|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Clarification Question** | **Authority Response** |
| 1 | Please provide more clarity on the hosting requirement. Whilst the tender identifies that an existing hosting environment exists it is not clear whether it will be mandatory to host the DXP on this. If so, more detail needs to be provided and specifically whether it is a Unix, Windows or other environment. | A hosting environment is required for all components of the DXP. Information given about the existing provision is purely for background information.  4.2.2 in the technical criteria provides detail on this requirement. |
| 2 | We note that you have not provided a budget (or budget range) and we would recommend this is provided so tenderers can be compliant with any parameters. Providing no budget range can mean that responses are disqualified from the outset by being outside your intended investment. | Whilst we appreciate a lack of budget is frustrating, the Authority has detailed its requirements within the ITT, including any immediate, and future requirement for the solution which we do not believe to be complex.  Tenderers should therefore review the full requirement whilst considering |
| 3 | Does the authority have mandatory size, turnover and other requirements of their suppliers | Whilst the Authority has not set mandatory parameters for the size and turnover of prospective tenderers, the Authority shall take a risk based decision based on the details provided by the tenderers and the value of their submission. |
| 4 | Page 6 references an "open source DXP". Please clarify if this means that a DXP with an associated licensing or subscription model would not be considered? | The ITT now confirms that the Authority specifically requires that it is able to support and develop any proposed solution with an alternate supplier on expiry of this contract term – therefore, proposed solution should be non-proprietary. This shall be without encumbrance.  Therefore, tenderers shall ensure that any future model is considered within this tender, and assure the Authority of its ability to exit this contract and still retain use of the software.  Technical criteria 2.1.6 and Schedule 28 refers |
| 5 | Do you want features of digital experience such as AI driven personalisation or experimentation? | This is something we are interested in exploring in the future, so the use of the term DXP as opposed to CMS is deliberate. |
| 6 | The procurement timeline (page 15) does not include any form of presentation or meeting to discuss the tender submission. Will a decision be made solely on the evaluation of the tender response? | Yes |
| 7 | Timelines on page 23 appear to suggest the project will go through all the phases to the launch of phase 1 in 5 months including full content population, meaning a completion of design and build by June 2021. From our perspective a 2 month design and build timeline appears unrealistic. Is there are specific driver for completion of design and build by June 2021 or would you consider revising this timeline? | June 2021 is for launch of the public beta, not the completed site with all content locked. |
| 8 | Are you open to conversations regarding specific terms, for example delay payments aren't typical in our contracts with so many external factors influencing timelines? | It should be noted that with regards to delay payments, the Authority would be recognisant of any external factors that may have an impact on delivery, including those caused by the Authority. Delay payments therefore be implemented in line with Schedule 8 – Implementation Plan |
| 9 | Please can you provide details of the security clearance required? | Schedule 16 – Security Schedule applies. However, it is not currently envisaged that SC clearance shall be necessary, and will be assessed on a role by role basis during the contract term. |
| 10 | Schedule 22 states £10million cover level for each insurance required. If the supplier has £2million of professional indemnity cover will this result in the rejection of the tender response? | Insurance requirements had not been finalised on publication of the draft documentation. This has now been amended. |
| 11 | Our typical contractual model is based on a vendor contract for the DXP licensing and infrastructure with an implementation partner's services covered by separate terms, is this a model you'd consider? | The ultimate responsibility for the contract shall be with the tenderer as a prime contractor.  Therefore, if you wish to bring an implementation partner on board with separate terms between you and them, this would be between yourselves.  However, the terms of this contract shall prevail. |
| 12 | Hosting is stated as UK-based. Are you open to hosting in EU regions such as Ireland? | In the instance that a tenderer is unable to propose a solution that is hosted in the UK, the Authority shall consider alternate options within the EU. Tenderers must propose their alternate data processing model, and where exactly data shall be hosted.  Should the UK not be granted an adequacy decision, the tenderer shall be obligated to repatriate data back to the UK as a fallback.  Tenderers must address this as a risk. |
