

Request for clarification	Response
Which tender reference number should be indicated in the response?	Software Services to support the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).
<p><i>"NPFC will implement a shared decentralised VMS that requires vessels to transmit VMS data to their Fisheries Monitoring Centres (FMC) and for the FMC to transmit this data to the NPFC Secretariat. NPFC has also adopted provisions to allow a vessel to transmit VMS data directly to the NPFC Secretariat."</i></p> <p>In which cases the VMS data will be collected directly from vessels to NPFC?</p> <p>Who will cover the airtime costs (for mobile originated / inward messages and mobile terminated / outward messages)?</p> <p>Should these costs be included in the present proposal?</p>	<p>At this stage, it is unclear what, if any vessels, will transmit VMS data directly to the NPFC VMS. This provision was included in the CMM to allow for special circumstances such as to meet import requirements for market states.</p> <p>The airtime costs for this would be carried by the vessels or the state of the relevant FMC and should not be included in your proposal.</p>
<p><i>"VMS data must be transmitted by vessels to their flag FMC every hour and by the FMC to the NPFC Secretariat no later than sixty (60) minutes after receiving the VMS data from the vessel"</i>.</p> <p>How does NPFC verify that the flag FMC sends the VMS data in less than 60 minutes after they were received?</p>	<p>There are no specifics about how NPFC would verify that the FMC sends VMS data in less than 60 minutes. The burden for fulfilling this obligations rests with the relevant state.</p>
<p>Please confirm that the duration of the initial contract is 3 years including the set-up phase (a three-month period counted from start of Services 14 Feb 2020), so that the actual operation time equals 2 years and 9 months?</p>	<p>That is correct.</p>
<p><i>"The Services must link to, or be integrated with, the NPFC vessel database to associate VMS data received with the vessel details maintained in the NPFC vessel database."</i></p> <p>Please provide an interface document to the vessel database including the protocols available for read-only access.</p>	<p>The API interface to the NPFC vessel registry follows the JSONAPI specification (<a href="https://jsonapi.org/">https://jsonapi.org/</a>). I have attached the NPFC vessel registry diagram.</p>

<p><i>"The Services must permit two-way VMS data transmission (where the VMS data transmission type supports this). "</i>                  Is the NPFC VMS going to interrogate the vessels directly through MCSPs or requesting the flag FMC to interrogate the vessels? In the first case, the polling costs will be charged to NPFC.</p>	<p>Both scenarios will be possible and yes, in the first case, the cost would be charged to NPFC. How this is managed with relevant members is yet to be decided.</p>
<p><i>"The Services must process, and store manually reported VMS data received via email and record the manual nature of this data in the metadata."</i></p> <p>Please confirm if the VMS manual entries are made through a mail browser or through the VMS application?</p>	<p>No firm requirement for this but it should be through the mail browser.</p>
<p><i>"The Services must provide the ability to search and extract VMS data (including historical VMS data) "</i></p> <p>Are the historical data provided by the flag FMCs at time of service inception, and collected before the start of service?</p>	<p>No. There will be no need to migrate historical VMS data.</p>
<p><i>"The Services may receive and display Automatic Identification System (AIS) data from third party service providers."</i></p> <p>Should the service contract include the provision of the AIS feed? On which area?</p>	<p>It could but it should be costed separately. This could be highlighted in value-added services.</p> <p>The area would be the NPFC Convention Area. The shapefile can be found at <a href="https://www.npfc.int/about_npfc/convention_and_npfc_area_of_application/npfc-shape-file">https://www.npfc.int/about_npfc/convention_and_npfc_area_of_application/npfc-shape-file</a></p>
<p><i>"The Services may receive, process, store and display data transmitted by electronic logbooks."</i></p> <p>Please provide a sample of NPFC electronic logbook?</p>	<p>There is no electronic logbook at this stage. This is a general requirement for future consideration.</p>
<p><i>"The Services may provide the ability to export VMS data and remove non-generic vessel identifiers."</i></p> <p>What do you mean by non-generic vessel identifiers?</p>	<p>Name, registration number, vessel ID or IMO. Anything that would identify an individual vessel.</p>

