

Number	Document	Section / Requirement - Provision	Question Tenderer	Answer
1	Descriptive Document	Core Competencies / Experience Requirements	The tender documents require specific experience with e-books / e-lending as part of the core competencies. Could the Contracting Authority clarify why domain-specific experience with e-books is considered strictly necessary for the successful execution of the contract, and why generic experience with delivering, maintaining and operating complex digital platforms with similar scale and criticality is not considered sufficient or equivalent?	The KB considers experience with e-books and e-lending necessary, as the contract concerns a specific type of platform within the context of the online library. Generic experience with complex digital platforms is therefore not considered equivalent.
2	Schedule 1 – Requirements	Core Competencies	Is the Contracting Authority willing to confirm that experience with providing, maintaining and developing a SaaS platform, including hosting, security, availability and lifecycle management, may be considered functionally equivalent, even if this experience was not obtained specifically within the e-books domain?	The KB considers experience within the domain of e-books and e-lending necessary, as the contract concerns a specific type of platform within the context of the online library. Experience with a generic SaaS platform is therefore not considered functionally equivalent.
3	Descriptive Document	Scope of Services / Platform Responsibilities	Can the Contracting Authority confirm that, when assessing the core competencies, the technical and operational complexity of the platform (e.g. scalability, availability, international rollout, integrations with external systems) is considered more important than the specific type of digital content (such as e-books) hosted on the platform?	When assessing the core competencies, the submitted reference must meet the requirements as set out in the procurement documents in full. No relative weighting takes place between different aspects of the reference. This means that technical and operational complexity cannot compensate for the absence of the required experience with e-books and e-lending.
4	Schedule 1 – Requirements	Use of Third Parties / Combined Experience	In case a Tenderer demonstrates extensive experience with platform provision, platform maintenance and implementation of interfaces/connectors in other complex domains, can such experience be used (possibly in combination with other parties in the delivery chain) to meet the core competency requirements, even if the platform did not specifically concern e-books?	The Contracting Authority cannot accept this. The submitted reference must meet the requirements as set out in the procurement documents. Experience that does not relate to a platform for e-books cannot therefore be considered sufficient to demonstrate the relevant core competencies.
5	Descriptive Document	Risk Management / Suitability Criteria	Could the Contracting Authority specify which concrete risks it foresees if a Tenderer does not have prior experience with e-books, but does have extensive experience with mission-critical digital platforms, multinational implementations and complex administrative processes? Additionally, could the Contracting Authority explain why such risks could not be mitigated through contractual arrangements, governance or acceptance criteria?	The KB considers experience with e-books and e-lending necessary, as the contract concerns a specific type of platform within the context of the online library. The related functional, substantive and operational characteristics mean that the KB considers such experience relevant for the proper performance of the contract. In the KB's view, the absence of this experience cannot be adequately mitigated solely through contractual arrangements, governance or acceptance criteria.
6	Schedule 1 – Requirements	Interpretation of Core Competencies	Is the Contracting Authority willing to confirm that the intention of the core competency requirements is not to limit participation to suppliers with experience in one specific domain (e-books), but rather to ensure that the Tenderer is capable of sustainably delivering and operating a complex digital platform throughout the contract duration?	The core competency requirements have been formulated to ensure that the Tenderer has the experience relevant to this contract. Given the nature and context of the contract, the KB considers experience with e-books and e-lending necessary.
7	Schedule 1	M2C.2	MP4 is not a standard Audiobook format, but a video format. Also the descriptive does not mention video in any case but strictly referring to reading and listening. Could the requirement to support MP4 be removed or if not - changed from Must to Should requirement.	We acknowledge that MP4 (MPEG-4) is not a standard format for audiobooks. The platform is expected to support multiple types of digital content, including audiovisual (reading) materials. MP4 (MPEG-4) is a widely adopted and supported format for video delivery and is therefore included to ensure compatibility with such content. Video may, for example, be used as content type for read-aloud videos for small children or as trailers to promote and introduce books. However, although this functionality is highly important to the KB, we will consider whether this requirement should remain a must-have or be reclassified as a system desirable. Further clarification and the final positioning will be provided in the second Memorandum of Information.
8	Schedule 1	M2C.2	PDF is today an outdated ebook format. Especially it is very few books in this format that actually is compliant with the accessibility legislation. So to move the solution in to the future this requirement should be changed to a Should requirement if not removed.	PDF support is a requirement for our platform. PDF is used for periodicals such as magazines and newspapers (at this moment 2113), where preservation of the original layout, typography, and visual design is critical.
