

Helsinki, 25/08/2010  
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 3**

#### **Question 3.1:**

I would like to receive a clarification on a sentence in the ‘Specifications’ document of the Framework Contract for web services. At pages 17 and 18, there is a request for “at least 5 completed contracts where working language was English”.

We have several completed contracts where working language was ‘also’ English. The websites and other outputs and deliverables were in English even if the Client was Italian. In some other cases we had mixed situations where the ‘working languages’ were more than one because of the trans-national nature of the contract.

For these cases it would be a stretch to state that the ‘official working language’ was English, but nonetheless most of the meetings and all the emails were in English, so these contracts could be an undeniable proof of our capacity to deal with an international contract.

So, the question is: does the specification mean ‘english only’, or simply you need the Tenderer to have completed at least 5 contracts where the working language was ‘also’ English?

#### **Answer:**

‘Working language’ referred to in section 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 means that the language mainly used for the implementation of the contract, including meetings and reporting, was English.

#### **Question 3.2:**

Within the scenario 2 solution there is a large amount of pages to be migrated to the new WCMS of the agency. Within the migration process, should we consider the possibility to treat the content in order of it to be in most structured way in the new WCMS or should we only consider migrating the HTML as is in the current systems? The amount of time spent in each one of these cases is very different.

#### **Answer:**

In section 4.4.2, point 6 indicates that a detailed migration and synchronisation plan will define how the websites are migrated (from a content and technical point of view). Therefore the migration should not be considered as a simple copy and paste of HTML.

**Question 3.3:**

1. On page 31 you request in relation to the scenarios for the Tenderer to:

Prepare a document of a maximum of four (4) pages long describing the different tasks.

Given that our approach also includes tables, can you please indicate if Tables can be added at the end of the 4-page text and will be taken into consideration in the evaluation process?

2. One of the Profiles requested for Lot 2 is that of a Web Consultant. In the Context of Lot 3 you indicate that

Note: “Web Consultant” CVs might address different fields of expertise within the profile (i.e.either particularly knowledgeable in Search Engine Optimisation or in Customer Insight Research or in Web 2.0 or in best practices to present content).

Does the same apply for Lot 2 given that the Profile Requested encompasses a broad range of services i.e. can more than one CV be provided for this Profile?

3. In Relation to Scenario 1 can you please give an indication of the number of Stakeholders that are likely to be affected by the new web design?

**Answer:**

3.3.1 The maximum of four (4) pages restriction applies exclusively to the first bullet point:

“Prepare a document of a maximum of four (4) pages long describing the different tasks that tenderer consider necessary to ensure a successful execution of the scenario”

The length of other required descriptions (bullet points 2-4) is not restricted.

3.3.2 No, only 1 CV per profile may be submitted for each profile under each Lot. Requirements for ‘web consultant’ for Lot 2 and Lot 3 are different. The same CV may be submitted for one or more lots if the CV fulfils the requirements of the specific Lot.

3.3.2 In the context of scenario for Lot 1, we expect an amount of 10 000 stakeholders to be affected by the new web design.

**Question 3.4:**

- For some profiles the education requirement is “post secondary level of education”. Some of our employees are Italian. In our understanding (please see [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase\\_en.php](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/eurybase_en.php)) “post secondary level” means to have completed the high school, i.e. to have at least two years of studies after the compulsory education. Please confirm our understanding.

- In the context of other calls for tenders from the European Commission and more particularly with DIGIT, we collect our staff CVs using the standard DIGIT format. A copy of the template is attached. May we provide you with CVs using the aforementioned template?

Answer:

3.4.1 We can not confirm your understanding. High school is to be considered 'secondary education' (giving access to post-secondary education). Post secondary level of education means additional years of education after high school.

3.4.2 No. The CV must be submitted by using the form in annex 5.10.

**Question 3.5:**

1) In section 4.3.5.3.1 "First Deliverables" of the tendering specifications, it writes: "*All tenderers shall supply a draft overall Project Management and Quality Plan (PMQP).*" Further below in the same section, it writes: "*The final PMQP is the first deliverable for the project and will be included as a deliverable of each specific contract. It shall be of sufficient detail to enable the Agency to evaluate that all activities, described in this plan are duly executed. The plan shall be subject to approval of the Agency (see Acceptance procedure). The plan shall be updated whenever required during the implementation of the contract.*"

From the above it is evident that ECHA requires from the Tenderers to write a draft PMQP that will refer to the entire framework contract covering at least all points listed in the same section of the specifications. The draft PMQP will be finalised after the signature of the framework contract with the successful tenderer and be included as a deliverable "**of each specific contract**". There is no mention in this section, which is a general section, to the scenario. In addition, the fact that the final PMQP is to be included in each specific contract – which naturally not all specific contracts will concern e.g. the migration of a website to a WCMS or design of a website, as the current scenarios of the tendering specifications – makes it more clear that the PMQP does not refer specifically to the scenarios of Lot 1 or Lot 2.

