

Invest International

Tender: European tender for development, maintenance and support of an Integrated Enterprise Reporting (IER) solution
Date: 14 March 2024

Please note that a new version of the pricing sheet (v1.1) has been uploaded in TenderNed, since some of the fields were not properly locked. No content changes were made to the file.

| Nr. | Subject | Question | Answer |
|-----|---|---|---|
| 1 | Appendix 06 Concept Agreement | The contractor commits to the agreed-upon arrangements with the contracting authority. To this end, the contractor makes significant investments in the training, development, and guidance of its employees. In this context, we expect the contracting authority not to approach or engage in conversations with the contractor's employees with the intention of hiring them. Is the contracting authority willing to include in the agreement an article containing the mutual agreement that neither party will approach each other's employees or engage in conversations with them for the purpose of hiring them? | Absolutely! We intend to have a long term working partnership with the chosen vendor and we will not approach your employees for the purpose of hiring them. Equally we expect the chosen vendor to respect the same agreement. |
| 2 | Article 26.3," "Article 26. Liability," of the "ARBIT version 2022 | Is it correct to assume that - as is customary in the industry - indirect damages are not eligible for compensation? Therefore, it is customary and proportionate to exclude indirect damages from liability. Can you agree to this? If not, could you please provide a rationale for your decision? | This is agreed. |
| 3 | Article 15.5," section "Article 15. Payment and invoice audits," of "ARBIT version 2022 | The statutory rights of suspension and dissolution serve an important purpose. They also provide us with leverage in case the Contracting Authority unexpectedly fails to fulfill its obligations. Without them, we lack reasonable means to ensure Contracting Authority compliance. Therefore, we propose the following addition: ", to the extent reasonably expected of the Counterparty." Can you agree to this? If not, could you please provide a rationale for your decision? | This is agreed. |
| 4 | Article 12.3," section "Article 12. Guarantees," of "ARBIT version 2022 | A warranty period of 12 months is unusually long and not market standard. Therefore, we propose adjusting this period to 3 months after acceptance. Can you agree to this? If not, could you please provide a rationale for your decision? | Our working assumption is that the acceptance procedure should identify bugs/defects in which case we believe the probability of a situation occurring after 3months is small. Nevertheless, insofar that it does arise, we find it reasonable to have a warranty period of 12months and, if in discussion, it is concluded that we should reasonably have discovered the bug/defect during acceptance testing, we will bear the cost of the change. We are open to discuss this topic and the duration of the warranty period during the verification meeting (before signing the contract). |
| 5 | Article 7, setion "Liability," of "Appendix 06 Concept Agreement | Setting a liability cap of three times the contract value per incident and six times the contract value overall deviates from industry standards. In the IT sector, it's typical to limit liability to 100% of the contract's annual revenue. Would you consider reducing the cap to align with 100% of the contract's annual revenue? If not, could you please explain the reasoning behind this decision? | We agree to a limit of the average annual revenue per event and a limit of the maximum your insurance currently covers per year. The Concept Agreement v1.1 is updated accordingly. |
| 6 | 3.6 QUESTIONS IN RESPONSE TO THE TENDER INSTRUCTIONS" of "Tender Document" | Is the Contractor correct in understanding that the only opportunity to ask questions, make comments, and submit text proposals for the draft (Framework) Agreement, including the General Terms and Conditions (ARBIT version 2022), is before the "Deadline for submitting questions"? If so, the Contractor requests the introduction of a second round of questions that allows for further clarification based on the answers provided by the Contracting Authority in the first round. | Yes that is correct. At the time of publishing it was not the intent to have a second round of questions. Having considered the questions received and the associated responses, we conclude that a second round of questions is not necessary. |
| 7 | Requirements relating to resourcing" of "Appendix 04 Technical Requirements" | With both a business analyst from the Contracting Authority and the Contractor: How does the Contracting Authority expect to divide responsibilities between the analysts? | In our experience the BA at the Contracting Authority has more of a focus on business/process/functional aspects of the requirements with the BA at the Contractor focusing more on the technical aspects. That said, we work agile in a project team and we anticipate there will be many grey areas and it is our expectation that the BA's work together and in case of grey areas and/or on a case by case basis they agree who will pick up which aspects of the workload. |
