Summary of Clarification Meeting – First Information Notice CRIS

Tuesday November 3rd, at 10:00 AM CET

Below is a summary of the clarification meeting, including the questions raised by tenderers and TU Delft's responses.

1. ISO 27701 – Comparable Proof

Question: What does TU Delft accept as "comparable proof" instead of an ISO 27701 certificate, and what requirements apply to the auditor providing such proof?

Answer:

- An independent audit report or attestation may be accepted as comparable proof.
- The evidence must be provided by an independent third party.
- TU Delft does not require this auditor to be accredited or certified for ISO 27001 or ISO 27701.
- The key requirement is that the proof is not self-declared by the tenderer but originates from an independent auditor.

2. Change from MoSCoW to Mandatory Requirements

Question: What is the rationale behind changing all requirements in Appendix 1 to mandatory requirements?

Answer:

- During the previous tender process, the MoSCoW structure led to considerable ambiguity.
- To improve clarity, all former "Must Have" requirements have been placed in Appendix 1 as mandatory requirements.
- Non-mandatory requirements have been moved to Appendix 2.
- TU Delft welcomes feedback if any mandatory requirement is perceived as blocking participation.

3. Future ISO 27701 Certification Commitment

Question: Would TU Delft accept a contractual commitment to obtain ISO 27701 certification after contract commencement?

Answer:

- No, tenderers must comply with the applicable requirements at the time of tender submission.
- A commitment to obtain certification after award is not considered sufficient.

4. Go-Live Date and Contract Term

Question: Which go-live date and contract end date apply where the tender documents appear inconsistent?

Answer:

- The go-live date for the core functionality was confirmed.
- The apparent inconsistency regarding the contract end date could not be clarified during the meeting.
- TU Delft indicated that this point would be reviewed and answered separately.

Status: The go-live date for core features is 1 July 2027. The initial term of license will begin on 1 July 2027 and will end after three years on 30 June 2030.

5. Data Breach Notification Period

Question: Which notification period applies in case of a data breach: 24 hours or 48 hours?

Answer:

- The applicable notification period will be **48 hours**.
- The Data Processing Agreement (DPA), specifically section 9b, will be amended accordingly.

6. Portal Pricing

Question: Why has the portal been separated in the pricing structure, and how should it be priced?

Answer:

- TU Delft intends to retain the portal during the initial three-year contract term but wants flexibility to decide annually thereafter whether to continue using it.
- Pricing Component 1 should contain the all-inclusive annual price, including the portal.
- Pricing Component 3 should provide a separate price breakdown of the portal component.
- The separate portal price is requested for information purposes only and will not be evaluated.

7. Deliverables During the Second Implementation Phase

Question: Which deliverables are expected between 1 July and 31 December 2027, given that future integrations are excluded from the fixed implementation fee?

Answer:

- Items resulting from future user stories in the Innovation Plan are excluded.
- The fixed implementation scope includes:

- all mandatory functionalities;
- all functionalities offered as part of the tenderer's proposed solution and functionality plan.

8. Liability Cap (Question 7)

Question: How does the EUR 1 million amount in the SaaS Agreement relate to the EUR 3 million amount in the AIV?

Answer:

- The SaaS Agreement prevails over the General Terms and Conditions (AIV).
- Therefore, the minimum insurance cover of **EUR 1,000,000 per event** as stated in the SaaS Agreement applies.

9. SCIM 2.0 and Equivalent Functionality (Question 29)

Question: Is user provisioning through the HR (AFAS) interface combined with attribute-based provisioning through SURFconext considered equivalent to SCIM 2.0 functionality?

Answer:

- TU Delft was unable to provide an answer during the meeting.
- Additional input from ICT specialists is required.
- Tenderers were requested to submit a follow-up question through TenderNed.

Status: Open for further clarification.

10. SLA – Expected Traffic Volumes and Crawler Activity

Question: What web traffic volumes are expected, and are there any specific requirements or restrictions regarding crawler or bot activity?

Answer:

- TU Delft considered this a new substantive question rather than a clarification of the first Information Notice.
- Tenderers were requested to submit the question through the TenderNed Q&A module.
- TU Delft indicated that a separate response would be prepared.

Status: Open for further clarification.