

Helsinki, 31/08/2010
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 4

Question 4.1:

Regarding above call for tenders, the specifications for the scenarios (section 4.4) apply to all scenarios. We noticed however the following differences across scenarios:

Scenario for lot 1:

- 4 tasks
- 7 deliverables

Scenario for lot 2:

- 7 tasks
- 9 deliverables

Scenario for lot 3:

- 1 main task
- 3 main deliverables

As you request a document of maximum 4 pages to describe:

- the different tasks needed
- the approach taken
- the final deliverables

it would mean, for the scenario 2, that we have on average ½ page to describe a task, the approach taken to perform it, and its different deliverables.

In order to provide a better description of the deliverables, could that description be provided in the PMQP? Please let us know for lot 2 in particular and indicate whether this also applies to the other lots.

Answer:

See clarification 3.3, point 1.

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

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

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

Question 4.2:

1. Ref. scenario for lot 2: please clarify if, as part of the described assignment, "migration" means that all non-Java applications (such as applications written in php or aspx) will be entirely rewritten in Java by the contractor, or if the non-Java applications will only be integrated into the chosen WCMS.
2. Ref. scenario for lot 2: regarding the migration of externally-hosted applications (more specifically the REACH discussion forum): please confirm if the discussion forum will only be integrated into the chosen WCMS, or if it will need to be re-written as part of the assignment in order to benefit from potential technological advantages offered by the chosen WCMS.
3. Ref. scenario for lot 2: regarding the migration of externally-hosted applications (more specifically the REACH discussion forum): please confirm if the discussion forum will be migrated and hosted internally alongside with the WCMS, or if it will continue to be hosted externally.
4. Ref. scenario for lot 2: at page 31 it is required as follows: "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;". Please confirm:
 - a) If all (7) tasks will be described in the 4 pages, or each of the 7 tasks will be described in 4 pages each.
 - b) If any other information regarding the scenario, such as required team, activities, deliverables etc will enter into the mentioned 4 pages.
5. Please confirm that the only CVs that must and should be included in the offer are the CVs required at paragraph 3.2.3, page 19 of the tender documentation, bullet c), that requires exactly 1 CV per requested profile. In particular, please confirm that CVs are not considered for the application of Award criteria (assessment of tenders).

Answer:

1. In the context of the scenario for lot 2, all the products listed in 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 should be migrated and integrated in a WCMS based on Java. It is up to the tenderers to identify the best way to do it.
2. See 4.2.1
3. The tenderers can assume, in the context of the scenario, that the Lead Registrant forum will be hosted inside ECHA.
4. See clarification 3.3.1

5. Yes, confirmed. The CVs will be used for the selection of the tenderers, not for the assessment of the tenders in light of the award criteria.

Question 4.3:

Having reviewed the existing clarifications and documentation for ECHA/2010/124 Framework Contract for web services I am still unclear about the PMQP as it relates to the content to be included in Section 4.

4.3.5.3.1 p28

"All tenderers shall supply a draft overall Project Management and Quality Plan (PMQP)."

4.4 p31

"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".

Clarifications 1

"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."

Clarifications 2

"PMQP must be submitted for the specific lot for which the tender is submitted"

My question is as follows:

Should the 4 page document in Section 4 include the draft PMQP, or should we supply a 4 page document describing the approach and tasks with the PMQP as an additional item?

Answer:

For lot 1 and 2, the PMQP should be submitted as a separated document from the 4 page document in Section 4. For lot 3 no PMQP is required.

Question 4.4:

In the scenarios section of the tender it states that – Prepare a document of a maximum of four pages long describing the different tasks that tenderer consider necessary to ensure a successful execution of the scenario.

Please could you confirm that this is 4 pages per task and not 4 pages for the entire scenario that encompasses 4 tasks.

Answer:

No, the 4 pages document should describe all tasks the tenderer considers necessary to ensure a successful execution of the whole scenario. See clarification 3.3.1 for additional information.

