Helsinki, 04/06/2012
D(2012)

**CLARIFICATION 2**

**Open call for tender ECHA/2011/150**
**Invitation to Tender No 2012/S 88-143630**
**Framework Service Contract for the Provision of Enterprise Content Management (ECM) Services and Solutions**

## Question 2.1

On p. 3 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"**The scenario is used for evaluating the proposed solution architecture design** and project plan that should be based on the scenario".* On the other hand, in Annex 5.1.2.2 of echa_2012_150_specifications_and_model_contract_en.pdf, it is stated that the scenario proposal should only include a Project Plan, and there is no reference of a Software Architecture Design document as a deliverable for the tendering process.

Our question is, is a Software Architecture Design document indeed required as part of our Tender, and if yes, what is the weight that it will carry during the evaluation of the Tender?

## Answer

*The Software Architecture Design document is not required and shall not be included in the Tender. That reference on page 3 of the document ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf is a clerical error. The correct sentence should read: "**The scenario is used for evaluating the proposed project plan that must be based on the scenario.**"*

## Question 2.2

On p.5 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf*, in Figure 1 the Records Management system is shown as a stand-alone system, separate from the Business applications systems which include Document Management and Case Management. Our question is, given that some aspects of the Business Application systems are implemented using Documentum technologies and that the respective infrastructure is already in place, has ECHA made a decision on whether the RM repository will be hosted on the same repository as the Case Management system, or on a separate one? The reasoning for our question is that having a separate repository increases the complexity of the solution and will affect the planning of the project.

**Answer**

*Figure 1 is a logical representation of the ECHA ECM systems. Nevertheless, the Records Management repository should be hosted on a separate repository and the project plan should be based accordingly.*

**Question 2.3**

On p.8 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"(the electronic RM application) shall also be the records management system for the electronic records,* ***once the electronic record is considered to be the primary one (e.g. digital signature and other similar prerequisites in place)****".*

Our question is, should we in our project plan consider a dependency on the digital signature infrastructure / implementation being in place, or should the RM implementation ignore this dependency?

**Answer**

*The implementation of digital signature is not requested in the proposal for the scenario.*

**Question 2.4**

On p.9 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"****Later e.g.*** *a Scanning service may need to be implemented e.g. to bulk import large volumes of records to the application".* In addition, the Scanning module is shown as optional (drawn with a dotted line) in Figure 2 on the same page.

Our questions are:

a. Should the implementation of a scanning service be included in the Project Plan, or is it considered out of scope?

b. Can you please elaborate on the meaning of the word "later"? Is the project to be implemented in discrete phases with separate versions of the delivered application, each augmenting on the functionality, or will there only be one final production system?

**Answer**

a. *The implementation of scanning service is not requested in the proposal for the scenario.*

b. *"Later" refers to the fact that additional functionalities may need to be introduced to the system afterwards, i.e. after its go-live. The proposed project plan shall ignore these post go-live events.*

**Question 2.5**

On p.8 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"****The import (of relevant records) shall be possible*** *either* ***automatically*** *from another system using an*

*automated interface, or manually by a user using a suitable user interface screen.".* Also, on p. 12 of the same document, it is mentioned that *"Both manual (user-interface driven) and* ***automatic (application-to-application) ways to input records to the system are foreseen****".*

Our question is, can you please elaborate on the specific applications that will be able to automatically import records into the RM system as part of the scenario implementation? For each of these applications, can you please explain the mechanism that these applications will employ in order to export records from their internal databases to the RM system?

**Answer**

*This automatic interface refers to a "standard" or "generic" interface (e.g. based on Web Service technologies) exposed by the Records Management system to other systems. Another system can use this interface to automatically enter information to the RM system.*

**Question 2.6**

On p.12 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"The registration service will ensure that (...) a record is* ***promoted from a document at the time of registration****.".*

We understand that many ECHA documents are residing on Document Management Systems (e.g. SharePoint) outside Documentum repositories. Our questions are:

a. We would like to confirm our understanding that the RM system will not be used as a Document Management System but only as an RM system.

b. Given that the registration takes place after the import process, and therefore can only access records that are already residing in the RM system, how will the registration service access the documents residing in the various ECHA applications in order to promote them?

