**Restricted Procedure for Enterprise Integration Platform as a Service ( e iPaaS)**
**Request To Participate (RTP) (Stage 1)**

**HSE Ref 28439, eTenders ID: 9034881**

**RTP Clarification Deadline - 12:00 Friday, 25th September 2026**

**RTP Submission Deadline - 12:00 Monday, 26th October 2026**

Note: The Contracting Authority will make every effort to respond to clarification questions received. All clarifications will be disseminated among all candidates, unless the response is self-explanatory and/or contained in the procurement documentation. All clarification requests will be treated in a confidential manner. Please note that all clarifications issued constitute an integral part of the tender documentation. The Contracting Authority is committed to carrying out the process in a manner that is fair, objective, transparent, and non-discriminatory to all involved. Candidates who submit clarifications will not be disadvantaged at any of the stages of the procurement process.

The information contained in this document is for this procurement process only. The information is provided by the Contracting Authority and while we endeavour to keep the information up to date and correct, we make no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, about the completeness, accuracy, reliability or suitability that the information in this document has for your organisation. Any reliance you place on such information for the submission of this procurement process is, therefore, strictly at your own risk

The Contracting Authority accepts no responsibility for changes to, or interception of this document after it was sent or for any damage to the recipient's systems or data caused by this message or its attachments.
Candidates are requested to read all procurement documentation prior to submitting questions.

| Clarification No./Message ID | Date received | Question No | Clarification Question | Contracting Authority Response | Date Response Issued |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 795255 | 24/09/2026 | 1 | Dear Sir or Madam,<br>Could the Contracting Authority please clarify the insurance requirement in Section IV.3?<br>The RTP states that a Candidate will only be required to obtain and hold the specified types and levels of insurance if it is "ultimately successful in this Procurement Process".<br>Could you please confirm whether "ultimately successful" in this context means being awarded a contract following a subsequent competition/call-off under the DPS, rather than being admitted to the DPS itself?<br>In other words, please confirm that Candidates are not required to obtain the specified insurance levels solely as a condition of admission to the DPS.<br>We would appreciate your clarification very much. | Thank you for your question.<br>To clarify: This is a **restricted procurement procedure** . Ref 3.2 of the RTP: "This RTP/ Stage 1 invites Submissions from Candidates interested in being shortlisted for the Tender Stage of the Procurement Process"<br>Ref* 3.8.**1**Provided that there are a sufficient number of suitable Candidates, the Contracting Authority anticipates that the five (5) highest ranked Candidates will be shortlisted and invited to participate in the Tender Stage" (RFT/Stage 2).<br><br>**This is NOT a DPS Qualifier *nor* a DPS Tender.**<br><br>For this RTP/Stage 1 phase, Ref: 4. (iv): Insurance Levels<br><br>The Candidate **must confirm and provide evidence to confirm** that it (or if the Candidate is a Consortium, that the Lead Consortium Member) ***has in place (or has the ability to obtain prior to Contract award)*** insurances of the levels as detailed on page 37 (as a minimum):<br>**Note: It is only if the Candidate is ultimately successful in this Procurement Process that it will be required to obtain and hold the types and levels of insurance as specified above**<br>The Candidate (and where the Candidate is a Consortium, the Lead Consortium Member) is required to evidence that it has in place or has the ability to obtain insurance at the levels set out in the table on page 37. It must do this by providing a letter from the Candidate's insurance broker clearly (or letters from the Candidate's insurance brokers) stating that it accepts that the Candidate has the ability to obtain each of the insurances at the required level ***should the Candidate be ultimately successful.***<br><br>I trust this clarifies. | 30/09/2026 |
| 795901 | 24/09/2026 | 2 | Does the response need to be in a .docx format (as specified in the naming convention in the RTP Section D, 6 (d)) or is pdf format permitted as specified in the RTP Section D, 6 (e)? | PDF format is acceptable, but the naming convention set out in Section D (6) must still be followed with .docx to be replaced by .pdf in the filename. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 3 | Will the vendor shortlist consist of four or five vendors? Four vendors is specified in the RTP Section C, 4.3.12. and five vendors is specified in Section A, 3 (3.8). | Five vendors will be shortlisted as specified in Section A, 3 (3.8). | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 4 | We are planning to bid with an Integration Engine as our core vendor and will be actively using their Professional Services team to support the implementation. Other SIs may also reference the same Integration Engine as a) a core vendor or b) an other entity as they have licensing arrangements in place with the Integration Engine to use their platform but those SIs will not be using that Integration Engine's professional services for implementation. Can you confirm that we will be compliant under Section B, paragraph 5 which states that where an entity is the "Core Vendor" of a proposed solution, that entity is limited to submitting one Submission only, whereas other entities fulfilling different roles may participate in more than one Submission subject to notification of and approval by the Contracting Authority in advance of the Submission Deadline. | As set out in the Foreword to the RTP document, "This procurement is for the EiPaaS product capability, including software licensing or subscription, vendor support, and the establishment of the core platform capability. A separate procurement for enablement, support, development or managed integration services may follow. That later procurement may provide additional capacity to configure, develop, test, deploy, support and operate integrations using the EiPaaS"<br><br>Candidates are not being asked in this procurement to provide implementation services beyond "Creation of a small scale implementation of a Proof of Concept to ensure functionality" (Section 2.5). This procurement is otherwise a procurement solely for the licensing and/or subscription for the Platform.