

Subject: Additional information in relation to the SURFnet Qualification Document for a  
Wi-Fi-as-a-Service Innovation Partner  
Ref. 2014/S 188-332370 of September 26<sup>th</sup> 2014

Date: October 22, 2014

**Note: questions and answers 1-39 are unchanged,  
question 40 is answered with this release,  
question 41 is new and answered.**

Dear Madam/Sir,

Please find herewith the answers of general interest to all questions received, concerning the above-mentioned Request for Proposal Document. This information is published with the other tender documents at the TenderNed platform. Insofar this note contains modification and/or additions to earlier tender documents the text in this note prevails.  
Please take note of this document in preparing your Qualification Submission.

Kind regards,  
Maurice van den Akker  
SURFne

#	Question	Answer
1	This document hasn't been added (separately) to the tender documents. Please publish this on Tendered so we are able to fill it in and we have the possibility to ask any question about it if necessary.	The self-declaration form is added to the documents.
2	kunt u het selfdeclaration document beschikbaar stellen? We hebben het niet aangetroffen tussen de aanbestedings stukken.	Yes. The self-declaration form is added to the documents.
3	What is exactly mentioned with supporting documents within 4.1.8?	This may be, for example, a detailed description of candidates organisation, or details of a reference.
4	Which type of institutions are mentioned. Is this only HBO and UT, or also Dutch ROC's and MBO's?	All higher education and research, including ROC's, MBO and academic hospitals. As was stated in chapter 1, currently connected institutes can be found at the following url:  <a href="https://www.surf.nl/en/about-surf/subsidiaries/surfnet/about-surfnet/connecting-to-surfnet/connected-institutions/index.html">https://www.surf.nl/en/about-surf/subsidiaries/surfnet/about-surfnet/connecting-to-surfnet/connected-institutions/index.html</a>
5	Have we assumed right, that the institutions whom will buy a WaaS solution from Surfnet, do not need to write their own tender anymore?	Correct.
6	Have we read the tender right that Surfnet wants to contract only one contractor, and only this party will fill in the order for the upcoming 6(maximum) years.	Correct.
7	Surfnet has estimated approx. 5000-15.000 AP's. Is this an estimation over a period of three years? On which information is this amount of AccessPoints based.	As stated, the estimated amount of access points is based on a two year time frame. Since it is yet unknown how many institutions will use the SURFnet WaaS in the coming years, this is the estimate at this time, based on internal market research.

8	<p>In the overview list of designed and managed Wi-Fi networks Surfnet asks for a list of customers. How can the AccessPoints be counted? For example: a healthcare organisation has over 50 location. All locations benefit from a WaaS solution. The amount of AP's depends from a few AP's for the smaller locations towards more than fifty AP's in the bigger location. Do we pretend the sheet (annex E) right if we count all AP's and add them to particular this customer?</p>	<p>If this healthcare organisation is one customer (=contract) although multiple locations then this may be submitted as one entry in the form. Splitting this customer in multiple lines like customer-location is also correct. As long as no APs for customers are counted more than once.</p>
9	<p>In the Reference cases Surfnet doesn't ask for a WaaS (WiFi as a Service) solution. In the opinion from the tenderer this is an added value above the realisation of a 'normal' WiFi network. In our opinion this should be a significant factor which will be weighed? Could this be changed?</p>	<p>Candidate is free to describe its current WiFi as a service solution as showcase reference. The scoring criterion as described will be applied and are expected to value such solution.</p>
10	<p>Surfnet demands a turnover requirement. Since the European tender law in 2013 it's the intention of each tender to not have such requirements. Is Surfnet able to motivate the turnover requirements with several cogent arguments, why it's necessary to have such demands. Additional, why aren't the regulations mentioned in 3.3.1b and 3.3.1c only not enough.</p>	<p>3.3.1.a the turnover requirement is withdrawn.</p>
11	<p>Inschrijver is van mening dat punt 3.3 en 3.4 van het "Self Declaration form" ook aangevinkt dient te worden. Is dit een juist?</p>	<p>No.</p>
12	<p>Point G en H in the timetable refer to January and February 2014. Candidate thinks this should be 2015. Can SURFnet confirm this?</p>	<p>Confirmed. The January and February in the timetable are 2015.</p>
13	<p>In the Qualification Submission, Candidate must provide a self-declaration form. This document has not been added separately to the tender documents and forms. When can Candidate expect this form?</p>	<p>The self-declaration form was added to the documents.</p>

