

Helsinki, 22/07/2010
D(2010)

CLARIFICATIONS

Open call for tender ECHA/2010/124 - Web services
Lot 1 – Web design, Lot 2 – Web development, Lot 3 – Web consultancies

CLARIFICATIONS 1

Question 1.1:

General: Who are the current contractors for the services described in the CfT?

Answer:

At the moment ECHA website(s) and web services are managed in-house at ECHA.

Question 1.2:

Section 2.3.1 – Administrative proposal: We intend to submit a proposal for more than one Lot.

a. Do we need to submit different proposals for different Lots?

Answer:

Yes.

b. If yes, could we submit the Administrative dossier once only with clear reference to the fact that it addresses more than one Lot?

Answer:

No. For the evaluation purposes the Tenderers have to submit a complete offer for each lot they submit an offer (including all the information required for the application of the exclusion and selection criteria as detailed in sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the specifications).

c. If yes, could we provide the project references in the Administration dossier clearly stating the Lot they refer to?

Answer:

Project references must be submitted separately for each specific lot for which an offer is submitted.

Question 1.3:

Section 2.3.3 – Financial proposal: On page 14 you mention Annex 5.7 and Annex 5.8. This is an erroneous reference? Can you please confirm?

Answer:

There is a clerical error in the document, on page 14, a reference to Annex 5.7 should read Annex 5.6. and reference to Annex 5.8. should read 5.7.

Annex 5.6 – Price Schedule will become an integral part of the framework contract and the unit prices of this list will apply to the future specific contracts to be signed under the framework contracts. Annex 5.7 represents financial proposal for scenarios under each lot which is used only for evaluation purposes. Unit prices in these two tables (5.6 and 5.7) must be equal and both of them must be submitted for each lot for which an offer is submitted for.

Question 1.4:

Section 3.3 – page 21: you mention as the award criterion section 5.8 – this is an erroneous reference. Can you please confirm?

Answer:

Yes. Instead of “Section 5.8” it should read “Annex 5.7.”

Question 1.5:

Section 4.3.4 – Can you please clarify or give examples on the tasks referring to in the sentence “Similar tasks relating to relevant web services under a specific lot...”.

Answer:

Tasks foreseen for each lot are specified in sections 4.3.4.1, 4.3.4.2 and 4.3.4.3 (see pages 26 and 27 of the specifications).

Question 1.6:

Section 4.4.1 – Scenario for Lot 1: Can you please confirm whether the Tenderer is allowed to propose a different estimated workload?

Answer:

Yes.

Section 4.4 reads: “An indicative estimation of the workload and methodologies is already given by the Agency in some scenarios. *Nevertheless, the tenderer will make his own assumptions on the approach taken, the total workforce and the specific profiles required to perform the scenario(s)/deliver all services.* The tenderer shall add a clear explanation on how the profiles and total man-days of the project team are determined. The absence of these comments will result in a very low mark.”

Question 1.7:

Section 4.3.4.3 – First paragraph mentions: “...training services will be included in this Lot” and the list of tasks foreseen for Lot 3 includes “training of ECHA staff”. What kind of training would that be and which aspects of Lot 3 will it cover?

Answer:

Training is related to tasks foreseen for Lot 3. The exact scope and duration of training will be specified in one or more specific contracts under the framework contract.

Question 1.8:

The qualitative award criteria (pages 19-20) refer to “mock-ups (samples)”. However, we can find no mention of mock-ups in the requirements for the scenarios (page 31) which appear to limit the proposal to a 4-page description of the methodologies to be applied. Please explain exactly what you expect when you refer to “mock-ups (samples)” in the award criteria:

1. Do these refer only to the references of previous web site graphic design work, or to something else?
2. Should these mock-ups be purely graphical, or should they include a written explanation of the objectives, the work undertaken, the main features, etc.?
3. Should they be included in the main technical proposal or in the Lot 1 scenario proposal?
4. If they are to be included in the Lot 1 scenario proposal, please confirm that they are in addition to the 4-page methodological description.

Answer:

1. They refer only to the references of previous website graphic design work.
2. As specified in section 4.4 “For Lot 1, the tenderer shall include portfolio of at least three references of web site graphic design”, for “portfolio” we expect to receive a detailed description of the work carried out including graphic mock-ups.
3. They should be included in the LOT 1 scenario proposal.
4. Yes, we confirm.

Question 1.9:

In regards to Lots 1 and Lot 3, will the Contractor have to provide the requested services for all websites under the ECHA brand (i.e. [Guidance](#), [REACH-IT portal](#), [IUCLID](#), [CHESAR](#)) or just the main ECHA website? Along the same lines, can the Contractor propose the consolidation of some of the external websites into the main ECHA website, as he may seem appropriate?

Answer:

The Contractor has to provide the services for all websites under the ECHA brand. This call for tender is based on the current situation of ECHA websites and the objective of the framework contract is to provide services in support of the management and further development of the ECHA web products and the relevant web communication activities. The consolidation of the external websites into the main ECHA website is to be decided and may be subject of one or more specific contracts under the framework contract.

Question 1.10:

With regards to the Lot 2 scenario required in the ‘ECHA/2010/124’ call for tender, could you elaborate on what is type of answer is expected i.e.

- A Project Quality Plan (a standard deliverable at the beginning of a project);
- Or
- A more detailed technical approach to achieve the objective.

Answer:

The Project Management and Quality Plan should be detailed with all the steps needed to achieve the objectives (see section 4.3.5.3.1, p. 28 of the specifications). Additional description on the technical approach is required as specified in the scenario for LOT 2 (see section 4.4.2, p. 34 of the specifications). The Tenderers must submit their offer in accordance with section 4.4, p. 31 of the specifications.

Question 1.11:

Can the same individual be proposed for two different profiles?

Answer:

No.

Question 1.12:

On Page 28 Point 4.3.5.3.1 you state that all Tenderers must supply a draft PMQP. Is this PMQP in addition to the PMQP that you require for the development of each Scenarios.

Answer:

The Tenderers must submit their offer in accordance with section 4.4, p. 31 of the specifications. The PMQP is one of the deliverables required for each scenario. Description of a PMQP is given in section 4.3.5.3.1, p.28 of the specifications.

Question 1.13:

In relation to Lot 1 – Page 31 Point 4.4 you request that for "the purpose of evaluation that the Tenderer shall include portfolio of at least three reference web site graphics designs". Do these references need to fill the requirements associated with the evidence of "Technical and Professional Capacity" i.e. that "the working language is English and at least one from a public sector" or can we select from any of our project references

Answer:

For the scenario of Lot 1 the references can be selected from any of the project carried out by the Tenderers.