<br><br>Section B Paragraph 5.1 excludes an entity from being nominated as a Core Vendor in a Consortium and subsequently being included as a Consortium member in multiple Consortia making submissions. Candidates should consider the Core Vendor here to refer to the EiPaaS product/platform vendor (i.e. the vendor that developed and/or owns the product/platform IPR).<br><br>Section B Paragraph 5.1 further states that "The Contracting Authority, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to require an entity participating in more than one Consortium to take such steps as are necessary to ensure effective competition or security of supply or to mitigate the risk of a conflict of interest which may extend to a requirement that the entity withdraw from multiple Submissions." Should the situation arise whereby an entity is a participant in more than one Consortium, the Contracting Authority will review the situation and take any steps deemed necessary. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 5 | In the RTP, Table A shows a Minimum Qualifying Threshold (MQT) for every scored Award Criteria line except C.9 (Artificial Intelligence), which is marked "N/A." Please confirm whether this is intentional, i.e. that there is no minimum qualifying score for the AI criterion, unlike all other Part 3C criteria. | Table A is correct as published. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 6 | Candidates are asked to provide three Project References "of a similar size, scale, scope and complexity" to the EiPaaS requirement, assessed with reference to "core functional scope" and "number and complexity of integrations supported." Given the national scale and 15-year duration of this Contract, can the Contracting Authority provide any indicative quantitative parameters (e.g. approximate transaction/message volumes, number of live interfaces, or population/organisation size served) to help Candidates judge whether a given reference is of comparable scale? | The scope of the solution being procured is set out in Section 2 and Appendix 2 of the RTP document. Further detail of solution requirements will be provided to shortlisted candidates in the RFT stage of this procurement. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 7 | RTP Appendix 2 states the HSE's "preference" is for a fully managed, fully hosted service residing within the EEA, while also requiring Candidates proposing solutions hosted, developed, supported or backed up in a country covered by an EU adequacy decision (e.g. UK) to describe contingency arrangements. Please confirm whether EEA hosting is a mandatory requirement at this shortlisting stage, or a preference against which a non-EEA (adequacy-covered) hosting model with an EEA contingency plan would still be acceptable. | The HSE preference is for a fully managed, fully hosted service which must reside within the European Economic Area (EEA). Any vendor proposing supporting solutions which are currently developed, hosted, supported or backed up in a country covered by an EU adequacy decision (example UK) must provide the HSE with details of how the vendor will continue to process all HSE personal data within the EEA or a country outside the EEA covered by an EU adequacy decision, in the event that the country loses its EU adequacy decision. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 8 | The RTP states that a separate future procurement may follow for enablement, development, support or managed integration services built on top of the EiPaaS, potentially involving multiple suppliers. Please clarify<br>(a) whether that future procurement, if run, will be a separate competitive process open to other suppliers,<br>(b) whether the successful Candidate under this procurement would be eligible to participate in that future process, and<br>(c) at a high level, how licensing and administrative access to the platform are envisaged to work for third-party suppliers or the HSE operating on top of the licensed platform. | (a) and (b): The future procurement will be an entirely separate competitive process, and as such will be open to any Candidates who deem themselves suitably qualified to meet the requirements of that procurement.<br><br>(c) Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process, including any appropriate details on working with third-party suppliers. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 9 | The Contract Notice lists the estimated value excluding VAT as €0. Please confirm whether an indicative contract value or budgetary range will be disclosed at this stage or at the Tender (RFT) Stage, to assist Candidates in scoping a proportionate response. | An indicative contract value will be disclosed at the RFT stage. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 10 | The cyber security baseline requirements checklist items 6 and 7 apply "where your organisation develops, configures or materially customises software, hardware or firmware" and candidates are instructed to answer N/A where no development, configuration or material customisation would be performed. For a Candidate proposing a SaaS platform delivered through standard configuration (interface/connector configuration, mapping and parameterisation) rather than bespoke code development, please confirm whether such configuration activity is considered "material customisation" for the purposes of these two questions, or whether N/A would be an appropriate response. | The applicability statement for checklist items 6 and 7 covers organisations that develop, configure or materially customise software, hardware or firmware. Configuration is therefore within scope in its own right, independent of whether it amounts to material customisation.<br><br>Configuration of a SaaS platform, including interface and connector configuration, data mapping and parameterisation, falls within the scope of items 6 and 7. Candidates should not answer N/A on the basis that delivery uses standard configuration rather than bespoke code development.<br><br>Where the Candidate is also the developer or owner of the SaaS platform, items 6 and 7 apply to the development and maintenance of that platform as well as to any configuration performed for this requirement. Candidates should describe their approach to both.<br><br>Where a Candidate is supplying a third-party SaaS platform that it does not develop, it should answer items 6 and 7 for the configuration activities it will perform. It should also describe how it obtains assurance over the platform provider's secure development practices, for example through certification, attestation or contractual flow-down.<br><br>N/A remains appropriate only where the Candidate will perform no development, configuration or material customisation of any kind. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 11 | The timeline in the RTP Section A (4) sets out the Clarification Deadline and Submission Deadline for the Shortlisting Stage only. Please provide an indicative timeline for the subsequent Tender (RFT) Stage, including anticipated notification of shortlisting outcome and issuance of the RFT, to assist shortlisted Candidates with resource planning. | It is intended that the RFT stage will be open for responses from shortlisted candidates from late Q4 2026 into Q1 2027. This is a provisional timeline only and the HSE bears no liability for any costs incurred by Candidates should this provisional timeline change. | 30/09/2026 |
