that the Beneficiary remains responsible for procuring, owning, providing, and maintaining the compliance of these database licenses for the contract duration, consistent with 1.4.7.	
268	2.6.5	All documentation, source code, configurations, and related materials developed under the Contract shall become the exclusive property of the Beneficiary (NARW).	Where the proposed solution incorporates licensed COTS products (e.g., Microsoft, Oracle, or equivalent), the Proposer's intellectual property (IP) obligations are necessarily limited to the custom developments,	Confirmed. The IP transfer obligation applies to custom-developed components, configurations, workflows, scripts, integration components, documentation and other project-specific artifacts developed under the Contract. Underlying COTS products, third-party software, open-source components and

Question no.:	Reference	Requirement / Information	Clarification question	Answers to Question no.:
			configurations, integration scripts, and project-specific artifacts produced within the scope of this Contract. The underlying COTS product source code remains the property of the respective software vendor Please confirm that the IP transfer obligation under Section 2.6.5 applies exclusively to custom-developed components, configurations, workflows, scripts, and documentation produced specifically for this project.	pre-existing vendor or Contractor intellectual property remain subject to their respective ownership and license terms. The source code of licensed COTS products is not transferred to the Beneficiary.

Question 269: Considering:

- the complexity of the technical, functional and integration requirements
- the limited period remaining between the issuance of clarification responses and
- the current proposal submission deadline
- the need to identify, secure and coordinate the availability of suitably qualified Key
- Experts and specialized partners
- the need to ensure that proposals are comprehensive, well-founded and fully
- responsive to the Purchaser's requirements

We kindly request the Purchaser to consider extending the Submission Deadline twenty one (21) days beyond the current submission deadline.

Answer to Question 269:

The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

General Integration Architecture

Question 270: **Reference:** Section VII – Integration & Interoperability **Question:** Please clarify the expected integration patterns for SIGAR interoperability with external systems (e.g. DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA, ArcGIS, ECA-RO, HYDRA), including whether integrations are expected to be real-time (API-based), event-driven, or batch-based.

Answer to Question 270:

The expected SIGAR integration patterns are described in Annex 13 – *SIGAR Interoperability with Other IT Systems*. SIGAR shall support a flexible interoperability approach, including secure APIs, controlled import/export mechanisms and, where applicable and approved, direct database access or database views, depending on the capabilities and maturity of each external system.

The integration pattern shall be defined based on the business process. For example, SIGAR shall receive payment confirmation from ASIS and/or ATHOS as the agreed financial integration channel. Real-time validation may be used where supported, while periodic or batch synchronization may also be acceptable if agreed during the analysis phase.

Where APIs are not available or mature, controlled data exchange mechanisms may be used as interim or fallback solutions, subject to Beneficiary approval.

Adaptation of external systems is outside the Contractor's responsibility. The final integration pattern for each external system shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

Question 271: **Reference:** Section VII – API Requirements **Question:** Please confirm the required API standards and protocols for SIGAR integrations, including REST, SOAP or others, as well as authentication mechanisms (OAuth2, OIDC, mutual TLS).

Answer to Question 271:

Proposers shall refer to the integration requirements in Section 2.3 and Annex 13.

The preferred approach is REST-based integration through documented, secure and versioned APIs. Equivalent standard mechanisms, such as GraphQL, SOAP, file-based exchange, Excel import/export or direct database access, may be used where required by an existing system or where agreed with the Beneficiary. All integrations shall enforce strong authentication and authorization, encryption in transit, logging, traceability and configurable access restrictions. The specific authentication mechanisms, such as OAuth2, OIDC, mutual TLS, API keys or certificate-based authentication, shall be defined for each integration during the analysis phase, based on the applicable security requirements and the capabilities of the external system.

Question 272: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Exchange **Question:** What are the required data exchange formats (e.g. JSON, XML, CSV, Excel) and are there mandatory schemas or canonical data models to be respected?

Answer to Question 272:

Data exchange formats may include JSON, XML, CSV, Excel or other structured formats, depending on the interface and integration scenario. Where mandatory schemas, data models or official templates exist, they shall be used. Where they do not exist, the Contractor shall propose the data mapping and exchange structure for Beneficiary review and approval during the analysis phase.

Question 273: **Reference:** Section VII – Integration Architecture **Question:** Is a centralized integration layer or API gateway mandated for all system interactions, or are point-to-point integrations acceptable?

Answer to Question 273:

The RFP **requires** a governed integration approach through the shared Integration Layer / API Gateway. Point-to-point integrations are not the preferred architectural model and may be accepted only where justified by technical constraints and approved by the Beneficiary, if security, auditability, traceability and maintainability requirements are met.

Specific Integrations

Question 274: **Reference:** Section VII – GIS Integration **Question:** Does ArcGIS integration imply only data retrieval (read access), or must SIGAR support transactional validation and enforcement of spatial rules?

Answer to Question 274:

ArcGIS integration is primarily intended for retrieval, visualization, spatial identification and correlation of project locations and affected water bodies based on authoritative GIS layers maintained by the Beneficiary.

SIGAR shall consume the authoritative spatial data and may support configured spatial checks or validations where agreed. It is not expected to create or enforce authoritative spatial rules independently from the GIS data governance model.

Question 275: **Reference:** Section VII – External Systems Integration **Question:** For systems such as ECA-RO, HYDRA, and Water Registry, are integration interfaces already available and documented, and what type of interfaces are provided (API, file-based, database-level)?

Answer to Question 275:

Note: References to the **Water Registry System** shall be understood as references to the existing NARW **Water Cadastre** system. The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency.

Today, ECA-RO and ASIS provide certain REST API capabilities. The availability, documentation, access conditions and detailed technical specifications of ECA-RO, ASIS, HIDRA, the Water Cadastre System and other external systems shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Where documented APIs are available, they shall be the preferred integration mechanism. Where APIs are not available or cannot be used, direct database access, controlled file-based exchange or other agreed mechanisms may be considered, subject to Beneficiary approval, security requirements and the technical capabilities of the respective system.

For the Water Cadastre System, the required integration concerns the automatic transmission by SIGAR of permit or authorization details upon issuance of the relevant regulatory act. The Consultant shall design and develop the required API or integration mechanism for this purpose, based on the data structures, technical specifications, and access arrangements confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 276: **Reference:** Section VII – SEICA Workflow **Question:** Should SEICA-related workflows be fully implemented within SIGAR, or is integration expected with an external SEICA workflow system?

Answer to Question 276:

SEICA-related workflows shall be implemented within SIGAR, in accordance with the RFP requirements for regulatory-act processing and SEICA Commission activities.

Question 277: **Reference:** Section VII – Financial Integration **Question:** Is real-time integration required for payment validation (fees, invoices), or are periodic/batch synchronization mechanisms acceptable?

Answer to Question 277:

SIGAR shall receive payment confirmation from ASIS and/or ATHOS, as the agreed financial integration channel.

Real-time payment validation may be used where the interface supports it. Periodic or batch synchronization may also be acceptable if agreed during the analysis phase and if it supports the required business process. Adaptation of external financial systems is outside the Contractor's responsibility unless expressly agreed under the Contract.

Question 278: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Governance **Question:** Could the Beneficiary clarify the system of record for key datasets (documents, permits, environmental data), and the ownership boundaries between SIGAR and ROwaterDATA?

Answer to Question 278:

The system-of-record boundaries shall follow the functional allocation in the RFP.

SIGAR is the system responsible for regulatory-act workflows, requests, permits, authorizations, SEICA-related processing and related case data. DMS-RAE is the authoritative platform for documents, registry references and document traceability. ROwaterDATA is the authoritative platform for datasets, validated reference data, reporting-related data and dataset governance.

Detailed ownership boundaries, data flows and synchronization rules shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

WATMAN Integration and Role

Question 279: **Reference:** Section VII – Integration with Existing Systems **Question:** What is the architectural relationship between the existing WATMAN system and the future IWRACS platform (SIGAR, DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA, Portal)?

Answer to Question 279:

Based on the RFP requirements, including Section 1.3.3.6 – SIGAR Integration with External Systems and Annex 13 – SIGAR Interoperability with Other IT Systems, WATMAN is not identified as a required integration system for SIGAR or for the IWRACS platform components.

The architectural scope of IWRACS shall be defined in accordance with the systems, data sources and interoperability mechanisms expressly specified in the RFP. Therefore, no architectural integration with WATMAN shall be assumed or required under the current RFP scope.

Where historical, contextual or operational information originating from WATMAN may be relevant for institutional purposes, its use, if any, shall be subject to Beneficiary decisions and shall not be considered a mandatory IWRACS integration requirement under this procurement.

Question 280: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Integration **Question:** Should SIGAR consume WATMAN data directly, or only via intermediary platforms such as ROwaterDATA or other domain systems?

Answer to Question 280:

SIGAR is not required to consume WATMAN data, either directly or through intermediary platforms, under the current RFP scope.

According to Section 1.3.3.6 and Annex 13, the SIGAR interoperability requirements refer to the systems and data sources expressly identified in the RFP, including ArcGIS, HIDRA, ECA-RO, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, the Water Cadastre System, ASIS/ATHOS, ROwaterDATA and the dedicated metadata exchange with ANMAP.

Accordingly, no direct API connection, database access, intermediary data flow or other technical integration with WATMAN is required for SIGAR workflows.

Question 281: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Governance **Question:** Which system (WATMAN, ROwaterDATA, or others) is considered the authoritative source for hydrological and monitoring datasets?

Answer to Question 281:

The authoritative sources for hydrological and monitoring datasets remain Hidrolog and HIDRA/HYDRA, which are the Beneficiary's dedicated systems for the management, consolidation and use of such data.

Question 282: **Reference:** Section VII – Functional Requirements **Question:** Does WATMAN play a direct role in regulatory decision workflows (permits/authorizations), or is it limited to providing contextual/operational data?

Answer to Question 282:

WATMAN does not play a direct role in the regulatory decision workflows required under this RFP.

The issuance, modification, suspension or withdrawal of water management endorsements and authorizations is handled within SIGAR, with the required workflows, validations, document generation, traceability and human review by the competent Authority users.

Based on Section 1.3.3.6 and Annex 13, WATMAN is not listed as a required integration system for SIGAR. Therefore, WATMAN is not required to provide workflow data, contextual data or operational data for SIGAR regulatory processes under the current RFP scope.

Question 283: **Reference:** Section VII – External Systems Dependencies **Question:** Are systems such as HYDRA, ECA-RO, or GIS platforms technically or functionally dependent on WATMAN, or are they standalone systems?

Answer to Question 283:

For the purposes of this RFP, HIDRA, ECA-RO, GIS platforms and the other systems expressly listed in Section 1.3.3.6 and Annex 13 shall be treated as distinct external systems or data sources, each with its own functional scope, data ownership and technical interfaces.

No technical or functional dependency on WATMAN shall be assumed for these systems under the current RFP scope. Any required data flows, dependencies or interoperability mechanisms shall be limited to the systems and integration requirements expressly specified in the RFP and shall be further detailed during the analysis phase.

Accordingly, no integration with WATMAN is required as a prerequisite for SIGAR interoperability with HIDRA, ECA-RO, GIS platforms or other systems listed in the RFP.

Question 284: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Requirements **Question:** Do SIGAR workflows require real-time access to WATMAN operational data, or only validated and consolidated datasets?

Answer to Question 284:

According with RFP Section **1.3.3.6** – SIGAR Integration with External Systems and **Annex 13** – SIGAR Interoperability with Other IT Systems, SIGAR workflows do not require any integration with WATMAN.

WATMAN is not identified in the RFP as a required integration system for SIGAR. The SIGAR interoperability scope is limited to the systems and data sources expressly listed in the RFP, including ArcGIS, HIDRA, ECA-RO, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Cadastre, ASIS/ATHOS, ROwaterDATA and the dedicated metadata exchange with ANMAP. Accordingly, no real-time or other form of direct integration with WATMAN is required for SIGAR workflows under this RFP.

Migration Scope, Volumes and Metadata Transformations

Question 285: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Migration and Integration Requirements **Question:** Could the Beneficiary provide a complete list of source systems from which data must be migrated for DMS-RAE and SIGAR, including document repositories, registry systems, and regulatory/permit systems?

Answer to Question 285:

The complete list of source systems for migration, including document repositories, registry systems and regulatory/permit-related sources, shall be identified and confirmed during the analysis phase.

The main migration scope within IWRACS concerns the datasets to be managed in ROwaterDATA.

For SIGAR, migration is not intended to replicate full historical workflows. The expected scope is limited to the import of previous and active permits and authorizations, mainly for storage, consultation and search purposes, together with associated metadata and available documents, where such information exists and is agreed with the Beneficiary.

For DMS-RAE, no full historical migration of existing document repositories or registry systems is confirmed at this stage. Any migration needs related to documents, registry entries or metadata shall be assessed during the analysis phase, based on the sources and data made available by the Beneficiary.

The Contractor shall analyze the identified sources and prepare the detailed migration approach, priorities, mapping and validation rules for Beneficiary review and approval.

Question 286: **Reference:** Section VII – Legacy Systems and Data Migration **Question:** For each identified source system, please clarify the type of data to be migrated (documents, metadata, registry entries, workflow data, permits, etc.).

Answer to Question 286:

For each source system, the type of data to be migrated — documents, metadata, registry entries, workflow data, permits, authorizations, case files or other records — shall be defined during the analysis phase.

Only data sources and data categories agreed in the migration scope shall be migrated.

Question 287: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Management and Storage Requirements **Question:** What are the estimated data volumes to be migrated, including:

- number of documents
- total storage size
- number of registry entries
- number of historical permits and case files?

Answer to Question 287:

The main migration scope within IWRACS concerns the datasets to be managed in ROwaterDATA, including the relevant dataset structures, values, metadata and reference information required for implementation.

For SIGAR, migration is not intended to replicate full historical workflows. The expected scope is limited to the import of a list of previous and active permits and authorizations, mainly for storage, consultation and search purposes, together with the associated metadata and documents where available and agreed.

Indicative information regarding estimated data volumes and capacity planning is provided in Annex 12 – Estimated Capacity Planning per IWRACS Subsystems. Final data volumes, migration effort, migration priorities and migration strategy shall be validated and refined during the Data Migration Assessment Phase, based on the data made available by the Beneficiary.

Question 288: **Reference:** Section VII – Document Management Requirements **Question:** What are the document formats and quality levels (e.g. scanned PDFs, Office documents, CAD files, archives), and are OCR or metadata extraction activities expected as part of migration?

Answer to Question 288:

The document formats and quality levels to be migrated shall be assessed during the analysis phase, based on the source repositories, available exports and sample data provided by the Beneficiary.

For SIGAR, migration may include available electronic technical documentation related to previous or active permits and authorizations, where such documents are made available by the Beneficiary in an accessible electronic format and are included in the approved migration scope.

The migration scope covers the transfer of available documents and associated metadata, as provided and validated by the Beneficiary. OCR, automated metadata extraction or substantive interpretation of document content are not included in the migration scope.

Question 289: **Reference:** Section VII – DMS-RAE Functional Requirements **Question:** Could the Beneficiary clarify the expected mapping and transformation rules between legacy metadata structures and the target DMS-RAE data model, including:

- retention
- mandatory fields
- classification schemes
- registry numbering continuity?

Answer to Question 289:

The mapping between legacy metadata structures and the target DMS-RAE data model shall be defined during the analysis phase. This includes mandatory fields, document classes, retention rules, classification schemes, registry-numbering continuity and other required metadata. The Beneficiary shall provide or validate the authoritative rules and classification structures.

Migration for SIGAR, Ownership and Boundaries

Question 290: **Reference:** Section VII – SIGAR Functional Requirements **Question:** Does migration for SIGAR include historical permits and authorizations, and is there a requirement to preserve:

- full lifecycle history
- associated documents
- audit trails and decision records?

Answer to Question 290:

Whether historical permits and authorizations are to be migrated into SIGAR shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.
If included, the migration scope shall define whether associated documents, lifecycle history, audit information and decision records are available in the source systems and whether they shall be migrated fully or partially.

Question 291: **Reference:** Section VII – Workflow and Lifecycle Requirements **Question:** Should in-progress cases and workflows be migrated into SIGAR, or only finalized and archived records?

Answer to Question 291:

Only finalized records shall be considered for migration into SIGAR, where applicable and where such records exist in an accessible electronic format.

Migration of in-progress cases, active workflows, workflow states, pending actions or historical workflow execution data is not included in the baseline scope, unless expressly agreed during the analysis phase.

The final migration scope shall be defined based on the data made available by the Beneficiary and approved in the migration plan.

Question 292: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Governance and Integration Requirements **Question:** Could the Beneficiary clarify the data ownership boundaries during migration between SIGAR, DMS-RAE, and ROwaterDATA, including which datasets are:

- migrated into SIGAR
- migrated into DMS-RAE
- or remain managed exclusively in other components?

Answer to Question 292:

The data ownership and migration boundaries between SIGAR, DMS-RAE and ROwaterDATA shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the detailed data inventory, source systems and agreed migration strategy.

As a general principle:

- ROwaterDATA shall govern dataset structures, reference data, metadata, validation rules and institutional datasets used for water-management data collection, consolidation and reporting.
- SIGAR shall manage regulatory case data, permits, authorizations and SIGAR-specific workflow information. Migration into SIGAR is expected to be limited to previous and active permits/authorizations, together with relevant metadata and available documents, where agreed.
- DMS-RAE shall manage documents, registry records and official correspondence where applicable. No full historical migration of existing document repositories or registry systems is confirmed at this stage.

Datasets or records that remain authoritative in other institutional systems shall not be duplicated unnecessarily and shall be accessed or referenced through agreed interoperability mechanisms, where applicable. The final allocation of data ownership, migration scope, mapping rules and validation responsibilities shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

Migration Responsibilities, Tooling and Execution Strategy

Question 293: **Reference:** Section VII – Implementation Scope and Responsibilities **Question:** Please clarify the allocation of responsibilities for data migration activities, including:

- data extraction from legacy systems
- data transformation and enrichment
- data loading into target systems

across the contractor, and the Beneficiary.

Answer to Question 293:

The Beneficiary shall provide access to legacy systems, available documentation, data exports, data owners and validation resources. The Contractor shall prepare the migration strategy, mapping, transformation scripts/tools, loading procedures, migration testing and reconciliation reports for the agreed migration scope.

Data extraction may require support from the Beneficiary or the legacy system owners, especially where the Contractor does not have direct access or where proprietary systems are involved.

Question 294: **Reference:** Section VII – Data Governance Requirements **Question:** Who is responsible for data cleansing, deduplication, and data quality correction prior to or during migration?

Answer to Question 294:

The Beneficiary remains responsible for business validation, data cleansing decisions, correction of source data and approval of migrated data.

The Contractor shall support technical profiling, identify inconsistencies, report issues and implement agreed transformation and deduplication rules. The Contractor is not responsible for reconstructing unavailable, incomplete or incorrect legacy data unless expressly agreed.

Question 295: **Reference:** Section VII – Integration and Data Exchange Requirements **Question:** What are the expected technical mechanisms for migration, such as:

- API-based extraction/import
- database-level extraction
- file-based batch migration (CSV, XML, etc.)

and are interfaces or export tools available for the legacy systems?

Answer to Question 295:

Migration mechanisms may include API-based extraction/import, database-level extraction, file-based batch migration, CSV/XML/Excel import or other agreed methods.

The available interfaces, export tools and source-system access conditions shall be confirmed during the analysis phase. The Contractor shall propose the most appropriate migration mechanism for each source.

Question 296: **Reference:** Section VII – Testing and Operational Acceptance **Question:** What are the acceptance criteria for migrated data, including:

- completeness thresholds
- reconciliation requirements
- validation methodology
- legal validation requirements for SIGAR records?

Answer to Question 296:

Migration acceptance criteria shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

They may include completeness thresholds, reconciliation reports, sample-based validation, record counts, document counts, metadata validation, error logs and formal sign-off by Beneficiary data owners. Legal validation of SIGAR records remains the responsibility of the competent Beneficiary users.

Question 297: **Reference:** Section VII – Availability and Business Continuity **Question:** What are the constraints related to business continuity and downtime during migration activities?

Answer to Question 297:

Migration shall be planned to minimize disruption to ongoing operations.

Any downtime windows, data-freeze periods, cutover steps, rollback procedures and business-continuity constraints shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, in coordination with the Beneficiary and relevant system owners.

DMS-RAE Registries, Retention and Performance

Question 298: Reference: Section VII – DMS-RAE Functional Requirements (Registry) **Question:** Could the Beneficiary clarify the expected registries and numbering model, including:

- whether registries and numbering are centralized or per organizational unit
- what is the intended separation of registries (e.g., incoming, outgoing, internal)
- constraints for numbering continuity during migration

Answer to Question 298:

DMS-RAE shall implement the electronic registry model described in Section 1.3.4, including interoperable registries at SCAR, ABA, INHGA and ECSC level, as well as configurable local registries for SGA/SHI within the ABA registry framework.

The numbering model shall be configurable and based on Beneficiary-defined rules per registry level or organizational unit, including format, sequence, prefix, annual reset and number reservation, where applicable. The solution shall support incoming, outgoing and internal document registration, aligned with the mandatory registry workflows defined in the RFP.

No migration of previous registry systems or historical registry numbering is required under the baseline scope. Therefore, numbering continuity during migration is not applicable, except for any specific reference data or records expressly agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 299: Reference: Section VII – Records Management Requirements **Question:** Is there an existing classification scheme / file plan in use, and should the solution:

- fully adopt it as-is
- or support redesign / harmonization across organizational units?

Answer to Question 299:

The Beneficiary shall provide or validate the existing classification scheme, file plan and institutional recordkeeping rules during the analysis phase.

The solution shall support adoption of the existing scheme and, where agreed, controlled harmonization across organizational units. Redesign of institutional classification rules is not assumed unless expressly agreed.

Question 300: Reference: Section VII – Records Lifecycle Management **Question:** Are retention and disposal rules already formally defined, and if so:

- are they attached to document types, file plan classes, or other structures?
- are legal holds and exception cases already modeled?

Answer to Question 300:

The Beneficiary shall provide or validate retention and disposal rules during the analysis phase.

These rules may be attached to document types, classification classes, file-plan structures or other agreed metadata elements. Legal holds, exceptions and special cases shall be configured where defined and approved by the Beneficiary.

Question 301: **Reference:** Section VII – Performance Requirements **Question:** Since the RFP document states that the Portal needs to handle 1000 concurrent users, could the Beneficiary estimate the expected load in the DMS-RAE component (expressed in concurrent users and/or concurrent API calls)?

Answer to Question 301:

At this stage, the expected DMS-RAE load cannot be precisely estimated in terms of concurrent internal users, concurrent API calls, document access volumes, indexing workload or reporting usage.

For indicative planning purposes, based on the 2025 registry closure figures currently available, the total registered volume at national level for SCAR, ABA and INHGA was approximately 275,054 documents/year, corresponding to approximately 754 registered documents per calendar day or approximately 1,100 registered documents per working day.

These figures are indicative and refer to registered documents, not to concurrent users or API calls. The Contractor shall use them, together with the RFP requirements, Annex 12, the expected institutional use of DMS-RAE and the selected hosting model, as input for the initial sizing approach.

The detailed workload assumptions, including concurrent users, concurrent API calls, peak registry transactions, document access, indexing and reporting usage, shall be defined and approved during the analysis and design phase.

Question 302: Considering:

• the complexity of the technical, functional and integration requirements
• the limited period remaining between the issuance of clarification responses and the current proposal submission deadline
• the need to identify, secure and coordinate the availability of suitably qualified Key Experts and specialized partners
• the need to ensure that proposals are comprehensive, well-founded and fully responsive to the Purchaser's requirements

We kindly request the Purchaser to consider extending the Submission Deadline twenty one (21) days beyond the current submission deadline.

Answer to Question 302:

The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

Question 303:

We respectfully submit the following request:

The deadline for submitting clarification questions is 8 June 2026. The Purchaser will reasonably require several additional days to review and respond to the questions raised by interested Proposers, and the responses may, where necessary, result in amendments to the request for proposals documents in accordance with ITP 8. In practice, **this leaves the Proposers with only approximately**

one week between the issuance of the clarifications and the current submission date of 18 June 2026.

We consider that **this period is not realistic for the preparation of a responsive and high-quality offer**. The IWRACS system described in the tender documentation is a complex, institution-wide solution comprising four integrated subsystems (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, DMS-RAE, and the Intranet/Extranet Portal), numerous internal and external integrations, data migration, training, and multi-year support obligations. A serious offer for a system of this scope cannot be properly designed, documented, and financially estimated in the time remaining until the current deadline - particularly while awaiting the Purchaser's answers to clarification questions and any resulting addenda, which are themselves essential inputs for accurate technical design and financial estimation.

Accordingly, and in order to ensure effective competition and the submission of well-founded, comparable Proposals, we respectfully request that the Purchaser amend the request for proposals documents to extend the deadline for submission of Proposals so that Proposers have **one month, calculated from the date on which the Purchaser issues its responses to the clarification questions** (and any related addenda), to prepare and submit their offers.

Answer to Question 303:

The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

ROwaterDATA – Scope and Sizing

Question 304: **Reference:** Section 1.3.2.3 – Dataset Management Component **Question:** The Dataset Management component is sized at almost 350 distinct datasets. Could the Beneficiary clarify how many of these are expected to be configured and migrated by the Proposer during implementation versus configured by NARW post-go-live, and provide representative examples of dataset complexity (number of fields, validation rules, relationships) so that configuration effort can be estimated?

Answer to Question 304:

The reference to “almost 350 distinct datasets” represents the Beneficiary’s current estimate for planning and proposal preparation purposes.

It is expected that the Contractor will perform the initial configuration and one-time migration of most of the datasets currently known and managed by NARW, estimated at approximately 90% of the identified datasets, subject to confirmation of the final inventory, data availability and migration priorities during the analysis phase.

The remaining datasets, as well as future datasets or subsequent adjustments, may be configured and maintained by authorized NARW users after go-live through ROwaterDATA administrative/configuration functionalities.

Annex 1 provides representative examples of dataset structures, attributes, relationships and complexity levels. The complete list of datasets, including available information on fields, validation rules, relationships and volumes, will be provided during the analysis phase.

Question 305: **Reference:** Section 1.3.2.5 / 1.3.2.6 – Directive-based reporting **Question:** Could the Beneficiary specify the number and complexity of directive-based and national reports to be implemented as configurable outputs at go-live (e.g. Nitrates, WFD, EQS/EDL, ICPDR/DanubeGIS, bathing water, drinking water, marine strategy), and confirm whether the completion templates and validation rule sets for each will be provided during the analysis phase as stated in Section 1.3.2.5?

Answer to Question 305:

The reports and outputs to be implemented at go-live shall be those required by the RFP, **annexes** and Beneficiary-confirmed reporting obligations.

The detailed reporting templates, validation rules, output formats and directive mappings, including Nitrates, WFD, EQS/EDL, ICPDR/DanubeGIS and other applicable reporting frameworks, shall be provided, reviewed and approved during the analysis phase.

Question 306: **Reference:** Section 1.3.2.4 – Hierarchical workflow / initial data import **Question:** Could the Beneficiary indicate the volume and format of historical/initial dataset values to be imported into ROwaterDATA (e.g. number of records, source systems, file formats), and confirm whether the existing NARW database structures and access will be made available to support the initial import?

