

1. Any further information around the tech stack or functionality of the existing maths toolkit?

Unfortunately no. This was built for an Educational Organisation in the North.

2. Is there the option of building this from scratch if it is seen as unfeasible to work with the existing solution or recommending a 3rd party solution?

Building from scratch is an option. We don't know if we would have access to the existing site.

3. For the save and share solution, is a file based approach a necessity or could this be managed via configured web forwarding?

Either or is fine – whichever proposal you think would work best for us.

4. For the authoring platform, could this potentially be managed via a CMS or would it need to be another external system? If not, is there any clarity of what this system might be or examples of systems that may be considered?

Whichever proposal you think would work best for us.

5. Four-year pricing schedule

The contract and specification describe a four-year delivery period; however, Appendix 1 – Pricing Schedule appears to provide rows for Years 1, 2 and 3 only. Should tenderers add a separate Year 4 cost line to the pricing schedule and provide the full four-year total?

Yes, please add a fourth line.

6. Insurance requirements

The Terms and Conditions require Employers' Liability, Public Liability and Professional Indemnity insurance. Are there minimum indemnity limits required for any of these policies?

No. We are unaware of the minimum and maximum requirements.

7. Irish-language and curriculum content responsibilities

The RFT states that COGG will supply existing mathematics resources and that public-facing Irish-language content will be subject to COGG review and approval. Could COGG please confirm whether the successful contractor will primarily be responsible for the technical design, development, presentation, management and functionality of the platform, with COGG providing and/or approving the educational, curriculum and Irish-language content?

COGG will be responsible for all Irish language text, proofing etc.

8. Pre-existing contractor intellectual property

The Terms and Conditions provide for intellectual property in client-specific deliverables to vest in COGG following payment. Could COGG please confirm whether pre-existing contractor frameworks, generic libraries, utilities and reusable components may remain the intellectual property of the contractor, while COGG retains full ownership of the project-specific deliverables and all COGG-created content?

Yes, we can confirm this.

9. Please clarify the following points in the tender documentation for the Primary Mathematics Hub:

Maximum contract value and VAT basis

The TED notice states an estimated value of EUR 200,000 excluding VAT, while the RFT states a maximum budget of EUR 200,000 inclusive of VAT over four years.

Please confirm the applicable maximum contract value and whether it is inclusive or exclusive of VAT.

Inclusive.

10. Four-year pricing schedule

The contract term covers four years, but the pricing appendix contains rows for Years 1, 2 and 3, followed by a total. Please confirm the pricing schedule to be used for all four contract years, or provide a corrected appendix.

Four years.

11. References to An Tobar

The tender documents include references to the An Tobar educational platform and a bilingual website. Please confirm whether these requirements apply to the Primary Mathematics Hub procurement. If not, please provide corrected terms.

Typo here. Mathematics hub will not be bilingual.

12. Insurance requirements

Please confirm the minimum required insurance limits for Employers Liability, Public Liability and Professional Indemnity insurance.

We are unaware of the minimum and maximum requirements.

13. Language requirements

Section 13 (Educational, Curriculum and Language Requirements) states the website must support Irish-language content and accurate display of fadas, Irish-language titles, metadata and search terms. Could COGG confirm whether the Primary Mathematics Hub is required to be Irish-language only, or whether any bilingual (Irish/English) functionality is expected at any phase?

Irish language only.

14. Terms and Conditions document

The Terms and Conditions of Services Agreement document refers in several places (Clause 1, Definitions, and Clause 8.2) to "An Tobar" and a "bilingual educational website," and states a target launch date of August 2027. As these references do not appear anywhere in the Request for Tender itself, could COGG confirm whether these are clerical errors carried over from a different template, and if so, provide a corrected version of the Terms and Conditions document?

Clerical error. The correct version should be available on E-Tenders.

15. Intellectual property

Clause 11.1 of the Terms and Conditions states that "all intellectual property rights in the Deliverables produced specifically for the Client shall vest in the Client" upon full payment. Tenderers may propose solutions built using proprietary authoring platforms, and clarity on this point would help ensure tenders are costed and structured appropriately. We presume this only applies to the specific content, activities and configurations created for COGG under this contract. Can COGG confirm that this does not apply to any underlying software, platforms or tools previously developed by the tenderer and used to produce the Deliverables.

Yes.

16. Subcontracting

Clause 19 requires prior written approval from the Client before subcontracting "any material part" of the Services. Many tenderers in this sector operate with an established network of contractors and specialists as part of their standard delivery model. Could COGG confirm whether this clause would require case-by-case approval for each individual, or whether an agreed contractor network or team,

disclosed and approved at contract commencement, would satisfy this requirement for the duration of the Agreement?

This would need to be granted on a case by case approval. We would prefer if this work was not sub-contracted.

17. Tender Response Button Missing

We can't see the Tender option in the dropdown Show CFT Menu. Will that appear later or are we looking in the wrong place?

Submissions should be made to eolas@cogg.ie by the specified deadline.

18. Contract Value / VAT

The RFT states that the total budget over four years is €200,000 VAT inclusive, while the Contract Notice refers to an estimated value of €200,000 excluding VAT. Please confirm whether the €200,000 contract value is inclusive or exclusive of VAT.

Inclusive

19. Existing Mathematics Toolkit

The RFT refers to reviewing, integrating and enhancing the existing mathematics toolkit. Can COGG provide access to the current toolkit and any available technical documentation, including details of the underlying technology, source code, dependencies and current functionality?

Probably not. This would have to be agreed with the old provider. The old toolkit was created for an Edu Org in the North.

20. Authoring Platform

The RFT refers to the integration of an authoring platform approved by COGG. Has an authoring platform already been selected? If so, please provide details of the

platform and confirm whether any associated licensing costs are to be included within the tendered contract value.

None selected yet. Costs to be included.

21. Irish / Bilingual Requirement

The RFT primarily describes an Irish-language mathematics portal, while the Terms and Conditions refer to functionality in both Irish and English. Please confirm whether the completed portal is required to operate in Irish only or as a fully bilingual Irish/English platform.

Irish only.

22. Year 4 Pricing

The contract is stated to cover a four-year period; however, the pricing table in Appendix 1 includes fields for Years 1, 2 and 3 only. Please confirm how tenderers should present pricing for Year 4.

Add an extra line for year 4.

23. Third-Party Software and Intellectual Property

The Terms and Conditions refer to COGG receiving a perpetual, transferable and royalty-free licence in respect of third-party software incorporated into the solution. Please confirm that commercially licensed third-party software, plugins and platforms may remain subject to the relevant third-party licence terms, with COGG receiving the appropriate rights of use under those licences.

Confirmed.

