

Questions and Answers NVI II

Nr	Question	Answer (EN)
52	We work with/implement various contract management and supplier management solutions that could be suitable for Enexis. Based on the information provided in the market exploration document, it is not possible for us to choose the most suitable solution. Does Enexis agree that we may answer parts of the response in a technology-agnostic way?	Yes, Enexis consents. This market exploration is not yet intended to select a specific system, but primarily to gain insight into the possibilities the market offers.
53	It is not entirely clear to us what is meant by the question: To what extent does your solution (possibly together with another solution) support Enexis in keeping financially relevant contract agreements up to date in an automated way? Does Enexis expect full automation whereby indexation, price changes, etc. are applied automatically, a notification when this is applicable, or a proposal for an indexation/price change, etc.?	At this moment our focus is on automation in which indexations, price changes, etc. are processed automatically in SAP S/4HANA. If there are additional possibilities, we would be pleased to hear about them.
54	It is not entirely clear to us what is meant by the question: How is the link between contract data and the ordering and payment process (e.g., SAP S/4HANA) designed? Are market parties expected to explicitly substantiate possible integration choices (including pros and cons), or only to describe which patterns are common practice?	We expect an elaboration of the integration possibilities, both from a process perspective (how contract data and changes flow through to relevant transactions and the best practices therein) and technically (APIs, etc.).
55	It is not entirely clear to us what is meant by the question: What preconditions does your solution place on Enexis and/or suppliers to enable automated processing of contract agreements? Can Enexis clarify: 1) what is meant by preconditions in this context (e.g., organizational, process, data quality, governance, technical setup), and 2) what is meant by automated processing of contract agreements (e.g., fully end-to-end processing without manual intervention, or support with controls and exceptions), so that market parties can answer this question unambiguously and comparably?	1) "Preconditions" refers to everything that Enexis or its suppliers must meet in order to enable automation (including any approval steps). This may relate to all aspects you mention. Enexis would like to gain insight into what is required to automate this step in the broadest sense of the term. 2) Enexis expects the automated processing of contract agreements in the broadest sense of the term, such as indexations and price changes, with the aim of minimizing manual intervention as much as possible.
56	Enexis prefers one integrated contract with a single point of contact for both license delivery and implementation. Is Enexis willing to contract a party that is not itself a software vendor but acts as the prime contractor and arranges license delivery through a subcontractor, provided there is one contractual responsibility and point of contact?	Based partly on the information gathered through this market exploration, Enexis is shaping its procurement strategy; this choice is a part of that strategy. At this stage, it is certainly not excluded that we will work with a prime contractor in the set-up you described.
57	Enexis uses SAP S/4HANA for financial and logistics processes and ServiceNow for ITSM. Is there a defined target integration architecture within Enexis (e.g., an enterprise integration platform such as MuleSoft or Azure Integration Services), and if so, is connecting to this a hard requirement for the new solution?	Yes, there is a defined target integration architecture based on common integration patterns, and connecting to it is in principle a requirement. Nevertheless, we would like to hear which integration patterns are supported by the solution in order to make a well-considered architectural choice.
58	The market exploration describes four domains (Contracting, CMT Assets, Facility Management, Digital), each with its own maturity level. Does Enexis already have an indication which domain should go live first and what the desired rollout sequence is? And does the requirement for an externally accessible supplier portal apply to all ~550 suppliers at go-live, or is phased supplier onboarding accepted?	Based partly on the information gathered through this market exploration, Enexis is shaping its further strategy; this choice is a part of that strategy. At this moment we have not yet made a definitive decision on this.
59	After NVI 1, Enexis shared the documents in both Dutch and English. We assume that a submission in Dutch is sufficient. Can Enexis confirm this?	Yes, a submission in Dutch is sufficient.
60	Enexis limited the response to a maximum of five pages. Given the broadened scope, is it possible to increase the maximum number of pages?	In the market exploration document we refer to approximately five pages. What matters most to Enexis is that only the questions are answered and no unsolicited information is shared. The limit is not strictly fixed at five pages; we ask you to exceed this number only after careful consideration.

