



---

---

**Clarification Note No. 1**  
**Request for Information (RFI) and for Pre-Qualification**  
**To identify and prequalify companies to be invited to the planned tender**  
**For End User Devices**

---

---

The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe has received request for clarifications from potential bidders. In accordance with RFI document, the OSCE would like to provide the following clarification:

**Question 1:** The reference model from Canon for the required scanner in LOT 2 has an ADF capacity of 500 pages. We could offer a model from our manufacturer of choice with only 200 pages capacity, but in this case would be able to offer all devices of LOT 2 from one manufacturer. Would this also be an acceptable model?

**Answer 1:** Yes, please indicate the deviation, which should be as close to the requirement as possible, providing that the machines will come from the same manufacturer.

**Question 2:** One of the reference models quoted in LOT 2 is the HP Page-Wide Pro 772DN. The bidder understands that these models fulfill the requirements of the OSCE. However, the minimum criteria provided below the reference models ask for a print speed of minimum 70 pages per minute. Currently, the Page-Wide Pro 772DN only has a speed of 45 pages per minute and other available Ink A3 models a maximum of 60 pages per minute (much higher product categories than employed today). The same applies for the Laser Model 775f, which only has 35 pages per minute today. We kindly ask to lower the minimum speed required for the A3 models.

**Answer 2:** The mentioned models take precedence over the ppm speed.

**Question 3:** The required specifications for LOT 2 list a minimum paper weight which is supported. From the bidder's understanding this should be the maximum weight supported. We kindly ask for correction.

**Answer 3:** Correct, it should be the maximum weight.

**Question 4:** The specifications for LOT 2 define the time until the first page is printed. The model currently in use, HP M775f has a time of 10.5 seconds. We therefore ask to slightly raise the number for the A3 Teams device.

**Answer 4:** The mentioned models take precedence over the first page out speed.

**Question 5:** All devices for LOT 2 shall be AD enabled. This specification is rather uncommon for single function devices, the bidder therefore asks for allowing models without AD integration for this category, especially as the model in use today does not support this feature either.

**Answer 5:** If any model is not AD enabled, please mention this deviation in the submitted documentation.

**Question 6:** The specification for LOT 2 asks for 802.1X support for the A4 VIP model also. This feature is so far not widely spread in the field of single function printers. We therefore ask to allow models without that feature, especially as the model in use today does not support this feature either

**Answer 6:** If any model does not 802,1X support, please mention this deviation in the submitted documentation.

**Question 7:** As part of the background section Windows 7 is mentioned as the current operating system and Windows 10 is still in the planning phase. Is the bidder's understanding correct that the devices which will be delivered after the award of the contract shall only support Windows 10? As all major manufacturers start discontinuing devices which still support Windows 7 it will not be possible to offer devices that still support Windows 7 for all device types requested.

**Answer 7:** Ideally the OSCE would still need devices to support Win7 in 2019, however we understand that there will be a gradual reduction of Skylake processors until phase out. Therefore, with the information we have currently, your understanding of not being able to offer all device types for Win7 is correct.

**Question 8:** It is requested to provide a rather large number of test devices. The bidder intends to offer HP hardware only for notebooks, desktops and monitors. Is the bidder's understanding correct that in this case no samples are required as all devices that will be offered are already in use at the OSCE and therefore the compatibility is already proven.

**Answer 8:** All devices from Lot1 need to come from the same manufacturer. If the interested company will offer desktop/notebook HP devices, then this should be the same for the hybrid and all-in-one types. The mentioned models are currently not in use at the OSCE and are therefore required to be shipped as test devices. Nowhere in the documentation is it mentioned that such an assumption is implied.

**Question 9:** It is required that the bidder provides a statement attesting that the interested company has the capabilities, qualifications, and financial and human resources to perform the services listed under the Expected Tender Deliverables. This statement shall be signed and sealed. Is the bidder's understanding correct that a signed and scanned document will be sufficient as the documents shall be provided by email? We kindly ask for a short confirmation.

**Answer 9:** Yes, that will be sufficient.

**Question 10:** Point 6 g) of the pre-qualification criteria mentions a table of locations for road and air freight. This table was not provided as part of the bidding documents. We kindly ask for this table.

**Answer 10:** At this stage this is not required, it will come as part of the Tender process. At this stage, please provide your input to Requirement 7, Logistic Services as requested.

**Question 11:** In the tender documents OSCE Executive Structures are mentioned in some paragraphs. Is the bidder's understanding correct that these are the OSCE locations which can be found on the web site? If not, we kindly ask for clarification.

**Answer 11:** Yes, here: <https://www.osce.org/where-we-are>

**Question 12:** The bidder understands that each location will send orders and receive goods as part of the frame contract. However, it is not clear whether invoices also need to be sent to each location or if invoicing will only be to the Secretariat in Vienna.

**Answer 12:** The invoicing is centralised in Vienna and payment is processed in Vienna.

**Question 13:** As part of LOT 4 dual-SIM phones are requested. Also Apple DEP is mentioned. As Apple does not offer any dual-SIM phones, is this a mandatory requirement?

**Answer 13:** Apple DEP ability is mandatory as a service in case this provider is chosen; in addition Android dual-SIM phones can be offered.

**Question 14:** In LOT 4 Samsung phones are mentioned as reference devices setting the minimum requirements. In case of a bidder intending to offer Apple instead on Samsung, fingerprint and a 4000 mAh battery cannot be offered. Please advise, if an Apple offer not meeting all requirements is also acceptable.

**Answer 14:** Apple is just slightly lower in mAh and therefore acceptable.

**Question 15:** In 7.6 you are requesting Lot 5 – Test devices. Lot 5 is Professional and support services, but in 7.6 you request test devices for laptop, desktop, monitor and Docking base and bag. Will you please confirm if the test devices you require are **Lot 1** instead? I know it doesn't make much sense in offering Lot 5 as test devices, but just want to be sure.

**Answer 15:** Thank you for spotting the typo. Of course test devices should be provided for Lot1 products.

**Question 16:** Furthermore, you request test devices delivered already at the Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of June the latest but this ability we have to answer in the RfI: "Please indicate the ability to deliver sample devices free of charge at the indicative date of Monday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2018". We are not to answer this question until July 2<sup>nd</sup> Is the test units to be delivered Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> latest?

**Answer 16:** The answer to the relevant requirement is to be considered as a pass/fail mark to the respective specification, with regards to the ability to deliver the test devices.

**Question 17:** This is to confirm that (*name of company*) is interested in being prequalified to be invited to the planned tender for End User Devices. (*name of company* International) is the parent company of (*name of company* Europe, based in European country), and we would like to submit our offer in the name of (*name of company* International). Please confirm this is acceptable.

**Answer 17:** The interested company may submit an offer as long as the mandatory requirements are filled and is a legal entity with its own legal personality.

**Question 18:** Because the delivery time for Test Devices is short, we will supply prebuilt models which may not have the exact configuration envisioned by OSCE. Is this acceptable as long as key specifications are met to enable OSCE to evaluate the device for its intended purpose?

**Answer 18:** This is acceptable as long as they correspond to the exact models proposed by the interested company.

**Question 19:** For the eventual tender, we may quote models from 2 different manufacturers. Is it useful to OSCE for us to provide Test Devices from both manufacturers?

**Answer 19:** Yes, the interested company should provide a set of test devices for each manufacturer they shall partner with.

**Question 20:** reg. your RFI if it is a knock-out criteria if we cannot ship currently to all OSCE countries?

**Answer 20:** We are looking for suppliers who can ship to all OSCE countries, and this is a mandatory requirement.