To: **ALL FRAMEWORK 5: AMS-HOPS, PART 11 AND ACCOUNT BASED TICKETING SERVICES**

11th July 2023

Dear Bidders,

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION – V4 UPDATE

Please find below the response to all RFI Questions received by the date as shown.

Title/Summary:	RFI 1 – Lot 3 ABT Token Encryption		
Question:	For an EMV token based PAYG scheme we realise that the ABT solution will need to manage encrypted tokens created from EMV taps. We assume that the solution will not need to manage the process of creating the encrypted tokens by encrypting the EMV taps recorded by the Validators, and also for managing the payment process once the appropriate fare has been communicated back from the ABT solution. Is that correct?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The specification is intended to be token agnostic in key areas such as the arrival at fares and calculation of caps. It is recognised that in closed loop systems such as ITSO the token identifier will be transmitted to the solution in a consistent manner irrespective of which mode of transport, operator or ticketing equipment the token was presented to. However, we do know that the encryption requirements around cEMV may result in the token identifier, arriving at the solution, for a customer not being the same for all of their journeys across operators and modes. To be of relevance to a scheme the solution must be able to combine the taps received from more than one supplier of ticketing equipment and/or back-office systems so that caps can be calculated across operators and modes – with the opportunity within a response to detail for which equipment or supplier(s) your solution will be able to calculate that cap. We

would expect the explanation around the role that encryption of tokens would play in ensuring the solution to arrive at a cap to be a key part of your response.

Equally, for the equipment or supplier(s) that your solution would be able to calculate caps over we would expect your response to be clear as to how the amount of a calculated cap would actually be collected from the customer.

As was set out within the specification we recognise that this requirement relates to an element of solution that may well be new to suppliers. Given the wish to future proof the requirements though it was important that it was included.

Title/Summary:	RFI 2 – All Lots – Supplier One-to-One Sessions		
Question:	Regarding the ability to pre book a one-to-one meeting as part of the Supplier Event. What is the process / guidance here as it wasn't mentioned in detail within the Tender docs		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	The Supplier Event is included in the Tender but the full breakdown of the day was not. It was agreed that as Lot 3 (ABT) is new, we wanted to find a way to enable Suppliers to engage with the team who have developed the Specification and were concerned that the 30 minute morning session allocated may not be enough. As such we agreed to make available to any Supplier who wanted one, a one-to-one session, to potentially reduce the number of potential RFI's submitted. Any Supplier seeking a one-to-one session would have one in the knowledge that any questions asked, and answers given will be added to the RFI process, meaning all potential bidders will see the Q&As, to ensure no potential bidder is at a disadvantage.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 3 – All Lots ITT / Page 14 / Item 2.10		
Question:	Could SAM please confirm that submission of responses on a USB stick is necessary?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Yes, a USB Stick is required. However, with the submission day being a Monday and with Royal Mail dispute still not resolved, we will accept proof of postage of the USB stick (recorded delivery or similar) sent before 11am on Monday July 17th as acceptable.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 4 – Lot 3 ABT Engine Capping Specification / Page 11 / GR – 16		
Question:	Are there any geographical requirements/restrictions for IT infrastructure hosting?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	As per Section 3.2 of the Technical Specification, it is expected that data is hosted and stored within the UK.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 5 – Lot 3 F5 selection questionnaire / F5 Lot 3 _'Experience' Tab		
Question:	Could SAM please clarify whether we are allowed 2000 characters (1.32.12) or 6000 characters (1.32.13).		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Up to 6000 Characters.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 6 – Lot 3 F5 selection questionnaire / Standard Tab / Part 1- Starter Questions / 1.1.3		
Question:	Could SAM please clarify our understanding that acceptance of the contract terms as incorporated in the Framework Award Form is mandatory to achieve a Pass? Furthermore, could SAM please clarify our understanding that whilst the Framework contract terms are non-negotiable, these terms can be varied by mutual agreement with a Buyer at the point of Call-Off Order?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Acceptance of the Terms is an SSQ Requirement 1.1.3. When a customer wishes to undertake a Call Off Order, Joint Schedule 2 (Variation Form) does allow for a Customer and Supplier to jointly amend the Framework Schedules as they apply to that Order, so long as both parties are happy.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 7 – Lot 3 F5 selection questionnaire / F5 Lot 3 Experience details / 1.32.13

