



Project co-funded by the  
CIVIL JUSTICE PROGRAMME  
of the EUROPEAN UNION

## iSupport

cross-border recovery  
of maintenance obligations  
*pour le recouvrement  
transfrontière des  
obligations alimentaires*

### **iSupport Tender, Maintenance and Governance Working Group (5) – 9 March 2015 Meeting**

#### **Draft Report of Meeting n°4**

---

#### **List of Participants**

<b>Experts</b>	<b>iSupport Team</b>
John AXIAK (Malta) - excused Leo de BAKKER (The Netherlands) Cameron COWPER (Canada) - excused Alisha GRIFFIN (United States of America) Arnaldo JOSÉ ALVES SILVEIRA (Brazil) Dominique PARTENAY (France) Hannah ROOTS (NCSEA) Thomas STEIMER (Switzerland) - excused	Philippe LORTIE (Chair) Brigitte VOERMAN Marie VAUTRAVERS Patrick GINGRAS - excused

---

#### **Opening of the meeting**

1. Philippe Lortie, First Secretary, welcomed experts to the Meeting of the Tender, Maintenance and Governance Working Group.

#### **Discussion of a draft Tender and Contractual Matters document**

2. Philippe Lortie presented the Draft Tender and Contractual Matters document that had been circulated to the experts in advance of the meeting and asked for general comments on that document.

3. Philippe Lortie read out the broad lines of the Chapter 1 of the Draft Call for Tender (CFT). He suggested adding paragraph numbers for experts and candidates to refer more easily to a specific content.

4. An expert from the United States of America suggested adding to paragraph 2 of 2.1.1 a timeline detailing deadlines for sending queries. She also recommended formatting the structure for questions.

5. An expert from France queried the absence of a “cahier des charges” describing the product requirements in the CFT.

6. Philippe Lortie explained that a draft version of the Deliverables Document including a comprehensive description of the functional and technical requirements was currently being discussed by the iSupport team. The Deliverables document is developed based on the input of Working Groups. He noted that this Document would be published on the iSupport webpage after the publication of the Prior Information Notice in a view to collecting comments from Working Groups, Partner States and private sector experts by 15 April 2015. He stated that the iSupport Advisory Board would discuss and approve the Deliverable Document before publication of the CFT on 1<sup>st</sup> May 2015.

7. An expert from the NCSEA suggested identifying the leader in the event of joint tenders from different companies. She suggested asking tenderers bidding through a partnership to designate the person responsible for the interconnection of the project.

8. An expert from the Netherlands queried the incentive to bid through partnerships. He stressed the need to nuance this call for joint tenders. He suggested that the Hague Conference reserves its right to award the contract to two separate tenderers if none of the tenders for both lots comply with iSupport requirements.

9. Philippe Lortie explained that tenders responding to both lots, either individually or through partnerships, would be favoured, while tenderers bidding for one lot only would not be given priority but should not in any circumstances be excluded. Marie Vautravers clarified that responding to both lots would not be a prerequisite and rather be one of the evaluation criteria. An expert from the NCSEA suggested using “may” instead of “will”. All the experts agreed on that modification.

11. An expert from France queried the designation of a “leader” and sought clarification as to whether this designation would only be required in case of partnership. He also asked whether the leader would be allocated to a specific phase of the project (one leader for the development phase, one for the maintenance phase), or whether this person would rather act as a point of contact.

12. Philippe Lortie indicated that flexibility should be given to tenderers in that respect. He clarified that this person would be the point of contact and coordinator on behalf of the partnership.

13. Philippe Lortie further read out the broad lines of the document. With regard to the evaluation model, he indicated that it was being finalized and will be distributed by the end of the week. Brigitte Voerman explained that this Excel document will attribute relative weighting to the award criteria, and significantly facilitate the selection.

14. Philippe Lortie reminded the experts that the Deliverables Document will reflect the Working Groups discussions and will be released after the Prior Information Notice.

15. An expert from the NCSEA expressed concerns about the use of the expression “Best Value Procurement”. She suggested removing the capital letters and providing a clear definition to avoid receiving tenders that would not comply with to the mandatory requirements but would argue providing best value for price. She particularly recommended closely circumscribing the possibility to deviate.

13. Brigitte Voerman noted that all functional and technical requirements will be listed. Tenderers will have to provide mandatory requirements. With regard to non-mandatory requirements, labelled under the ‘Moscow’ priority scheme, tenderers will be given the opportunity to specify whether they can provide this requirements, under which condition.

14. An expert from the United States of America concurred in the comment of the NCSEA. She clarified that “best value procurement” was mostly used as a general warning that price would not be the only selection criteria, which was already mentioned in paragraph 2.2.5.

15. An expert from France recommended describing the pilot phase in further details, including a time line and the identification of the pilot countries. He took this opportunity to indicate that France has already accepted to be a pilot State. He also expressed concern about paragraph 3.2.2 regarding remote maintenance, and specified that remote access was not authorized in France.

16. Brigitte Voerman clarified that “remote maintenance” refers to the possibility for the Service Provider to work in another location, and to provide support by phone for instance. She explained that the Service provider will not be provided with remote access to a State system.

16. Philippe Lortie indicated that the legal terms and conditions were currently being drafted and will be circulated in advance of the next meeting.

#### **Other items for discussion**

17. Philippe Lortie reiterated that an enhanced version of the CFT will be distributed in advance of the next meeting, supplemented with the evaluation model.

18. Philippe Lortie thanked the experts and welcomed any further contributions before the next meeting with regard to non-addressed issues.