| 13 | Would an ESCROW agreement provide sufficient assurances for a proprietary platform to be considered? | ESCROW is more likely to be used in the instance of the supplier being unable to perform services.  The purpose of requesting a non-proprietary solution is that as a public sector authority, we need to ensure that we are able to re-compete at the end of the contract term, without having to replace the solution. |
| 14 | Does the proposed DXP, DAM and WFM components need to be part of  Gartner MQ? | No. Reference to gartner is for definition purposes only. |
| 15 | Is it required to have all components - DXP, CMS, DAM and WFM  in a single platform or Department would be open to have different tools for DAM and WFM with a DXP platform? | No they are not required in a single platform, but must integrate effectively as per the requirements. |
| 16 | Is there a preference for a particular platform or should we propose tools/platform meeting the requirements? | There is no preference for a particular platform, and tenderers should address and meet the requirements. |
| 17 | Is it possible to have info on budget/funding for this initiative? | As above |
| 18 | Do you expect the new site design to reflect the brand guidelines only or is there any flex for new iterations or evolving of the brand if that was something that all parties felt could add impact? | Not in scope of the project, but reasonable suggestions would be considered. |
| 19 | In terms of visual digital marketing assets that you create, looking through the current site there are a range of different ones that are designed all slightly differently, and often not directly in line with the brand guidelines. How will you approach a consistent roll out of website content post launch? Can we propose a web content styleguide as part of this piece of work? | Brand portal has recently launched, so some legacy material is still in circulation, much of which will be withdrawn as it comes up for review.  We would not be looking for a web content styleguide as part of the scope of this project. |
| 20 | How would you like us to provide you with the variant costs for these types of tools | The pricing schedule should be completed as is, taking into consideration the guidance provided within.  It should be noted that we are evaluating on the basis of implementation of phases 1 and 2, on any costs that should be known through the articulation of the requirement. |
| 21 | Are you looking for a DXP specifically from the list on https://www.gartner.com/reviews/market/digital-experience-platforms or are you open to alternatives as long as the delivery meets the definition by Gartner? | No, the purpose of using Gartner was for definition purposes only, as long as the product meets the definition. |
| 22 | At this stage are there additional feeds of content required OUT of the future CMS that will receive data in such as an app or a jobs board etc? | A recruitment portal is not in scope, and KFRS does not have any proprietary apps. |
| 23 | Could you explain how integrated and embedded Dynamics CRM is into the organisation currently | An ongoing project to refine and improve risk management data for customers, premises and staff is in progress. Data is held in Dynamics, and used to allocate resources and provide operational information on demand |
| 24 | Is there an internal preference or expectation that the majority of the DXP and digital delivery should be .Net based? | No |
| 25 | How many external people would be required to login to the experience platform on a monthly basis? | The ability to login to a customer portal is a potential future requirement and as such has not been fully scoped |
| 26 | What social media listening tools are currently being used if any? | Information is in the ITT – Section 3: Statement of requirements |
| 27 | What marketing tools are or will be used to manage, handle and drive digital public engagement with the FRS and to the website? | Information is in the ITT – Section 3: Statement of requirements |
| 28 | What are the annual number of phone calls and email enquiries by (a) the public, (b) media and (c) press, and what reductions are the FRS targeting the digital experience platform to make? | Non-emergency contacts are not routinely audited |
| 29 | The two phases of the project currently have considerable timelines. Is there a requirement for this to be the case due to operational or technological reasons, or is there an opportunity to optimise this? | Timelines are negotiable if objectives can be met fully in a shorter timescale |
| 30 | Other than content upload or transfer, what are the key factors in the determined timelines and deadlines? | Availability of internal resources and other projects. |
| 31 | It is mentioned that the new CMS platform should be Open Source; How stringent is this if the DXP solutions (CMS, DAM etc) are built on Software as a Service (SaaS) and Platform as a Service (PaaS) microservices and headless, API first architectures? (Providing, should there be a need, any development will be Open Source and the IP of the Authority) | Non-proprietary as opposed to open source. To allow transfer of IPR at end of contract, allowing an alternate vendor to take over development and support of the solution, including any custom-developed code.  Technical criteria 2.1.6 and Schedule 28 refers |