In Clarifications no2, dated 3/8/2010, in question 2.1 "*Can you please confirm that the PMQP to be included in the Tender is only the one related to the Scenario for Lot 1?*"; ECHA's answer is: "*Yes. PMQP must be submitted for the specific lot for which the tender is submitted (lot 1 and/or lot 2).*"

All the above seem to us to be quite contradictory. For example, how can the same PMQP that is written for a specific scenario be included in each specific contract of the framework contract, no matter the context, the tasks involved, complexity, quality requirements, etc?

**Question 1.1:** Please confirm that the draft PMQP that is to be prepared in the context of the tendering procedure by the Tenderers is only one (1).

**Question 1.2:** Please clarify whether this draft PMQP will refer to the (a) framework contract, or (b) to the specific scenario of each Lot.

**Question 1.3:** If the latter is the case, that is the PMQP refers to the scenario ONLY, then please clarify how can this PMQP be included as a deliverable in each specific contract of the framework contract?

**Question 1.4:** If the draft PMQP concerns the scenario and only the scenario, can you please clarify the connection of the PMQP document with the document requested in section 4.4 of the tendering specifications? Quote: "*Prepare a document of a maximum of four (4)*

pages long describing the different tasks that tenderer consider necessary to ensure a successful execution of the scenario". We draw the attention to ECHA on the fact that there are issues that overlap both documents i.e. methodology for the tasks.

**Question 1.5:** Please clarify whether there is any page limit on this draft PMQP

2. Regarding the award criteria of Lot 2 in connection to your answers to the above questions, if the PMQP concerns only the scenario of Lot 2,

**Question 2.1:** Please confirm that at least 70% of the award points concern the Lot 2 scenario only ("Appropriateness of the proposed team which will provide the services requested" is 40 points and "Project Management and Quality Plan" is 30 points).

**Question 2.2:** Please clarify whether the remaining 30 points of the qualitative award points (i.e. "Understanding of the objectives and consistency of the proposal in respect of the services requested") concern (a) the scenario, (b) the entire proposal or (c) both.

**Question 2.3:** if the answer to the above question is (b) or (c), please specify the documents that will be evaluated for the Tenderer's understanding of the objectives and consistency of the proposal.

3. In Clarifications no2, dated 3/8/2010, in question 2.27, your answer is "*In the context of this scenario, the migration would be undertaken by the contractor.*"

**Question 3.1:** Please confirm that the Migration task, as described in section 4.4.2, page 34 of the specifications, includes also the actual migration of content to the new WCMS, and as such the effort required must be taken into account in the overall estimated workload for the execution of the scenario.

Answer:

3.5.1.1) Please see the corrigendum No 2, published on 20/08/2010. We confirm that the PMQP to be prepared in the context of the tendering procedure is one per lot (one for lot 1 and lot 2 and none for lot 3).

3.5.1.2.) This draft PMQP refers to the specific scenario of each Lot (lot 1 and lot 2, not lot 3). Please see the corrigendum No 2, published on 20/08/2010.

3.5.1.3) Please see the corrigendum No 2, published on 20/08/2010.

3.5.1.4) The tenderer is required to prepare both documents.

3.5.1.5) No page limit is given in the tender specifications for PMQP.

3.5.2.1 – 3.5.2.3) The evaluation of tenders will be carried out **per lot** by the evaluation committee, in accordance with the award criteria **for each lot** specified in section 3 of the specifications.

3.5.3 Confirmed.

### Question 3.6:

1. According with the Annex IV ( page 66) we understand that ECHA will reimburse the travel expenses and subsistence for the project meetings in ECHA premises at Helsinki, is it correct?

2. According with terms of payment ( page 6 ) ,Is it possible to know how ECHA suppose would be the quote in percentage of Fixed price, quoted time and means specific contract and time and means specific contract ?

Answer:

- 3.6.1 Travel and subsistence expenses incurred in connection with meetings which the Contractor is required to attend will be reimbursed.
- 3.6.2 The type of specific contract (Fixed price contract, Quoted Time and Means contract or Time and Means contract) will be defined in function of the tasks to be carried out during the implementation of the framework contract.