Question 4.5:

In regards to “Section 5.6 - Price Schedule”, do we have to provide CVs for every profile that we may propose, in addition to the ones required by the Tender?

Answer:

No, tenderers are not required to provide CVs for additional profiles they might want to include in “Section 5.6. - Price Schedule”.

Question 4.6:

The Invitation to Tender mentions:

“4. The tender must be submitted, in triplicate (one set of originals and two sets of copies) and in electronic format on CD ROM, under double sealed cover.”

Must we include in the CD all sections of the Tender? (i.e. Section one, Section two, Section three, Section four and Section five)

Answer:

The complete offer should be on CD ROM.

Question 4.7:

In regards to the second corrigendum to the Tender, which reads:

2. Section 4.3.5.3, page 28, instead of

“All tenderers shall supply a draft overall Project Management and Quality Plan (PMQP). The plan submitted by the tenderers can be based on their own (approved) model.”

It should read

“The contractor shall supply a draft overall Project Management and Quality Plan (PMQP). The plan submitted by the contractor can be based on their own (approved) model.”

From our experience, when a reference is made to the Contractor it implies that it refers to any actions after the tenderer has been awarded the contract.

Does this mean, that we do not have to include with our bid a draft overall PMQP?

Also, if we don't have to include a PMPQ with our bid, how is the “Qualitative award criteria” affected?

Answer:

See clarifications 3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.2, 3.11.2 and 3.14.3.

Question 4.8:

3.2 Stage 2 – Application of selection criteria (selection of tenders), “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 and economic and financial capacity”, p. 17

Questions:

Usually, the technical and professional capacity is assessed for the Consortium as a whole. However, in that case we understand that each company of the Consortium should cover the criteria for the technical and professional capacity (i.e. 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the chapter 3.2.1 Selection Criteria). Could you please confirm that it is the case? In cases of subcontractors, does the same condition apply? It is obvious that a tenderer proposes a sub-contractor in order to cover a specific business domain, technology, etc. Could you please clarify why the sub-contractors need to cover the technical and professional capacity for all the fields of the lot in the context of this CfT?

Answer:

See 3.11.4.

Question 4.9:

Could you clarify if the documents related to subcontractors should be submitted in originally signed form, or if a copy is considered sufficient?

Answer:

The documents submitted (e.g. letter of intent, legal entity form, exclusion criteria form) should be originals.

Question 4.10:

1.1 The PMQP is a document that is usually specific to a project (a specific contract). It cannot exist in the context of a framework contract as it is not a continuous service with various types of services and activities:

1.1.1 What is your definition of a ‘project’? As it is referred to in section 4.3.5.3.1, page 28?

1.1.2 How can a Tenderer propose a draft PMQP? For which services, what duration, size and volume? For example do you expect that a specific contract of say 5,000 Euros should be accompanied by a PMQP?

1.1.3 You mention that the PMQP is the first deliverable for the project... Do you mean specific contract? See also question (b) above?

1.2 Do you expect the Tenderer to describe its methodologies towards the tasks of Lot X? If yes, where exactly should we do that?

Answer:

1.1.1 Each specific contract under the framework contract is considered a project (or can include more than one project).

1.1.2 The tenderer should propose a draft PMQP only in the context of the scenarios (particularly lot 1 and 2). See clarifications 3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.2 and 3.5.1.3.

1.1.3 See clarifications 1.1 and 1.2

1.2 The information about the methodology adopted e.g. can be included in the documents listed in the first two bullets point of section 4.1 and/or in the relevant deliverables for each scenario (e.g. PMQP - for lot 1 and 2 -, Risk Management Plan, etc.). It is up to the tenderer to decide how to best structure their proposal.

Question 4.11:

Referring to point 3.2.1 Selection criteria - 2.3 Technical and professional capacity for Lot 2 -

1. the tenderer must (at the time the offer is submitted) have at a minimum three year experience in web development, with at least 5 completed contracts where working language was English.
2. sufficient staff with relevant education and professional experience meeting the defined requirements in section 4.5
3. the tenderer must have over the last three years in average in minimum 20 technical staff working in web development.”

