

Questions & Answers 2: Common Use			
Question number	Name of document, section and page number	Question	Answer Eindhoven Airport (EANV)
1	Appendix 2a 1 Facts (p.6) vs Appendix 2b A41–A46 (A3 PPS); Appendix 2a Section 4A	The Facts & Figures list 10 airlines while A41 names 7 carrier codes (4 airline groups). Please provide the definitive list of airlines and their DCs/Passenger Processing Systems with software versions that must be certified on the solution (e.g. Navitaire GoNow, Navitaire SkySpeed, Res2 iPort, Aerocloud eDCS, Pegasus, SunExpress). Please also confirm whether EANV or the airlines provide test access and coordinate certification, and the expected lead time per application.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 78.
2	Appendix 2b A41–A44 (A3 PPS), p.3	For the Critical PPS support requirements (A41–A44, which allow only a Compliant/Non-compliant response), please confirm whether the required PPS support and certification must be demonstrably in place at Tender submission or by the acceptance date.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 79.
3	Appendix 2a Section 4C (Airport applications)	Please confirm the AODB and gate-client product in use (Airport Hive) and the required integration scope with the CUPPS solution (e.g. flight-data feed and gate client), and whether any interface development is within the scope of this Engagement.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 80.
4	Appendix 2b A49 & A50 (A4 Data, reporting and integration)	A49 and A50 give ActiveMQ and HTTP API as examples for the real-time boarding-pass and bag-tag data feed. Please confirm the required target interface (ActiveMQ topic and/or HTTP API), the message format, and which party owns and provides the receiving endpoint.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 81.
5	Appendix 2a Section 3D (Baggage control room); Appendix 2b A15	Please confirm the Baggage Handling System (BHS) and Baggage Reconciliation System (BRS) at the baggage control room, including product name and required message standard (e.g. BSM/BPM per IATA RP1745), and whether BHS/BRS interface development is within the Participant's scope. Please also confirm how many baggage control room workstations are required (A15 is Critical but not itemised in the 38 positions) and whether they are additional to the 38.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 82.
6	Tendering Guide Section 1.3.1 Scope, p.4; Appendix 2a Section 1, p.6	The scope lists 38 positions (1 test, 14 check-in, 13 gate, 10 service desk). Service desk shows 10 in scope yet Appendix 2a lists 11 service desk positions (incl. 1 arrivals and 2 PRM). Please confirm the definitive number of service desk workstations and the position-type breakdown to be priced and delivered.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 83.
7	Appendix 2b A17, A26, C28 (back-office VDI); Appendix 2a Section 3E	Please confirm: (a) the expected number of concurrent back-office VDI users, to size concurrent/pooled licensing; (b) that back-office access will continue from handler-owned PCs via virtual desktop technology as in the current architecture; (c) whether the Participant must provide the VDI platform and on whose hardware the back-office virtual desktops execute (EANV hypervisor vs handler PCs); (d) whether management of handler endpoints is in scope; and (e) whether these positions are additional to the 38.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 84.
8	Tendering Guide Section 1.3.1 Scope ('Spare parts'), p.4	Spare parts are included in scope but not quantified. Please specify the spare-part set to be included in the base offer (quantity per component type), or confirm the Participant may propose it and describe how it will be evaluated.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 85.
9	Appendix 2a Section 1 Facts (self-service bag drop), p.6	12 self-service bag-drop units are installed at check-in positions 1–12 and self-service bag drop is out of scope. Please confirm whether the CUPPS solution must interface/integrate with these existing units and, if so, the required interface and responsible party.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 86.
10	Appendix 2b A18 (A2 Workstations and peripherals)	Please confirm the maximum number of Passenger Processing Systems expected to be open simultaneously on a single workstation, so the workstation and platform can be correctly sized.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 87.
11	Appendix 2b A9 & A39 (A2 Workstations and peripherals)	Please confirm whether EANV requires specific makes/models of peripherals (boarding-pass printer, bag-tag printer, document printer, scanner, boarding gate reader, swipe/OCR keyboard), or whether the Participant may propose its own certified peripherals meeting the stated requirements.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 88.
12	Appendix 2b A33 (A2 Workstations and peripherals)	A33 asks that the gate workstation be expandable to support two self-boarding gates in future. Please confirm that self-boarding gate hardware is out of scope for this Engagement and required only as a future-expansion capability of the gate workstation design.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 89.
13	Appendix 2b A22 (A2 Workstations and peripherals)	Please confirm that the required boarding-pass scanning performance is a minimum of 20 scans per minute per workstation, and that scanning of a barcode from a mobile phone is required at both check-in and gate positions.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 90.
14	Appendix 2b A19 (A2 Workstations and peripherals)	Please confirm the expected lock/unlock behaviour: that on unlock the agent resumes all previously open airline applications without re-authenticating to each, and confirm the airport's preferred lock/timeout values.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 91.
15	Appendix 2b B9 & B10, p.4 vs E4 & E13, p.11–12	B10 states the solution shall contain no Participant-provided network switch and B9 uses EANV's Layer-2 services, while E4 requires VLAN segmentation inspected by a next-generation firewall and E13 states the firewall 'should' be provided by EANV. Please confirm which party provides and manages the firewall and VLAN segmentation, that firewall rule changes follow an EANV change-management process, and that the Participant is not expected to supply any network hardware.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 92.
16	Appendix 2b B9–B13 (B2 IT infrastructure); Appendix 2a Section 5; Tendering Guide Section 1.3.2	Please confirm that EANV provides all Layer-2 switching, structured cabling and a live 1 Gbps data outlet at each CUPPS position, and that no cabling or electrical work is within the Participant's scope.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 93.
17	Appendix 2b B14 & B18 (B2 IT infrastructure); B15	B14 requires any on-premise servers to run on the EANV hypervisor while B18 states the solution should not require any local server. Please clarify EANV's preference between (a) on-premise virtual servers on the EANV hypervisor and (b) a no-local-server solution, confirm both are acceptable, and confirm that the 12 vCPU / 48 GB RAM / 240 GB HDD envelope (B15) is the hard maximum and whether it applies to the solution as a whole.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 94.
18	Appendix 2b B14–B17 (B2 IT infrastructure)	If on-premise virtual servers are used on EANV's hypervisor, please specify the hypervisor platform and version, and confirm whether the Participant will have direct management access to its own virtual machines.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 95.