**Question 3.7:**

- 1.) Can we use the same reference for one o more lots?
- 2.) Can we use the same CV for one or more lots?
- 3.) Regarding the point 2.3 Structure of the tender

*All tenders must be presented in five sections:*

*Section one: Administrative information – Presentation of the tender (see 2.1 & 2.3.1)*

*Section two: Evidence relating to the exclusion criteria (see 3.1)*

*Section three: Evidence relating to the selection criteria (see 3.2.2 & 3.2.3)*

*Section four: Technical Proposal – Addressing technical specifications and award criteria (see 2.3.2, 3.3 & 4)*

*Section five: Financial Proposal (see 2.3.3)*

We understand that we must present five(5) different files ( one for each section) with the relative information may be group in a big file.

So, we shall send one original version and two copies plus another electronic copy on CD rom. Under double sealed cover.

That means, all together the 3 big files and the CD in a big box inside the envelope ( inner envelope )with the address:

European Chemicals Agency ( ECHA)  
Finance Unit R1  
Invitation Tender N° ECHA/2010/124

“Not to be opened by the internal mail service”

And this envelope, inside the another upper envelope only with the address:

European Chemicals Agency ( ECHA)  
Finance Unit R1  
Invitation Tender N° ECHA/2010/124  
Annankatu,18  
00120 Helsinki  
Finland

Is it correct our interpretation ? or in both envelopes we must write the note “Not to be opened by the internal mail service”.

Is it not necessary to separate the financial propose to the other section?

Answer:

- 3.7.1 The same reference may be submitted for one or more lots if the reference fulfils the requirements of the specific Lot.
- 3.7.2 See reply to 3.3.2.
- 3.7.3 Both envelopes should mention: "Not to be opened by the internal mail service". The financial proposal (section 5 of the offer) should be in a separate envelope.

**Question 3.8:**

- 1.) For Lot 2 work packages, what would be the work ratio on Design and Development? (reference: General)
- 2.) Is Annual Turnover criteria mentioned in each lot, is this turnover of the particular Lot work executed or Annual Turnover of the company? (reference Section 3.2.1)
- 3.) Periodicity of progress review meetings for Lot 1 and Lot 2 specifies bi-monthly. Can the periodicity be decided based on the specific contracts? (reference: Section 4.4.1 & 4.4.2)
- 4.) As part of the final report, is ECHA expecting any specific statistics to be covered? (reference: Section 4.3.5.3.3)
- 5.) Web Development customer references should it be only in Java or we can consider the references of Web Development being done in .Net/SharePoint/PHP etc. (reference: Section 4.3.4.2)

Answer

- 3.8.1 The tasks for lot 2 are indicated in section 4.3.4.2. More specific information about the execution of the work will be detailed in the specific contracts.
- 3.8.2 The overall annual turnover of the tenderer.
- 3.8.3 The bi-monthly meeting as indicated in section 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 are just for the scope of the scenarios.
- 3.8.4 The information about the statistics to be provided will be detailed in the specific contracts.
- 3.8.5 There is no restriction concerning programming languages in customer references in section 4.3.4.2.

**Question 3.9:**

The final evaluation will be done considering the total quality points and the prices of the lot (section 5.7) where only the off-site prices should be used (the three scenarios do not foresee T&M activities and they are all in the Contractor premises). According to this does the Unit Price of Onsite of the section 5.6 has any kind of involvement in the awarding criteria? In case it is used could you explain how?

Answer:

Your assumption is correct, they do not influence the award of the contract.

**Question 3.10:**

Page 26, Ch. 4.3.4.2 - (Lot 2: web development) it says:

“All the development shall be compatible with a Web Content Management System yet to be selected by ECHA. [...]The Agency will provide the relevant licenses to allow the contractor to work with the WCMS. Any training required on the use and possible development of the WCMS is on contractor’s responsibility.”

Question 1:

Is our understanding correct, that the contractor of Lot 2 will be involved during the evaluation/selection of the new WCMS?

Question 2:

If NOT, is our understanding correct, that the contractor will have to train its own developer resources in case that the chosen WCMS is not part of the technology portfolio?  
Will those training measures be covered by the framework contract?

Question 3:

In case that the WCMS evaluation is not part of this framework contract and ECHA is already evaluating possible WCMS, which products are currently shortlisted?