Answer to Question 306:

The volume, format and source of historical or initial dataset values to be imported into ROwaterDATA shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

The Beneficiary shall provide and facilitate access to available source data, structures, exports, documentation and data owners. The Contractor shall prepare the migration/import approach, mapping and reconciliation methodology for the agreed scope.

SIGAR – Scope and Sizing

Question 307: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3.2 – Front-Office request categories **Question:** Ten main request categories are to be supported. Could the Beneficiary confirm the number of distinct dynamic electronic forms and project/work types to be configured, and provide the estimated annual volume of requests (per category and per ABA/SCAR) so that workflow configuration and capacity can be estimated?

Answer to Question 307:

The ten request categories identified in Section 1.3.3.2 shall be supported.

Annex 8 – SIGAR Illustrative Interfaces and Forms provides the baseline illustrative forms and request interfaces, while Annex 10 – SIGAR Use Case Scenarios for Request Management describes the ten request categories and their corresponding process scenarios.

The distinct dynamic electronic forms, project/work types and workflow details to be configured shall be defined based on Annex 8, Annex 10, the applicable legal requirements and Beneficiary validation during the analysis phase.

For capacity-planning purposes, Annex 12, Section B – IWRACS Subsystem II: SIGAR, provides indicative 2024 volumes of regulatory acts by category and by ABA/NARW level, including authorizations, endorsements, location endorsements, crossing permits, technical consultations, declarations and transfers.

The estimated annual volumes **per request category** and **per** ABA/SCAR shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on available historical information and Beneficiary inputs, and shall be used for workflow configuration, capacity planning and performance validation.

Question 308: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3.2 / 1.3.3.3 – SEICA Tables 1–4 **Question:** For the SEICA-related analysis (Tables 1–4 per Order No. 828/2019), could the Beneficiary confirm the number of project categories with distinct validation rule sets and thresholds to be implemented, and whether these rules and parameters will be provided in full during the analysis phase?

Answer to Question 308:

SEICA validation shall be implemented using deterministic rules, decision tables and threshold validations based on the applicable legal framework, Annex 3 and Beneficiary-approved inputs. The number of project categories, complete thresholds, parameters and Tables 1–4 validation rules shall be provided or validated by the Beneficiary during the analysis phase.

Question 309: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3 – Historical data migration for SIGAR **Question:** Could the Beneficiary clarify whether historical permits, authorizations, case files and their associated documents from the existing AA (permits/authorizations) system are to be migrated into SIGAR, and if so, provide the approximate volumes and the availability of interfaces/exports from the legacy system?

Answer to Question 309:

For SIGAR, migration is not intended to replicate full historical workflows or complete historical lifecycles from the existing AA system.

The expected migration scope is limited to a list of previous and active permits and authorizations, mainly for storage, consultation and search purposes, together with associated metadata and available electronic documents, where such information exists and is made available by the Beneficiary in an accessible format.

Only finalized records shall be considered for migration, where applicable. In-progress cases, active workflows, workflow states, pending actions, audit trails or historical workflow execution data are not included in the baseline migration scope, unless expressly agreed during the analysis phase.

The available volumes, data structure, document availability, interfaces or export mechanisms from the legacy AA system shall be assessed and confirmed during the Data Migration Assessment / analysis phase, based on the data and access provided by the Beneficiary.

User Volumes and Licensing Basis

Question 310: **Reference:** Section IV / PDS – pricing basis; Section 2.4 – training population **Question:** For licensing and pricing purposes, could the Beneficiary provide the total number of internal named users per subsystem (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR Back-Office, DMS-RAE, Intranet) and the expected number of external/public users? The RFP indicates at least 300 DMS-RAE document users, 200+ Portal users and 1,000 concurrent external Portal users, but a clear (maximum number of users) and consolidated user model is needed for licensing.

Answer to Question 310:

For licensing and pricing purposes, Proposers shall use the user volumes and capacity assumptions indicated in the RFP, including Section 2.4, Annex 9 and Annex 12.

For ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, the indicative internal user groups are aligned with the expected training groups and operational roles, including at least:

- 150 Data Operators, 50 Data Validators, 30 Dataset Administrators / Responsible Users, 20 Report Administrators and 15 IT/System Administrators for ROwaterDATA;

- 110 Operators / Collaborators, 15 Coordinators / Managers, 15 SEICA Members and 15 IT/System Administrators for SIGAR.

For DMS-RAE and the Portal, Proposers shall consider the RFP indications, including 300+ DMS-RAE document users, 200+ Portal users and the requirement to support at least 1,000 concurrent external Portal users.

These figures are indicative and are provided for proposal preparation, licensing assumptions, training planning and capacity sizing. The final consolidated user model, including named users, concurrent users, role allocation per subsystem, external/public users and licensing categories, shall be validated and approved during the analysis phase.

Proposers shall clearly state in their proposals the licensing assumptions used for each subsystem and/or for any COTS included in the proposed solution.

External System Interfaces and Availability

Question 311: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3.2 / 1.3.3.6 – Ghiseul.ro and financial systems **Question:** For online payment via Ghiseul.ro and payment confirmation via ASIS (and ATHOS in one administration), could the Beneficiary confirm that integration interfaces/APIs exist and are documented, who owns each integration endpoint, and whether sandbox/test access will be provided to the Proposer during implementation?

Answer to Question 311:

At this stage, integration with Ghiseul.ro is not included as a confirmed operational integration.

SIGAR shall receive payment confirmation from ASIS and/or ATHOS, as the agreed financial integration channel. The detailed integration flow, ownership of endpoints, test access, exchanged data, timing and error-handling mechanisms shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

If Ghiseul.ro integration becomes available, the Authority shall provide or facilitate the necessary onboarding, credentials, technical specifications and test access, where applicable.

Adaptation or modification of external financial systems remains outside the Contractor's responsibility, unless expressly agreed under the Contract.

Question 312: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3.6 / Annex 13 – ANMAP, Water Registry, HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar **Question:** For the SIGAR external integrations (ANMAP, Water Registry, HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar, ECA-RO), could the Beneficiary confirm for each whether documented APIs already exist, the integration type (API, file-based, database-level), the owning party, and whether test environments and Annex 13 (SIGAR Interoperability) will be made available?

Answer to Question 312:

The external integrations in scope are those specified in Section 1.3.3.6 and Annex 13 of the RFP.

Note: *References to the **Water Registry System** shall be understood as references to the existing NARW **Water Cadastre** system. The ToR shall be amended accordingly for terminology consistency.*

For each external system, including ANMAP, Water Cadastre System, HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar and ECA-RO, the availability of documented APIs, file-based mechanisms, database-level access, system ownership, test environments, test data and access conditions shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, in coordination with the Beneficiary and, where applicable, the relevant third-party system owners.

Where documented APIs are available, they shall be the preferred integration mechanism. Where APIs are not available or cannot be used, the integration may rely on controlled import/export, direct database access or another agreed mechanism, subject to Beneficiary approval, applicable security requirements and the technical capabilities of the respective system.

For the Water Cadastre System, the integration refers to the automatic transmission by SIGAR of permit or authorization details upon issuance of the relevant regulatory act, to ensure traceability and alignment with national water cadastre records. The Consultant shall design and develop the required API or integration mechanism based on the data structures, technical specifications and access arrangements confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 313: **Reference:** Section 1.3.3.2 – ArcGIS Enterprise integration **Question:** For GIS integration, could the Beneficiary confirm the ArcGIS Enterprise version in use, the available services (e.g. REST/Feature/Map services, geocoding, spatial queries on water bodies and STEREO 70 coordinates), and whether NARW will provide the necessary ArcGIS licenses, layers and test access?

Answer to Question 313:

NARW currently operates an **ArcGIS Enterprise 11** deployment, with the future possibility of upgrading to **ArcGIS Enterprise 12**. In addition to the central ArcGIS Enterprise portal operating at NARW level, each River Basin Administration (ABA) maintains its own separate ArcGIS Enterprise 11 portal for regional operational needs.

ArcGIS capabilities and licenses are available within the Beneficiary's existing infrastructure. The Contractor is not expected to provide ArcGIS licenses but shall ensure interoperability and integration with the existing ArcGIS environment.

The future SIGAR system is expected to integrate primarily with NARW's central ArcGIS Enterprise environment, while ensuring interoperability with regional GIS infrastructures where required.

Expected interactions may include, as applicable, map visualization, identification and localization of water bodies and project sites, coordinate-based search and positioning, STEREO 70 handling, visualization of relevant GIS layers, and retrieval of spatial reference information required for permitting and authorization workflows.

The detailed ArcGIS services to be used, including available REST, Feature or Map services, geocoding, spatial-query capabilities, authoritative layers, test access and technical configuration, shall be defined and agreed during the analysis phase.

Question 314: **Reference:** Section 1.3.5 A3 / B4 – portal.just.ro and ROeID **Question:** For the Portal Legal Module synchronization with portal.just.ro and future ROeID identity integration, could the Beneficiary confirm whether ROeID integration is in scope of this Contract or future (out of scope for pricing), and the availability and documentation of the portal.just.ro interface?

Answer to Question 314:

ROeID integration is not included in the current baseline scope. The current Extranet requirement is user identification through verified e-mail registration, together with architectural compatibility for future ROeID integration. The RFP does not require implementation, activation or operational demonstration of ROeID integration at Go-Live or during Operational Acceptance Testing. Proposers shall propose a solution architecture capable of accommodating future ROeID integration through standard identity federation and authentication mechanisms, where applicable.

For the Legal Module, the availability, documentation and technical approach for synchronization with portal.just.ro shall be confirmed during the analysis phase. Where automated interfaces are not available, manual or scheduled data entry/import mechanisms may be used, as agreed with the Beneficiary.

Question 315: **Reference:** Section 1.3.2.9 / 1.3.3.6 – Trade Register / ANAF / public sources **Question:** For automatic queries to the Trade Register, ANAF and other public open-data sources, could the Beneficiary confirm whether NARW already holds the necessary access agreements/credentials?

Answer to Question 315:

The proposed solution shall support mechanisms for preventing duplicate external entities and for maintaining the consistency and accuracy of sender/beneficiary information.

Automatic validation through ANAF, Trade Register or other external public sources is not confirmed as a mandatory direct integration at this stage. NARW currently has access to CUI-related information through existing integrations available within its information systems.

The detailed approach for entity validation, including the possible reuse of existing NARW integrations, database views, APIs, public/open-data services or other controlled access mechanisms, shall be discussed and agreed during the analysis phase.

Where authenticated access, institutional agreements or specific credentials are required, these shall be provided or facilitated by the Beneficiary in coordination with the relevant public institutions. The Contractor shall implement the agreed technical integration within the approved project scope.

Electronic Signature and Trust Services

Question 316: **Reference:** Section 1.3.4 E / DMS-RAE – Electronic Signature; eIDAS **Question:** For qualified/advanced electronic signature workflows in DMS-RAE, SIGAR and the Portal, could the Beneficiary confirm whether qualified certificates and any QTSP/trust-service or signing-platform subscriptions will be provided by NARW, and identify the validation service to be used?

Answer to Question 316:

NARW does not currently operate under a single centralized institutional contract with one Qualified Trust Service Provider.

Qualified electronic signature services may be used through different arrangements at the level of NARW organizational units. For example, some River Basin Administrations have cooperation agreements with STS, enabling the use of both token-based qualified electronic signatures and remote qualified electronic signatures.

Accordingly, qualified certificates, trust-service arrangements, signing platforms or related subscriptions shall be provided or facilitated by the Beneficiary, where required.

The proposed solution shall support interoperability with commonly used eIDAS-compliant qualified or advanced electronic signature services and allow configuration of the applicable signing method, signing workflow and validation approach during the analysis phase.

Support, Maintenance and Service Desk

Question 317: **Reference:** Section 5.2 / RC-2 – Support and Maintenance effort basis **Question:** The RC-2 table provides indicative man-day inputs per role for 2027 and until March 2028. Could the

Beneficiary confirm whether these man-days are the fixed basis to be priced for the Recurrent Cost (post-warranty support) line, given that bug-fixing during the 24-month warranty is provided at no cost under Section 5.1?

Answer to Question 317:

The indicative man-days presented in the RC-2 tables are provided solely as reference information to assist Proposers in estimating the level of effort required for Technical Support Services. They do not constitute fixed quantities or guaranteed workloads to be priced as mandatory inputs. Proposers shall determine and price the required Technical Support Services based on their proposed support approach and the requirements set out in Section 5.2 of the Purchaser's Requirements.

As provided in the RFP, defect correction and bug-fixing activities during the 24-month warranty period are covered under Warranty Services and shall not be duplicated under Technical Support Services. The post-warranty period is not required in the Contract.

Payment for Technical Support Services shall be made only for the Technical Support Services actually provided and accepted by the Purchaser, based on the actual support period applicable to each subsystem and in accordance with the RFP provisions.

Question 318: **Reference:** Section 5.1.2 – Beneficiary's existing Service Desk platform **Question:** Section 5.1.2 requires use of the Beneficiary's existing Service Desk platform. Could the Beneficiary identify the platform so that configuration effort can be estimated?

Answer to Question 318:

At this stage, NARW does not yet have an operational Service Desk platform in place for this purpose. The implementation of a Beneficiary Service Desk platform is currently envisaged under another separate project. Accordingly, the specific platform, access model, configuration requirements and integration approach shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the Service Desk solution available at that time. If the Service Desk platform is not available within the IWRACS implementation timeline, an alternative support and incident-management mechanism shall be agreed with the Beneficiary.

Question 319: **Reference:** Section 5.1.1 / Schedule – Warranty and support period alignment

Question: The 24-month warranty starts at each subsystem's Operational Acceptance, while the Recurrent Cost support line is described as 12 months or until March 2028 (whichever is first). Given the staggered go-live dates in the Implementation Schedule, could the Beneficiary clarify how the warranty period (24 months) and the priced support/maintenance period (RC-2, to March 2028) relate, to avoid double-counting and to price the recurrent line correctly?

Answer to Question 319:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

The 24-month Warranty Services form part of the Supply and Installation scope and their costs shall be included in the Supply and Installation Contract Price. Recurrent Costs relate exclusively to the Technical Support Services described in Section 5.2 and any other recurrent items expressly identified in the Recurrent Cost Schedules.

Proposers shall price the Recurrent Cost items in accordance with the Recurrent Cost Schedules and the requirements set out in Section 5.2 of the Purchaser's Requirements. Double counting of activities covered under the Warranty Services and Technical Support Services is not permitted.

Question 320: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Sub-Factor **1.4.2 Specific Experience**, which requires participation in "at least 3 contracts within the last 5 years, each with a value of at least EUR 1,000,000", and which further specifies six minimum characteristics that each similar contract must demonstrate (multi-module system, integration with at least two external applications, cloud-based or hybrid deployment, workflow automation and document management, role-based access control, and Operational Acceptance Certificate), we kindly ask you to please confirm that not all six listed characteristics are required to be demonstrated within each individual contract submitted as a similar reference, and that it is sufficient for the full set of characteristics to be met cumulatively across all submitted reference contracts.

Answer to Question 320:

The request is **not accepted**.

The requirement shall be assessed in accordance with Section III, Sub-Factor 1.4.2 – Specific Experience. Each qualifying contract submitted as similar experience must individually meet the minimum value requirement of EUR 1,000,000 and must demonstrate the minimum characteristics specified in the RFP.

The listed characteristics are cumulative minimum requirements for each qualifying contract and may not be demonstrated only cumulatively across the three submitted contracts.

However, each qualifying contract is not required to replicate the exact scope, architecture, or four-subsystem structure of IWRACS, provided that it demonstrates compliance with all minimum characteristics specified under Sub-Factor 1.4.2.

Question 321: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Sub-Factor **1.4.2 Specific Experience**, which requires that "the successfully completed similar contracts shall be documented by a copy of an Operational Acceptance Certificate (or equivalent documentation satisfactory to the Purchaser)", we kindly ask you to confirm: (a) please confirm that documentation equivalent to an Operational Acceptance Certificate includes completion certificates, client acceptance protocols, signed delivery reports, client recommendation letters, and certified extracts from contracts confirming successful completion

Answer to Question 321:

Confirmed with clarification. Equivalent documentation may include completion certificates, client acceptance protocols, signed delivery/acceptance reports, client confirmations, recommendation letters or certified extracts from contracts, if they demonstrate successful or substantial completion to the Purchaser's satisfaction.

The Purchaser reserves the right to request clarifications or additional evidence where the submitted documentation is insufficient.

Question 322: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Sub-Factor **1.4.1 General Experience**, which requires "experience under Information System contracts in the role of prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, or subcontractor for at least the last 5 years", and Sub-Factor **1.4.2 Specific Experience**, which also sets a 5-year reference window, we kindly ask you to confirm that the same contracts may be submitted to satisfy both Sub-Factor 1.4.1 and Sub-Factor 1.4.2 simultaneously.

Answer to Question 322:

Confirmed. The same contracts may be submitted to support both Sub-Factor 1.4.1 General Experience and Sub-Factor 1.4.2 Specific Experience, if they meet the respective requirements of each sub-factor.

Question 323: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, **Sub-Factor 1.3.2 Average Annual Turnover**, which sets a minimum average annual turnover of EUR 6,000,000 "calculated as total certified payments received for contracts in progress or completed, within the last 3 years", and which states this requirement must be met by the Proposer (individual) or collectively by JV members (Must meet requirement / Must meet requirements columns), we kindly ask you to clarify: whether turnover generated by a formally engaged sub-consultant or sub-contractor may be included in the calculation, or whether only the turnover of JV members is considered.

Answer to Question 323:

The requirement under Sub-Factor 1.3.2 – Average Annual Turnover shall be assessed in accordance with the provisions of the RFP.

For a single-entity Proposer, the requirement shall be met by the Proposer itself. For a Joint Venture, compliance shall be assessed based on the combined turnover of all JV members, as specified in the qualification criteria.

Turnover generated by subcontractors, sub-consultants, or other third parties that are not members of the Joint Venture shall not be taken into account for the purpose of demonstrating compliance with Sub-Factor 1.3.2.

Question 324: Taking into account the provisions of Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, Section 2.7.3 Minimum Key Expert Profiles, which defines six Key Expert positions (PM, BA, SA, TL, DEV, CSE) and their respective minimum qualification requirements, please confirm that "comparable complexity" / "similar complexity" as used in the minimum requirements for positions PM ("at least two IT systems of comparable complexity"), BA ("at least two systems of similar complexity"), SA ("at least 3 systems of similar complexity"), TL ("at least 3 systems of similar complexity"), and DEV ("at least 3 systems of similar complexity") encompasses software development projects, information systems, applications, new functionalities, and extensions of existing information systems.

Answer to Question 324:

Confirmed. “Comparable complexity” or “similar complexity” may include software development projects, information systems, applications, new functionalities or extensions of existing information systems, provided that the referenced experience is relevant to the role and comparable to the nature, scale and complexity of the IWRACS assignment.

Question 325: Taking into account the provisions of Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, Section 2.7.2 Key Experts (Minimum Requirements), which states that "the bid shall include CVs and supporting evidence (as applicable) demonstrating compliance with minimum requirements (e.g., diplomas, certifications, recommendations or similar proofs of experience)", please confirm that acceptable proof of experience includes extracts from contracts, signed delivery acceptance reports, client attestation letters on official letterhead, and certification from the Proposer's authorized representative regarding the accuracy of the stated experience, in the absence of formal Operational Acceptance Certificates for each project referenced in a Key Expert's CV.

Answer to Question 325:

Confirmed with clarification. Acceptable proof of experience may include extracts from contracts, signed delivery or acceptance reports, client attestation letters, recommendation letters, certificates, or other similar evidence demonstrating the expert's role and relevant experience.

Where formal acceptance certificates are not available for each project referenced in a CV, the Proposer may provide alternative supporting evidence. The Purchaser reserves the right to request clarifications or additional evidence.

Question 326: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Sub-Factor **1.3.1 Historical Financial Performance**, and Form FIN 1.3.1 – *Financial Situation: Historical Financial Performance*, which instructs Proposers to complete a table containing rows for "Information from Balance Sheet" and "Information from Income Statement", together with columns for each year and a final column labelled **"Avg. Ratio"**, we kindly ask you to provide the exact computation formula to be applied by the Proposer for the calculation of the **Avg. Ratio** — given that the form template does not define which financial indicators are to be extracted from the balance sheet and income statement, what arithmetic operation is to be applied between them, or over how many years the average is to be computed — and that the absence of this formula prevents Proposers from completing Form FIN 1.3.1 in a consistent and comparable manner.

Answer to Question 326:

The purpose of Form FIN 1.3.1 is to present the Proposer's historical financial information based on the audited financial statements or other financial statements acceptable under the RFP.

The RFP does not prescribe any specific financial ratio or calculation methodology to be derived from the information presented in Form FIN 1.3.1. Accordingly, no specific formula is required for the completion of the "Avg. Ratio" column.

Proposers shall complete Form FIN 1.3.1 using the information available from their financial statements for the relevant years and shall provide the supporting documentation required under the RFP. Compliance with Sub-Factor 1.3.1 will be assessed based on the submitted financial statements and the overall financial soundness of the Proposer, in accordance with the qualification requirements set out in the RFP.

Question 327: Regarding Sub-Factor 1.3.2 Average Annual Turnover (Section III) and the corresponding Form FIN 1.3.2, which refers to "annual turnover data (applicable activities only)", please confirm that total company turnover from all IT-related activities — including IT services, maintenance, licensing, and other IT revenue streams, in addition to Information System design, supply, and installation — is acceptable for the purposes of satisfying the EUR 6,000,000 minimum threshold.

Answer to Question 327:

The requirement under Sub-Factor 1.3.2 – Average Annual Turnover shall be assessed in accordance with the RFP.

For the purpose of demonstrating compliance with the minimum average annual turnover requirement, Proposers may include turnover generated from their IT-related business activities, provided that such turnover is supported by the financial statements and documentation required under the RFP.

The requirement does not limit eligible turnover exclusively to revenues derived from Information System design, supply, and installation contracts similar to the proposed IWRACS solution. However, the turnover declared in Form FIN 1.3.2 shall be consistent with the Proposer's audited financial statements and the definition of average annual turnover set out in the RFP.

Question 328: Taking into account the provisions of Sub-Factor **1.2.3 Pending Litigation**, which requires that the "Proposer's financial position and prospective long-term profitability still sound according to criteria established in 2.3.1 below, and assuming that all pending litigation will be resolved against the Proposer", and the reference to "criteria established in 2.3.1" — a numbering that does not appear to correspond to any sub-factor in the Qualification Table as presented in Section III — we kindly ask you to clarify: whether "2.3.1" is a typographical error or a reference to a section of the document not included in the publicly available RFP, and if the latter, to provide the complete content of the criteria applicable to this sub-factor.

Answer to Question 328:

The reference to "criteria established in 2.3.1 below" shall be understood as a reference to Sub-Factor 1.3.1 – Historical Financial Performance.

For the purposes of Sub-Factor 1.2.3 – Pending Litigation, the Purchaser will assess whether, assuming that all pending litigation is resolved against the Proposer, the Proposer would nevertheless maintain a sound financial position and prospective long-term profitability, as evidenced by the financial information and documentation submitted under Sub-Factor 1.3.1. No additional or undisclosed qualification criteria apply.

Question 329: Taking into account the provisions of Section IV – Proposal Forms, **Personnel Capabilities – Key Personnel** form, which requires Proposers to submit information on proposed Key Experts, and Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, **Section 2.7.2**, which states that "the bid shall include CVs and supporting evidence (as applicable) demonstrating compliance with minimum requirements (e.g., diplomas, certifications, recommendations or similar proofs of experience)", we kindly ask you to clarify: whether the CV format prescribed in the Personnel Capabilities form is mandatory and exhaustive — such that supplementary CV formats or annexes are not permissible — or whether Proposers may supplement the standard form with additional structured annexes providing more detailed project descriptions, provided the mandatory form fields are fully completed.

Answer to Question 329:

The prescribed Personnel Capabilities / Key Personnel form must be completed for each proposed Key Expert and shall contain all information required by the RFP.

Proposers may submit additional supporting documentation, including detailed CVs, certificates, diplomas, references, or other evidence demonstrating compliance with the qualification and experience requirements, provided that the mandatory information is clearly presented in the prescribed form.

Any supplementary documentation shall support, but shall not replace, the information required in the Personnel Capabilities / Key Personnel form.

Question 330: Taking into account the provisions of Section IV – Proposal Forms, **Form CCC – Summary Sheet: Current Contract Commitments / Work in Progress**, which requires Proposers to list all current commitments on contracts awarded or approaching completion for which a full completion certificate has not yet been issued, and Sub-Factor **1.3.3 Financial Resources**, which requires the Proposer to demonstrate EUR 500,000 in financial resources "net of current commitments", we kindly ask you to clarify: whether "current commitments" in Form CCC refers only to contracts for which the

Proposer has an active financial obligation at the time of Proposal submission, or also to contracts that are substantially complete but for which final acceptance has not yet been issued;

Answer to Question 330:

"Current commitments" refer to contracts or obligations still active at the time of proposal submission and for which resources or financial capacity remain committed, including contracts not yet fully completed or for which a final completion certificate has not yet been issued.

The Proposer shall disclose commitments in accordance with Form CCC and the RFP requirements, so the Purchaser may assess the financial resources net of current commitments can be assessed.

Question 331: Taking into account the provisions of Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Sub-Factor 1.4.2 Specific Experience, which requires contracts to have been "successfully and substantially completed" and to demonstrate specific minimum characteristics (multi-module system, external integrations, cloud deployment, workflow automation, role-based access control, and Operational Acceptance Certificate), we kindly ask you to please confirm that contracts primarily covering technical support, adaptive or corrective software maintenance, evolutionary development, system enhancements and extensions, API integrations, or operational continuity management of an existing Information System — rather than the initial design, supply, and installation of a new system — are eligible as similar experience references under Sub-Factor 1.4.2.

Answer to Question 331:

Contracts covering support, maintenance, enhancements, extensions, API integrations or operational continuity may be considered as similar experience only if they demonstrate the minimum characteristics required under Section III, Sub-Factor 1.4.2.

The assessment will be based on the actual scope and activities performed, not only on the contract title. Pure support or corrective maintenance contracts, without significant functional implementation, enhancement, integration or system-development activities, shall not be sufficient on their own.

The Proposer shall clearly describe the functional scope, technologies and key activities in the Similar Contract form. The Proposer shall clearly describe the scope, functionalities, technologies, and activities performed under each referenced contract and provide the supporting documentation required by the RFP.