9	Schedule 1	M2C.6	From a usability standpoint it will be a very poor user experience with a dropdown filter on author and title. These parameters are usually handled in a search and not a filter. We suggest that these parameters are not required filters but must be possible to combine this with other filters.	The intent of this requirement is to ensure that users can effectively refine results using multiple metadata attributes in combination. This includes the ability to combine text search (e.g. on author and title) with additional filters such as subject/genre, publication date, language, format etc. Accordingly, it is acceptable for author and title to be primarily supported through search functionality, provided that users can combine these search input with other filtering options in a seamless and user-friendly manner. The overall requirement to support multi-criteria refinement of search results remains applicable.
10	Schedule 1	M2D.3	The descriptive document refers to a e-lending solution for reading and listening - not video or viewing. Could the requirement for playing video be removed or changed from Must to Should requirement.	Although this functionality is highly important to the KB, we will consider whether this requirement should remain a must-have or be reclassified as a system desirable. Further clarification and the final positioning will be provided in the second Memorandum of Information.
11	Schedule 1	M2G.3	This seems to be a very specific use case without being described in detail. We suggest this will be removed from the tender as a demand and instead formulated as a development project that can be scoped properly with the tenderer.	User segmentation based on membership type is a core capability of the platform. This part of the requirement remains mandatory. User defined preferences will be reconsidered whether this requirement should remain a must-have or be reclassified as a system desirable. Further clarification will be provided in the second Memorandum of Information.
12	Schedule 1	M2G.4	Can this be demonstrated at a later stage than during the use case demonstration in June.	We will consider whether this requirement should remain a must-have or be reclassified as a system desirable. Further clarification will be provided in the second Memorandum of Information.

13	Schedule 1	M2G.5	This is a very specific wish that normally is not a part of a standard solution for e-reading/e-listening. Could this requirement be removed or changed from Must to Should requirement.	<p>We acknowledge that this requirement may extend beyond the core functionality typically associated with standard solutions.</p> <p>However, this requirement reflects the broader scope of the platform as envisaged by the KB, which includes not only content delivery but also communication and compliance with legal obligations. The ability to manage service pages, landing pages, and cookie/privacy information is essential to support these objectives. The KB is not seeking a fully featured enterprise CMS solution, but rather a basic and manageable content management capability sufficient to support these operational and communication needs.</p> <p>For this reason, the requirement will remain classified as a "Must". Contractors are free to meet this requirement either through native functionality within the solution or through integration with existing or third-party components, provided that the overall capability is delivered in a cohesive and manageable way.</p>
14	Schedule 1	M2G.6	<p>These tasks are normally handled in a distribution interface and not directly in the e-lending solution. Can this be reformulated to say:</p> <p><i>"Administrators must be able to manually upload digital content items and add or edit metadata. This functionality must include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Support for standard e-book and document formats; The ability to enter or edit metadata (e.g., title, author, subject, description, rights information);</i> <i>• Optional assignment to collections or categories;"</i> <p>This will fulfill the purpose of the requirement but allow this to be done outside the actual platform.</p>	<p>This requirement remains applicable. It is essential for the KB that this functionality is included as part of the overall solution provided by the Contractor.</p> <p>However, whether implemented within the core platform or via an integrated administrative interface or distribution component, the solution must enable administrators to manually upload digital content and manage metadata. This must be delivered, supported, and maintained by the Contractor as part of the solution, and must not rely on separate tools or processes operated by the KB.</p> <p>In other words, the implementation approach is flexible, but the responsibility and usability of this functionality must clearly reside within the Contractor's solution.</p>
15	Schedule 1	M2H.1	This will be possible under the circumstance that branding, colours, logo, typography, etc. os WCAG compliant	<p>The Contracting Authority is responsible for providing a visual identity that complies with applicable accessibility standards, including WCAG requirements. Contractors are expected to implement this visual identity consistently across the app and website.</p> <p>Where specific elements of the provided design may require adjustment to ensure technical feasibility or compliance with accessibility standards, this should be addressed in consultation with the Contracting Authority during implementation. However, this does not change the requirement to support and apply the provided visual identity.</p>