| 796041 | 25/09/2026 | 12 | Current Integration Landscape:<br>Can the HSE provide an indicative inventory of existing integration platforms, engines, API gateways, message brokers and interoperability products currently in use across national, regional and programme-specific implementations? | Will be provided at later stages of the procurement process | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 13 | Integration Volumes:<br>Can the HSE provide indicative current and projected annual transaction volumes (HL7 messages, FHIR transactions, API calls, event volumes and document exchanges) expected across the national platform? | The disperate nature of the current estate makes an accureate baseline difficult to generate. A reasonable current baseline would be 10m messages/day across all stream types, extending over 10 years to 60m messages/day | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 14 | Interface Counts<br>What is the estimated number of existing interfaces and APIs that may ultimately be onboarded to the national EiPaaS platform? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 15 | Migration Expectations<br>What percentage of existing integrations does the HSE anticipate migrating to the EiPaaS platform during the first 3, 5 and 10 years? | Migration of existing integrations is not within the scope of this procurement process and will be dealt with under a separate procurement process to be conducted at a later date. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 16 | Platform Ownership<br>Will the HSE establish a central interoperability competency centre or platform operations team that will assume long-term ownership of the EiPaaS capability? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 17 | Delivery Responsibilities<br>Which activities are expected to remain under HSE responsibility versus vendor responsibility during implementation and ongoing operations? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. If it is felt to be appropriate, a RACI chart will form part of the documents to be published in the RFT stage. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 18 | Cloud Strategy<br>Has the HSE selected preferred public cloud providers or cloud landing zones for national digital health solutions? | The HSE operates a hybrid multi vendor cloud strategy | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 19 | Identity Strategy<br>Does the HSE have an existing enterprise identity platform (e.g., Entra ID, national IAM platform) that the EiPaaS must integrate with? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process, including any requirements for platforms with which the EiPaaS is expected to integrate. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 20 | Terminology Services<br>Does the HSE currently operate or plan to implement national terminology services for SNOMED CT, ICD, LOINC or other clinical coding systems? | The HSE currently operates a national terminology service for clinical coding. Full requirements for integration of the EiPaaS with this and any other HSE operated services will be communicated to shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 21 | Patient Identity<br>Can the HSE provide further information regarding national patient identity management services and whether patient de-duplication is expected within the EiPaaS platform or via separate enterprise services? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 22 | FHIR Strategy<br>Is HSE developing a national FHIR implementation guide and governance framework that vendors will be expected to comply with? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 23 | Multi-Tenant Requirements<br>Does the HSE require organisational, regional or programme-level logical tenancy segregation within the EiPaaS platform? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 24 | Proof of Concept Scope<br>Can the HSE provide anticipated scope, target systems, success criteria and expected duration of the proof-of-concept implementation? | Further information on the Proof of Concept scope will be provided to shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 25 | Performance Requirements<br>Can the HSE provide target non-functional requirements including transaction throughput, latency objectives, concurrency expectations and availability targets? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 26 | Monitoring Tooling<br>Does the HSE currently operate enterprise observability platforms (e.g., Azure Monitor, Splunk, Elastic, Dynatrace) with which the EiPaaS must integrate? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process, including any requirements for platforms with which the EiPaaS is expected to integrate. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 27 | AI Requirements<br>Beyond AI governance, are there specific AI-enabled use cases the HSE wishes vendors to support within the EiPaaS platform? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process. In this RTP stage, Candidates should address the AI experience being requested under Question C9 of Part 3 of the RTP Response Document. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 28 | Evaluation Weighting<br>During the RFT stage, will commercial evaluation include total cost of ownership over the full 15-year contract duration, including integration growth and platform expansion? | Evaluation methodology for the RFT stage of this procurement will be communicated to the shortlisted candidates only when the documents for that stage are published to the eTenders platform. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 29 | DICOM Workflow<br>Could the Contracting Authority clarify the intended role of the EiPaaS in DICOM-based imaging workflows? Specifically:<br><br>Is the EiPaaS expected to sit in the data path as an intermediary AE Title, actively routing or relaying DICOM image/study payloads between source and destination systems (i.e., functioning as a DICOM broker/router)?<br>Or is the requirement limited to the EiPaaS orchestrating, auditing, and monitoring DICOM-related transactions (e.g., order/result event notifications, study metadata exchange via DICOMweb QIDO-RS/WADO-RS, or exposure of imaging metadata as FHIR ImagingStudy resources) — while the underlying image transfer continues to occur directly between the existing PACS/VNA/modality AE Titles outside the platform?