19	Appendix 2b B17 (B2 IT infrastructure); D29 & D30 (Business Continuity)	B17 states EANV backs up the on-premise servers to two locations. Please confirm the backup frequency, retention and recovery capability EANV provides, so the Participant can align with the D30 recovery objectives (RTO 4 hours, RPO 8 hours).	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 96.
20	Appendix 2b B13 (B2 IT infrastructure)	Please confirm the minimum functions expected to continue in offline/degraded mode during a loss of EANV-provided internet (e.g. check-in and boarding on local operation), and whether a store-and-forward mechanism is required for external interfaces once connectivity is restored.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 97.
21	Appendix 2b D3, p.7 & B13, p.4	The solution must achieve at least 99.9% availability per calendar month, while EANV provides the internet (99.95%), network, firewall, hypervisor and power. Please confirm that downtime caused by EANV-provided infrastructure or by third parties is excluded from the Participant's availability calculation.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 98.
22	Appendix 2b B22 (B3 Performance)	Please confirm that the 90-second workstation readiness target is measured from cold power-on to ready-for-login, and confirm the reference test conditions (e.g. first boot after power loss vs normal restart).	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 99.
23	Appendix 2b B6 & B7 (B1 Standards and compliance)	B6 (Critical) and B7 (High) appear near-identical (deletion of personal data in log/debug files within 2 months). Please clarify the intended distinction between them (or confirm B7 is redundant), the exact retention/deletion period, and whether automatic deletion is mandatory for all data sources that may hold personal data.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 100.
24	Appendix 2b (Service and support section), p.10	The requirement IDs skip from D22 directly to D24 (no D23). Please confirm that no requirement is missing between D22 and D24.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 101.
25	Appendix 2a Section 5C (Airline connectivity)	Two airlines are currently connected via the incumbent CUPPS provider's data centre and must be replaced during deployment. Please confirm which two airlines are affected, the target connectivity method (SITA AirportHub, local ISP, or EANV-provided), and the responsibility split for making the change.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 102.
26	Appendix 2b D42 (D4 Monitoring and alerting)	Please confirm EANV's central monitoring and alerting platform and the required integration method (SNMP and/or API), so the CUPPS solution can be integrated into EANV's central monitoring.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 103.
27	Appendix 2b D39 & D40 (D4 Monitoring and alerting)	Please confirm whether the real-time monitoring platform must be provided by the Participant or integrated into an existing EANV tool, and confirm the required scope of consumable/peripheral alerts (e.g. toner low, paper low, peripheral disconnect).	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 104.
28	Appendix 2a Section 2 Teams, p.7; Appendix 2b D5, D13, D15, p.7–9	First-line support is by EANV, but TS&FM is on-site only 06:00–21:00 and D&IT works business hours (with an on-call operator for P1/P2). Please clarify how the Participant is expected to meet the P1 target (response ≤30 min, resolution ≤4 h, 24/7) for incidents requiring on-site action between 21:00 and 06:00, whether a defined on-site dispatch response time applies, and whether a permanent local presence is expected.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 105.

29	Appendix 2b E5 & E8 (E1 Cyber Security)	E5 and E8 are marked Priority '1. Critical' (knock-out) yet worded with 'should'. Please confirm whether these are genuinely knock-out. For E5 (handler identity-provider federation), please confirm the handler IDp(s) to integrate (e.g. Entra ID, OAuth, SAML 2.0), which handler operates them, and whether federated login is required at go-live or may be delivered before acceptance.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 106.
30	Appendix 2b E11 & E15 (E1 Cyber Security); Annex 9 Security Annex	24/7 security monitoring (E11) is Critical while SIEM integration (E15) is only High. Please confirm whether the 24/7 security monitoring (SOC and SIEM) is operated by EANV, by the Participant, or shared, where responsibility for alert triage and first response sits, and the responsibility boundary between the CUPPS solution components and the EANV enterprise security environment.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 107.
31	Appendix 2b E12 (E1 Cyber Security); Annex 9 Security Annex Section 8.1, p.7	Please confirm the vulnerability-remediation timescales by severity in the Security Annex that will apply to the CUPPS platform (Critical internet-facing = 48 hours). Given internet access is provided centrally by EANV and the solution sits behind EANV's firewall, please clarify which components EANV considers 'internet-facing' for these timelines.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 108.
32	Appendix 2b C13 (C2 Acceptance and go-live)	Please confirm the scope and target of the independent penetration test (e.g. whether the single test workstation due 1 March 2027 is the test target), the expected test window and retest process, the remediation window relative to the 1 June 2027 acceptance date, and which party bears the cost of any required re-testing to close Critical/High findings.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 109.
33	Appendix 2b C16 (C2 Acceptance and go-live); Appendix 2a Ch.4; Tendering Guide Section 8.4	Acceptance/go-live is required by 1 June 2027 during the airport closure, when airlines are not operating. Please confirm the network, server and airline-DCS access available for the single test/exploration workstation by 1 March 2027, EANV's target dates for provisioning the Layer-2 network, internet, firewall and hypervisor dependencies, and how end-to-end acceptance testing of live airline DCS/PPS connectivity will be validated during the closure (test environments, test data or airline participation EANV will facilitate).	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 110.
34	Tendering Guide Section 1.2, p.3–4 vs Security Annex Section 2.2, p.5	Section 1.2 states no governmental screening is expected during the airport closure, whereas the Security Annex requires a VGB (Verklaring van Geen Bezwaar) for staff/third parties accessing high-privileged accounts, critical systems or sensitive information. Please confirm whether VGB screening will be required for the Participant's 2nd/3rd-line and administrative personnel after airport re-opening and for the remainder of the contract.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 111.
35	Security Annex Section 1.3, p.4; Tendering Guide Section 2.10.5, p.10	The documents prohibit processing EANV confidential/sensitive data in generative-AI or external AI platforms without prior written consent. As modern support/monitoring tooling is often cloud-based, please clarify whether operational data such as system logs, telemetry and monitoring data that the Participant must process in its own tooling falls within this restriction, and the process for obtaining consent.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 112.
36	Appendix 1 Agreement Section 6.7 (p.7); Pricing sheet header; Tendering Guide Section 1.4	The pricing sheet states prices are fixed to 31-12-2027 with indexation possible from 1-1-2028, whereas Agreement Section 6.7 permits indexation only after the Agreement has been renewed for the first time (i.e. after the initial 5-year term), capped at 5% of the CBS Business Services turnover index. Please clarify what 'FA/DA' refers to, reconcile these provisions, and confirm from which date and on what basis the recurring rates may be indexed.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 113.