<p>"The Services must be fully implemented by the service provider and include the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• training for relevant NPFC Secretariat staff;</li> </ul> <p>Where will the training take place?</p>	<p>It is envisaged that this will occur at the NPFC Secretariat in Tokyo.</p>
<p>"The Services must be subject to a Fabric Acceptance Test (FAT) undertaken by the service provider."</p> <p>Does the FAT include a site visit of the service provider facilities?</p> <p>If yes, should the proposal include the costs of travel of NPFC project staff to the service provider factory, for how many persons?</p>	<p>I think the FAT could be done remotely and there would be no need for a site visit.</p>
<p>"The Services must be supported by an online Helpdesk."</p> <p>What are the expected working hours and office days for the online Helpdesk?</p>	<p>We would like this to be proposed by the service provider but at a minimum, NPFC would expect during working hours (Tokyo time) Monday to Friday.</p>
<p>There is no Schedule or model of letter dedicated to the bidder's solemn declaration on compliance and good practices.</p> <p>Is it necessary to provide such declaration, and if yes could you please give a model of letter?</p>	<p><b>A Declaration has been prepared and attached below. This needs to be completed and included in proposals.</b></p>
<p>Evaluation: what are the respective weights to give to the technical and financial evaluation criteria?</p>	<p>Approximately 50/50 but the proposals will be evaluated holistically.</p>
<p>"Detail the warranty cover for labour: "</p> <p>What do you mean by labour? Labour in NPFC premises for the training of staff?</p>	<p>Yes, that is what is meant by labour.</p>
<p>When you would need service to be active?</p>	<p>As noted in the RFP, we expect the start of Services on 14 February 2020 and that this "will commence with implementation and training to relevant NPFC Secretariat staff over a period of three (3) months". We would expect the Services to be active after this initial three months.</p>

<p>Please provide more about the project such as background information, project objective, the source of data, etc.</p>	<p>The background information and objective of the NPFC VMS is clarified in the RFP document itself. This can be found at <a href="https://www.npfc.int/request-proposal-npfc-regional-vms">https://www.npfc.int/request-proposal-npfc-regional-vms</a></p> <p>Additional information about the Commission's decision to adopt the VMS can be found in the Commission's meeting's report at <a href="https://www.npfc.int/cmm-2019-12-vessel-monitoring-system-vms">https://www.npfc.int/cmm-2019-12-vessel-monitoring-system-vms</a></p> <p>NPFC Members receive VMS data from their flagged vessels through a range of MTUs and a range of MCSPs including Argos, Goniets, Inmarsat-C, Iridium, Orbcomm and WidestarII. The Services will be expected to ingest these native VMS data formats and provide the ability to ingest VMS data reported via NAF or FLUX formats.</p>
<p>Are you able to specify which FLUX networks needs to be connected? This could affect how many FLUX TL End Nodes need to be hosted and maintained, as well as which versions of the FLUX TL End Node software need to be used.</p> <p>Also, would it be possible to get "all native VMS data formats" expanded to be an explicit list of formats necessary to support?</p>	<p>The FLUX requirement was a bit of a compromise and left in just in case. You are correct, none of the NPFC members, CNCPs or relevant non-Members, use FLUX and it is highly unlikely that it will be required.</p> <p>NPFC Members receive VMS data from their flagged vessels through a range of MTUs and a range of MCSPs including Argos, Goniets, Inmarsat-C, Iridium, Orbcomm and WidestarII.</p>
<p>In relation to it will be "Highly Desirable" if the system can " The Services may receive, process, store and display data transmitted by electronic logbooks. "</p> <p>Later in Part A you write that it will be "Highly Desirable" if the system can "The Services may be scalable to allow the inclusion of new technologies or requirements such as electronic logbooks."</p> <p>How are VMS and electronic logbook Services to be include this in an offer?</p>	<p>You will need to include the details of your electronic logbook services in the Response Template under the relevant requirement with a statement of compliance. You are invited to provide as much detail as you wish and provide attachments if required.</p> <p>There is also a section in the Response Template, Overall Services, where you can provide the details of any value-added services additional to those identified in the Statement of Requirements. In terms of pricing, the electronic logbook pricing will need to be provided separately from the VMS.</p> <p>We will not accept non-disclosed pricing.</p>