24. Budget / VAT basis. Section 2 and Section 5 of the RFT state the total budget is "€200,000 Euro (VAT inclusive)". The TED contract notice (sections 2.1.3 and 5.1.5) states "Estimated value **excluding** VAT: 200 000 Euro". Please confirm which applies.

Inclusive

25. Pricing schedule — Year 4. Appendix 1 provides rows for Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 only, but the contract term is four years. Please confirm how Year 4 costs should be presented.

Add a line for year 4.

26. The existing toolkit (7.2.2). Please identify the existing toolkit to be integrated. Specifically: (a) who developed it and who owns the IP; (b) what technology it is built in; (c) whether source code and a technical contact will be made available to the successful tenderer; (d) whether tenderers may inspect it, or a specification of it, before the submission deadline.

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

27. Authoring platform (9.2.1). Section 9.2.1 refers to "an authoring platform approved by COGG". Has COGG identified a preferred platform? If not, will licence and subscription costs for the platform be borne by COGG or must they be included in the tender price for Years 3 and 4?

No platform has been identified yet. Price for platform must be included.

28. Irish-language content. Please confirm whether translation and Irish-language authoring of website interface text, metadata and resource descriptions is the

responsibility of the tenderer or will be supplied by COGG. Section 13 states COGG will review and approve public-facing content, but does not state who produces it.

COGG will supply.

29. Existing content volume. Approximately how many existing lesson plans, activities and PDF resources are to be migrated in Phase 1, and approximately what additional volume is anticipated in Phase 2?

Approx 100 in phase 1, approx 50 in phase 2

30. Format and limits. Please confirm the required submission format and whether any page or word limit applies to the response sections listed in Section 19.

MS Word, no limit

31. Presentations. Section 21 reserves the right to invite shortlisted tenderers to interview or presentation. Please confirm whether one is anticipated, and the indicative date.

One is anticipated, no date set yet.

32. Exit and handover. Section 18 refers to contract-exit arrangements. Please confirm whether source-code escrow, or any specified transition-to-successor obligation, will form part of the contract.

This will form part of the contract.

33. Approximately how many existing resources (lesson plans / PDFs) will make up the initial resource library?

Approx 100

34. Does COGG have a preferred or already-approved authoring platform for Phase 3?

No preference

35. Approximately how many COGG staff will require content-management access and training?

3

36. Could you please confirm whether all fourteen sections listed under Section 19, “Tender Response Requirements”, are to be prepared by the tenderer in a free format, as no specific templates or prescribed forms appear to have been provided for these sections?

MS Word will suffice

37. In particular, please confirm whether tenderers may structure and present the required information in their own format, provided that all requirements specified in Section 19 and the relevant sections of the RFT are fully addressed.

We understand that Appendix 1 – Pricing Schedule / Form of Tender and Appendix 2 – Tenderer’s Statement are prescribed forms and should be completed and signed in the format provided. Please confirm whether this understanding is correct.

This is correct

38. In addition, regarding the “Cost Proposal” required under Section 19 and further detailed in Section 20, could you please clarify whether:

A separate detailed Cost Proposal should be prepared by the tenderer in addition to completing Appendix 1 – Pricing Schedule / Form of Tender; or

The completed Appendix 1 – Pricing Schedule / Form of Tender is intended to constitute the required Cost Proposal.

If a separate Cost Proposal is required, please confirm whether it may be prepared in a free format, provided that it includes the cost breakdown and other information required under Section 20.

A separate Cost Proposal can be prepared if that is your preference.

39. We would also appreciate clarification regarding Appendix 1, as the Pricing Schedule provides fields for Costs for Years 1, 2 and 3, while the RFT requires a cost proposal for the full four-year contract period. Please confirm how the costs for Year 4 should be presented.

Please add Year 4 yourself (inclusive of the 200K budget)

40. Existing toolkit (clauses 7.2.2 and 12.3). Clause 7.2.2 requires the successful tenderer to integrate "the existing toolkit", and clause 12.3 asks for our approach to reviewing existing toolkit code. The toolkit is not identified in the tender documentation. Please confirm: (a) which specific toolkit is meant, with a URL if it is publicly accessible; (b) who owns the intellectual property and the source code; (c) what technology it is built in; (d) whether tenderers may inspect the code or a working instance before the submission deadline; (e) whether technical documentation exists.

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

41. Authoring platform (clauses 9.2.1 and 12.4). Clause 9.2.1 requires integration of an authoring platform approved by COGG, and clause 12.4 asks about licensing or subscription implications. Please confirm: (a) whether COGG has already selected a specific authoring platform, and if so which; (b) if not, whether tenderers should propose one; (c) whether any licence or subscription fees for the authoring platform are to be included in the tender price for the full four-year term, or whether COGG will procure them separately.

No preferred platform, tenderers should propose one, all costs to be included in 200K budget

42. Cost evaluation methodology (clause 21). Please confirm the formula that will be used to award marks under the "Cost and value for money" criterion, for example whether the lowest price receives full marks with other tenders scored pro rata, or whether a percentage-difference method is used, and how "value for money" is assessed separately from price, if at all.

No, the lowest price is not always selected. Value for money will be based on quality of application and presentation.

43. Pricing schedule (Appendix 1). The Pricing Schedule contains rows for Cost Year 1, Cost Year 2, Cost Year 3 and Total, while the contract term stated in clause 3.2 of the Terms and Conditions is four years. Please confirm whether tenderers should add a fourth year row, or whether the priced term is three years.

Please add in Year 4 (inclusive of 200k budget)

44. Final tender notice and evaluation criteria (clauses 21, 24 and 25). Clause 25 states that submission arrangements will be set out in a final tender notice, and clause 21 reserves the right to refine the evaluation criteria prior to publication of the final tender documentation. Please confirm: (a) whether a further tender notice will be issued, or whether the documents currently published on eTenders are final; (b) whether the criteria and weightings in clause 21 are final for this competition; (c) whether any minimum scoring thresholds apply to individual criteria; (d) whether a maximum page limit applies to the tender response; (e) whether interviews or presentations are envisaged, and if so approximately when.

No further tender notice will be issued (subject to change)

Yes they are final

No minimum scoring thresholds

No maximum page limit

Yes, interviews and presentations are envisaged, date TBC

45. Terms and Conditions of the Services Agreement. Please confirm: (a) clause 1 defines "Services" and "Website" by reference to the An Tobar educational platform, which appears to relate to a different competition, and we assume this should read Primary Mathematics Hub; (b) clause 8.2 states a target launch date of August 2027, while the indicative milestones in clause 22 of the Request for Tenders place launch at the end of Year 1, and we would welcome confirmation of which governs; (c) clause 14 requires Employers' Liability Insurance, and we ask whether this is required of a tenderer that engages no employees, given that the Irish obligation arises only where employees are engaged, and whether Public Liability and Professional Indemnity Insurance alone would be acceptable, and at what minimum levels of indemnity; (d) clause 19 requires prior written approval for subcontracting, and we ask whether collaborators named and described in the tender response are treated as approved on award, or whether separate approval is required after contract signature.

