Dear Bidders,

Please find attached the response to queries raised by a potential bidder in respect to RFP No. 2021-0068/THORVALDSDOTTIR "Scientific Writing and Editing of OSI Technical Reports".

Please take the response into account in the preparation and submission of your Quotation. Please note that previous questions and answers have been grayed out.

We are looking forward to receiving your Quotation prior to the closing date on 14 July 2021, 17:00h Vienna local time.

Kind regards

O.I.C.
Courtney Linley
Chief, Procurement Section
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions from Bidders</th>
<th>Answers from the Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong> Please clarify which activities shall be included in the quoted &quot;Total Contract Price&quot;, as specified in PART II FINANCIAL PROPOSAL, par. (i). Please advise whether to refer to the work needed to process 15 drafts in 18 months, or to the work needed to process one single draft.</td>
<td><strong>Answer 1</strong> As indicated in the Instructions to Bidders, the bidder shall submit a proposal which indicates: The Total Contract Price, exclusive of taxes. A breakdown of the Contract Price, indicating the price for all items indicated in section i, ii and iii of the Instructions to Bidders (Part II, Financial Proposal). The bidder shall thus submit a financial proposal indicating the unit prices for each work task/report (hourly/daily/per page/per report etc.) as well as indicating the overall, aggregated cost of the Contract (the “Total Contract Price”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong> With a reference to the Instructions to Bidders, page 1. The mentioned Attachment C is not apparent, nor listed in the documents included in the RFP. Please explain.</td>
<td><strong>Answer 2</strong> As indicated in the Instructions to Bidders, two Attachments are included with the Terms of Reference; Technical Evaluation Criteria (Attachment 1) and Sample Document (Attachment 2). The awarded Proposal will be added as Annex C to the Contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong> Attachment 2 is a sample of CBITO documentation. Please explain what is required to be done with the Sample Document (Attachment No. 2) in order to demonstrate the quality of the bidder’s work.</td>
<td><strong>Answer 3</strong> Please refer to Terms of Reference, Section 2.1 (“Scope”) for the expected scope of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong> With reference to Sample document: Your previous answers indicate that we should refer to Section 2.1 (“Scope”) for the expected scope of work: Please supply the sample document in Word format. Are there any specific instructions regarding style that we should follow?</td>
<td><strong>Answer 4</strong> • The Sample Document is attached herewith in Word format. • There are no specific instructions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>Answer 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reference to Bidder’s statement (p. 9 of RFP): Do we need to complete and submit this form?</td>
<td>The Bidder’s statement is part of the solicitation package. Bidders indicate “Not applicable” to those sections that are not relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Answer 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With ref. to Technical evaluation criteria: Table 1 lists all criteria as essential. This contradicts what is stated in 4. Requirements (p. 40 of RFP), where it says that the final 3 criteria in the table are desirable, not essential. Please advise which is correct.</td>
<td>The technical evaluation criteria as stated in Attachment 1 will be used for evaluation. All evaluation criteria listed in such an Attachment are essential, therefore their compliance is mandatory. Please note that Section 4 of the ToR included two lines referring to the same criterion “Editing for grammar, usage, spelling, punctuation, and other mechanics of style”, which was indicated as essential in one line and as desirable in the other one. The Commission acknowledges the contradiction and confirms that the line with the indication of this criterion as desirable should be considered erroneous, as its compliance is mandatory. Moreover, the Commission confirms that the practical knowledge of the CTBTO and, specifically, of the On-Site Inspection pillar of the CTBT including inspection techniques, should be considered only as desirable, therefore lack of compliance with it shall not regarded as a ground for disqualification of the non-compliant proposals. A revised ToR to reflect the above mentioned change in Section 4 is attached to this clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Answer 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Please advise if we can assume that all 15 reports foreseen will need everything listed under 2.1 Scope.</td>
<td>Most, if not all, of the reports will require the tasks described under section 2.1 of the ToR. Regarding the schematics, it can be assumed that there will be 5 schematics per report but this number could still vary. Some could be reused for different reports. Regarding the redrawing, it can be assumed that there will be 10 schematics per report but this number could still vary. Some could be reused for different reports. Regarding maps we can assume no more than 3 to 5 per report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please advise how many new schematics will need to be created per report on average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Please advise how many existing diagrams/maps will need to be redrawn/revised per report on average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Answer 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide the extracts of a draft technical report and an example of previously published unrelated technical report as indicated in Section 7 (Quality of Proposal) in the Terms of Reference.</td>
<td>Please refer to documents already provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9</th>
<th>Answer 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Please provide the Protocol to the CTBT, paragraph 69 or the associated web link. | The Treaty text can be accessed via the CTBTO website: [https://www.ctbto.org/the-treaty/treaty-text/](https://www.ctbto.org/the-treaty/treaty-text/)