Question:	Could SAM please clarify the three key criteria referred to?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The three Criteria are those listed in 1.32.12, namely Expertise, Approach and Outcome.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 8 – Lot 3 Pricing Matrix / Lot 3 Option Tabs 1 – 3 /**		
Question:	Could SAM please clarify the level of help desk cover required, e.g. Customer facing or 2nd level plus enquiries?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The Help Desk is to support the staff of the Framework Customer who placed the Order, not individual clients using the scheme to travel.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 9 – Lot 3 Pricing Matrix / Lot 3 Option Tabs 1 – 3 /**		
Question:	We understand that Lot 3, Account Based Ticketing, of the proposed framework is to be used to select a supplier for Nexus. Will the Nexus ABT solution include heavy rail as well bus and light rail?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	We confirmed at the Supplier day that Nexus are a sponsor of Lot 3 within Framework 5. However, the RFI process can only be used to respond to questions about the Framework Tender process. Questions about any potential user of the Framework is out of scope.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 10 – Lot 3 Pricing Matrix / Core Information Tab / Line 36**		
Question:	PSP Service is listed here but not shown on the subsequent 3 Option tabs. Could SAM please clarify if PSP Service should be included on the Options tab?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	

Response:	Clarified in the pricing template that references to revenue collection referred to the PSP.

Title/Summary:	RFI 11 – Lot 3 Pricing Matrix / Options Tabs 1- 3 / Priced Decrements Section		
Question:	Could SAM please clarify the definition of a 'CEMV Broker'?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Clarification added to the pricing template.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 12 – Lot 3 Pricing Matrix / Core Information Section / Device Interfaces		
Question:	The requirements related to device interfaces are not clear. Are those interfaces direct links into the ABT solution, or the link via e.g. HOPS?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Clarification added to the pricing template.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 13 – Lot 3 ABT Engine Capping Specification / Page 3 / 1.1 Overview		
Question:	Could SAM please clarify who will be the merchant of record for the ABT scheme?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	It is not intended that the Supplier would need to be the merchant of record.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 14 – Lot 3 ABT Engine Capping Specification / Page 37 / GR - 143
Question:	With regard to the proposed Tap Converter Service that Rail Delivery Group is delivering in partnership with GBRTT: as there no specification for this service currently, it will be difficult to provide an integration cost with any degree of certainty.

	Could SAM please advise on how bidders should indicate their caveats in this respect within the Technical Response and the Pricing Matrix?

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	

Response:	Clarification added to the pricing template. Within the Technical Response bidders should outline their potential approach for a solution for two capping engines, one for rail and a supplied one for other modes.

Title/Summary:	**RFI15 – Lot 3 F5 Pricing Matrix**
Question:	Could you confirm that both delivery and support costs are to be included in the 'Core' sections of the pricing matrix provided? We are trying to understand where hosting, software support etc should sit. If this section is a combination of delivery and support, how would you like us to present YR2, YR3 costs etc? The current format would seem to apply CPI to YR1 delivery costs as well as YR1 support costs.

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	

Response:	We have reissued the pricing template which now includes separate columns for: - development and implementation, - fixed costs - revenue costs

Title/Summary:	**RFI 16 – Lot 3 - Technical Response to ABT Technical Requirements**
Question:	Please could you advise how bidders should respond if they feel a requirement is N/A to the solution they are proposing? Additionally, assuming we are then compliant for the remainder of the requirements in a section, should our response state 'Yes Now'.

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	

Response:	If you are proposing a solution which does not include something, then you should indicate in the that is the case in the relevant sections of the response documents If you offer specified functionality but it is not as described in the specification then you should indicate it is offered and use the response documents to provide relevant information

Title/Summary:	RFI 17 – Lot 3 Charging Model
Question:	Raising this as an RFI as requested on the supplier day. The currently requested pricing model for ABT is based on "number of accounts" in the system. Our pricing for ABT is based on number of transactions (and this is also true of a number of other suppliers we know of); the total number of accounts registered in the system does not meaningfully translate to the total compute or hosting needs, nor payment charges, and so will not enable an accurate estimate of fees. Can you please consider providing a benchmark number of: 1) number of actively travelling accounts per week and 2) number of transactions per active account per week for all suppliers to use as a reference, to enable a fair comparison for those who use a transaction-based model. We are also assuming that anonymous users count as one account per token used, if you could please confirm.