Answer:

- 3.10.1 No, the contractor will not be involved in the evaluation / selection of the WCMS.
- 3.10.2 Yes, any training required on the use and possible development of the WCMS is on contractor’s responsibility. Training measures will not be covered by the framework contract.
- 3.10.3 ECHA is not in a position of giving out any prior information about the WCMS yet to be selected.

**Question 3.11:**

**Clarification 1:**

4.4.2 – Scenario for Lot 2 – Web Development

"Deliverables

Bi-monthly progress reports;"

Questions:

We understand that the bi monthly progress reports correspond to two reports within a month. Please confirm.

**Clarification 2:**

Please take into account the following points of the tender specifications and the relevant ECHA's answers:

- 1) 2.3.2, Section Four: technical proposal,
- 2) 4.4 Scenarios,
- 3) Question 1.10, 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."
- 4) Question 2.1, Answer: "Yes. PMQP must be submitted for the specific lot for which the tender is submitted (lot 1 and/or lot 2)."

Questions:

It is not clear to us what the tenderers should submit as a response to the technical award criteria. Could you please clarify which of the following three cases is the correct one in order the tenderers to be in position to present their offers with the most effective manner and in conformity with the requirements of the tender specifications:

Case A: ONLY one document is required as a response to the technical award criteria. This document will be the maximum of 4 pages long and it should present briefly the approach for each task necessary for the implementation of the scenario. It also should present the deliverables without submitting any of them (e.g PMQP). In the Lot 1, this 4 pages document will be accompanied by a portfolio of at least three references of web site graphic design. The whole technical proposal (Section 4 of the offer) will be 4 pages, while in the Lot 1 will be accompanied by the portfolio of web design projects.

Case B: As a response to the award criteria the tenderer should submit the following documents:

- 1) A document of maximum 4 pages long describing the different tasks of the scenario
- 2) A document where the tenderers should describe the approach for each task of the scenario (without restriction on the number of pages). No description of tasks others than those requested in the scenario should be analysed.
- 3) A document which should describe the deliverables including the PMQP. The PMQP itself should be presented.

In the Lot 1, a portfolio of at least three references of web site graphic design should also be submitted.

There is no restriction on the number of pages concerning the technical proposal (Section 4 of the offer).

Case C: The tenderer should follow the distinction of the award criteria as they are presented in chapter 3.3 – Stage 3 – Application of Award Criteria (assessment of tenderers) in the presentation of its technical offer. In particular the tenderer should submit as a response to the award criteria the following:

- 1) A document presenting the proposed team with respect to the scenario (no restriction on the number of pages)
- 2) Understanding of the objectives of the scenario (4 pages document)
- 3) A project management and quality plan (no restriction on the number of pages)

In the Lot 1 the aforementioned documents will be accompanied by a portfolio of at least three references of web site graphic design.

There is no restriction on the number of pages concerning the technical proposal (Section 4 of the offer).

Could you please clarify which of the aforementioned cases is the correct one? In case none of the above is the correct please specify explicitly what the tenderers should submit with respect to the award criteria. We would highly appreciate your advice in this point in order to present our offer with the appropriate manner.



Furthermore, could you please specify how the award criteria as specified in chapter 3.3 – Stage 3 – Application of Award Criteria (assessment of tenderers) will be applied in the correct case?

**Clarification 3:**

We understand that in case that the tenderers should submit in the context of the award criteria a PMQP, this PMQP should correspond to the scenario and NOT to the framework contract as a whole. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

**Clarification 4:**

3.2 Stage 2-Application of Selection Criteria, page 17/82:

"If several service Providers are involved in the bid, each of them must have the professional and technical capacity to perform the tasks assigned to them in the Tender and the necessary economic and financial capacity".

Question:

It is our understanding that the selection criteria for both the economic and financial capacity as well as the technical and professional capacity will be applied at the level of the consortium/group of tenderers submitting a joint offer. Evidences should be provided by each provider involved in the joint offer in order the consortium/group of tenderers as a whole to meet the tender thresholds. Please confirm that our understanding is correct.

**Clarification 5:**

Invitation to Tender Letter, point 5:

"Tenders must be:

- signed by the tenderer or his duly authorized representative;
- .....

and

2 Form and Content of the Tender, 2.1 General, page 11/82:

"Tenders must be signed by the Tenderer or his duly authorised representative"

Question:

Could you please specify whether the Tenderer should sign each page of the submitted offer or it is sufficient to provide solely a signed cover letter and any other form and statement that is required?