An Tobar is a typo, we have two tenders up at the moment. August 2027 is the target launch date. Whichever insurance you have used in the past should suffice – this is the responsibility of the tenderer. Separate approval is required for subcontracting.

46. Existing Toolkit — Phase 1 Scope

Could COGG provide a more detailed definition of what is meant by the “toolkit”, including its current functionality and intended scope?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

47. The RFT refers to both “create a toolkit” and “integrate the existing toolkit.” Could COGG clarify whether the requirement is to: develop a new toolkit; enhance and integrate the existing toolkit; or deliver both new and existing toolkit functionality? This distinction will materially affect the Phase 1 scope and cost.

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

48. What technology stack is the existing toolkit built on? Could COGG provide access to the source code/repository and any available technical documentation during the clarification or tender process to support accurate estimation?

We do not know what it is built on.

49. Is the existing toolkit currently hosted and in active production use by schools? If so, are there any availability or downtime constraints that must be considered during migration/integration?

When schools are closed would be the best time.

50. Does the term “toolkit” refer to a single application/tool or to multiple existing digital mathematics tools that need to be integrated?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

51. What technical documentation currently exists for the toolkit, and has the existing solution previously undergone a code quality, security, accessibility or technical architecture review?

We do not know.

52. Content Volume and Migration — Phases 1 and 2

Approximately how many existing PDFs, lesson plans and other resources are expected to be uploaded/migrated into the initial resource library, and what is their approximate total storage size? Is there existing mathematics content on cogg.ie or affiliated legacy sites that must be migrated, redirected, or retired as part of this contract, or will all content be fresh uploads supplied by COGG?

Approx 100

53. Will COGG provide the existing resources with the required metadata, e.g., class level, strand, strand unit, topic and curriculum alignment, or is the tenderer expected to review, categorise and apply metadata to the resources? The RFT identifies a relatively extensive metadata structure, so clarification would assist with estimating the content migration effort.

COGG will provide this

54. Are all existing resources already available in digital, publication-ready formats, or should the tenderer allow for any digitisation, document conversion, formatting or accessibility remediation?

Yes they are available as PDFs

55. Could COGG confirm that, following the initial migration/setup, routine content creation, upload and management will primarily be undertaken by COGG staff through the CMS, with the tenderer providing technical support where required? This appears consistent with the requirement for COGG staff to make routine changes without developer intervention.

Yes, this is correct

56. Save-and-Share and Authoring

Are there any specific requirements or constraints regarding the format, maximum size or complexity of the locally saved activity files used by the save-and-share functionality?

Best to keep it as low as possible to make it easier for schools.

57. Should a saved activity file be completely self-contained and capable of operating offline, or is it acceptable for the file to contain the activity configuration and load/open that activity through the online toolkit/portal?

Offline would be best. Something that can be shared by a teacher to student and vice versa

58. Usage, Third-Party Services and Cost Assumptions

Could COGG provide indicative expected usage volumes, including the approximate number of schools and teachers, monthly visitors, peak concurrent users, resource downloads and anticipated year-on-year growth?

We anticipate that this will be used by 200 – 250 schools after year 4.

59. Where third-party services such as hosting, storage, CDN, monitoring or other usage-based services are required, costs may vary according to actual traffic and consumption. Would COGG accept pricing based on clearly stated reasonable usage assumptions, with any consumption materially exceeding those assumptions treated as a variable/pass-through cost or separately agreed additional cost?

Yes

60. For the “agreed minor enhancements” included within the four-year support and maintenance requirement, could COGG specify the expected allowance, for example, an agreed number of development hours or days per year?

This all depends on what comes up. The tenderer can set the number of development / support hours.

61. Hosting, Domain and Infrastructure

Does COGG have any mandatory hosting or data-residency requirements, such as hosting within Ireland, the EU/EEA, or use of a particular cloud provider?

Do not know.

62. Does COGG have any existing cloud provider agreements, subscriptions, or pricing arrangements that the tenderer should use, or should all hosting and infrastructure services be included in the tenderer's commercial proposal?

No.

63. Has a specific .ie domain already been selected or reserved for the Mathematics Hub, or should domain selection, registration and ongoing management be included within the tenderer's scope and pricing?

Included please.

64. CMS and COGG Users

Approximately how many COGG staff members are expected to require CMS and/or authoring-platform access?

3

65. What user roles and approval workflow should be supported, for example, Administrator, Editor, Author and Reviewer/Approver, and is a formal content approval workflow required before resources can be published?

3 admins

66. Accessibility, Data Protection and Security

Could COGG confirm the required WCAG conformance standard and level, for example, WCAG 2.1 AA or WCAG 2.2 AA, and whether compliance must be validated through an independent third-party accessibility audit/certification or whether tenderer-led testing and reporting will be sufficient? The RFT currently refers generally to recognised accessibility standards and EAA/WCAG.

The NDA will monitor the site and all recommendations put forward by the NDA must be adhered to / rectified.

67. Does COGG require the successful tenderer to conduct and deliver a formal Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA), or is the tenderer expected only to provide the data-protection/privacy approach and supporting technical information required by COGG to complete its own assessment?

Yes please provide.

68. Is independent penetration testing or another third-party security assessment required before launch or at any stage during the four-year contract, or will tenderer-led security and vulnerability testing be sufficient?

This will be sufficient.

69. Pupil and Teacher Experience

What primary device environments does COGG expect the portal to support, e.g., Chromebooks, shared Windows/Mac desktops, iPads? Given the local file sandboxing restrictions in iPadOS, commonly used in primary classrooms, are alternative low-friction loading mechanisms, such as compressed URL state parameters or QR codes, acceptable alongside standard local file uploads?

Yes, this will be acceptable. Irish schools use a wide variety of devices so this site must be device agnostic.

70. Is the interaction flow strictly one-way, i.e., pupils load and complete activities locally without transmitting work output back to a server, or is there a requirement for

pupils to submit completed work back to the teacher, e.g., via exported local submission files?

We expect to use this functionality on year 2 or 3

71. Authoring Platform and Editorial Workflow

Does COGG have a preferred digital authoring platform in mind, e.g., H5P, Articulate, Genially, Lumi, or will tenderers be expected to conduct a formal evaluation and recommend an authoring platform at the onset of Phase 3?

Tenderers should propose whichever platform they think is best suited for the project.

72. Standard platform-authored digital activities, e.g., compiled HTML5 modules, typically do not support client-side editing by end-users without source editor access. Would COGG accept a model where teacher adaptation is supported for a defined subset of customizable toolkits, while standard authored activities remain browse-and-play?