16	Schedule 1	M2H.2	This is often a choice between 2 evils from a design perspective. Allowing more tenderes to be able to bid on this tender. We suggest that this is changed from a Must to a Should	<p>Preserving the original cover images without deformation, cropping, or alteration of aspect ratio is essential to ensure visual consistency, recognisability, and alignment with how content is presented by publishers. In addition, differentiation between content types (e.g. e-books, audiobooks, periodicals) must be clearly visible to users when they are presented together. This can be achieved through the use of a subtle icon; however, the icon does not necessarily need to be placed directly on the cover image, as long as the intended distinction is clear and user-friendly.</p> <p>For these reasons, this requirement is considered essential and will not be reclassified as a desirable requirement.</p>
17	Schedule 1	M2I.1	This requirement is related to M2G.3, that we suggest will be removed for further definition and scoping, thus we also suggest taking this requirement out of scope for the tender or at least the use case demonstration so it can be further evalutated and adjusted according to the intention behind the requirement and developed, so it is ready at contract start.	<p>The requirement remains within scope of this tender.</p> <p>The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the system supports configurable lending rights at the subscription level. Currently, we work with four subscription types, each with its own set of rules. The solution must allow these lending rights (such as number of simultaneous loans, loan duration, and access to specific collections) to be set and adjusted per subscription type in a flexible manner.</p> <p>It is not required that these configurations are performed by employees of the Contracting Authority. It is acceptable if this is managed by the Contractor's administrators, provided that the process is efficient and does not require technical changes or development effort.</p> <p>For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.</p>
18	Schedule 1	M2I.2	This requirement is related to M2G.3, that we suggest will be removed for further definition and scoping, thus we also suggest taking this requirement out of scope for the tender or at least the use case demonstration so it can be further evalutated and adjusted according to the intention behind the requirement and developed, so it is ready at contract start.	<p>The requirement remains within scope of this tender.</p> <p>The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the system provides sufficient flexibility to define and manage subscription models over time. In addition to the current four subscription types, the Contracting Authority must be able to introduce new subscription types with their own specific rules, allowances, and limitations (e.g. lending rights, access to collections, usage limits).</p> <p>It is not required that this configuration is performed directly by employees of the Contracting Authority. It is acceptable if this is managed by the Contractor's administrators, provided that new subscription types can be created and adjusted efficiently without requiring technical changes or development effort.</p> <p>For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.</p>

19	Schedule 1	M2I.5	This requirement is related to M2G.3, that we suggest will be removed for further definition and scoping, thus we also suggest taking this requirement out of scope for the tender or at least the use case demonstration so it can be further evaluated and adjusted according to the intention behind the requirement and developed, so it is ready at contract start.	<p>The requirement remains within scope of this tender.</p> <p>The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the system supports differentiated lending and access rules for distinct customer groups. This is essential to reflect our current and future subscription models, where different groups (e.g. based on subscription type, age group, or other criteria) may have varying entitlements and restrictions.</p> <p>The solution must therefore provide the flexibility to define and manage such rules, including access to specific subcollections, loan limits, and counting logic per content type. These configurations should be adjustable without requiring technical changes or development effort.</p> <p>It is not required that these configurations are performed directly by employees of the Contracting Authority. It is acceptable if this is managed by the Contractor's administrators, provided that the process is efficient and manageable.</p> <p>For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.</p>
20	Schedule 1	M2K.1	This requirement has never been raised before by any of the +750 library customers we have been working with and it is definitely not included in standard industry products for the library market. We suggest it is reformulated with the purpose of the value you need for analytics from a e-lending solution and changed from a Must to a Should demand.	<p>We note that the term "analytics platform" may have caused confusion. This requirement does not imply a separate or standalone analytics product. The intent is that the solution must enable analytics on user behaviour and provide authorised employees with access to relevant usage and interaction data. These insights are essential for managing and improving the service, as well as for reporting and accountability purposes. Therefore, the requirement remains a "Must".</p> <p>Contractors may fulfil this through native functionality or integration with existing tools, provided that users have access to dashboards, filtering, analysis, export capabilities, and regularly updated data.</p> <p>For clarity, the requirement should be read as: "The solution must enable analytics on user behaviour and provide access to reporting and insights for authorised employees."</p> <p>For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.</p>
21	Schedule 1	M3A.4	According to the Tender checklist in the Descriptive Document there is no document to describe Must-demands. However in this requirement we are asked to describe which mechanisms are available. How or where should we do that?	We acknowledge this observation. The request for explanation ("The Contractor must describe...") will be removed from the requirement to align with the tender procedure and documentation structure.