Question 332: Taking into account the provisions of Section II – Proposal Data Sheet, **ITP 10.1**, which establishes that the language of the Proposal and all correspondence is **English**, and that "the language for translation of supporting documents and printed literature is **English**" — meaning that supporting documents in any other language must be accompanied by translations into English — and the provisions of Section VII – Purchaser's Requirements, **Section 2.7.6 Evidence and Validation**, which states that "if such supporting documents are issued in a language other than Romanian, they must be submitted together with **certified translations into Romanian**", we kindly ask you to clarify the applicable language regime for

supporting documents submitted as part of the Proposal, given that these two provisions are directly contradictory:

(a) whether supporting documents for the Proposer's qualification (e.g., financial statements, Operational Acceptance Certificates, references for similar contracts under Forms EXP 1.4.1 and EXP

1.4.2) must be submitted with translations into **English** (as required by ITP 10.1) or into **Romanian** (as required by Section 2.7.6);

(b) whether supporting documents for Key Expert qualifications (diplomas, professional certifications, recommendation letters, project references) are subject to the same language regime as qualification documents, or whether Section 2.7.6 establishes a separate and exclusive regime for expert-related documents only;

(c) whether translations are required to be **certified** (i.e., produced by a sworn/authorized translator) or whether informal translations prepared and signed by the Proposer's authorized representative are acceptable; and

(d) whether Romanian-language documents — such as financial statements filed with ANAF, Operational Acceptance Protocols (Procese-Verbale de Recepție Finală) issued by Romanian public authorities, or diplomas awarded by Romanian universities — may be submitted without any translation, given that Romanian is the official language of the Purchaser's country and the Purchaser's personnel are native Romanian speakers.

Answer to Question 332:

For Proposal submission and evaluation purposes, the language requirements set out in ITP 10.1 shall apply. Accordingly, the Proposal and supporting documents submitted with the Proposal shall be provided in English or accompanied by an English translation.

Section 2.7.6 applies to the Beneficiary's right to request clarifications and additional supporting evidence during the verification and validation process. In such cases, where additional supporting documents are requested and are issued in a language other than Romanian, the Beneficiary may require certified translations into Romanian.

Therefore:

- Qualification documents submitted as part of the Proposal shall be submitted in English or accompanied by an English translation.
- Supporting documents relating to Key Experts submitted as part of the Proposal shall be subject to the same requirement.
- Certified translations into Romanian may be requested only in the context of additional evidence and validation under Section 2.7.6.

Question 333: ANNEX 13 - Technical modalities of interoperability - Please confirm that the beneficiary will provide support in developing data import/export mechanisms and secure API connections or direct database access for the mentioned systems (ArcGIS, ECA-RO, SEEAU etc)

Answer to Question 333:

Confirmed. The Beneficiary shall provide or facilitate the necessary support for defining and implementing the agreed data import/export mechanisms, secure API connections or direct database access, as applicable, for the systems mentioned in Annex 13, including ArcGIS, ECA-RO, SEEAU and other relevant systems. This support includes access to available documentation, technical contacts, test data, credentials, test environments and interface specifications, where available. The detailed integration approach for each system shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase.

Question 334: Section B.FUNCTIONAL, ARCHITECTURAL AND PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS, subsection 1.1.2 Reference to Applicable Legal and Regulatory Framework. Please confirm that the component (4) NARW Internal (Intranet 4b) and External (Extranet 4a) Portal, can be based on configurable open source Content Management System (CMS), solution available on the market.

Answer to Question 334:

Confirmed. The NARW Internal Portal/Intranet and External Portal/Extranet may be implemented using a configurable open-source CMS or another market-available CMS/Portal solution, if it meets the functional, architectural, security, interoperability, performance and support requirements of the RFP.

Question 335: Section 1.3.1.4 Reporting & Statistics (Common Requirements). Please confirm that the Reporting and Statistics solution can be an open source solution, solution available on the market.

Answer to Question 335:

Confirmed. The Reporting and Statistics capability may be implemented using an open-source or market-available reporting/BI solution, if it meets the RFP requirements, including role-based access, integration, export formats, auditability, performance and maintainability.

Question 336: Section 1.3.1.4 Reporting & Statistics (Common Requirements). Please indicate the estimated number of reports to be configured within the project.

Answer to Question 336:

The final number of reports to be configured under the common Reporting and Statistics capability shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the RFP requirements, annexes and Beneficiary-confirmed reporting needs.

The Proposer shall propose an implementation approach allowing both predefined reports and configurable/self-service reporting for authorized users, within the agreed access-rights model.

Question 337: 1.3.1.5 Integration Support (Functional Scope). Please confirm that the authority accept an open source solution, solution available on the market.

Answer to Question 337:

Confirmed. The Integration Support capability may be implemented using an open-source or market-available solution, if it meets the RFP requirements for API management, secure integration, authentication, authorization, routing, versioning, monitoring, logging, auditability and maintainability.

Question 338: Reports & Statistics (specific requirements). Please indicate the estimated number of reports to be configured within the project.

Answer to Question 338:

The final number of ROwaterDATA-specific reports to be configured shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the applicable reporting obligations, the RFP annexes, directive-related requirements and the needs confirmed by the Beneficiary.

The Contractor shall configure the agreed set of reports and consider to provide the functionality for authorized users to create, adapt and manage additional reports, including statistical dashboard reports, within the approved reporting framework.

Question 339: 2.3.2. Database Compatibility and Data Layer Integration. Please clarify if the Contracting Authority will provide Database management system licenses required for the IRACW system.

Answer to Question 339:

Based on chapter 1.4.7 of the RFP, the Proposer shall collaborate with the Beneficiary during the analysis phase to define and size the cloud-ready deployment environment and to prepare the corresponding IT Architecture documentation.

This documentation shall identify the minimum required infrastructure, software components, configurations, supporting services and licenses necessary for the correct implementation, secure operation, scalability and long-term maintenance of the IWRACS subsystems.

For custom-developed components, such as ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, the Proposer shall prepare and submit a comprehensive inventory of all required software licenses, including any database management system licenses required by the proposed architecture. The inventory shall exclude pricing information and shall specify, at a minimum, the product name, version, edition or model, quantity, license duration and intended purpose.

Such licenses shall be procured and owned by the Beneficiary, as stated in chapter 1.4.7.

Therefor the Proposer shall clearly state in its proposal any database licensing assumptions, dependencies and technical requirements, including whether the proposed solution relies on Beneficiary-provided database licenses or requires additional licenses to be procured.

Question 340: 2.3.7 Reporting and Data Analytics Integration. Please clarify who is responsible for providing licenses/ subscriptions related to business intelligence tools (e.g. Power BI, Tableau, or equivalent) for advanced analysis

Answer to Question 340:

Currently, within NARW there are systems that already use reporting and analytics functionalities, including reports implemented in Microsoft Power BI.

Business intelligence tool licenses or subscriptions, such as Power BI, Tableau or equivalent, shall be provided or procured by the Beneficiary. If the Proposer proposes a specific BI or reporting tool as part of its technical solution, the Proposer shall clearly identify the tool, licensing model, required number of users/subscriptions, any recurrent costs and any assumptions regarding licenses to be provided by the Beneficiary.

Question 341: 2.5.4 Data Validation and Quality Assurance. The quality of migrated data is fundamentally dependent on the quality, completeness, and consistency of the source data provided by the Beneficiary (NARW). Where source data provided by NARW does not meet the acceptance criteria defined in this section (e.g., completeness ≥ 99%, mandatory fields populated, referential integrity intact) due to defects pre-existing in the legacy system, will such deviations be excluded from the Proposer's conformance obligations and documented as Beneficiary-accepted exceptions?

Given that "final acceptance of migrated data shall be subject to Beneficiary validation and approval", what is the maximum review and approval period allocated to NARW, and what happens if approval is delayed beyond that period? Will such delays affect project timelines and associated Proposer obligations?

Will the stated acceptance thresholds (e.g., completeness ≥ 99%, referential integrity fully preserved) be evaluated against the migrated data relative to the source data as-provided, rather than against an assumed ideal data quality standard?

Answer to Question 341:

The migration acceptance thresholds shall be assessed against the source data provided by the Beneficiary and against the agreed migration mapping, transformation rules and validation criteria approved during the analysis phase. Where source data contains pre-existing defects, such as incomplete mandatory fields, inconsistent references, duplicates or other legacy data-quality issues, these shall be documented in the migration assessment, data-quality reports or exception logs. Such pre-existing defects shall not be considered non-conformities of the Contractor, provided that the Contractor has correctly migrated, transformed and reported the data in accordance with the agreed migration rules.

Data cleansing, correction or completion of defective legacy data remains the responsibility of the Beneficiary, unless specific cleansing activities are expressly agreed within the project scope.

The Beneficiary validation and approval period for migrated data shall be defined in the migration plan approved during analysis phase. Delays in validation or approval beyond the agreed period may affect the project timeline and should be managed in accordance with the project governance and contractual procedures.

Clarification questions — Issue 1

Question 342: Please confirm that NARW (or MMAP, as applicable) is aware of the active SEAP procurement procedure CN1080560 (internal reference DGMFIL/115835/03.03.2025, SMIS 322548) and that this procedure has been considered in the design and justification of the IWRACS / ROwaterDATA component.

Answer to Question 342:

NARW, as Beneficiary, is aware of the development of the “Virtual IT Laboratory” project, and discussions have taken place between the relevant institutions regarding the scope and positioning of this project in relation to existing and planned digitalization initiatives in the water and environmental sector.

Unlike the information systems managed by the National Administration “Romanian Waters” (NARW), whose main purpose is the **integrated management of data and information** related to water management, the integrated information system developed under the “Virtual IT Laboratory - LIV” project (SMIS code 136810) is mainly focused on **predefined reporting for publication and management** purposes, based on the implementation status of the requirements of European directives in the water sector, namely Directive (EU) 2020/2184 on the quality of water intended for human consumption, Directive 2024/3019 concerning urban wastewater treatment, Directive 91/676/EEC concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources, and Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks.

The **two systems** have **distinct** characteristics:

- the integrated information system developed under the “Virtual IT Laboratory” project uses databases managed by the institutions responsible for reporting on the requirements of the above-mentioned European directives, including MMAP, NARW and INSP, and makes the relevant information available to decision-makers and stakeholders in an appropriate format;

- the ROwaterDATA subsystem of IWRACS is primarily intended for the collection, analysis and validation of water-management data and information, of both technical and economic nature, used by NARW across its institutional activities.

Therefore, the data collected and integrated through the ROwaterDATA subsystem provide the basis for the reports prepared by NARW regarding the implementation of European directives in the water sector. The same data may also be used by MMAP for decision-making and for **informing the public** through a public transparency portal on compliance with the requirements of European directives.

Question 343: Please specify in concrete, measurable terms how the ROwaterDATA component of IWRACS does NOT duplicate the functionalities of "IT platform, data collection, database construction, and reporting formats" that are being acquired through procedure CN1080560. In particular, for EU reporting under the Nitrates, Water Framework, EQS, and UWWTD Directives, please indicate which system will produce which report.

Answer to Question 343:

As clarified in the answer to Q1, ROwaterDATA and the LIV platform have distinct purposes.

ROwaterDATA is intended to support NARW's internal collection, validation, consolidation, governance and traceability of water-management data, including technical and economic data used in NARW's activities.

The SEAP reference CN1080560 project is mainly oriented towards predefined reporting, publication, management information and transparency regarding the implementation status of selected European directives, using data made available by the responsible institutions.

Therefore, ROwaterDATA does not duplicate CN1080560. ROwaterDATA manages and validates the underlying institutional datasets at NARW level, while LIV may use relevant validated data for reporting, decision-support and public transparency purposes.

The detailed allocation of final reporting outputs, including those related to the Nitrates Directive, Water Framework Directive, EQS Directive and UWWTD, shall be confirmed during the analysis phase with the Beneficiary and relevant stakeholders, based on applicable reporting obligations, existing systems and agreed interoperability mechanisms.

Question 344: Please confirm whether an inter-institutional coordination document (memorandum, protocol, or equivalent) exists between the contracting authorities of CN1080560 and of IWRACS, defining the demarcation of responsibilities, data exchange arrangements, and avoidance of duplication.

Answer to Question 344:

At the date of issuance of this clarification, coordination on digitalization initiatives, data exchange and interoperability requirements has been carried out through the competent structures of MMAP and NARW, including meetings and technical discussions between representatives of the two institutions.

During these discussions, the functional distinction between IWRACS / ROwaterDATA and the "Virtual IT Laboratory – LIV" project, SMIS code 136810, was also approached.

The two systems have distinct primary purposes:

- the "Virtual IT Laboratory – LIV" project is mainly focused on predefined reporting, publication and management dashboards related to the implementation status of specific EU water directives, including Directive (EU) 2020/2184, Directive (EU) 2024/3019, Directive 91/676/EEC and Directive 2007/60/EC. LIV uses databases made available by the institutions responsible for reporting under these directives, including MMAP, NARW and INSP, and presents the relevant information to decision-makers and stakeholders in an appropriate format;

- ROwaterDATA, as a subsystem of IWRACS, is primarily intended for the collection, structuring, analysis, validation, governance and operational use of technical and economic data related to water management within NARW's activities.

Accordingly, ROwaterDATA is not intended to duplicate LIV. ROwaterDATA provides the operational data collection, validation and governance layer used by NARW. The data collected and integrated through ROwaterDATA may subsequently support the reports prepared by NARW regarding the implementation of EU water directives and may also be used by MMAP for decision-making and public information purposes, including through public transparency tools such as LIV.

The detailed data exchange arrangements and interoperability mechanisms between LIV and future information systems such as IWRACS will be further defined through institutional coordination between MMAP and NARW. As the LIV project advances in implementation, the Beneficiary will ensure that the relevant coordination arrangements, including functional demarcation, responsibilities, data exchange and interoperability mechanisms, are documented through an appropriate institutional protocol.

Question 345: Please confirm whether the existence and scope of procurement CN1080560 has been formally communicated to the World Bank as part of the procurement planning for IWRACS, and whether the Bank has issued any guidance or approval on this point.

Answer to Question 345:

The Beneficiary confirms that the IWRACS procurement documentation was prepared, reviewed and cleared in accordance with the applicable project governance arrangements and the World Bank procurement framework.

The World Bank review and clearance process applies to the IWRACS procurement documentation as submitted under the applicable project procedures. Internal project communications are not part of the procurement documentation. The responsibility for ensuring avoidance of duplication, appropriate functional demarcation and interoperability between existing and future systems remains with the Beneficiary.

Clarification questions — Issue 2

Question 346: Please confirm the expected operational availability date of the ADR Government Private Cloud and whether it will be operational at the time of each IWRACS subsystem's Go-Live (Weeks 25–60 of the implementation schedule). If not, please describe the contractual contingency mechanism.

Answer to Question 346:

As specified in Section 1.4.7 of the RFP, the proposed solution shall support deployment within the future ADR Governmental Private Cloud or, alternatively, within the NARW Azure tenant, as agreed with the Beneficiary.

At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot formally confirm the operational availability date of the ADR Governmental Private Cloud based on Microsoft Azure Stack Framework in relation to the implementation schedule of the IWRACS subsystems. Therefore, the proposed solution shall be designed with sufficient deployment flexibility to support either hosting scenario.

Should the ADR Government Private Cloud not be operationally available at the planned Go-Live date of a subsystem, the Beneficiary may decide to deploy the solution within the NARW Azure tenant or another agreed hosting environment, with subsequent migration to the ADR Government Private Cloud when required. The detailed deployment approach shall be agreed during the analysis and implementation phases.

Question 347: Please specify the mandatory RTO (Recovery Time Objective) and RPO (Recovery Point Objective) for each subsystem, as these are essential parameters for sizing the recovery infrastructure.

Answer to Question 347:

For ensuring comparability of bids, the Bidders may consider the following baseline RTO/RPO targets when sizing the disaster recovery, backup, business continuity and operational resilience solution:

- 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 components: RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours;
- Reporting, dashboards and analytical / publication components not directly required for operational continuity: RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours.

These targets are baseline values intended to support comparable technical and financial offers. The Contractor may propose more stringent RTO/RPO values where supported by the proposed architecture, cloud platform capabilities and cost model.

The proposed solution shall follow cloud reliability and disaster recovery best practices applicable to the selected hosting model, including Azure / Azure Stack Hub capabilities where relevant, such as automated backups, point-in-time restore, tested recovery procedures, availability zones or equivalent redundancy mechanisms, replication according to the required RPO, and documented failover / failback procedures.

Where a component is shared by several subsystems, the most stringent applicable RTO/RPO target shall apply.

The detailed recovery architecture, backup policy, replication approach and operational procedures shall be finalized during the analysis and design phase together with the Beneficiary, based on the criticality of each subsystem, the proposed architecture, the cloud infrastructure characteristics and the operational requirements.

Question 348: Please confirm which entity (Proposer, NARW, ADR) will bear the following recurring costs over the operational life of the IWRACS system (5–10 years post Go-Live), and indicate the source of funding committed to cover these costs once the technical support period under the IBRD-financed contract ends (March 2028, per GCC 12.3 and the closing date of Loan IBRD 9505-RO on 30 June 2028): (a) cloud subscription fees (compute, storage, egress); (b) WAN connectivity between the regional offices and the cloud; (c) Microsoft 365 / Entra ID / Exchange / Teams licensing for NARW users accessing IWRACS. Please also provide indicative annual amounts.

Answer to Question 348:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

The present procurement procedure covers the implementation, warranty, support and maintenance services explicitly defined within the RFP documentation. Bidders shall price only the costs that are required to be included under the Contract, in accordance with the RFP.
For clarity, the following principles apply to the recurring operational costs referred to in the question:

a) **Cloud subscription fees**
Recurring cloud consumption costs after the contractual implementation / support period, including compute, storage, backup, monitoring, network traffic and egress, will be managed by the Beneficiary in accordance with the applicable institutional budgeting, financing and operational governance mechanisms. The final hosting model, including the use of ADR Government Cloud / Azure Stack Hub or other Beneficiary-approved cloud arrangements, will be confirmed during analysis phase.

b) **WAN connectivity between regional offices and the cloud**
WAN connectivity and institutional network access between NARW headquarters, regional / basin offices and the selected hosting environment are part of the Beneficiary's operational infrastructure and will be managed by the Beneficiary through its applicable institutional arrangements. These costs are not to be priced by Bidders.

c) **Microsoft 365 / Entra ID / Exchange Online / Teams licensing**
As indicated in Annex 12 NARW already owns approximately 4,100 Microsoft licenses covering the relevant Microsoft 365, Entra ID, Exchange Online and Teams services used by NARW personnel. Therefore, Bidders are not required to include these existing Microsoft licenses in their financial proposals.

The references to Microsoft 365 / Entra ID / Exchange Online / Teams in the RFP concern integration with the Beneficiary's existing environment, not the procurement of a new Microsoft licensing baseline by the Contractor.
At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot provide binding long-term annual operational cost commitments for a 5–10 year post Go-Live period beyond the scope of the current procurement procedure. Such costs will be planned and managed by the Beneficiary under the applicable institutional budgetary and operational governance mechanisms.

Question 349: Please provide initial data volumes and 5-year growth projections (compute, storage, bandwidth), as these are essential for correct infrastructure sizing.

Answer to Question 349:

Initial data volume estimates, user numbers, transaction volumes, and indicative capacity planning assumptions for each subsystem are provided in Annex 12 – Estimated Capacity Planning per IWRACS Subsystems and should be used by the Proposer for infrastructure sizing and solution design purposes.

The Beneficiary clarifies that the values presented in Annex 12 represent indicative planning assumptions, including estimated current volumes and expected evolution over a minimum five-year horizon. Actual compute, storage, and bandwidth requirements may vary depending on the pace of digitalization, usage patterns, reporting obligations, interoperability requirements, and future operational needs.

Accordingly, the proposed solution shall be designed using scalable architecture principles, allowing future expansion of infrastructure resources without major architectural changes. Detailed sizing assumptions and capacity planning shall be validated and refined during the analysis and design phase together with the Beneficiary.

Question 350: Please confirm whether a Proposer offering an equivalent solution based on open identity standards (OIDC, SAML 2.0) without native dependency on Microsoft Entra ID, Exchange Online, or Teams would be considered compliant. If not, please justify the technical necessity of brand-specific integration in light of Procurement Regulations §5.26 (prohibition of brand specifications without 'or equivalent' wording).

Answer to Question 350:

The RFP requires compatibility and interoperability with the existing and planned institutional ecosystem used within NARW, including identity management, communication, collaboration, and productivity services.

The Beneficiary clarifies that references to Microsoft technologies reflect the current operational environment and interoperability requirements. Equivalent solutions based on open standards such as OIDC, SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, SMTP/IMAP, or equivalent mechanisms may be proposed, provided that they ensure full functional interoperability with the infrastructure and services referenced in the RFP.

Any alternative technical approach shall provide equivalent functionality, security, auditability, supportability, and integration capabilities. Compliance will be evaluated based on the Proposer’s ability to meet the functional, technical, interoperability, operational, and security requirements defined in the procurement documentation.

Clarification questions — Issue 3

Question 351: Please confirm that the SLAs defined in §5.1.3 of the RFP apply exclusively to the application layer delivered by the Proposer, and that the availability of the underlying cloud infrastructure (compute, storage, network) is the contractual responsibility of the Beneficiary directly with the cloud provider (ADR or Microsoft).

Answer to Question 351:

The SLA requirements defined in the RFP primarily apply to the services, application components, integrations, support activities, and operational responsibilities falling within the scope of the Contractor’s deliverables under the Contract.

Infrastructure-level availability related to the underlying cloud platform, compute, storage, networking, and related cloud infrastructure services may depend on the service levels and operational conditions provided by the relevant cloud infrastructure provider and associated institutional operational arrangements.

Downtime or service degradation caused by cloud infrastructure, telecommunications, WAN, internet, power, data center services or other third-party infrastructure layers outside the Contractor’s reasonable control shall be excluded from SLA penalty calculations applicable to the Contractor. The Contractor shall remain responsible for monitoring, notification, escalation and reasonable cooperation in incident resolution.

Question 352: Please confirm that, in the calculation of SLA compliance, downtime caused by incidents at the infrastructure level (outside the Proposer's control) is not attributed to the Proposer and does not generate contractual penalties.

Answer to Question 352:

Downtime or service degradation caused by cloud infrastructure, telecommunications, WAN, internet, power, data center services or other third-party infrastructure layers outside the Contractor's reasonable control shall be excluded from SLA penalty calculations applicable to the Contractor. The Contractor shall remain responsible for monitoring, notification, escalation and reasonable cooperation in incident resolution.

SLA measurement and incident assessment shall be performed based on the actual root cause, affected service layer, and contractual responsibilities associated with each incident.

Incidents demonstrably caused exclusively by failures or unavailability of external infrastructure components, cloud platform services, telecommunications providers, identity providers, or other dependencies outside the Contractor's operational control shall be analyzed accordingly within the incident management and SLA assessment process.

Question 353: Please specify the contractual 'back-to-back' mechanism by which the SLAs that the Beneficiary contracts with the cloud provider are transferred as baseline assumptions to the SLAs required from the Proposer.

Answer to Question 353:

The RFP does not impose a specific contractual "back-to-back" SLA transfer mechanism between the Contractor and external infrastructure or cloud service providers.

The Contractor shall propose an operational architecture, support model, monitoring approach, escalation procedures, and service management processes aligned with the infrastructure environment made available for the Project and with the SLA requirements defined in the RFP.

The detailed operational coordination and responsibilities between application-level services and infrastructure-level services shall be further clarified during the analysis and implementation phases together with the Beneficiary.

Question 354: Please confirm that the measurement methodology for application SLAs (response time, throughput) covers application processing time only, excluding network transit and cloud latencies.

Answer to Question 354:

Application SLA measurement will target the performance, availability, responsiveness, and operational behavior of the application components and services delivered under the scope of the Contract.

Performance degradation or latency generated exclusively by external infrastructure layers, telecommunications networks, cloud platform services, identity providers, or other dependencies outside the Contractor's operational control shall be analyzed separately based on the incident context and technical evidence.

Downtime or service degradation caused by cloud infrastructure, telecommunications, WAN, internet, power, data center services or other third-party infrastructure layers outside the Contractor's reasonable control shall be excluded from SLA penalty calculations applicable to the Contractor. The Contractor shall remain responsible for monitoring, notification, escalation and reasonable cooperation in incident resolution.

Question 355: In line with Procurement Regulations §5.28, please provide the responsibility matrix allocating availability risks between Proposer, Beneficiary (NARW), ADR (as Government Cloud provider, if applicable), and Microsoft (as Azure tenant provider, if applicable).

Answer to Question 355:

The detailed operational responsibility matrix regarding infrastructure availability, cloud platform services, identity services, connectivity, application services, integrations, and operational support activities shall be further defined and agreed during the analysis and implementation phases based on:

- the finalized deployment architecture,
- the operational model,
- the selected infrastructure environment,
- and the institutional governance arrangements applicable at implementation time.

In general:

- the Contractor shall be responsible for the application components, integrations, support services, and deliverables within the contractual scope;
- infrastructure-level services and dependencies may involve external providers or institutional infrastructure arrangements outside the Contractor’s direct operational control.

Clarification questions — Issue 4

Question 356: Please confirm that NARW is recognised as an Essential Entity under EU Directive 2022/2555 (NIS2),Romanian Law 58/2023, and GEO 155/2024transposingNIS2— covering the drinking water sector (Annex I, point 6) and wastewater sector (Annex I, point 8). Please indicate whether NARW has been formally registered with DNSC and which sectoral CSIRT applies.

Answer to Question 356:

At the time of preparation of the RFP documentation, NARW had not been formally designated or officially registered as an Essential Entity under the national implementation framework associated with the NIS2 Directive.

The Beneficiary notes that national institutional processes, analyses, and discussions regarding the implementation and applicability of the NIS2 framework are ongoing. In this context, NARW currently receives cybersecurity recommendations, operational notifications, and security hardening guidance from DNSC regarding cybersecurity good practices, vulnerability mitigation, access control, MFA, patch management, monitoring, and institutional resilience measures for operational IT systems.

Consequently, the proposed solution shall be designed in accordance with good practices regarding cybersecurity, operational resilience, auditability, access control, traceability, and security governance, as required by the RFP and applicable legislation in force at implementation time.

Question 357: Please specify the concrete operational requirements through which IWRACS will fulfil NARW's obligations under Article 21 of NIS2 (risk management policies, incident management, business continuity, supply chain security, mandatory MFA, encryption standards) and Article 23 (incident notification within 24h / 72h / 30 days to DNSC).

Answer to Question 357:

The proposed solution shall implement the cybersecurity, auditability, continuity, access management, monitoring, logging, backup, recovery, and operational security requirements explicitly defined in the RFP documentation and applicable legislation in force during implementation.

At this stage, no additional subsystem-specific operational obligations formally derived from NIS2 implementation are imposed beyond the requirements already described within the procurement documentation. Should additional sectoral cybersecurity obligations become formally applicable during implementation, the Beneficiary reserves the right to analyze together with the Contractor the necessary alignment measures within the applicable contractual and regulatory framework.

Question 358: Please specify the mandatory technical standards (rather than 'where applicable'): (a) minimum encryption algorithms accepted (e.g. AES-256 at rest, TLS 1.3 in transit); (b) frequency of penetration testing after Go-Live; (c) vulnerability disclosure procedures; (d) whether ISO 27001 certification of the Proposer is mandatory or optional.

Answer to Question 358:

The RFP, as updated through Amendment No. 5, defines the required cybersecurity outcomes, compliance objectives and minimum mandatory security capabilities to be delivered under the Contract. The RFP does not prescribe a closed or exhaustive list of technologies, tools, certifications or operational procedures, and therefore the Proposer remains responsible for proposing a technically sound and compliant security architecture.