**Clarification 6:**

2 Form and Content of the Tender, 2.1 General, page 11/82:

"Tenders must be clear and concise, with continuous page numbering, and assembled in a coherent fashion (e.g. bound or stapled, etc.)."

Question:

Could you please specify if it is mandatory for Tenderers to follow a continuous page numbering in their offers?

Can you please indicate if all of the types of Tender page numbering presented below will be accepted?

Example 1:

1, 2, 3, 4, ..., 3589 (i.e. the tender has a total of 3,589 pages)

Example 2:

I-1,2,3,... 457 - II-1,2,3,..., 1875 - III-1,2,3,...,87, etc. (where I, II, III, etc. stands for Section One, Section Two, Section Three, etc.)

Example 3:

I-A-1,2,3,...54 - I-B-1,2,3,...,87 - I-C-1,2,3,...,280 etc. (In this example, Section One is composed of three documents, namely document A (pages 1-54), document B (pages 1-87) and document C (pages 1-280).

Should document separators, index tags, dossier covers, cover letter, etc. also be included in the continuous page numbering?

Answer:

- 3.11.1 Bi-monthly progress reports correspond to one report every two months
- 3.11.2 The documents which will be used to assess the tenders at the award stage are those listed in section 4.4 and, for specific lots as deliverables, in section 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3.  
As award criteria, for the appropriateness of the proposed team which will provide the service requested, the tenders should pay attention to the relevant description of the team proposed for the scenarios.
- 3.11.3 Correct. (see clarifications 1.12 and 2.1 and corrigendum 2)
- 3.11.4 If several service providers are involved in a joint offer, their consolidated economic and financial, professional and technical capacity will be taken into consideration in order to assess the selection criteria. The same also applies when the tenderer relies on the capacities of sub-contractors for fulfilling the selection criteria, to the extent that the sub-contractor(s) puts its resources at the disposal of the tenderer for the performance of the Contract.
- 3.11.5 It is sufficient to provide a signed cover letter. The offer should be signed, not each page.
- 3.11.6 The tender should be clearly structured. Tenderers are required to submit their tenders with continuous page numbering. All presented page numbering types are acceptable. Tenderers may include document separators, index tags, dossier covers, etc. in the continuous page numbering.

**Question 3.12:**

1. In the case of joint offers, we read:
- On p. 10: the documents required and listed in the present specifications must be supplied by every member of the grouping
  - On p. 17: if several service Providers are involved in the bid, each of them must have the professional and technical capacity to perform the tasks assigned to them...
  - Still on p. 17: Sufficient economic and financial capacity ..... the tenderer (in our case, a grouping of companies) must have .... At least 5 completed contacts.... Sufficient staff... in average in minimum xxx staff...
  - On p. 18-19: Evidence of the technical and professional capacity of the Providers involved in the Tender should be provided by the following documents: customer references....
  - On p. 82 – checklist of documents to be submitted: for Evidence of technical and professional capacity, all parties are selected

Are we correct in understanding that, as is the case in other public calls for tenders, it is the technical and professional capacity of the consortium as a whole that will be assessed, i.e.

a/ 5 customer references have to be provided by the consortium (and not 5 by each member of the consortium). Please confirm.

b/ Statement of permanent and technical staff: each company provides its figures, but it is for the consortium that the threshold has to be attained. Please confirm. Correct

c/ Sufficient staff with relevant education and professional experience: one CV has to be provided per profile and per lot by the consortium and not by each member of the consortium separately. Please confirm.

d/ Regarding the financial and economic capacity: p. 18, it reads “all the tenderers must provide proof ....”. Could you please specify, in case of a joint bid, whether you mean the tenderer (i.e. the consortium) as a whole or the service providers (i.e. each company) separately?

2. For references:

- On p. 17, “have a minimum 3 year experience” : we understand this has to be demonstrated by at least 5 references spread across the years 2007-2009. Is our understanding correct? If not, please specify
- In Annex 5.8 “customer references”: we have to specify the start and end dates – as well as the total duration. Are we correct in understanding you mean the duration of the project (i.e. for start until end date)?

Answer:

3.12.1 In case of joint offers, we confirm what is mentioned under a, b and c and for d/ the consortium is meant.

3.12.2.1 It is not mandatory to have the technical and professional experience over the last 3 years.

3.12.2.2 Yes. The tenderers should pay attention to the fact that the duration of a project might be different from the period between the start and end date (e.g. project breaks).