37	Standard Form Pricing sheet, 'Hourly rates / Mark-up rates' section	The mark-up line labelled 'Out of business hours (08:00–18:00 CET)' appears mislabelled. Please confirm the intended business-hours window and the time periods to which the out-of-hours, Saturday and Sunday/public-holiday mark-ups apply.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 114.
38	Agreement Annex 5 / Section 6.1 (p.11); Appendix 2a Ch.4	Acceptance/go-live is targeted for 1 June 2027, while full operational use begins at airport re-opening on 19 July 2027. Please confirm the exact trigger date for commencement of recurring-fee invoicing.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 115.
39	Agreement Section 12.1 / GPC Art 18.2 (p.9); SR2 (p.16)	Supplier liability appears capped at EUR 500,000 per event / EUR 1,500,000 per year for an up-to-8-year (5+3x1) critical passenger-processing contract. Please confirm whether this cap has carve-outs for data breach/GDPR non-compliance, IP infringement, wilful misconduct or gross negligence, or whether it is an all-inclusive cap.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 116.
40	Agreement Section 5.2 & Section 8.3 (pp.6–7)	Please confirm whether the stated penalties are the Supplier's sole and exclusive remedy for the relevant breach (liquidated damages), or whether EANV may claim additional (uncapped) damages beyond the stated penalty caps.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 117.
41	Agreement Section 6.6 (p.7)	Section 6.6 allows EANV a 5% discount if an invoice is submitted more than 4 months after the Delivery Date. Please confirm whether this applies per invoice or in aggregate, and whether it applies to recurring/annual invoices or only one-off milestone invoices.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 118.
42	Agreement Annex 5 Payment Schedule (p.11)	If a P1/P2 incident occurs during an acceptance/milestone window due to causes outside the Supplier's control (e.g. EANV infrastructure failure or third-party airline outage), please clarify whether the milestone clock resets, whether the related milestone payment can be delayed, and the treatment of such external-cause events.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 119.
43	Tendering Guide Section 8.2 AC1 Price (p.22)	Please confirm whether the 'Total Tender Price' used for AC1 scoring covers only the 5-year firm term, or also incorporates the value of the 3 optional 1-year extension periods.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 120.
44	Tendering Guide Section 1.4 (p.4); Agreement Section 3.1	Please confirm the pricing/rate basis for the 3 optional 1-year extension periods — i.e. whether extension-year pricing is at the original Tender rates (subject to Section 6.7 indexation) or subject to renegotiation when each extension is exercised.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 121.
45	Appendix 2b B15/B16 (p.4); Appendix 2a Ch.2 Section 6	B15/B16 require any virtual-server software licensing (incl. upgrades/updates) at no additional cost. Please confirm whether this no-additional-cost obligation extends to the fictitious pricing add-on in Appendix 2a Section 6, or whether that fictitious amount is purely a scoring mechanism with no cash-flow implication.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 122.
46	TenderNed Publication (p.2) vs Agreement Section 3.1 (p.5)	The TenderNed notice states a contract 'Duration end date' of 31/12/2034, while Agreement Section 3.1 states termination by operation of law on 31 December 2031, extendable by up to 3x1 year (i.e. max 2034). Please confirm the correct base (firm) contract end date for financial modelling: 31 Dec 2031 or 31 Dec 2034.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 123.
47	Reserve Contractor Agreement (Appendix 3) Section 3 (p.3)	Section 3.1 confirms no fee is payable for maintaining the Tender under the Reserve Contractor Agreement for the 6-month standstill period. Please confirm whether the rates held open are the original Tender rates without escalation, irrespective of how much of the 6-month standstill has elapsed before the option is invoked.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 124.
48	Tendering Guide Section 2.7 (pp.7–8)	Please confirm the applicable VAT/tax treatment for a non-Dutch (foreign) prime bidder — specifically whether reverse-charge VAT applies and whether the Total Tender Price should be quoted inclusive or exclusive of Dutch VAT.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 125.
49	Agreement Section 6.2 (p.6)	Please confirm the currency in which invoices, fees and the Total Tender Price/Pricing Sheet are to be denominated and settled, and whether any FX risk-sharing or currency-adjustment mechanism applies for a non-Eurozone prime bidder.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 126.
50	ARN2016 Section 15.1 (p.8); Tendering Guide schedule (p.5)	Please confirm the Tender validity period applicable to this procurement and whether an extension request should be anticipated.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 127.
51	Tendering Guide Section 5.1 SR1 Corporate Guarantee (p.16)	Please confirm the exact Standard Form Format/Wording of the SR1 Corporate Guarantee, and whether it must be issued and submitted with the Tender or only upon request within 10 calendar days.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 128.
52	Tendering Guide Section 5.1 SR1 & Section 5.2 SR2 (p.16)	Please confirm whether this tender requires a Bid Bond and/or Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG); if so, the applicable value/percentage and required format/template. Note: the Participant may not have a legal entity or bank account in the Netherlands — please advise in advance any specific local requirements for issuing a Bid Bond or PBG.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 129.
53	Agreement Section 6.2 (p.6); GPC Annex 2 Section 5	Please confirm the payment term (days from receipt of a valid invoice to payment) under the General Purchase Conditions, as this materially affects working-capital planning for the back-loaded payment schedule under Annex 5.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 130.
54	Appendix 1 Agreement; Annex 2 (General Purchase Conditions) and Annexes 3a–3d	Please confirm the order of precedence between the CUPPS-specific requirements and SLA (Appendix 2b) and the General/Special Purchase Conditions (Annex 2 and 3a–3d) where they conflict — for example on service credits, warranty duration and limitation of liability.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 131.
55	Tendering Guide Section 5.5 SR5 Core Competence 2 (p.17)	Core Competence 2 requires a reference airport operating under a regime 'comparable' to the EU (e.g. NIS2, EASA Part-15). Please confirm whether references from airports outside the EU subject to comparable regimes are acceptable, and how 'comparable' will be assessed.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 132.

56	GPC IT & Systems – Special Provisions SaaS Section 5 Service levels (p.4)	Please clarify the scope of the 'special requirements' EANV may impose on fall-back facilities under Section 5.2, and the extent of the compatibility obligation with Hardware/Software 'in use or to be used' at EANV, including treatment of material additional cost or implementation impact.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 133.
57	GPC IT & Systems – Special Provisions Software Section 10 Escrow (p.6)	Please clarify whether Section 10 applies to third-party Software permitted under Section 4 where the Supplier does not own or have the legal right to deposit the underlying source code and proprietary materials.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 134.