Accordingly:

(a) Minimum encryption algorithms accepted

As a minimum mandatory requirement, the proposed solution shall ensure encryption of data at rest using AES-256 or an equivalent strong encryption mechanism, and encryption of data in transit using TLS 1.3 or an equivalent secure protocol.

The Contractor shall propose detailed encryption architecture, including algorithms, key management, certificate management, configuration parameters and implementation controls, as part of the solution design, in line with industry good practices and applicable security standards in force at the time of implementation.

(b) Frequency of penetration testing after Go-Live

The RFP does not prescribe a fixed mandatory frequency for penetration testing after Go-Live. The Contractor shall propose an appropriate security testing and vulnerability assessment approach, considering the criticality of the solution, exposed interfaces, APIs, integrations, administrative interfaces and applicable cybersecurity requirements.

As a minimum requirement, security testing shall be performed before Go-Live / Operational Acceptance and whenever major changes are implemented that may affect the security posture of the solution. Any post-Go-Live penetration testing regime shall be agreed during implementation and aligned with the Beneficiary’s cybersecurity governance, applicable legal obligations and operational constraints.

(c) Vulnerability disclosure procedures

The proposed solution and implementation approach shall support vulnerability management, incident handling, remediation tracking and security reporting processes.

The detailed vulnerability disclosure and remediation procedures shall be agreed during implementation, in coordination with the Beneficiary's cybersecurity and operational teams. As a minimum, the Contractor shall ensure that identified vulnerabilities can be registered, classified by severity, assigned for remediation, tracked until closure and evidenced through appropriate documentation. The solution shall also include centralized audit logging, security event logging, incident logging and the capability to support incident investigation and reporting.

(d) ISO/IEC 27001 certification

ISO/IEC 27001 certification of the Proposer is not explicitly required as a mandatory eligibility or qualification criterion under the RFP.

However, the Proposer shall demonstrate that the proposed solution, implementation methodology, security controls and operational processes comply with the security requirements defined in the procurement documentation, as updated through Amendment No. 5, as well as with applicable legislation and relevant cybersecurity good practices.

The minimum security requirements defined above shall apply to all relevant subsystems, integrations, APIs, databases, administrative interfaces and technical components delivered under the Contract.

Question 359: Please specify the data residency requirements: must the data remain physically within the EU, or within Romania, particularly for data concerning the location, capacity, and vulnerabilities of critical water infrastructure (dams, intakes, treatment plants)?

Answer to Question 359:

The proposed solution shall comply with the applicable Romanian and European legal, cybersecurity, operational, and data protection requirements in force at implementation time.

As specified in the RFP, the solution may be deployed within the ADR Government Private Cloud or alternatively within the NARW Azure tenant, as agreed with the Beneficiary. In the latter case, data hosting and disaster recovery services are expected to be provided through Microsoft Azure datacenters located within the European Union.

At this stage, the RFP does not impose a formal requirement that all data must be physically stored exclusively within Romania. However, the proposed solution shall ensure that data hosting, processing, backup, and disaster recovery arrangements comply with the applicable legal, security, confidentiality, and operational requirements relevant to the Beneficiary, including those applicable to information related to water management infrastructure and associated operational data.

Question 360: Please specify the contractual incident notification procedure between Proposer and NARW, and between NARW and DNSC, with the timelines mandated by NIS2 (24h / 72h / 30 days).

Answer to Question 360:

The Contractor shall implement incident management, escalation, communication, monitoring, and reporting procedures in accordance with the SLA, support, and security requirements defined in the RFP.

At this stage, the RFP does not prescribe a specific contractual incident notification procedure aligned to the NIS2 timelines of 24 hours, 72 hours, and 30 days. The proposed solution shall support the logging, monitoring, auditability, traceability, and reporting capabilities necessary to facilitate incident management and regulatory compliance activities.

The detailed operational procedures, notification workflows, escalation mechanisms, responsibilities, and reporting timelines between the Contractor and the Beneficiary shall be agreed during the analysis and implementation phases. Any obligations regarding notification of incidents to DNSC or other competent authorities shall be governed by the applicable legal and institutional framework in force at the relevant time.

Clarification questions — Issue 5

Question 361: Please confirm whether the Beneficiary has performed or will perform a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) under Article 35 GDPR for the processing of personal data in IWRACS, prior to Operational Acceptance.

Answer to Question 361:

The Beneficiary shall ensure compliance with the applicable GDPR requirements and institutional data protection obligations throughout the implementation and operation of the IWRACS solution.

At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot confirm that a formal Data Protection Impact Assessment — DPIA — under Article 35 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 — GDPR — has already been performed or that it will be required for all components of the solution.

The necessity, scope and timing of any DPIA shall be assessed during the analysis phase, based on the detailed functional design, the categories of personal data processed, the processing operations, data flows, system integrations, user roles, access rights and applicable legal requirements.

The RFP, as updated through Amendment No. 5, clarifies that, where the Contractor processes personal data on behalf of the Beneficiary, the Contract shall include a Data Processing Agreement in accordance with Article 28 of the GDPR.

In such cases, the Contractor shall process personal data only on documented instructions from the Beneficiary and shall implement appropriate technical and organizational measures to ensure confidentiality, integrity, availability, access control, auditability, data protection, retention and secure deletion, in accordance with the GDPR and the requirements of the RFP.

The Contractor shall also assist the Beneficiary, where required, in the preparation or update of a DPIA under Article 35 of the GDPR, including by providing information on data flows, categories of personal data, processing operations, security controls, risks and mitigation measures related to the delivered solution.

These obligations shall apply to all relevant subsystems, integrations, databases, logs, reporting components and administrative interfaces delivered under the Contract where personal data is processed.

Question 362: Please provide the draft Data Processing Agreement (DPA) under Article 28 GDPR that the Proposer (as processor) will be required to sign with NARW (as controller). This DPA should form part of the contractual documentation from the bidding stage.

Answer to Question 362:

At this stage, no separate draft Data Processing Agreement is attached to the procurement documentation.

The RFP, as updated through Amendment No. 5, clarifies that, where the Contractor processes personal data on behalf of the Beneficiary, the Contract shall include a Data Processing Agreement in accordance with Article 28 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 — GDPR.

The Data Processing Agreement shall set out the obligations applicable to the Contractor in relation to the processing of personal data under the Contract, including processing only on documented instructions from the Beneficiary, confidentiality, implementation of appropriate technical and organizational measures, access control, auditability, data protection, retention, secure deletion and assistance to the Beneficiary in fulfilling its GDPR obligations.

The Contractor shall also assist the Beneficiary, where required, in the preparation or update of a Data Protection Impact Assessment in accordance with Article 35 of the GDPR, including by providing information on data flows, categories of personal data, processing operations, security controls, risks and mitigation measures related to the delivered solution.

The final Data Processing Agreement shall be completed as part of the contractual documentation, considering the detailed processing activities, categories of personal data, data flows, subsystems, integrations, databases, logs, reporting components and administrative interfaces identified during the analysis phase.

These GDPR-related obligations shall be considered by Proposers when preparing their technical and financial proposals.

Question 363: Please specify mandatory encryption standards: AES-256 (or equivalent) at rest; TLS 1.3 minimum in transit; password hashing.

Answer to Question 363:

The RFP, as updated through Amendment No. 5, defines minimum mandatory security capabilities related to encryption, secure communications and credential protection. The RFP does not prescribe a closed or exhaustive list of technologies, algorithms or implementation configurations, and therefore the Contractor remains responsible for proposing a secure and compliant technical solution.

As minimum mandatory requirements:

- data at rest shall be encrypted using AES-256 or an equivalent strong encryption mechanism;
- data in transit shall be protected using TLS 1.3 or an equivalent secure protocol;
- passwords and credentials shall not be stored in plain text and shall be protected using secure password hashing mechanisms, including appropriate salting and modern, industry-recognized hashing algorithms suitable for credential storage.

The Contractor shall propose the detailed encryption architecture, secure communication protocols, key management approach, certificate management, password hashing mechanisms, credential protection controls and related configuration parameters as part of the analysis phase.

These requirements shall apply to all relevant subsystems, databases, integrations, APIs, administrative interfaces and technical components delivered under the Contract.

Question 364: Please specify how the IWRACS system will comply with EU Regulation 2024/903 (Interoperable Europe Act), in particular the obligation to perform an Interoperability Assessment under Articles 3-4.

Answer to Question 364:

The proposed solution shall be designed based on interoperability, open standards, API-based integration capabilities, and data exchange principles as defined in the RFP.

At this stage, the RFP does not impose a specific Interoperability Assessment methodology under Regulation (EU) 2024/903. Where applicable legal or institutional obligations become relevant during implementation, the Beneficiary and the Contractor shall analyze and implement the necessary measures to ensure compliance with the applicable interoperability framework and regulatory requirements in force at that time.

Question 365: Please confirm the applicability of EU Directive 2007/2/EC (INSPIRE) and Romanian transposition (Government Ordinance 4/2010 establishing the National Spatial Data Infrastructure) for ROwaterDATA's geospatial datasets and specify the associated technical requirements: ISO 19115/19139 metadata, OGC-compliant WMS/WFS services, ETRS89 coordinate systems.

Answer to Question 365:

ROwaterDATA may manage and process datasets containing geospatial information relevant to water management, environmental reporting, monitoring and institutional operational activities.

The applicability of Directive 2007/2/EC — INSPIRE — and of the Romanian transposition framework, including Government Ordinance No. 4/2010 establishing the National Spatial Data Infrastructure, shall be assessed in relation to the specific geospatial datasets managed, exchanged or exposed through ROwaterDATA.

The RFP, as updated through Amendment No. 5, clarifies that, for ROwaterDATA datasets containing geospatial information and sourced from the Beneficiary's existing ArcGIS systems. The proposed solution shall support integration with such GIS sources through the interfaces made available by the Beneficiary, including ArcGIS REST services, database views, OGC services or equivalent mechanisms.

The solution shall preserve and correctly process geospatial attributes, coordinates, spatial identifiers, geometry reference systems received from the source GIS systems, including ETRS89 and WGS84, where applicable.

The Contractor shall ensure that ROwaterDATA can consume, validate, map and use such geospatial data for the relevant data collection, reporting, analysis and interoperability workflows.

ROwaterDATA is not intended to replace the Beneficiary's existing ArcGIS platform, and the Contractor shall not be responsible for the completeness, accuracy or legal compliance of source GIS datasets managed outside ROwaterDATA.

Where ROwaterDATA is required to expose or exchange geospatial datasets, the solution shall support, where applicable, interoperable geospatial mechanisms such as INSPIRE-aligned metadata, ISO 19115 / ISO 19139, ETRS89 / WGS84 and OGC-compliant WMS / WFS or equivalent services, subject to the actual datasets, available source systems and requirements confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 366: Please specify the Proposer's obligations under EU Regulation 2023/138(High-Value Datasets): which IWRACS datasets qualify as HVD and will be published free of charge via API.

Answer to Question 366:

At this stage, the Beneficiary has not established a formal inventory of datasets that will qualify as High-Value Datasets under Regulation (EU) 2023/138.

The proposed solution shall support configurable publication, metadata management, open-data export, and API-based data access capabilities for datasets designated by the Beneficiary for public dissemination, in accordance with applicable legislation and institutional policies.

The identification of datasets to be published as High-Value Datasets, including applicable access conditions and publication mechanisms, shall be further analyzed and agreed during the analysis and implementation phases together with the Beneficiary.

Question 367: Please confirm that the system will be compatible with the European Digital Identity Wallet (Regulation 2024/1183) at Go-Live of the Portal Extranet and SIGAR Front-Office (Weeks 36–60, year 2027), as required by eIDAS 2.0.

Answer to Question 367:

The proposed solution shall support modern authentication, identity federation and interoperability mechanisms based on open standards and applicable electronic identification requirements.

At this stage, the RFP does not impose mandatory operational integration with the European Digital Identity Wallet at the initial Go-Live of the Portal Extranet or SIGAR Front-Office. In addition, no specific mandatory business use case requiring European Digital Identity Wallet integration at Go-Live has been defined in the RFP.

However, the solution should be designed in a flexible and extensible manner to support future integration with national and European electronic identification frameworks, including the European Digital Identity Wallet, where such services become operationally available, technically accessible and applicable to the Beneficiary's business processes.

Clarification questions — Issue 6

Question 368: Please confirm that the figure of 4,100 internal NARW users (RFP §1.3.2) represents the correct estimate of users requiring Microsoft licensing for IWRACS operation. If higher or lower, please provide the corrected number with the source.

Answer to Question 368:

The figure of approximately 4,100 internal NARW users represents the current indicative institutional estimate used in the RFP for operational sizing, access management and planning purposes.

The Beneficiary already owns 4,100 Microsoft licenses for NARW internal users. Therefore, Proposers are not expected to include Microsoft user licenses in their financial offers.

As clarified through **Amendment No. 5**, references in the RFP to Microsoft Entra ID, Exchange Online, Microsoft Teams and Microsoft 365 shall be understood as requirements for integration and interoperability with the Beneficiary's existing Microsoft 365 environment, and do not imply the replacement, duplication or reimplementation of such services.

Not all users will necessarily require the same level of access, roles or service usage within IWRACS. The final user allocation, role mapping, access rights and service consumption model shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the Beneficiary's organizational structure, implementation approach and applicable institutional policies.

Question 369: Please provide the detailed annual estimate of Microsoft licensing and Azure subscription costs (Entra ID, M365, Exchange Online, Teams, Azure) that the Beneficiary will pay over a 5-year horizon. As these recurring costs continue indefinitely beyond the end of the IBRD-financed technical support period (March 2028, per GCC12.3), please indicate the budget source committed to cover them for the operational life of the system.

Answer to Question 369:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

The present procurement procedure covers the implementation, warranty, support, and maintenance services explicitly defined within the RFP.

Operational subscription costs related to cloud infrastructure, Microsoft licensing, collaboration services, identity services, communication services, or other operational subscriptions applicable after the contractual implementation/support period shall be managed by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable institutional budgeting and operational governance mechanisms.

At this stage, the Beneficiary does not provide binding long-term operational licensing budgets or detailed 5-year operational cost estimations within the procurement documentation.

Question 370: Please confirm that these Microsoft recurring costs (in the order of 4-17 M EUR over 5 years, depending on scenario) have been included in the Total Cost of Ownership analysis presented to the World Bank in the Project Appraisal Document.

Answer to Question 370:

The Project Appraisal Document does not provide a component-level Total Cost of Ownership analysis or specific estimates for Microsoft recurring costs under IWRACS.

For clarity, the references to Microsoft 365 / Entra ID / Exchange Online / Teams in the RFP relate to integration with the Beneficiary's existing institutional environment. As clarified under Answer 368 and reflected in Annex 12, NARW already owns the relevant Microsoft licensing baseline for its users; therefore, Bidders are not required to price such existing Microsoft licenses as new recurring costs under this procurement.

Question 371: Please justify, for each specific Microsoft product named in the RFP (Entra ID, Exchange Online, Teams, Microsoft 365 for in-platform editing), the absence of an 'or equivalent' clause as required by Procurement Regulations §5.26. Please confirm whether a Proposer offering an equivalent solution based on open standards (OIDC, SAML 2.0, IMAP/SMTP, WebDAV, CalDAV) without Microsoft dependency would be considered compliant.

Answer to Question 371:

References within the RFP to Microsoft technologies, services, or collaboration platforms reflect the Beneficiary's current operational ecosystem, existing infrastructure landscape, institutional operational practices, interoperability requirements, and compatibility objectives.

The Beneficiary clarifies that:

- the proposed solution may use equivalent technologies and open standards where compatible with the operational and interoperability requirements defined in the RFP;
- equivalent solutions based on interoperable standards such as OIDC, SAML 2.0, OAuth 2.0, SMTP/IMAP, WebDAV, CalDAV, or equivalent mechanisms may be proposed provided that the overall solution ensures equivalent functionality, interoperability, operational usability, security, auditability, supportability, and integration capabilities within the Beneficiary's operational environment.

Compliance shall be evaluated based on the overall capability of the proposed solution to meet the functional, technical, interoperability, operational, and security requirements defined in the procurement documentation.

Question 372: Please confirm whether a Total Cost of Ownership (TCO) comparison has been performed between: (a) the Microsoft-centric ecosystem currently specified; and (b) alternative ecosystems based on open standards or European sovereign solutions. If yes, please provide the analysis.

Answer to Question 372:

The procurement documentation and associated technical requirements were prepared based on the Beneficiary’s operational needs, institutional context, interoperability objectives, existing infrastructure landscape, implementation constraints, operational sustainability considerations, and Project objectives.

At this stage, no separate detailed comparative TCO study between proprietary ecosystems and alternative open-standard ecosystems forms part of the procurement documentation released under the present procedure.

Question 373: Please justify, for DMS-RAE and the Portal subsystems, the architectural restriction to COTS solutions only, given that ROwaterDATA and SIGAR — subsystems of comparable complexity — are permitted to be custom-developed. What is the objective functional criterion that distinguishes them?

Answer to Question 373:

The architectural and implementation approaches defined within the RFP were established based on the specific operational characteristics, functional maturity expectations, implementation timelines, operational sustainability objectives, integration complexity, configurability requirements, and long-term maintainability considerations associated with each subsystem.

The Beneficiary notes that different subsystems within IWRACS address different operational domains and therefore may require different implementation approaches, including configurable COTS platforms, low-code approaches, hybrid architectures, or custom-developed components where considered appropriate for achieving the Project objectives.

Question 374: Please confirm whether solutions based on enterprise open-source components with contractual maintenance and support (e.g. Alfresco, Nuxeo, OpenKM, Liferay, Drupal, Plone, Nextcloud) are considered 'COTS' for the purposes of the RFP. Please specify the criteria by which a solution qualifies as 'COTS'.

Answer to Question 374:

For the purposes of the RFP, the qualification of a solution as COTS shall be assessed based on the existence of a mature, reusable, configurable, commercially supported software platform capable of meeting the operational, supportability, maintainability, upgradeability, interoperability, and warranty requirements defined in the procurement documentation.

Solutions based on enterprise-grade open-source platforms may be considered acceptable provided that they:

- are commercially supportable,
- include professional maintenance and update mechanisms,

- ensure operational sustainability,
- provide adequate documentation and vendor/integrator support,
- and comply with all functional, interoperability, operational, security, and contractual requirements defined in the RFP.

Question 375: Please indicate the estimated number of Proposers capable of cumulatively meeting all the requirements (COTS DMS + COTS Portal + Microsoft integration + custom development of ROwaterDATA and SIGAR + national integrations + WCAG + multi-language + manufacturer's authorisations), and the measures taken to ensure effective competition.

Answer to Question 375:

The Beneficiary prepared the procurement documentation in accordance with the applicable procurement framework and with the objective of ensuring fair competition, transparency, proportionality, interoperability, operational sustainability and achievement of the Project objectives.

The Beneficiary does not provide an estimate of the number of potential Proposers or market participants expected to submit proposals under this procedure.

Economic operators are responsible for assessing their own capacity to deliver the requested solution, either individually or through legally permissible association, subcontracting, consortium or partnership arrangements, in accordance with the procurement documentation.

The requirements were defined based on the functional, technical, operational and institutional needs of the Project and are not intended to restrict competition. The requested technology mix, including COTS-based components for the DMS and Portal, integration with the Beneficiary's existing Microsoft environment, and custom development for ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, is considered achievable for mid-size and large IT companies, as well as for consortia or associations of economic operators with complementary expertise.

Question 376: Please specify the contractual mechanisms protecting the Beneficiary against: (a) Microsoft licensing price increases over the operational life of IWRACS; (b) discontinuation of the chosen COTS products; (c) migration costs in case of a future decision to change the solution.

Answer to Question 376:

The RFP documentation include requirements regarding:

- operational continuity,
- interoperability,
- portability of data,
- documentation transfer,
- knowledge transfer,
- administrative configurability,
- and operational sustainability.

The proposed solution shall support export, interoperability, transition, and operational continuity capabilities necessary to reduce dependency risks and facilitate future operational evolution where required.

Future licensing models, subscription pricing, vendor product evolution, technology lifecycle decisions, and future migration strategies remain subject to institutional operational, budgeting, procurement, and governance decisions applicable during the operational lifecycle of the system.

Question 377: Please clarify the number of users for the DMS (back office) component.

Answer to Question 377:

For planning and sizing purposes, the DMS-RAE back-office component shall be considered in correlation with the DMS-RAE training requirements defined in the RFP.

As an indicative minimum, the Proposer shall consider approximately 85–135 DMS-RAE back-office key users and administrators, composed of:

- at least 10 IT/System administrators responsible for system administration, configuration, security management, integration oversight and ongoing maintenance of DMS-RAE;
- approximately 75–125 key users and content owners, based on 5 indicative training hubs with 15–25 participants per hub, covering representatives from SCAR and the 11 ABA offices.

In addition, the broader DMS-RAE (front office) user base shall include personnel working with documents and electronic registry activities, as reflected in the RFP training requirements.

The final number of DMS-RAE users, including named users, concurrent users, administrators, key users, power users and organizational distribution, shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the Beneficiary's organizational structure, rollout approach and approved user-role model.

Question 378: Please clarify whether, for the requested non-key experts, their nomination and the submission of supporting documents are required at the time of bid submission, or whether they may be nominated after the contract is signed?

Answer to Question 378:

As stated in Section 2.7.4 of the RFP, submission of CVs for non-key experts is not mandatory at bidding stage, unless specifically requested by the Beneficiary.

Accordingly, non-key experts are not required to be nominated at bidding stage. The successful Proposer shall nominate and mobilize the necessary non-key experts during contract implementation, in accordance with the agreed workplan and project requirements.

The Proposer shall, however, ensure the availability of suitably qualified non-key experts and supporting staff necessary for the execution of the Contract, including, as applicable, software developers, QA/testing specialists, system administration and security specialists, infrastructure/network specialists, trainers, training material developers and documentation specialists.

The Proposer remains fully responsible for ensuring that any non-key experts mobilized during contract implementation are appropriately qualified for the tasks assigned.

Question 379: Please accept a postponement of the bid submission deadline by at least 14 business days, specifically until at least July 8, 2026, given the particular complexity of the contract, the dependence on partners and suppliers whose responses require extensive analysis time, as well as the need for accurate pricing to prepare a competitive bid.

Answer to Question 379:

The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3 and Amendment No. 4 to the RFP for the revised submission date and related details.

Question 380: Regarding 3.1 Computing Hardware Specifications: Please clarify if the required computing resources Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) and/or Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) will be provided by The Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests, or should be included in the Proposer 's proposal?

Answer to Question 380:

The required computing resources for IWRACS shall be defined in accordance with Section 1.4.7 of the RFP.

The solution shall be designed to support deployment either within the future ADR Government Private Cloud, based on Microsoft Azure Stack Hub or an equivalent platform, or alternatively within the NARW Azure tenant, using IaaS and/or SaaS models, as agreed with the Beneficiary in analysis phase.

Proposers are not required to include the procurement of the Beneficiary's cloud infrastructure itself in their financial proposal, unless they propose specific SaaS subscriptions, COTS hosting services or other cloud-based services as part of their own solution.

However, as Section 1.4.7 stated: "For custom-developed systems such as ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, prepare and submit a comprehensive inventory of all required software licenses, excluding pricing information, specifying at a minimum the product name, version, edition or model, quantity, license duration, and intended purpose. All such licenses shall be procured and owned by the Beneficiary.

Question 381: Is participation in association / consortium with other companies permitted?

Answer to Question 381:

Participation in the procurement process as a Joint Venture (JV), consortium, association, or other legally permitted grouping of firms is allowed, in accordance with ITP 4.1.

In the case of a Joint Venture, all members shall be jointly and severally liable for the execution of the Contract and shall designate an authorized representative empowered to act on behalf of all members during the procurement process and contract implementation.

The ualification requirements applicable to Joint Ventures shall be assessed in accordance with Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria and the provisions of the RFP relating to Joint Ventures.

Question 382: Does the scope include any hardware, infrastructure or third-party software licenses, or is it limited to software design, development, integration and implementation services?

Answer to Question 382:

The scope includes software design, configuration, development, integration, implementation, testing, deployment, and training services, as required by the RFP.

The underlying cloud hosting infrastructure shall be provided through the agreed Beneficiary environment, namely the future ADR Government Private Cloud or the NARW Azure tenant, as confirmed during the analysis and design phase. The Proposer shall identify all required infrastructure, software components, third-party products, COTS solutions, licenses, and subscriptions necessary for the proposed solution. Licenses to be procured and owned by the Beneficiary shall be listed in the licences inventory required under chapter 1.4.7.

Question 383: Have any clarifications, amendments or supplementary documents already been issued for this procedure?

Answer to Question 383:

The Purchaser has issued Addendum No. 1, Amendment No. 2, Amendment No. 3, Amendment No. 4 and Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

No clarifications have been issued prior to the publication of the present Clarification Responses.

Any clarifications and amendments issued by the Purchaser shall form an integral part of the RFP and shall be taken into account by all Proposers when preparing their Proposals.

Question 384: Is there an estimated contract value or budget range available for this procurement?

Answer to Question 384:

The Purchaser does not disclose the estimated contract value or any indicative budget range.

Proposers shall prepare their Technical and Financial Proposals based on the scope, requirements, implementation schedule, pricing schedules, and contractual provisions set out in the RFP.

Financial Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation methodology and requirements specified in the RFP.

Question 385: Are international reference projects accepted for demonstrating similar experience?

Answer to Question 385:

Yes. International reference projects may be accepted, provided they meet the qualification and similarity requirements set out in the RFP and are supported by appropriate documentation. The Evaluation Committee will assess their relevance based on the submitted information and evidence.

Contract Schedule and Implementation Timeline

Question 386: According to GCC 8.1, the Works shall commence within five (5) days after the Contract becomes effective, while the implementation schedule is expressed in weeks counted from that moment (T0). Kindly indicate the estimated date of contract signature and effectiveness. We require this information to correlate the 60-week implementation period with the loan closing date (30 June 2028), especially considering that the Proposal validity period is limited to 120 days.

Answer to Question 386:

The Purchaser is not in a position to provide an estimated date for Contract signature or Contract effectiveness.

Proposers shall prepare their Proposals on the basis of the implementation schedule and contractual provisions set out in the RFP.

In accordance with the Contract, the implementation schedule shall commence from the Effective Date of the Contract (T0), and all milestones shall be measured relative to that date.

Any dates indicated in the RFP, including the Project implementation schedule and reporting milestones, shall be interpreted accordingly.

Question 387: Please clarify whether the maintenance and technical support period lasts for twelve (12) months following the acceptance (Go-Live) of each subsystem, or whether it must end no later than March 2028 regardless of the actual Go-Live date. If March 2028 represents a fixed deadline, please confirm whether both the implementation schedule and this support period will be recalculated based on the actual Contract Effective Date.

Answer to Question 387:

The provisions referred to in the question have been revised by Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.

In accordance with the amended SCC Clause 12.1(g), each of the first three (3) subsystems shall include a technical support period of four (4) months commencing from its respective Go-Live date and two (2) months technical support period shall apply to the fourth subsystem (SIGAR).

Accordingly, the previously referenced twelve (12)-month support period no longer applies. The support period is determined by the amended Contract provisions and shall be calculated from the respective Go-Live date of each applicable subsystem.

Payment for Technical Support Services shall be made only for the Technical Support Services actually provided and accepted by the Purchaser, based on the actual support period applicable to each subsystem and in accordance with the RFP provisions.