| 8 | "1.5 THE AGREEMENT" of the "Tender Document" | Could you please provide clarification on the methodology used to determine the allocated budget for the integrated enterprise reporting solution, considering both development and maintenance costs over the five-year period? | No. The funds available for this project is limited and a constraint to be taken into account by the contractor in their respective proposals. |
| 9 | "3.4 TIME SCHEDULE" of the "Tender Document" | Currently, there is only a week between the "Invite to interviews" and the actual interview itself, during which the demonstration should be held. Creating a demonstration that meets the requirements described in Sub Award Criterion D requires considerable effort from the Contractor. The Contractor is willing to put in this effort if the demonstration is to be presented directly to the Contracting Authority, but we would appreciate confirmation of our invitation before dedicating resources to this preparation. Regarding the timing between the "Invite to interviews" and the demonstration: Could there be three weeks between the invitation and the actual demonstration to allow sufficient time for preparation? | With consideration for your question and the likelihood that other possible vendors will also welcome additional time, we've updated the planning as follows: Invitation to interviews - 16 April 2024 (remains unchanged) Presentation/interviews - week starting 6 May 2024 Send award decision - 14 May 2024 Verification meeting - 22 May 2024 Expiry stand still term & send final award - 4 June 2024 Contracting - 4 June 2024 Start of project - 17 June 2024 |
| 10 | Tender Document - Data Model | There are numerous mentions of the data model within the prototype. The data model itself would provide valuable insights to gauge the expected complexity of the data modeling and would enhance the demonstration in "Sub Award Criterion D: Demonstration" for the Contracting Authority. To this end, could you please supply the data model of the current prototype as soon as possible? | Reference section 2 in the technical requirements. The chosen Contractor will have the opportunity to get further insight into the data feeds and data model developed in the prototype prior to entering the contracting phase. |
| 11 | "1.7 MONITORING THE AGREEMENT" of the "Tender Document" | It is mentioned that "in order to monitor these contractual agreements and to assess performance, a monitoring tool can be used." Regarding the monitoring tool for contractual agreements and performance assessment: Will the tool be supplied and used by the Contracting Authority, or is it expected that the contractor supplies it? What metrics will be used for performance monitoring? | Contractor needs to provide reports as to how they monitor contractual agreements and performance thereof. We will not provide a tool but the contractor is free to provide the necessary monitoring and reporting thereof as they see fit. Reference section 6 in the Technical Requirements. |
| 12 | "High-level reporting categories" of the "Tender Document" | There does not seem to be a reference to footnote 4 "Data and reports can be extracted from dashboards.". Could you please specify whether reference to footnote 4 ("Data and reports can be extracted from dashboards.") should be included or disregarded? | Apologies for the omission. Footnote 4 refers to all aspects under "(Managed) reporting dashboards categories". It is the working assumption that there is a means to extract data and create reports from dashboards e.g. pdf, powerpoint, excel versions of dashboards. |
| 13 | "Expected Results" of the "Tender Document" | The expected results mention significant and non-significant changes to the data model concerning non-standard or standard changes, respectively. Could the Contracting Authority specify the criteria for significant and non-significant changes to the data model? | Your question is not fully clear and we do not recognise mention of non-significant changes. Nevertheless we try to add clarification. A non-significant change could be, for example, to add a field to an existing table in the data model. A more significant change could be, for example, adding a completely new object and/or source system to the data model. In your proposal it is possible for you to include a list of standard and non-standard changes as you interpret them. Reference section 5.4.3 of the Tender document (sub criterion C: Maintenance, support and service levels). |
| 14 | "Expected Results" of the "Tender Document" | Can the Contracting Authority elaborate on the provision of "Guidance and support related to data governance and data catalogue as deemed necessary"? What are the concrete expected results of guidance and support? | As a new organisation we're building our data management governance, process, etc pretty much from scratch. It would be very valuable if you can share your experience and advice on, for example best practices appropriate to our organisation type/size. Amongst others we expect this could include (best practice) process, templates, guidance materials, etc. |