58	Security Annex v8.0 – Ch.1 About this document – Para B (p.4)	Please clarify (i) who is responsible for conducting/providing the Business Impact Analysis referred to in Paragraph B, and (ii) how cybersecurity requirements identified after contract formation will be addressed where they materially affect the agreed scope, cost or timeline.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 135.
59	Data Processing Agreement Section 13.3 and Section 14.3 Amendments	Section 13.3 permits EANV to amend the DPA terms during the term, whereas Section 14.3 requires amendments to be agreed by both parties in writing. Please confirm that any amendment under Section 13.3 will require mutual written agreement in accordance with Section 14.3.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 136.
60	General	Please confirm what dates the new airside areas will be available and if there will be any dates with restrictions to access during the airport closure time.	This question is already answered in Information Memorandum 1. Please see question 137.
61	Agreement, Article 5.2, p.6	Textual amendment request on penalty for late delivery: Original text: "If Supplier fails to meet a Delivery Date, delivery schedule, milestone or other deadline referred to in this Agreement, EANV shall be entitled, but not obligated, to impose a penalty of 1% of the total one-off fees for the relevant Deliveries for each commenced week of delay, with a maximum of 10% of such fees." Requested modification: "If Supplier fails to meet a Delivery Date, delivery schedule, milestone or other deadline referred to in this Agreement, EANV shall be entitled, but not obligated, to impose a penalty of 1% of the total one-off fees for the relevant Deliveries for each commenced week of delay, with a maximum of 5% of such fees." Justification: More balanced level of compensation. This rate still compensates EANV for delays while keeping the penalty reasonable compared with the value of the delayed delivery.	EANV does not accept the proposed modification. EANV believes the Article is already reasonable.
62	Agreement, Article 12.1, p.9	Textual amendment request on liability limit: Original text: "Pursuant to Article 18.2, the Parties agree that the Supplier's liability as referred to in Article 18.1 of the General Purchase Conditions is limited to an amount of EUR 500,000 per event, with a maximum of EUR 1,500,000 per calendar year." Requested modification: "Pursuant to Article 18.2, the Parties agree that the Supplier's liability as referred to in Article 18.1 of the General Purchase Conditions is limited to 100% of the contract's value". Justification: A limit based on the contract value gives EANV clear protection and keeps the risk proportionate to the services and insurance coverage.	In response to the concerns raised regarding cumulative liability (question 82), EANV is prepared to introduce an aggregate liability cap. However, EANV does not prefer to relate this cap to the contract value. In stead an aggregate cap of EUR 1,500,000 for the entire term of the Agreement, including any extensions, will be implemented. Article 12 of the Agreement will be amended accordingly: "Pursuant to Article 18.2, the Parties agree that the Supplier's liability as referred to in Article 18.1 of the General Purchase Conditions is limited to EUR 500,000 per event, subject to a maximum aggregate liability of EUR 1,500,000 for the entire term of the Agreement, including any extensions."
63	Annex 3d - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT_Systems_-_Special_Provisions_Software, Article 7.3, p.5 Annex 3d - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT_Systems_-_Special_Provisions_Software,	Textual amendment request on Warranty: Original text: "EANV may arrange for repair of defects or Maintenance, during the term of the Agreement and with retention of rights, to be carried out by a third party at the Supplier's expense. This only applies if the Supplier has not commenced the work within a reasonable period set by EANV, the work has not been carried out to EANV's satisfaction or if EANV obtains permission from the Supplier to do so." Requested modification: Delete article 7.3 Justification: By entering the agreement with EANV, the supplier commits to provide proprietary software solutions and the required associated maintenance services, including corrective, evolutive and preventive maintenance. Service levels will be agreed upon between the parties. There is no need for this clause. Furthermore, no third party may intervene on the supplier's proprietary software solutions.	The Supplier's obligation to provide Maintenance and comply with the agreed Service Levels does not remove the need for EANV to retain an effective contractual remedy in the event that the Supplier fails to remedy a defect or perform the required Maintenance properly and within the applicable timeframe. Article 7.3 therefore constitutes an essential safeguard for the continuity and proper functioning of the services. EANV acknowledges that intervention by a third party may be restricted where proprietary software is concerned. Therefore, EANV will amend Article 7.3 as follows: "EANV may arrange for repair of defects or Maintenance, during the term of the Agreement and with retention of rights, to be carried out by a third party at the Supplier's expense. This only applies if the Supplier has not commenced the work within a reasonable period set by EANV, the work has not been carried out to EANV's satisfaction or if EANV obtains permission from the Supplier to do so. This right shall not apply to the Supplier's proprietary software to the extent that third-party intervention would infringe the Supplier's intellectual property rights or is otherwise legally prohibited."
64	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT_Systems_-_General_Provisions, , Article 10.4, p.9	Textual amendment request on Acceptance: Original text: "If the Parties have not agreed on an Acceptance Test, EANV shall inform Supplier in writing within two (2) weeks of Delivery whether or not it accepts the Delivered. If the Supplier has not received any written notification from EANV within the aforementioned period, the Supplier may not infer that EANV has accepted the supplied goods. If EANV has put the supplied goods into use, EANV shall be deemed to have tacitly accepted the supplied goods." Requested modification: "If the Parties have not agreed on an Acceptance Test, EANV shall inform Supplier in writing within two (2) weeks of Delivery whether or not it accepts the Delivered. If EANV has put the supplied goods into use, EANV shall be deemed to have tacitly accepted the supplied goods." Justification: Avoids artificial blockages. If EANV does not report a documented issue within the agreed review period, acceptance should be confirmed so that the project can move forward.	EANV does not accept the proposed amendment. The mere expiry of the two-week period should not result in deemed acceptance of the Delivered. Acceptance requires either an explicit confirmation by EANV or follows from EANV putting the Delivered into use, as already provided for in the clause. The current wording therefore remains unchanged.