Proposers shall price Technical Support Services and any other recurrent costs only in accordance with the amended Price Schedules and the amended scope of services set out in the RFP.

Financial Proposal and Evaluation Methodology

Question 388: Please explain how recurrent costs (both those included within the warranty period and those related to post-warranty support) are considered in the calculation of the financial score (60%). Our question arises from the fact that ITP 39.1 indicates that the discount rate is "not applicable", while the criterion "Present Value of Recurrent Costs" under ITP 36.1(f) is marked "No". Please confirm whether such costs are included or excluded from the evaluated Proposal Price.

Answer to Question 388:

The evaluation of Financial Proposals shall be carried out in accordance with the methodology set out in the RFP.

As provided in Section III, Item 4(b), the Recurrent Costs priced in Price Schedules 3.3 and 3.5 shall form part of the Evaluated Proposal Price.

As indicated in ITP 36.1(f), as amended by Amendment no. 5, the criterion "Present Value of Recurrent Costs" is applicable to this procurement. Accordingly, the Recurrent Costs included in the Evaluated Proposal Price shall be discounted to their Net Present Value (NPV) using a discount rate of five percent (5%) per annum.

Costs associated with the 24-month Warranty Services are deemed included in the Supply and Installation Contract Price and shall not be priced separately as Recurrent Costs.

Question 389: Kindly indicate the advance payment percentage provided under the SCC corresponding to GCC 12.1, as this directly impacts cash-flow planning and the Advance Payment Security Requirements.

Answer to Question 389:

The Advance Payment percentage is ten percent (10%) of the entire Supply and Installation Contract Price, exclusive of Recurrent Costs, as specified in SCC GCC Clause 12.1(a).

The Advance Payment shall be made against receipt of the corresponding claim and the Advance Payment Security required under the Contract.

Question 390: GCC 28.2 establishes delay damages of 0.5% per week of delay calculated on the Contract Price (excluding recurrent costs), but does not specify a maximum cap. Please confirm the maximum aggregate amount of delay damages applicable under the Contract.

Answer to Question 390:

The applicable liquidated damages are 0.5% of the Contract Price (exclusive of Recurrent Costs), or the relevant part of the Contract Price where a Subsystem has not achieved Operational Acceptance, for each week of delay.

In accordance with GCC Clause 28.2, the aggregate amount of liquidated damages shall in no event exceed ten percent (10%) of the Contract Price (exclusive of Recurrent Costs). Once this maximum amount is reached, the Purchaser may consider termination of the Contract in accordance with GCC Clause 41.2.2.

Question 391: Please clarify whether the Proposal may be submitted entirely in Euro (EUR) or whether the financial offer must be expressed in Romanian Lei (RON).

Answer to Question 391:

In accordance with ITP 17.2, the Proposer may express the Proposal Price in any currency.

If the Proposer wishes to be paid in a combination of currencies, it may quote its price accordingly, subject to the limitations set out in ITP 17.2.

For evaluation and comparison purposes, proposals will be converted into a single currency in accordance with the provisions of the RFP.

Expert Team and Effort Estimation

Question 392: The effort estimation tables included in the annexes contain the profile "QA" (Quality Assurance), although this role is not listed among the six Key Experts defined under Section 2.7 (PM, BA, SA, TL, DEV, CSE). Please confirm that QA and other supporting profiles are considered non-key experts and clarify whether their rates must be included and financially evaluated within the Proposal.

Answer to Question 392:

Confirmed. The QA profile and other supporting profiles included in the effort estimation tables are to be understood as non-key experts / supporting roles, in accordance with Section 2.7.4 of the RFP.

They are not part of the six Key Expert positions identified in Section 2.7 — PM, BA, SA, TL, DEV and CSE — and are therefore not subject to the Key Expert CV evaluation requirements, unless otherwise expressly requested by the Beneficiary.

The evaluation of personnel qualifications at Proposal stage shall be limited to the Key Experts identified in the RFP.

Since the Contract is based on a lump-sum pricing approach, Proposers are not required to submit or price separate man-day rates for QA or other non-key experts, unless specifically required by the Price Schedules.

However, the Proposers shall include within its lump-sum offer all costs necessary to mobilize qualified non-key experts and supporting staff required for the successful delivery of the Contract, including QA/testing, documentation, training, infrastructure, security and other supporting activities.

Question 393: Please clarify whether the estimated number of person-days presented in the annexes is mandatory for the preparation of the financial proposal or whether it serves only as an indicative estimate, allowing Proposers to submit their own effort estimations provided that the implementation schedule and contractual deadlines are respected.

Answer to Question 393:

The estimated number of person-days presented in the annexes is indicative and is provided solely to assist Proposers in understanding the anticipated level of effort associated with the implementation of the Information System. It does not represent a mandatory effort allocation for the preparation of the Financial Proposal.

Since the Contract is based on a **lump-sum pricing approach**, Proposers may submit their own effort estimates and resource allocation, based on their proposed methodology, technical solution and implementation approach.

However, the Proposer remains fully responsible for delivering the complete scope of work, meeting all technical requirements, respecting the implementation schedule and achieving the contractual milestones and deadlines defined in the RFP.

IV. Cloud Infrastructure and Licensing

Question 394: Please clarify how licenses for the COTS products (DMS-RAE and Portal) should be priced. The Supply and Installation Cost Sub-Tables (3.1 and 4.1) appear to contain only service related items and do not include a dedicated line for product licenses, while Section 5.2.4 indicates that maintenance and updates for these products will be contracted directly by the Beneficiary. Specifically, please clarify:

a) Whether the initial acquisition of the COTS licenses (perpetual licenses or first subscription term) shall be included in the Proposal Price and, if so, under which pricing line item, or whether such licenses will be procured directly by the Beneficiary and therefore should not be quoted by the Proposer.

b) If the responsibility lies with the Proposer, please indicate the expected licensing model (IaaS with licenses supplied by the Proposer, or SaaS subscription model) and the period for which licensing costs should be quoted, considering the 24-month warranty period and the support period ending in March 2028

c) Whether license renewals and maintenance services for the COTS products after system acceptance remain, as suggested in Section 5.2.4, the responsibility of the Beneficiary.

Answer to Question 394:

a) DMS-RAE and the Centralized NARW Portal may be proposed as COTS solutions, if they comply with the functional, technical, security, interoperability, deployment and licensing requirements of the RFP.

The Supply and Installation Cost Summary Table includes dedicated line items for **DMS-RAE** and **Centralized NARW Portal**, with corresponding Cost Sub-Tables **3.1** and **4.1**. Therefore, Proposers shall include in their Proposal Price all costs necessary for the supply, installation, configuration, deployment, integration and operational readiness of the proposed DMS-RAE and Portal solutions, including any COTS product licenses or initial subscription rights required for the solution to be delivered and accepted.

The Proposal Price shall include perpetual usage rights for the proposed COTS solution, or licensing rights of equivalent effect, allowing the Beneficiary to continue using the solution after Operational Acceptance without interruption and without additional mandatory licensing fees during the warranty period.

All licensing assumptions and dependencies shall be clearly stated in the Proposer's offer.

b) The RFP does not prescribe a single mandatory licensing model for DMS-RAE and the Portal.

Proposers may propose an appropriate licensing model for their COTS solution, including IaaS deployment with product licenses supplied by the Proposer, SaaS subscription, perpetual licensing, term subscription or another equivalent model, provided that the proposed model is compatible with the hosting and deployment requirements of the RFP and ensures full operation of the solution after Operational Acceptance without interruption and without additional mandatory licensing fees during the warranty period.

The Proposer shall clearly indicate in its Proposal the proposed licensing model, license duration, number and type of users or usage metrics, environments covered, renewal assumptions and any dependencies on Beneficiary-provided infrastructure or services.

c) The Proposal Price shall include all licenses, subscription rights and licensing entitlements required for the operation of the proposed DMS-RAE and Portal solutions at minimum throughout the period covered by the Contract, including the applicable warranty period.

Question 395: Please confirm that all cloud resource consumption (compute, storage, networking), for production, development, testing, training and disaster recovery environments, throughout implementation, warranty and support periods, will be provided by the Beneficiary and/or ADR Government Cloud, without any cost to the Proposer.

Answer to Question 395:

The underlying cloud resource consumption, including compute, storage, networking and related infrastructure services for production, development, testing, training and disaster recovery environments, is expected to be provided through the Beneficiary's approved hosting environment, namely the ADR Government Cloud or the NARW Azure tenant, as applicable.
Accordingly, Proposers are not expected to include cloud infrastructure consumption costs in their Proposal Price. The Contractor shall, however, define the required infrastructure sizing, environments, capacity assumptions, availability and disaster recovery requirements during the analysis phase, in collaboration with the Beneficiary and in accordance with Section 1.4.7.

The Contractor shall remain responsible for designing, configuring, deploying and operating the delivered solution in accordance with the agreed architecture and considering the characteristics, constraints and service levels of the underlying cloud infrastructure.

Question 396: Please clarify who is responsible for providing third-party or embedded software licenses required by the custom-developed systems (for example, operating systems, Microsoft SQL Server referenced in Section 2.7.3.4, middleware components, etc.). Are such licenses already available within the ADR Government Cloud infrastructure, or must they be supplied by the Proposer? If they are to be supplied by the Proposer, please indicate where such costs should be included in the financial proposal, considering that the software inventory for custom-developed systems is required to be submitted “without prices”.

Answer to Question 396:

Based on Section 1.4.7 of the RFP, the Proposer shall identify all third-party or embedded software licenses required for the custom-developed systems, including, where applicable, operating systems, database management systems, middleware, runtime components, integration components and other supporting software. Those costs should not be included in the financial proposal.

The Proposer shall submit a comprehensive software license inventory, excluding pricing information, specifying at least the product name, version, edition or model, quantity, license duration and intended purpose. This inventory is required so that the Beneficiary can review, approve and, where applicable, procure the necessary licenses.

At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot confirm that all such licenses are already available within the ADR Government Cloud or the NARW Azure tenant. The availability of any existing licenses, including Microsoft SQL Server or other platform components, shall be confirmed during the analysis phase, based on the selected hosting environment and approved architecture.

Question 397: Our solution will be installed in Azure or in ADR cloud. In both cases we do not have control of existing infrastructure, then we cannot control on what premises some processes are running. Due to this is impossible to organize a DR solution. Please confirm that DR is organized by infrastructure provider with his own mechanism.

Answer to Question 397:

Not confirmed as stated. DR is not organized exclusively by the infrastructure provider. The Consultant shall propose an appropriate DR architecture, while the final recovery model, connectivity, RTO/RPO and infrastructure arrangements shall be agreed during the analysis phase, based on the capabilities of the selected hosting environment.

Additional details are provided in **Clarification No. 1, Answers to Questions 53, 54 and 347**, and in **Amendment No. 5, Article 12 – Section 1.6.0**.

Question 398: In chapter 1.4.6 there are some requirements for hardware infrastructure. We suppose that proposed infrastructure (ADR, Azure) meets these requirements. One proposed solution (ADR) is based on Microsoft Hub Stack and will be soon out of Microsoft extended support. Please confirm that problems related with ADR lack of support are not our concern or responsibilities.

Answer to Question 398:

Not confirmed as stated. The current and future support status of the ADR platform cannot be formally confirmed at this stage. Infrastructure failures outside the Consultant’s reasonable control are excluded from availability measurement; however, the Consultant shall ensure that the proposed solution is compatible with the approved hosting environment and shall identify relevant dependencies, limitations and risks.

Additional details are provided in **Clarification No. 1, Answers to Questions 55 and 380**, and in **Amendment No. 5, Article 12 – Section 1.6.0**.

Question 399: If the solution will be located in ADR cloud, we will use cloud services available in that infrastructure (DB, security, etc). Please give us a list of available services and associated costs if there are.

Answer to Question 399:

A final list of ADR cloud services and associated costs cannot be provided at this stage. 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.

The Beneficiary's cloud infrastructure costs shall not be included in the Financial Proposal, except for specific SaaS subscriptions, COTS hosting services or other cloud services proposed as part of the Consultant's solution.

Additional details are provided in Clarification No. 1, Answers to Questions 13, 55, 348 and 380.

Question 400: In view of the current status of the procedure, as outlined below, we respectfully request an extension of the submission deadline for the Technical and Financial Proposals. At this moment, the answers to the clarification requests submitted by prospective proposers have not yet been communicated. As you know, any clarification that modifies, supplements, or reinterprets the original RFP documentation may require substantial adjustments to the technical solution, implementation plan, and financial proposal. A reasonable period is therefore necessary to ensure that all bidders can properly integrate the clarifications and prepare compliant, accurate, and high-quality proposals.
We would also like to highlight that this period coincides with the summer vacation season. Many key technical and financial experts are already scheduled to be out of office, and it would be unreasonable to expect teams to remain on standby indefinitely awaiting clarifications and then produce a complete proposal under compressed timelines.
Additionally, we kindly draw attention to several objective considerations:

- The complexity and multidisciplinary nature of the IWRACS system requires coordinated input from software architects, hydrology specialists, hardware suppliers, cybersecurity experts, and financial analysts.
- Any change in requirements or interpretation may impact system architecture, integration assumptions, cost modelling, and supplier quotations.
- Ensuring equal treatment and fair competition requires that all bidders have sufficient time to adjust their proposals once clarifications are issued.
- A short preparation window increases the risk of rushed submissions, which may affect the overall quality and comparability of proposals.

Considering these factors, and in order to maintain a fair, transparent, and competitive process, we respectfully propose that the revised submission deadline be set for mid-September 2026. This timeline would allow all bidders to incorporate the forthcoming clarifications and finalize their proposals in a professional and compliant manner.

Answer to Question 400:
The Purchaser has extended the Proposal submission deadline. Please refer to Amendment No. 5.

Question 401: The RFP requires the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet (the "Portal") to be implemented or modernized using a configurable CMS-based Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution. At the same time, the RFP expressly allows the use of open-source software, subject to appropriate licensing, security, documentation, support, and maintenance requirements.
Question:

Please confirm whether a mature, market-available and configurable open-source CMS/product, supported by an appropriate enterprise/commercial support and maintenance model, may be proposed as the COTS platform for the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet, provided that it fully complies with all functional, technical, security, interoperability, support and maintenance requirements of the RFP.

Answer to Question 401:

Confirmed.

A mature, market-available and configurable open-source CMS/product may be proposed as the COTS platform for the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet, provided that it is supported by an appropriate enterprise/commercial support and maintenance model and fully complies with all functional, technical, security, interoperability, licensing, documentation, support and maintenance requirements of the RFP.

The fact that the underlying product is distributed under an open-source license does not, by itself, exclude it from being considered a COTS solution, provided that it is an established, reusable, configurable product available on the market and not developed specifically for this Contract.

The Proposer shall clearly identify the applicable open-source licenses, support arrangements, maintenance model, security update mechanisms and any third-party components included in the proposed solution.

Question 402: Acceptance of a Custom-Developed Solution for the Centralized NARW Portal

The RFP specifies that the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet shall be based on a configurable CMS-based COTS solution and further indicates that its implementation may require configuration, tailoring and limited custom development.

Question:

Please clarify whether the Purchaser would accept, as compliant, a fully custom-developed or predominantly custom-developed solution for the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet, instead of a COTS-based CMS platform, provided that the proposed solution fully meets or exceeds all functional, technical, security, interoperability, performance, support and maintenance requirements specified in the RFP.

If the answer is No, please confirm that the use of a COTS-based CMS platform is a mandatory requirement, and that custom development is permitted only for configuration, tailoring, integrations and limited extensions of the proposed COTS platform.

Answer to Question 402:

No.

The RFP requires the Centralized NARW Portal – Intranet & Extranet to be implemented or modernized using a configurable CMS-based COTS solution.

Accordingly, a fully custom-developed or predominantly custom-developed Portal solution would not comply with this requirement.

Custom development is permitted only to the extent necessary for configuration, tailoring, integrations, workflows, interfaces and project-specific extensions of the proposed COTS platform.

The proposed Portal solution shall therefore retain a clearly identifiable, mature and cloud-ready CMS-based COTS product as its foundation and shall comply with all functional, technical, security, interoperability, performance, support, maintenance and implementation timeline requirements of the RFP.

An open-source CMS can still qualify as COTS if it is a mature, market-available, configurable product with an appropriate support and maintenance model. That would be compatible with the RFP. A bespoke Portal built specifically for IWRACS would not.

Question 403: The bidding documents require at least six Key Experts, each assigned to a single position, but incorrectly use the wording “the five (6) Key Experts”, while the personnel form contains only three positions, one of which is pre-filled for the Cybersecurity Expert. The six identified profiles are PM, BA, SA, TL, DEV, and CSE.

“Please confirm that the Bidder must propose at least six distinct individuals for the six Key Expert positions provided for under Section 2.7.3, namely Project Manager, Business/System Analyst, Solution/System Architect, Technical Lead, Senior Developer, and Cybersecurity Expert, with each individual being permitted to occupy only one Key Expert position. Furthermore, please confirm that

the ‘Personnel Capabilities – Key Personnel’ form may be duplicated or extended to cover all six positions, without such adaptation being considered an unauthorized amendment to the form.”
This is one of the mandatory questions.

Answer to Question 403:
Confirmed.
The correct number of Key Experts is six (6). The reference to “the five (6) Key Experts” is a typo error and shall be read as “the six (6) Key Experts.”
The Proposer shall propose six distinct individuals for the positions of Project Manager, Business/System Analyst, Solution/System Architect, Technical Lead, Senior Developer and Cybersecurity Expert. Each individual may be proposed for only one Key Expert position.
The Personnel Capabilities form may be duplicated or extended to include all six positions, without being considered an unauthorized amendment.

Question 404: The personnel form states that it must be completed by the Bidder and, in the case of a Joint Venture, by each member. It is unclear whether each member must present its own complete team or whether a single team must be presented at Joint Venture level.
“In the case of a Joint Venture, please clarify whether the ‘Personnel Capabilities – Key Personnel’ form must be completed only once, on a consolidated basis, for the team proposed by the Joint Venture, indicating the member providing each expert, or whether each Joint Venture member must submit a separate form.”
Answer to Question 404:
For Joint Venture, the Personnel Capabilities – Key Personnel form shall be completed on a consolidated basis for the entire Joint Venture.
The Joint Venture members are not required to submit separate complete Key Expert teams. The consolidated form shall identify the JV member providing each expert.

Question 405: External Experts or Employees of Subcontractors
The bidding documents do not expressly require the Key Experts to be employees of the Bidder or of the Joint Venture members.
“Please confirm that the Key Experts may be individuals who are not employed under individual employment agreements by the Bidder or the Joint Venture members and may be made available based on declarations of availability signed by the respective experts.”
Answer to Question 405:
Confirmed.
Key Experts are not required to be employees of the Proposer or of a Joint Venture member.
They may be external experts or consultants made available for the assignment, provided that their availability and commitment are demonstrated through an appropriate declaration of availability or equivalent commitment.
The Proposer remains responsible for their mobilization and performance.

Question 406: Mandatory Documents for Experts
Section 2.7.2 requires CVs and supporting evidence “as applicable”, listing diplomas, certifications, references, or similar evidence only as examples. Section 2.7.6 allows the
Purchaser to subsequently request additional evidence. It is unclear which documents must mandatorily be included in the Proposal in order to avoid its rejection.
“Please specify the minimum list of supporting documents that must be submitted with the Proposal for each Key Expert. In particular, please confirm whether the following documents are mandatory:
a) educational diploma;
b) professional certifications mentioned in the CV;
c) references or certificates issued by employers or beneficiaries.”

Answer to Question 406:
For each Key Expert, the Proposal shall include the CV and supporting evidence, sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the minimum requirements of the respective position.

Such evidence may include diplomas, required professional certifications, recommendations, references, certificates or other equivalent documents demonstrating the qualifications and experience claimed.
The Beneficiary may request clarifications or additional supporting evidence during evaluation in accordance with Section 2.7.6.

Question 407: Language of Translations for Experts' Documents
There is a direct contradiction: the PDS requires supporting documents to be translated into English, whereas Section 2.7.6 requires certified Romanian translations for experts' documents issued in another language.
"Considering that ITP 10.1 establishes English as the language of the Proposal and of the translations of supporting documents, whereas Section 2.7.6 requires certified Romanian translations for documents relating to experts, please clarify the language in which such translations must be submitted. Please confirm whether documents issued in English may be submitted without a Romanian translation."

Answer to Question 407:
For Proposal submission and evaluation purposes, the language requirements set out in ITP 10.1 shall apply. Accordingly, supporting documents submitted with the Proposal shall be provided in English or accompanied by an accurate English translation.
Documents originally issued in English may be submitted without translation into Romanian.
Section 2.7.6 applies to clarifications and additional supporting evidence requested by the Beneficiary during the verification and validation process. Where such additional documents are issued in a language other than Romanian, they shall be submitted together with certified translations into Romanian.

Question 408: Considering the requirement on page 13, under ITP 10.1, concerning the language of the Proposal, please confirm that all legal documents issued by Romanian authorities, such as Certificates of Registration and Tax Certificates, as well as supporting documents and evidence of qualifications, such as CVs, diplomas, and certificates relating to previous projects, may be submitted in their original Romanian language, provided that they are accompanied by a plain English translation in accordance with ITP 10.1.
Furthermore, please confirm that these translations do not require certification, notarization, or legalization, since ITP 10.1 refers to an "accurate translation" and not to a "certified" or "notarized translation", thereby avoiding unnecessary costs and administrative delays.

Answer to Question 408:
Confirmed.
Legal documents, supporting documents and evidence of qualifications issued in Romanian may be submitted in their original Romanian language, provided that they are accompanied by an accurate English translation, in accordance with ITP 10.1.
English translations submitted as part of the Proposal are not required to be certified, notarized or legalized.
However, where the Beneficiary subsequently requests additional supporting evidence under Section 2.7.6, documents issued in a language other than Romanian shall be accompanied by certified translations into Romanian.

Question 409: Definition of "Systems of Comparable/Similar Complexity"
The wording "systems/projects of comparable/similar complexity" is repeatedly used in relation to experts, without providing a specific definition.
"Please specify the criteria used to determine whether the systems or projects presented for the Key Experts are of 'comparable complexity' or 'similar complexity'. In particular, please confirm whether the definition of the Bidder's similar experience under Subfactor 1.4.2 applies
or whether, for experts, similarity is assessed by reference to the duties and competencies specific to each position."

Ideally, the Purchaser should confirm the second interpretation. Otherwise, the requirements for demonstrating the experts' experience would become excessively restrictive.

Answer to Question 409:

For Key Experts, "comparable complexity" or "similar complexity" shall be assessed by reference to the nature, scope and complexity of the assignments performed by the expert and to the duties and competencies relevant to the respective Key Expert position.

The corporate similar-experience definition under Subfactor 1.4.2 does not automatically apply to the individual experience of Key Experts.

Relevant factors may include business-process complexity, implementation scale, stakeholders, integrations, data criticality, cloud technologies, workflows, document management, reporting and security requirements.

No single quantitative criterion shall be decisive.

Question 410: Experts' Scoring Methodology

The CVs account for 10%, while the experts' experience accounts for an additional 10%. A scale from 0 to 4 is used, but the bidding documents do not specify what constitutes a "slight" or "significant" exceedance of the requirements, nor how the score is distributed among the six experts.

"Please publish the detailed evaluation methodology for the subfactors 'CVs of proposed experts' and 'Experience of Key Experts', including:

a) the objective criteria for awarding scores of 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4;

b) the manner in which the score is distributed among the six Key Expert positions;

c) whether each expert is evaluated separately or the team is evaluated as a whole;

d) the number of years, projects, qualifications, or certifications required to obtain scores of 3 and 4;

e) the manner in which requirements identified as 'an advantage' contribute to the score

Answer to Question 410:

The evaluation of the subfactors "CVs of proposed experts" and "Experience of Key Experts" shall be carried out in accordance with the evaluation methodology, qualitative scoring scale, criteria and weightings set out in the RFP.

The minimum qualification and experience requirements applicable to each Key Expert are pass/fail requirements. Only Proposals demonstrating compliance with the minimum requirements for all six Key Experts shall be subject to scored evaluation.

No additional fixed numerical thresholds for years, projects, qualifications or certifications shall apply to scores 3 or 4 beyond those expressly stated in the RFP. Requirements identified as "an advantage" are not minimum requirements but may contribute positively to the qualitative assessment where relevant to the respective position.

Each expert shall be assessed against the requirements of the respective position, and the resulting assessment shall contribute to the overall score of the relevant subfactor in accordance with the RFP.

No additional scoring matrix or methodology shall be issued.

Question 411: "Prime" and "Alternate" Candidates

The Candidate Summary form contains the options "Prime" and "Alternate", although the bidding documents do not specify whether reserve experts are required or permitted.

"Please clarify whether Bidders are required or permitted to propose alternate candidates for the Key Expert positions. Where alternate candidates are permitted, please specify whether they must fully comply with the minimum requirements and whether they will be included in the evaluation and scoring of the Proposal."

Answer to Question 411:

The Proposer shall nominate one Prime candidate for each of the six Key Expert positions.

Alternate candidates are not required or requested under this procurement. Accordingly, the "Alternate" option included in the standard Candidate Summary form shall be considered not applicable.

The technical evaluation and scoring shall be based exclusively on the six candidates identified as Prime. Any subsequent replacement of a Key Expert shall be governed by Section 2.7.5.

Question 412: The criterion requires experience during the five years preceding the Proposal submission deadline. However, Form EXP 1.4.1 states that a calendar year may be listed only where there were at least nine months of contractual activity during that year. In the year in which the Proposal is submitted, nine months of activity cannot have elapsed by June.
"Please clarify the exact period to be taken into account for demonstrating at least five years of general experience and the application of the note in Form EXP 1.4.1 concerning at least nine months of contractual activity within a calendar year.
In particular, please specify:
a) the exact start and end dates of the reference period;
b) whether continuous experience is required;
c) whether the Bidder must demonstrate at least nine months of activity in each of the five years;
d) how the year in which the Proposal is submitted, which is an incomplete calendar year, will be taken into account."

Answer to Question 412:
The relevant reference period is the five-year period immediately preceding and ending on the final Proposal submission deadline.
Continuous contractual activity throughout that period is not required. The Proposer is not required to demonstrate at least nine months of activity in each of the five calendar years.
The nine-month note in Form EXP 1.4.1 is a reporting rule for completed calendar years and does not establish an additional annual qualification requirement. The incomplete calendar year in which the Proposal is submitted may be reported up to the Proposal submission deadline.

Question 413: Meaning of "Five Years of Experience"
"Please confirm whether the general experience requirement is fulfilled by demonstrating the performance of Information System contracts during the reference period, without requiring a single contract to have had a duration of five years and without adding together the durations of contracts performed simultaneously."

Answer to Question 413:
Confirmed.
The requirement concerns experience gained under Information System contracts during the applicable five-year reference period. It does not require one contract with a duration of five years. Overlapping contracts may be presented, but overlapping periods shall not be added together to create additional years of experience. Continuous contractual activity throughout the full reference period is not required.

