

Questions and Answers N°1

15.CAT.OP.001

Question	Answer
<p>1. In the event of the award of a contract to a consortium is it expected that the leader will invoice and be paid the whole value of the contract or will it be possible for each member of the consortium to be paid separately?</p>	<p>Payments are done to the Consortium leader ,payment master office of the consortium.</p>
<p>2. Please clarify the extent to which ground elements are to be addressed within the study. In some places (eg referring to current & planned satellites), in others there are references to ground related aspects such as managing conflicting booking and networks and terminals.</p>	<p>Ground segment covers the SOC, NOC and end-user terminals. EDA foresees to take into account the most commonly used standards related to equipment and terminals. The activity should also identify the impact of a further standardization activity so that equipment remain compatible with any satellite providing a govstcom capability.</p> <p>So, the extent is related to a clear assessment of the implications of the Govsatcom developments on the ground segment. The implications cover the benefits, constraints and limitations for example when addressing Earth Stations of the backbone infrastructure, data and security policy, SOC and NOC characteristics and end-user terminals.</p>
<p>3. If the feasibility study expected to address both FSS and MSS Satcom use, or is it limited to FSS?</p>	<p>There is no mention of a limitation to FSS system. It shall address the most cost-effective solution to address the configurations identified in the WP1. If the IERs cover requirements generally addressed by MSS Satcom use, then the feasibility study shall address also the MSS Satcom use.</p>
<p>4. For the Hand over workshop at the end of WP1 and the Final Presentation is it expected that the contractor will use its contacts to ensure that the defence and wider communities are appropriately represented or will the EDA take responsibility for the attendance?</p>	<p>The attendance will be managed by EDA. Participants will come from the Project Team Satcom gathering national representatives from each MoDs of the EU. Additional participants will come from the EC (DG GROW) and ESA (including potential companies working for them in relation to the Govsatcom initiative). The meeting will be hosted either by EDA or ESA.</p>

<p>5. Section 1.9 it is stated that only 3 representatives per tenderer. Should this be interpreted as 3 per company? If not will attendance at the meeting prevent a company from joining with another company who was also present?</p>	<p>3 representatives per company even if some companies decide afterwards to present a joint offer.</p>
<p>6. Section 2.2.1.1 please provide further information about the type of information contained in the CST, this will help us to better scope the analysis task</p>	<p>The CST provides information related to the defence needs with respect to the EU level of ambition concerning typical CSDP missions. The contractor will receive a list of generic illustrative scenarios (eg Separation of parties by force, conflict prevention) with a table listing the number of involved defence assets. The contractor is then expected to derive the appropriate network topology and satcom requirements. EDA expects the contractor to simulate through the forecast tool the occurrence of various types of conflicts along the Satellite lifetime (15y) so that an estimate of the satcom requirements over time can be derived (see slide)</p>
<p>7. Section 2.2.2 & 2.3.4.1 i) please clarify the gap analysis which is expected. Is it the cap between each existing planned asset and the requirements or is it between the combination of existing assets and the requirement?</p>	<p>In section 2.2.2, the contractor will assess to what extend each GOVSATCOM asset, taken in isolation, can fulfill the various configurations identified in WP1. The gap analysis will then be part of the report on WP2. The combination of GOVSATCOM assets is dealt with in section 2.2.3.2 and will be reported in the first part of the report on WP3. There is a typo on i). Gaps and recommendations headline belongs to the suggested skeleton of D7.x : report on WP2 Section 2.3.4.1 i) reads D8.x: executive summary of D7.x</p>
<p>8. Section 2.2.3.3 Please clarify the information about the high-level architectures that will be provided by ESA, in particular</p> <p>a. Will this cover the ground system or will it be limited to the space assets?</p> <p>b. Will the architectures include the contractual architecture or be limited to the technical architecture</p> <p>c. Will the architectures include cost information for the Contractor to analyse or will it be the responsibility of the Contractor to develop cost estimates or is the contractor expected to perform a critical review of the costs provided?</p> <p>.</p>	<p>8a) most likely limited to space segment first. The objective is to identify a set of technical features which would be considered as prerequisite for any satellite to be eligible to the GOVSATCOM segment. 8b) ESA work will be limited to the technical architecture. 8c) EDA's contractor responsibility. EDA expects the contractor to be able to assess a rough order of magnitude of the supplementary cost when addressing more and more complex configurations. This should be realized independently of any value engineering techniques performed by ESA.</p>

<p>9. Section 2.2.3.3 Please clarify what aspects will be covered by the “minimum set of technical requirements” for future satellites to enable them to be eligible for GOVSATCOM</p>	<p>EDA assumes that the GOVSATCOM segment will be defined more precisely in terms of threats to be addressed and mitigation techniques which would be affordable in this context. That will be an exercise driven by EDA whose findings will be made available to industry. The minimum set of technical requirements will be the high-level functions to be covered by any satellite wishing to be eligible to the GOVSATCOM concept. That could cover areas such as antenna processing, signal processing, flexible management of power, frequencies, resource... That should be an input from ESA.</p>
<p>10. Section 2.2.3.4 the list of items to be given particular attention in the Business Case includes “logistics and spares management, education and training dimensions”. Please clarify the expected scope of these aspects, in particular whether training, spares etc is for users or for some other group</p>	<p>The GOVSATCOM initiative is an area where some benefits are expecting from pooling and sharing not only the space and ground segment but also the associated services or dimensions. In the context of the feasibility study, the contractor is expected to provide some thoughts on the benefits this initiative may have on the management of logistics and spare elements as well as on the training and education (eg how to book and manage resources).</p>
<p>11. Section 2.3.4.1 j) & k) implies that there will be multiple reports covering multiple GOVSATCOM solutions with the phrase “ ‘x’ stands for the considered GOVSATCOM solution”. Please confirm how many reports on the Development of FOC are expected.</p>	<p>One report per configuration identified in WP1. We can envisage merging some findings if some configurations can be addressed by the same architecture. The overall result shall allow decision maker to understand why a collaborative option make sense and what is the benefit to extend the set of requirements to be addressed (eg IER1->IER3)</p>
<p>12. Section 2.3.4.1 j) please clarify what is expected in the report on GOVSATCOM requirements (architecture design). Is this expected to be addressing the requirements for GOVSATCOM regardless of the solution adopted, a description of the architecture of a particular solution, or something else?</p>	<p>The report on GOVSATCOM requirements (architecture design) will be based mainly of the ESA findings complemented by the added value of the contractor and exchange of views with the defence community. EDA expects a description of a high level solution addressing each configuration (findings of WP1) at a level of details compatible with the Phase A/B1 of a space programme.</p>