65	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT_Systems_-_General_Provisions, Articles 16,10 p.11-12	Textual amendment request on Termination for convenience: Original text: 16.10h the event of termination of the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 1 or 2 of this article or Article 17 paragraph 1, EANV shall pay the fees (pro rata) to the Supplier up to the moment of termination. In the event of termination of the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 3, EANV shall only pay the fees in accordance with the value of the Deliveries received by EANV. Requested modification: 16.10h the event of termination of the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 1 or 2 or 3 this article or Article 17 paragraph 1, EANV shall pay for the fees in accordance with the value of the Deliveries received by EANV, service already performed, orders incurred and unrecoverable costs. Justification: Protection of the supplier's investments. EANV may still terminate the contract, but the Supplier should be paid for work already completed and reasonable costs already committed for the project.	EANV does not accept the proposed amendment in its current form. The wording "orders incurred and unrecoverable costs" is considered too broad and may result in EANV being liable for costs that have not resulted in Deliveries or Services received by EANV. However, EANV is willing to replace Article 16.10 with the following: "In the event of termination of the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 1 or 2 of this Article or Article 17 paragraph 1, EANV shall pay the fees (pro rata) to the Supplier up to the moment of termination. In addition, in the event of termination pursuant to paragraph 1 or 2 of this Article, EANV shall reimburse the Supplier for reasonable and demonstrable costs that were necessarily incurred by the Supplier specifically for the performance of the Agreement prior to termination, provided that such costs cannot reasonably be cancelled, recovered or otherwise mitigated and are adequately substantiated by the Supplier. Such reimbursement shall not include any loss of profit, loss of revenue or other indirect or consequential losses. In the event of termination of the Agreement pursuant to paragraph 3, EANV shall only pay the fees in accordance with the value of the Deliveries received by EANV."

66	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_General_Provisions, Articles 15.5 & 15.6, p.11 Annex 3d - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_Special_Provisions_Software, Article 3.2 p.3	Textual amendment request on Intellectual property: Original text: 15.5 If intellectual property rights arise as a result of the performance of the Agreement, EANV shall be the owner of such intellectual property rights from the time they arise. To the extent necessary, the Supplier hereby transfers, assigns and delivers these rights to EANV in advance, which transfer, assignment and delivery EANV hereby accepts in advance. To the extent possible, the Supplier waives its moral rights as referred to in Section 25 of the Dutch Copyright Act. 15.6 The Supplier is obliged to provide EANV with all such information and render such assistance as is necessary for the transfer and/or establishment of the rights referred to in the preceding paragraph, without being able to impose conditions in doing so. To the extent that a further deed is required for the transfer and/or establishment, the Supplier shall sign such deed at EANV's first request. Annex 3d – Software 3.2 The Right of Use does not include any transfer by Supplier to EANV of intellectual property rights to the Software, unless it concerns (the development of) Custom Software, to which article 15.5 of the General Provisions applies. Requested modification: Delete Annex 2 – General Provisions articles 15.5-6 Annex 3d – Software, article 3.2: The Right of Use does not include any transfer by Supplier to EANV of intellectual property rights to the Software Justification: These clauses are too ambiguous or extensive. Modification required to protect the supplier's software products. The Supplier must keep ownership of its software, tools and know-how, while EANV receives all agreed rights needed to use the solution.	Proposal accepted. EANV acknowledges that it is highly unlikely that any intellectual property will arise that should reside with EANV. Therefore Article 15.5 and 15.6 of the General Provisions will not be applicable to this agreement. Article 3.2 of the Special Provisions Software will be replaced by: "The Right of Use does not include any transfer by Supplier to EANV of intellectual property rights to the Software."
67	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_General_Provisions, Article 16.5 p.12	Textual amendment request on Source code: Original text: 16.5 If the Agreement is terminated for any reason whatsoever, the Supplier must provide EANV at EANV's first request with: (i) the (source code(s) of) Custom Software and New Versions thereof; and (ii) all other data necessary for the use, further development and maintenance (by third parties) of the Custom Software. EANV may use the source code at its discretion for its further use, development and maintenance of the Custom Software. Requested modification: 16.5 If the Agreement is terminated for any reason whatsoever, the Supplier must provide EANV at EANV's first request with: all data necessary for the use of Software. Justification: To ensure the protection of the software editor's know-how, the supplier may not provide access to the source code. Access to the source code could expose confidential components and third-party rights. There will be no custom software as such. In case evolutions are desired by EANV in the supplied software, the supplier shall include it in its roadmap and provide the necessary updates. However such evolutions may not be considered as custom.	Accepted. Article 16.5 shall not be applicable.
68	Annex 3c - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_Special_Provisions_SaaS, Articles 7.3 p.5 Annex 3d - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_Special_Provisions_Software, Articles 10.3 and 10.5	Textual amendment request on Software Escrow: Original text: Annex 3c – SaaS Articles 7.3 The SaaS residing in Escrow shall be released to EANV if (i) Supplier is declared bankrupt, ceases to exist, or a third party acquires Supplier and that Supplier does not consider itself bound by the Agreement or poses unreasonable conditions to the continuation of the Agreement; (ii) Supplier is in material breach of the SLA; or (iii) the Agreement is terminated, ends within one month, or is not renewed. Annex 3d – Software 10.3 If Supplier modifies the Source Code, Supplier must also deposit the modified version(s) in Escrow. 10.5 EANV shall be entitled to release of the Source Code and other deposited information residing in Escrow if (i) Supplier is declared bankrupt, ceases to exist, or a third party takes over Supplier that does not consider itself bound by the Agreement or poses unreasonable conditions to the continuation of the Agreement; (ii) Supplier materially breaches its Maintenance obligations; or (iii) the Agreement is terminated, ends within one (1) month, or is not renewed Requested modification: Deletion of 7.3 ii and iii and 10.5 ii and 3iii. 10.3: At EANV cost. Justification: The software escrow clauses cannot be accepted as such because the release conditions are too broad and could expose sensitive source code without ensuring that EANV could use it effectively. Clauses to be discussed.	Taking into account the provided answers to questions 35, 38 and 134 in the Information Memorandum 1, Escrow is already removed from this agreement. Therefore no amendments are necessary.
69	Annex 9 - Security Annex, Article 4.1, p.5-6	Textual amendment request on Security Audits: Original text: Annex 9 – Security Annex 4.1 In consultation with the contractor and insofar as permitted with regard to costs and planning, EANV can carry out, or arrange for independent third parties to carry out, risk analyses (e.g. penetration tests), technical risk assessments, security scans (e.g. PCI compliance scans) and audits on the service provision of the contractor – including and exclusively information systems that process EANV data. The contractor shall make available any information security documents, standards, process descriptions, documentation and information that are relevant to those activities. The contractor shall implement, within the agreed time line, corrective actions further to the findings that are identified during audits/technical risk assessments carried out by EANV. Requested modification: Add in 4.1: These security will be carried out at EANV cost and with a minimum notice time to the supplier of 2 months. Justification: Advance notice and agreed planning allow EANV to perform the audit properly without disrupting services or creating new security risks.	EANV agrees that security audits, assessments, and penetration tests initiated by EANV shall be conducted at EANV's expense and coordinated with the Supplier. EANV considers a minimum notice period of two (2) months reasonable, except in the case of security incidents, regulatory requirements, suspected non-compliance, or high and critical findings. Any findings identifying deficiencies resulting from inadequate security measures, non-compliance with generally accepted security standards, or vulnerabilities posing risks to the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of the service, and any resulting remediation activities, shall remain the sole responsibility of the Supplier and shall not be chargeable to EANV.