14	Candidate would like to know the further developments of the WaaS business model: Is the scope of the potential WaaS business model restricted to services towards educational/research institutions or will SURFnet also look for potential business models where the WiFi/WaaS environment can be used for instance for 3G/4G offloading for Mobile Network Operators?	For SURFnet the scope of the WaaS business model is restricted.
15	Candidate would like to know if the WaaS proposition is solely intended for educational/research purposes or does SURFnet also look for additional services on Campus grounds for students (in housing etc.)?	The SURFnet WaaS proposition is solely aimed (restricted) at the educational/research, this includes campus grounds for students.
16	A main general features to be fulfilled within the envisioned WaaS is an excellent end users and trusted Wi-Fi connectivity suitable for real-time data services such as voice and video communication within the premises of the Institutions subscribed to the service. What does SURFnet expect from the partnership in accordance to the real-time data services such as voice and video communication? Does the Partner have to deliver and maintain or only have to give support?	Delivery and maintenance of the voice and communication services itself is not expected from partnership.
17	What is the tender number?	2014/S 188-332370
18	Met de "Eigen Verklaring voor aanbestedingsprocedures van aanbestedende diensten" zijn eis 1 tot en met 3 beantwoord. Kan aanbestedende dienst aangeven of het invullen van deze "Eigen Verklaring" voldoet voor eis 1 tot en met 3?	Yes the self-declaration suffices.
19	Voor deze eis lijkt aanbestedende dienst te verwijzen naar een "verklaring van Non Faillissement" in plaats van een uittreksel Kamer van Koophandel. Kan aanbestedendediens aangeven welk document inschrijver dient toe te voegen op deze eis?	The self-declaration form as provided digitally.

20	Voldoet een digitaal gewaarmerkte versie van het uittreksel Kamer van Koophandel?	Yes
21	Subscriber has learned that SURF has done some preliminary investigations and tests vendors. Can Surf provide information on the outcome of those investigations?	Yes, the outcome of (ongoing) pilots will be shared as soon as these are available. We expect information to be released in December.
22	In order to provide a high level service standardisation is necessary. How would SURF support subscriber in achieving "standardisation"?	These details will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.
23	How will end users participate in the process in of building the service catalog for WaaS?	These details will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.
24	Is Surfnet striving at a WaaS solution filled in with a single-vendor. Or, is it the purpose to offer a WaaS solution with multi-vendor possibility's.	This is undecided yet and is subject of the next phase in the tender procedure.
25	Which party will be the formal owner of the hardware? Have we assumed right this will be the Tenderer?	This will be subject of the next phase of the Tenderer. In general SURFnet is interested in ownership of hardware at Tenderer.
26	How will be dealt with a WaaS contract which has started in the last year the contract with Surfnet will end?	The contract arrangements between SURFnet and selected-partner will have to cover exit procedures. This will be subject of the next phase.
27	Kan aanbestedede dienst aangeven hoe het Governance model eruit komt te zien ten aanzien van de eindklant, SURFnet en inschrijver?	Not at this moment. This will be subject of the next phase of the tender procedure.
28	Kan aanbestedende dienst aangeven of de architectuur voorziet voor een "Private Cloud" of een "Shared Cloud"?	These details will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.
29	Welk commitment kan aanbestedende dienst afgeven ten aanzien vn de genoemde "Scope of the Intended Contract"	This will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.