| 15 | "Expected Results" of the "Tender Document" | It is expected that "Training on IER and the associated reporting (environment)" is delivered. Concerning training on IER and associated reporting: What is the scope of training envisioned by the Contracting Party? Is it limited to usage of reports and dashboards, or does it extend to training end-users in the 'self-service' environment/tooling to create there own reports and dashboards? | We anticipate the exact training requirements will be determined during the project and in close cooperation with yourselves. That said, training (materials) might include for example: - general documentation for example a user guide, covering system access, availability and use of standard reports. - Super-user/champion user training about IER DM, user maintenance tables, ability to load 'non-source' files, etc. - Training to end-users on 'self-service' environment. Please note that super-users and end users of the 'self-service' environment are limited and in general 'tech savvy' users already experienced with the use of Invest data. |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 16 | "Expected Results" of the "Tender Document" | One of the expected results is "A 'self-service' environment/tooling in which (authorised) users within Invest can create their own dashboards, reports and data extracts.". The current prototype utilizes Power BI as a self-service environment/tooling. Does the Contracting Authority consider Power BI as fulfilling this requirement? If not, what additional requirements does the Contracting Authority have that Power BI does not fulfill? | Yes, we expect Power BI is the basis for the self-service environment. |
| 17 | Tender Document - Requirements | On many occasions the Contracting Authority mentions reports, dashboards, data extracts, reporting obligations/objectives (internal and external) industry standards, additional source tables, additional data model entities without specifying the amount and complexity of each of these or the requirements of each of these. Could you please elaborate on these to enable the Contractor to assess feasibility within the allocated budget? | As indicated in the requirements information already provided, we are a small organisation and complexity is limited. In many/most instances, our dashboards/reports/extracts are slicing/dicing of the same (limited) data. |
| 18 | "Problem Statement", "1.3 Description of Assignment" of the "Tender Document" | It is stated that "Data which is not included in source systems is often embedded in various documents e.g. client contracts, spreadsheets". This indicates semi-structured or possibly unstructured data. Given that "All IER source data is structured data," does this imply that the Contracting Authority will ensure the structuring of data within these documents? | We disagree that data will be semi-structured/unstructured. Missing data will be structured by placing it in the correct source system or introduce it as a new structured 'non-source' system input. |
| 19 | "Background", "1.3 Description of Assignment" of the "Tender Document" | Of It is stated that "Not all data elements which are needed for analysis and reporting are (readily) available in the source systems" and that it is the intention to "to incorporate these missing data elements in either the related source system or input/upload them to IER". Could you please specify: The total number of missing data elements required for analysis and reporting? The number of data elements the Contracting Authority intends to incorporate into the related source systems themselves? The number of data elements intended for input/upload into the Integrated Enterprise Reporting (IER) system? This clarification is essential for assessing the workload for the Contractor concerning data input/upload into the IER. | This is not yet known but is expected to be identified in the course of phases 1 and 2. The ability to address 'missing data' falls within phase 3 and should be covered by the general requirement that the solution is scalable. |
| 20 | Transformation Layer | Would you be open to adding a third layer of transformations to the database (a medallion architecture)? | Our intention is two layers but we are open to considering (substantiated) addition of a third layer. |
| 21 | Source Systems | Are all source systems (and its underlying application databases) under management and in the network of I, or is some of it outsourced to a third party? | All our source systems are external supported i.e. outsourced. |
| 22 | Dashboards/Report | Is it correct to assume that building the dashboards/reports itself is not part of the assignment, but only delivering the data feeds for these reports? | Not correct, it is expected that building the standard and governed reports and dashboards is an (important) part of the assignment. Reports/dashboards built in the 'self-service' environment do not need to be built by the vendor. |
