

FINAL

No further clarification questions will be considered

Ref: CFT8495035 - T21680 - Request for Tenders to establish a Multi Supplier Framework Agreement for the provision of legal services to the Commission for Communications Regulation.

Clarification Questions dated_16/07/2026 @ 17.55

Message Ref No:	Question	ComReg Response
7371294	Good evening, Thank you for issuing the clarification responses to date and for extending the Tender submission deadline. Having reviewed the clarification responses issued to date, we remain unclear on a small number of drafting and submission requirements that materially affect the preparation of a compliant tender. Our intention is simply to ensure that our submission is structured in accordance with ComReg's requirements and, importantly, that all Tenderers prepare their submissions on a like-for-like basis to support a fair and consistent evaluation. We would therefore be grateful if ComReg could clarify the following: 1. Lot 3 Submission Structure Paragraph 2.6.6 of the RFT states that Tenderers are to submit one complete response comprising: • Section 1 – Compliance; • Section 2 – Selection Criteria; and • Section 3 – Tender. The clarification responses subsequently state that Tenderers applying for more than one Lot must submit a separate bespoke Tender for each Lot and each Sub-Lot, whilst also confirming that cross-referencing is permitted where information fully addresses the relevant criterion. To ensure submissions are prepared consistently, could ComReg please confirm which of the following approaches is intended?	Tenderers should submit a complete standalone submission for each lot or Sub-Lot, each containing separate Compliance, Selection Criteria and Tender sections A practical example is provided as follows: If a tenderer wishes to submit a tender for Lot 1, and say Lot 3.4 only, that tenderer must submit two separate and distinct submissions to the RFT. If a tenderer wishes to submit a tender for Lot 3 only, that tenderer is only required to submit one submission. If a tenderer wishes to submit a tender for Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3.2 and Lot 3.4, that tenderer must submit four separate and distinct submissions to the RFT. Identical content may be replicated across submissions where applicable.

	Option A One master response comprising: • Section 1 – Compliance; • Section 2 – Selection Criteria; and • common Tender responses, together with separate Sub-Lot responses containing only the specialist content relevant to each Sub-Lot. OR Option B A complete standalone submission for each Sub-Lot, each containing separate Compliance, Selection Criteria and Tender sections. 1. Re-use of Common Content If Option B is the intended approach, can ComReg please confirm whether identical content may be replicated across submissions where applicable, including: • Compliance documentation; • Selection Criteria responses; • Methodology; • Designated Team; • CVs; • Reference projects; and • Pricing (where unchanged). If so, can ComReg also confirm that the reuse of identical content across submissions will not adversely affect evaluation?	The reuse of identical content across separate submissions will not adversely affect evaluation where specific to the Lot being tendered for.
	1. Selection Criteria and Award Criteria The clarification responses refer Tenderers back to the guidance contained within the RFT. However, it remains unclear whether information submitted under the Selection Criteria is expected to be repeated within the Award Criteria where similar information is requested. Could ComReg please confirm whether: 1. information submitted under the Selection Criteria is intended solely for the pass/fail assessment; or	Confirmed Tenderers are expected to expand upon the selection criteria information within the Award Criteria responses where relevant to the qualitative evaluation. Each section should be clear and distinct and contain information specific to the lot being tendered for without cross references.

	2. Tenderers are expected to repeat or expand upon that information within the Award Criteria responses where relevant to the qualitative evaluation. If repetition is not required, can ComReg confirm that Tenderers may cross-reference the relevant Selection Criteria response where it fully addresses the Award Criterion?	
	1. Reference Projects and Referees The clarification responses state that “Two (2) references are required for each contract for the past three years”, however it remains unclear how many reference projects and referee contacts are required per submission. Could ComReg please confirm: 1. the total number of reference projects required per Lot/Sub-Lot submission; 2. the total number of referee contacts required; and 3. whether one referee contact per reference project is sufficient, or whether two referee contacts are required for each reference project.	For each Lot or sub lot applied for THREE (3) relevant contracts within three (3) years from the Tender Deadline are required. Two (2) references are required for each contract for the past three years
	1. Evaluation of Lot 3 Sub-Lots Could ComReg please confirm whether each Sub-Lot under Lot 3 will be evaluated independently against the full Selection and Award Criteria and receive a separate evaluation score?	Correct
	1. Green Highlighted Text Our previous query related to the wording highlighted in green within the RFT rather than the highlighting itself. The clarification response confirmed that the highlighting has no meaning. Could ComReg please confirm whether the highlighted wording on pages 25–28 forms part of the tender requirements, or whether it is template/internal drafting guidance that is not intended to form part of the evaluation requirements?	The highlighting of the text forms part of internal guidance / template and cross referencing and does not change or affect in any way the meaning of the text that is highlighted. Tenders should treat as deleted the text highlighted in green on pages 25 and 26.
	1. Further Extension Request Whilst we appreciate ComReg’s extension of the Tender deadline, the clarification responses raise a number of matters which materially affect the interpretation of the RFT and the structure of compliant submissions.	The Tender deadline is now further extended to 4 pm on 30 July.

	We would therefore respectfully request that ComReg considers a further extension to the Tender submission deadline to allow Tenderers sufficient time to review the clarification responses, prepare submissions on a consistent basis and ensure that all Tenderers are evaluated on a like-for-like basis. Thank you for your consideration.	
--	---	--

Ref: CFT8495035 - T21680 - Request for Tenders to establish a Multi Supplier Framework Agreement for the provision of legal services to the Commission for Communications Regulation.

Clarification Questions dated 21/07/2026 @ 16.44

Message Ref No:	Question	ComReg Response
740573	Good afternoon, I hope you are keeping well. Can we kindly follow up on our follow up to the issued clarifications on Friday 17th? Many thanks in advance.	See above

Ref: CFT8495035 - T21680 - Request for Tenders to establish a Multi Supplier Framework Agreement for the provision of legal services to the Commission for Communications Regulation.

Clarification Questions dated 22/07/2026 @ 12.07

Message Ref No:	Question	ComReg Response
741211	Dear Commission for Communications Regulation We note that the Tenderer's Statement uploaded to eTenders is missing an item 13. Is this intentional or is there another version of the Statement you would like tenderers to use? Kind regards	This is intentional as this section (13) is not used.