

CHARM MCD Q+A

This document lists the questions CHARM has received after the Industry Day until April 10th and includes the answers for the benefit of filling in the Questionnaire.

Q1 Can you tell me if this programme has a mapping component.

A1 Please refer to the Business Requirements round 1 final where there are several requirements that would need a mapping component in order to fulfil the requirement.

Q2. We are looking at the Round 1 Questionnaire to complete this. The Questionnaire refers to "paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Market Consultation Document". Please could you clarify which paragraphs this refers to as we cannot find any paragraph numbers in the Market Consultation Document?

A2. This refers to the sections in the Market Consultation Document headed Background, which gives an overview of the functionality of a Traffic Management Centre and the section headed CHARM which describes the requirements in terms of quality for a Traffic Management Centre.

Q3 I see the timetable that you have published for your market consultation, but I am not clear of where the PCP process which you mention will fit in there. Will the answers of the market consultation also contribute to the call for tender for the PCP?

A3. At this stage we are interested in your feedback, we will use this to inform our views about the CHARM programme and are not selecting suppliers for procurement purposes.

Q4 Should we be interested in both PCP and the COTS procedure, do we have to answer 2 questionnaires.

A4. One questionnaire will be sufficient. However in your response it would be helpful if you could identify where your answers relate to PCP or COTS.

Q5. Having been through the objectives of CHARM again it occurred to us that, although it is talking about essentially a future system, there are no “green” or environmental references. Specifically we were

thinking about power usage, as control offices and data centres use not an inconsiderable amount of power. Should there be something to address this aspect?

A5. Agreed. Both organisations have strategies in place to address green issues such as power usage.

Q6. Can the Market Consultation Document be made available in word format so that it can be completed electronically ?

A6. We do not think this is necessary because we have produced a special PDF document which allows you to process electronically. In this form we have limited the space for answers to the allowed 300 words.

Q7. Within Market consultation document – Introduction paragraph is mentioned: “The CHARM programme has identified that 90% of the functionality of HA and RWS control rooms are the same”. Could the client identify what are the other 10% of TMC functions that are not common between HA and RWS?

A7. The main difference is that RWS manage tunnels from TMC whilst HA do not, and the HA operate a large loads system. However we have not decided on the scope of the future system or service at this point.

Q8. Within Market consultation document – CHARM and other paragraphs is mentioned “No technology or vendor lock in”. There are many types of ‘vendor lock in’ possible, ranging from de facto commercial products from single suppliers (e.g. Oracle), closed, proprietary product solutions from a single vendor to long-term maintenance contracts for example. Could the client identify what aspect or aspects of ‘vendor lock in’ are viewed as being undesirable?

A8. The main aspects of vendor lock concern the knowledge of the design of the TMC and the intellectual property of the goods and services used.

By “no vendor lock in” we mean that building and maintaining a TMC has to be possible by any supplier of choice. It must be possible for any supplier with the right knowledge and experience to build or maintain a TMC. As soon as a contract ends or is being ended a new supplier of choice must be able to continue the build or maintenance activities. In addition it has to be possible to change any part or

service by an equal one with a limited amount of effort and without restrictions regarding issues of intellectual property.

Q9. The business requirements document provided 29 March references the production of the “CHARM Requirements Catalogue” – Could the client organisations identify when this document will be made available for consideration by suppliers.

A9. This document will be made available in round 2 of the Market Consultation.

Q10. Currently there are several initiatives, both in the Netherlands and UK, which overlap with described CHARM scope and objectives concerning the deployment of (central) Traffic Management System. Could the client please describe when and how will initiatives from Dutch Min I&M like "RegioDesk" , “Mobiliteits Aanpak pakket 20” or “NDW”, and HA involvement with “UTMC” or “NTIS” development in UK, be engaged with CHARM program?

A10. At this moment we are focused on establishing whether we can meet the requirements of CHARM by the end of Dec 2012. We are using the results from other programmes and project to improve the business requirements of CHARM. In Dec 2012 a decision will be made about the future potential procurement and it will be after that stage whether other programmes or projects will be included in CHARM.

Q11 Prior information notice – In the PIN announcing the Market consultation it is mentioned that (CHARM) “systems will: (...) Support an aspiration to move towards a managed service model". Neither during the presentations and documentation was the term "Managed Service model" further explained or specified. What can already be said about the expectations and requirements from CHARM concerning "Managed Service model"? Is CHARM likely to be delivered as a system or a service (if so what timeframe is being considered)?

A11. Our existing situation is that we have a large number of contracts with disparate solutions which is difficult to manage. Our aspiration is to move towards a managed service model in order to improve our relationship with the supply chain and reduce the number of contracts we hold. In the following year we will define the managed service

model further. The major difference we are considering is a move towards an integrated approach rather than a fragmented approach.

Q12 During the Market Consultation kick off session it was mentioned (HA) that CHARM financing scheme is open for innovative approaches Are there any given boundaries already known for Public Private Partnerships (PPP) or Private Finance Initiative (PFI) alike constructions or expected length of contracts?

A12. There are no current boundaries to financing schemes. Our aim is to seek feedback from the market in order to generate a viable business case.

Q13. During the Market Consultation kick off session it was mentioned a PCP process to be initiated in 2013 with specific challenges to be approached and researched. How does this PCP process going to be structured or related with a CHARM specification phase? On which way are they connected or separated (parallel)?

A13. Our aim is to seek feedback in 2012 on how the solutions can be structured in an overall system architecture and we will use this feedback to define the overall architecture and use it to define PCP challenges. This reinforces the integrated approach.

Q14. Is it possible to receive the given presentation(s) during the Intertraffic?

A14 The presentation(s) and notes of the sessions given during Intertraffic are available at <http://www.rws.nl/charm>.