| 23 | Data Model | Is the data model delivered (95 tables) already in a dimensional (star) format and does it already cater for historical data? | Yes. |
| 24 | Appendix 04 Technical Requirements | Would only a DEV and PROD environment be sufficient, or is a STAGING environment also preferred? | We don't understand this question. STAGING is available in DEV/TEST and PROD. The IER DEV/TEST environment receives data from the source system TEST environments and the IER PROD environment receives data from the source system PROD environments. |
| 25 | Award criteria | In the criteria for the IER solution is stated the user-friendliness of non-source data entries and self-service components. This can vary significant between users, based on their skills and experience. How will this be concretely assessed? | Non-source data entries will be managed by skilled/'tech savvy' users. Using the import functionality should be user-friendly in the sense that it should speak for itself, can be used by a more 'functional' user which doesn't require technical (development) skills to, for example, write scripts, queries, etc. For the non-source inputs section there is also less of an emphasis on the appearance of the screens. |
| 26 | Award criteria | In the criteria for the IER solution is stated to which extent the implementation design takes future cost effectiveness and efficiency into account. How will this be measured? | We want to be able to grow/scale in line with the expectations provided in the tender documentation. It goes without saying that if we grow as an organisation we anticipate that our costs will also grow especially as our data and reporting needs grow but there should be no sudden or unexpected significant growth in costs. This requires that the IER solution proposed considers the longer term (3-5 years) growth and how the costs can be arranged flexibly but also with consideration for aspects such as when data is needed e.g. real-time is not needed, so there doesn't need to be ongoing update to data in IER throughout the day, end of day and off-peak updates might be examples to achieve cost effectiveness and efficiency. |
| 27 | The Agreement, budget | Could you explain how the budget of EUR 350,000 was established? Is it assumed that the available team from Invest International will also carry out part of the work? | Reference response to question 8. The tender document (definition of assignment) clearly states who will carry out the work. |
| 28 | Deliverables of assignment | Can you provide an (approximate) number of dashboards/reports/data extracts? | Reference response to question 17. |
| 29 | Anticipated Roadmap | How many FTE will be available for each function? | We are a small organisation and during the project function representatives will be included as necessary. The core team e.g. PM and PO roles will have more than sufficient time dedicated throughout the duration of this project. |
| 30 | Historical data | Invest International is currently building up historical data through a combination of Hasura and PostgreSQL. After migration the historical data to the IER, can the Hasura and PostgreSQL resources be deleted or should this still be maintained by the contractor? | Following the successful testing and implementation of the IER solution the current prototype can be decommissioned. |
| 31 | IATI Reporting | Throughout the Tender Document and Appendix 04 Technical requirements, data extraction towards IATA (tooling not yet defined) is stated as a requirement. However, there is a contradiction between the Anticipated Roadmap, Expected results, scoping aspects and 'Points to note' in the Tender document regarding IATI. Just to clarify, the proposed IER solution should/must have capabilities for an automated data-feed/data-export towards IATA, but creating the required IATA reports is out of scope. | We don't recognise the contradiction. That said we attempt to clarify. The IER solution should cater for an automated data feed/data export to a (yet to be chosen) IATI reporting tool. The IER solution will also include IATI related 'non-source' inputs. The actual creation of the IATI report/XML will be from the (yet to be chosen) IATI reporting tool and delivery to IATI is not in scope of this vendor assignment. |
| 32 | Data Governance | Will there be a Data Governance Officer available for guarding and maintaining the right use of data? | This role does not yet exist but will be assigned during the project. |
| 33 | Appendix 02: Suitability requirements | what is Calamity Fund? | We don't expect this to apply to this assignment. |
| 34 | Appendix 04: Technical Requirement | Are there SLAs defined by Invest International or Vendor has to recommend? | An SLA provided by the vendor is part of the award criteria. Reference section 5.4.3 of the Tender document (sub criterion C: Maintenance, support and service levels). |
| 35 | Appendix 04: Technical Requirement | CSP Price - Do you mean Azure pay-as-you-go as CSP price or is there any other meaning of CSP price? | Yes, we mean pay-as-you-go. |