61	Can Enexis further specify which functionalities must at a minimum be included within the CLM solution itself, and which functionalities may also be provided by an integrated solution or implementation partner, such as supplier scorecards, risk dashboards, compliance workflows, service level reporting and a supplier portal?	At this moment we are mainly looking for the possibilities available in the market so that we can make a well-considered choice based on this information. We would like to hear what options you can offer, and these may include multiple variants.
62	Does Enexis expect the new solution only to register and manage contracts, or also to convert contract content into structured, searchable and reusable contract data, such as clauses, obligations, indexations, notice periods, SLAs, risks and compliance obligations?	At this moment we are mainly looking for the possibilities available in the market so that we can make a well-considered choice based on this information. We would like to hear what options you can offer, and these may include multiple variants.
63	When migrating, does Enexis expect only a technical transfer of contract records, documents and attachments, or also substantive enrichment of existing contracts by extracting metadata, clauses, obligations, risks, pricing agreements, indexations and deadlines?	We expect migration of documents and the currently linked (meta) data recorded in the contract records. If further enrichment is possible by extracting information from the linked contract documents, we would like to explore that option further.
64	If contract data is extracted from documents automatically or semi-automatically, does Enexis expect each extracted field to be traceable back to the original contract passage, including source reference and audit trail?	This depends on what can be extracted. We are curious about the possibilities, but we do not expect traceability to be necessary or meaningful in all cases.
65	Which AI use cases does Enexis consider potentially relevant within contract and supplier management, such as contract extraction, contract search, clause analysis, deviation detection, redlining, summarization, obligation management, risk signaling or invoice validation?	We are exploring what is possible in this area. It would in any case be beneficial if it can support clause analysis, deviation detection, summarization, obligation management and risk signaling.
66	Can Enexis clarify which additional requirements apply to AI functionality within a restricted SaaS environment, such as tenant isolation, logging, explainability, human approval, source referencing, data location and exclusion of model training with Enexis data?	An important principle is that Enexis data cannot leave Enexis without Enexis' knowledge. When training AI on Enexis data, the confidentiality of the data must be taken into account. (Supra)national legislation must also be complied with when using AI. We also expect that, when anonymization is applied, it is made concrete how the data cannot be traced back to Enexis. Regarding AI, our primary stance is that we want to understand what is possible around AI given our request; additionally, we are open to what you see as best practices or useful features.
67	Can Enexis indicate which CATS-CM facets must at a minimum be supported by the tooling, such as contract objectives, obligation management, risk management, performance management, governance, evaluations and improvement actions?	Enexis would like the tooling to at least cover the pillars of CATS CM, such as objectives, obligations, risk management, performance management, stakeholders, finances and governance. It is desirable that a PDCA cycle can also be incorporated, for example by assigning and monitoring actions.
68	Does Enexis expect the solution to support the full pre-signature process, including intake, contract request, template selection, playbooks, drafting, internal review, negotiation, redlining, approval and e-signature, or is the primary focus on post-signature management?	The primary focus is on post-signature management.
69	Does Enexis already have contract templates, clause libraries and negotiation playbooks, or does Enexis expect these to be created, harmonized or translated into configurable workflows and template logic during implementation?	Enexis already has these.
70	Should the solution support policy-based redlining and issue detection, whereby deviations from templates, the clause library or the playbook are automatically flagged and submitted to Enexis for review?	No, this is not required—although it would be nice to have.
71	Which obligations does Enexis want to actively monitor after signing, such as commercial obligations, reporting obligations, SLAs, certificates, audits, security controls, privacy obligations, indexations, notice periods, service credits and milestones?	This differs per contract type. In general, it will largely (in part) relate to the pillars mentioned.