22	Schedule 1	M3A.6	According to the Descriptive document the content is provided by Centraal Boekhuis (CB). So our understanding is that we would need to integrate to them to get access to the content, but according to this requirement it is KB's API. Can you please clarify this?	The term 'content supplied by CB' refers to the ePUBs, audio files and PDFs for magazine/journals. The KB API relates to the metadata and licence details
23	Schedule 1	M3D.1	This seems to be an outdated method to transfer data to the data warehouse. We suggest this to be changed from a Must to a Should demand and preferable formulated as the data point you wish to extract and the tenderer can describe their solution for this.	<p>This requirement remains applicable.</p> <p>We acknowledge that SFTP-based CSV export may not represent the most modern integration approach. However, it reflects the current state of our data infrastructure and operational processes. At the time of go-live, our Data Warehouse relies on structured CSV exports via SFTP for data ingestion.</p> <p>At the same time, we recognise the benefits of more modern integration patterns. As part of future development, we intend to transition towards API-based data access for these datasets.</p> <p>In summary: SFTP-based CSV export is required at go-live and remains a must-have.</p>
24	Schedule 1	M4A.5	It is not specified what the requirements for passwords are. Please elaborate.	<p>We would like to clarify that the requirement is intended for accounts not managed through Microsoft Entra ID.</p> <p>At a minimum, the solution must support configuration of the following password and authentication criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum password length; Maximum password length; Detection and prevention of the use of breached or compromised passwords; Support for multi-factor authentication (MFA) <p>These criteria must be configurable to allow alignment with evolving security policies. Contractors are expected to ensure that their solution can enforce these controls for all relevant accounts.</p>
25	Schedule 1	M4B.1	In the Descriptive document KB is stating that <i>"The intended solution is based on a proven Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) offering that is already operational at the Tenderer and has been demonstrably used in a comparable context. The starting point here is to limit customisation as much as possible and to make maximum use of standard functionalities."</i> Many libraries are using older systems with less secure protocols, that we need to support. By requiring a score of at least "A" it is no longer a standard functionality. We suggest this will be changed to at least "B" or changed from a Must to a Should requirement letting the tenderer explain how security is handled.	<p>This requirement remains applicable.</p> <p>Achieving at least an "A" rating in the Qualys SSL Labs SSL Server Test is considered a widely accepted benchmark for secure configuration of internet-facing endpoints. It reflects current best practices for Transport Layer Security (TLS) and aligns with the security expectations for public digital services.</p> <p>While we recognise that some legacy systems may rely on older protocols or cipher suites, the e-lending platform must adhere to contemporary security standards. Supporting outdated or weak cryptographic configurations introduces unnecessary risk and is not acceptable for this platform.</p> <p>Given the nature of the platform and applicable regulatory expectations (e.g. NIS2), this level of security is considered proportionate and necessary. The requirement will therefore remain a mandatory requirement.</p>

26	Schedule 1	M4C.1	<p>With several years in the business we have never come across this requirement before and really don't understand it's relevance. It mostly sounds like a demand from someone outside the book business.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is meant by "uploaded to a fixed location" - What is the purpose of filtering on extensions? This is not a file repository but a completely different way to structure metadata and resources belonging to specific books. - We have concerns with setting limits on file size. Does this mean that you don't want to accept large audiobooks? - scanning for malware - sounds like unnecessary security measures. all files are provided by publishers with the intention to sell books, not infiltrate computers. We have never heard about files as resources to e-books or audiobooks containing malware. 	<p>We would like to clarify that this requirement reflects our baseline security and operational standards and therefore remains applicable.</p> <p>"Uploaded to a fixed location" means that files must be stored in a designated, system-controlled directory, container, or storage bucket that is predefined in the platform configuration. Uploading files to arbitrary or user-defined paths must not be possible. This ensures that all uploaded content is stored in a known location where security measures are applied.</p> <p>Filtering on file types is intended as a validation measure to ensure that only expected and supported file types are accepted by the platform.</p> <p>File size limits are required to safeguard platform performance and stability. These limits are expected to be configurable and should accommodate realistic use cases, including large files such as audiobooks.</p> <p>Malware scanning is a standard security control, regardless of the source of content. While content is typically provided by trusted publishers, this measure mitigates supply chain risks.</p> <p>Contractors are expected to support these controls as part of a secure and robust platform.</p>
27	Schedule 1	M4E.1	<p>We have never come across this requirement before. It is not standard in the book business. We suggest it is changed from Must to Should so the tenderer can explain their security setup</p>	<p>This requirement remains applicable.</p> <p>System hardening based on recognised standards such as the Center for Internet Security benchmarks (or comparable vendor guidelines) is considered a fundamental and widely adopted security practice, not a platform-specific or exceptional measure. It applies generically to modern IT environments.</p> <p>The requirement is intentionally formulated as "comply or explain", allowing flexibility where strict adherence to a specific benchmark may not be feasible or appropriate. In such cases, the Contractor is expected to demonstrate that equivalent or stronger security measures are in place.</p> <p>Given the nature of the platform, including user data and public accessibility, proper hardening of all components is essential to reduce the attack surface and ensure a secure baseline configuration. This aligns with common security frameworks and regulatory expectations (e.g. NIS2).</p> <p>For these reasons, the requirement is considered standard for secure system operation and will remain a mandatory requirement</p>
28	Schedule 1	M4E.5	<p>What is meant here. Is this something the Contracting Authority is conducting or is this something the Tenderer must provide documentation for?</p>	<p>The Contractor is responsible for conducting the annual penetration test.</p> <p>The intention of this requirement is that the Contractor ensures that an independent white-box penetration test is performed on the full e-lending platform, including the web application and mobile applications. The test must be carried out by a qualified and independent third party.</p> <p>The Contractor remains responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *commissioning and facilitating the penetration test; *ensuring the scope covers the complete platform; *addressing and remediating identified vulnerabilities; *making the resulting reports available to the Contracting Authority upon request.