	<p><b>It is recommended that any details for the inclusion of new technologies or requirements such as electronic logbooks separately in financial proposals.</b></p>
<p>Part A Statement of Requirements is states "Mandatory" to "The Services must link to, or be integrated with, the NPFC vessel database to associate VMS data received with the vessel details maintained in the NPFC vessel database.</p> <p>To facilitate this, the Services must recognise the ALC or MTU identifiers reported in VMS data and associate these with the corresponding vessel details maintained in the NPFC vessel database."</p> <p>Can you please describe the interface that are to be used to integrate the VMS database with the NPFC vessel database?</p>	<p>The API interface to the NPFC vessel registry follows the JSONAPI specification (<a href="https://jsonapi.org/">https://jsonapi.org/</a>).</p> <p>Currently the API cannot be queried based on MTU identifier, but this functionality will be added.</p>
<p>Do you have some strict limitations or other specifications for the system to be developed?</p>	<p>Other than what is specified in the RFP, there are no strict limitations or other specifications. I would however reiterate a few key elements in the RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Services must be externally (cloud hosted);</li> <li>• the Services must be able to ingest, store and display the range of VMS data types that will be reported by FMCs and in rare instances, directly by vessels; and</li> <li>• VMS data reported via NAF or FLUX formats.</li> </ul> <p>Please note that in relation to the integration with the NPFC vessel registry, the API interface to the NPFC vessel registry follows the JSONAPI specification (<a href="https://jsonapi.org/">https://jsonapi.org/</a>). Currently the API cannot be queried based on MTU identifier, but this functionality will be added.</p>
<p>Is the hardware part handled/specified somehow currently so we can check this data somewhere?</p>	<p>In terms of hardware, there are several elements for VMS hardware including MTUs installed on vessels, and hardware in the FMCs of states. NPFC Members receive VMS data from their flagged vessels through a range of MTUs including by Argos, Goniets, Inmarsat-C, Iridium, Orbcomm and WidestarII. The implementation, management or otherwise of this hardware is outside the scope of the RFP and we are only seeking the VMS software.</p>

<p>The Services must permit two-way VMS data transmission (where the VMS data transmission type supports this).</p> <p>Could you please clarify what is being referred to by two-way data transmission? Does it refer to the unit being able to receive messaging, or does it refer to being able to apply remote programming to the unit?</p> <p>If you could supply an example of what is being referred to it would be of assistance.</p>	<p>Vessels reporting directly to the NPFC Services and only using MTUs/ALCs that can be communicated with via the Services, e.g. Inmarsat-C. This would include both test transmissions and remote programming.</p> <p>In the case of NPFC, it is very unlikely that this will be required as most, if not all VMS data coming from FMCs.</p>
<p>Reports on the basis of appropriate criteria and send these reports via secure data transfer method. Does the Functional Requirement refer to data reports relating to VMS data that is transmitted or does it relate to the data regarding a vessel/s positions?</p>	<p>For NPFC, VMS data includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the current geographical position (latitude and longitude) of the vessel</li> <li>• (accurate to within 100m); and,</li> <li>• the date and time (expressed in Coordinated Universal Time (UTC)) of the</li> <li>• fixing of the position of the vessel.</li> </ul> <p>The VMS data reports will need to include this data for vessels and include inter alia, relevant vessel details.</p>
<p>Can I have more detail about the endpoint or node the service will connect to? (e.g. FMC of NPFC member)</p>	<p>There is no “endpoint” or “node” that the Services will connect to per se. The Services must be configured to receive VMS data from an FMC and in some instances fishing vessels.</p>
<p>Regarding to RFP page 7 and 14, What is Fabric acceptant test (FAT) or where can I have an explanation about it?</p>	<p>The Fabric should be Factory and a FAT is to verify that the system and its components function properly that all software generation and configuration have been done correctly and completely and that the system performance is in compliance with the agreed upon procurement specification.</p> <p><b>Fabric should be read as Factory for FAT in the RFP.</b></p>
<p>Is there a sole provider of VMS hardware and feeds already chosen by NPFC? Or are they one of multiple providers, hence the need for a separate software solution?</p>	<p>NPFC does not have a single provider of VMS hardware or feeds, rather each relevant state uses a range of MTU providers and MCSPs. The provision of</p>