Yes.

73. Is a self-hosted authoring solution required, or is a third-party Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) subscription platform acceptable, provided it complies with EU data protection standards?

Yes.

74. Is the new Primary Mathematics Hub required to integrate with any existing COGG web estate systems, such as shared hosting environments, centralized design systems, or Single Sign-On / SSO frameworks, or will it operate as a standalone platform?

Standalone.

75. Language, Search and Localization

Is the public-facing portal strictly Irish-only, or is a bilingual Irish/English site with a language switcher required? If bilingual, does this apply to the user interface, the content assets, or both?

Irish only

76. Are the downloadable PDF resources purely in Irish, or will bilingual/English versions be hosted, requiring language as a search filter facet?

Irish only

77. Could COGG clarify if the user interface and text within the existing legacy toolkit are already fully available in Irish, or will localisation/translation of toolkit elements form part of the awarded contractor's scope?

Already available

78. Will all Irish-language content and any required translations/localisation be supplied and approved by COGG, or is the tenderer expected to provide translation/localisation services as part of the contract?

Supplied by COGG

79. Does the backend administrative/editorial interface of the authoring platform need to be fully localized in Irish for COGG content creators, or is an Irish-language public front-end paired with an English administrative UI acceptable?

Irish is preferred here but not necessary

80. Subcontracting / Technical Delivery Partner

Please confirm whether the Prime Tenderer is permitted to engage a subcontractor or technical delivery partner for the technical delivery of the services.

Permitted but with approval from COGG

81. Budget/VAT: The eTenders notice states €200,000 excluding VAT, while the RFT refers to €200,000 VAT inclusive. Could you confirm the correct maximum contract value and VAT basis?

Inclusive

82. Year 4 pricing: The contract is for four years, but the pricing schedule appears to provide lines for Years 1–3 only. How should Year 4 be priced?

Please add a line for year 4 (inclusive of 200K budget)

83. Existing mathematics toolkit: Could you confirm what existing toolkit/platform is to be integrated or enhanced, and whether further technical details or access can be provided to tenderers?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

84. Digital activities/content: Is the successful tenderer expected to design and author the mathematics activities themselves, or mainly provide the technical platform/templates while COGG supplies or approves the mathematical and Irish-language content?

COGG will provide all of this

85. Subcontractors/specialists: May a prime tenderer rely on the relevant experience, references and named personnel of subcontractors or specialist consultants as part of the tender response?

Subcontracting is permitted but with prior approval from COGG

86. Platform/IP: Are existing commercial/open-source/reusable platform components acceptable, provided the required licensing, handover and long-term usage rights are met?

Yes

87. Selection requirements: Are there any minimum turnover, project-reference value/number, certification or other pass/fail requirements beyond those already stated in the published documents?

No

88. Language scope: Could you confirm which elements must be available in both Irish and English — public UI, CMS/admin interface, activities, documentation and support?

Everything public facing must be in Irish - everything else is optional, Irish preferred but not necessary

89. Phase 1 refers both to creating toolkits and integrating an existing toolkit. Does this phase require integration and enhancement of the existing toolkit, creation of additional toolkits, or both? How many existing toolkits are included?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

90. Can COGG provide a demonstration or technical overview of the existing toolkit, including its technology, representative activities, source-code availability and licensing arrangements?

Unfortunately at this stage we can't

91. For Phase 3, does COGG expect tenderers to propose and integrate an existing third-party authoring platform, or could bespoke authoring-platform development be required? Are there preferred platforms, technical standards or licensing restrictions?

No preferred platforms.

92. Must activities created through the Phase 3 authoring platform support teacher adaptation and the same local-file save-and-share workflow developed during Phase 1? Should the toolkit and authoring platform use a common activity or file format?

Yes, it should. The save and share function will need to work on various devices, laptops, ipads, tablets, chromebooks etc.

93. For pricing purposes, can COGG indicate the approximate number of:

Existing PDFs and resources to be uploaded or recategorised **Approx 100**

Existing toolkit activities **12 approx**

Additional Phase 2 resources **Approx 50 lessons, possibly extra toolkits (approx 4)**

Phase 3 activity templates or sample activities expected from the successful tenderer

94. Will PDFs and other resources supplied by COGG already meet the applicable accessibility requirements, or should the tender include remediation of existing documents?

Include remediation

95. The RFT refers to EAA-WCAG, while the attached terms refer to WCAG 2.1 AA, NDA requirements and annual accessibility audits. Please confirm the applicable accessibility standard and whether annual independent audits are included within the successful tenderer's scope.

WCAG 2.1 AA is the required standard. The NDA will monitor the site and any recommendations from the NDA will have to be implemented.

96. The contract is described as a four-year engagement, but the pricing schedule contains rows for Years 1-3 only. Please confirm how Year 4 should be entered and whether pricing for the possible additional one-year extension should also be provided.

Please add a Year 4 row (inclusive of 200k budget)

97. The RFT permits third-party software licences and subscription costs, while the attached terms refer to a perpetual, transferable, royalty-free licence for incorporated third-party software. Please confirm whether normal open-source and commercial third-party licensing terms are acceptable where all costs and restrictions are clearly disclosed.

Yes, this is acceptable.

98. Can COGG provide access to the existing mathematics toolkit(s), associated technical documentation and details of the underlying technology stack to enable tenderers to accurately estimate the effort required for integration, enhancement and ongoing maintenance?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

99. Is the successful tenderer expected to create digital mathematics activities and content as part of the contract, or is the requirement limited to providing the authoring platform, publishing workflows, templates, training and support for COGG staff to create and manage activities themselves?

The tenderer will create toolkits based on recommendations from COGG. Activities based on these toolkits will be created by COGG.

100. Can COGG provide an estimate of the volume of existing resources to be uploaded, organised and managed within the portal, including the approximate number of PDFs and any other content types expected during Phases 1 and 2?

Approx 100 in phase 1, approx 50 in phase 2.

101. Will metadata and curriculum categorisation information be supplied by COGG for existing resources, or is the successful tenderer expected to create, apply and validate metadata as part of the contract?

Supplied by COGG

102. Does COGG have a preferred authoring platform or any existing licences that should be considered, or are tenderers expected to propose the most appropriate authoring solution as part of their response, whether an external platform or authoring using the platform itself?

No preference

103. What is the existing toolkit. Could you let us know the technology it's built in, who developed it, and when we'd get access to the code and environment?

Is there a sample toolkit we can be provided with/linked to?

Does "create a toolkit" mean build a new one, or integrate/enhance the existing one?

Who owns the existing toolkit code and are there any licensing constraints on adapting it?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

The new toolkit can be based on this.