29	Schedule 1	M4E.6	<p>This sounds like a massive overkill for a e-lending platform. Please elaborate on the need for this level of security and why do you require both this and requirement M4E.5</p>	<p>This requirement remains applicable.</p> <p>As a public organisation, we are required to maintain a high level of security for our digital services. Regular vulnerability scanning is a standard and widely accepted practice to identify and mitigate security risks in a timely manner. A minimum frequency of quarterly scans is considered proportionate and aligned with common security standards and best practices.</p> <p>In addition to vulnerability scanning, penetration testing serves a different and complementary purpose. Vulnerability scans are automated and effective for identifying known issues, whereas penetration tests provide a deeper, manual assessment of the system, including the exploitation of vulnerabilities and the identification of attack scenarios. Both measures are necessary.</p> <p>The requirement defines a minimum baseline; Contractors are free to implement more frequent or advanced security measures as part of their standard operations.</p>
30	Schedule 1	M4E.7	<p>Referring to the Descriptive document and the quote: <i>"The intended solution is based on a proven Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) offering that is already operational at the Tenderer and has been demonstrably used in a comparable context. The starting point here is to limit customisation as much as possible and to make maximum use of standard functionalities."</i></p> <p>When the intention is to 'make maximum use of standard functionalities' it is a paradox to ask for custom security. Proven systems are built as they are built so we suggest this to be changed from Must to Should to let the Tenderer elaborate on how security is handled</p>	<p>The requirement remains mandatory.</p> <p>Preventing the OWASP top 10 mobile risks is considered a widely accepted baseline for secure mobile application development, not a custom or optional measure. It reflects best practices and is aligned with common security standards.</p> <p>The requirement does not prescribe a specific implementation approach, allowing Contractors flexibility in how they design and build their solution. However, the outcome - mitigation of the OWASP top 10 mobile risks - must be demonstrably achieved.</p> <p>Given the nature of the platform, this requirement is essential and will remain a "must-have".</p>
31	Schedule 1	M4I.1	<p>This sounds like a massive overkill for a e-lending platform. Referring to the Descriptive document and the quote: <i>"The intended solution is based on a proven Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) offering that is already operational at the Tenderer and has been demonstrably used in a comparable context. The starting point here is to limit customisation as much as possible and to make maximum use of standard functionalities."</i></p> <p>When the intention is to 'make maximum use of standard functionalities' it is a paradox to ask for custom security. Proven systems are built as they are built so we suggest this to be changed from Must to Should to let the Tenderer elaborate on how security reporting is handled</p>	<p>The requirement remains applicable.</p> <p>For a public-facing platform, structured and periodic security reporting is considered a baseline requirement rather than an exception. The purpose of the quarterly report is to provide the KB with insight into the security posture of the solution, including incidents, identified vulnerabilities, associated risks, and the status of mitigation actions.</p> <p>The requirement does not imply the need for bespoke or ad hoc reporting, but rather a structured summary of information that is typically already available within standard security and operational processes. It enables transparency and allows the KB to monitor whether appropriate measures are taken to manage and reduce risks.</p> <p>Given these considerations, the requirement is not considered excessive and will remain in scope.</p>

32	Schedule 1	M4I.2	This is not a standard requirement in tenders on e-lending platforms. We recommend this to be changed from Must to Should allowing the Tenderer to elaborate on how they operate and explain their certifications as there are no way in the current Tender material to elaborate on Must requirements.	We acknowledge that this requirement may go beyond what is typically included in tenders for standard e-lending platforms. However, these certifications reflect the Contracting Authority's baseline requirements for information security, risk management, and cloud service assurance. Given the nature of the platform, its integration within our broader system chain, and the handling of user and operational data, it is essential that both the Contractor and any engaged (Cloud) Service Provider meet recognized and auditable security standards. This also aligns with the Contracting Authority's obligations and responsibilities under NIS2. The requirement is therefore not intended to limit solutions, but to ensure a demonstrable and verifiable level of security maturity and compliance with established best practices. Contractors are expected to provide evidence of valid certifications or clearly demonstrate equivalence where applicable. For these reasons, the requirement will remain classified as a "Must".
