



TO: All Bidders

DATE: 22 June 2026

FROM: Sally Alvarez de Schreiner
Chief, Procurement Services Section

REF.: RFP No. 2026-0042/RICKARD

TEL. NO.: +43 1 26030 6350

EMAIL: procurement@ctbto.org

SUBJECT: **Clarifications No. 3 to RFP 2026-0042/RICKARD: Provision of Software Engineering Services for Database and Web Applications - Database of the Technical Secretariat Modernization (DOTS Modernization) On a Call-Off Basis**

Dear Bidders,

In reference to request for proposal (RFP) No. 2026-0042/RICKARD: Provision of Software Engineering Services for Database and Web Applications - Database of the Technical Secretariat Modernization (DOTS Modernization) On a Call-Off Basis:

Please find attached **Clarifications No. 3** to questions raised by interested bidders. The attached Clarifications No. 3 are an integral part of the RFP documents and shall be considered in the preparation and submission of proposals.

We are looking forward to receiving your proposal prior to the extended deadline for the submission of proposal on 30 June 2026, 17:00 hours, Vienna (Austria) local time.

Sincerely,

Sally Alvarez de Schreiner
Chief, Procurement Services Section

Attachments:

- 1. Questions and Answers – Clarifications No. 3***

Clarifications No. 3 - questions and answers

#	Bidders' Question	Answer
1	<p><u>Geospatial Data Scope</u></p> <p>The RFP references both “assisting in extracting insights from raw geospatial data” and “a map view will be implemented, using layers provided by the Commission.”</p> <p>Could you please clarify the expected scope of geospatial functionality to be delivered by the selected bidder? Specifically, is the requirement limited to the visualization and consumption of existing geospatial data and map layers within the application, or does it also include geospatial data management, processing, storage, and maintenance capabilities?</p> <p>If geospatial data management is within scope, please provide details regarding the current geospatial data repository and technology stack used for storing and managing geospatial datasets.</p>	<p>The requirement is limited to the visualization and consumption of geospatial data and map layers within the application and does not include geospatial data management, processing, storage, and maintenance capabilities.</p>
2	<p><u>Data Migration Requirements</u></p> <p>Could you please confirm whether any data migration activities are expected as part of the project scope, including but not limited to operational data, historical records, documents, or metadata?</p> <p>For example, based on our understanding of the RFP, the current Alfresco-based document management solution may be replaced by SharePoint. If so, should bidders assume responsibility for migrating existing content and associated metadata from Alfresco to SharePoint?</p>	<p>Data migration activities are not within the scope of this contract. Bidders should not include or assume responsibility for migrating operational data, historical records, documents, or metadata as part of their proposals.</p>

<p>3</p>	<p><u>Deployment Environment and Infrastructure Requirements</u></p> <p>The RFP indicates that the proposed solution should support deployment either on-premises or within a cloud environment. Additionally, the DevOps requirements state that the selected bidder will be responsible for designing, implementing, and maintaining the infrastructure required to run and evaluate the software.</p> <p>Could you please clarify whether there is a preferred cloud platform (e.g., Microsoft Azure, AWS, Oracle Cloud, etc.) and whether prior experience with a specific cloud provider is expected?</p> <p>In the case of an on-premises deployment, could you provide any available information regarding the target infrastructure, hosting environment, technology standards, or architectural constraints that bidders should consider when preparing their proposals?</p>	<p>The target deployment infrastructure is already defined and maintained by the Commission. As stated in Section III.1 of the ToR, DOTS is deployed through Kubernetes using the PTS Kubernetes infrastructure.</p> <p>The DevOps requirement to "design, implement and maintain infrastructure for running and evaluating the Software" (Section IV.5.1) refers specifically to the CI/CD pipeline, container orchestration configuration (e.g., Kubernetes manifests, Helm charts, Dockerfiles), and related software development lifecycle tooling, but not to the underlying hosting infrastructure, which remains the Commission's responsibility.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><u>Identity and Access Management</u></p> <p>The architecture diagram included in the RFP references both Microsoft Entra ID and Oracle SSO.</p> <p>Could you please clarify the current identity and access management landscape and identify which identity provider should be integrated with the new solution?</p> <p>Additionally, should bidders assume integration with an existing identity provider and user directory, or is the implementation of a new identity provider and migration of existing users and identities expected as part of the project scope?</p>	<p>Both Microsoft Entra ID and Oracle SSO are existing identity providers operated by the Commission.</p> <p>Integrating DOTS with these identity providers is planned to be performed by the Commission, not the bidder. However, their skills in case of issues might be drawn upon and the solution should be developed in a way allowing this integration.</p> <p>No implementation of a new identity provider or any migration of users and identities is expected as part of the project scope.</p>

<p>5</p>	<p><u>Mapping Framework Requirements</u></p> <p>The scoring matrix references OpenLayers as part of the proposed solution.</p> <p>Could you please clarify whether OpenLayers is a mandatory technology requirement, or whether functionally equivalent open-source mapping frameworks (e.g., MapLibre) would also be considered acceptable, provided that they fully satisfy the functional and non-functional requirements?</p>	<p>OpenLayers is not a mandatory technology requirement. Functionally equivalent open-source mapping frameworks will be considered acceptable, provided they meet all functional and non-functional requirements and are compatible with the map layers provided by the Commission.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>Regarding the geospatial visualization requirements (ToR, Section IV.6): The Terms of Reference state that web mapping components shall be compatible with map layers provided by the Commission. Could the Commission please clarify what form these map layers will be made available in, including the standards and formats used (such as WMS, WMTS, XYZ/vector tiles or GeoJSON), and how they will be accessed?</p>	<p>The Commission primarily produces XYZ/vector tiles and GeoJSON. Additionally, a MapProxy instance is deployed which can serve layers in alternative formats such as WMS and WMTS where needed.</p> <p>Bidders should therefore ensure that their proposed solution is compatible with these formats. The specific layers and access endpoints relevant to a given work item will be confirmed at the time of call-off.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Regarding the technical requirements in Annex B, Section V.2.5, item 9, which lists a recognized security certification such as CISSP or CSSLP (or equivalent) as an asset, we understand that a CISM (Certified Information Security Manager) certification is considered an acceptable equivalent for the purpose of the technical evaluation. Could you please confirm our understanding?</p>	<p>CISSP and CSSLP are technical security certifications focused on software and systems security engineering.</p> <p>CISM is primarily management-focused and does not directly address the technical software security competencies required by this criterion.</p>