**Question 3.13:**

1. Will the scope of work that needs to be covered in Fixed payments be circulated as separate RFP? Or are the vendors expected to provide fixed prices for the each lot now itself? (Reference: Page 6, payment terms, sections 1.7)

2. In the Quoted Time and Means specific contracts, can the vendor include onsite and offshore delivery model depending on the specific contract or should it be completely done at contractor’s premises?

Over can Vendor consider the providing onsite offshore model where offshore is not located in Europe? (Reference: Page 6, payment terms sections 1.7)

3. In the specific contract conditions will there be a multi vendor scenario involved to execute a particular project or will the contract be awarded to single vendor depending on the requirements? (Reference Page 7, Specific contract conditions 1.7.1)

4. What pricing model will be used in a specific contract conditions will it be purely Time and Means as per the agreed price schedule? Or will it be fixed bid as well? (Reference Page 7, specific contract conditions 1.7.1)

5. With regard to training within appropriateness of the proposed team, are you looking at internal team within the Vendor for resource replacement and knowledge dissemination or the contractor should train the agency on any specific areas? (Reference: Page 19, Section 3.3 Stage 3 Application of award criteria)

6. With regard to Lot1 Web Design, will agency provide licenses for Adobe Photoshop, Macromedia Dreamweaver, Flash, IRISE etc for carrying out design and prototyping (Reference Page 26, Section 4.3.4.1 Lot1 Web Design)

7. With regard to Lot3 Web consultancies, do you expect the contractor to provide pure play consultancy in all the areas defined or will it include implementation of SEO recommendations or web analytics tool implementation etc? (Reference: Page 26, Section 4.3.4.3 Lot 3 Web Consultancies)

8. With regard to Lot3 web consultancies, do you expect the contractor to work on multi language sites? (Reference: Page 26, Section 4.3.4.3 Lot 3 Web Consultancies)

9. With regard to Lot3 web consultancies, what kind of training do you expect the vendor to provide the ECHA staff? In what format? Could you please give some examples (Reference: Page 27, Section 4.3.4.3 Lot 3 web consultancies)

10. With regard to Lot 3 web consultancies, will all specific contracts under this category is expected to be implemented from contractor's premises or will it require delivery from agency's premises or combination of both? (Reference: Page 27, Section 4.3.4.3 Lot 3 web consultancies)

11. With regard to Organization, Project management principles, is the contractor expected to collect business requirements approvals from different stakeholders within the agency or the project Officer will do the same? (Reference: Page 27, Section 4.3.5.1 Organization)

12. With regard to Objective of Scenario Lot1, should we assume that the scope is only for main ECHA website ie (<http://echa.europa.eu>)? If so, will it involve any custom functionality or design for different languages or will it be the same across all languages? (Reference: Page 31, Section 4.4.1. Scenario for Lot 1 – Web Design)

13. With regard to tasks of Scenario Lot1, will the agency be supplying key user groups and provide licenses for conducting remote prototype testing or card sorting exercise with internal or external agency users? (Reference: Page 32, Tasks 2 & 3 Section 4.4.1 Scenario for Lot1 – Web Design)

14. With regard to final deliverable of Scenario Lot1, will the contractors supposed to give a graphical design of the new site in GIF/JPEG as per the revised navigation and information architecture or should it be clickable prototype (HTML format)? (Reference: Page 32, Task 4 Section 4.4.1 Scenario for Lot1 – Web Design)

15. Do we need to migrate all the content which ECHA has in the existing system or ECHA will give us new content for some websites. Since we have to prepare the estimation, we want to clarify that how much content and what type of content we need to migrate /create/ upload. (Reference:Page 32, Task 2 Section 4.4.1 Scenario for Lot1 – Web Design)

16. With regard to the list of tasks within the Scenario 1, should we strictly provide approach note, profiles or we could include additional profiles apart from the suggested one. Will it impact the criteria for assessment of vendor? (Reference: Page 32, Section 4.4.1 Scenario for Lot1 – Web design)

17. With regard to nature of tasks for project management profiles or project assistant profiles, is there any systems or processes from the agency side that the profiles need to understand or get trained to manage the project effectively? (Reference: Page 36, Section 4.5 Profiles)

18. In CLARIFICATIONS\_2 doc- Question 2.25 - Is it acceptable for us to base our proposal on a .NET based WCMS? The tender stated Java & .NET are acceptable, while the response to this question specifically mentions Java-based WCM alone. (Reference: CLARIFICATIONS\_2 doc ,Page 9,Question 2.25)

19. Content Migration -

1. What is the typical type of content that is required to be migrated?

2. How much content (size) is currently there? What percentage is required to be migrated to the new site?

3. Besides the page counts, can you give us indicative numbers of various type of content to be migrated? (eg. number of images, number of documents, PDFs, HTML etc.) This will be required for our estimates.