The paragraph reads as follows:
69. The following inspection activities may be conducted and techniques used, in accordance with the provisions on managed access, on collection, handling and analysis of samples, and on overflights:
(a) Position finding from the air and at the surface to confirm the boundaries of the inspection area and establish coordinates of locations therein, in support of the inspection activities; (b) Visual observation, video and still photography and multi-spectral imaging, including infrared measurements, at and below the surface, and from the air, to search for anomalies or artifacts; (c) Measurement of levels of radioactivity above, at and below the surface, using gamma radiation monitoring and energy resolution analysis from the air, and at or under the surface, to search for and identify radiation anomalies; (d) Environmental sampling and analysis of solids, liquids and gases from above, at and below the surface to detect anomalies; (e) Passive seismological monitoring for aftershocks to localize the search area and facilitate determination of the nature of an event; (f) Resonance seismometry and active seismic surveys to search for and locate underground anomalies, including cavities and rubble zones; (g) Magnetic and gravitational field mapping, ground penetrating radar and electrical conductivity measurements at the surface and from the air, as appropriate, to detect anomalies or artifacts; and (h) Drilling to obtain radioactive samples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question 10</strong></th>
<th>Practical experience can be used in lieu of a postgraduate degree in scientific writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I would like to enquire as to the qualifications required, and whether having a post-graduate scientific writing qualification is mandatory. I have a PhD in Mechanical Engineering. Furthermore, I have written many well recognized scientific and engineering papers as well as consultancy reports. I will be grateful if you can inform me as to whether this qualification and writing experience will pass the test of criteria”. Unquote.</td>
<td>“Principle scientific writer/editor has postgraduate qualification in scientific writing/editing with 3 years of relevant professional practical experience* in the field or a minimum of 8 years of relevant professional practical experience* in the field of scientific writing/editing”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical and/or theoretical experience of one or more of the techniques listed in paragraph 69 of part II of the Protocol to the CTBT is essential. This includes various seismic, optical, radiological and geophysical techniques.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B

Terms of Reference

Call-off Contract for
Scientific Writing and Editing Services
1 BACKGROUND

The Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”) operates a global verification regime to monitor compliance with the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. It provides timely data, assessments and other products and services to Signatory States of the Treaty.

The purpose of an On-Site Inspection (OSI) is to clarify whether a nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion has been carried out in violation of Article I (of the CTBT) and to the extent possible, to gather any facts which might assist in identifying any possible violator.

Following on from the OSI Action Plan for 2016-2019, the Equipment and Implementation Section has produced a series of draft technical reports providing a history of the development of inspection techniques; these include technical reports on:

- Ground-based visual observation and position finding,
- Passive seismological monitoring for aftershocks,
- Resonance seismometry,
- Environmental sampling,
- Airborne multispectral imaging.

It is expected that over an 18-month period up to 15 draft technical reports will be reviewed, edited and prepared for publishing.

The draft technical reports have been written by different authors and vary in structure and style. The aim is to publish these as fully edited PTS Technical Reports with a common structure and style. It is expected that each published technical report will be between 50 and 100 pages long and contain a mix of:

- text,
- schematic diagrams,
- photographs,
- tables
- maps.
2 SCOPE OF CONTRACT

2.1 Scope

The Commission seeks to establish a Contract with a Call-off Period of two (2) years for scientific writing/editing. These Terms of Reference (hereinafter referred to as “ToR”) form the technical framework for the provision of Scientific Writing and Editing Services on a Call-off Basis (hereinafter referred to as “Services” or “Work”).

The Contractor shall review and edit draft technical reports prepared by the Equipment and Implementation Section of the OSI Division. While reviewing and editing the technical reports, the Contractor shall be responsible for:

- fact checking content;
- improving consistency and structure of content, in line with required standard structure and style;
- rewriting text for consistency and clarity;
- ensuring better flow of information;
- avoiding redundancy of content;
- editing for grammar, usage, spelling, punctuation, and other mechanics of style;
- rewriting and editing executive summary, preface and/or foreword;
- creating schematic diagrams;
- editing tables, figures and lists;
- editing captions;
- checking direct quotations, including page references;
- checking for consistency of mechanics and for internal consistency of facts, including correspondence of data given in graphics and text;
- putting citations in house style and checking completeness and style of references, including flagging any bibliography references not cited in text;
- inserting header levels and approximate placement of graphics.

2.2 Tasks

Upon request, the Contractor shall be responsible for editing OSI draft technical reports in line with the services described in section 2.1. It is envisaged that one technical report shall be made available for
editing every 1 to 2 months and that the editing process for each technical report should not exceed four weeks.

2.3 Deliverables

Deliverables shall be developed for tasks and responsibilities as they are assigned when the work is called-off (see Section 5). They will include meeting operational or project task objectives, following established standards, and writing technical documentation. The deliverables may include:

- Edited technical report text in line with agreed structure;
- New schematic diagrams in line with agreed style;
- Revised diagrams/maps in line with agreed style.