| 32 | Are there any international bodies, organizations or persons that interact or are planned to interact with the platform in any way – API, Login, Private Portal etc? | Not in scope. |
| 33 | What is the ongoing validation and verification for Accessibility compliance with Public Sector Bodies Accessibility Regulations 2018 for level AA of the WCAG 2.1 beyond each Phase delivery?  Will there be a requirement for the platform to provide workflow approval for the indicated Accessibility compliance? | Independent audit and maintenance of the regulatory required ‘Accessibility Statement’  Ideally, yes that would form part of the workflow |
| 34 | - How do the Authority see this working with software as a service products? Would it be acceptable if any functionality gaps are implemented at the supplier’s cost? Although the Authority wouldn’t own the solution they would obtain it at a much lower cost and the service would meet the delivery deadlines and be supplied for the lifetime of the contract either way. | Non-proprietary as opposed to open source. To allow transfer of IPR at end of contract, allowing an alternate vendor to take over development and support of the solution, including any custom-developed code.  Technical criteria 2.1.6 and Schedule 28 refers |
| 35 | In order to put forward a fixed price quote we would need more detail on the exact integration requirements i.e. which specific systems and what the use case definitions of an acceptable integration are for each system. | Many of these are nice-to-haves or things KFRS would like to consider in future. Pricing should be included within the pricing schedule where indicated for phases 1 and 2. |
| 36 | I’m not aware of any fully open source solution that combines WFM with DAM and CMS, but the ITT is written in quite a specific manner. Did the Authority have a particular product in mind when writing the ITT? | No, recommendations are welcomed. A unified product stack is not a mandatory criteria, provided requirements are met. |
| 37 | Does the admin system (i.e. the non-public areas) of the DXP have to comply to WCAG 2.1 AA? | Preferably yes |
| 38 | The spreadsheet of requirements outlines the need for ISO27001 certification, but Schedule 19 references only Cyber Essentials. The Authority will likely get a lot of questions as to which is the preferred standard or whether either is acceptable. We see this crop up on the Digital Marketplace quite regularly. | Ideally the solution and the hosting environment shall be ISO27001 accredited. However, Cyber Essentials shall be accepted in reference to both Schedule 16 (Security) and Schedule 19 (Cyber Essentials) |
| 39 | The Authority consider the seperation of the Content Management Solution (CMS) from the DAMS solution | We have not specified that the components must be fully integrated, just that they are compatible and meet requirements. |
| 40 | The development team are ISO27001 certified but the consultancy arm are not.  Will that preclude us from being considered? | ISO27001 can be obtained in different areas,  so in this case we would be more interested in the final solution/environment being ISO27001 accredited to ensure the data is protected. |
|  | Clarifications added 29th January 2021 |  |
| 41 | * Please confirm clearly that hosting may be in the EU (or not, if that is the case) | Whilst hosting is preferred in the UK, we shall accept hosting in the EU, providing that security measures are met, and tenderers address and confirm the obligation to repatriate data in the instance the UK is not granted an adequacy decision. |
| 42 | * Please confirm the £400,000 budget is for 3 years | The provision of an estimated budget is a mandatory publication on Contracts Finder.  However - tenderers should be aware that this is an INDICATION only, and the Authority reserves the right to amend this estimated budget for the initial term of the contract.  To confirm, the budget of £400k, is set on Contracts finder as an estimate over 4 years internally. To clarify, the Authority does not commit to this as a minimum or maximum figure, and do not wish to be bound by this estimate. |
| 43 | For question 4.5.9 you require Prince2 Practitioner or APM PMQ.  Would the Authority be willing to accept other comparable project management qualifications?  For instance Project Management Professional (PMP)? | To confirm, the requirement for 4.5.9 should state (for a score of 5) that it is Prince 2 Practitioner, APM PMQ **or equivalent** as a minimum, as also stated for a score of 3.  In the instance that an equivalent qualification is provided, tenderers must provide evidence that the qualification is equivalent or higher than the stated requirement.  This shall therefore be amended in the evaluation criteria as per the below in bold and underlined:  *445 - Evidence of Prince 2 Practitioner or APM PMQ,****or equivalent is****provided. Evidence can include a copy of certificate, or name and/or link to exam board website confirming qualification status.****Any equivalent qualification must be evidenced that it meets the required qualifications as a minimum or higher.****In addition, tenderers should evidence that the proposed Project Manager is experienced in undertaking previous similar projects within the last 4 years.*  *3 - Evidence of Prince 2 Foundation or equivalent qualification provided. Evidence can include a copy of certificate, or name and/or link to exam board website confirming qualification status.****Any equivalent qualification must be evidenced that it meets the required qualifications as a minimum or higher.****In addition, tenderers should evidence that the proposed Project Manager is experienced in undertaking previous similar projects within the last 4 years.*  *0 - Confirmation of project manager will be provided but no qualification evidence provided,****or evidence of equivalency of qualification level,****or project manager has no previous experience in a similar project, or no project managers assigned. Tenderer will not be taken further through the process.* |