104. Existing toolkit.

The RFT requires the successful tenderer to review the existing toolkit code and integrate the existing toolkit into the new website (Sections 7.2.2, 12.3, and the Year 1 technical-audit milestone in Section 22). Could you please describe the existing toolkit — its technology/framework, current hosting and condition — and confirm that source-code / repository access and any available documentation will be provided to the successful tenderer at project initiation to enable the Phase 1 review and integration?

The existing toolkit is Mol Mata - <https://ccea.org.uk/learning-resources/mol-mata>

Source code and technical contact may be made available. Inspection will be subject to permission from original developer. We have not investigated this aspect yet.

105. Existing content volume.

Approximately how many existing COGG mathematics lesson plans, activities and PDF resources are to be uploaded and categorised in Phase 1 (Section 7.2.4), and roughly what additional volume is anticipated to be integrated across Phases 2 and 3?

Approx 100 in phase 1, approx 50 in phase 2.

106. Submission requirements.

Section 25 states that the required file format, maximum page limit (if any), submission method and any interview/presentation arrangements will be set out in a final tender notice. Could you please confirm these — in particular the required format and any maximum page limit — so we structure our response correctly?

MS Word is acceptable, no limit

107. Appendix 1 pricing form.

The Appendix 1 Form of Tender (which must be signed) lists cost rows for Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3, whereas the contract term is four years (Section 5) and Section 20 requires a full four-year, by-year cost breakdown. Please confirm how you wish Year 4 costs to be entered on Appendix 1 — for example whether we should add a Year 4 row — so the signed form is completed correctly.

Please add a Year 4 row (inclusive of 200k budget)

108. We noticed the Terms and Conditions document refers to the platform as "An Tobar" and mentions an August 2027 launch date, which doesn't quite match the rest of the tender. Just want to check - is that a leftover from an earlier template, and if so, what's the correct name and target launch date for this project? **The references to "An Tobar" and an August 2027 launch date in the Terms and Conditions document were included in error. The project is the Primary Mathematics Hub, MolMata.ie. It will be delivered in four phases. In line with the tender, the initial Phase 1 launch is expected in Year 1, Month 6.**

109. Could you give us a quick technical snapshot of the existing stack (what it's built on, where it's hosted, anything we should know about its condition) so we can scope the integration realistically? **I am unable to provide a technical overview of the existing stack at this time. I will come back to you when the other members of the project team return from leave, as they will be better placed to answer this question.**

110. For the authoring platform in Phase 3 - is COGG already leaning toward a particular tool, or are you open to tenderers proposing their own recommendation? **COGG has not specified a particular authoring platform. Tenderers may recommend a suitable platform, which will be subject to COGG's approval.**

111. Roughly how much existing content (lesson plans, PDFs, activities) are we talking about for the initial resource library? Just want to size the migration work

properly. **Approximately 300 existing lesson plans, activities and PDF resources are expected to form the initial resource library. Further resources will be added over the course of the project.**

112. Eligibility and project delivery

Are suppliers established in other EU Member States, including Poland, fully eligible to participate in this procurement procedure? **Yes.**

113. Is there any requirement for the successful supplier to have a registered entity, local office, representative or implementation partner in Ireland? **No.**

114. Can the project be delivered primarily or entirely remotely by a team based in Poland? **Yes.**

115. Are any on-site workshops, meetings, training sessions or support activities in Ireland mandatory? **No.**

116. Will references and relevant project experience from clients outside Ireland be assessed on an equal basis? **Yes.**

117. Are there any specific professional indemnity, public liability, cyber insurance or certification requirements that an overseas EU supplier should be aware of? **These will be evaluated on review of applications.**

The answer to many of these questions depends on the relevant phase of the project. As set out in the tender document, the project will be developed in phases over four years. Phase 1 will focus on establishing the website, creating the toolkit, and enabling a simple save-and-share workflow for teachers. Later phases will expand the website into a broader mathematics portal and introduce additional

functionality. Unless otherwise stated, the answers below relate to Phase 1 of the project.

- 118.** What level of interaction is expected between pupils and the digital activities available through the Mathematics Hub? **The Hub will provide adaptable interactive activities, but individual schools and teachers will decide how pupils engage with them according to their classroom context.**
- 119.** We understand that pupil accounts and server-side storage of pupil data should not be required. Should pupils therefore use the platform entirely anonymously? **Pupils should be able to access activities without accounts, logins or providing personal information.**
- 120.** Will pupils complete interactive mathematics activities directly within the portal? **Yes.**
- 121.** Should results or completed activities be communicated back to teachers in any form? **No.**
- 122.** Is any direct interaction between teachers and pupils expected, such as feedback, comments or communication? **No.**
- 123.** Will teachers have individual user accounts and personal workspaces? **No.**
- 124.** Will teachers be able to create collections or sets of activities for particular classes or groups? **Teachers may adapt, save and share individual activities locally.**
- 125.** Could COGG clarify the expected user experience for the “save-and-share” functionality? **Teachers should be able to prepare or adapt an activity, save it as a**

local file and share it through existing systems, such as Google Classroom or email, for pupils to open without an account or login.

126. Would solutions such as unique shareable links, access codes, downloadable activity packages or browser-based local storage be acceptable? **Tenderers may propose an appropriate solution, provided it supports the required save-and-share workflow without pupil accounts or unnecessary server-side storage of pupil data.**
127. Is any activity or progress information expected to remain available after the pupil closes the browser or changes device? **No.**
128. Toolkit
Could COGG provide a more detailed definition of what is expected under the term “toolkit”? **The toolkit refers to interactive digital mathematics tools that teachers can configure, save, and share with pupils for classroom use.**
129. What specific tools should be included in the initial release? **Tenderers should recommend an appropriate initial toolkit aligned with the project objectives, subject to agreement with COGG.**
130. Are these expected to include, for example, worksheet generators, quizzes, interactive mathematical exercises, games, visualisation tools or activity builders? **Tenderers should recommend an appropriate initial toolkit aligned with the project objectives, subject to agreement with COGG.**
131. Should teachers be able to create completely new resources, or mainly configure templates and activities provided by COGG? **Teachers should mainly configure or adapt activities provided by COGG.**