Can you please confirm that the Technical and professional capacity for LOT 2 must NOT be accomplished by each subcontractor individually?

Answer:

Yes, confirmed. See also 3.11.4.

Question 4.12:

1. We understand that you request One PMQP per LOT specifically for the SCENARIOS. This is not going to be included in the 4-pages limitation. Can you confirm?

2. What are exactly the contents of the Technical Proposal that you expect? Your references to various sections may lead to different interpretations.
3. In the Award Criteria you mention 4 different parts to be evaluated accordingly.
 - 3.1 Since the Scenario is not mentioned, how and where is it going to be evaluated in the context of these criteria?
 - 3.2 How will the Scenario be evaluated in terms of points and scores? How will this integrate with the 100 max points assigned to each Lot?

Answer:

1. Yes, confirmed for lot 1 and 2. For lot 3, no PMQP is required.
2. and 3 (3.1, 3.2). The tenders are per lot assessed according to the award criteria mentioned under point 3.3 of the Specifications. The tenderer is requested to make per lot a technical and financial offer in light of the scenarios mentioned under point 4.4 of the Specifications.

Question 4.13:

1. If a branch company intends to rely on parent company for financial and economic criteria, do we need to establish a relationship (as a consortium or sub contractor)? Or can we just submit the financial documents of parent company for it to be considered?
2. In an event of parent company being a subcontractor will the financial resources of parent company be accepted (having said that sub contractor signs a document stating that its resources are at disposal of the tenderer for the performance of the contract)?
3. If financial resources of parent company are considered in a sub contractor relationship, will the resources considered be in proportion to amount of work that will be performed by the sub contractor?

Answer:

1. No. An economic operator (e.g. branch) may rely on the capacities of other entities (e.g. the parent company), regardless of the legal nature of the link which it has with them. In that case, evidence must be provided that the branch will have at its disposal the resources necessary for the performance of the contract, for example by producing a clear undertaking on the part of the parent company to place those resources at its disposal.
2. Yes.
3. In case of subcontracting, for the selection criteria for economic and financial capacity, a consolidated assessment will be made, to the extent that the subcontractor puts its resources at the disposal of the tenderer (branch) for the performance of the contract.

Question 4.14:

Is scenario for Lot 2 expected to cover integration and migrations of all the sites and applications listed under 4.3.2. to one single website, or to a single WCMS, or is it only the current ECHA main website that is meant by the Scenario specifications?

Answer:

The scenario for Lot 2 is expected to cover the integration and migrations of the products listed in 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 to one single website and one single WCMS.

Question 4.15:

On p. 31, it is indicated that “the tender is required to analyze and provide a detailed technical and financial offer” (according to the scenario provided) and further down: “for the purposes of the evaluation, the tenderer shall prepare a document of a maximum of 4 pages long...”

“Qualitative evaluation of the tenders will be based on criteria specified in section 3.3”

Those criteria are the following;

Appropriateness of the team (including staff management measures) – for all lots

Understanding of the objectives – for all lots

Originality – for lot 1 only

PMQP – for all lots

1. Are we correct in understanding that:
 - PMQP
 - Presentation of the team

Are to be provided in addition to the 4 pages document? Please confirm.

2. Regarding the understanding of objectives (for all lots) and originality (for lot 1), could you please specify whether those should be reflected in the 4 pages document or on top of it?
3. We understand that for lot 1, the description of the portfolio is to be provided in addition to the 4 pages document. Is that correct?

Answer:

1. Yes, confirmed.
2. Please see 3.11.2.
3. Yes, it is correct.

Question 4.16:

Are we correct in understanding that it is the document that we will get from them (or a copy of that, that you will get upon delivery at your side) when they pick up the documents at our premises, that is considered as “deposit slip” for timely submission? In other word, is it the date and time of the documents being given to the courier service, that is taken into account (and not the time of delivery of the documents at your premises)? Please confirm.

Answer:

Your understanding is correct. It is the date on which the offer is handed over to the courier and not the date of arrival at ECHA.