<br>If option (2) applies, could the Contracting Authority confirm whether this is expected to cover only order/result/metadata traffic, or also bulk pixel-data transfer, given the volume and latency implications of routing full imaging studies through a central integration hub? | The EiPaaS is expected to orchestrate, audit, and monitor DICOM-related transactions rather than operate as a DICOM router or proxy/broker. It is expected that the Platform would act as DICOM SCU with AE Title when DICOMizing non-DICOM documents or media, for example storing documents received through HL7v2 MDM messages in a VNA. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 30 | Document-based exchange<br>Is document-based clinical exchange required as IHE XDS.b specifically, or would IHE MHD (FHIR DocumentReference/DocumentManifest over REST) satisfy the publish, query, retrieve and metadata-handling requirement? Is the platform expected to act as Document Registry/Repository. | The platform should aim to maximise the profiles and standards supported to enable wide support for HSE's estate which includes a range of legacy and modern systems. It is likely that HSE will have a requirement to integrate applications which support only older profiles and interfaces such as IHE XDS.b as well as more modern applications which support FHIR and IHE MHD specifically.<br>We do not anticipate a need for the platform to act as Document Registry/Repository. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 31 | SOAP directionality<br>Does "bi-directional integration via SOAP web services" require the platform to expose SOAP/WSDL service endpoints, or only to consume third-party SOAP services? If exposure is required, which WS-* profiles are in scope (WS-Security, WS-Addressing, MTOM/XOP)? | The integration platform will require the capability to expose SOAP/WSDL service endpoints as well as consume third-party SOAP services. At the very least given the requirement to support IHE XDS/XDR/XCA then WS-Security, WS-Addressing, and MTOM/XOP are required. The platform could additionally support WS-Policy / WS-SecurityPolicy, WS-Trust, WS-ReliableMessaging, WS-SecureConversation to provide a broad range of integration capability relevant to healthcare integration. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 32 | Existing Integration Estate Ownership<br>For existing integrations and platforms, does the HSE currently maintain central ownership and inventory of integrations, or are these managed independently by programmes, regions and suppliers? | The Contracting Authority considers this query to be outside the scope of the RTP and not material to the preparation or evaluation of RTP submissions. Accordingly, no further response is provided. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 33 | Migration Governance<br>Will the HSE mandate that all newly developed integrations and APIs be implemented through the EiPaaS platform following go-live, or will programme-specific integration platforms continue to be permitted under defined governance exceptions? | The Contracting Authority considers this query to be outside the scope of the RTP and not material to the preparation or evaluation of RTP submissions. Accordingly, no further response is provided. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 34 | Interface Development Services<br>Does the HSE anticipate that the successful EiPaaS supplier will be permitted to compete for future integration development and enablement services procurements, or will these services be delivered exclusively through separate suppliers? | It is not anticipated that the successful Candidate in this procurement process will be excluded from any future procurement processes which may be run by the Contracting Authority save where the successful Candidate's involvement in delivery of EiPaaS would create a conflict of interest or have a negative impact on the competitive balance of any individual future competitions. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 35 | DevSecOps Toolchain<br>Has the HSE selected or standardised enterprise DevOps, source control and CI/CD tooling (e.g., Azure DevOps, GitHub Enterprise) that the EiPaaS platform must integrate with? | Detailed requirements for the EiPaaS will be provided to all shortlisted candidates as part of the requirements for the RFT stage of this procurement process, including any requirements for platforms with which the EiPaaS is expected to integrate. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 36 | Data Residency and Disaster Recovery<br>Could the Contracting Authority confirm whether hosting and disaster recovery environments located anywhere within the EEA would satisfy the data residency requirements, or whether there are specific geographic restrictions applicable to primary and/or disaster recovery environments? | The HSE preference is for a fully managed, fully hosted service which must reside within the European Economic Area (EEA). Any vendor proposing supporting solutions which are currently developed, hosted, supported or backed up in a country covered by an EU adequacy decision (example UK) must provide the HSE with details of how the vendor will continue to process all HSE personal data within the EEA or a country outside the EEA covered by an EU adequacy decision, in the event that the country loses its EU adequacy decision. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | 37 | Proof of Concept<br>The RTP references a Proof of Concept implementation. Could the HSE clarify whether the PoC will form part of the RFT evaluation process and, if so, whether the scope, use cases, evaluation approach and success criteria will be provided as part of the RFT documentation? | Evaluation methodology for the RFT stage of this procurement will be communicated to the shortlisted candidates only when the documents for that stage are published to the eTenders platform. Requirements for any part of a Candidate's response to the RFT which is to be evaluated will be clearly communicated in the documents that will be published for that stage. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | 38 | Consortium<br>Where a Candidate participates as a consortium and individual consortium members are responsible for different elements of the proposed solution or service, please clarify how these respective responsibilities should be reflected in the Response Document and associated questionnaires, particularly where a requirement applies to one consortium member but not another. | As set out in the instructions to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, "Where a Consortium Member/s or Other Entity/Entities were involved in the delivery of the cited project references, please ensure that the role of such entities is made clear in the responses to the questions in this Part 3 of the Response Document."