



TO:	ALL BIDDERS	FROM:	Sally Alvarez de Schreiner Chief, Procurement Services Section
DATE:	30 October 2025	REF.:	RFP 2025-01/SANZ 
		EMAIL:	procurement@ctbto.org
SUBJECT:	Clarifications No. 1 RFP No. 2025-0149/SANZ: Design and development of tools to support the generation of inspection team reports		

Dear Bidders,

In reference to the Commission's Request for Proposal No. 2025-0149/SANZ pertaining to Design and development of tools to support the generation of inspection team reports (the "RFP"):

- Please find attached **Clarifications No. 1** to questions raised by bidders in respect to the aforementioned RFP.
- **The deadline for the submission of proposal is hereby extended from Friday 31 October 2025 to Friday 7 November 2025, 17:00 hours, Vienna (Austria) local time.**

Please take all of the above and attached documentation into account in the preparation and submission of your proposal.

We are looking forward to receiving your proposal prior to the extended deadline of 31 October 2025, 17:00 hours, Vienna (Austria) local time.

Sincerely,



Selma Bukvic
OiC, Procurement Services Section

Attachments

1. Clarifications No. 1

Item#	Bidders Question	CTBTO Answer
1	Scope of PIR/PFD Reports (Chapters 3.2ff): What is the intended scope of each PIR/PFD report? Should they be time-bound or based on another criterion? This is crucial for determining which TMRs, FTRs, etc., should be included in a given report.	The PIR (CTBT, Article IV, paragraph.47) and PFD (CTBT, Protocol Part II, paragraph.109) document are one in the same document with a few differences and are time-bound by the CTBT. Kindly note that RFP Annex B – TOR Page 2 under Scope explains the 2 additional attachments to the PFD, they are the Attachment 13: PIR itself attached to the PFD and Attachment 12: Equipment not removed from the Territory of the Inspected State Party. The PIR will not have attachment 12, nor 13, because the inspection is still on-going and has not concluded. The TMRs, FTRs, etc. that have been published in GIMO must be included in both the PIR and PFD. The only difference is that the PFD is further along in the inspection than the PIR.
2	Versions of PIR (Chapter 3.9): Could you clarify the purpose of the different PIR versions? Are these multiple versions of a single report or separate reports altogether?	Kindly note that this included in the RFP Annex B – ToR – paragraph 3.9. The report generation can be pressed multiple times, and the expectation is that the compilation will generate a PIR/PFD report that has a date/timestamp on it to distinguish the same reports from each other. The button takes the generated content sections and the inspector content sections and puts the PIR and/or PFD together in one final document for review. The PIR will have one final version that is the official PIR document, and when it is put back into the GIMO application as an Inspection Documents, it is the official PIR. The Admin Officer still has the possibility to make changes to the document, but that would be an exception case. The editing of the document takes place in the file system under the Inspector Content (TOR Figure 10-11).
3	User Roles and Permissions: The requirements do not specify which roles and permissions are needed to work with the reports or whether an approval process is required. For example, which roles should be allowed to edit specific sections of the report?	Kindly note that this included in the RFP Annex B – ToR – under 3 -Scope- has a requirement to understand Active Directory and Samba. Therefore the roles are covered here, as the roles are already available. All sections of the report which are the inspector content are written by the Deputy Inspection Team Lead role with the assistance of the Admin Officer. The Data Flow Officer and Subject Team Leads may be tasked to write parts of the inspector content sections of the report. The only function that is limited to the Admin Officer, and DITL/ITL is the ability to generate the final document.

4	SZSR Template Reference (Chapter 3.6): The reference to the SZSR template (AUT-REP-TMP-018.Rev.X) in Annex I of the RfP cannot be located. Could you confirm its availability or provide the correct reference?	This has been provided as ANNEX 1 to the TOR, please refer to pages 44-77 of the RFP 2025-0149 PDF document.
5	A consistent response to ToR Section 11 Risk Management includes a change management procedure for the case that scope adjustments need to be made during the project. Please provide the following clarification: Is there a defined change process for software delivery projects in place at CTBTO? - If so, please provide us with a description of the process. - If not, what are the boundary conditions we should observe when proposing a change process?	CTBTO does not have a predefined change process for this project. It is therefore the responsibility of the bidder to propose an appropriate risk management and change control process as part of their proposal as requested in the RFP Annex B TOR section 11..