30	Wordt inschrijver betrokken in het Sales Engagement model? Heeft inschrijver direct interactie met de eindklant?	Yes we expect that selected-partner will be involved in the sales engagement and having direct interaction with the Institutions as customer. . The details will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.
31	Is het een juiste aanname dat inschrijver het complete support/ maintenance/ beheer moet doen voor de beschreven scope of blijft dit (voor een gedeelte) in beheer bij aanbestedende dienst. Kan aanbestedende dienst hier een demarcatie voor opgeven?	The assumption of selected-partner responsibility of maintenance and support as scope of intended contract is correct. The details will be subject of the next phase in this tender procedure.
32	Is it the intention of SURFnet that in the context of the partnership, any specifically developed part of a Wi-Fi as a Service proposition will be exclusively for the offering of the selected partner and SURFnet? In other words, will the selected partner be allowed under the agreement to offer WaaS-like services to the market and the education segment in particular?	The details of the partnership concerning WaaS will be subject of the next phase.
33	WaaS is based on recent standards that are certified and widely adopted (or to be adopted) by the Wi-Fi network industry such as 802.11ac and 802.1X. Candidate would like to know which phase of 802.11ac is being requested by SURFnet?	SURFnet currently aims at supporting IEEE802.11ac wave1. The roadmap to support multi-user MIMO and the other Wave2 functionalities - as well as the way to integrate the equipment that supports Wave2 functionalities with the existing components - may be part of the tender.
34	Is it the intention of SURFnet that the selected partner will work with SURFnet exclusively in the Education Market? In other words, will the selected partner be allowed to independently offer Wi-Fi products and services to the education segment?	The selected partner will work with SURFnet exclusively with the WaaS towards the (potential) customers of SURFnet.  Other - non-SURFnet-WaaS - independent propositions is outside the scope of this tender.
35	SURFnet is searching for a partner who will work closely with SURFnet on the design, development, building, delivery and maintenance of a Wi-Fi-as-a-Service environment. Can SURFnet specify where the responsibility stops of the first line support and where the support of the second line starts?	The exact roles and responsibilities between institutions, partner and SURFnet is subject of the next phase in the tender procedure.  First line support, that is the contact and communication with the users remains a responsibility of the institution. The installation of the equipment at the location of the institution is also a responsibility of the institution.

36	Can SURFnet specify what is meant by first line support by describing the tasks that are being expected?	<p>First line support is the general helpdesk to help the users.</p> <p>The exact roles and tasks between Institution, WaaS-Partner and SURFnet will be subject of the next phase in the tender procedure.</p>
37	Een van onze aansprekende referenties voor WAAS betreft de Olympische spelen in Londen 2012. Deze eindklant bestaat echter niet meer. Wij kunnen deze succesvolle referentie wel door middel van case- en fact-studies aantonen en deze referentie door de project verantwoordelijke director design and implementation en onze CEO Benelux laten ondertekenen. Gaat aanbestedende dienst hiermee akkoord?	<p>You have a reference of a customer which as an organization or otherwise an entity does not exist anymore and you ask if SURFnet can accept this reference case. You may provide other evidence, like the self-declaration you suggest, that the services in the reference have actually been delivered.</p> <p>In addition SURFnet may require further demonstration like the agreement, acceptance or billing document.</p>
38	Aanbestedende dienst heeft ervaring met met vergelijkbare opdrachten. Echter vanwege het feit dat inschrijver voorafgaand aan gerelateerde opdrachten Non Disclosure Agreements (NDA's) heeft ondertekent met haar klanten, zijn we niet in de positie om informatie van contactpersonen tot deze opdrachten te verstrekken. Indien inschrijver wordt uitgenodigd tot de dialoog ronde, zijn wij uiteraard bereid om deze klanten te vragen of ze bereid zijn om in vertrouwen te spreken met SURFnet. Deze klanten zullen hiermee akkoord gaan. Het is echter geen optie voor SURFnet om contact op te nemen met deze klanten met betrekking tot het stellen van gerelateerde vragen. Kan aanbestedende dienst hiermee akkoord gaan?	<p>If in reference to the phrase "To verify the references as valid, Candidates must supply on SURFnet's first request a declaration from the reference customer, stating that the services in the reference have actually been delivered" of section 3.3.2.</p> <p>If SURFnet is not able to verify the reference submitted then this reference may be rejected with the possible consequence of the disqualification or non-selection of candidate.</p> <p>In case specific agreements (e.g. NDA) with customers prohibit candidate the sharing of information we suggest to submit another reference.</p>
39	Regarding to the answering of question number 9 the Candidate asks for a clarification; Can SurfNet confirm that it is legitimate that Candidate uses its own WaaS solutions as the Showcase reference Surfnet is asking for? (all the other demands we will respect regarding this specific showcase reference.)	Confirmed.