| 44 | **Whilst we recognise the budget of £400000 is not fixed as clarified in a previous response earlier today, is this figure associated to purely licensing costs over the initial 5-year term, or does this figure incorporate implementation & licensing costs?** | Our estimated budget would be for the full whole life cost of the initial term.  As clarified, this is not fixed, and we do not wish to eliminate potential tenderers either way.  It should be noted that the budget is representative of the 'KNOWN' costs of implementation, licensing etc, as indicated in the pricing schedule, in particular for phases 1 and 2 only. It is appreciated that further unidentified or unscoped costs would be required throughout the course of the contract term. The Pricing schedule sets out what costs we are looking to understand. Further development would be separate and would be unable to be articulated at this stage |
| 45 | **What is the driver for being live on the 1st September and is there any flexibility around the timeline?** | One of the most important drivers for us is WCAG compliance for our public facing website by September 2021, which are timelines we must meet.  The requirements provide details about what needs to be live by that date, which is not the whole solution - live components shall be phased as indicated. |
| 46 | Please provide the detailed requirements of zero version of the system. | The Authority intends to release at version 1.0. If the tenderer intends on developing using a zero-version based approach, this should be documented in the tender response with the final version (v1.0) meeting all requirements |
| 47 | Which parts of DXP have to be implemented by June 1st? (CMS, WFM, DAM etc.) | The 1 June implementation milestone is for a public beta of a new website, which is powered by the CMS, DAM and WFM components of the DXP. |
| 48 | Please describe minimum acceptable set of functionalities for each of expected parts of the DXP. | This is covered by the Gartner definition provided. |
| 49 | Does the authority consider a possibility of using another identity provider instead of Microsoft ADFS for Single Sign On? | The Authority’s preference is for ADFS or SAML using Azure AD. If the tenderer can provide an alternative solution, with similar equal functionality and support for our existing services Windows/Azure, it will be considered following data risk assessment and due diligence. Tenderers must provide evidence to indicate how an alternate solution meets the same requirements as ADFS or SAML.  It should be noted that the evaluation criteria shall be updated to reflect this minor change. |
| 50 | Should the platform be tested for potential security vulnerabilities manually by dedicated team provided from our side or the testing will be handled by authorised vendor? | Manual testing is required against the OWASP top 10 known vulnerabilities as a minimum by the tenderer or its sub-contractors. |
| 51 | How should the security report look like and be shared with the authority? | The process for Security reports and processes are detailed within Schedule 16 – Security.  As a minimum, the Authority would expect any related OWASP security report to include for example:   1. The date/time of test 2. Name or initials of tester (and company name if external) 3. Component/element being tested 4. Type of test / and OWASP category 5. Contents of test scenario 6. Sample data/result of test when passed, and full data/result when failed 7. Details of fix for a fail, including expected fix time, and status (unfixed/fixed) 8. Results of test re-run where required, post fix.    The report can be in PDF format for individual report, or a version controlled Excel spreadsheet containing all tests and their results as above |
| 52 | Can the Backup and recovery requirements be split to different milestones and provided after zero version release? | There are no definitive milestones for backup and recovery requirements.  However, it is expected that back ups are working and that suppliers have demonstrated that they are able to restore data by the go live date. |
| 53 | **Digital Asset Management requirements: The DXP must include a GDPR-compliant DAM that integrates with the workflow solution to provide assets for inclusion across the DXP’s content endpoints...** Could you please describe in more details the requirements and deadlines for the "user-friendly permission based portal for non-employees to access approved content assets...". Could you provide an example of such the system? This part of the DXP is not described well in the "Appendix A DXP Evaluation and Pricing Schedule", we'd like get more information of it. | The DAM needs a web-based front end that can be logged into by members of the public, media and other organisations to gain access to our assets. |
