Tender No. PS/SRV/WBR/032/2025 – Setting up the Western Balkans Electronic Register of Road Undertakings (WBRRU)

Clarification no. 1

No.	Clarification request	Contracting authority's answer
1.	**ERRU/SEED+ integration endpoint:** please confirm whether integration with ERRU/SEED+ is the Contractor's responsibility via direct connection to EU endpoints, or whether a centralized gateway/middleware will be provided by the Contracting Authority.	**WBRRU is the regional interoperability gateway with two main interfaces: to national registers and to the EU network (ERRU). It "acts as a compliant messaging and validation hub". Testing of the integration with ERRU/SEED+ is the Contractor's responsibility via direct connection to the respective endpoints when they become available. WBRRU shall by default be ERRU compliant as it is designed to follow ERRU standards. Final integration with ERRU is not subject of this tender.**
2.	**Onboarding of national registers**: for countries not immediately ready for real-time integration, are transitional formats (e.g., batch/XML/CSV with digital signatures) foreseen and what are the acceptance criteria? Who validates the connectors (Contractor vs. Contracting Authority/third party)?	**A secure web interface shall be provided by the contractor so Regional Partners can compose/review/ dispatch messages without a NER API connection. Also, they shall be able to share undertaking data by a remote connection to an Excel file.**

3.	**Hosting & data residency:** are there constraints on the hosting model (on-premises, EU cloud, specific country) and on data residency? Is a minimum DR/multi-region plan required?	**Cloud-based, container orchestration (Kubernetes) is required. The system is to be "hosted on a scalable, container-based cloud environment (e.g., Kubernetes on GCP AWS, or similar)," with horizontal scaling and failover.**
4.	**eIDAS – depth of implementation:** should the platform implement eIDAS signatures directly (e.g., QSCD, long-term validation), or is interoperability with national eIDAS-compliant providers sufficient?	**Interoperability with national eIDAS-compliant providers is sufficient.**
5.	**Security audits – responsibility and standards:** will initial and periodic audits/vulnerability assessments be under the Contractor's responsibility with shared evidence, or will external audits be conducted by/under the Contracting Authority? Are there reference standards/templates to follow?	**The initial and periodic audits/vulnerability assessments are under the Contractor's responsibility with shared evidence.** **All audits are run by Security Specialists (internal or external to the contractor) that are responsible for vulnerability scanning, penetration test coordination, and validation of compliance with relevant security standards. The contractor may choose to use external auditors. All testing plans and evidence are approved by the Contracting Authority as per Annex B to the Technical Specifications, point 4.7 Security Testing.**

6.	**Test & integration environments:** will a pre-production environment (including potential ERRU/SEED+ sandboxes) be provided by the Contracting Authority, or must the Contractor provision test/staging environments? If the latter, please indicate the minimum requirements (isolation, synthetic data, access controls).	**Sandbox environments for the potential ERRU and SEED+ integration shall be provided by the respective entity (EU Movehub or CEFTA) when available.**
7.	**Performance testing – how acceptance is conducted:** please indicate expected tools/suites, reference scenarios/workloads and evidence required for acceptance (reports/graphs/logs), as well as the role of any third party in audit/validation.	**Tools / suites (as required by WBRRU System Requirements → §17 Quality Assurance and Technical Specifications (Services) → §3.3 Task 8 – Operations, Maintenance & Support)** • **Load & performance tools: recognised frameworks such as Apache JMeter, Gatling, or k6 (for automated result collection & reporting).** • **Schema/WSDL conformance: SoapUI for service validation and XMLSpy (or equivalent) for XSD/WSDL checks; CI scripts for automated schema regression.** • **General QA automation (supporting tests): application of QA tools such as Postman, SoapUI, Jest, Cypress, or equivalent.** • **Defect tracking (for acceptance records): defects "shall be managed" in a platform such as JIRA or Azure DevOps to ensure full traceability.** **Reference scenarios & workloads (to be executed)** • **Load test: simulate steady workload ≈ 5,000 messages/day.**

		• **Stress/peak test: simulate bursts at 500 messages/minute.** • **Soak/endurance: 48–72 hours under normal + peak profiles.** • **KPI targets to verify during these tests: Availability ≥99.9%; throughput ≥5,000 msgs/day/RP with 500/min bursts; UI <1 s; dispatch confirmation ≤500 ms; error rate <0.5%; scalability 2× without degradation; UI load <2 s; search <1.5 s; exports <10 s (<50 MB).**
8.	**Deliverable acceptance – templates and criteria:** are there official templates and formal acceptance criteria for deliverables (inception, design, QA reports, training plans), or should the Contractor propose formats and quality checks for approval during inception?	**The contractor shall propose formats and quality checks as stipulated in the Technical Specifications and Inception Report. Those should be formulated according to ANNEX B Quality Assurance and Testing Plan document.**
9.	**Key Experts in the proposal:** must Key Experts be named with CVs already at proposal stage (with commitment of availability), or is it sufficient to describe the profiles and present the names at project start?	**Key Experts must be nominated by name/surname and the proposed role in the tender submission. Their Curricula Vitae (CVs) shall be included as part of the technical offer, clearly demonstrating compliance with the required qualifications and experience set out in the tender dossier, as well as Reference Letters for the projects mentioned in the CV relevant to this tender. Each proposed Key Expert must also submit a signed declaration of availability and exclusivity confirming their commitment for the duration of the contract.**

10.	**Subcontracting & declarations:** what is the maximum allowed percentage of subcontracting and when must subcontractors/supporting entities be formally declared (submission vs. post-award), particularly for security and interoperability areas?	**In accordance with Section III.1.3.a) of the Instructions to Tenderers, subcontractors whose share of the contract, known at the time of submission, exceeds 20 %, or on whose capacities the tenderer relies to meet the selection criteria, are considered *Identified Subcontractors* and must be formally declared in the tender submission.**
11.	Concerning the III.1.3) TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL ABILITY, Criterion 1 - List of the main services properly provided, **please confirm** if we are correct in our understanding that the projects in the following areas are to be considered similar projects: 1.establishment of national electronic registers, 2.digitalisation of public services, 3.system integration in transport modes, 4.cross-border regulatory information systems aligned with EU requirements. Also, please confirm our understanding that for a project to be eligible under the Criterion 1 it needs to cover minimum one of the areas above.	**The Contracting Authority confirms that projects implemented in the following areas may be considered as *similar projects* for the purposes of Criterion 1, provided that they demonstrate relevance to the subject of this contract and comparable scope and complexity:** **1. Establishment of national electronic registers;** **2. Digitalisation of public services;** **3. System integration in transport modes;** **4. Cross-border regulatory information systems aligned with EU requirements.** **It is further confirmed that, to be eligible under Criterion 1, a project must cover at least one of the above areas. The degree of relevance and similarity will be assessed based on the nature of the services provided, their technical complexity, and their alignment with the objectives of the present contract.**