40	<p>Explanation from our point of view:</p> <p>1. Only a few large parties in the Netherlands are able to participate in the dialogue or even to fulfil this aggregated assignment because virtually all potential demand from the educational institutions is aggregated/combined (in dutch: "vraagbundeling") into a (very) large assignment: initially in the first two years 10 up to 20 educational institutions and 5,000 up to 15,000 access points. According to us, this is contrary to the anti-cluster regulations as included in Article 1.5 Aw 2102. Smaller companies are consequently unnecessarily excluded now and in the future because this procurement procedure could directly lead to the situation that other comparable or similar assignments are no longer publicly accessible by a large number of educational institutions via a newly organized procurement under free competition. Therefore entrepreneurs are not treated on an equal and non-discriminatory manner in accordance with Article 1.8 Aw 2012.</p> <p>2. The target group of SURFnet BV concerns WO, HBO and increasingly MBO educational institutions. A very large part of the educational market will acquires wifi services and products via the granted supplier by SURFnet BV. Free competition is in our viewpoint (unintentionally) disadvantaged. Although educational institutions are possibly given the freedom to either acquire these services from the winning supplier of this present procurement procedure or to individually organize a procurement procedure independently, competition is still at stake. If an educational institution chooses to acquire wifi services from the winning supplier then consequently competition is directly avoided and the obligation to held a procurement procedure evaded. Also our experience in similar cases is that educational institutions will often conveniently choose to acquire services and products via SURFnet because of a lack in time, the corresponding costs of organizing a new procurement procedure or for other reasons. Therefore we would like to stress that competition is not an option, but an obligation imposed by the European and national legislators.</p>	<p>Due to the limited space in this table to answer we placed the answer to this question is at page 12.</p>
----	---	--

40	<p>(continued)</p> <p>3. The setup of the current procurement procedure by SURFnet BV does not contribute to the transparency in accordance to in Article 1.9 Aw 2012. Only during and most likely after completion of the competitive dialogue (initially only for the companies which participate in this dialogue initially) it will explicitly clear what the precise scope and size of the wifi services and products within this assignment are. According to your documentation the scope may substantially vary from design, development, planning, delivery, installation and configuration up to the management and support of the targeted wireless services and products. Therefore it is not clear what the consequences will be for (potential interested) suppliers and your members (too) of the substantial evaporation or loss of potential demand and therefore future assignments. Also, the chosen procurement procedure, the competitive dialogue, inevitably leads to significant administrative burdens for smaller companies raising the threshold for participation. This also seems to be contradictory with Article 1.6 of Aw 2012.</p> <p>Instead of directly submitting a formal complaint to the formal, internal window of complaints, our proposal is to let the CAE verify and justify the setup of this procurement procedure in accordance with the points mentioned above by us above. We will respect the results and conclusions of the CAE. This approach leads to clarity even on the part of SURFnet BV which, after all, aims to fully service its members. Our question is whether you are willing to do so on a short notice and consequently postponing the current procurement procedure?</p>	
----	--	--

40	<p>(continued)</p> <p>We currently have frequent contacts with a number of ICT companies (wireless specialists, system integrators, specialists in secondment and hardware resellers), which are active in the (higher) education market, of which can be directly or indirectly affected by the consequences of the decline of free competition as a result of this procurement procedure. On request these companies are willing to express their point of views and visions to the CAE.</p> <p>Finally, we wonder what the exact role of SURFnet BV is? According to your website "SURFnet promotes and develops new ICT applications that make the most advanced results possible. Our innovations lead to improved services for the affiliated institutions, to greater efficiency and effectiveness and to lower costs. " In short, acting as formal ordering party as well as contractor on behalf of its members as well as the actual marketing (and exploitation) of wireless services and products as described in this procurement procedure does not seem to be a part of this role.</p> <p>We are looking forward to your response to these questions and our proposal as soon as possible. A copy of these questions will also be sent to the companies of which we are in frequent contact with concerning this case.</p>	
----	---	--

40	<p>(continued)</p> <p>In short our questions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How does SURFnet see our objections and particularly in regard to the following topics which are explained above?             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Unnecessarily merging of multiple assignments of individual educational institutions into one, very large assignment.</li> <li>b. Evaporation of (future) potential demand on wireless services and products by educational institutions.</li> <li>c. Unequal treatment of potential interested companies.</li> <li>d. Facilitating voluntary competition instead of mandatory competition prescribed by legislation; educational institutions unconsciously evade procurement and antitrust laws.</li> <li>e. The current documentation and usage of the competitive dialogue procedure in this case leading to:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. an unclear and indistinctive size and scope of the assignment.</li> <li>ii. high administrative burden for smaller companies and therefore raising the threshold for participation.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Could you please carefully and soundly motivate the following topics:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Merger of multiple assignments for wireless services and products into one assignment.</li> <li>b. The application of the "Competitive dialogue" procurement procedure.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Do you consider to let the CAE verify and justify the setup of this procurement procedure in accordance with the points mentioned above by us above on a short notice and consequently postpone the current procurement procedure until the CAE has communicated its verdict ?</li> </ol>	<p>See page 12 for the answers.</p>
41	<p>Core competence #2 on page 16 and 17 of the qualification document concerns the technical capacity to deliver and install two Wi-Fi networks with at least 100 access points. Could you please explain what you mean with 'installation'?</p>	<p>The term 'installation' is to be explained as 'the configuration of the local Wi-Fi network' and may, but does not necessarily have to include the actual physical installation of the access points.</p>