Question 414: Evidence of General Experience
For general experience, the qualification table refers only to Form EXP 1.4.1 and does not expressly require contracts or acceptance documents.
"Please confirm whether, for the purpose of demonstrating the general experience required under Subfactor 1.4.1, the duly completed Form EXP 1.4.1 is sufficient, without attaching the contracts and acceptance documents. Where supporting documents are required, please specify the types of documents that will be accepted."

Answer to Question 414:
Form EXP 1.4.1 shall be duly completed. The form does not, however, replace any supporting documentation required by Section III of the RFP.
The Proposer shall submit the completed form together with documentation sufficient to verify the Information System contracts relied upon, including the relevant dates and the capacity in which the Proposer participated. The Purchaser may request clarification or additional evidence where the submitted information is insufficient.

Question 415: The criterion accepts as "substantially completed" a contract completed to an extent of at least 80%, including on the basis of accepted payments or activities. However, each contract must also have achieved "Successful Operational Acceptance", confirmed by an Operational

Acceptance Certificate. A contract that is only 80% complete would not normally have received final operational acceptance.
“Please clarify the relationship between:
- the possibility of relying on a contract completed to an extent of at least 80%, in accordance with the note relating to Subfactor 1.4.2; and
- the requirement that each contract must have achieved Successful Operational Acceptance, confirmed by an Operational Acceptance Certificate or equivalent document.
Please specify whether an ongoing contract that has been performed and accepted to an extent of at least 80% may be used to fulfil the requirement and which documents must be submitted in such circumstances.”

Answer to Question 415 - TBR by UMP
An ongoing contract may be used where at least 80% of the contract has been successfully performed and accepted, and the accepted portion includes a clearly identifiable operational system or phase that meets the applicable requirements of Subfactor 1.4.2. Final completion of the entire contract is not required.
The 80% threshold does not waive the Operational Acceptance requirement. Accepted payments or activities may evidence the percentage of completion, but the Proposer shall also provide an Operational Acceptance Certificate or an equivalent document issued or confirmed by the beneficiary, demonstrating that the qualifying system or operational phase has been placed into operation and accepted.
A contract that has reached 80% completion but has not achieved such operational acceptance does not qualify.
The Proposal shall include and provide sufficient evidence regarding the percentage performed and accepted, together with the Operational Acceptance Certificate or an equivalent document identifying the accepted scope and acceptance date. The Purchaser may request clarification or additional supporting evidence where necessary.

Question 416: “For the requirement concerning at least three contracts during the last five years, please specify the relevant event for determining whether a contract falls within the reference period: the contract signing date, the commencement date, the substantial completion date, the operational acceptance date, or the existence of a performance period overlapping with the last five years.”

Answer to Question 416:
The qualifying event is the successful or substantial completion and acceptance of the Information System, or of the clearly identifiable operational phase relied upon, as evidenced by the Operational Acceptance Certificate or equivalent document.
The contract-signing or commencement date is not decisive. A contract signed before the reference period may qualify if the relevant qualifying completion and acceptance occurred within the last five years. Mere overlap of an unaccepted performance period with the five-year window is not sufficient.

Question 417: The wording states that each similar contract must demonstrate all the listed characteristics: at least three components, two integrations, cloud-based or hybrid deployment, workflow and document management, RBAC, and operational acceptance.
“Please confirm whether each of the three contracts presented must individually meet all the characteristics listed under Subfactor 1.4.2 or whether these characteristics may be demonstrated cumulatively through the three contracts.”
Under a strict interpretation, the bidding documents require all the characteristics to be demonstrated by each individual contract. The question is particularly useful as a request to relax the requirement.

Answer to Question 417:
Each qualifying contract must individually demonstrate all six minimum characteristics specified under Subfactor 1.4.2. The characteristics may not be aggregated across different contracts.

A qualifying contract is not required to replicate the exact scope, architecture or four-subsystem structure of IWRACS, provided that it independently meets the minimum value and all six minimum characteristics.

Question 418: "Please specify which documents are considered equivalent to an Operational Acceptance Certificate. Please confirm whether the following documents are accepted, as applicable:
- acceptance reports issued upon completion of the services;
- final acceptance reports;
- certificates of satisfactory performance;
- performance certificates or equivalent records;
- references issued by the beneficiary;
- acceptance reports issued for individual stages or milestones;
- other documents issued by the beneficiary confirming that the system was placed into production and accepted."

Answer to Question 418:
Confirmed with clarification.
Equivalent documentation may include completion certificates, client acceptance protocols, signed delivery or acceptance reports, client confirmations, recommendation letters or certified extracts from contracts, provided that the document demonstrates successful or substantial completion to the Purchaser's satisfaction.
A document relating to a stage or milestone may be relied upon only where it covers a clearly identifiable operational scope that independently satisfies the applicable qualification requirements.
The Purchaser may request clarification or additional evidence where the submitted documentation is insufficient.

Question 419: "Considering that the similar experience threshold is set at the equivalent of EUR 1,000,000 for each contract, whereas Form EXP 1.4.2 (cont.) requires the equivalent value to be stated in USD, please specify the currency into which the conversion must be made.
Furthermore, please indicate:
a) the official source of the applicable exchange rate;
b) the date of the applicable exchange rate;
c) whether the exchange rate applicable on the contract signing date, the acceptance date, or the Proposal submission deadline must be used."

Answer to Question 419:
The applicable qualification threshold is EUR 1,000,000 for each qualifying contract. The reference to USD in Form EXP 1.4.2 (cont.) is a clerical inconsistency and shall be read as EUR.
Where conversion is required, the official exchange rate published by the National Bank of Romania and applicable on the date of the Operational Acceptance Certificate or equivalent acceptance document shall be used. The Proposer shall indicate the original contract value, the exchange rate and date applied, and the resulting EUR equivalent.
For clarity, the invoice-date exchange-rate rule introduced by Amendment No. 5 concerns payments in RON under SCC 12.1 and does not determine the conversion date for qualification evidence.

Question 420: "In the case of contracts performed as a Joint Venture member or subcontractor, please specify the documents accepted for demonstrating:
a) the value corresponding to the part performed by the economic operator;
b) the activities and responsibilities actually performed;
c) the similarity characteristics corresponding to the part performed.
Please confirm whether the Joint Venture or subcontracting agreement, the contract, financial annexes, the certificate issued by the beneficiary, and the acceptance documents will be accepted."

Answer to Question 420:

Only the economic operator’s own share, role, scope and responsibilities under the referenced contract shall be considered.
The submitted evidence shall identify the value attributable to that operator and the activities and similarity characteristics actually performed by it. Evidence may include the Joint Venture or subcontracting agreement, relevant contract extracts and financial annexes, beneficiary certificates, acceptance records or other equivalent documentation.

Question 421: “Please confirm that, in the case of a Joint Venture, the three similar contracts may be provided cumulatively by the Joint Venture members, for example, two contracts by one member and one contract by another member, without each member being individually required to present three similar contracts.”
This is largely clear from the table but should be confirmed where the Proposal relies on the experience of several Joint Venture members.

Answer to Question 421:
Confirmed.
For a Joint Venture, the three qualifying contracts may be demonstrated cumulatively by its members; for example, two by one member and one by another. Each member is not individually required to submit three contracts.
Each contract relied upon must nevertheless be successfully and substantially completed and must individually satisfy the minimum value and all similarity requirements. Values or experience from different members may not be aggregated to make one otherwise non-qualifying contract satisfy the minimum threshold.

Question 422: “Form EXP 1.4.2 does not include the ‘JV Member’ option, although Subfactor 1.4.2 permits the use of contracts performed in this capacity. Please confirm that Bidders may add the ‘JV Member’ option to the form and provide information concerning the percentage, value, and activities performed within the Joint Venture.”

Answer to Question 422:
Confirmed.
Where a referenced contract was performed as a Joint Venture member, the Proposer may add the “JV Member” option to Form EXP 1.4.2. The form shall state the participation percentage and the value, scope, activities and responsibilities actually performed by the economic operator.
This adaptation shall not be considered an unauthorized amendment to the form.

Question 423: “Please confirm that the main Form EXP 1.4.2 must be completed on a consolidated basis for all three contracts, while Form EXP 1.4.2 (cont.) must be completed separately for each contract presented. Please also confirm that the forms may be duplicated where the Bidder presents more than three contracts.”

Answer to Question 423:
Confirmed.
Form EXP 1.4.2 shall be completed on a consolidated basis to list the contracts presented by the Proposer or Joint Venture. Form EXP 1.4.2 (cont.) shall be completed separately for each contract relied upon.
The forms may be duplicated where additional contracts are presented, provided that their prescribed structure and requested information are preserved.

Question 424: “Please confirm that Bidders may duplicate the rows, pages, and sections of Forms EXP 1.4.1, EXP 1.4.2, Personnel Capabilities, and Candidate Summary, while preserving the content and structure of the requested information, without such action being considered an amendment to the wording of the forms.”

Answer to Question 424:
Confirmed.

Proposers may duplicate or extend the rows, pages and sections of Forms EXP 1.4.1, EXP 1.4.2, Personnel Capabilities and Candidate Summary as necessary, provided that the prescribed content, structure and requested information are preserved.
Such duplication or extension shall not be considered an amendment to the wording of the forms. Supplementary information may support, but shall not replace, the mandatory information required in the prescribed forms.

Question 425: "Please confirm that, for the Non-Key Experts provided for under Section 2.7.4, the bidding documents do not establish individual minimum requirements concerning education, number of years of experience, similar projects, or certifications and that their CVs and supporting documents do not have to be submitted with the Proposal.

Answer to Question 425:
Confirmed.
The RFP does not prescribe individual minimum education, experience, project or certification requirements for Non-Key Experts, and their CVs and supporting evidence are not required at Proposal stage unless specifically requested by the Beneficiary.
The successful Proposer remains responsible for mobilizing suitably qualified Non-Key Experts and supporting personnel and for including all associated costs in its lump-sum offer.

Question 426: Furthermore, please clarify whether the Bidder must nominate the Non-Key Experts in the Proposal or whether it is sufficient to present the personnel categories, estimated number of personnel, required competencies, and their planned mobilization as part of the Preliminary Project Plan."

Answer to Question 426:
Non-Key Experts are not required to be individually nominated at Proposal stage.
The Preliminary Project Plan shall identify the necessary personnel categories, indicative staffing, competencies, roles, responsibilities and planned mobilization. The successful Proposer shall nominate and mobilize the required Non-Key Experts during implementation in accordance with the agreed workplan and project requirements.

Question 427: Considering the requirement on page 196 (chapter 1.3.3.6), respectively: «ECA-RO: Automatic retrieval of official data required for documentation analysis, through APIs or direct database connection» and «HIDRA: Automatic transmission... of project identifiers...», please clarify whether for the ECA-RO and HIDRA systems there is an API-type documentation (REST/SOAP) available, or whether the integration will be done through direct access at the database level (SQL). Also, please provide us with the estimated transaction volumes (number of queries per hour/day) for each system, in order to correctly size the computing resources and integration connectors required in the technical proposal.

Answer to Question 427:
The final integration mechanism for ECA-RO and HIDRA shall be confirmed during the analysis phase based on the interfaces and access mechanisms available. Documented APIs are preferred; where unavailable, controlled import/export, direct database access or another approved mechanism may be used.
The Beneficiary cannot presently confirm complete API documentation, database access or sandbox/test environments for all scenarios, but will provide or facilitate available documentation, technical contacts, test data, credentials and testing arrangements.
The indicative planning figures in Annex 12, including available transaction-volume assumptions, shall be used for initial sizing. System-specific volumes and final sizing parameters shall be validated and refined during analysis and detailed design.

Question 428: Considering the requirement on page 197 (chapter 1.3.3.6), namely: «NARW Financial Systems (ASIS/ATHOS): Integration through API for invoice generation, payment monitoring, and linking of economic data with regulatory files», please clarify whether ASIS and ATHOS have a centralized API Gateway for the exposure of economic data or whether the development of point-to-point connectors for each individual system is required. Also, considering the integration with the Ghiseul.ro platform (page 187), please confirm if the financial flow is bidirectional (ASIS/ATHOS -> IWRACS -> Ghiseul.ro) and if there is a format specification for payment confirmation messages.

Answer to Question 428:
ASIS and ATHOS do not presently expose one centralized and fully documented public API covering all IWRACS integration scenarios. Dedicated APIs are expected to be made available for the agreed financial flows; the detailed endpoints, data structures, security mechanisms and test arrangements shall be defined during the analysis phase.
The Beneficiary cannot presently confirm the operational and technical arrangements for Ghiseul.ro across all relevant organizational units. The end-to-end flow, including invoice generation, payment initiation, confirmation and reconciliation, shall therefore be defined during analysis. Where available, the Beneficiary will facilitate access to the applicable documentation, credentials and testing arrangements.

Question 429: Considering the requirement on page 196 (chapter 1.3.3.6) and page 201 (D.1.1 Incoming external correspondence), respectively: «NARW Document Management System (DMS-RAE): The IWRACS subsystem supports the registration of requests... all maintained under the same electronic registry entry number», please confirm whether DMS-RAE will be the master system for managing unique registration numbers across the institution or whether IWRACS will generate its own registration numbers which it will later synchronize with DMS-RAE.

Answer to Question 429:
DMS-RAE shall manage the official institutional electronic-registry numbers.
Other IWRACS subsystems may initiate a registration request and use temporary internal identifiers for processing. The official number shall be assigned in accordance with the parameterized DMS-RAE numbering scheme and returned to the originating subsystem so that all related documents and actions remain traceable under the same registry entry.

Question 430: Considering the title of the contract: «Design, Supply, and Installation of the Integrated Water Resources Analysis Center System (IWRACS)» (page 1) and the hosting requirements on page 212 (section 1.4.7), please confirm our understanding that the term «Supply» does not imply the purchase of physical servers on-premise, but refers to the provision of the necessary software/COTS licenses and source code for custom components, with hosting provided exclusively in the Cloud environment (Azure Stack Hub or NARW Azure Tenant). In this respect, please confirm that the tenderer must not include CAPEX costs for the infrastructure hardware in the financial offer.

Answer to Question 430:
Confirmed.
The Contract does not include physical servers, other hardware or other physical equipment. “Supply” covers the delivered software solution, including required COTS licenses or subscription rights, custom-developed components and deliverable source code, configurations, integrations, documentation and related implementation services.
The underlying cloud infrastructure shall be provided through the hosting environment approved by the Beneficiary. Physical-server CAPEX shall not be included in the Financial Proposal.

Question 431: Considering the requirement on page 174 (chapter 1.3.1.5), respectively: «Support initial one-time or phased import of historical data, with clear identification of migrated records», please specify if the data from the legacy systems (ECA-RO, HIDRA, ASIS, ATHOS) are stored in a standardized/cleaned format or if the tenderer must include data cleansing and normalization activities in the migration effort. In the absence of a test (sample) dataset,
please specify the estimated total volume of records (in millions of rows/records) requested to be migrated to allow realistic sizing of the ETL script development effort.

Answer to Question 431:

Legacy data shall not be assumed to be fully standardized, cleansed or normalized.
The Contractor shall prepare the migration strategy, perform technical profiling, identify and report inconsistencies, prepare mapping and transformation scripts or tools, implement the agreed transformation and deduplication rules, load the agreed data, and perform migration testing and reconciliation.
The Beneficiary remains responsible for business validation, data-cleansing decisions, correction of source data and approval of migrated data. The Contractor is not responsible for reconstructing unavailable, incomplete or incorrect legacy data unless this is expressly agreed.
Annex 12 provides indicative capacity information. The final sources, datasets, historical periods, data quality and volumes shall be validated during the Data Migration Assessment Phase.

Question 432: Considering the requirements on page 164 (chapter 1.2, point 3 and 4) that provide for the use of COTS platforms for DMS-RAE and the NARW Portal, please clarify whether the Operational Acceptance Tests will be limited to the validation of configuration parameters and specific operational flows, or whether exhaustive testing of the native functionalities of COTS products that have not been modified by customization is required. Please specify if there is a distinct set of acceptance criteria for configured versus custom developed components.

Answer to Question 432:
Operational Acceptance Testing shall verify that the implemented DMS-RAE and Portal solutions comply with the contractual requirements.
For standard, unmodified COTS functionality, testing shall verify the functions required by the Contract, including their licensing, configuration and operational readiness. Native functions unrelated to the contractual requirements need not be exhaustively tested. Configurations, workflows, integrations, extensions and custom-developed components shall be tested against the applicable functional and non-functional requirements.
This test-design distinction does not replace the mandatory acceptance procedure. For each Software Module, the Contractor shall submit the Deliverable Report, the required narrative compliance statement, the source code and technical documentation required under the Contract, and the internal test report, including protocols, scenarios and results.
The Technical team shall issue either a Technical Acceptance Testing Report or written observations. After successful technical testing, the Reception Commission shall issue either further observations or the Quantitative and Qualitative Reception Certificate (PVRCC). The PVRCC is the basis for the corresponding Operational Acceptance Certificate and the right to invoice under SCC 12.1.
If the procedure is not completed within 45 calendar days for reasons solely attributable to the Purchaser, the remedy is the delay damages specified in SCC 27.2.2. No automatic, deemed or tacit Operational Acceptance arises.

Question 433: Considering the intellectual property and licensing requirements mentioned on page 211, please specify whether the intellectual property rights for the configurations and integration scripts developed for the COTS modules (DMS-RAE and Portal) will be transferred in full to the Beneficiary, or if they remain the property of the Provider, with the Beneficiary receiving only a perpetual use license. Please clarify this aspect so that you can correctly size the licensing and ownership costs in the financial offer.

Answer to Question 433:
The Purchaser shall obtain ownership of custom-developed source code, integrations, interfaces, business logic, workflows, configurations and related documentation developed specifically under the Contract.
Pre-existing proprietary software, COTS platforms, third-party frameworks, libraries and tools remain the property of their respective owners and are governed by their applicable licenses. The RFP does not require transfer of proprietary third-party or COTS source code not developed under the Contract.
Accordingly, Amendment No. 5's requirement to submit the complete source code and technical documentation for each Software Module applies to source code and materials required to be delivered under the Contract; it does not expand the transfer obligation to proprietary COTS source code that the Proposer does not own and is not entitled to transfer.

The Proposer shall clearly identify all COTS, third-party, open-source and pre-existing components and the applicable licensing conditions

Question 434: Considering the requirements on page 211 regarding «Separation of Environments», please confirm if the Contracting Authority will make available completely separate test and development environments (mirroring) for each subsystem (ROwaterDATA, SIGAR, DMS-RAE, Portal) or if the bidder is expected to configure these environments within the secured Azure/Government Cloud tenant, also bearing the resource consumption costs related to these environments throughout the implementation and testing phases."

Answer to Question 434:
Testing and Production environments shall, at a minimum, be provisioned within the Beneficiary's agreed hosting infrastructure. The final number, structure, separation and lifecycle of Development/Integration, Testing, Staging/UAT and Training environments shall be agreed during the analysis phase.
The RFP does not require a fully mirrored, physically separate cloud instance for each subsystem. Logical isolation, and combination of appropriate non-production environments, is acceptable where security, data integrity, testing independence and controlled deployment are maintained.
The Beneficiary shall bear the cloud-infrastructure costs for the approved environments. The Proposer shall define the required sizing and configure and deploy the solution within the approved hosting environment.

Question 435: Considering chapter 5.2 (page 153), regarding «Technical Support and Maintenance Services», please provide the Service Level Matrix (SLA) agreed by the Beneficiary, including response times and remedial times for incidents classified by severity levels (Critical, Major, Minor). In the absence of these parameters in the RFP, please confirm if they will be the ones defined in the head. 5.1.3 Warranty Response and Resolution Times or will be defined by negotiation before signing or if there is a technical annex containing these parameters and to be made available.

Answer to Question 435:
The response, escalation and resolution times in the SLA table under Section 5.1.3 shall apply to Technical Support Services under the amended Section 5.2. The replacement wording requires all incidents and support requests to follow the applicable SLA provisions of the Contract; Section 5.1.3 is the applicable contractual SLA table.
No separate SLA matrix is required. Detailed incident-reporting, classification, escalation, communication and monitoring procedures may be agreed during implementation, but shall not reduce the contractual service levels.

Question 436: Considering the requirements on page 211, section 1.4.7 (Hosting and Deployment Requirements), please confirm who will bear the consumption costs (Azure/Cloud credit) for the Development, Test and Acceptance (UAT) environments for the duration of the deployment period. Given that these are separate environments from the production environment, please confirm that all required environments with associated processing and storage resources will be provided by the Contracting Authority under the project.

Answer to Question 436:
The underlying cloud-resource consumption for the approved Production, Development, Testing, Training and Disaster Recovery environments—including compute, storage, networking and related infrastructure services—shall be provided through the Beneficiary's approved hosting environment. These infrastructure-consumption costs shall not be included in the Proposal Price.
The Proposer shall define the required sizing, environments, capacity, availability and disaster-recovery assumptions and shall configure and deploy the delivered solution.
Any product-specific SaaS subscription, COTS hosting service or other cloud service proposed as part of the Proposer's own solution shall be clearly identified and priced in accordance with the applicable Price Schedules.

Question 437: Considering the requirement on page 202 (chapter 1.3.4, section E. Electronic Signature), please clarify whether the DMS-RAE system must be compatible with a specific Qualified Trust Service Provider (QTSP) accredited in Romania or whether it must support an open architecture, capable of integrating any qualified certificate issued by eIDAS certified providers. Also, please confirm whether the applied electronic signatures will be of the «Electronic Seal» type (for documents issued by NARW) or «Qualified Electronic Signature» type signatures (for users).

Answer to Question 437:
NARW does not operate under one centralized institutional contract with a single Qualified Trust Service Provider. Qualified electronic-signature services are used through different arrangements across NARW organizational units.
The solution shall therefore support an open and interoperable architecture compatible with commonly used eIDAS-compliant qualified or advanced electronic-signature services and shall not be restricted to a single QTSP.
Depending on the applicable process, the solution shall support qualified electronic signatures applied by authorized users and electronic seals applied on behalf of NARW. The applicable signing method, workflow and validation approach shall be configured during the analysis phase.

Question 438: Considering the requirement on page 202 (chapter 1.3.4, section E. Electronic Signature), please confirm that electronic signature certificates are not part of the scope of the offered solution (they should not be considered in the technical proposal and provided by the bidder).

Answer to Question 438:
Confirmed.
Qualified certificates, trust-service arrangements, signing platforms and related subscriptions shall be provided or facilitated by the Beneficiary where required. Their procurement cost shall not be included in the Proposer's Financial Proposal.
The Proposer shall provide the functions and integration capabilities needed to use and validate the applicable eIDAS-compliant signature services.

Question 439: In view of the requirement on page 162 (chapter 1.1.2.d) regarding compliance with WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility standards, please specify whether the conformity assessment must be certified by an independent external audit or whether a self-assessment by the offeror supported by automated test reports is sufficient for the acceptance of this module at final acceptance.

Answer to Question 439:
An independent external accessibility certification is not required.
WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance shall be demonstrated through a documented assessment combining automated tests with appropriate manual verification, including keyboard navigation, focus order, screen-reader compatibility, form accessibility and semantic structure. Automated reports alone are not sufficient where manual verification is necessary.
The Beneficiary may verify accessibility compliance during testing and acceptance.

Question 440: Taking into account the «compliance by design» principle mentioned on page 160 (section 1.1.1.2), please confirm that, in the event of a change in the legislative framework (eg: amendment of annexes 1.a-1.g to Ord. 828/2019) appearing after the date of signing the contract, the adaptation of the flows in the SIGAR and ROwaterDATA system will be the subject of an additional act/Change Request, and is not part of the maintenance obligation bidder's correction.

Answer to Question 440:
The contractual baseline comprises the legislation, implementing acts, reporting requirements, schemas and templates applicable at Contract signature and/or confirmed during the analysis phase.
A subsequent legislative or regulatory change that materially changes the agreed scope, functionality, datasets, formats or implementation effort shall be managed through the applicable maintenance or change-control mechanism, in accordance with the Contract.

Amendment No. 5 replaces the former broad maintenance wording with a limited Technical Support scope. A legislative change may be handled within that scope only where it can be implemented as an approved configuration or parameter adjustment, approved update or minor operational adjustment within the Proposer's scope of control. For custom-developed components, the amended scope also permits minor adjustments necessary to ensure continued use during the support period.
Changes involving software development beyond those limited activities, major redesign, material additional effort or expansion of the agreed scope shall be addressed through formal change control and, where required, a Contract amendment.
Such legislative changes are not corrective bug-fixing under the Warranty.

Question 441: Considering the requirement on page 201 (D.1.3 Rest Leave request), respectively: «HR verification (leave balance and compliance), via internal logic and/or integration with HR/Payroll systems if available», please confirm if, in case the current HR/Payroll system of NARW does not allow an API integration (it is not available), it is sufficient to configure some static/manual validation rules in DMS-RAE. At the same time, please specify if there is a centralized database with employees' leave balances that can be imported into DMS-RAE.

Answer to Question 441:
At present, leave requests are managed using paper-based forms with handwritten signatures and manual registration. The availability of an API or other external HR/Payroll interface is not confirmed and shall be assessed during the analysis phase.
Where a Beneficiary-provided HR/Payroll interface is available, leave-balance verification may be integrated. In the absence of such an interface, verification of the actual leave balance shall be performed as a manual HR step within the workflow. Static rules may be configured for procedural or compliance checks that do not depend on the current authoritative balance.
At this stage, the Beneficiary cannot confirm the existence of a centralized electronic database of employee leave balances available for import. Any available data source, format and import approach shall be confirmed during the analysis phase.

Question 442: Considering the complexity and volume of the bidding documents, the extensive technical, qualification, and documentary requirements, as well as the time required for the preparation of a complete and compliant Proposal, including the collection, verification, and translation of supporting documents and the coordination of Joint Venture members, subcontractors, experts, and technology providers, please consider extending the Proposal submission deadline to a date in September 2026, preferably no earlier than 15 September 2026.
Such an extension would allow interested Bidders sufficient time to properly analyse the requirements, obtain the necessary clarifications and supporting documents, and prepare technically and financially substantiated Proposals, thereby facilitating effective competition and reducing the risk of incomplete or non-compliant submissions.
Please confirm the revised Proposal submission deadline.

Answer to Question 442: the deadline was modified by Amendment no. 5.

Question 443: Confirm the required envelope structure, sealing method and number of copies. Reconcile the wording in SPN §7 ("ORIGINAL PROPOSAL" / "TECHNICAL PART") with the layered inner/outer scheme in ITP 22.1 and the PDS requirement of one original plus one copy (hard-copy only; no electronic submission).

Answer to Question 443:
The Proposal shall be submitted in hard copy only, with one original and one copy of each Part. The original Technical Part and original Financial Part shall be placed in separate sealed envelopes and enclosed in an outer envelope marked "ORIGINAL PROPOSAL". The copy of each Part shall likewise be placed in separate sealed envelopes marked "COPIES: TECHNICAL PART" and "COPIES: FINANCIAL PART", enclosed in an outer envelope marked "PROPOSAL COPIES".
The "ORIGINAL PROPOSAL" and "PROPOSAL COPIES" envelopes shall then be enclosed in one final sealed outer submission envelope bearing the Proposer's identification, the Purchaser's address, the

RFP reference, and the warning not to open before the stated opening date and time. The SPN wording is a summary and does not replace the detailed sealing structure in ITP 22.1.

