

RFT 8311801: Request for Tenders for the establishment of a Multi Supplier Framework Agreement for the provision of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Development, Managed Services and Support Services

Message Ref No	Question	Contracting Authority Response
717604	We would be grateful for clarification on the following points relating to Lot 3 (FME Professional): 1. Anticipated utilisation of Lot 3 Could you please provide any indicative information regarding the anticipated utilisation of Lot 3 throughout the framework term? In particular: • whether Lot 3 is expected to be used primarily for resource augmentation or project-based delivery; • whether the anticipated demand is expected to focus mainly on FME development, FME Flow administration, or a combination of both; • and whether you anticipate a small number of long-term engagements or a larger number of shorter assignments. 2. Resource mobilisation Could you please provide an indication of the typical mobilisation timeframe expected following the award of a mini-competition under Lot 3? For example, would resources generally be expected to commence work within days, weeks, or months of contract award?	1: The purpose of the framework is to provide a mechanism to access additional GIS resources as and when requirements arise. It is not possible to forecast specific future projects in advance. Accordingly, it is not possible to provide information on the anticipated utilisation of Lot 3, or any other Lot. 2: Mobilisation timeframes will depend on the nature of future requirements, the specifics of which have yet to be finalised. No specifics can be supplied until mini-competition or direct drawdown stage.

Message Ref No	Question	Contracting Authority Response
	3. Relevant project references Could you please provide guidance on the types of project references that would be considered most relevant during the evaluation of Lot 3 submissions? For example, would greater emphasis be placed on: • FME Flow and workflow automation projects; • ETL and data integration projects; • GIS-focused projects; • public sector references; • or projects involving enterprise GIS platforms and integrations?	3: As stated in the RFT; <i>‘Tenderers must, using the tender response document (TRD), provide three (3) examples of previous contracts, in respect of each Lot (category) for which they are applying, for the provision of GIS Development, Managed Services and Support Services in support of their proposal. Where a consortium is tendering, then at least three (3) independent references should be supplied in respect of each Lot (category) for which the consortium is applying. Where possible at least one reference should relate to a project where the consortium members have worked together before. Tenderers must confirm that the Contracting Authority may contact each referee directly without further reference to the tenderer and must provide sufficient contact information to facilitate that.</i> <i>Tenderers must provide a clear, substantive, and independently verifiable comparability narrative demonstrating three (3) years of relevant prior contract experience. The narrative must provide meaningful evidence of comparability and must not rely on restating or paraphrasing the tender requirements.</i> <i>Tenderers are solely responsible for supplying sufficiently detailed and convincing information to enable a pass/fail determination. The Contracting Authority will not infer, interpret, or assume relevance where it is not explicitly demonstrated.</i>

Message Ref No	Question	Contracting Authority Response
		<i>Any doubt, ambiguity, or lack of clear comparability in the narrative will result in a fail and elimination from the tender process.</i>
717614	We request clarification regarding a potential error or ambiguity in the wording of the ESPD. In particular, in Part III, Section C, the final question: Can the economic operator confirm that: YES/NO (a) It has been guilty of serious misinterpretation in supplying the information required for the verification of the absence of grounds for exclusion or the fulfilment of the selection criteria, (b)... , (c)... appears to be formulated in a way that may lead to confusion. The question is phrased in an affirmative manner with respect to negative conduct, meaning that a “Yes” response could be interpreted as confirming such conduct, which seems contrary to the usual approach of ESPD declarations. Could you please confirm whether this is a drafting error and clarify the correct interpretation of this question?	The Contracting Authority confirms that this is not a drafting error. The Contracting Authority is aware that there are a number of other versions/template ESPDs in use across the public sector. Tenderers in this competition should read carefully each question in the ESPD and provide the appropriate response. The Contracting Authority reserves the right to clarify responses to ESPD questions to ensure accuracy of responses provided by tenderers.