20. SharePoint & Documentum -

1. Are both SharePoint and Documentum currently used for storing documents?

2. Will both continue to be used in the near future?

3. Is there a requirement that the new Web-CMS has to tightly integrate with both SharePoint and Documentum? This will help us in narrowing the WCMS product)

21. For the user (site visitor) registration purposes, user profile management and application security, what is currently being used in ECHA? Is it Microsoft Active Directory services?

22. On page 33, it states that content editing function will be provided by the agency. However, on page 26, it does speak of "Web Mastering" that includes content modification as being in our scope. It seems contradictory. Please confirm if content editing in our scope so that we can propose the staffing accordingly. (Reference: Modified RFI doc)

23. Page 24 mentions that the discussion forum is currently hosted outside. In the future scenario, is there an expectation that this forum will also be hosted on the WCMS platform? Or will it continue to be hosted outside? If ECHA can share any thoughts they have had on this, it will help us make a decision on the WCM best suited for ECHA.

24. Post roll-out, would ECHA prefer us to include a Warranty period in our estimate? What is a typical acceptable warranty period for ECHA? (Typically it can extend from 30 - 90 days).

25. What are the roles that the IT department of ECHA will perform in this project? Knowing this can help us remove redundancy in our staffing.

## Answer

- 3.13.1 What the choice between the 3 types of specific contracts is concerned: see reply Question 3.6.2.
- 3.13.2 Quoted Time and Means contracts will be executed at the premises of the contractor (off site).
- 3.13.3 For each lot a Framework Contract will be awarded to a single contractor.
- 3.13.4 Per lot the services will be provided by means of a fixed price contract, Quoted Time and Means contract or Time and Means contract.
- 3.13.5 In the section “Appropriateness of the proposed team which will provide the services requested” the tenderers have to prove that their internal organization in terms of resources can guarantee consistently high level of services.
- 3.13.6 It depends on the specific contract and relevant deliverables.
- 3.13.7 It depends on the specific contract and relevant deliverables.
- 3.13.8 It depends on the specific contract and relevant deliverables.
- 3.13.9 It depends on the specific contract and relevant deliverables.
- 3.13.10 It depends on the specific contract.
- 3.13.11 It depends on the specific contract.
- 3.13.12 Yes, the scope of the scenario is only for the ECHA website (<http://echa.europa.eu>). The design will be the same across all languages.
- 3.13.13 In the scenario for Lot 1, the tenderer can assume that the user groups information will be provided by the Agency. In the scenario for Lot 1, tenderers should not pay attention to any licenses relevant issue.
- 3.13.14 As indicated in section 4.4, only a description of the final deliverables will be taken into account.
- 3.13.15 In the context of the scenario 2, the tenderers can assume that the content to be migrated is only the one listed in sections 4.3.2 and 4.3.3, but, as indicated in 4.4.2, its editorial revision will be provided by the Agency.
- 3.13.16 The tenderers can include additional profiles in their proposal (annexes 5.6, 5.7). As award criteria, for the appropriateness of the proposed team which will provide the service requested, the tenders should pay attention to the relevant description of the team proposed for the scenarios.
- 3.13.17 There are no additional requirements that the Project Manager and Project assistant in section 4.5 need to satisfy, apart from those indicated in the relevant section.
- 3.13.18 No, for the purpose of the scenario 2, the tenderer should base its proposal on Java technologies (section 4.4.2). The future WCMS of the Agency will be based either on .NET or Java (section 4.3.4.2), but this is not relevant to the context of the scenario 2.

- 3.13.19
- 3.13.19.1 As indicated in the scenario 2 (section 4.4.2), for a description of the web products to be migrated, please see points 4.3.2 & 4.3.3.
  - 3.13.19.2 For the content size, see the answer to the previous question. For the percentage, the whole content should be migrated (see section 4.4.2).
  - 3.13.19.3 No, the information provided in 4.4.2 is considered enough for the scope of the scenario.
- 3.13.20 Section 4.3.3 is considered enough as background information for the tenderers. The tenderers are not required to identify any WCMS for ECHA.
- 3.13.21 Section 4.3.3 is considered enough as background information for the tenderers.
- 3.13.22 On page 33 as “editorial revision”, in the scope of the scenario, the tender can assume that ECHA will provide the content revised and optimized for web communication purposes.  
On page 26 for the task “web mastering” it is meant, as indicated, the addition / modification and withdrawal of content.
- 3.13.23 The tenderers are not required to identify any WCMS for ECHA.
- 3.13.24 It is up to the tenderers to decide how to best organize their proposals for the relevant scenarios.
- 3.13.25 The information provided in section (5.7) is considered enough for the tenderers to submit their proposal about staffing. As indicated in the same section, the tenderers are allowed to add any staff they think useful for the completeness of their proposal.