Question 444: For which specific items is a Manufacturer's Authorization Form (MAF) mandatory (e.g. proprietary DBMS, GIS, cloud platform, DMS or CMS products)?

Answer to Question 444:
A Manufacturer's Authorization Form is mandatory for each proprietary commercial software product proposed by the Proposer that the Proposer does not manufacture and for which it has or will establish an OEM/manufacturer relationship. This includes any proprietary DBMS, GIS product, cloud software, DMS, CMS/Portal platform, security product, middleware, or other COTS product meeting those conditions.
A MAF is not required for software manufactured by the Proposer or for open-source/freeware components. For proprietary products sourced through authorized distribution channels without an OEM relationship, the Proposer shall instead provide evidence satisfactory to the Purchaser that it is entitled to source and supply the product. Required MAFs shall accompany the Proposal.

Question 445: Confirm the exact combined-score formula and the cost weight. Section III lists the variables C, Clow, T, Thigh and X but does not render the equation. Is it the standard form B = X · (Clow / C) + (1 − X) · (T / Thigh) with X (cost) = 60 % and Rated (technical) = 40 %? Please also confirm the weighted-sum definitions of the Category Technical Score and the Total Technical Proposal Score, which are referenced but not rendered.
Source: Section III Combined / Technical Evaluation; PDS / ITP 32.1 & 39.1; SPN §4

Answer to Question 445:
Confirmed. The combined score is B = 0.60 × (Clow / C) + 0.40 × (T / Thigh), where the variables have the meanings stated in Section III. If the score is displayed on a 100-point scale, the result is multiplied by 100.
For each technical category j, the Category Technical Score shall be calculated as: $Sj = \Sigma_i(tji \times wji)$. The Total Technical Proposal Score is $T = \Sigma_j(Sj \times Wj)$, where tji is the 0–4 score for feature i, wji is its within-category weight, and Wj is the category weight. The Proposal with the highest B is ranked first, subject to responsiveness and qualification.

Question 446: If recurrent costs are evaluated, confirm the NPV discount rate (I) and the number of recurrent-cost years (N / "initial period of operation") to be used.
Source: Section III Financial Evaluation (b); PDS ITP 39.1

Answer to Question 446:
Amendment No. 5 change.
Recurrent Costs in Schedules 3.3 and 3.5 are included in the Evaluated Proposal Price and discounted at five percent (5%) per annum. For completion of the amended schedules, N = 2, corresponding to the Y1 and Y2 columns. The applicable calculation is $PV = RC1/(1.05) + RC2/(1.05)^2$, with costs entered only in the year in which the relevant Technical Support Service is expected to be provided. The amended support periods remain four months from Go-Live for DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA and Portal, and two months for SIGAR. The Y1/Y2 layout does not create a two-year support obligation.

Question 447: Confirm the exact Price Schedule structure and which recurrent-cost items (Schedules 3.3 / 3.5) enter the Evaluated Proposal Price. Given that prices are fixed with no adjustment (PDS ITP 17.9), how should bidders treat the ±15 % quantity variation on licences / users at award (PDS ITP 44) — as unit-priced line items?
Source: Section III Financial Evaluation; PDS ITP 17.2, 17.9, 44

Answer to Question 447:
The Recurrent Cost Summary and Sub-Tables shall include the Technical Support Services and any support-period software/security subscriptions expressly required for operation during the amended support periods. Warranty defect correction is included in the Supply and Installation Price and shall

not be priced as a recurrent cost. Underlying cloud consumption and Beneficiary telecommunications costs are not to be priced by the Proposer.
Schedules 3.3 and 3.5 form part of the Evaluated Proposal Price. Items subject to the ±15% quantity variation under ITP 44, including licenses or users where applicable, shall be shown as quantity-based line items with fixed unit prices. The same quoted unit price applies to the quantity adjustment at award; lump-sum items are not remeasured unless expressly identified as variable.

Question 448: Is there an estimated contract value or budget ceiling? None is stated in the RFP.
Source: RFP generally

Answer to Question 448:
No estimated contract value or budget ceiling is disclosed. Proposers shall determine their prices based on the complete RFP requirements, amendments, clarifications, and their proposed technical and implementation approach.

Question 449: Confirm the currencies of the Proposal: (a) which currencies are to be used in Price Schedule columns 3.1–3.5; (b) the single currency and the exchange-rate source and date used to convert Proposals for evaluation (ITP 36.2); and (c) the applicable Incoterms edition (understood to be Incoterms 2020 per PDS ITP 17.5–17.6).
Source: ITP 18.1 / 18.2 / 36.2; PDS ITP 17.5–17.6

Answer to Question 449:
The Proposal Price may be expressed in any currency or permitted combination of currencies under ITP 17.2, using no more than three foreign currencies in addition to RON. Amounts shall be entered in the applicable currency columns of Schedules 3.1–3.5.
For evaluation and comparison, all prices will be converted to Romanian Lei (RON) using the official National Bank of Romania exchange rate applicable on the day before the Proposal submission deadline. This evaluation rate does not govern Contract payments; where payment conversion into RON is required, the NBR rate applicable on the invoice date applies. Incoterms 2020 applies.

Question 450: The Country of Origin Code table (Schedule 3.6) is empty. Confirm the code standard to be applied and whether the table must be completed for every priced component.
Source: Section IV Price Schedule 3.6

Answer to Question 450:
Schedule 3.6 shall use ISO 3166-1 alpha-3 country codes. The table shall be completed for each country of origin appearing in the priced Supply and Installation Schedules and the corresponding code shall be used for each applicable supplied product, software license, or component. Pure services for which country of origin is not applicable may be marked “N/A”.
D. Contract Mechanics, Payment, Warranty, Securities and Disputes

Question 451: GCC Clause 27.4.1 provides that Installation and Commissioning shall be carried out individually for each identified Subsystem "if so specified in the SCC for GCC Clause 27.2.1". The SCC entry for GCC 27.2.1 states that no Special Conditions are applicable. However, subsystem-level acceptance is relied upon throughout the RFP (per-module payment under SCC for GCC 12.1, separate Go-Live milestones for DMS-RAE (W25), Portal (W36), ROwaterDATA (W48) and SIGAR (W60), liquidated-damages milestones R1–R4, and warranty commencement from each subsystem's Operational Acceptance under §5.1.1). Please confirm whether the SCC for GCC Clause 27.2.1 will be amended to designate the four subsystems, or clarify the contractual basis on which per-module payment, per-subsystem warranty and the R1–R4 milestones are to operate.
Source: GCC 27.4.1; SCC for GCC 27.2.1; SCC for GCC 12.1; Implementation Schedule; Section VII §5.1.1

Answer to Question 451:
Amendment No. 5 change

Amendment No. 5 replaces the statement that no SCC applies to GCC 27.2.1 with a module-level acceptance procedure. Each Software Module is submitted with its report, source code/documentation and internal test evidence, is technically tested, and is then examined by the Reception Commission. The PVRCC is the basis for the corresponding Operational Acceptance Certificate and invoice.
Accordingly, separate Operational Acceptance Certificates may be issued for DMS-RAE, Portal, ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, followed by Operational Acceptance of IWRACS as an integrated whole. These certificates support the module payments, subsystem warranty commencement, and the R1–R4 milestones.

Question 452: Section VII §5.1.1 and the SCC for GCC 29.4 provide a warranty of twenty-four (24) months from the Operational Acceptance of each subsystem (extending, on the Purchaser's own estimates, to approximately weeks 130–165). The SCC for GCC 12.1(g) and Annex 15 Phase P9 provide that each module includes a technical-support period of twelve months or until March 2028, whichever occurs first, and that 100 % of recurrent costs are paid after 30 March 2028. On any plausible Effective Date consistent with the current submission deadline and 120-day validity, SIGAR Go-Live at W60 falls at or close to March 2028, so that the warranty obligation would run for approximately two years beyond the last payment and beyond the end of the support period (and beyond the RAPID loan closing date of 30 June 2028). Please clarify how the warranty obligation subsisting after March 2028 is to be funded and priced, which instrument governs it, and whether the Contract Period, the recurrent-cost tables or the March 2028 date will be adjusted. This question is material to the Proposal price.
Source: Section VII §5.1.1 / §5.2; SCC for GCC 12.1(g) & 29.4; Annex 15 P9 / RC-1; TR 0.1.1

Answer to Question 452:
Amendment No. 5 change
The 24-month warranty applies independently to each subsystem from its respective Operational Acceptance. Warranty defect correction is included in the Supply and Installation Price and is not a recurrent-cost item.
Amendment No. 5 replaces the former twelve-month/March 2028 support arrangement with four months of Technical Support from Go-Live for DMS-RAE, ROwaterDATA and Portal and two months for SIGAR, payable only for services actually provided and accepted. References to 30 March 2028 in Section VII are replaced by 25 June 2028. The shorter Technical Support period does not shorten or duplicate the 24-month warranty; warranty obligations continue for their stated duration and shall be priced in the Supply and Installation Price.

Question 453: Where and when is the remaining approximately 20 % of each custom-software module's price paid? SCC for GCC 12.1(c) provides 60 % at Installation + 20 % at Operational Acceptance = only 80 % per module. Is the balance bridged at whole-system level by the 10 % advance (12.1(a)) + 10 % Complete System Integration (12.1(f))? Please give the full 100 % payment schedule per module.
Source: SCC for GCC 12.1(a), (c), (f)

Answer to Question 453:
See the Amendment No. 5 that changed the payment mechanism.

Question 454: Provide a cap, objective criteria and cure mechanics for the cyber-security payment withholding under GCC / SCC 12.6. The "assessed amount" withheld for cyber non-performance is currently at the Project Manager's sole discretion and is undefined / uncapped.
Source: GCC 12.6 / SCC 12.6

Answer to Question 454:
The provisions of SCC GCC Clause 12.6 shall apply in accordance with the Contract. Any withholding shall be based on documented non-compliance with the applicable contractual cybersecurity requirements, taking into account the nature and extent of the identified non-compliance. The

Supplier shall be informed accordingly and given the opportunity to address the identified non-compliance.

Question 455: Reconcile the liquidated-damages base (GCC 28.2: Contract Price excluding Recurrent Costs, 0.5 %/week, cap 10 %) with the aggregate liability-cap base (GCC 33.1(b): total Contract Price). SCC 27.2.1 states "no special conditions" for partial acceptance, yet 12.1(c) pays per module ("Go-Live"). Are per-module Operational Acceptance Certificates issued, and do liquidated damages apply per subsystem? Please also confirm the exact Implementation Schedule (60-week Operational Acceptance) and any per-Subsystem OA dates, which drive liquidated-damages exposure.
Source: GCC 28.2, 33.1(b), 27.4, 8.2; SCC 27.2.1, 12.1(c); Implementation Schedule

Answer to Question 455:
The liquidated-damages base and the aggregate liability cap address different liabilities and are not inconsistent. Delay liquidated damages are 0.5% per week of the Contract Price excluding Recurrent Costs, or of the relevant part of that price where a subsystem has not achieved Operational Acceptance, capped in aggregate at 10% of the Contract Price excluding Recurrent Costs. The general liability cap under GCC 33.1(b) remains based on the total Contract Price.
Separate module Operational Acceptance Certificates are issued under amended SCC 27.2.1. The binding implementation period is 60 weeks from T0, with T0 being the Effective Date; the applicable subsystem OA milestones are DMS-RAE W25, Portal W36, ROwaterDATA W48 and SIGAR W60. LDs apply to the delayed subsystem/relevant part and, where applicable, to delayed integrated-system OA, without double counting the same period and loss.

Question 456: Confirm the submission deadline for the Advance Payment Security and the fixed expiry date the Purchaser will require. The Letter of Acceptance requests only the Performance Security (28 days) and Beneficial Ownership form (8 Business Days), yet Contract Agreement Article 3.1 makes both securities a precondition to the Effective Date.
Source: Section X Art. 3.1; Letter of Acceptance; Form 2.2

Answer to Question 456:
The Advance Payment Security is required only if the optional advance payment is elected. It shall be submitted within twenty-eight (28) days after notification of Contract award, in the amount and currency of the advance payment.
The security shall be valid until Operational Acceptance of the System, reduced in accordance with GCC 13.2.2 as the advance is recovered, and shall automatically expire when the advance has been fully recovered. The security should therefore state an estimated expiry date consistent with the implementation schedule and contain an extension mechanism; the governing expiry condition is full recovery in accordance with GCC 13.2, not an earlier fixed calendar date.

Question 457: SCC 29.1 / 29.10 defer warranty response and resolution times to the Purchaser's Requirements (TR §5.1.3–5.1.4). Please confirm the binding response and resolution times per severity class, noting that under GCC 29.10 the Purchaser may engage third parties and deduct the cost if remedy work is not begun within two weeks. These parameters are required to price warranty risk.
Source: SCC 29.1 / 29.10; GCC 29.10; TR §5.1.3–5.1.4

Answer to Question 457:
The SLA table in Section 5.1.3 is binding for both Warranty Services and the applicable Technical Support Services: P1—response ≤2 hours, resolution ≤4 hours; P2—response ≤4 hours, resolution ≤8 hours; P3—response ≤8 hours, resolution ≤16 hours; P4—response ≤1 Business Day, resolution ≤24 hours.
P1 times run on a 24/7 calendar-hour basis. P2–P4 times run during NARW working hours. The two-week period in GCC 29.10 is a separate ultimate remedy allowing the Purchaser to engage a third party where remedial work has not begun; it does not replace or extend the SLA response and resolution times.

Question 458: Appendices 4 ("Categories of Software") and 5 ("Custom Materials") of the Contract Agreement are to be completed by the Supplier. Confirm the expected granularity and the timing of completion (at Proposal submission, at contract signature, or during contract finalization).
Source: Section X Appendices 4 / 5.

Answer to Question 458:
Appendices 4 and 5 are not Proposal forms. They shall be completed by the successful Proposer following the Letter of Acceptance and finalized as part of the Contract Agreement.
Appendix 4 shall list each software title/product at a granularity sufficient to classify it as System, General-Purpose or Application Software; Standard or Custom Software; and Proprietary or Open Source. Appendix 5 shall list each Custom Material by title and concise description, including project-specific source code, interfaces, scripts, configurations, models, documentation, training materials, and other bespoke deliverables where applicable.
E. Hosting, Licensing, Hardware and COTS

Question 459: Section VII §1.4.7 describes deployment into the future ADR Government Private Cloud based on Azure Stack Hub (or equivalent) or alternatively into the NARW Azure tenant, under IaaS and/or SaaS as agreed, with the final option to be confirmed during analysis and design. Please confirm: (a) which hosting option is to be assumed for pricing purposes; (b) whether the ADR Government Private Cloud will be available and accessible by W9 and its available managed-service catalogue; (c) the onboarding process and applicable service levels; (d) which party holds and pays for the cloud subscription; and (e) whether a COTS component delivered as a vendor-hosted SaaS service outside the ADR Government Private Cloud and outside the NARW Azure tenant is admissible and, if so, subject to what data-residency condition under GDPR.
Source: Section VII §1.4.7; Implementation Schedule (cloud preparation from W9); TR glossary

Answer to Question 459:
For pricing, Proposers shall assume deployment in a Beneficiary-approved environment: the ADR Government Private Cloud or the NARW Azure tenant. The Beneficiary cannot confirm ADR availability or its detailed managed-service catalogue at this stage. The proposed solution must remain deployable in either environment; if ADR is unavailable at the relevant milestone, the Beneficiary may direct deployment in the NARW Azure tenant or another approved environment, with later migration if required.
The Beneficiary will hold and pay the underlying cloud consumption subscription. The Proposer shall price the solution design, sizing, configuration, deployment, migration, integration, and any product-specific COTS/SaaS rights required under the Contract. Onboarding, access, service levels and the detailed responsibility matrix will be agreed during analysis.
Vendor-hosted SaaS outside ADR/NARW Azure is not automatically admissible. It requires prior written Beneficiary approval and compliance with the RFP's security, audit, continuity, portability and data-residency requirements. Where Azure hosting is used, data and disaster-recovery hosting shall remain within the European Union; Romania-only residence is not presently required.

Question 460: Confirm whether DMS-RAE and Portal / CMS solutions are permitted to be hosted in a commercial cloud environment provided by established providers (for example Microsoft SharePoint Online hosted on Microsoft Azure), or whether deployment in the ADR Government Private Cloud / NARW Azure tenant is mandatory. If commercial hosting is allowed, state any data-residency or other constraints.
Source: Section VII §1.4.7; standalone clarification

Answer to Question 460:
DMS-RAE and Portal/CMS may be delivered under IaaS or SaaS models, but the proposed product and deployment model must be compatible with the hosting option approved by the Beneficiary. Deployment within ADR Government Private Cloud or the NARW Azure tenant is the baseline.
A commercial-cloud or vendor-hosted SaaS deployment outside those environments is permissible only with prior written Beneficiary approval and only if it satisfies all functional, security, audit,

business-continuity, portability and GDPR requirements. Data hosting, processing, backup and disaster recovery shall remain within the European Union.

Question 461: Section VII §1.4.6 requires a hardware architecture providing high availability, scalability, resilience and security, with detailed sizing proposed by the Contractor. Section VII §3.1 / §3.3 state that computing hardware, shared storage, ancillary hardware and power conditioning are "not applicable", and the Implementation Schedule Site Table states that no on-premises delivery is required. Please confirm whether infrastructure design and capacity sizing is a deliverable under the Contract, and whether any infrastructure or capacity cost falls within the Proposer's scope of supply.
Source: Section VII §1.4.6, §3.1, §3.3; Implementation Schedule Site Table

Answer to Question 461:
Infrastructure architecture, environment design and capacity sizing are Contract deliverables. The Proposer shall identify and size production, testing, training and disaster-recovery resources and define availability, backup and recovery assumptions.
No on-premises computing hardware, shared storage, ancillary hardware or power-conditioning equipment is to be supplied under the Contract. The underlying cloud compute, storage, networking and related platform consumption will be provided through the Beneficiary's approved hosting environment and shall not be included in the Proposal Price.

Question 462: Section VII §1.4.7 provides that licences are procured and owned by the Beneficiary, but expressly only in respect of custom-developed systems (ROwaterDATA and SIGAR). No equivalent provision addresses the COTS platforms on which DMS-RAE (§1.3.4) and the Portal (§1.3.5) are to be implemented. Please confirm: (a) which party procures and owns the DMS-RAE and Portal platform licences; (b) the licensing metric to be assumed (named user, concurrent user, capacity, or server / core); and (c) the licence quantities to be assumed (noting Annex 12 indicates approximately 4 100 NARW staff, some 450–550 active users, and §1.6.2.1 requires support for at least 1 000 concurrent external Portal users).
Source: Section VII §1.4.7, §1.3.4, §1.3.5, §1.6.2.1; Annex 12; TR 5.2.4

Answer to Question 462:
The Proposer shall supply and include in the Proposal Price all DMS-RAE and Portal COTS licences or initial subscription rights required to deliver, accept and operate those solutions throughout the Contract and the applicable 24-month warranty. The licensing rights shall be perpetual or of equivalent effect so that operation is not interrupted by mandatory additional licence fees during the warranty period. The Beneficiary will hold the resulting usage rights under the proposed licence terms.
No single metric is prescribed. The Proposer shall state a proposed licensing model, user/capacity/server/core metrics, quantities, environments, duration, renewal assumptions and dependencies. For sizing, use the RFP's indicative volumes, including 300–400 DMS document users, the stated Portal populations and at least 1,000 concurrent external Portal users; final named/concurrent user allocation will be validated during analysis.

Question 463: The cost sub-tables in the Price Schedules contain line items for services only. We can identify no line item for COTS software licences, for cloud infrastructure or subscription capacity, or for non-production environment licensing. Please confirm where these costs are to be entered in the Price Schedules, or alternatively confirm that they are excluded from the Contract Price and will be procured directly by the Beneficiary. If a line item is to be added, we request that it be issued by Addendum.
Source: Price Schedules; Section VII §1.4.7

Answer to Question 463:
COTS licence and initial subscription costs for DMS-RAE shall be included under the DMS-RAE line and Cost Sub-Table 3.1; corresponding Portal costs shall be included under the Portal line and Cost Sub-

Table 4.1. The Proposer may add clearly identified component rows within those sub-tables without changing their totals or structure.
Licensing required for production and non-production use of those COTS products during implementation, acceptance and warranty shall be included. Underlying Beneficiary cloud consumption is excluded. For custom-developed ROwaterDATA and SIGAR, third-party platform licences to be procured by the Beneficiary shall be listed in the unpriced licence inventory and shall not be included in the Financial Proposal.

Question 464: Section VII §0.1 defines COTS as a Commercial Off-The-Shelf software product available on the market and configurable to meet the Beneficiary's requirements; §1.4.7 requires mature, cloud-ready COTS solutions. Section VII §2.2.5 separately permits open-source components subject to long-term support, security and licensing compliance. Please confirm whether an open-source product supplied with a commercial support subscription satisfies the COTS requirement for DMS-RAE and the Portal.
Source: Section VII §0.1, §1.4.7, §2.2.5

Answer to Question 464:
Confirmed. An enterprise-grade open-source product supplied with professional maintenance and commercial support may satisfy the COTS requirement for DMS-RAE or the Portal, provided it is mature, reusable, configurable, upgradeable, commercially supportable, documented and capable of meeting all functional, interoperability, operational, security, warranty and long-term support requirements.

Question 465: Section VII §1.3.4 D requires an electronic registry with centrally assigned unique numbers, a configurable numbering format and annual reset, and §1.1.2(c) requires compliance with national records and archival legislation (including retention, transfer and controlled disposal). To our knowledge no commercially available platform implements Romanian registratură and nomenclator arhivistic requirements as native product functionality. Please confirm whether the Purchaser expects these requirements to be met by native COTS product capability, or whether custom extension of a COTS platform is anticipated and acceptable. The answer materially affects both effort and the achievability of the W25 institution-wide Go-Live for DMS-RAE.
Source: Section VII §1.3.4 D, §1.1.2(c)

Answer to Question 465:
Amendment No. 5 change—National Archives transfer removed
Native Romanian registry and archival functionality is not required where the selected COTS platform can meet the requirements through supported configuration or project-specific extension. Configuration and custom extension of the COTS platform are therefore acceptable and anticipated where necessary.
The electronic registry, numbering, retention and archiving requirements remain mandatory for DMS-RAE acceptance. The Beneficiary will provide or validate numbering schemes, archival nomenclature and retention rules during analysis. Under Amendment No. 5, integration with or controlled transfer to the National Archives is outside the current scope.

Question 466: Please clarify: (a) where configuration ends and custom development begins for the COTS platforms, and on which side scripting, plug-in development and schema extension fall; (b) how §2.6.5 (all documentation, source code, configurations become the exclusive property of the Beneficiary) is to be read in respect of intellectual property owned by a COTS vendor; and (c) whether configuration artefacts must be deliverable in a vendor-neutral, exportable form.
Source: Section VII §2.1.2, §2.6.5, §5.2.4

Answer to Question 466:
Configuration comprises settings and artefacts supported by the standard product—parameters, forms, metadata models, workflows, rules, roles, templates and mappings—without changing the vendor’s core source. Project-specific scripts, plug-ins, extensions, connectors, custom schema code and bespoke business logic are Custom Materials, even when deployed inside a COTS platform.

The Beneficiary owns all custom-developed source code, integrations, interfaces, business logic, workflows, configurations and project documentation specifically produced under the Contract. Pre-existing COTS/vendor software, frameworks and third-party components remain the property of their owners and their proprietary source code is not transferred.
Configuration and custom artefacts shall be delivered in the product's documented native export format, together with schemas, scripts, API specifications, deployment instructions and data export mechanisms. A vendor-neutral representation is required where technically supported; it does not require conversion of proprietary product internals into a new neutral format.

Question 467: TR 2.3.2 requires compatibility with "Microsoft SQL Server (2012 or later)". SQL Server 2012 is out of extended support. Please confirm whether 2012 is a genuine deployment target or only a floor for reading legacy data sources.
Source: TR 2.3.2

Answer to Question 467:
"Microsoft SQL Server 2012 or later" is a legacy compatibility floor and shall not be interpreted as requiring deployment of a new solution on SQL Server 2012. New production components shall use a currently supported DBMS/version compatible with the approved hosting architecture. Where legacy SQL Server 2012 sources exist, the Contractor shall support controlled read/migration access as required by the agreed integration or migration design.
F. Technical Scope, Subsystems, Schedule and Boundaries

Question 468: Is DMS-RAE fully within the scope of this Contract? If so, please provide or confirm the location of its detailed functional requirements, effort estimates and Implementation Schedule milestones. Annex 15 currently schedules only ROwaterDATA, SIGAR and Portal; DMS-RAE appears principally as an integration target (Portal A1.13, W24–30) and a "future document management system" (UC1). Confirm whether SIGAR and/or the Portal can achieve Operational Acceptance / go-live without it.
Source: Annex 15; Annex 10 UC1; Annex 13; TR 1.3.4

Answer to Question 468:
Confirmed. DMS-RAE is one of the four IWRACS subsystems and is fully within the Contract scope. Its detailed functional requirements are in Section VII §1.3.4; its delivery, training, payment, support and acceptance provisions are also addressed in the Implementation Schedule, Section 2.4, SCC 12.1 and amended SCC 27.2.1. Its institution-wide Go-Live target is W25.
Annex 15 details only the custom-developed subsystems; its omission of a separate DMS effort table does not remove DMS-RAE from scope. SIGAR and Portal acceptance shall include their required DMS-RAE integrations.

Question 469: Please confirm whether the external submission interface is to be delivered within the Portal Extranet with SIGAR exposing services behind it, or as a separate public SIGAR Front-Office application to which the Portal links; and accordingly which component owns external session management, form validation and document upload.
Source: Section VII §1.4.2 B, §1.2.4, §1.3.5 B3 / §1.3.5

Answer to Question 469:
The Portal Extranet shall provide the common public entry point and presentation shell for citizen-facing e-services. The SIGAR Front-Office remains the regulatory application component behind that entry point and owns the ten request categories, regulatory form logic, validations, dossier handling and workflow submission services.
External identity/session management, common navigation and shared upload/security services should be implemented once as common IWRACS capabilities and consumed by SIGAR. The detailed allocation may follow an equivalent architecture proposed by the Proposer, provided users receive unified experience and the functions are not duplicated. The final component boundaries and APIs shall be approved during analysis.

Question 470: Section VII §0.2 and §1.3.4 D establish DMS-RAE as providing the electronic registry with centrally assigned unique registration numbers. Section VII §1.3.5 A4 provides that the Portal shall provide, within the Intranet, an electronic registry capability that registers documents and assigns a unique registry number. Please confirm which component is the authoritative source of registration numbers, and whether the Portal capability is to be implemented as a user interface onto DMS-RAE rather than as a separate registry.
Source: Section VII §0.2, §1.3.4 D, §1.3.5 A4

Answer to Question 470:
DMS-RAE is the authoritative source for official registry numbers and registry records. The Portal/Intranet registry capability shall be implemented as a user interface or service integration with DMS-RAE, not as an independent authoritative numbering engine.
Any provisional number used before successful DMS-RAE registration shall be clearly identified as provisional and reconciled to the DMS-RAE number. Numbering shall follow Beneficiary-approved parameterized schemes, including sequence, prefix, competent unit, reservation and annual reset.

