FINANCE AND PROCUREMENT

Thessaloniki, 05 September 2013

CLARIFICATIONS 2 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Web development, support and maintenance services for the Cedefop official website
AO/CID/NT/Website-CMS_services/014/13

REFERENCE: http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/EN/working-with-us/public-procurements/21710.aspx

Question 1:

ANNEX M, CMS requirements list and fit-gap reply form, ID 24
"An approval workflow will be needed for certain content types and/or for the content of special pages (e.g. approval of content on the homepage)."
Could you provide information on how many different groups of editors (i.e. with different user rights) need to be supported and how many different workflows are necessary to fulfil Cedefop's requirements?

Cedefop answer 1:

The number of user groups or the number of workflows is not an essential factor for the selection of a suitable CMS. Nevertheless, about 10 to 15 user groups would be needed, one for each content type or different section of the website, for example "News posters". Editors will be able to publish content without approval by other users.
Editors can flag content to be included also in the homepage. One workflow will be needed for simple approval of that content before it appears in the homepage. Also, one translations' workflow will be needed.

Question 2:

ANNEX N, Instructions for the exercise, ID 4
Do you expect the migration concept to cover also the automatic migration of all content in French and German? How shall pages be treated that have mixed language content, e.g. navigation structure in DE and content in EN? For which part of the content shall the "include in site variant" meta-information be provided? How is this currently implemented and how would you expect the migration to proceed?

Cedefop answer 2:

According to the exercise as described in Annex N, the tenderer is required to describe various tasks which consist of a sub-set of the real migration. Therefore, only the content in the Microsoft Access database has to be migrated: the content, as listed under ID 7, will be flagged according to the language variants. The current implementation is irrelevant with this exercise.

Question 3:

ANNEX N, Instructions for the exercise, ID 7
Shall all content items provided in the current web-portal be migrated? Does this include content that has already been automatically migrated once prior to the launch of the current portal? Is additional quality assurance of the current content necessary before applying migration scripts?

Cedefop answer 3:

In this exercise, the content only consists of what is described in ID 7, and would be provided in the form of a Microsoft Access database as described in ID 2; therefore, it does not cover the complete content that currently exists on the Webportal. As for the methodology to apply, it is up to the tenderer to propose the most suitable one for managing this task.

Question 4:

ANNEX N, Instructions for the exercise, ID 9
ID 9 describes the desired configuration of the homepage. Shall the implementation of these functionalities be included in the migration's work plan? Shall each language variant get an individual home page?

Cedefop answer 4:

In the ID 9 the tenderers are expected to describe how these functionalities can be implemented. These functionalities are part of the exercise and must therefore appear in the work plan. Each language variant should have its own homepage with the same functionalities.

Question 5:

ANNEX N, Instructions for the exercise, page 4, Indicative list of fields of each content type
Is there an export available already? Does it contain all listed fields? Does it respect the export of item/node id's instead of text, when referencing other content/lists? Is the export customizable?

Cedefop answer 5:

This is only a theoretical exercise: there is no ready database. The tenderers can safely assume that the database contains the listed fields and the relationships between them (foreign keys, etc.). For this exercise there is no need for a customized export.

Question 6:

Tender Specifications, Terms of Reference, chapter 2.4.1
Could you please specify all existing Web applications that are in scope of the migration on order to enable the tenderer to calculate a monthly hosting fee?

Cedefop answer 6:

Information provided in clarification 1, annexes P and Q as well as the tender specifications are considered to be sufficient for the tenders to submit an offer for the hosting monthly fee. See also answer to question 7.

Question 7:

General Question on hosting services
Is the application "Skills forecast" in scope of the future hosting services? Could you provide a quantity structure of this application?

Cedefop answer 7:

The Skills forecast's application is currently out of the scope of the CMS. The tenderer's offer related to the hosting should therefore cover only the requirements of Annex Q and any other requirement imposed by the CMS that the tenderer will have proposed.

Question 8:

ANNEX M - ID 11, Annex O
"The user must be able to add any number of photos or videos in this section."
How will videos be hosted? External (e.g. Youtube or Video Streaming Service Provider) or should it be handled by the site/hosting environment itself?

Cedefop answer 8:

It is up to the tenderer to propose the optimum solution for the hosting of videos, either internally or externally on a "cloud" or streaming service provider.

Question 9:

ANNEX M in general

Do we have to use the ANNEX-Template to answer question therein or can we also use our own document and refer to the regarding questions/requirements of the ANNEX.

Cedefop answer 9:

The tenderers can use their own document but must clearly link each point of ANNEX-M to the related answer stated in their document.

Question 10:

Annex Q, chapter 2.7 "Support" / Financial Offer, Table 3
Is the described 1st and 2nd Level Support expected to be included in the cost of monthly hosting or will it be additionally charged, e.g. on a T&M basis?

Cedefop answer 10:

Section 2.7 of Annex Q describes the conditions (e.g. availability, infrastructure, response time, etc.) and this is included in the cost of monthly hosting. Actual work done by the contractor following a request from Cedefop will be charged on a time and mean basis (see also section 2.7.2 of the call for tender).

Question 11:

Could you please provide clarification to the following questions associated with Annex O - the Demo:

a- Can we assume that for the demo requested that no graphical work is required? It appears that this request is in conflict with the request to provide a screen shot of page "list of events" where some graphics work would be required to reflect the requirement.

Cedefop answer 11 a:

The tenderer may use simple graphics if deem necessary; nevertheless, the quality of graphics will not be evaluated; therefore no effort for graphical works is required. The screen shot is meant to show the work done at the date of submission: what matters is how the information related to the events will be listed.

b- Could you please clarify what is meant by blue print in this particular context as stated in the Notes associated with the Demo - Annex 0

Cedefop answer 11 b:

"blue-print" means that the tenderer is expected to submit a prototype demonstration and not a final solution.