**Question 3.14:**

In regards to the statement of "It shall be noted that these scenarios will be used to assess the tenders during the evaluation" our understanding of the deliverables, in specific for lot 2, of the tender are:

1. Scenario 2, a document of a maximum of four (4) pages long describing the different task that the tenderer consider necessary to ensure a successful execution
2. A separate deliverable referring to a draft PMQP of the scenario 2. Separate from the 4 pages of the scenario 2 delivery
3. Award criteria deliverables
  1. Appropriateness of the proposed team which will provide the services requested. This delivery is specific to the team and organisation of the scenario 2, but it is not part of the 4 pages of the scenario and it has no page limitation
  2. Understanding of the objectives and consistency of the proposal.
  3. Project Management and Quality Plan

Questions:

1. Is our understanding correct? If not, how many deliverables are you expecting? Is there one deliverable of the scenario 2 that should contain all award criteria evaluations in 4 pages? Or are there several deliverables supporting the scenario as mentioned above? Could you please clarify.

2. If more than one deliverable, could you please clarify if award criteria "understanding of the objectives and consistency of the proposal in respect to the services requested" is specific to the scenario or is it a more global question of the tender?
3. Is the award criteria "Project Management and Quality Plan" the draft of the PMQP? Or are you expecting the PMQP draft and also a more global explanation of the methodology and quality of the project?

Answer:

- 3.14.1 See clarification 3.11.2
- 3.14.2 For each lot, the evaluation of the "understanding of the objectives and consistency of the proposal in respect to the services requested" will be based on the relevant scenario.
- 3.14.3 Yes. ECHA does not expect more explanation of the methodology and quality of the project in addition to the draft PMQP.



### **Question 3.15:**

With respect to page 18 of the Modified document, point 3.2.3 says –

a) Customer references, including at least 5 projects where working language was English of which at least one from public sector. The customer references should be provided by using the template in Annex 5.8.

Question

In case of subcontracting, does the main contractor needs to have all 5 references? Or the main contractor and sub contractor together can submit 5 references? (e.g. 3 from main contractor and 2 from subcontractor).

Answer:

See clarification 3.11.4

### **Question 3.16:**

We have got the following questions regarding above call for tenders:

1. Profiles  
From your clarification 2.21 and 2.22, we understand that the same person can be proposed for the same profile in different lots. As the description of profile Web analyst for Lot 1 (p. 37 of consolidated version) is exactly the same as that of the Senior analyst for Lot 2 (p. 39), may we also propose the same person for those 2 profiles?
2. Acceptance procedure  
P. 30 : the deliverables will be either approved or rejected within 30 days of receipt by the Agency : do you mean 30 days after initial receipt (hence 15 days after the deliverable has been re-submitted) or 30 days after second delivery ? Could you also let us know when we may expect the clarifications to questions raised until now? In case we do not get those very soon (i.e. tomorrow), could you postpone the deadline for the submission of offers, given their potential impact on our answers?

Answer:

3.16.1 See clarification 3.3.2

3.16.2 As indicated on page 30 of the Specifications (Section 4.3.5.3.4) the Agency will inform the contractor whether the deliverable(s) is rejected within 30 days. If the deliverable is rejected, then the contractor has 15 days (from the day when they receive Agency's comments) to re-submit a revised version.

### **Question 3.17:**

Page 31, Ch. 4.4 - (Scenarios) it says:

"[...]For the purposes of evaluation, the tenderer shall:

- Prepare a document of a maximum of four (4) pages long describing the different tasks that tenderer consider necessary to ensure a successful execution of the scenario;
- For each task, tenderer will briefly describe the approach taken

- Particular attention will be given to the description of the final deliverables.  
[...]"

Question:

Is our understanding correct, that the description of the second and the third bullet point has to be included into the 4 pages document stated above?

Answer:

No. Please see clarification 3.3.