Question 471: The Implementation Schedule places DMS-RAE Go-Live at W25 and SIGAR Go-Live at W60, and §1.3.3.6 requires that SIGAR submissions and issued acts share a single registry entry number in DMS-RAE. Annex 10 Use Case 1 states that in the initial phase SIGAR will enable manual registration of applications in both Front-Office and Back-Office, and that an integrated document management system is planned in the medium term. Please confirm whether manual registration functionality within SIGAR is required, permitted or excluded, and if required, for what period and on what basis it would subsequently be retired.
Source: Implementation Schedule; §1.3.3.6; Annex 10 UC1

Answer to Question 471:
Manual registration within SIGAR is permitted as a controlled transitional/fallback mechanism during the initial phase or where the DMS-RAE registration interface is unavailable. It shall remain traceable and shall not create a second authoritative registry.
Once the DMS-RAE integration is operational, SIGAR shall request and use the authoritative DMS-RAE registration number through the agreed API. The manual function shall then be restricted to authorized exception handling and reconciliation under Beneficiary-approved procedures.

Question 472: Confirm the length (in days or weeks) of the "agreed observation period" / "continuous operation period" that forms part of the Operational Acceptance criteria, per subsystem and for the ecosystem OAC. This period sits on the critical path after SIGAR Go-Live at W60 and directly affects payment release.
Source: TR 4.3.1–4.3.3 / Operational Acceptance criteria

Answer to Question 472:
The RFP does not prescribe a fixed number of days for a separate observation or continuous-operation period. The duration, workload, monitoring evidence, permitted maintenance and restart conditions shall be defined in the approved Master Test Plan and subsystem OAT plans during analysis.
The agreed periods shall be performed within the contractual testing and acceptance windows and shall not, by themselves, extend the stated W25/W36/W48/W60 milestones. Any proposed extension of a contractual OA date remains subject to the Contract’s change or extension-of-time provisions.

Question 473: Reconcile the apparent schedule inconsistency whereby Portal UAT acceptance is shown at W30 while Deployment acceptance is at W32 (and related A1.12 / A1.13 milestones at W28 / W30). Please confirm the intended sequence for the Preliminary Project Plan.
Source: Implementation Schedule A1.12–A1.15

Answer to Question 473:
The intended sequence is: Portal content migration through W28; SIGAR/DMS-RAE integration and Portal UAT through W30; production deployment/hardening during W30–W32; training during W31–W33; and institution-wide Go-Live/Operational Acceptance no later than W36. UAT may therefore be

performed in the UAT/pre-production environment before final production deployment, with limited overlap at W30.
The Preliminary Project Plan may refine day-level sequencing and dependencies but shall preserve these contractual milestone dates like W36.

Question 474: Annex 15 phase numbering jumps P1 → P2 → P3 → P4 → P5 → P9, with no P6–P8, and Phase P5 (Training & Go-Live) has no week window. Please confirm the complete phase list and their week windows, the go-live target week, and that the plan fits within the 60-week schedule. Please also reconcile the RC-1 line-item references (which cite A2.14 / A2.15 / A3.13 / A3.14 while the schedule lists A3.12 / A3.13).
Source: Annex 15; TR 3.6 / RC-1

Answer to Question 474:
The Annex 15 was modified by Amendment No. 5.

Question 475: Section VII treats Annex 9 as an integral part of the Contract whose session counts, durations, delivery formats and minimum participant numbers are mandatory. As supplied, Annex 9 is entirely prose and contains no tabular training matrix or quantified figures (those appear only in §2.4.5). Please confirm the binding source of the training quantities and whether any training effort for DMS-RAE is required / budgeted (none currently appears).
Source: Section VII (Annex 9); §2.4.5

Answer to Question 475:
The binding pricing basis is: Annex 9 for ROwaterDATA and SIGAR training, and Section VII §§2.4.5.3–2.4.5.4 for DMS-RAE and Portal training. Amendment No. 5 expressly confirms this allocation.
DMS-RAE training is required and shall be priced. It includes in-person key-user/administrator training at the identified hubs/locations, 10 IT/System administrators, and online training for 300–400 staff working with documents, together with the delivery formats and evidence specified in Section 2.4. Any Beneficiary-requested increase beyond the stated figures is subject to prior agreement and, where required, a Contract amendment.

Question 476: TR 1.3.4 D requires DMS-RAE to integrate an institution-wide Rest Leave (Concediu de Odihnă) workflow with HR / Payroll "if available". Please confirm whether an HR / Payroll API is available (and provide its specification), or whether a standalone leave-balance engine is expected.
Source: TR 1.3.4 D

Answer to Question 476:
No confirmed externally accessible HR/Payroll API is available at this stage. The Rest Leave workflow shall be implemented using DMS-RAE workflow capabilities. If the Beneficiary makes an HR/Payroll interface available, leave-balance verification shall use the agreed integration; otherwise, verification shall be a controlled manual HR step within the workflow.
A separate standalone leave-balance engine is not required under the baseline scope. Any later automated integration shall be defined and approved during analysis based on the actual interface made available by the Beneficiary.
G. Integration, Interfaces and Data Migration

Question 477: Which integrations are firm, mandatory deliverables versus optional and subject to the Beneficiary's agreement and prioritization? Annex 13 marks only GIS and ECA-RO as mandatory; the remainder (SIGAR ↔ ROwaterDATA, SEAUU, ASIS, HYDRA / HIDRA, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Registry, ANMAP, etc.) are conditional, yet Annex 15 budgets only 160 md total for P2.2.1 External Integrations. Fifteen-plus integrations cannot be delivered within that envelope. Please either fix the mandatory list in writing or confirm that non-mandatory items may be priced as options. Provide API specifications / availability for each.
Source: Annex 13; TR 1.3.3.6; Annex 15 P2.2.1

Answer to Question 477:

The integrations in the baseline scope are those expressly identified in Section 1.3.3.6 and Annex 13, including ArcGIS, HIDRA, ECA-RO, SEEAU, Borrow Pit Radar, Water Cadastre, ASIS/ATHOS, ROwaterDATA and ANMAP. They are not separate price options. The Proposer shall price the IWRACS-side integration capability, mapping, security, testing and the approved fallback mechanism for each. "Subject to agreement/prioritization" concerns the final method, sequence and available third-party interface; it does not authorize omission of the underlying interoperability requirement. Ghișeul.ro is not a confirmed operational integration, ROeID is future compatibility only, and direct ONRC/ANAF integration is not presently mandatory. A material new interface or scope beyond the RFP/Annex 13 is handled under the Contract's change provisions.

Question 478: For each external system identified in §1.3.3.6, §2.3.6 and Annex 13, please confirm the integration mechanism to be assumed: gateway-mediated API, event or webhook, scheduled file exchange, direct database connection, or manual / Excel import as a transitional arrangement.
Source: Section VII §1.3.3.6, §2.3.6; Annex 13
Answer to Question 478:
API-based integration through the shared gateway is preferred where a documented interface exists. Events/webhooks may be used for notifications such as payment confirmation. Scheduled file exchange or controlled Excel import/export is an acceptable transitional mechanism where APIs are unavailable. Direct database access is an exception requiring Beneficiary approval and the external system owner's schema, access rights and security conditions.
The final mechanism for each system shall be recorded in the approved integration architecture and interface document during analysis, based on actual third-party capabilities.

Question 479: We can identify a field-level specification only for the exchange described in Annex 13 in respect of ANMAP. For ArcGIS Enterprise, ECA-RO, HYDRA / HIDRA, SEAUU / SEEAU, LIMS, ASIS / ATHOS, the Water Registry, the Water Cadastre and Borrow Pit Radar we can identify no interface contract. Please provide, or confirm the availability and timing of: interface specifications and data schemas; authentication methods; test and production endpoints; rate limits; and confirmation that each counterparty institution has agreed to the exchange and will make a test environment available. Please also confirm which party is responsible for concluding any data-sharing agreement required.
Source: Annex 13; TR 1.3.3.6; PDS ITP 16.3

Answer to Question 479:
The Beneficiary cannot guarantee that all external interfaces, schemas, endpoints, authentication arrangements, rate limits, sandboxes and test data will be available at the start of development. Available documentation and stakeholder access will be facilitated during analysis; each interface contract shall then be defined and approved with the relevant system owner.
The Beneficiary is responsible for providing or facilitating institutional access, credentials and any required inter-institutional/data-sharing agreement. The Contractor is responsible for designing and implementing the agreed IWRACS-side integration, security, mappings, error handling, logging and tests within the approved scope. Where an API is unavailable, an approved file, database or other fallback applies.

Question 480: Section VII §1.3.3.2 requires online payment through Ghișeul.ro, and §1.3.3.6 requires queries to the Trade Register (ONRC) on CUI to validate CAEN codes, and correlation with Land Registry (Cartea Funciară) records. Section VII §1.3.5 B4 refers to compatibility with ROeID. None of these appears in the integration inventory at §1.3.3.6, in Annex 13, or in the effort estimates at Annex 15 P2.2.1. Please confirm whether integration with Ghișeul.ro, ONRC, ANCPI and ROeID is within the scope of supply and, if so, provide the applicable interface specifications and onboarding procedures. In the case of Ghișeul.ro, please also confirm whether accounts are held centrally or by each Basin Water Administration.
Source: Section VII §1.3.3.2, §1.3.3.6, §1.3.5 B4; Annex 13; Annex 15 P2.2.1

Answer to Question 480:
Ghișeul.ro is not included as a confirmed operational integration in the baseline. SIGAR shall receive payment confirmation through ASIS and/or ATHOS. If Ghișeul.ro becomes available, the Beneficiary

will facilitate onboarding, credentials, specifications and test access; the detailed account arrangement will be confirmed during analysis.
Direct ONRC/Trade Register and ANAF validation is not confirmed as mandatory; existing NARW integrations, database views, public/open-data services or controlled manual validation may be used. No separate mandatory direct ANCPI/Land Registry integration is established; cadastral correlation shall use the authoritative GIS/cadastral sources made available by the Beneficiary. ROeID implementation is outside the baseline scope; only architectural compatibility for future federation is required.

Question 481: Section VII §1.4.4 provides that applications shall not directly access each other's internal databases and that all exchange shall occur through documented APIs or events. Section VII §1.4.3 D requires the API gateway to prevent direct access to internal databases and subsystems, and §1.4.5 prohibits direct cross-zone access from public components to internal data stores. Annex 13 and §1.3.3.6 nevertheless contemplate direct database access for several external systems. Please confirm which provision governs, and whether direct database connections to external systems are permitted.
Source: Section VII §1.4.3 D, §1.4.4, §1.4.5; Annex 13; §1.3.3.6

Answer to Question 481:
The prohibition on direct database access governs exchanges between IWRACS applications and protects IWRACS internal data stores. Such inter-subsystem exchanges shall use documented APIs or events through the approved integration architecture.
Direct read access to an external system database may be used only as an approved exception where no suitable API exists and the external system owner provides the schema, credentials, access restrictions, security conditions and stability assumptions. It shall be mediated and isolated through the integration layer; public-zone components shall never connect directly to an internal database.

Question 482: Annex 13 identifies systems that are themselves "future / under development" (including the Water Registry System). Where a counterparty system may not exist or be ready at delivery time, please confirm the fallback arrangement to be assumed (e.g. Excel / file import as a transitional mechanism), which party owns the resulting schedule and delivery risk, and how acceptance of the affected integration is handled.
Source: Annex 13

Answer to Question 482:
References to the “Water Registry System” shall be understood as references to the existing NARW Water Cadastre System, in accordance with Amendment No. 5.
For external systems whose final interface or integration mechanism is not available during implementation, the integration approach shall be defined and approved during the analysis phase, based on the actual technical capabilities and access arrangements available.
Where a documented API is not available, controlled file-based import/export, including Excel where applicable, or another agreed integration mechanism may be used, subject to Beneficiary approval.
The Beneficiary shall facilitate coordination with the relevant system owners and access to available documentation, interfaces, test data and test environments. The Contractor shall implement and test the agreed integration mechanism within the approved implementation framework.
The applicable acceptance criteria for the affected integration shall be defined during the analysis phase, within the framework of the contractual requirements and taking into account the actual availability and technical capabilities of the relevant external system.

Question 483: Confirm the authoritative dataset count for migration ("almost 350" versus "more than 350") and the split between structural definition and value migration.
Source: TR 1.3.2.3 vs 0.3.2

Answer to Question 483:

“Almost 350” is the authoritative current estimate for planning and Proposal preparation; “more than 350” shall be read as an approximate/non-binding description of the same inventory. The final rationalized inventory will be confirmed during analysis.
The Contractor is expected to define/configure the agreed dataset structures and perform one-time value migration for most currently known datasets—estimated at approximately 90%—subject to data availability and migration priorities. Future datasets and the remainder may be configured by authorized NARW users after Go-Live. A different final count alone does not create an automatic Contract variation.

Question 484: Data migration is budgeted at 80 md yet must cover the migration and semantic validation of approximately 350 datasets spanning 11 thematic domains from heterogeneous sources (GIS, WIMS, REBAR, RNBR, ECA-RO, Excel and paper), with a ≥ 99 % completeness acceptance gate and preserved referential integrity; historical Nitrates data alone requires cross-cycle station matching across three reporting periods (1 258 / 1 384 / 1 355 sections, 1 004 in common) with justification records for every removed, renamed and added station. Please provide, for each source system in scope of migration (including the existing AA permits system): record counts and data volumes; the data model or schema; document counts and storage volumes; any existing data-quality assessment; the number of back-years of regulatory acts and documents to be migrated (or confirm whether legacy documents are migrated or only referenced); and the planned decommissioning date. Please confirm whether DMS-RAE is within the scope of data conversion (it is not listed at §2.5.1), and whether the Data Migration Assessment Report will serve as a formal scope-setting gate.
Source: TR 2.5.1 / 2.5.4; Annex 12 B; Annex 15 P2.2.2

Answer to Question 484:
The detailed source inventory, schemas, volumes, document counts, data quality, history and decommissioning assumptions are not fully available at bidding stage. Annexes 1 and 12 provide the pricing baseline. During the Data Migration Assessment, the Beneficiary will facilitate access to available sources, exports, documentation and data owners; the Contractor will profile, map, cleanse/transform, migrate, reconcile and test the agreed scope.
For SIGAR, baseline migration is limited to finalized previous/active permits and authorizations, associated metadata and available electronic documents; active workflow states and full historical execution trails are excluded unless agreed. For DMS-RAE, no full historical migration of existing repositories or registries is confirmed. The principal bulk migration concerns ROwaterDATA datasets.
The approved Data Migration Assessment Report and Migration Plan form the formal scope-setting and acceptance baseline for detailed execution, without removing the baseline RFP obligations. A material requirement beyond that baseline is handled under the Contract’s change provisions.

Question 485: TR 2.5.4 sets data-completeness acceptance at "≥ 99 % (unless otherwise agreed per dataset)". Please confirm which datasets carry a different threshold, and how the source of truth is defined where parallel or conflicting versions of the same data exist.
Source: TR 2.5.4; TR 0.3.2

Answer to Question 485:
The ≥99% completeness figure is a migration quality objective, not an unconditional requirement to cure defects or omissions in the legacy sources. Dataset-specific measurement rules, denominators, reconciliation reports and justified exceptions shall be documented in the approved Data Migration Assessment and Migration Plan.
For each dataset, the Beneficiary’s designated data owner shall identify the authoritative source and approve conflict-resolution rules. Where parallel sources conflict, the agreed source hierarchy, cut-off date and reconciliation decision log will govern. No different thresholds are fixed at this stage; any agreed exception must be documented per dataset and formally accepted by the Beneficiary.

Question 486: Will the SEICA rule set (Order 828/2019 and its Tables 1–4 / 1b / 3b) be provided as a machine-readable specification rather than only as legal text?
Source: TR 1.3.3.2; Annex 3

Answer to Question 486:
The Beneficiary does not confirm the existence of a complete machine-readable SEICA rule package. During analysis it will provide the available legal and reference materials under Order No. 828/2019 and will provide or validate the complete thresholds, Tables 1–4 structures and rules.
The Contractor shall assist in structuring them as configurable deterministic decision tables, validation rules, parameters, thresholds and workflow steps. Substantive assessment of technical documentation remains the responsibility of the SEICA Commission and shall not be automated.

Question 487: The reference catalogues, completion templates, validation rules and the 53 ICPDR dataset structures (Annexes 4–7) are "to be provided during the analysis phase", and the RFP states that each directive report's completion template and validation rules are delivered only during analysis — meaning the transformation rules for every directive report are unknown at bid time. Please confirm: (a) whether representative samples can be provided pre-award so that effort can be estimated; (b) how changes to the "indicative" EU report structures (Annex 5: the 44-column Programs-of-Measures database and WISE nomenclatures KTM1–25 tied to ~12 EU directives) are handled contractually — change control versus fixed price; and (c) the number and extent of Order 828/2019 form variants in scope (Annexes 2 / 8), to bound configuration effort.
Source: Annexes 2, 4–8; TR reporting requirements

Answer to Question 487:
The representative materials already included in Annexes 1, 5 and 8 constitute the pre-award sizing baseline. No additional complete catalogue of reporting templates or form variants is available before award. The detailed report templates, validation rules, output formats, directive mappings, dynamic forms and workflow variants shall be provided, reviewed and frozen through the approved analysis deliverables.
Changes to reporting templates, validation rules, formats or regulatory requirements after approval of the relevant analysis deliverable will be assessed under GCC 39 according to their impact on scope, effort and schedule; they are not automatically absorbed without review. For SIGAR, the baseline is ten request categories, generally one primary form per use case, plus the annexes, notifications, generated acts and conditional variants required by the applicable procedure. The final inventory and mapping are approved during analysis.

H. Performane, Capacity, Security and Data Protection
Question 488: Please state the binding availability (uptime %), Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) targets, and whether they apply per subsystem or to IWRACS as a whole. These values determine the disaster-recovery design and its cost. Currently they are cited only as examples (e.g. ≥ 99.5 %) or left unquantified.
Source: Section VII §4.2.3, §4.3.1–4.3.3, §1.6

Answer to Question 488:
The binding availability target is ≥99.5% on a 24/7/365 basis for the production IWRACS ecosystem as a whole. Approved scheduled maintenance and the exclusions introduced by Amendment No. 5—external cloud/infrastructure, telecommunications, Beneficiary/third-party dependencies, force majeure and other events outside the Contractor’s reasonable control—are excluded from the calculation.
For bid sizing, the baseline recovery targets are: ROwaterDATA, SIGAR and DMS-RAE—RTO 8 hours / RPO 4 hours; Portal/Intranet/Extranet—RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours; non-critical reporting/analytics/publication—RTO 24 hours / RPO 24 hours. A shared component shall meet the most stringent applicable target. Detailed architecture and test procedures will be finalized during analysis, but may not be less stringent than these baselines without formal approval.

Question 489: Provide the authoritative storage sizing, annual growth projections and retention assumptions for SIGAR dossiers (individual case files commonly 700 MB–5 GB; approximately 15 671 regulatory acts issued in 2024) and for DMS-RAE, including any existing document holdings to be migrated, and confirm who provides and pays for that storage capacity. (Only ROwaterDATA is

currently dimensioned at ≥ 50 GB scalable to 100 GB, while the SIGAR volumes imply many terabytes per year.)
Source: Annex 12 A vs B; TR 1.3.3.2, §1.6.3

Answer to Question 489:
Annex 12 provides the indicative sizing baseline and five-year planning assumptions currently available. No additional authoritative SIGAR dossier-storage or DMS-RAE historical-holding volume is fixed at this stage. DMS-RAE document counts, migration holdings, retention horizon and immutability requirements, and SIGAR dossier growth by file type, shall be validated during analysis using Beneficiary-provided volumes and the regulatory-act statistics in Annex 12.
The solution shall be horizontally/vertically scalable without major redesign. The underlying storage, backup and disaster-recovery capacity will be provided and paid through the Beneficiary's approved cloud environment; the Contractor remains responsible for sizing, lifecycle design, configuration, monitoring and capacity recommendations. Product-specific storage licences or SaaS entitlements remain part of the applicable COTS price.

Question 490: Annex 12 B records SIGAR act volumes but contains no user estimates. Please provide the expected concurrent and total user counts for the SIGAR Front-Office (external applicants) and Back-Office, for sizing and licensing purposes.
Source: Annex 12 B

Answer to Question 490:
For SIGAR Back-Office sizing, use the indicative minimum of 155 internal users: 110 Operators/Collaborators, 15 Coordinators/Managers, 15 SEICA Members and 15 IT/System Administrators. These figures are planning minima, not a final named-user ceiling.
No separate reliable total or concurrency estimate is presently available for external SIGAR applicants. The public-facing architecture shall therefore use the IWRACS/Portal baseline of at least 1,000 concurrent external users for shared front-office services, with the SIGAR-specific concurrency and workload profile validated during analysis and performance testing. The Proposer shall clearly state its licensing and capacity assumptions.

Question 491: Annex 12 B states that submission through the Front-Office must not be restricted by limitations on file size or format, and that all file types associated with application dossiers must be supported (including PDF, CAD, images and archives). Section VII §1.6.2.5 requires standard document upload and download within three seconds and stable preview of multi-gigabyte files. Please confirm: (a) whether an upload architecture writing directly to object storage using pre-signed URLs is acceptable; (b) the maximum individual file size to be supported; (c) whether a permitted-format list applies notwithstanding Annex 12 B; and (d) whether preview is required for CAD formats.
Source: Annex 12 B; Section VII §1.6.2.5

Answer to Question 491:
A secure object-storage upload design using short-lived pre-signed URLs is acceptable, subject to the approved hosting/security architecture, authorization checks, audit logging, malware quarantine and binding of each object to the relevant dossier.
"5 GB+" is neither an unlimited requirement nor a fixed maximum single-file size. No final maximum is prescribed at bidding stage. Large files shall use stable, progress-tracked, chunked and resumable transfer; the three-second target applies only to standard files within the agreed normal range. The accepted-format list and final limits will be approved during analysis. CAD files must be stored and downloadable; native browser preview is required only where supported by the selected platform/approved viewer, with metadata/thumbnail or controlled download as the fallback.

Question 492: Annex 12 B requires that uploads be unrestricted as to size and format, including archive files. Section VII §1.4.5 places the Portal Extranet and the SIGAR Front-Office in the Public Access Zone subject to input validation and security monitoring, and §1.7.4 requires protection of data against unauthorised access, modification or deletion. We can identify no explicit requirement for malware or content scanning of uploaded files. Please confirm which provision governs, and

specify the malware, content and structure scanning requirements applicable to files received through the Front-Office, including the treatment of archive files and multi-gigabyte uploads.
Source: Annex 12 B; Section VII §1.4.5, §1.7.4

Answer to Question 492:
All files received through the SIGAR Front-Office/Public Access Zone shall be subject to malware scanning before release to users or downstream processing. Multi-GB uploads may be scanned asynchronously after upload into a quarantine area. Files shall remain inaccessible until scanning and structural validation are complete.
Archives shall be inspected recursively subject to approved depth, expansion-ratio and timeout limits. Password-protected/encrypted archives, unsupported formats, detected malware and suspicious structures shall be rejected or quarantined for authorized review. The selected scanner(s), signatures, update frequency, retention of quarantined objects, user notification and fallback workflow shall be defined during analysis phase.

Question 493: "No critical vulnerabilities" is listed as an acceptance criterion. Please define the scanner(s) to be used, the severity scale, any CVSS threshold, and the retest procedure. Combined with the currently uncapped, discretionary cyber-security payment withholding (see Q12), this constitutes a material commercial exposure that should be bounded before pricing.
Source: Acceptance criteria; GCC / SCC 12.6

Answer to Question 493:
The cybersecurity testing and acceptance criteria have been clarified through Amendment No. 5 to the RFP.
Vulnerabilities shall be classified using CVSS, with vulnerabilities scoring 9.0 or higher classified as Critical. No unresolved Critical vulnerability shall remain at Operational Acceptance. Applicable security testing, remediation, retesting and evidence requirements are specified in Amendment No. 5.
Please refer to Amendment No. 5.

Question 494: Clarify the permitted technology for the mandatory Virtual Assistant / ChatBot on the public Portal (intent-based guidance and request-status lookup under §1.3.5 B5). Section 2.2.4 prohibits AI / ML in business logic, validation or decision-making (permitted only as development support tools). Confirm that a purely rule-based, intent-mapped chatbot (no LLM) is required and acceptable, or state the intended approach. This materially affects the technical solution and build effort.
Source: Section VII §1.3.5 B5 vs §2.2.4

Answer to Question 494:
A rule-based or intent-based Virtual Assistant using a curated knowledge base is fully acceptable and meets the RFP requirement. A generative/LLM-based assistant is not mandatory and shall not be used for regulatory validation, eligibility, substantive assessment or decision-making.
If a Proposer voluntarily offers a generative component, it requires Beneficiary approval and controls for EU data residency, approved knowledge sources, security, logging, unsupported-answer mitigation and human escalation. The Beneficiary will provide, validate and maintain the knowledge-base content.

Question 495: Please provide or confirm: (a) the allocation of controller and joint-controller responsibilities under Regulation (EU) 2016/679 as between SCAR / NARW Headquarters, the eleven Basin Water Administrations, INHGA and ECSC; (b) whether a Data Protection Impact Assessment exists and can be made available; (c) retention periods for personal data (including CNP / CUI identifiers, applicant contact details, whistleblowing reports, Virtual Assistant conversation logs and rest-leave records); (d) any data-residency requirement applicable to the hosting environment and to any SaaS component; and (e) the required approach to sub-processor authorization.
Source: Section VII §1.1.2(c), §1.3.3.2, §1.3.5 B3 / B5, §1.2.3

Answer to Question 495:
The Beneficiary will determine and document the applicable controller and, where relevant, joint-controller arrangements among the participating institutions in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and their respective legal roles. The Contractor shall act as processor to the extent it processes personal data on the documented instructions of the Beneficiary.
No completed DPIA is confirmed. Its necessity, scope and timing will be assessed during analysis, and the Contractor shall provide the technical information and assistance required. Retention periods for applicants, CNP/CUI, whistleblowing reports, chatbot logs, leave records and other personal data shall be fixed in the approved data inventory/retention schedule based on applicable law, purpose limitation and the archival nomenclature; secure deletion shall be supported.
For NARW Azure or any approved SaaS, hosting, backup and DR data shall remain within the European Union.

Question 496: Section VII §0.2 and §1.3.4 require DMS-RAE to enforce retention periods, archival classification, transfer and controlled disposal in accordance with the institution's approved archival classification schedule. That schedule is not included in the RFP documents. Please provide the approved archival classification schedule, including document series, retention periods, appraisal rules and disposal conditions.
Source: Section VII §0.2, §1.3.4

Answer to Question 496:
The Beneficiary will provide or validate during analysis the applicable archival nomenclature, document series, retention periods, appraisal rules, access restrictions and disposal conditions available under its approved internal procedures. These materials will form the configuration baseline for DMS-RAE retention and controlled disposal.
DMS-RAE shall support both manual and automatic archiving and preserve the original file and, where applicable, a non-editable PDF consultation copy. Under Amendment No. 5, the current scope covers controlled storage and preservation within DMS-RAE; integration with or controlled transfer to the National Archives is excluded.

Mihai CONSTANTINESCU

PMU DIRECTOR