132. Are there any existing educational platforms or digital tools that demonstrate the type of functionality COGG would like to achieve? **No**
133. Authoring platform
What types of digital mathematics activities should COGG staff be able to create using the authoring platform? **COGG staff should be able to create adaptable, curriculum-aligned, activities incorporating instructions, interactive elements, teacher guidance, and curriculum information.**
134. Does COGG expect the authoring platform to be developed specifically for this project, or would integration with an established authoring solution be acceptable? **Integration with an established authoring solution is acceptable, subject to COGG's approval.**
135. Would an open-source authoring technology such as H5P, appropriately customised and integrated into the platform, be acceptable? **An open-source solution such as H5P may be proposed, subject to COGG's approval and compliance with all accessibility, security, licensing, and maintainability requirements.**
136. Should the authoring environment provide drag-and-drop creation of activities? **Tenderers should propose a user-friendly authoring environment suitable for use by COGG staff without developer support.**
137. Should non-technical COGG administrators be able to create and publish new activities without developer involvement? **Trained COGG staff should be able to create, edit, publish, and unpublish activities without developer involvement.**
138. Is a preview, review and approval workflow required before new activities are published? **Activities should be previewable before publication.**

139. Is version history required for created activities? **Version history is not specifically required under the tender; however, tenderers may identify any standard version-control functionality included in their proposed authoring platform. Existing resources and migration**
140. Approximately how many existing mathematics lesson plans, activities and PDF resources will need to be added to the new portal? **Approximately 300 existing lesson plans, activities and PDF resources are expected to form the initial resource library, with further resources added over time.**
141. In what formats will the existing materials be provided? **Existing materials will be provided primarily as PDF files; any additional formats will be identified and agreed during implementation.**
142. Are the existing resources already categorised and tagged, or will the successful supplier be expected to classify them? **The successful tenderer will be expected to work with COGG to recategorise the resources.**
143. Is content migration required from an existing website, CMS or repository?
Yes.
144. Will COGG provide all educational texts, PDF files, illustrations, multimedia materials and Irish-language content? **Yes.**
145. Is the supplier expected to create any new educational content, illustrations, animations, audio or video materials? **No.**
146. Language

We understand that the Mathematics Hub is intended to be a public-facing Irish language portal. Should the entire public interface therefore be available exclusively in Gaeilge, or is an English-language version also required? **The public-facing interface and content should be provided in Irish.**

147. Can the administration interface be provided in English? **Yes.**
148. Will COGG provide all Gaeilge translations for navigation, interface elements and system messages? **Yes.**
149. Are the existing mathematics PDFs and lesson plans already available in Gaeilge? **Yes.**
150. CMS and technology
Does COGG have a preferred CMS, technology stack or technical architecture? **No. Tenderers should recommend a suitable, secure, accessible, and maintainable solution that meets the requirements of the tender.**
151. Would WordPress be acceptable as the main content management platform, combined with custom-developed modules for interactive tools and save-and share functionality? **Yes, WordPress may be proposed, provided the overall solution meets all security, accessibility, performance, maintainability and functional requirements of the tender.**
152. Are there restrictions regarding the use of open-source software, plugins, libraries or frameworks? **No specific restrictions apply, provided all proposed software, plugins, libraries and frameworks meet the tender requirements regarding security, accessibility, licensing, performance, support and long-term maintainability.**

153. Is a traditional CMS architecture acceptable, or is a headless architecture preferred or required? **COGG has no preferred architecture.**

154. Are any APIs or integrations with existing COGG systems required? **No integrations with existing COGG systems or APIs are currently required. Tenderers should ensure that the proposed architecture supports possible future integration.**

155. Are there specific hosting, infrastructure or data residency requirements? **Tenderers should propose secure and reliable hosting that complies with applicable Irish and EU data-protection requirements.**

156. Search and organisation of resources

What search and filtering criteria should be available to teachers? **Teachers should be able to search and filter resources by class level, curriculum strand, strand unit, topic, mathematical concept, resource type, and format.**

157. Should resources be filterable by class level, curriculum strand, mathematical topic, age group, resource type or other criteria? **Yes.**

158. Should the platform index and search the contents of PDF resources? **No.**

159. Does COGG already have an established taxonomy and content structure, or should the supplier develop this as part of the UX and information architecture process? **COGG has identified indicative categories and metadata fields, but the successful tenderer will be expected to work with COGG to develop and agree the final taxonomy and content structure.**

160. Administration

Approximately how many COGG administrators and content editors will use the system? **A small number of nominated COGG administrators and content editors will use the system; tenderers should state any user limits or additional licensing costs in their proposal.**

161. What administration roles and permission levels are required? **The system should provide appropriate administrator and content-editor roles. Detailed permission levels and publishing rights will be agreed with COGG during implementation.**

162. Is an editorial approval workflow required before resources are published? **No formal editorial approval workflow is required, but authorised COGG staff should be able to preview, publish and unpublish resources.**

163. Is a complete audit log and version history required? **No; however, tenderers may identify any standard audit or revision features included in their proposed CMS.**

164. Is bulk import of educational resources required? **Yes**

165. Accessibility

What specific WCAG version and conformance level is required, for example WCAG 2.2 AA? **The website, portal, interactive tools and digital activities must comply with all applicable Irish and EU accessibility requirements. Tenderers should identify the accessibility standards and conformance levels on which their proposed solution is based.**

166. Does the accessibility requirement apply to all interactive mathematics activities and authoring tools as well as the standard website content? **Yes.**

167. Will an independent accessibility audit be required prior to acceptance? **An independent accessibility audit is not required under this tender; however, the successful tenderer must test accessibility and provide evidence of compliance before acceptance. COGG reserves the right to arrange independent accessibility testing.**
168. Is the supplier expected to prepare and maintain an Accessibility Statement? **Yes. The successful tenderer should prepare the initial Accessibility Statement and provide COGG with the information and guidance required to maintain and update it. COGG will retain responsibility for approving and publishing the statement.**
169. Are there specific expectations regarding mathematical notation and screen-reader accessibility? **Mathematical notation must be accessible to screen readers and other assistive technologies. Tenderers should explain how their proposed solution will provide accessible notation and alternatives for any visual mathematical content.**
170. Security and data protection
- Will the platform store personal data relating to teachers? **The platform is not expected to require individual teacher accounts or store teachers' personal data. Any incidental personal data collected through standard website operation must be minimised and handled in accordance with applicable data protection requirements.**
171. Will teacher authentication use standard platform accounts or integration with an existing identity provider or SSO solution? **No.**
172. Is a Data Protection Impact Assessment required? **A DPIA is not currently expected because the platform is designed to avoid pupil accounts and minimise**

personal-data processing. COGG will determine whether a DPIA is required once the proposed solution and its data-processing arrangements are known, and the successful tenderer must provide the necessary technical information and assistance.

173. Is independent penetration testing required before production launch?

Tenderers should describe the security testing proposed and identify whether independent penetration testing is included or recommended.

174. Are there specific backup, disaster recovery and data retention requirements?

Tenderers should propose appropriate backup, disaster-recovery and data-retention arrangements and clearly state their recovery times, retention periods, and restoration procedures.

175. Must all hosting and data processing take place within Ireland or is EU/EEA infrastructure acceptable?

Infrastructure located within the EU/EEA is acceptable, provided it complies with all applicable data protection, security, and contractual requirements.