72	Does Enexis expect the solution to actively help prevent value leakage, for example by monitoring contractual obligations, rates, SLAs, service credits, indexations and invoices against agreed conditions?	At this stage we are mainly looking for the possibilities in this area, in particular regarding active support for indexations, price changes, etc.
73	Is invoice validation against contract terms part of the desired scope, such as flagging invoice deviations versus rates, contract conditions, service credits, indexations or agreed payment terms, or does this remain entirely out of scope within SAP Finance?	At this stage we are mainly looking for the possibilities in this area so that we can make choices before we issue a formal request. We would therefore like your response to include what the possibilities are and what you recommend—and why.
74	Which SAP S/4HANA objects are in scope for linking with contract data, such as supplier master data, purchasing contracts, outline agreements, purchase requisitions, purchase orders, service entry sheets, invoices, price conditions or spend reporting?	At this stage we are mainly looking for the possibilities in this area so that we can make choices before we issue a formal request. We would therefore like your response to include what the possibilities are and what you recommend—and why.
75	Does Enexis expect the new solution to directly update financially relevant contract agreements in SAP S/4HANA, or is it sufficient that approved contract data is made available to SAP via integration, after which SAP remains leading for transactional processing?	At this stage, we are primarily looking to understand what possibilities exist in this area, so that we can make an informed choice before we launch a formal request for proposal. In your response, we would therefore like to see what the options are, what you recommend, and why. Given the close link with integration, we would also like you to describe how this could be implemented technically. Based on our current insights, our preference is that the new solution can directly update financially relevant contract agreements in SAP S/4HANA.
76	Which information from ServiceNow is relevant for contract and supplier management, such as SLA results, incident trends, CMDB relationships, service level reporting, escalations, supplier performance or improvement actions?	At this moment it is mainly incident trends and CMDB relationships. However, we are looking for a method to create a one-to-one relationship with the CMDB, as this is not always possible. We would therefore like to see what the market can offer to obtain one integrated view with respect to a contract. Currently, SLRs, SLA results, escalations, performance and improvement actions fall outside ServiceNow.
77	For supplier scorecards and dashboards, does Enexis expect the supplier to provide standard KPI models and best practices, or does Enexis define the KPIs and scoring models itself and the solution supports this in a configurable way?	In this phase we are looking for the possibilities in this area. For example, what falls under standard KPI models and best practices, and to what extent configuration is possible for both options.
78	For which supplier groups is the supplier portal in scope— all active suppliers, strategic suppliers, contractors, suppliers with compliance documentation or suppliers with active contract changes—and which actions must external users be able to perform at a minimum?	For supplier management, we expect all suppliers with whom we have signed contracts to be in scope. At present, only the suppliers in the Contracting domain have compliance documentation requirements; this may change in the future. External users can currently upload certificates themselves. We are very curious about any other possibilities.
79	Should the supplier portal, in addition to document upload, also support contractual collaboration, such as reviewing contract documents, providing input on commercial terms, confirming obligations, uploading evidence, responding to actions and managing changes?	Enexis would like to see what is possible in this area. If contractual collaboration is possible, that would be appreciated.
80	Should the solution support different authorization and data models per domain, such as Contracting, Digital, Facility Management and CMT Assets, including segregation of contracts, supplier information, commercial conditions, AI results and compliance documents?	Yes, that should be possible.
81	If Enexis chooses a phased implementation, which value areas would have priority, such as contract repository, contract lifecycle, AI extraction, supplier portal, certificate management, SAP/P2P integration, obligation management, dashboards or invoice validation?	These choices have not yet been made; in the event of a tender we will be able to provide clarity on this.

82	Is the intended solution aimed exclusively at buy-side contracts with suppliers, or does Enexis also want insight into the extent to which the same CLM solution could in the longer term be applicable to sell side or commercial contracts with customers, partners or other external parties?	The intended solution focuses exclusively on buy-side contracts with suppliers.
83	Does Enexis expect commercial terms from contracts—such as pricing agreements, discounts, volumes, indexations, service credits, payment terms and renewal agreements—to become available as structured data for commercial, financial or operational steering?	Enexis is curious about what is possible in this regard. If feasible, this seems like an interesting capability.
84	Are there processes within Enexis in which commercial agreements from quotations, framework agreements, or customer/partner agreements need to flow through to contracts, and is integration with CPQ, CRM or quotation processes relevant now or in the future?	No, this is not relevant.
85	Is it relevant for Enexis that the solution actively monitors contractual commercial agreements after signing, for example to signal deviations between agreed conditions, delivered performance, invoicing, service credits or commercial obligations?	Enexis is curious about what is possible in this regard. If feasible, this seems like an interesting capability.
86	Does Enexis have standardized templates, clauses and playbooks for commercial or external contracts, and does Enexis want these to be centrally managed and reused for faster, consistent contract creation and review?	Yes, Enexis has templates and would like to see what this can offer, for example for purchases under €60K and data processing agreements.
87	Which requirements does Enexis have for identity and access management, such as SSO, SAML, OAuth, Azure AD/Entra ID, MFA, role-based access control, supplier accounts, external users and periodic recertification of authorizations?	All the functionalities mentioned are relevant. We would like to see which functionalities the proposed product offers so that we can assess them internally against the applicable non-functional requirements.
88	Which minimum requirements apply to hosting, data residency, encryption, key management, logging, monitoring, penetration testing, vulnerability management and security reporting, given Enexis' role as a grid operator and an organization subject to NIS2 obligations?	We would like to know which minimum requirements the proposed product can meet so that we can assess them internally against the applicable non-functional requirements.
89	Which non-functional requirements does Enexis expect for the solution, such as availability, performance, response times, scalability, backup and restore, disaster recovery, RPO/RTO, release management, OTAP, test automation and operational management processes?	We would like to know which minimum requirements the proposed product can meet so that we can assess them internally against the applicable non-functional requirements.