**Answer**

a. *Records Management system and Document Management system(s) are separate and the scope of the project for this scenario is limited to the RM system.*

b. *Referring to our reply to question 5: Records Management system is "passive" in the sense that it only provides interface which other systems used to import records to RM system. RM system does not actively fetch information from other systems.*

**Question 2.7**

On p.13 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"****the ECHA filing plan*** *is a coherent logical structure that allows ECHA staff* ***to organize correctly the documents and records*** *they deem as important".*

As explained in the previous point, we understand that the RM system will not be used for Document Management purposes but only for RM purposes. Our questions is, will there be a Filing Plan structure also implemented in the Document Management systems (e.g. SharePoint), and if yes, should there be any functionality to integrate the two as part of the scenario implementation?

**Answer**

*The filing plan of the other systems is not relevant for the scenario. What is relevant is that the other system, once it uses the automatic import interface exposed by the RM system (see ECHA replies above), provides the correct information to RM system as part of the import process. However, how this will be implemented in the other systems is out of the scope of the Records Management project, and hence the scenario. The RM system and the project plan for the scenario shall include only the implementation of the import interface.*

**Question 2.8**

On p.13 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* there is a reference to document PRO-0008 which was not included in the scenario documentation ("Annex 5.1.2.2 Scenario and References.zip") file. Could you please make this document available on the ECHA page related to this call for tender?

**Answer**

*This document will be sent by e-mail to all companies who have submitted a signed NDA related to the scenario.*

**Question 2.9**

On p.19 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"Two-factor (strong) authentication is necessary when a user accesses the system outside the ECHA perimeter (i.e. outside the local area network).".* Also, on a footnote on the same page, it is mentioned that *"At the moment, no ECM system is available via ECHA VPN. In addition, there is no requirement identified at the moment that the Records management system should be available through it either to internal or external users.".*
Our question is, is any part of external user access in scope as part of the scenario implementation, and if yes, exactly what functionality related to such user access should be implemented in the RM system?

**Answer**

*External user access is out of the scope of the scenario.*

**Question 2.10**

On p.21 of document *ECHA.2012.150 - Annex_5_1_2_2_Scenario on ECHA Electronic Records Management System.pdf* it is mentioned that *"the file must be **encrypted** if the document/information is classified 'Confidential'".*

Our question is, what does the term "encryption" refer to?

a. Does it refer to storing the file in an encrypted file store storage areas by leveraging the functionality offered by Trusted Content Services?

b. Does it refer to using a password known only to a selected set of users for encrypting it? If yes, how will this password be set and communicated / shared among users?

**Answer**

*For the proposal for the scenario, the encryption shall be assumed to be compliant with option a., i.e. leveraging Trusted Content Services functionality.*

**Question 2.11**

In relation to Chapter 4.1.2.1 and the requirements identified for partners in joint offers and subcontractors, we understand that Freelancers / Non-Permanent staff are not considered as subcontractors and as such should provide only the Letter of Intent while the Tenderer should not identify any percentage / share allocated to Freelancers.

**Answer**

*When Tenderers rely on experts with whom they maintain a non-permanent relationship in order to prove the ability to provide the necessary human resources to deliver the required services under the contract, the Tenderer does not need to identify the percentage or share of contract implementation allocated to such freelancers or non-permanent staff. In these cases, instead of the letter of intent for subcontractors of Section 4.1.2.1 of the Specifications, a signed declaration stating the commitment of the expert to working for the particular tenderer in the contract implementation in case of contract award will be required, as foreseen in Section 4.1.2.1.3 of the Specifications.*

*Please note, on the other hand, that as indicated on page 27 of the same section 4.1.2.1.3 of the Specifications with regard to selection criteria documentation "For the purpose of the consolidated assessment,* ***the entities*** *(tenderer/s or sub-contractor/s) of the consortium which contribute to the aggregated capacity, as stated in the tender, shall provide the relevant documentary evidence described below in proportion to their contribution to the overall capacity of the consortium".*

**ECHA**