



European Centre for the  
Development of Vocational Training  
Procurement Service

## **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION (1) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **Question Nr. 1**

*Could you please confirm that CEDEFOP will accept Tenders with postmark on the 5<sup>th</sup> of December 2006, irrespectively from the exact time submitted to the post office?*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 1**

Yes.

### **Question Nr. 2**

*Cover Letter, point 4, page 2, "Tenderers must ensure that their tenders are signed by a duly authorised representative...".*

*And*

*Annex F – "both the technical and financial proposal of the offer are signed by the tenderer or his duly authorised agent.*

*Question:*

*Could you please confirm that a signed cover letter in our offer by the Tenderer's duly authorised representative is sufficient? If not, please specify whether it is requested by CEDEFOP to sign each page of both the technical and the financial proposal.*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 2**

Signature in the cover letter, as well as a signature in the financial offer, are enough.

### **Question Nr. 3**

*Could you please confirm that the deadline for raising questions is the 29<sup>th</sup> of November 2006?*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 3**

As mentioned in the tendering documents: "Request for additional information received less than five working days before the closing date for submission of tenders will not be processed".

#### **Question Nr. 4**

*In Questionnaire 1 – Selection Criteria, it is requested for Tenderers to ‘enclose a list of contracts performed during the past three years’ (question 5). Moreover, question 6 requests additional information as regards the Tenderers relevant projects. In particular, Tenderers are here requested: “to certify experience of the company with the requested kind of software products and services and its ability to offer a mature solution please indicate online communities of practice projects and customers that have used the platform before 2004 (2004 included). Use any facts and documents to prove that you have offered communities of practice web platforms and tools at least for two years. You can use the same project form as above.”*

- a) *Could you please indicate why CEDEFOP chose the threshold of Dec 2004 and not any other date (i.e. Dec 2006)?*
- b) *In case a Tenderer can demonstrate several references of active online communities for various major institutions and projects, will this be considered by CEDEFOP as unacceptable, if these communities are active after December 2004?*
- c) *The opinion of our Legal Department is that this is not a valid Selection Criterion. Could you please verify this with the Commission’s DG MARKT?*
- d) *How many references that satisfy the criterion of question 6 should be included in a Tenderer’s proposal? Please provide us with the minimum threshold.*

#### **Cedefop’s clarification to Question Nr. 4**

- a) Question 5 addresses the overall recent relevance of the tenderer experience with the requested kind of products and services.  
The meaning of Question 6 is to constrain further the experience requested in Question 5. More precisely it aims to ensure that no company can be accepted having only contracts that started in 2005 and thereafter. This is to prove the maturity and stability of the provider (and consequently the solution he/she is able to provide) given the fact that the call is addressing a highly fragmented, versatile and fast moving market, where companies and products are emerging and disappearing constantly. Maturity proven by “time in the particular market” of over two years is considered a valuable asset for company selection in this call, as one must take also into account that we are aiming at the continuation with minimum disturbances of an already operational Cedefop service, provided to more than 5000 users.
- b) As you can understand from the answer given above, a minimum of two years “time in the particular market” is requested.  
If in your question “..are active after December 2004” means that the project has started (proven by contract facts or otherwise) at the latest in January 2005, then we would be able to accept the proposal in a case so close to boundaries, of course given that other selection criteria are met, although the normal limit for the project start is actually December 2004 and before.
- c) It is a valid selection criteria.
- d) There is no minimum threshold for references submitted.

### **Question Nr. 5**

*In the Financial Proposal, it is mentioned that Tenderers have to provide a price as regards the cost of a person-day for migration, tailor-made integration and minor development services for custom expansions. Could you please specify if the Tenderer is permitted to propose different daily rates per type of activity indicated above, or whether it is mandatory to propose one single (average) daily rate?*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 5**

In order to allow for simplicity in evaluation only one price can be given for all types of requested services.

### **Question Nr. 6**

- a) Could you please indicate which is the current platform used by CEDEFOP as regards the Virtual Communities? Also could you please indicate who, was the Supplier of this platform?*
- b) Could you please indicate the drawbacks of the current platform?*
- c) Is CEDEFOP in favour of a specific platform to be purchased? Has CEDEFOP conducted any survey to facilitate its decision as regards the platform to be purchased? If so, could you please provide us with all relevant documentation and results?*
- d) Please specify the size/volume of the data/content to be migrated to the new platform.*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 6**

- a) The current platform used is CommunityZero by Ramius Corporation <http://www.ramius.ca/>.
- b) This question is not considered relevant.
- c) Cedefop is not in favour of a specific platform.
- d) Number of current users is already mentioned in the tendering documents in §2.3 (~5000 users). The volume of the data of all currently operational VC's in terms of MB is about 800MB. To have an idea of the type of data, please take into account the exported sample files from the current system that are published together with the tendering documents on Cedefop's web site.

### **Question Nr. 7**

*With regards to the implementation of a single sign-on procedure:*

- a) Could you please provide more information on any user directories other than those which are LDAP-based? Regarding the LDAP installation, could you please specify the LDAP server details (vendor, version, etc.). Finally, what users have been stored in the LDAP and what in the communities user database?*
- b) Do any Cedefop portals which will be accessed using the implemented SSO procedure already exist? If so, are there any specific integration requirements?*
- c) Will the SSO implementation be dependent on the technical details of any upcoming portals? If so, could you please provide any relevant technical details?*
- d) Will the solution be required to act as the authorization/authentication authority, or will the solution interface with such an authority (existing or planned)?*

### **Cedefop's clarification to Question Nr. 7**

- a) This requirement stems from the fact that today the Virtual Communities user base is a subset of the LDAP user base of Cedefop's main ETV (electronic training village) site ([www.trainingvillage.gr](http://www.trainingvillage.gr)). There exist today a single sign on procedure between the two systems which is very convenient to both users and administrators. Due to reasons of equal competition and due to the fact that user registration policy in ETV is about to change, we are not considering as a mandatory requirement to be able to recreate the same kind of single sign on procedure with the new platform, but it is a plus. As our entire web architecture and systems are subject to change in the future with specifications not finalised at this point of time, it is considered a plus if the platform can be integrated with various types of user bases (the type and number of which is intended to be an evaluation criterion). In addition we are asking for an estimation of maximum person-days possibly needed to implement a specific SSO project focusing on LDAP user bases in general, based on our existing ETV platform user base.
- b) See above. This single sign on implementation is a possible future project with no exact requirements at this time.
- c) See answer to a)
- d) For the scope of the evaluation procedure (question 6, of questionnaire 2) please focus on a solution of your choice that provides single sign on capabilities. The bottom-line condition is that users should not logon twice if they visit the new system through the in-house website link.