70	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_General_Provisions, Article 13.5, P.9-10	Textual amendment request on Licenses Audits: Original text: 13.5#At EANV's request, the Supplier must, at its own expense, submit, periodically or otherwise..." Requested modification: "At EANV's request, the Supplier must, at its own expense, submit, once a year..." Justification: Limiting the number of audits to once a year allows reducing the technical costs associated.	This article does not concern the frequency of audits, but the frequency in which Supplier must submit a TPM to EANV. EANV does not accept a general restriction limiting this frequency to once per year. Such limitations would be inappropriate in situations requiring an urgent or additional verification.
71	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_General_Provisions, Article 7.2, p.13	Textual amendment request on Force majeure: Original text: 17.2#force majeure on the part of the Supplier shall, in addition to the law, in any case not mean: lack or illness of Personnel, strikes, non-performance of third parties engaged by the Supplier, failure and/or unsuitability of auxiliary materials and/or liquidity or solvency problems at the Supplier. Requested modification: 17.2#force majeure on the part of the Supplier shall, in addition to the law, in any case not mean: lack or illness of Personnel, strikes, non-performance of third parties engaged by the Supplier, failure and/or unsuitability of auxiliary materials, major cyberattack, embargo, pandemic and/or liquidity or solvency problems at the Supplier. Justification: Addition of specific cases to reflect the reality of modern IT projects.	EANV does not accept the proposed amendment. Whether a major cyberattack, embargo or pandemic constitutes force majeure must be assessed on the basis of the specific circumstances and applicable law. Article 17.2 therefore remains unchanged.
72	Schedule of Requirements - Common Use, Chapter 4, pg 13	During the closure period what is the expected use of the system, such as any training or partial operations? Is a phased transition plan required or a full cutover on reopening?	During airport closure, CUPPS will be used for training and testing. There is no phased transition as the current CUPPS system will be decommissioned on 1 February 2027.
73	Schedule of Requirements - C28	What are the applications being run on the back office PC?	Primarily the airline DCS is accessed through the back-office for flight closure activities.
74	Schedule of Requirements - A.3 Passenger Processing Systems	Can you confirm whether local DCS is outside the contract scope?	Yes, that is confirmed.
75	Schedule of Requirements - C14 / C17	Is the focused support during first 10 days of operation the first 10 days following delivery acceptance or the first 10 days of passenger operations following reopening? Additionally, what is the anticipated CUPPS vendor's role during the ORAT period?	First 10 days of operation is the first 10 days of passenger operations. As we expect full implementation and acceptance by 1 June 2027 (=before ORAT starts), no specific role is anticipated for the vendor during ORAT. However, if vendor prefers to have a role during ORAT, we highly welcome its suggestions.
76	Schedule of Requirements - A47	For this requirement, can you confirm whether a full list of systems already certified across our estate generally is needed, or only those relevant to the airlines currently operating at EANV?	At least the systems relevant to the currently operating airlines. However EANV prefers to understand all systems, including systems that may become relevant in the future.
77	Schedule of Requirements - C16	Please can the airport confirm the total number of workstations requested for the entire project. Through our review of the requirements, we have identified 14 check-in positions, 13 boarding gate positions, 2 PRM Mobility Assistance positions, 4 Service Desk Positions Landside positions, 2 Airside (Schengen) positions, 2 Airside (Non-Schengen) positions, 1 Arrivals Position, and 1 test workstation. This totals 39 positions. Can we assume that the test workstation will be repurposed into the full deployment?	Please refer to the answer to question 65 of Information Memorandum 1. The PRM positions and Arrivals position do not require a CUPPS workstation.
78	Appendix 2a - schedule of requirements, Chapter 2, Section 1	In the tender, the airport advises that there are 22 Check-in positions of which 14 are equipped with a workstation (position 9-12 and 15-24). With 12 Self-service retro-fit bag drop units installed at check-in positions 1 to 12. While the total of desk 9-12 + 15-24 totals the 14 positions requested. Please can the airport confirm that desks 1-12, and desks 13 & 14 will be left without a CUPPS set up on these desks?	Desks 1-8 will not have a CUPPS set-up. Desks 13 & 14 are non-existent.
79	Schedule of Requirements - A12-A16	Please can the airport confirm that no document printers are required for any of the Check-in or Gate positions? Please can the airport confirm which of the 11 service desk positions require a document printer? We imagine two positions in a similar area can share a single A4 Document Printer.	No documents printers are required at check-in and gate positions. For service desks, we assume three document printers: One at service desk landside, one at service desk airside (Schengen) and one at service desk (Non-Schengen).
80	Appendix 1. Agreement / 6.7 Fees and payment	Hardware/Equipment prices are quoted at tender submission in October 2026, while delivery will take place in Q1 2027. Over that period the Supplier remains exposed to changes in hardware/equipment costs. Could you please confirm that, where the Supplier's cost of any hardware/equipment at the date of delivery exceeds the corresponding cost as at the tender submission date by three percent (3%) or more, the Supplier will notify the airport authority in writing, supported by documentary evidence, and the difference above that threshold will be added to the invoice for that hardware/equipment?	EANV cannot accept the proposed amendment. EANV notes that the Tender submission deadline is 26 October 2026 and that the final award decision will be announced on 17 December 2026. The Participant may choose to order the hardware and equipment as soon as the final award decision is known. The Participant would therefore be exposed to this risk for less than two months, which EANV considers reasonable.