<br><br>The experience of the Consortium must be demonstrated through the responses to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, regardless of which Consortium member is responsible for the experience being demonstrated<br><br>Candidates are reminded to ensure that where they are participating as part of a Consortium, that they must provide all requested information and declarations from those Entities as has been requested in Part 1 and Part 2 of the RTP Response Document and in the ESPD. | 30/09/2026 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **796163** | 25/09/2026 | **39** | Delivery model<br>It's required to deliver "The solution […] as a supplier-operated SaaS or fully managed cloud subscription service. Respondent is offering multiple variants where responsibilities on different layers of the stack can either be retained or outsourced. The delivery model will affect the response to the security questionnaire. Would it be allowed to give multiple answers for multiple scenarios, and if not, from what perspective should we answer? | Where a tenderer submits more than one delivery option, it should complete the questionnaire as follows:<br><br>One questionnaire per option.<br>Submit a separate, fully completed CISO questionnaire for each delivery option.<br>Each questionnaire must be self-contained.<br>Where an answer is the same for more than one option, it should be repeated in full in each questionnaire rather than cross-referenced.<br><br>Clear identification.<br>Give each option a unique name or reference (for example, "Option A: Supplier-operated SaaS").<br>Use the same reference on the questionnaire and consistently across all other parts of the tender response, including the commercial response.<br><br>Option summary.<br>At the start of each questionnaire, include a short description of the delivery option.<br>The description should set out the hosting arrangements, the parties responsible for each layer of the solution stack, and any third parties involved in delivering the service.<br><br>Responsibility matrix.<br>For each option, include a responsibility matrix showing which controls are delivered directly by the tenderer and which are delivered by named third parties, together with how the tenderer obtains assurance over those third parties.<br><br>For every option, the tenderer remains responsible for the whole service, including any parts delivered by third parties (for example, a public cloud infrastructure provider or other subcontractors). Answers should describe how each control is met across the full service for that option.<br><br>Each option will be reviewed separately against the CISO questionnaire, on the basis of the questionnaire submitted for that option only. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **40** | Delivery model<br>The Respondent can offer multiple cloud-native deployment models, including a sovereign/customer-managed infrastructure model, bring-your-own-cloud, and a hybrid model combining centrally hosted and locally deployed components. In each case, the integration platform would remain vendor-managed, with operational responsibilities clearly defined.Would HSE consider any of these deployment models compliant with its requirements, and if so, are there any specific constraints or preferred allocation of responsibilities that Respondents should consider? | The requirement is for the solution to be delivered as a supplier-operated SaaS or fully managed cloud subscription service. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **41** | Scope<br>Will the future integration domain be scoped to inter-organisational integration only, or is intra-organisational integration also in scope? | The platform will operate and integrate across inter-organisations and intra-organisations. It will also play an important part in meeting the EU EHDS mandate for cross-border record sharing. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **42** | Governance<br>With "public, voluntary, private and partner organisations involved", will governance be centralised or distributed in nature? | Governance and operating models are still in formation, and will be aligned to the wider HSE technical and programme governance models | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **43** | Project references / consortium<br>Where a Candidate is participating as a consortium, may the three required Project References be drawn from different consortium members, provided the consolidated response demonstrates the collective capability and capacity of the consortium? | As set out in the instructions to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, "Where a Consortium Member/s or Other Entity/Entities were involved in the delivery of the cited project references, please ensure that the role of such entities is made clear in the responses to the questions in this Part 3 of the Response Document."<br><br>In the case of a Consortium, the experience of the Consortium must be demonstrated through their responses to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, regardless of which Consortium member is responsible for the experience being demonstrated.<br><br>Candidates are reminded to ensure that where there is a reliance on an Other Entity or Entities, they must provide all requested information and declarations from those Entities as has been requested in Part 1 and Part 2 of the RTP Response Document and in the ESPD. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **44** | Reliance on vendor references<br>Where a Candidate relies on the technical and professional capacity of an Other Entity, may Project References belonging to that Other Entity be used to satisfy the Project Reference requirements in Part 3? If so, please confirm what evidence/undertaking is required from that entity. | As set out in the instructions to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, "Where a Consortium Member/s or Other Entity/Entities were involved in the delivery of the cited project references, please ensure that the role of such entities is made clear in the responses to the questions in this Part 3 of the Response Document."<br><br>In the case of a Consortium, the experience of the Consortium must be demonstrated through their responses to Part 3 of the RTP Response Document, regardless of which Consortium member is responsible for the experience being demonstrated.