|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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? |  |
| 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. |