## Answer to question 40

### Competitive dialogue

The public contract at hand is innovative, both for SURFnet and the future contract partner. The innovative character of the contract is related to the nature of the services, i.e. SURFnet and the Institutions require the provision – in the form of a service – of (i) a distributed but centrally managed Wi-Fi network and (ii) functionality for both individual Institutions and all Institutions and SURFnet jointly, in a financially responsible, operationally manageable, accessible (ease of use) and safe manner.

Due the innovative character of the contract SURFnet came to the conclusion that it is not capable of defining the means of satisfying the needs of SURFnet and the Institutions and/or of assessing what the market can offer in terms of technical, financial and legal solutions without interacting with the market. Examples of topics that require discussion with the market are:

- The workload related to the installation of access points largely depends on the local conditions of each site and the possibilities of the on-site owner to take specific measures. As these conditions and possibilities cannot sufficiently be determined upfront, the related workload would be too big of an uncertainty for the Tenderers. Therefore SURFnet has adopted the basic assumption that the Institutions itself should remain responsible for the installation of the access points. However even then quite a number of details concerning the practical implications thereof remain unclear. What specific arrangements and agreements need to be made between SURFnet, the Institutions and the Innovation Partner to have the hardware properly installed by the Institutions, while at the same time transferring the responsibility of managing the hardware to the Innovation Partner? Does such a construction have an impact on hardware warranties? Is there an impact on service levels? Which requirements do Tenderers set on the installation of the hardware by the Institutions?
- Another uncertainty is that the distribution of risks and costs between the SURFnet, the Innovation partner (contractor, including subcontractor(s)) and the institution (site owner) cannot unilaterally be specified in advance. SURFnet would like the Innovation Partner to be the owner of all hardware, but is such a legal requirement feasible? And what is the impact of such legal requirement on the overall price of the services? Furthermore, SURFnet prefers to remain the 'single point of sales contact' towards the Institutions. Is this acceptable for the market? Which measures does the market propose to safeguard that SURFnet adequately fulfils this role?
- SURFnet currently sees positive aspects in group functionality, i.e. functionality offered to both all Institutions and SURFnet jointly (for example edu roam), but also in individual functionality, i.e. functionality offered to individual Institutions (for example local break-out of data). Because both types of functionality may have different or even conflicting technical and/or architectural requirements, SURFnet needs to hear from the Tenderers to what extent group functionality can be combined with individual functionality.

Because the open and restricted procedure do not allow for the flexibility which is required in this case, SURFnet has chosen to organise this Wi-Fi-as-a-Service Innovation Partner as a competitive dialogue procedure.

(continued answer to question 40)

### Aggregation of demand

The decision to aggregate the demand of SURFnet and the Institutions into one contract is based on the following grounds:

#### 1. Suitable for smaller integrators

SURFnet is familiar with the Wi-Fi market and the different kind of enterprises which operate in it:

- Several (large) global operating Wi-Fi manufactures but also 'challengers' which (yet) are not large scale but do have promising and possible innovative solutions.
- Companies (mostly small or medium sized) who are specialised in specific Wi-Fi network related activities such as radio planning, designing Wi-Fi networks or network management.
- Integrators, consisting of several large enterprises but also small companies. Integrators do not manufacture Wi-Fi hardware themselves but work closely together with one or more manufactures and may work closely with one or more companies specialised in specific Wi-Fi network related activities.

As stated in section 1.4 of the Qualification Document SURFnet is seeking an Innovation Partner that will take part in the development and operation of WaaS and is able to think critically and seek chances to create a world class Wi-Fi network service within the demanding (but rewarding) field of higher education and research. It is important for SURFnet that the Innovation Partner relieves SURFnet of the management of all the complex tasks and activities which are required to implement and operator WaaS. Hence, SURFnet seeks an integrator as innovative partner. At the same time, SURFnet has adopted the basic assumption that the Institutions itself should remain responsible for the installation of the access points and the first line services. The integrator therefore is not required to have a large (service) organisation in order to be able to carry out the contract. Both large and small integrators are capable of fulfilling the role of Innovation Partner.