33	Schedule 1	M4I.3	This is not a standard requirement in tenders on e-lending platforms. We recommend this to be changed from Must to Should allowing the Tenderer to elaborate on how they comply to NIS2 Directive.	Compliance with the cybersecurity obligations stemming from the NIS2 Directive and its implementation in Dutch legislation is not optional for the e-lending solution. Given the nature of the services and the potential impact on information security, data integrity, and service continuity, adherence to these requirements is considered a baseline condition rather than a differentiating feature. While we acknowledge that this may not yet be standard in all e-lending platform tenders, the regulatory landscape has evolved significantly, and organisations are expected to align with NIS2-related obligations, including risk management, incident response, and supply-chain security measures. Tenderers are therefore required to demonstrate how their solution complies with these requirements. The requirement remains mandatory.
34	Schedule 1	M5B.1	Referring to the Descriptive document and the quote: <i>"The intended solution is based on a proven Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) offering that is already operational at the Tenderer and has been demonstrably used in a comparable context. The starting point here is to limit customisation as much as possible and to make maximum use of standard functionalities."</i> When the intention is to 'make maximum use of standard functionalities' it is a paradox to ask for custom system setup. Proven systems are built as they are built so we suggest this to be changed from Must to Should to let the Tenderer elaborate on how the production vs. test environment is structured and the arguments for these choices.	We acknowledge your point regarding the use of standard SaaS solutions and the aim to minimize customisation. However, this requirement does not conflict with that principle. The requested separation between acceptance and production environments is a standard practice in professional SaaS delivery and is essential for operating the solution within our broader IT landscape. The platform will form part of an integrated system chain (i.e. a set of interconnected systems), including components such as Identity and Access Management and customer authorisation systems. In this context, it is necessary to validate changes, configurations, and integrations end-to-end before deploying them to production. An acceptance environment that is functionally equivalent to production, including connected mobile applications, is required to: *Perform realistic user testing; *Validate integrations with other systems in the chain; *Reduce risks associated with releases and changes. This does not imply unnecessary customisation of the core solution, but rather the provision of appropriate environments and configuration to support controlled testing and deployment processes. For these reasons, the requirement will remain classified as a "Must".
35	Schedule 1	M5B.2	This is not a common requirement for a proven and operational Software-as-a-Service product. As functionalities and features are released to benefit multiple library customers it is not possible to have a system in place to deliver specific test results to one out of many customers. We suggest this requirement is removed.	We acknowledge that in a multi-tenant SaaS context, releases are typically managed centrally and not customised to individual customers. However, this requirement is intended to ensure transparency into the Contractor's standard quality assurance and release management process. As the platform will be part of our broader system chain and directly impacts our services, it is essential for the Contracting Authority to have insight into the quality and stability of each release prior to deployment in the production environment. The requested test reports are intended to provide a structured summary of the tests performed, their outcomes, identified issues, and resolution status. This can be based on existing internal test documentation, release notes, or quality reports that are already produced as part of the Contractor's standard processes. The level of detail should be proportionate and aligned with a SaaS delivery model, but sufficient to support informed acceptance and risk assessment on our side. For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.
36	Schedule 1	M5F.1	Referring to the Descriptive document and the quote: <i>"The intended solution is based on a proven Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) offering that is already operational at the Tenderer and has been demonstrably used in a comparable context. The starting point here is to limit customisation as much as possible and to make maximum use of standard functionalities."</i> It is per definition not possible to deliver this as a standard solution but via KB's app store accounts. It would then instead be a white label solution that should be provided. This demand together with many other requirements provides the experience that what the KB is asking for is a tailor made solution or a development project. We suggest this requirement is entirely removed.	We acknowledge your concern regarding standard SaaS delivery models versus white-label or customer-specific configurations. However, this requirement reflects a key principle for the KB: maintaining ownership and control over the app store presence and ensuring continuity for end users. Publishing the applications under the KB's app store accounts is essential to guarantee that, in the event of a transition to another provider, the existing app can be updated without requiring more than 500,000 users to install a new app. This setup does not necessarily imply a custom-built solution. Many SaaS providers support deployment under customer-owned app store accounts or offer white-label configurations as part of their standard capabilities. The requirement focuses on control, continuity, and ownership, rather than prescribing how the underlying solution is built. For these reasons, the requirement will remain as stated.
37	Schedule 1	M7.11	DPIA is today carried out based on standardised models which have been accepted by all current customers. Without knowing KB's specific model for this we suggest it is changed to "preferably in accordance with the KB's model."	We acknowledge that Contractors may use standardised DPIA models preferably in accordance with the KB's model.
38	Schedule 4	4,5	Can you please explain what Karaoke reading is. We have never met that term before.	We use the term Karaoke reading for a text to speech feature where the text element that is being read aloud is highlighted simultaneously.