<br><br>Where the Other Entity is not a Consortium member, we would refer Candidates to Paragraph 6.1 in Section B of the RTP:<br><br>"In order to demonstrate a Candidate's economic and financial standing and/or technical and professional ability, a Candidate may rely on the capacities of Other Entities (for example, parent/group companies or unrelated entities). In such cases the Candidate must prove to the satisfaction of the Contracting Authority that it will have the necessary resources at its disposal when required, for example, by producing an undertaking from the Other Entities to that effect. The Candidate is required to submit a letter of undertaking, from the Other Entity to this effect, as part of its Submission. A contractual commitment in the form of a guarantee or in such other form as the Contracting Authority may specify may be required at contract stage in favour of the Contracting Authority from any such Other Entity."<br><br>Candidates are reminded to ensure that where there is a reliance on an Other Entity or Entities, they must provide all requested information and declarations from those Entities as has been requested in Part 1 and Part 2 of the RTP Response Document and in the ESPD. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **45** | Reference requirements<br>Please confirm whether each of the three Project References must individually demonstrate all of the requirements under C.1, or whether the requirements may be demonstrated collectively across the three references where the relevant subsection states "at least two of the Project References". | Each Project Reference provided under part 3B must demonstrate the Candidate's experience and capability in the delivery of projects of a similar size, scope and nature.<br><br>Each question in part 3C outlines the number of Project References which must be able to demonstrate the experience being examined in that specific question.<br><br>In the case of question C1 and C3 each sub-question has separate requirements for the number of Project References that must cover the requirements set out.<br>Candidates should ensure that they are addressing the requirements being asked in each sub-question.<br><br>Requirements may be demonstrated collectively across questions C1 and C3 so long as the minimum requirements for each sub-question are being met. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **46** | Supplier vs platform vendor<br>Where the Candidate proposes a third-party EiPaaS product/platform, please confirm whether the platform vendor is required to be a consortium member/Other Entity, or whether the Candidate may contractually provide the vendor platform, subscription and support as prime contractor. | Yes, the EiPaaS product/platform vendor must be a Consortium Member or Other Entity. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **47** | Managed service boundary<br>The RTP states that a separate procurement for enablement, support, development or managed integration services may follow. Could HSE clarify the boundary between the "establishment of the core platform capability" required under this procurement and the implementation/development services expected to fall within any subsequent procurement? | The Contracting Authority can confirm that the scope of this procurement is limited to the integration platform/software itself and the licensing or subscription for same. Implementation, configuration and ongoing support services will be procured under a separate future procurement process, with the exception of a Proof of Concept which the Contracting Authority reserves the right to request from the successful Tenderer of this competition. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **48** | Hosting accountability<br>Where infrastructure is provided by a hyperscaler or another cloud provider but the Candidate remains contractually accountable to HSE for the managed EiPaaS service, would this satisfy the requirement for a "supplier-operated SaaS or fully managed cloud subscription service"? | Yes, it could be acceptable as long as contractual arrangements meet the required level of service and flow down to subcontracted suppliers. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **49** | EEA<br>Please confirm whether the EEA residency requirement applies to all HSE data, including telemetry, logs, backups, support data and disaster-recovery copies, and whether administrative/support access from outside the EEA is permitted subject to appropriate safeguards. | The HSE preference is for a fully managed, fully hosted service which must reside within the European Economic Area (EEA). Any vendor proposing supporting solutions which are currently developed, hosted, supported or backed up in a country covered by an EU adequacy decision (example UK) must provide the HSE with details of how the vendor will continue to process all HSE personal data within the EEA or a country outside the EEA covered by an EU adequacy decision, in the event that the country loses its EU adequacy decision. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **50** | Future services procurement<br>Will suppliers appointed under this EiPaaS procurement be eligible to participate in the anticipated separate procurement for enablement, development, support and/or managed integration services? | The future procurement will be an entirely separate competitive process, and as such will be open to any Candidates who deem themselves suitably qualified to meet the requirements of that procurement. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **51** | Cyber Security - «consortium/ Other Entities<br>Where a Candidate participates as a consortium or relies upon an Other Entity/platform vendor, please confirm whether every named entity must independently satisfy every applicable requirement of the HSE Cyber Security Baseline, or whether compliance may be demonstrated collectively based on the responsibilities performed by each entity. | Where a Candidate participates as a consortium or relies on the capacities of other entities (including subcontractors and platform vendors), compliance with the HSE Cyber Security Baseline may be demonstrated collectively, based on the responsibilities each entity will perform in delivering the service. It is not required that every named entity independently satisfies every requirement of the Baseline.<br>Where a Candidate relies on another entity to meet any part of the Baseline, that reliance must reflect the entity's actual role in delivering the service. The HSE reserves the right to seek further evidence from any named entity. | 09/10/2026 |
| **796202** | 25/09/2026 | **52** | The tender documentation appears to indicate a preference for a cloud-based Integration Platform as a Service (iPaaS) solution. Can the Authority please confirm whether bids proposing an on-premises integration engine/platform will be considered compliant, or whether the proposed solution must be cloud-based? | The requirement is for the solution to be delivered as a supplier-operated SaaS or fully managed cloud subscription service. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **53** | Additionally, can the Authority confirm whether the scope of this procurement is limited to the integration platform/software itself, with implementation, configuration, and ongoing support services to be procured under a separate future procurement process? | The Contracting Authority can confirm that the scope of this procurement is limited to the integration platform/software itself and the licensing or subscription for same. Implementation, configuration and ongoing support services will be procured under a separate future procurement process, with the exception of a Proof of Concept which the Contracting Authority reserves the right to request from the successful Candidate in this competition. | 30/09/2026 |