|  | Clarifications added 5th February 2021 |  |
| 54 | Are you prioritising commercial off-the-shelf solutions, or are you expecting custom-developed platforms? | **Our preference would be a COTS product which is widely supportable, as per requirement 2.1.6.  However, as long as tenderers can meet this requirement, as well as meet he definition of a DXP, we have not stated whether it should be COTS or custom developed platform.** |
| 55 | The CMS needs to be able to integrate with notice boards and digital magazines, at the moment they are desirable and not mandatory. Does that mean we can consider them post-launch initiatives as ongoing iterations? | **Requirement 3.1.18 outlines the desirable requirement.  The threshold for meeting this requirement is a score of 3, which outlines that the functionality is already on a future roadmap, or already exists with some functionality that requires further development.  Tenderers in this instance should evidence how they meet this requirement with their intended roadmap** |
| 56 | Our team is not ISO27001 certified, but the hosting environment will be ISO27001 compliant. Will this discount us from the process? | **Clarification no. 40 and req 4.2.3 indicates that the final solution/hosting environment should be ISO27001 accredited.** |
| 57 | Is a greater preference given to agencies that are ISO27001 compliant over those that have Cyber Essentials? | **As per requirement 4.2.3, and our clarification no. 38, either accreditation is acceptable, provided it meets the scope of the certification as stated.** |
| 58 | The Payment Card Industry (PCI) Data Security Standard encompasses most or all of the security requirements of ISO 27001. Would PCI compliant status be considered? | The Authority have considered which security standards it will accept and are proceeding with ISO27001 as an international standard, and/or Cyber Essentials only.  PCI DSS, nor any other standard shall be accepted for this requirement. |
| 59 | * **3.1.5 Long-form document presentation features** - Please can you provide an example of a long-form document that you would expect the solution to be able to convert into accessible content for web display. Are these documents PDF files or some other file format? | Documents would normally have been created in Word and converted to PDF without specialist tools. Some documents may have been created in Adobe InDesign and converted to PDF with some accessibility options included, but not usually in a manner that is specifically intended for compliance with accessibility regulations. This means that document structure, reading order and metatagging is not enforced. Some use of styles is expected.  Examples of relevant long-form documents, with tabulated information, charts and diagrams, cross-referencing, footnotes and endnotes can be found on the current KFRS website:  Full statement of accounts 2019-20 - <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org/_resources/assets/inline/full/0/25545.pdf>  Customer Safety Plan 2020-24 - <https://www.kent.fire-uk.org/_resources/assets/inline/full/0/20249.pdf> |
| 60 | * **3.1.18 Manage digital noticeboard content** - Please can you state the product and version used for the digital noticeboard CMS, and confirm whether this system has the ability to pull content from other systems via an API. * **3.1.19 Manage digital magazine content** - Please can you state the product and version used for the digital magazine CMS, and confirm whether this system has the ability to pull content from other systems via an API | For 3.1.18 and 3.1.19, these are potential future requirements so have not been scoped in detail. We don't have a preferred product for either of these content endpoints at present, but if the tenderer wishes to suggest how it the requirement detail could be achieved, it would be useful. |
| 61 | We had a further question arise around brand design:   * Is there an expectation for the successful supplier to visually design the brand new website as part of the first release by September 1st, or will we receive a branded design from the authority which we implement? | Yes, the expectation is that the successful supplier shall visually design the new website as part of the first release, using the brand guidelines provided. |
| 62 | 1. General: Do you want us to respond directly within the documents you have provided or to create a new standalone response document? | Each requirement in section 4 indicates that you may respond in ‘x’ number of pages. The tenderer may choose how this is done within the guidelines, as long as they are clearly indicated and marked in response to each question, and each individual requirement as outlined in the instructions.  We do however insist that response documents are **not** embedded within documents, and if a full response is provided in one document it is clearly indexed to enable evaluators of various elements of the tender to navigate quickly to responses they are required to review. |