<p>Why have these software services been separated from hardware?</p>	<p>VMS hardware and feeds by several service providers is why the software is separate and must be able to ingest VMS data from the FMCs of relevant states.</p>
<p>What is a Fabric Acceptance Test?</p>	<p>It should be Factory Acceptance Test.</p> <p><b>Fabric should be read as Factory for FAT in the RFP.</b></p>
<p>Is the previous work undertaken on VMS related to the work covered by this RFP or the VMS more broadly?</p> <p>Are the estimated indicative costs in particular related to work covered by the RFP?</p>	<p>The work undertaken previously was on VMS more broadly and the estimated indicative costs are not related to work covered by this RFP.</p>
<p>Are companies that have previously worked with NPFC permitted to submit a proposal for this work?</p>	<p>No company has been excluded from the RFP but will need to declare their previous relationship with NPFC (as will all bidders) to be considered by the SWG PD in their evaluation.</p>
<p>NPFC has asked the respondents to describe the offered warranty cover for labour.</p> <p>Please explain what is understood by this and which type of details NPFC wish to have included in the proposal on such warranty.</p>	<p><b>The section <i>Warranty, servicing and support</i> should be considered as removed from the Response Template in the RFP and does not need to be completed for proposals.</b></p>
<p>NPFC has asked the respondents to specify the whole-of-life costs. It is difficult to understand how this information should be provided in this particular context.</p> <p>Please provide some guidance on what you mean by whole-of-life costs and what kind of information you would like us to provide?</p>	<p><b>The section <i>Warranty, servicing and support</i> should be considered as removed from the Response Template in the RFP and does not need to be completed for proposals.</b></p>
<p>In Part C- Response template, part related “Warranty, servicing and support” (page 20 of the RFP document) could you please specify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• what is the difference between the warranty/servicing and support services and the maintenance/helpdesk services as required within the project?</li> <li>• what does NPFC mean by “warranty cover for labour”?</li> </ul>	<p><b>The section <i>Warranty, servicing and support</i> should be considered as removed from the Response Template in the RFP and does not need to be completed for proposals.</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how should we understand the terms “relevant whole-of-life costs” within the context of the project.</li> </ul>	
<p>Concerning the synchronisation with the NPFC vessel register: the JSON protocol will not send information from the register to the VMS software at any update, so the VMS software needs to be notified of any new vessel register database update.</p> <p>How can the VMS software be informed of the last changes in the vessel registry such as new vessels or vessels deletion?</p>	<p>The JSONAPI endpoint can be queried with a timestamp filter to retrieve only the vessel records that have changed after a certain time. This can be used to implement a high-watermark approach to synchronising the vessel register data onto the VMS. This can support deletions too as the database records these as archived.</p> <p>The VMS could do live queries against the vessel register every time vessel register data is needed, so that a data sync process is not needed.</p> <p>A webhook could be setup so that whenever a vessel in the vessel register is updated the VMS system is notified so that it can then initiate a fetch of just that vessel from the JSONAPI endpoint.</p>
<p>Can you provide a document that indicates NPFC's data management and use requirements?</p>	<p>This is currently a working draft only and not available for release.</p>
<p>Regarding data exchange protocols, does NPFC currently have access to all required data exchange protocols, including FMCs and MCSPs? If not, will access to other data exchange protocols be setup by NPFC or will access (connection, user credentials and other guidance) be provided by a data provider?</p>	<p>We expect that the service provider will establish the connection and user credentials with FMCs.</p>
<p>Regarding the manual import (individual and massive) of VMS data, will the VMS data be provided in a specific format, such as CSV?</p>	<p>In the case that this needs to occur, we could request this in a range of formats including CSV.</p>
<p>Regarding the manual import (individual and massive) of VMS data, should users be able to import VMS data into the system through the web-based application?</p>	<p>This is not an expectation but if efficiencies could be gained in this approach then yes, this would be a good approach.</p>
<p>Regarding the two-way VMS data transmission, what data exchange protocol(s) is /are required?</p>	<p>There is no specific requirement for this.</p>
<p>Regarding the establishment of vessel groups or vessel lists by defining criteria relating to vessels, please provide some examples of important defining criteria.</p>	<p>Flag of the vessel, target species, gear type or vessel type.</p>