176. Hosting, support and maintenance

Should the successful supplier provide complete hosting for the full four-year contract period? **Yes.**

177. What approximate number of users and level of traffic should the solution be designed to support? **The Hub is intended for national use by Irish-medium primary schools. Tenderers should propose a scalable solution and clearly state the user numbers, concurrent usage and traffic assumptions on which their proposal is based.**

- 178.** What SLA is expected for critical incidents and technical support? **Tenderers should propose response and resolution targets for critical incidents and other support requests as part of their submission.**
- 179.** Is 24/7 infrastructure monitoring required? **24/7 technical support is not required; however, automated 24/7 monitoring of website availability and critical infrastructure is expected, with appropriate alerting and incident-response arrangements.**
- 180.** Should the four-year maintenance service include ongoing functional development and new features? **The maintenance service should include updates, bug fixes, support, and agreed minor enhancements.**
- 181.** If so, should the tender include a defined number of development hours or days per year? **Tenderers should state the allowance included for minor enhancements each year, together with their rates for any additional development.**
- 182.** Does the estimated EUR 200,000 excluding VAT cover the complete design and development of the portal together with hosting, support, maintenance and future development for the entire four-year contract? **The total budget is €200,000 inclusive of VAT. Delivery and acceptance**
- 183.** What is the expected target date for the first production release of the Mathematics Hub? **Phase 1 is expected in Year 1, Month 6.**
- 184.** Is a phased delivery approach expected? **Yes.**
- 185.** Would COGG expect an MVP or pilot version before the full public launch? **A separate MVP is not required; however, a test or staging version should be**

provided to COGG for review, testing and approval before the Phase 1 public launch.

186. Is pilot testing with teachers and/or pupils expected before final acceptance?

Pilot testing with a small group of teachers is expected before final acceptance.

Pupil testing may also be included where appropriate and will be coordinated by COGG.

187. Could COGG provide further information regarding the acceptance criteria for the major platform components, particularly the toolkit, authoring platform and save and-share functionality? **The components must meet the relevant functional, accessibility, security, usability and performance requirements set out in the tender. Detailed test cases and acceptance criteria will be agreed with the successful tenderer during each project phase.**

188. Eligibility of Non-Irish / Non-EU Tenderers

Please confirm whether an organisation incorporated outside Ireland and outside the European Union is eligible to submit a tender independently, without establishing an Irish/EU subsidiary, branch, local office, consortium or local delivery partner, subject to satisfying all applicable qualification, legal, tax, insurance, data-protection and contractual requirements.

Local Presence / On-Site Requirement

Please confirm whether the successful tenderer is required to maintain an office, registered establishment or minimum staffing presence in Ireland, and whether project management, technical support, training, meetings and maintenance may be delivered remotely from outside Ireland.

No Irish office, establishment, local representative, consortium member or delivery partner is required. Services may be delivered remotely. Mandatory on-site workshops, meetings, training and support activities are not required.

189. Existing Mathematics Toolkit – Source Code and Technical Access

Please confirm whether COGG will provide the successful tenderer with full access to the existing Mathematics Toolkit source code, technical documentation, repositories, dependencies, build/deployment processes and associated assets required to undertake the technical audit and integration described under Phase 1. **There is no existing toolkit. Tenderers should recommend an appropriate initial toolkit aligned with the project objectives, subject to agreement with COGG. This would then be enhanced as the project progresses, phase by phase. The toolkit refers to interactive digital mathematics tools that teachers can configure, save, and share with pupils for classroom use.**

190. Existing Toolkit – Technology Stack and Architecture

Please confirm the current technology stack, programming language(s), framework(s), database/storage architecture, deployment model and hosting environment of the existing Mathematics Toolkit, or whether these details will be made available during a later stage of the procurement. **There is no existing toolkit. Tenderers should recommend an appropriate initial toolkit aligned with the project objectives, subject to agreement with COGG. This would then be enhanced as the project progresses, phase by phase. The toolkit refers to interactive digital mathematics tools that teachers can configure, save, and share with pupils for classroom use.**

191. Existing Toolkit – IP and Modification Rights

Please clarify who owns the intellectual property and source code of the existing Mathematics Toolkit and whether the successful tenderer will be permitted to modify, refactor, extend, integrate and maintain the Toolkit throughout the contract

period. **There is no existing toolkit. Tenderers should recommend an appropriate initial toolkit aligned with the project objectives, subject to agreement with COGG. This would then be enhanced as the project progresses, phase by phase. The toolkit refers to interactive digital mathematics tools that teachers can configure, save, and share with pupils for classroom use.**

192. Save-and-Share – File-Based Architecture

The RFT requires teachers to configure an activity, save it as a local file and enable pupils to reopen the file with the activity restored exactly as prepared. Please clarify whether COGG has an existing file format/schema and technical specification for this workflow or whether the successful tenderer is expected to design and propose the file format, validation mechanism, compatibility approach and versioning strategy. **The successful tenderer is expected to design and propose the file format, validation mechanism, compatibility approach and versioning strategy.**

193. Authoring Platform – Who Provides It?

The RFT requires integration of an authoring platform approved by COGG. Please clarify whether COGG already owns or has selected an authoring platform, or whether tenderers are expected to recommend, procure, license and integrate an appropriate platform. **COGG has not selected an authoring platform. Tenderers are expected to recommend a suitable authoring platform which will be subject to COGG approval. Integration with an established solution is acceptable.**

194. Authoring Platform – Four-Year Licensing Costs

If a third-party authoring platform is proposed, should the tender price include all licensing, subscription, hosting, user-seat and renewal costs for the complete four-year contract period, including any minimum or mandatory licence commitments? **The tender requires cost proposals to identify licensing, subscription and recurring costs over the four-year project period. If a third-party authoring platform is**

proposed, all associated costs should therefore be reflected within the tender pricing.

195. Content Migration – Volume and Responsibility

Please provide an indicative estimate of the number and formats of existing lesson plans, PDFs, activities and other mathematics resources to be migrated/uploaded. Please also clarify whether COGG will supply structured metadata or whether the successful tenderer is responsible for extraction, conversion, tagging, categorisation and metadata creation. **Approximately 300 lesson plans, activities and PDF resources will form the initial resource library. Existing materials will be supplied primarily as PDFs. COGG will provide content, but the successful tenderer will work with COGG to recategorise resources and develop the final taxonomy and content structure.**

196. Irish-Language Content and Curriculum Responsibility

Please confirm whether COGG will provide and approve all Irish-language educational content, terminology, translations, curriculum descriptions and metadata, with the successful tenderer responsible primarily for technical implementation, content-management functionality and display/search support. **Yes. COGG will provide and approve all Irish-language content, educational materials, terminology, translations and associated content. The successful tenderer will be responsible for technical implementation, platform functionality and content management structures.**

197. Curriculum Taxonomy and Versioning

Please confirm whether COGG will provide the authoritative taxonomy for class level, strand, strand unit, topic, mathematical concept, learning focus and curriculum alignment. Given the four-year term, should the platform support versioning of curriculum mappings when curriculum structures or classifications change? **COGG has identified indicative categories and metadata fields, but the successful tenderer**

will work with COGG to develop and agree the final taxonomy and content structure. Versioning is not mandated, although tenderers may propose version-management functionality.