| 36 | Appendix 04: Technical Requirement | As per our understanding Invest International provide the licenses for Power BI and we don't need to cost estimate Power BI licenses? Please confirm. | Yes, that is correct. |
| 37 | Appendix 04: Technical Requirement | As per our understanding we need to provide costs for all Azure components required for the solution. However these will be provisioned and managed by Invest International 3rd party service provider in the existing Azure tenant. The Azure cost will be directly borne by either 3rd Party Service provider or Invest International. Please confirm. | That is correct and by providing this information there is transparency in the necessary components and associated costs. By providing this information we also ensure a fair comparison of proposed solutions across various tender proposals some of which will use Hasura. In summary, we are looking for clear view of the total cost of ownership. Costs for Azure components/licenses will indeed be borne directly by Invest International or it's 3rd Party Service provider(s). |
| 38 | Tender Document | What does Product administration data means for Invest International? | Data with regard to our contracts, investments and everything related to it e.g. relationships, disbursement schedules, repayments, interest % |
| 39 | Tender Document | For the new connection with new data sources like RISE, HR, Procurement - what is the approximate number of tables to be integrated. And what is the expected data volume from these tables? | We don't know yet but as we are not such a large organisation the scope and volume is limited. |
| 40 | Tender Document | Direct data into IER with a user-friendly front-end - How many number/count of such UI screens for data entry will be required? | We anticipate two flavours of UI screens. One to facilitate the upload of, for example, csv/xls files and a second for (very) limited manual input of specific fields most probably related to static/organisational data. Details as to which data will be captured will be clarified during the project implementation. |
| 41 | Tender Document | Power BI - expected number/count of dashboards and reports required? | Reference response to question 17. |
| 42 | Tender Document | Indicative/estimated inputs for scoping - What does this data means? i. Investment volume - 700 ii. Relationship volume - 2.200 | It indicates the number of contracts (loans, subsidies, grants) we have with clients and emphasises our small organisational size compared to other financial institutions. |
| 43 | Tender Document | Whether the following will be online or in-person? i. Invite to interviews ii. Presentation / Interview iii. Verification meeting | - (i) Invite to interviews will be microsoft outlook email invitations - (ii) Presentation/Interview should be in-person - (iii) Can be in person and online if (absolutely) necessary |
| 44 | 1.3 Description of assignment | On which platform is the current PostgreSQL SQL environment running? On-premises or in the cloud? If in the cloud, which cloud provider? | PostgreSQL is running on Hasura within in a docker container. It is in the cloud and Digital Ocean is the current provider. |
| 45 | 1.3 Description of assignment | Where does the transformation of the data provided by the sources take place? | We load all data from sources provided in PostgreSQL database and transform after staging. We do Extract, Load, Transform (ELT) in prototype. |
| 46 | 1.3 Description of assignment | The data modeling process. Which methodology and process did you follow to arrive at 95 tables? | No specific methodology used. Because we were building a prototype we accept and 'unpack' all data provided by the source systems and have structured it in 95 tables. In some instances there are arrays within arrays which in turn lead to separate tables. For some tables this means that data is not (yet) used but is (historically) available as the data model matures. |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|--|
| 47 | Appendix 03a Format reference competence | Please specify what Contracting Authority means with: The implementation should be similar to that included in this tender and also include data migration and interfacing with third-party systems. Similar to what exactly? Do you mean a functional similar platform or technical similar? | We expect you to submit reference projects that demonstrate that you have the core competencies to successfully carry out this assignment. |
| 48 | 1.3 Description of assignment | Can you describe the technical and functional datamodel used to create the integration layer and can you also elaborate about the status, is it in place or does it still needs to be created? | Reference response to question 10. |
| 49 | 1.5 The agreement | The value is 350K for the contract period. What is the exact contract period for this budget? 2 or 5 years? | This budget is available for the contract period of 5 years. Please also refer to section 8 in the Technical Requirements. |