| 63 | 1. General: Various numbered Schedules appear to be missing (e.g. 9/12/15/17/18/23/24) – is that correct? | Yes this is correct. The contract is based on the Government Mid Tier Contract - [The Mid-Tier Contract - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/the-mid-tier-contract)  As such, the schedules that have not been used we did not deem to be relevant to this opportunity. |
| 64 | Are we correct in assuming that we do not have to fill-in anything within a Schedule as part of the proposal submission process and that the Schedules are to indicate what we will need to agree to (and fill in) if we were to be successful?  Does this also apply to Schedule 5 which lists any commercially sensitive materials as part of our bid? | Yes this is correct. However, Schedule 8 implementation plan is the exception to this, where we would expect some completion, as well as Schedule 5 for commercially sensitive information if applicable. |
| 65 | 1. Please could you confirm that the ONLY things that need to be submitted as part of a complete bid are:    * MS Word: a proposal document including responses to:      1. The requirements listed in Section 3 of the ITT      2. The requirements listed in Appendix B      3. Section 7 of the ITT      4. Section 8 of the ITT      5. Section 9 of the ITT      6. Section 10 of the ITT      7. Section 11 of the ITT      8. MS Excel Appendix A filled in 2. C19070 Contract Award Form Final: Please could you confirm that this does NOT need to be completed as part of a complete bid. | Yes, with some additions below:  Section 3 of the ITT includes insurance, sub-contractors and contract management data.  Section 4 requires responding to reg Form of Tender, Modern Slavery and Invoicing, as well as responding to the Requirements that ALIGN with Appendix B  Section 6 (if applicable)  Section 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the ITT  MS Excel – Yes, Appendix A Pricing – both tabs completed.  The Contract Award form requires review by tenderers, but shall be completed with data submitted from the Tender with the winning tenderer. |
| 66 | Where do you host currently? | Hosting is managed by our current vendor as part of a service level agreement, but we do not have details of the specification. |
| 67 | 1. Clarification thread 17.1.1: You say *“Our preference would be a COTS product”*– this normally means purely paid-for products, but does COTS here also include open source solutions (which would still allow KFRS to retain the developed IP and would cost you less)? | Yes |
| 68 | 1. Clarification thread 17.1.1: Do you see open source solutions as what you term *“custom developed platform”* or do you mean that only for a bespoke build? | The term ‘custom developed solution’ was used by a supplier within a clarification question. Please see line 54 of this document for our response which indicates we are not stating open source, but simply that we are able to retain the IPR, and have the solution supported post contract by alternate providers. |
| 69 | 1. ‘Clarifications 210125’ p.7: You say *“we would be more interested in the final solution/environment being ISO27001 accredited”* and on p.6 you say *“the hosting environment shall be ISO27001 accredited. However, Cyber Essentials shall be accepted…”* – are we ok to propose a solution which accords with our existing Cyber Essentials certification and a hosting environment that is already ISO27001 accredited? | Yes. |
| 70 | 1. ITT p. 23: Phase 1 completes by eo August 2021, but Phase 2 does not complete until October 2022. Is this correct? It seems a very long time between the two deadlines considering the more limited aspects of Phase 2. 2. If it is correct, please can you explain why there is such a gap? | See clarification line 29 - Timelines are negotiable if objectives can be met fully in a shorter timescale.  The gap is our internal milestone for delivery of phase 2, but if this can be delivered sooner, we would discuss with the successful supplier. |
| 71 | 1. ITT p. 23: You mention IoT. What sorts of IoT things did you have in mind here? | Example: Smart assistants using voice commands and scripted content to respond to queries about services and transactions we provide |
| 72 | 1. Appendix A: C19070 Evaluation Model Sheet: the elements on this worksheet appear to be all the mandatory elements from Appendix B. However, there appears to be one exception: 4.10.1 on Appendix B is a ‘desirable’ and relates to *“choose and book functionality for Safe & Well visits”* but on the Evaluation Sheet 4.10.1 is listed (even though it is not a ‘mandatory’) and appears to duplicate the 4.10.4 line item (*“ad hoc developer services”).* Should 4.10.1 actually should not be in the evaluation sheet because it is not mandatory? Or, if it should be, should it relate to *“Safe & Well visits”*rather than *“ad hoc developer services”?* Please could you confirm. | Appendix A Evaluation Model tab is provided for transparency on how we are evaluating the tenders.  The top section (rows 10 – 91) includes all of the mandatory Pass/Fail requirements taken from Appendix B.  This is followed by rows 98 – 127 of the qualitative ‘scored’ criteria, where you will find req 4.10.1 relating to CRM integration and safe and well visits.  Thank you for pointing out the error that line 86 under future requirements on Appendix A (C19070 Evaluation model tab) is a duplication and will be removed from the final version. |