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	

Response:	We have updated the pricing template to include daily transactions as well as account volumes Each anonymous token will equate to one account

Title/Summary:	RFI 18 - Selection Questionnaire (SQ) Tab: F5 Lot 3 Experience Details
Question:	1.32.2 Evaluation Guidance states: "You are required to submit Contract Examples in order to demonstrate each of the capabilities, as outlined in the Specification, that make up your offering. Where relevant If you are bidding for more than one capability, you must provide a Contract Example for each capability, meaning you can submit a maximum of 6 examples for this Lot. You may use the same example for different capabilities, but you must submit a separate Contract Example entry for each capability you are bidding for." 1.32.12 Contract Example Guidance states: "We requires bidders to demonstrate how they delivered/are delivering a contract for each of the capabilities they are bidding for in the Specification in Section 4 of the ITT." Instructions given under 1.32.13 (Contract Example 1) states: "You must clearly state the name of the capability the Contract Example describes." **Question:** Please could SAM confirm what specific "capabilities" need to be demonstrated through the Contract Examples?

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	N/A

Response:	There are 3 capabilities as outlined in 1.32.12 namely, 1. Expertise 2. Approach 3. Outcome

Title/Summary:	RFI 19 - Clarification Question F5 Selection Questionnaire		
Question:	Can you please clarify what information you require for this question please? *"The bidder should provide its yearly ("specific") turnover in the relevant business area(s) covered by the contract and specified in the relevant Contract Notice:"* *Is it possible to define the specified years in dates, please?*		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	The years should be the last four years as reflected in your company accounts.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 20 - Lot 3 – Essay Question 1		
Question:	We note that the essay question asks suppliers to outline how they meet each of the 8 sections of the technical requirements. Could you please clarify as there only appears to be 7 sections, as it the case for the bidders Technical Response (Yes Now etc).		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	The Technical Requirements Document does have 8 sections, with Section 1 being the Summary and Overview. We are not expecting a detailed response in the essay relating to Section 1, but it is a valid Section.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 21 - Pricing		
Question:	The pricing options are based on numbers of customers/users. A key parameter is the number of journeys made. Should we make a standard assumption on the number of annual journeys that a customer makes?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	N/A
Response:	The Pricing Matrix has been refined to include a fixed number of journeys per Option.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 22 - 1.18 Financial Risk
Question:	We are unable to attach .pdf documents to the F5 Selection Questionnaire. Word attachments work, but in our computing environment, .pdf documents fail. Can you confirm that it is possible to supply clearly labelled documentation as a component in our submission pack. Thanks

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Yes		

Title/Summary:	RFI 23 - F5 New Pricing Matrix - All Lots
Question:	Could SAM please confirm that the Mandatory functionality referred to throughout the tender document should now be interpreted as the grey-out cells in the New Pricing Matrix?

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	The specification is intended to be outcome based and offer options, as we understand that not every authority/scheme will require every element and that not every supplier will be able to offer every element. There has to be a mandatory core though, that every supplier needs to meet to ensure that proper comparison and evaluation can be completed. The first four items listed on the Core Information sheet of the New Pricing Matrix detail that core.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 24 - Framework Award Form SAM005
Question:	How would the Supplier be reimbursed in case of a major ABT Call-Off if the Buyer uses either the cancellation or termination option, where the Supplier did not breach any of the obligations of the contract?

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Then Section 10.6.3 would apply.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 25 - Framework Award Form SAM005
Question:	What is the relation between Section 3.2.11 and Section 10.2? In this respect, what would be the difference between a cancellation (Section 3.2.11) and a termination (Section 10.2)?

Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	A Section 3.2.11 cancellation can only be used where the Supplier does not deliver the Goods as requested – in full or in part. A Section 10.2.2 termination can be applied at any time subject to 90 days' notice. There is no direct relationship between the two clauses as one is based on a Supplier not delivering, and the other is a non-fault contractual clause.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 26 - Framework Award Form SAM005		
Question:	Is the limitation of liability as set out in Section 11 applicable for the case set out in Section 10.6.2 (costs for procuring Replacement Deliverables)?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Yes, the Supplier would be liable up to either the default liability value as set out in Core Terms clause 11.2, or for any different negotiated liability cap agreed and set out in the call-off order (Framework Schedule 6). The Replacement Deliverables (defined in Joint Schedule 1 Definitions) would include re-procurement costs (if any) and the cost of the goods and or services themselves (whether bought, made or repurposed). They would have to be evidenced		

Title/Summary:	RFI 27 - F5 New Pricing Matrix - All Lots		
Question:	Under the Framework Contract are bidders able to vary pricing from that given in the tender response, in negotiation with a specific customer in response to a Call-Off Order?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Not for a standard call-off. The exception to this is where a Further Competition has been issued, or the Order Variation element of the Order form is applied.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 28 - ITSO Part 11 Interface		
Question:	Is the assumption correct that this interface should be mainly used for the Customer App, or are there other use cases envisaged?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Yes.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 29 - Cyber Essentials Plus		
Question:	Please can we confirm if Cyber Essentials Plus (or commitment to attain by a certain date) is a mandatory requirement for the framework? Would a ISO 27001 certified information security management system represent an acceptable alternative?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	N/A
Response:	Please see Selection Questionnaire 1.25 which outlines that either the Supplier has Cyber Essentials Plus or will ensure it is in place prior to an Order.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 30 - Contract Commercial Terms		
Question:	Please can SAM confirm that there will be an opportunity to negotiate key contractual terms (for example, service levels / service credits) at the point of call-off?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	N/A
Response:	In the strictest sense, no. Direct awards will not permit any negotiation as the determination is made based upon framework submissions. Further competitions will allow Buyers to pre-engage with all Framework Members, to e.g. discuss specifications and service levels as market engagement. The results could then be used in the call-off contract ITT, e.g. in Call-Off Schedule 14 (Service Levels) and the specification. As part of the call-off process, Buyers could also request agreement, comment upon, or counter-proposals from Framework Members, allowing some flexibility within the described process. There is no explicit allowance for a negotiated procedure.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 31 – Payment Terms		
Question:	We may well have missed this, but is it expected when infilling the pricing document to include the 3% SAM Management fee within the costs.		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	N/A
Response:	Yes		

Title/Summary:	RFI 32 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification		
Question:	GR-15: Could you please give some examples related to the base data referred to?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Base data is any that is contained within the solution directly rather than has been imported from other sources. One example might be a list of roles and access.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 33 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification		
Question:	GR-21: Are examples of related import data available, or could we assume that related data structure will be defined jointly within the project design phase?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	No, examples are not available. And Yes, it is expected to be agreed during a project's design phase.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 34 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification		
Question:	GR-40: The assumption would be that the entitlement could be identified based on the received transaction/tap data. Is this approach correct?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	This will depend on the type of token. For an ITSO token, for example the product instance might indicate that it was held by a child – a TYP14 identifier on the card could also be used to identify the customer as a child . For other token types it may be necessary for the entitlement to have been recorded separately – for example as part of a registration process. This would not then be reflected in each transaction tap data.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 35 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification
Question:	GR-48: Could SAM please clarify the difference between 'Scheme' and 'Authority'? Will the related entity also be the ITSO shell owner in each case?

Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The definitions of Scheme and Authority remain as defined within the Glossary. In general where the term Authority is used, this would tend to relate to a public sector body. A Scheme may be owned by a private or public sector body. It would be likely that the related entity would be the ITSO Shell Owner, but may not always be.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 36 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification**		
Question:	GR-91: Is it assumed that there should be a continuous improvement process for the cap engine, or is a kind of AI handling envisioned?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The requirement outlines that learning may need to be developed over time. We are not specifying how a Supplier chooses to deliver this.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 37 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification**		
Question:	GR-93: Are examples for different fare table exports or related specifications available?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	No.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 38 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification**		
Question:	GR-132: Is SAM able to supply interface specifications available for the TfWM/Project Coral and RDG/GBR TT systems referenced?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	No.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 39 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification**		
Question:	GR- 149: This requirement refers to Rail rules. Will the Lennon settlement be part of the requirements?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	

Response:	This will be specified by RDG when the business rules for its Tap Convertor service is published.

