



European Centre for the  
Development of Vocational Training  
Procurement Service

## **REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION (3) – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **Question Nr. 1**

Questionnaire 2, Question 13, *“Custom Databases (lists, infolog) facility. Provide user updatable databases to collect and share structured information i.e. lists, tasks, useful links, events etc. Ability of user defined fields and saved views. Ability to cross reference and moderate databases. “*

*Question:*

*Could you please elaborate on the term “saved views”?*

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

By saved views we mean a particular layout of the stored data of a database that can be retrieved easily without having to set all the criteria every time one wants to view the data this way. E.g. such custom layout could have fields and columns and/or records sorted in a particular way etc.

### **Question Nr. 2**

*While navigating the Ramius web site (current platform of CEDEFOP), in order to find more information on the existing platform of CEDEFOP, we discovered that the technical evaluation criteria checklist (Questionnaire 2) is copied word by word from the Ramius web site!*

*For example: Questions 12 -17 and 20 -29 can be found in <http://www.ramius.ca/solutions-features.cfm>*

*Does this imply that CEDEFOP is interested in purchasing the relevant product from Ramius? As evident, the technical requirements are fully based on the technical features of this particular product. Is this approach compliant with the applicable EU legislation and the Financial Regulation?*

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

The tenderers must take into account the fact (stated clearly in the call for tender) that we are aiming at the continuation of an operational service provided by Cedefop. See §2.4 “...This solution must provide similar core functionalities and allow smooth migration of users and content”. This requirement is vital to our core business in order to maintain the professional standards followed in all the services we provide. All products that will meet this are acceptable. Given this starting point we have taken all humanly possible measures in order not to give any competitive advantage to the

current provider or to any other. It is however inevitable that some requirements and associated functionality descriptions stem from experience working with the current particular communities of practice platform and that the importance of continuity of service is also amply reflected in the evaluation criteria. We highlight and ask for features that are valued by users and have been proved useful by experience. Please also note that other features are not included at all. Finally, desired additional functionality, not offered on the current platform, is added when judged as useful for the evolution of the service. By no means, we impede competition in the particular field we are addressing. This open call was based on the findings of a market survey of what we define as virtual communities of practice platforms. This survey revealed that competition, offering the required functionality, exists and identified several products focusing on communities of practice that could be used for our purposes. Those solutions have been differentiated from the vast number of web content management and/or portal products with comparable functionality, which are focusing on other context's of online collaboration and most possibly could not address our needs. This differentiation is unavoidably reflected also in the technical specifications.