<p>Regarding the sending of reports via a secure data transfer method, does the NPFC have a secure data transfer method (data exchange protocol) that should be used?</p>	<p>No, not at this stage.</p>
<p>Regarding the support of auditing data access events for single sign-on protocol, can you provide examples of data access events?</p>	<p>Log-in and view, change to vessel details.</p>
<p>What is the intent of the VMS systems for each NPFC member country? Is the NPFC VMS intended to eventually replace the VMS system for each member country?</p>	<p>The objective of the NPFC VMS is to support the Convention’s objective to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of the fisheries resources in the Convention Area. The VMS forms an important part of the Commission’s MCS regime to ensure compliance with, and enforcement of, the provisions of the Convention and CMMs. The purpose of the VMS is to continuously monitor the positions and movements of all fishing vessels in the Convention Area for compliance purposes. VMS data may also be used to support scientific processes as agreed by the Commission.</p> <p>The NPFC VMS is a shared decentralised model with FMC transmitting VMS data from their flagged vessels to the NPFC VMS.</p> <p>The NPFC will not replace nationally implemented VMS.</p>

## Request for Proposal (RFP)

RFP Title:	Software Services to support the North Pacific Fisheries Commission (NPFC) Vessel Monitoring System (VMS).
Deadline for submission of proposals:	<b>21 January 2020 17:00 JST (UTC+9 hours)</b>
Issued by:	NPFC Secretariat and the Small Working Group Planning and Development (SWG-PD)

## Declaration

Personal information on this form is collected in order to assist the NPFC with its evaluation of the proposal. The information will be used only for the purpose for which it was provided and will not be disclosed except as authorized or required by law.

I, \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_,

do solemnly and sincerely declare as follows:

### PART A: AUTHORITY

I am currently \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_,

and am authorized to make this declaration on its behalf.

### PART B: OFFER AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

On behalf of \_\_\_\_\_, I confirm that:

- the information provided in this declaration and the proposal is complete and correct;
- my company has completed all parts of the Response Template;
- I have read, understood and my company agrees to the proposal conditions and the associated material contained in this RFP;
- my company understands that the NPFC will have the right (but will not be obliged) to act in reliance upon the contents of the proposal and this declaration;
- my company will regard all communication with the NPFC as confidential and will not disclose the contents without the NPFC's written consent; and
- to the best of my knowledge, there is no conflict of interest which would prevent my company from proceeding with this process.

14 January 2020

PART C: NO ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES

I confirm that:

- the proposal to which this declaration is appended has not been prepared with the benefit of information obtained from a current or former employee of the NPFC in circumstances that constitute a breach of an obligation of confidentiality or fidelity on the part of that person or a breach of any criminal law or information otherwise improperly obtained from the NPFC;
- through its employees my company has not attempted and will not attempt, to influence improperly any officer of the NPFC in connection with the assessment of proposals;
- to the best of my knowledge, my company has not engaged in any collusive practices, anti-competitive conduct or any other similar conduct with any other respondent or other person in relation to the preparation or submission of this proposal; and
- I am aware that giving false or misleading information is a serious offence.

PART D: DECLARATION

I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the statements contained in this declaration to be true in every particular.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Declared at \_\_\_\_\_, on the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_

This declaration was witnessed by:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_, of

\_\_\_\_\_