Title/Summary:	RFI 40 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification
Question:	GR-154: How are mobility credits provided to the system, and how could the system validate those? Are specifications available?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Mobility credits may be implemented in a number of different ways. This is likely to be achieved by an API link from another system that will have validated them. In regard of this solution mobility credits may then represent a further funding source that can be accessed to be pay for a customer's travel.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 41 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification
Question:	GR-169/GR-184: Could some samples of apportionment and reimbursement rules be provided?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	No, we would expect potential Suppliers to be familiar with the process of apportionment and reimbursement rules.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 42 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification
Question:	GR-204: Which languages are envisaged for multi-lingual support?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	To be determined by the customer. There are existing ticketing schemes where this occurs already within the UK for example, Wales.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 43 - F5 ABT Capping Engine Specification
Question:	GR-237: could SAM please provide further details on this requirement?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	

Response:	In common with running any business a scheme will need to be able to show that an implementation is operating within acceptable parameters. As such, a scheme would have to know if they were receiving their funds reliably as well as any that are refused travel.

Title/Summary:	RFI 44 - F5 ABT Fare Capping Engine - All Lots / 3.3 Data Transfer and Interfaces		
Question:	Could we assume that we can define interfaces to 3rd party systems, when there is not already an interface defined by a 3rd party, e.g. tariff interface should use NeTEx or GTFS-based interfaces?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	Where an interface is not already defined, we would expect the Supplier to work with the 3rd Party on a flexible basis to determine the best new interface for both parties.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 45 - F5 New Pricing Matrix - All Lots		
Question:	Payment service handling: Shall the payment transaction fees be covered within the proposal pricing?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	The updated Pricing Matrix of June 19th enhanced the ability to provide costing of the payment handling service. We expect Bidders to reflect how the full cost of this service would be captured.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 46 - Framework 5 Invitation To Tender v2/ 1. Shortlisting & Key points for bidders		
Question:	Is there a minimum/maximum number of bidders that SAM wishes to appoint to the framework?		
Confidential Response?	No	If yes, set out reasons why.	
Response:	No minimum, no maximum for F5.		

Title/Summary:	RFI 47 - Lot 3 ABT Engine Capping Specification

Question:	GR20 – given that GDPR is a Regulation in EU law on data protection and privacy in the EU and the European Economic Area, could SAM confirm that hosting outside the ULK but within the EU/EEA is acceptable, e.g. AWS cloud hosting located in Ireland?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	No, GR-20 is clear that at the time of award of a contract to a Scheme, any personal/GDPR controlled data must be held within the UK.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 48 - Lot 3 - Technical Response to ABT Technical Requirements**		
Question:	The word / page limit for Essay Question 1 is 7000 words or 16 pages of A4. Given 4000 words of this limit has been assigned to the opening question (we wish a supplier to outline how they meet each of the 8 sections of the Technical Requirements), can we assume this translates to circa 9 pages of the allocation? Additionally, are images permitted and if so, should these be included outside of the page count?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	
Response:	The number of pages does not need to correspond to word counts. Images are permitted but will be part of the page count.		

Title/Summary:	**RFI 49 - Word Count**		
Question:	Referencing "F5 Quality Technical Response Proforma", Lot 3: Account Based Ticketing (ABT). For Q2 please can you advise if the '1 A4 sized pdf of a 4 year cost to deliver the Clients required solution' is included, or in addition to the '5000 words and Max 14 pages of A4' limit you have set ?		
Confidential Response?	No	**If yes, set out reasons why.**	n/a
Response:	It may be in addition to the 14 pages of A4 stated for the word response.		

Thank you

Andrew Seedhouse
Chairman – Smart Applications Management