| **796127** | 25/09/2026 | **54** | 1. Are there any restrictions on the information we can share with the potential references about HSE's EiPaaS RTP to get their reference? | All information published by the Contracting Authority is privileged and confidential and should be treated as such by all Candidates. In this instance, the Contracting Authority considers the sharing of information with Candidate's clients to secure a recommendation to be valid provided that those clients also treat the information as privileged and confidential. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **55** | 2. Getting a reference and confirmation on corporate headed stationery can be challenging. Is it acceptable to get a reference and confirmation from the referee from their corporate email address? | As stated in the RTP Response Document, the Candidate must provide for each of the Project References a signed and dated confirmation letter on headed stationary from the relevant customer that the details provided in the Project Reference are a true reflection of the facts. Confirmation provided from a corporate email address is not considered a suitable substitute for this. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **56** | 3. In the RTP document, project references need to be up to 5 years old. Some of our clients originally bought the technology earlier than 5 years but they have renewed the contract within last 5 years and they are still using it. Will this qualify as valid reference? | A Project Reference will be considered as valid if the contract renewal date is within the 5 years preceding publication of the RTP. | 30/09/2026 |
| | | **57** | 4. To have a truly hybrid model, there might be a requirement of hosting runtimes in HSE environment (on-prem or cloud environment). Will this be acceptable? If yes, which cloud providers do you work with? | The supplier must provide a secure, production-grade hybrid connectivity model for NHN/on-prem data sources, supporting private connectivity and/or an outbound-only on-premises runtime/agent model, with no requirement to expose NHN systems directly to the public internet.<br>The HSE operates a hybrid multi vendor cloud strategy | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **58** | 5. What is your minimum required RTO/RPO requirements, especially for SaaS based components? Are they different for control plane and runtime plane? | We require zero RPO for acknowledged messages and requests. RTO of < 30 min should be supported. This should be aligned across both control plane and runtime as operatine a statform in a recovery without an effective means to observe and control it is unlikely to be considered safe. | 09/10/2026 |
| | | **59** | 6. Does HSE plan to do integration development itself or will be outsourced to vendor or another services partner? If outsourced to service partner, when will this transition happen? | HSE anticipate operating a hybrid model, with both HSE teams and outsourced service partners involved in integration development, dependant on the nature of the specific development required. | 09/10/2026 |
| **797006** | 28/09/2026 | **60** | As a US-based organisation, we operate under a different insurance structure, and our current coverage does not align with all of the insurance limits specified by HSE.<br>Could you please confirm whether meeting the stated insurance limits is a mandatory requirement for participation in the tender and whether any deviation would automatically result in disqualification? Alternatively, is there scope for the insurance position to be reviewed or agreed with the successful supplier prior to contract award? | As stated in the RTP, the Candidate, or the Lead Candidate in the case of a Consortium, must have the capability of obtaining the insurance cover as set out in the RTP should they ultimately be successful in this procurement process. The thresholds for liability cover are minimum levels required by the HSE. Candidate's will be excluded from the process should they be unable to meet the minimum liability thresholds set out. A letter from the Candidate's insurance broker clearing setting out that they do currently or can in the future meet the liability levels for incidents falling under each stated insurance type, whether through explicit policies or otherwise, is sufficient to establish compliance with the insurance requirements | 30/09/2026 |
| **797795** | 28/09/2025 | **61** | We would like to kindly ask whether it would be possible to extend the submission deadline until **11/12.**<br>An extension would provide us with the necessary time to ensure the highest quality of our submission, and incorporate all required information in a thorough and accurate manner.<br>We would greatly appreciate your consideration of this request and remain at your disposal should any further information be required.<br>Thank you in advance for your consideration and understanding. | The Contracting Authority is not in a position to grant the requested extension to the RTP deadline.<br>The published procurement timetable has been carefully considered and remains appropriate. Respondents have been afforded adequate time to prepare their submissions, and there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify revising the deadline.<br>To preserve the principles of transparency, proportionality and equal treatment, the RTP submission deadline will remain as published. No further extension will be considered. | 09/10/2026 |
| **804816** | 06/10/2026 | **62** | We understand that a project where the solution has been successfully implemented and remains in active production use, and the underlying contract remains active, with the Candidate currently providing ongoing support services under the contractual warranty/support period, constitutes an eligible reference. During this warranty/support period, the support services are covered under the existing fixed-price contract with no additional payment/invoicing milestones. Therefore no separate service payments are made, but the respective maintenance/support is included in the overall project budget. Can you please confirm our understanding? | A Project Reference will be considered as valid if the contract renewal date is within the 5 years preceding publication of the RTP. | 09/10/2026 |
