



European Centre for the  
Development of Vocational Training  
Procurement Service

## **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION (2) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **Question Nr. 1**

*Tendering Specifications, point 4.1, 'Such groups (or consortia) must specify the company or person heading the project and must also submit a copy of the document authorising this company or person to submit a tender.*

*Question:*

*Could you please specify what kind of documentation CEDEFOP will consider as appropriate to cover this requirement? For example: a duly signed Statement of a consortium partner that grants the powers of submission of tender, representation and signature to the leading company of the consortium and is followed by the necessary administrative certificates proving each company legal representative would meet the requirement satisfactorily?*

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

Yes.

### **Question Nr. 2**

*Can you please confirm that in terms of the 'Exclusion Criteria' the only evidence to be submitted by the Tenderers with the proposals is the 'Exclusion Criteria Self-Declaration' presented as Annex C and no other evidences/certificates/administrative papers are required?*

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

At this stage yes. In case of recommendation for contract the tenderer may be requested to provide the documentation as mentioned in the tendering documents.

### **Question Nr. 3**

*To our understanding, in several sections of the Questionnaire, the term 'site' is used invariably to signify different notions. For instance:*

- *Question 46 '...definition of a web space and site (e.g. community) administration to oversee a group of users and communities within a single domain or site';*

- *Question 48 'Does the platform provide the possibility for a customised community name, alias, description, welcome message etc. for each independent site?';*
- *Question 50 'Does the platform allow the easy addition of custom navigation buttons on the navigation menu of the site, leading to other web-based resources';*
- *Question 53 'Does the platform allow the addition of custom images, backgrounds, graphic files and flash files in order to customise the appearance of the site?'*

*Could you please specify the meaning of term 'site'?*

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

Although the particular word may indeed be used in slightly different contexts throughout the document, in each of the questions you are referring it is very clear what is asked from the tenderers to provide. In all the above referenced paragraphs the term “site” refers to the web site (collection of web pages) that represent the web presence of one virtual community. As the internal workings and the associated terminology of each platform, possibly offered, is not known, tenderers are free to describe and clarify the particularities of their platform in accordance to administrative levels and administrative delegation types (question 46) and various possible interface customisations (questions 48,50,53). This can be done both for the whole web virtual communities space, system, platform etc. and for each virtual community space, web presence, community site, particular community collection of web pages etc.

### **Question Nr. 4**

*In regards to the questions 14 and 53, is it envisaged that the system will support creation of additional HTML pages and their publishing to the public users (portal like functionality; e.g. introductory pages dedicated to each Community)?*

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

Question 14 refers to the required capability to easily publish various contributions (postings) of content (other than files) like news, articles stories, content in html or other format, visible through the web browser without having to open another application (as it is the case with files). This publishing can be provided by various ways, one of which should be an incorporated WYSIWYG editor which allows users to online edit and publish contributions.

Question 53 refers to particular customisations that one community administrator or possibly other delegates with proper rights can apply to the community web pages (web site etc.) in order to make it more appealing.

Particularities of implementation and/or way of working, usability etc. of those functionalities are left to the tenderers, have to be briefly described and are to be evaluated.

We describe specific desired functionality (with the detail possible under the particular context of a tendering procedure), instead of using terms like “portal like” or similar which could be more confusing given the fuzzy context in which those terms are used and the multiple meanings and semantics that can be given to them.

### **Question Nr. 5**

*What is the requested level of support? We understand that CEDEFOP does the first level of user support and that contract will do the second and the third level. Is this assumption correct?*

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

It is desired that only Cedefop will deal with users of the system. As the expected platform will need to have a maturity and be ready for use, we are expecting things (after maybe a short initial period) to run smoothly for users and community administrators. The administrators should be the only ones addressed by users when some problems occur (again we expect problems only in usability and not many technical ones if we choose the proper product for our purposes). Technical and usability support from the side of the contractor will be given to Cedefop ICT Department and not to users directly. Beyond that, the contractor (as he/she is the one who hosts the system) is obliged to keep the service alive and running without technical problems and the data safe.

### **Question Nr. 6**

*As it is provided, the example content contains so called contributions (articles).xml. Since you didn't specify any similar service for the new system, could you please tell us where this content should be migrated?*

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

In fact we did specify a similar service. It is the one described in question 14.

### **Question Nr. 7**

*In Question 2, it is specified that 70% of the content should be migrated to the new system. Could you please specify what metric will be used to confirm the migration (e.g. number of items, the total size of the documents, etc.)?*

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

The intended goal is to migrate the entire existing content to the new system. The limit of 70% was only set in order to anticipate and leave room for limited technical problems and potential difficulties that would not allow the immediate (within one month) importing of some content types. Again however, as it is also obvious from the next question (3) of Questionnaire 2, the final goal is to import all content as soon as possible.

The potential contractors should work with the exported content samples in order to find ways to import the particular content in the related areas of their system. The idea was that as soon as one has found an automated way to import a particular type of content to the related area of his system, it will not be a problem to import as many records of the same type as needed. Of course if the only possible way identified to address this requirement for a particular content type is to import content manually, then it could be difficult to be within the given deadline. This is the only case where the 70% limit would have a meaning.

In the undesired case manual import is proposed it will be acceptable if 70% of this particular content either based on quantity (e.g. MB) or number of items, will be transferred within one month.