39	Descriptive Document	2.3.3	Subject 1 defines specific that CB is responsible for "loan administration". While in 2.3.2 subject 1 it is pointed out that the e-lending module (backend/database) stores and manages lending transactions. Can KB confirm that every lending transaction in full is handled by the e-lending module in the provided solution and that CB only delivers the raw-files to the provided solution?	<p>We confirm that the e-lending platform is expected to maintain its own lending administration. This means registering which user has borrowed which title and managing the associated lending transactions within the platform. The statement in 2.3.3 that "loan administration" is out of scope refers specifically to the administration maintained by CB in relation to the financial settlement process with publishers. CB stores transaction data required for these financial and contractual processes.</p> <p>CB does not merely deliver raw files to the platform. For e-books, encrypted content files are delivered securely and directly to the end user as part of the lending transaction. These e-book files are therefore not stored within the e-lending platform itself.</p> <p>Audiobook content differs in this respect: audiobook files are stored and secured within the e-lending platform environment and are delivered to users by the platform.</p> <p>In addition, the KB wishes to retain the possibility to integrate content from parties other than CB in the future. This may include metadata and, where applicable, content files. In such scenarios, the platform must provide sufficient insight into the associated costs and transactions, enabling the KB to perform the financial settlement directly where required.</p>
40	Descriptive Document	4,2	There is several requirements for ISO compliance. All our existing customers demands ISAE 3000 type II statements which actually proves our approach and the way we work instead of just defining it. Can you confirm that ISAE 3000 type II declaration is sufficient as " similar equivalent" as defined in Descriptive Document section 7.4 Tender checklist (last three subjects in the table regarding ISO)?	<p>ISAE 3000 is an assurance standard, not a certification standard such as ISO 27001. An ISAE 3000 Type II report may be accepted as equivalent evidence, provided the following conditions are met</p> <p>i.The control framework underlying the ISAE 3000 Type II report demonstrably covers the controls corresponding to the requirements of ISO 27001 (Annex A), the cloud-specific controls of ISO 27017, and the relevant domains of the CSA Cloud Controls Matrix (CCM); ISO 9001 and ISO 27018.</p> <p>ii.The ISAE 3000 Type II report has been issued by a qualified IT auditor (e.g., a registered EDP auditor or a certified public accountant with relevant IT audit expertise);</p> <p>iii.The report covers an audit period of at least six months preceding the submission deadline;</p> <p>iv.The tenderer includes a control mapping with their submission, demonstrating per control domain how the controls included in the ISAE 3000 report correspond to the requirements of the aforementioned standards.</p> <p>The burden of proof for demonstrating equivalence lies with the tenderer.</p>
41	Descriptive Document	4,2	Ad. Suitability Requirements of technical and professional competence subject 1, 2 and 4: These requirements demands that we should have one or two very large customers that alone or together fulfills the thresholds of 250.000 active users as well as 1.000.000 annual loans. Our market consists of many diverse customers. We therefore asks KB to either expand the allowed references or in another way makes it possible to fulfill the requirements based on more than two references (e.g. demonstrate the fulfillment and just mention up to two substantial references).	No, the eligibility requirement will not be changed
42	Schedule 6A	2,2	Among other places in the complete tender material this subject states a term of 4 years that ends on 31 August 2030. This means that the delivery should start 1 September 2026 although the existing Framework Agreement will end by operation of law on 1 July 2028 due to Descriptive document 2.1 Background and the Final Award is 18 August 2026 due to 3.1 Planning overview in Descriptive Document. While at the same time in Schedule 10 Price Sheet it looks like the price is evaluated based on 3 years. Please clarify the exact time frame the KB expects after the Final Award has taken place 18 August 2026, especially when the KB expects the provided solution to go live for end-users.	The fixed term of the Framework Agreement is 4 years. The starting point is that the first year of the Framework Agreement will be used for the implementation of the proposed solution. The remaining 3 years are intended for the operational service delivery to end users. The KB may terminate the current agreement one year earlier, if necessary. As a result, the transition to the new solution may also take place earlier.
43	Schedule 6A	4	The contract does not specify any invoicing intervals nor payment terms. We propose this to be specified.	The payment terms are set out in Schedule 1. Programme of Requirements, Chapter 8. Invoicing.