| 73 | 1. Can the authority please confirm if we are confined to the set out format in the ITT for responding to the questions or are we able to submit in our own format providing we follow the rules surrounding font size and page limits? | See clarification line 62. |
|  | Clarifications added 12th February 2021 |  |
| 74 | 1. No references (prior work) are requested. Please confirm | No references have been requested.  Each requirement (where relevant), asks for evidence to support your response, and how you meet the requirement which will provide evaluators with the confidence in your ability to meet the requirement. |
| 75 | 1. No proposed team composition or individual CV (bios) are requested. Please confirm. | Whilst we have not asked for a full team bio, individual requirements request evidence of qualifications and experience of proposed members within key areas. |
| 76 | 1. Do page limits refer to the entire section or to individual questions? | Page limits refer to the relevant section which may cover numerous questions/requirements.  We have attempted to collate related questions together to allow for tenderers to provide a more succinct and contextual response. |
| 77 | 1. Project Clarification | We would just like to reiterate that the budget statement on Contracts finder is stated as £400k - this is mandatory field for the estimated 'minimum' budget over the life of the project.  Please note we have not stated a maximum budget. |
| 78 | 1. Acknowledging the response to clarification no. 11 would the Buyer accept the placement of two contracts both under the Buyer’s contract terms and conditions referred to in this tender.  One for the implementation services and one for the infrastructure software reflecting the more usual engagement model now in existence for this DXP solution. | The Authority are not looking to award, and/or manage two separate contracts with different providers, or provide an integration type role for doing so. This contract shall be awarded to one prime supplier, who shall manage any infrastructure/sub-contracts in line with the contract, and terms and conditions shall flow down to such parties.  Whilst it is acknowledged that specific hosting terms may be applicable from third party SaaS providers, these may be able to be incorporated into the contract (following review), with concise definitions of areas of responsibility and liability between parties. |
| 79 | 1. Acknowledging the response to clarifications no. 4 & 31 and subject to the response to the awarding of separate implementation and infrastructure contracts would the Buyer accept a “software as a service” infrastructure solution with IPR associated with the implementation being subject to a perpetual, non-exclusive,  royalty-free licence for the Buyers internal purposes, allowing the further development and support of the developed solution should the Buyer re-tender at the end of the Contract Term? Giving the Authority “…retained ownership of any developed IPR.”, as stated in Appendix B Sub-Lev | With regards to Intellectual Property, the Authority expects any proposed solution to meet the requirements outlined in response to Clarifications 4 & 31 within the clarifications log.  The Authority is not clear on what is meant by 'Buyers internal purposes', but would draw your attention to the previous responses regarding proposals of a non-restrictive, non-proprietary solution, that is able to be developed and supported by alternate providers post contract expiry.  The requirement is not solely regarding the Authority retaining IPR |
| 80 | 1. Can you please supply and estimate on the number of text assets (e.g. blogs, articles, collateral), images, videos, documents and so on that they need to store in the cloud. Also please can you give an estimate of the expected number of page views they are anticipating across the platform? | The current KFRS website is around 1500 pages in size although this is being streamlined.  1,191,478 page views for the existing public website in 2019 data. 2020 figures are down by about a third at 833,444, which would appear to be a side effect of C19 |
| 81 | 1. Secondly, please can you confirm if there are certain procurement frameworks you will be using or will this be direct? | This tender opportunity is via an open tender process, and will not be under any framework. |
| 82 | 1. Can you provide more information on the website templates required? Amount, rough outline of the type of pages (e.g. news, blog etc.) | The Authority do not have any relevant current examples because our current site isn't yet mobile first.  We are not expecting huge range of templates, as long as they are mobile first and flexible enough that content elements can be moved, added or deleted to create some variety.  We will work with the successful supplier on this. |
| 83 | 1. Can you confirm whether the reference to iTrent is an integration, or an external link? | iTrent is not an integration, currently a link is simply posted to an external job application portal which opens in a new tab. |
| 84 | 1. Is integration with MS Dynamics a requirement that needs costing for within this scope? It says it is part of future phase of work, but is also listed as a requirement. | In the costing model we have asked for costs for phases 1 and 2, and NOT for future work.  It is however a future requirement that would be costed once the scope of this requirement is defined. |