#### 2. Effects of aggregation + coherence

The essence of the WaaS is an innovative centrally managed service for the delivery of Wi-Fi connectivity to multiple institutions (sites). As such WaaS provides the Institutions and SURFnet the following benefits:

- A fully managed Wi-Fi network without efforts from the Institutions;
- Better price/quality ratio than today's installations as a result of economies of scale advantages;
- Lower administrative burden, reduce of FTE and/or expertise needed to support the (local) Wi-Fi network;
  - Better user experience by uniform implementation of eduroam across all sites;
  - Increased flexibility and speed on the implementation of new functionalities;
  - Uniform quality of service levels with respect to the service offering of WaaS;
- Increased compliance with the required high (and increasing) security standards.

(continued answer to question 40)

To achieve the successful development of WaaS and consequently the aforementioned benefits, WaaS requires economy of scale and standardisation of technique, both of which would be non-existent or at least jeopardised if the separate demand of the Institutions would not have been aggregated or if more than one market player would be contracted instead of only one Innovation Partner. Firstly, some Institutions lack the expertise and financial strength for high upfront investments to organise their Wi-Fi network in a good and innovative manner. Secondly, seen from the market side innovations require a flexible proving ground and the forecast of a potentially big enough market to ensure technical and commercial success. Thirdly, a centrally managed service requires the Wi-Fi sites to have similar radio planning and installation rules, and operate on the same or at least interoperable hardware. Such standardisation of technique would be seriously hindered if multiple parties would be involved in delivering the involved hardware and software.

By creating the WaaS SURFnet intends to inspire and stimulate the market by setting an example of what the innovation of Wi-Fi services for the research and educational sector may (or should) be. This intended effect aligns well with SURFnet's mission to boost the quality of higher education and research through the support, innovation, development and operation of an advanced, reliable and interconnected ICT infrastructure, enabling the potential of ICT to be harnessed to its full extent.

(continued answer to question 40)

Separate questions

We trust that the above clarification sufficiently covers the remarks/questions which were submitted. However to avoid any omissions, the answer to each specific question is:

1a. SURFnet does not regard the aggregation of demand 'unnecessary'. On the contrary, SURFnet strongly believes that a WaaS service is the next step in the development of Wi-Fi services, by fully utilising and stimulating further developments of the technology. Moreover, we envision that the WaaS business model will be exemplary for future connectivity services for the (higher) education and research community. Please see the clarification above for further underlying reasoning.

1b. SURFnet believes that the demand for wireless services and products will actually benefit from this contract, seeing that innovation creates new demands.

1c. All potentially interested companies are treated equally in the WaaS tender procedure.

1d. SURFnet aggregates the demand of educational institutions and enables these institutions to purchase ICT service in a more efficient manner, whilst at the same time allowing for more innovative solutions, which, especially for small and mid-sized educational institutions, would otherwise not be possible. SURFnet nor the Institutions are evading any procurement law, as this tender procedure is also conducted on behalf of the Institutions.

1e-i. The size and scope of the intended contract is described in sections 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 of the Qualification Document and conforms to the level of detail required in this phase of a restricted tender procedure like the competitive dialogue procedure. In the invitation to tender document, the scope of the intended contract will be further specified. Thereby SURFnet will strive to describe the size and scope of the intended contract and the main functional features of the envisioned WaaS as detailed as possible.

1e-ii. SURFnet conducts a 'lean and mean' competitive dialogue, thus aiming at avoiding any administrative burden or at least keeping it as low as possible. Should there nonetheless be any administrative burden, then (i) such is unavoidable in order to jointly come to the right mix of detailed requirements and legal and financial terms and (ii) such burden is equal to both smaller and larger companies. Ad (i): SURFnet would like to point out that the market has actually reacted in a positive way on SURFnet's decision to conduct a competitive dialogue, because it enables the market to provide SURFnet with valuable insights which improves the demand specification and prevents SURFnet from over-demanding.

2a/b. Please see the clarification above.

3. In reference to the clarification above SURFnet sees no reason to consider such verification or to postpone the current procedure.