| **805003** | 06/10/2026 | **63** | For those clarification questions marked 'Reponse to follow', is the Authority able to confirm when those will be updated and the responses made available to suppliers? | The Contracting Authority confirms that the responses to the clarification questions previously marked "Response to Follow" are now provided herewith. These responses form part of the procurement documentation and are issued to all economic operators on an equal basis | 09/10/2026 |
| **806205** | 07/10/2026 | **64** | We kindly request an extension to the submission deadline to allow sufficient time to obtain a signed and dated confirmation letter on the customers official headed stationery. The issuance of this document is subject to the customer's internal approval process and associated lead times.<br>The additional time would enable us to submit a complete and fully compliant response.<br>We appreciate your consideration and are at your disposal in case of any questions. | The Contracting Authority is not in a position to grant the requested extension. The published timetable remains unchanged and submissions must be received by the stated deadline. Respondents have been afforded adequate time to prepare their submissions, and there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify revising the deadline.<br>To preserve the principles of transparency, proportionality and equal treatment, the RTP submission deadline will remain as published. No further extension will be considered. | 09/10/2026 |
| **808500** | 09/10/2026 | **65** | Large public-sector programs often use centrally procured, shared government cloud infrastructure to support multiple information systems, rather than procuring separate infrastructure for each project. Consequently, hosting and managed cloud services may be provided under a separate contract from the development and operation of each system.<br><br>Where a Project Reference explicitly identifies such a government health cloud as its hosting environment, and both the reference project and the supporting cloud infrastructure are delivered and operated by the same contractor under separate contracts, please clarify:<br><br>(a) May the cloud capabilities and services used by that project be relied upon to demonstrate the relevant Part 3C requirements, although they fall outside the reference project's own financial scope?<br><br>(b) May this approach apply to two or all three distinct Project References using the same shared infrastructure, without nominating the cloud infrastructure contract as a separate Project Reference?<br><br>(c) What supporting evidence is required to establish the relationship between the contracts and the contractor's responsibilities for each referenced solution? | Where a Tenderer has delivered and operated a referenced solution using a shared government, public-sector or healthcare cloud environment under the Tenderer's control, the Tenderer may reference relevant cloud capabilities and services in demonstrating compliance with Part 3C requirements, even where those capabilities are provided under a separate contract from the referenced solution.<br>The Authority reserves the right to request supporting evidence confirming the Tenderer's role and responsibilities in relation to both the referenced solution and the supporting cloud environment. | 12/10/2026 |
| **808506** | 09/10/2026 | **66** | With reference to RTP Section A §2.2 and Response Document criterion C.1.ii, please clarify:<br><br>(a) Is HealthLink expected to remain an external national messaging service interfacing with the EiPaaS, or is the EiPaaS intended progressively to assume any of its integration functions?<br><br>(b) For C.1.ii, is experience of bidirectional integration with national health systems that remain operational sufficient, subject to the other stated requirements, without experience of migrating or replacing those systems? | a) The platform will need to coexist and integrate with existing integration services.<br><br>b) Experience of migration, replacement or decommissioning of national health systems may be considered relevant where provided but is not required | 12/10/2026 |
| **809160** | 09/10/2026 | **67** | Thank you for your response to Clarification Question #62 (Message ID 804814) - Question 62 above<br>We understand that a Project Reference is considered valid if the contract renewal date falls within the five years preceding publication of the RTP.<br><br>However, our question specifically concerns projects where the solution has been successfully implemented and remains in active production use, and the Candidate continues to provide support services under the original fixed-price contract during the contractual warranty/support period, without a separate contract renewal. In such cases, no separate recurring payments are made, as the warranty/support services are already included in the original contract value.<br><br>Could you please confirm whether such projects are considered eligible Project References and satisfy the requirement that the Candidate is receiving regular service payments, even though no separate payments are made during the warranty/support period?<br><br>Thank you in advance for your clarification. | The Authority considers the date of substantive implementation, deployment, contract award or contract renewal when assessing whether a Project Reference falls within the required 5 year timeframe. Ongoing warranty or support activity alone will not be regarded as sufficient to establish recency where the principal implementation activities occurred outside the period. | 12/10/2026 |
| **HSE** | 22/10/2026 | **68** | | The Contract Authority would like to remind Candidates that, pursuant to Paragraph 5.1 of Section B in the Request to Participate (RTP), where an entity is the Core Vendor of the proposed solution, that entity shall be limited to submitting one Submission only (either in its own capacity or as part of a Consortium) as part of this Competition.<br>Depending on the extent of entity's level of involvement in the proposed integrated solution and its overall contribution to meeting the required core functionality, as identified at paragraph 2.6 of Section A and Appendix 2 of the RFT, the Contracting Authority may determine at a later stage of the competition, once further information is available, that the entity is a Core Vendor and that the related one submission restriction is applicable.<br><br>Accordingly, it is for Candidates to consider the above carefully and decide how best to participate in the Competition in a compliant manner, taking into consideration other clarification responses (in particular clarification number 4) including those related to the scope of this Contract versus what services are intended to be procured separately. | 22/10/2026 |