| 85 | 1. How much discovery has already been done? Do you have personas, journey maps etc, and if not, do you see this being a part of this project? | Discovery done so far is limited to analytics, desktop research and findings from internal reports and strategies, as per the [Statement of requirements] on page 20 of the ITT document.  However, the Authority will expect to work with the successful supplier to develop further parts of the discovery process. |
| 86 | 1. The tender specifies a Tier 3 data centre and set it as a 'Fail' if we don't offer it. Given it is web application why is modern secure AWS cloud solution hosted in the London region not acceptable? AWS operates its data centres in alignment with the Tier III+ guidelines, but has chosen not to have a certified Uptime Institute based tiering level so that we have more flexibility to expand and improve performance. ] | The requirement is for a Tier 3 level data centre that meets the standard as defined by the Uptime Institute or EN50600 and ISO22237. The requirement does not require formal certification but the data centre must support concurrent maintain/repair/operation. |
| 87 | 1. We're particularly concerned with a particular combination of clause and request that would lead to substantial supplier risk above and beyond what we're comfortable with. In your Terms and Conditions the termination clauses do not give much notice and that you can end the contract without reason with 90 days notice. It is also our understanding that you will not consider holding contracts with both the implementation provider and the DXP provider. Most (if not all) platform providers will only commit to minimum year long terms, which means that as an implementation provider, we carry a lot of risk if you are to terminate the agreement. Can we negotiate on the contract? Are we able to insert a clause that if your relationship with implementation partner is terminated, then the hosting agreement will be passed back to you. As I hope you can understand, the risk to an SME agency for this is too great | The Authority has considered this request, and highlighting of the risks that suppliers are potentially undertaking in the instance of the Authority terminating without due cause.  In light of this, and the fact that most hosting providers do request a minimum 12 month term, the Authority proposes to extend the Termination without Cause period to 180 days as opposed to 90 days to mitigate this risk.  The Authority has confirmed it does not wish to hold two separate contracts, and that the prime supplier shall take ownership and liability for the hosting arrangement.  The Authority is open to discussions with the successful supplier on how hosting provider costs and risks can be mitigated in the circumstances that the Authority takes the decision to terminate without cause. Tenderers should therefore highlight this risk in their tender proposal for consideration by the Authority for future discussion. |
| 88 | 1. on the topic of Project Management, we notice you repeatedly mention a Prince. Would you consider an Agile approach with Certified Agile Scrum Masters and Product Owners? | The Authority require a Prince 2 or APM qualified project manager as per the requirement. We are not intending on running this has as an agile development process. |
| 89 | 1. Re Req 4.2.5 “…Testing must not be automated….”. OWASP testing is usually automated and then a human review of the report takes place. This is done with every code release/committ. Periodic pen testing (manual) would be normal but to say no to automated testing is not sensible, in our opinion. Would you accept automated testing followed by human review? | For clarity, automation refers to the entire process. The Authority accepts scripts will be used, but individual test results must be manually reviewed followed by human signed off |
| 90 | 1. Re Req 2.2.1 (User Journeys) - Do you have a set of user stories that you can share? | Please see answer to clarification 85 |
| 91 | 1. Re Req 2.1.5 Responsive UI Design - Can you confirm that you do still need to support machines with Windows 8.1? | Yes, the Authority’s current laptop estate run on Windows 8.1. Although we intend to move to Windows 10, this may not be in time for the roll out of this solution. |
| 92 | 1. Is a multilingual site a requirement, if so, how many languages? Do you need the ability to add the content yourselves? | No, the Authority does require a multilingual site. |
| 93 | 1. In addition to the 1500 web pages, do you have a rough figure as to how many images, videos and documents that may need to be managed in the DXP/CMS and if it is a requirement that these can be edited within? | We currently have around 3,600 non-web page assets in our CMS, which are a combination of images, PDFs, Excel, CSV and Word documents. Around 10% of these are code snippets used to embed content in <iframes> from CDNs such as Youtube, Vimeo and Soundcloud.  Basic image editing functionality (resize, rotate, flip, crop, etc) is in our current asset manager and we would hope for at least this functionality in the replacement system, but ideally as the DAM is a separate component it would provide a more robust toolset. |