81	Annex 2 - EANV_General_Purchase_Conditions_IT____Systems_-_General_Provisions / Article 13 Audit and TPM	The offered solution is a shared, multi-tenant cloud service. Intrusive testing of multi-tenant production infrastructure cannot be permitted, as it would risk the confidentiality, integrity and availability of services used by other customers (including EANV's own data). We therefore ask you to please confirm that audits under Article 13 will be conducted as document-based reviews, and specifically that: (i) they will not include penetration testing, vulnerability scanning or other intrusive testing of the Supplier's systems; (ii) the Supplier will not be required to give access to information or systems that would compromise the security of other customers; (iii) documentation is made available for inspection without copies being taken; (iv) findings are shared in full with the Supplier and not disclosed to third parties without its prior written consent, save where required by law; and (v) audit effort is limited to two (2) working man-days, with additional effort chargeable at the agreed rates?	EANV acknowledges the Participant's concerns regarding audits and penetration testing in a shared, multi-tenant environment. However, such environments introduce specific risks relating to shared components and tenant isolation. Proportionate validation of cybersecurity measures and resilience is therefore particularly important. EANV considers the following reasonable: (i) EANV acknowledges that it cannot independently and unilaterally perform unrestricted penetration testing of every component of a shared production platform. Where EANV wishes to audit or test the shared production platform, the Parties shall agree the scope, timing and rules of engagement. The Supplier shall not unreasonably withhold, condition or delay its cooperation. Where the Supplier demonstrates that the proposed testing would create a material risk to the service, other customers or shared infrastructure, it shall provide a representative non-production test environment or an equivalent assurance mechanism. Any alternative environment must adequately represent the relevant production architecture, interfaces, configurations and security controls. The Supplier shall arrange an independent assessment of the production service at least annually and following material security-relevant changes. Upon request, the Supplier shall provide EANV with a current independent third-party assurance report, such as SOC 2 Type II or an equivalent report. The report shall provide meaningful evidence regarding the production service and the design and operating effectiveness of relevant security controls, including tenant isolation. EANV retains a controlled right to test its own tenant, exposed interfaces, integrations, local CUPPS components and tenant-isolation controls. EANV may require additional assurance or testing following a material security incident or change, a credible vulnerability, inadequate assurance, or a request from a competent authority. (ii) Audits and penetration tests shall not require unauthorised access to information, systems or data relating to other customers, nor materially compromise their security or service availability. This shall not prevent controlled tenant-isolation testing using test tenants or an equivalent mechanism. (iii) Copies of relevant documentation shall be provided where reasonably necessary for audit, assurance, compliance or evidential purposes. Where providing copies would create a demonstrable material security or confidentiality risk, secure access may be provided instead, provided that EANV can obtain sufficient evidence. (iv) Findings relating to the Supplier or its systems shall be shared with the Supplier. EANV cannot accept a general restriction on disclosure where disclosure is reasonably required for legal, regulatory, audit, assurance or compliance purposes. Appropriate confidentiality safeguards shall apply where possible. (v) EANV does not accept a fixed limit of two working days. Audit cooperation and effort shall be reasonable and proportionate to the scope, complexity, purpose, urgency, severity and regulatory context of the audit.
82	Appendix 1. Agreement / 12.1 Deviations	We thank EANV for reducing the cap. Our remaining concern is not the annual figure but the absence of an aggregate limit: as the cap resets each calendar year, total exposure over a five-year term (extendable to eight) would significantly exceed the expected total contract value. Could EANV therefore confirm that, in addition to the per-event and annual limits, the Supplier's aggregate liability for all claims under the Agreement is limited to the total fees paid or payable to the Supplier over the contract term? If EANV does not consider this figure appropriate, could EANV please indicate an aggregate cap it would find acceptable?	Please refer to the answer to question 62 of this Information of Memorandum.

83	Special Provisions - SaaS / 3.1 Right of Use	In line with industry practice, and to protect the stability and security of the platform, no applications are tested, integrated or developed directly by the customer. Could EANV please describe the testing and development activities it envisages? For information, Supplier's has standard process so that Customer can test and integrate the solution: (i) new or updated applications go through the Supplier's application certification process before deployment; and (ii) integration, testing or development requests are assessed per use case with EANV and carried out in the Supplier's dedicated test lab, under details agreed between the Parties. Could EANV confirm that the right in will be exercised through this process?	EANV cannot generally confirm as this can differ case by case. Example: If vendors supplies an API (Application Programming Interface) to EANV, EANV may develop an application integrating with this API. Such an application is not subject to vendor's certification process, nor should its development be carried out in vendor's test lab.
84	Special Provisions - Software / 3.4 Right of Use	Could EANV confirm that passenger processing functions (check-in, boarding and service desk) are performed only on the workstations or Supplier-provided or approved mobile solutions, as these require certified peripherals and a controlled environment? Could EANV also confirm that remote access from EANV corporate devices (for example, when working from home) is limited to monitoring, reporting and administrative functions and is subject to security controls and secure connections, in line with the Security Annex? If EANV has other remote-access use cases in mind, could it please describe them?	Yes, EANV confirms.
85	Standard Form - Requirements compliance / E18	Please confirm whether compliance with the ISO 27001 certification requirement may be demonstrated through an ISO/IEC 27001-certified operational environment supporting the service, even where the certification scope does not explicitly include all software development activities associated with the offered solution.	The Participant must demonstrate that the scope of the certification adequately covers the organisational units, processes, systems and locations that are materially involved in this engagement. Where relevant activities are performed by an entity or organisational unit outside the certified scope, the Participant must clearly identify this and provide evidence explaining the nature and extent of those activities and how the associated information-security risks are controlled. EANV will assess compliance on the basis of the evidence submitted, taking into account the relevance and materiality of any activities outside the certified scope. Certification limited solely to the hosting or operational environment will not, by itself, be sufficient. A material gap in coverage may result in the requirement being assessed as non-compliant.
86	Set-off Rights – Agreement / General Purchase Conditions	Would EANV be willing to remove the provisions permitting EANV to set off penalties or other claims against amounts payable to the Supplier, with each Party instead settling amounts due independently in accordance with the Agreement?	No, we are not willing to. Please refer to the answers to question 20 of Information of Memorandum 1.
87	Data Processing Agreement – Limitation of Liability	Would EANV agree that any liability arising under the Data Processing Agreement (Annex 8) is subject to the agreed limitation of liability under the main Agreement?	This is already agreed upon. Please refer to the answers to question 55 of Information of Memorandum 1.
88	Limitation of Liability – General Purchase Conditions Article 18	Would EANV be willing to consider an alternative limitation of liability position to that currently set out in Article 18 of the General Purchase Conditions, including an aggregate liability cap linked to the contract value and an exclusion of indirect and consequential losses?	Please refer to the answer to question 62 of this Information of Memorandum.
89	Indemnification – Limitation of Liability	Would EANV agree that indemnification obligations are also subject to the agreed contractual limitation of liability, rather than being uncapped?	This is already agreed upon. Please refer to the answers to question 51 of Information of Memorandum 1.