198. Accessibility – Exact WCAG/EAA Target

Please confirm the required accessibility conformance level, such as WCAG 2.2 Level AA, and whether COGG requires an independent accessibility audit, accessibility statement or formal certification before phase acceptance. **The solution must comply with applicable Irish and EU accessibility requirements. The RFT references EAA/WCAG compliance and previous clarification confirms WCAG 2.1 AA as a mandatory requirement. An independent audit is not mandatory, but accessibility testing and evidence of compliance are required. COGG reserves the right to commission independent testing. An accessibility statement is required.**

199. Existing PDF Accessibility Remediation

Please clarify whether the successful tenderer is expected to remediate existing COGG PDFs and other legacy resources for accessibility, or whether accessibility compliance applies primarily to the website and newly created or subsequently modified digital resources. **The tender states that accessibility of downloadable resources should be addressed where feasible and the successful tenderer should provide accessible solutions and evidence of compliance.**

200. Hosting, Data Residency and Performance

Please confirm whether hosting must be located in Ireland or the EEA, and provide indicative expected traffic, concurrent-user volumes, resource downloads and peak classroom usage so that tenderers can accurately size the hosting and performance architecture. **Hosting does not need to be located specifically in Ireland. Infrastructure within the EU/EEA is acceptable provided all applicable data protection, security and contractual obligations are met. No indicative traffic or**

concurrency figures have been supplied; tenderers should propose a scalable architecture

201. Security Certification and Penetration Testing

Please confirm whether COGG requires compliance with a specific security standard or certification, such as ISO 27001 or an equivalent framework, and whether independent penetration testing/security assessment is required before launch or periodically during the four-year contract. **No specific certification (e.g. ISO 27001) has been mandated. Tenderers should describe their security testing approach and indicate whether independent penetration testing is included or recommended.**

202. Definition of 'Minor Enhancements

The RFT includes agreed minor enhancements within the support and maintenance scope. Please define or provide an objective threshold for what constitutes a 'minor enhancement', including whether this will be measured by development hours, complexity, functionality or an agreed annual allowance. **The maintenance service includes updates, bug fixes, support and agreed minor enhancements. Tenderers should specify the annual allowance included and identify rates for additional development.**

203. New Software / Reusable Components – IP Ownership

Please clarify whether the successful tenderer may retain ownership of pre-existing and generic reusable software components, libraries, frameworks, APIs and development assets, while granting COGG the rights necessary to operate, maintain and use the delivered platform. **The tender requires tenderers to clearly state ownership, licensing and intellectual-property arrangements. No prohibition has been issued regarding retention of ownership of pre existing reusable components, provided licensing arrangements are clearly identified. Final ownership and handover provisions will be addressed in contract documentation.**

204. Future LMS / API Integration Scope

The RFT states that a full learning platform may require a separate procurement. Please clarify whether the current contract requires only a Platform Readiness Report and future-state architecture, or whether APIs, data models, authentication mechanisms or integration interfaces must actually be developed under the current contract. **Future LMS integration is outside the mandatory scope. The contract requires preparation of a Platform Readiness Report that considers future options for accounts, progress tracking, LMS 5 integration and future procurement. Current architecture should support future integration, but there is no requirement to implement LMS functionality now.**

205. Four-Year Budget and Appendix 1 – Year 4

The RFT states that the contract will run for four years and that pricing is to be provided by year; however, Appendix 1 appears to show Cost Year 1, Cost Year 2 and Cost Year 3 only. Please confirm whether Year 4 pricing is required and whether COGG will issue an amended pricing schedule. Please also confirm whether the €200,000 VAT-inclusive budget covers the complete four-year scope, including development, hosting, licences, support, maintenance, training and minor enhancements. **The Mathematics Hub contract runs for four years and the total budget is €200,000 inclusive of VAT. Tenderers must provide a phased delivery plan and cost breakdown for the full four year period. Tenderer may include an extra row in the pricing schedule to include Year 4.**

206. Insurance and Non-Irish Insurer Acceptability

Please confirm the required insurance levels and whether insurance policies issued by an insurer regulated in India or another non-Irish jurisdiction will be acceptable, provided that the policies satisfy the coverage, indemnity, jurisdiction and contractual requirements specified by COGG. **Indicative guide levels are: Employer's Liability €12.7m, Public Liability €6.5m and Professional Indemnity €1m–€2m. The**

documentation does not restrict insurers to Ireland; however, policies must satisfy contractual requirements and will be evaluated during tender assessment.

207. Submission process:

Can you confirm the required submission format for the tender? **The tender may be submitted by e-mail to eolas@cogg.ie.**

208. Existing toolkit:

Can you provide access to or details of the existing mathematics toolkit/platform that is to be integrated, including its current architecture and constraints? **The existing toolkit refers to the collection of interactive mathematics tools currently available through the CCEA Mol Mata website, for example, the Uirlis Airgid. These tools are intended to provide a starting point for the new platform. However, some may need to be updated or redeveloped to improve their functionality, accessibility, compatibility with current browsers and devices, and ease of use in the classroom.**

209. Toolkit wording:

When the tender says create, enhance, and integrate the toolkit, does that mean reusing an existing toolkit, rebuilding parts of it, or creating a new one? **The intention is to incorporate the existing Mol Mata interactive mathematics tools into the new website while improving them where necessary. It does not necessarily mean that every existing tool must be retained in its current form.**

210. Authoring platform:

What is meant by authoring platform here, and is the supplier expected to propose one, provide one, or integrate with one selected by you? **An authoring platform is a system that enables authorised COGG staff to create, edit, manage and publish structured digital mathematics activities without requiring routine software development or coding. COGG has not selected a particular authoring platform. Tenderers are expected to recommend a suitable platform and explain how it**

would integrate with the website, toolkit and digital activity library. The proposed solution will be subject to COGG's approval.

211. Migration/content volume:

What existing content, resources, PDFs, activities, or legacy assets need to be migrated into the new platform as part of scope? **Approximately 300 existing lesson plans, activities and PDF resources are expected to form the initial downloadable resource library. These will be supplied by COGG in their available formats. Further resources will be added over the course of the four-year project.**