All deliverables shall be communicated by e-mail.
3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

When writing/editing, the Contractor shall ensure:

- Close cooperation with the Commission point of contact and with Commission editing staff;
- All materials provided by the Commission for edit and review must be treated as confidential.
4 REQUIREMENTS

4.1 Contractor

The Contractor shall be an individual or a group whose **principle scientific writer/editor** shall have:

- Principle scientific writer/editor has postgraduate qualification in scientific writing/editing with 3 years of relevant professional practical experience* or a minimum of 8 years of relevant professional practical experience* in the field of scientific writing/editing.

Additionally, the Contractor shall be an individual or a group with proven experience* in:

- Rewriting technical documents in Microsoft Word to ensure better flow of information, provide clarity of information for general audience and avoid redundancy of content;
- Fact checking English language scientific literature (preferably physics/geophysics-based texts);
- Checking for internal consistency of facts, including correspondence of data given in graphics and text;
- Creating simplified schematic diagrams representing concepts or workflows using commercial off-the-shelf applications such as the Adobe suite or similar;
- Editing for grammar, usage, spelling, punctuation, and other mechanics of style;

Additionally, it is **desirable** if the Contractor is an individual or a collective with practical knowledge of:

- The CTBTO and, specifically,
- The On-Site Inspection pillar of the CTBT including inspection techniques.

*Experience shall be supported by evidence of named projects or publications with references or links. Unsupported claims will not be credited.*
4.2 Proposals from a group

In the case of a proposal from a group of scientific writers/editors, the Contractor shall identify the principle scientific writer/editor. The Contractor shall commit to the requirement that all edited documents are proof-read by the principle scientific writer/editor before being communicated to the Commission. This shall be explicitly stated in the proposal.

A group of scientific editors/writers/graphic designers shall comprise no more than five (5) staff and will constitute a ‘roster’. Each member of the roster shall be named and their role and experience relevant to the criteria set out in 4.1 shall be stated clearly.

The Contractor shall maintain an up-to-date version of the roster for the duration of the Contract. The Contractor shall be responsible to inform the Commission when a staff member is to be removed or added to the roster, and if the details of staff are modified.

If the Commission estimates that the roster lacks capacity or capability to perform a specific work within the specified timeframe or quality, the Contractor shall provide, within three working days after a request is made by the Commission, the details of skilled and experienced staff to be added to the roster for consideration by the Commission.

The Commission shall be entitled to confirm whether or not the proposed roster revision is acceptable.
5 ORGANIZATION OF WORK

5.1 FRD Call-off

The Services will be initiated by the Commission in writing through a Formal Request of Delivery (hereinafter referred to as an “FRD”).

5.1.1 Initiating Work

Before the issuance of an FRD to the Contractor, a request will be communicated to the Contractor via email from the Commission, containing elaborations and definitions as to the nature of the particular Service(s) requested. The Contractor shall provide, at a minimum, within one (1) week of receiving the written request, the following information in the form of a Work Plan for each Service identified in the written request:

- A list of staff who will be working under this FRD – if a roster has been provided. These staff shall be a subset of the Team Roster, as described in Section 4;
- Work plan and key schedule to accomplish the Service;
- Number of person-days to be allocated to the Service;
- Commencement date and completion date of the Service.

After review of the Work Plan for each of the Services identified in the written request, and only after the acceptance by the Commission thereof, the FRD shall be issued to the Contractor.

The Commission will forward FRDs to the Contractor with adequate advance notice and containing all necessary details and expected deliverables.

The Commission shall not be liable for the performance of any particular Service(s), which have been performed before the formal issuance of an FRD to the Contractor.

It is expected that over an 18-month period up to 15 technical reports will be available for editing and publishing and the normal practice will be to issue 2 draft technical reports for review per FRD. This number is provided as guidance and the Commission reserves the right not to issue any FRDs.

5.1.2 Completion and Acceptance

At the end of a particular Service under the applicable FRD, the Contractor shall submit to the Commission the deliverable as stated in the respective FRD. The work will be reviewed by the Commission’s staff and by the Commission’s management against the requirements and the Commission’s internal working practices and standards.
5.1.3 Invoicing and Payment

The Work and deliverables, after being evaluated under reasonable performance criteria and accepted as satisfactory by the Commission, will form the basis for the invoicing and payment of a particular Service performed under an FRD.

6 RESOURCES PROVIDED BY THE COMMISSION

The Commission will provide:

- Relevant documentation via e-mail communication;
- Qualified staff to assist and cooperate in responding to information requests from the Contractor in order to allow the Contractor to carry out the Work;

All other resources are to be provided by the Contractor.

All Services are to be provided off-site and no access to the Vienna International Centre is required.
7 QUALITY OF THE PROPOSAL

Instructions for the preparation and submission of proposals are outlined in Attachment C, enclosed to the Request for Proposals document.

The Contractor is expected to submit a proposal that addresses the content of the ToR in a comprehensive and detailed way. In the proposal, the Contractor shall explicitly tabulate how the individual/collective meet the requirements set out in Section 4.

The Contractor shall show good understanding of the requirements as well as the responsibilities and duties expected from them including commitment to the timeframe indicated for issuing FRDs and completing the Work;

If requested, the Commission will share extracts of a draft technical report and an example of a previously published unrelated technical report.