44	Schedule 10		The desired solution will most likely be based on a marginal cost structure dependent on usage. The price sheet points towards a structure where a certain activity increase will trigger a one time fee which don't take into account a potential recurring increased activity level. In addition it does not cover either the same users loan more nor many more users with individually less loans per user since boths thresholds needs to be exceeded to trigger the extra payment. During 8 years of runtime in a more and more digitized world we see a "risk" of heavy increase in activity which this presented price scheme is not covering. It is simply too risky with almost a fixed price model covering a solution that is so dependent on the actual activity. We encourage the KB to rethink the structure of price model in Schedule 10 to cover this issue and instead pay attention to, potentially implement more, and evaluate tooling for controlling activity and ways of handle limitations in activity	The KB has taken note of your comment, but sees no reason to amend the pricing structure in Schedule 10. The Price Sheet has been deliberately designed in this way to allow for a transparent and comparable assessment of tenders.
45	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform	Scope of the Contract	With regard to the scope of the contract described in the tender documents, and specifically the mobile application (front-end) component, we kindly request clarification on the following point: Should the mobile application development include the full set of functionalities described for the digital lending solution (including complete management of users, content, loans, etc.), or is it limited to end-user library functionalities (such as browsing, borrowing, reading/listening, and basic preference management)? We would appreciate it if you could specify the expected functional scope for the mobile application.	<p>The mobile application is primarily intended for end users and is expected to support the core end user functionalities, including browsing, searching, borrowing, reading/listening, managing personal bookshelves and favourites, and related user preference functionalities.</p> <p>Functional and administrative management functions (such as content management, configuration, reporting and operational management) may be provided exclusively through a web-based management interface.</p>
46	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform	Out of scope	Regarding the point about integration interfaces (authentication, NBC catalog, metadata, and Datatheek), the description is very generic. To be able to plan properly, we would need you to specify exactly what you expect from us (e.g., a login integration with NBC, receiving/sending metadata from/to NBC, or only sending data to Datatheek?).	<p>Interfaces are specified in the Architectural Overview (Schedule 2), which will be provided upon signing the Non-Disclosure Agreement (Schedule 15).</p> <p>In addition, the requirements set out in Chapter 3 ("Interfaces") of Schedule 1 further specify the expected integrations and interface capabilities of the solution.</p>
47	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform		We understand that Centraal Boekhuis will be responsible for the content. However, we would like to know whether we should consider an initial load or migration of that content into the platform. If so, it would be helpful to have an estimated volume so we can factor it into our planning.	At this moment we have ca. 50000 e-books, 17500 audio-books, 2200 Magazines, 70 newspaper articles

48	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform		If user data comes directly from an SSO, what types of data are expected to be editable from the platform?	User data received via SSO cannot be edited within the platform
49	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform		In the case of not having full videos available, but having previews or clips instead, would this be considered acceptable? And in relation to this, what exactly is meant by "trailers" in this context: full promotional videos or content snippets/clips?	We distinguish two types of video content. One is a content type, for example read out loud books for young children. This content type we wish to include in our (lendable) content offering. The other is editorial content for inspiration of readers, think of book trailers, or short clips in which certain books are recommended.
50	Descriptive Document - Online Library - e-lending platform		Instead of using Matomo, would it be possible to integrate or use Amplitude?	Amplitude is not in line with the public value (Public Spaces) that the KB strives for. It is a publicly listed American company where the shareholders determine the direction of the business, not the public community. That is why the KB prefers to use Matomo.
51	Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements		Following our review of Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements, we would appreciate clarification on the KB's expectations regarding functionality at the planned go live on 1 October 2027. Could the KB please confirm which functional and non-functional requirements are expected to be fully delivered and operational at go live?	The KB expects that, at the planned go-live date of 1 October 2027, all functional and non-functional mandatory requirements as specified in Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements are fully delivered and operational, unless explicitly stated otherwise. This includes a complete, production-ready solution that is fully integrated within the broader system landscape, tested end-to-end, and ready for use by end users and our employees.
52	Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements		Following our review of Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements, we would appreciate clarification on the KB's expectations regarding functionality at the planned go live on 1 October 2027. Could the KB please confirm whether tenderers are permitted to propose a phased implementation and development roadmap, under which certain desired or enhanced functionalities may be delivered post launch, beyond October 2027?	The KB expects that, at the planned go-live date of 1 October 2027, all functional and non-functional requirements as specified in Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements are fully delivered and operational, unless explicitly stated otherwise. Tenderers are therefore not permitted to defer mandatory requirements to a post-launch phase. However, tenderers are welcome to propose system desirables that are not yet available at the planned go-live date of 1 October 2027, as well as additional enhanced functionalities as part of a future development roadmap. Such future enhancements may be described in the innovation plan accompanying the tender.
53	Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements		Following our review of Schedule 1 - Programme of Requirements, we would appreciate clarification on the KB's expectations regarding functionality at the planned go live on 1 October 2027. If phased delivery is acceptable, could the KB advise whether and how such roadmap-based elements will be considered during demonstration use cases evaluation?	See the answer to question 51.