90	Termination for Convenience – Agreement	Would EANV be willing to remove the right to terminate the Agreement for convenience on three (3) months' notice and limit termination rights to termination for cause, including material breach of the Agreement?	Termination for convenience is already removed. Please refer to the answers to question 46 of Information of Memorandum 1.
91	Third-Party Repairs and Maintenance – Hardware / Software	Would EANV agree that repair or maintenance of Supplier-provided hardware and software may only be undertaken by the Supplier or an appropriately authorised service provider, as unauthorised third-party intervention may invalidate applicable warranties and support obligations?	Not accepted. Please note that, in relation to this article, EANV can only appoint a third party if the Supplier has not commenced the work within a reasonable period set by EANV, the work has not been carried out to EANV's satisfaction or if EANV obtains permission from the Supplier to do so.
92	SaaS Escrow and Source Code Escrow	Would EANV be willing to remove the requirements relating to SaaS Escrow and Source Code Escrow, as the Participant does not consider escrow necessary or appropriate for the proposed solution and support model?	Escrow is already removed. Please refer to the answers to question 35 and 38 of Information of Memorandum 1.
93	Software Warranty – Special Provisions Software	Regarding the 12-month software warranty, would EANV accept that software is provided in accordance with the agreed specifications and that defects will be addressed through the Participant's standard software support, update, patch and fix processes, rather than an unconditional warranty that the software will be defect-free?	EANV believes the Special Provisions Software already allow for what is proposed in this question. No modification is required.
94	Importation / Incoterms – Hardware Delivery	Would EANV be willing to act as the importer of record for goods imported into the Netherlands from outside the EU, with the Participant delivering the goods on a DAP Netherlands Port of Entry basis in accordance with Incoterms® 2020?	No. As described in the pricing sheet, delivery shall be done DDP Eindhoven, not DAP.
95	Request for Additional Site Visit	Would EANV be able to accommodate an additional site visit for Participants who were unable to attend the earlier scheduled visit due to delays encountered during the TenderNed registration process? A site visit would assist in validating the existing environment, infrastructure and operational requirements and support the development of an accurate and compliant Tender. If possible, could EANV please advise whether an alternative visit can be arranged?	Unfortunately, this is not possible. However, parts of our terminal building are publicly accessible allowing you to observe parts of the operational processes.
96	Connectivity / Core Room Location	For the purpose of obtaining carrier connectivity quotations for the proposed CUPPS solution, could EANV please confirm the full service delivery address, building, core/MDF room designation and network demarcation point to be used for connectivity into Eindhoven Airport? Please also confirm whether Luchthavenweg 25, 5657 EA Eindhoven should be used as the service address for carrier quotation purposes.	These details will be discussed after contract awarding.
97	Equipment Hosting and Connectivity Costs	Could EANV please confirm whether any charges will apply for hosting Supplier-provided network or connectivity equipment at Eindhoven Airport, including rack space, power or associated infrastructure costs? In addition, where the Supplier uses EANV-provided internet connectivity for airline host traffic, please confirm whether any connectivity, usage or other associated charges will apply to the Supplier.	No, EANV will not impose any charges, as these costs would ultimately be borne by EANV in one way or another.
98	Solution Design & Implementation Plan – Page Limit	EANV requires the Solution Design & Implementation Plan to address the relevant requirements within categories A, B and C, including any responses that cannot be fully accommodated within Appendix 2b, while limiting the document to a maximum of 12 A4 pages. Given the number and technical breadth of the requirements to be addressed, could EANV please confirm whether supporting technical information, diagrams, architecture drawings, implementation schedules and/or detailed responses referenced from Appendix 2b may be provided as appendices outside the 12-page limit? If supporting appendices are not permitted, could EANV please confirm that Participants may cross-reference concise responses provided directly within Appendix 2b and that only the additional narrative required for the Solution Design & Implementation Plan must be contained within the 12-page limit?	Only drawings, images and photos are exempt from the page limit. Besides the 12 pages, Participant must also use "Standard Form - Requirements compliance.xlsx" to respond to every individual requirement.
99	Internet Connectivity During Implementation and Support	Could EANV please confirm whether internet connectivity will be provided by EANV for the Supplier's use during both the implementation/project phase and the ongoing support/operational phase? If so, please confirm whether this connectivity will be provided at no additional cost to the Supplier. If charges apply, please provide the applicable cost structure so that Participants can account for these costs consistently in their Tender pricing.	Yes, this is confirmed. No costs will be charged, as these costs would ultimately be borne by EANV in one way or another.
100	EANV Virtual Server Resource Limits	EANV has specified maximum resources of 12 vCPU, 48 GB RAM and 240 GB storage for on-premise virtual server infrastructure. Could EANV please confirm whether these limits apply to the entire Supplier solution, or whether a Supplier may utilise two or more virtual server instances, each with resources up to the stated maximum? In particular, please clarify whether additional storage capacity can be provided where required to support the transactional data retention and database requirements specified in the Tender.	The maximum resources apply to the entire solution. Participant may choose to dedicate all resources to one VM or to split/distribute the resources across multiple VMs.
101	Appendix 2b – E13: Firewall Management	Appendix 2b, requirement E13 indicates that EANV will provide the firewall. Could EANV please confirm which party will be responsible for the ongoing management, configuration, monitoring and maintenance of the EANV-provided firewall, including the implementation of any firewall rule changes required by the Supplier during implementation and ongoing operations?	Yes, EANV will be responsible of managing this firewall. EANV will provide a process such that supplier can apply for firewall rule changes.
102	Importer of Record and Hardware Delivery Terms	Could EANV please confirm whether it would be willing to act as the Importer of Record for the hardware and take title to the hardware prior to importation into the Netherlands?	No, delivery must be DDP, as described in the pricing sheet.

103	Airline DCS Host Connectivity	Could EANV please provide details of the current connectivity methods used to connect Eindhoven Airport to each of the airline DCS hosts within the scope of the Tender, identifying which connections are currently provided via private network circuits and which are provided via internet-based connectivity? For a cloud-hosted CUPPS solution, please also confirm whether the Supplier may establish the required airline DCS connectivity through its own private network connectivity and/or secure internet-based connectivity from the Supplier's cloud environment.	The current connectivity method is already described in section 5C of Appendix 2b (Schedule of Requirements). Establishing DCS connectivity through Supplier's own private network is permitted, but subject to the airline's approval. It's the airline's responsibility to provide connectivity into our airport. Please also refer to the question 102 of Information Memorandum 1.
-----	-------------------------------	--	--