

ProRail

ProRail Market Consultation

Project Veiligheid Actueel en Transparant (VAT)

Report for Market Consultation in preparation for the tender.

By
Author

Reference

Version 1.0

Date 14 October 2016

Filename Market consultation report VAT

Status Final

ProRail

Table of contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Goal of this report	3
3	Rules	3
4	Your responses and our preliminary conclusions	4
A.	General observations	4
B.	Feasibility and vision for your chosen solutions	4
C.	Insight into your market offering	4
D.	Commercial	6
E.	Question about interest in this assignment	6
F.	Questions about selection and award criteria	6
	Many thanks to the respondents	7

1 Introduction

By conducting this market consultation ProRail was investigating not only the maturity of the market, but also which suppliers might be able to deliver and implement an integrated safety information management software solution, containing all of the features ProRail sees as fit for the future.

Our aim was to:

- Assess the feasibility and vision for our chosen solution direction as articulated in this document.
- Obtain insight into your market offering, e.g.
 - a. software products (standard package or individual components)
 - b. service to grow to a phased solution
 - c. opportunities that your approach and solution offers to realize project Veiligheidsinformatie Actueel en Transparant (VAT).

To realize this aim, we developed a document which shared both our history and current situation, as well as project goal and boundaries. We also added a questionnaire for the market to respond to. The market consultation was announced on TenderNed.

Based on the content of the market responses, we decided it was not necessary to conduct any further clarification meetings with interested parties.

2 Goal of this report

This report is a way to share results of the consultation with the market, with results deliberately presented on a high level and anonymously in order to respect confidentiality.

3 Rules

Rules governing the market consultation:

- It is emphasized that participation in this market consultation will not lead to any privileges or advantages in the event of a tender nor will not participating mean that a participant will be excluded from the tender. Participating in this market consultation is entirely voluntary.
- Participants cannot derive any rights from the supplied information during the market consultation.
- ProRail is in no way bound to the results of the market consultation.

4 Your responses and our preliminary conclusions

A. General observations

The market consultation received a lot of interest from the market. Thirty-four people downloaded the documentation, with ten parties subsequently providing their responses to our questions.

The variety of responses was broad: small and large companies, both from the Netherlands and abroad, and included both software vendors and system integrators. Some respondents are specialized in rail and/or safety, some are generalists.

All solutions appear to be configurable, will allow a link to the ProRail infrastructure and offer mobility to a certain extent. However, cost and time implications are not always clear and not yet comparable from the response.

At this stage it is not yet possible to interpret the product features and fit, based on the descriptions (and sometimes screenshots) provided. The same applies to how the various parties deal with data or structure information.

B. Feasibility and vision for your chosen solutions

First of all: it is clear from the responses we received that our vision and the solution we are seeking is feasible in the current marketplace.

The responses we received vary widely, with some respondents describing their vision in broad terms, while others focus on either the products or the service.

The market provided limited input around areas of improvement, which also suggests our vision is feasible.

Respondents suggested solutions that include augmented reality. Some see an opportunity to compare information across different rail companies.

FINDINGS:

It would benefit the tender if we would provide:

- a clear description of our vision and the bottlenecks we encounter.
- a more detailed description of our safety processes.
- our vision on how to put safety management in practice and for what purpose we wish to document information.
- a clear description of the scope of our project links e.g. other rail companies.

C. Insight into your market offering

Section C. of the Market Consultation contained a large number of questions; for clarity we have provided the feedback using the same numbering.

1. A variety of proposed solutions have been described, although multiple respondents suggested the same third party software as a viable solution. Some offered platform solutions in which the functionality has to be developed, others – mostly modular – software solutions with the option to configure and customize. The maturity level – are they new or fully developed – of these modules is unclear.

ProRail

The respondents provided solutions from different points of view, including data compliance, communication solutions and other point solutions for sections of the safety process.

2. Respondents provided reference projects that are relevant, but never exactly the same as this project. For instance, some of the reference projects are for customers that are only using a limited number of modules, or customers are using a solution that is comparable in functionality, but not used in a rail environment.
3. The market provides modules to cover all processes: support barrier management, inspections & research, data & trend analysis, mobility and providing information to stakeholders.
Most respondents provide multiple modules to cover some or all processes. The responses did not provide insight into the relationship between the modules or what the impact in terms of time and costs would be to develop the parts into a complete safety management information software solution.
4. Some respondents provide their own software, some work with third parties
5. The market offers PaaS and SaaS solutions, as well as on-site and hosted license and maintenance models. Multiple license models are used, per user and/or per server and/or per module, concurrent users and/or named users licenses. A few respondents propose a SaaS solution in addition to on site solutions, others do not deliver a SaaS solution at all.
6. The technical specifications confirmed that our mobile needs can be met, with different platforms (e.g. Android, iOS and Windows) being described.
7. The market was unable to provide insight into the ratio between standard and custom requirements based on the information we provided. The solutions vary from fully customized to standard software with some configuration, with the level of customization dependent on many factors.
8. The pricing model differs greatly between different suppliers.

FINDINGS:

It would benefit the tender if we would:

- specify our processes and ask suppliers to describe the reasoning behind their proposed solution.
- be specific about the purpose of real-time communication towards stakeholders.
- include a request for the costs and time involved with configuration into our tendering process.
- request references based on size and complexity (and of course competences), not necessarily on rail.
- take into account the variety in licensing models when building a pricing sheet in order to assure a like-for-like comparison between suppliers.

D. Commercial

The market provided estimated implementation time between eight days and 12 months. Some communicated that based on the information provided, no viable estimate could be made.

The estimated costs also differed widely, partly due to differences in scope. Some respondents only provided license costs, while others included implementation and consulting charges.

The definition of project closure also differs based on the type of respondent. Some saw a natural split after delivering the software and train-the-trainer sessions, others after implementation was finalized.

Several respondents provide a three-month warranty period, other respondents include warranty handling as part of a support contract.

FINDINGS:

It would benefit the tender if we would:

- clearly define the scope of the project and the split between software purchase, business process consulting, implementation, data migration and integration into the ProRail environment.
- clearly define the required service levels regarding 1st and 2nd line support and warranty.

E. Question about interest in this assignment

All respondents expressed a clear wish to participate in the tendering process. Concerns were raised by respondents in relation to insufficient budget, insufficient resources from ProRail and the short contract period (less than three years).

With regards to creating a level playing field, respondents note that they require detailed information about ProRail, as well as the background and purpose of the tender. Also, respondents suggest that we should not mandate a specific software system, but specify our requirements on a functional level.

Other ideas were to use Total Cost of Ownership as an award criterion, divide the tender in lots, and to connect risk management.

F. Questions about selection and award criteria

Suggested selection criteria included R&D spend, continuity, number of professionals on payroll, reference cases, quality certificates and knowledge about ProRail.

In relation to what award criteria could be, terms such as compliance, robustness, future proof, integration in the ProRail IT landscape, price, TCO, integral solution, flexibility of the solution and a proof of concept with user evaluations were all mentioned.

In response to the question on how to test technical knowledge, respondents suggested vision and roadmap, resources, understanding of rail operations, references/site visits, proof of concept, level of participation of the software supplier and full functionality demos.

Many thanks to the respondents

Thank you very much for participating in the market consultation. Your input has not only provided us with the information required to assess the feasibility and vision of our chosen solution direction, but also offered valuable insight into market offerings.