



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

**QUESTIONS and ANSWERS:**

Issue	No.	Reference	Question (submitted by potential Bidder)	Answer (provided by NSPA)
<b>Deadline for Questions and Answers Submission: <u>18 August 2019</u></b>				
4	1 a	<b>Annex C List of Services</b>	<p>The question refers to the document “ANNEX C List of Services PRICE PROPOSAL.xlsx” Tab 1 “Prices”, and the Table 1 “Minimum Consultant CVs required with your submission” in the RFP defining the minimum requirement for consultants at the bid closing date (page 11 of RFP).</p> <p>The Excel file, for LOT1 and LOT2, does not provide the difference between SAP Analyst and SAP Developer related profiles, unlike the table in the RFP, that provides a clear differentiation.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LOT1, Table 1 in the RFP defines two profiles for SAP Analyst profiles (Sap Analyst Senior, SAP Analyst Standard) and two profiles for SAP Developer profiles (SAP Developer Senior and SAP Developer Standard), for a total of 4 profiles. However, for the same LOT, the Price Proposal Excel file allows the definition of a price for People Engagement SAP Analysis, Senior and Standard Profiles (2 profiles).</li> <li>LOT2, Table 1 in the RFP defines four Profiles for SAP Analyst profiles Senior (Finance, Supply Chain Management, Enterprise Asset Management and Procurement and Network), one profile for SAP Analyst Standard, one SAP Developer Senior profile and one SAP Developer Standard profile (7 profiles). However, for the same LOT, the price proposal Excel</li> </ul>	<p>The tables of “minimum requirement for consultants” (RFP, page 12) focus on every possible profile and refer to the numbers of consultants for every individual category, the categories being Senior Analyst, Standard Analyst, Senior Developer, Standard Developer, Senior SAP BI Engineer, Standard SAP BI Engineer etc.</p> <p>A total of 10 different profiles altogether.</p> <p>However, “ANNEX C List of Services PRICE PROPOSAL” is focussed on the pricing and refers to only two prices per Role.</p> <p>Result: for Lot 1 and Lot 2 there are apparent differences in the number of profiles.</p> <p>The correct interpretation: indeed, you should fill in Annex C without taking into consideration the difference between Analyst and Developer for Lot 1 and Lot 2. So the pricing proposed will of necessity be the same for both SAP Analyst and SAP Developer profiles.</p>



**QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)**  
**RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support**  
**Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)**

			<p>file allows the definition of a price for Corporate Business –Finance, Supply Chain Management, Enterprise Asset Management and Procurement and Network, which is four Senior Profiles and associated four Standard Profiles (8 profiles).</p> <p>In this context, should we fill in the Annex C without taking into consideration the difference between Analyst and Developer for LOT1 and LOT2?  As a concrete example, for LOT1, the pricing proposed for People Engagement SAP analysis (Senior and Standard) should include both, SAP Analyst and SAP Developer profiles?</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Profiles Information</b>	<p>With reference to the information required in the CVs, on page 11 of 15 there is no mention of passport number and date being required.</p> <p>However on page 11 of 16 in the draft terms and conditions in part 16, it states that 'for each identified person, the following particulars must be mentioned' and it include nationality, date and place of birth, Passport, ID etc.</p> <p>Can we please clarify if this is required after or before selection?  Can we submit candidates without the passport/ID number?</p>	<p>For Security reasons (although not directly related to the profile requirements of the candidate in question), we do need the passport/ID card number, expiration date, and where issued.</p>



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

3	1	<p><b>Annex B Evaluation Matrix</b></p>	<p>Could you please confirm that every time the column “Comments” does not specify the metric to be used (e.g. “Minimum 7 for Standard/Minimum 8 for Senior”), the number refers to a note assigned by NSPA (as described in answer 8.a)? Otherwise, if the metric is specified as “years” (e.g. “Minimum 3 years for Standard/ Minimum 5 years for Senior”), the answer provided to question 8.b applies.</p> <p>Concrete example (ref. Annex B Evaluation Matrix):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement PE.02 requires an SAP Analyst Standard profile to have minimum 3 years of relevant experience in order to qualify, while an SAP Analyst Senior should have at least 5 years.</li> <li>Requirement PE.05 requires an SAP Analyst Standard profile to be awarded minimum a note of 7 in order to qualify, while an SAP Analyst Senior should be awarded with at least a note of 8.</li> </ul>	<p>Correct.</p> <p>“Minimum 7 for Standard/Minimum 8 for Senior” refers to a note assigned by NSPA. “Minimum 3 years for Standard/ Minimum 5 years for Senior” refers to a number of years.</p> <p>In order to help clarify, please refer to the 2nd column (“SOW requirements”).</p> <p>Then, as an example, take PE.02.</p> <p>The requirement is: “Number of years of field relevant experience”, and the last column (“Comments”) mentions: “Minimum 3 years for Standard / Minimum 5 years for Senior”.</p> <p>The other case applies in row PE.04 (and in following rows). The requirement is: “Knowledge of the SAP Business Area business processes”, and the last column (“Comments”) mentions: “Minimum 7 for Standard/ Minimum 8 for Senior”. No years are mentioned.</p> <p>So either both columns indicate years or both columns do not indicate years, as the case may be. This is consistently applied throughout the matrix.</p> <p>Your example is equally relevant and correctly interpreted.</p>
2	1		<p>We didn’t found any description of the process to “post questions in regard to this RFP”.</p> <p>Can you please advise us?</p>	<p>Please submit your requests for clarification by electronic mail to:</p> <p><b>Rebekah McCarthy</b> (<a href="mailto:rebekah.mccarthy@nspa.nato.int">rebekah.mccarthy@nspa.nato.int</a>), and copy Arianna Stellato (<a href="mailto:arianna.stellato@nspa.nato.int">arianna.stellato@nspa.nato.int</a>)</p> <p>Bidders are strongly encouraged to check the NSPA ePortal regularly for all RFP updates, answers to clarifications and other communications.</p>



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

2	2		<p>In addition, we already have a question concerning the “two referee contact details” requested in the CV: Is it per project?</p>	<p>No this is not necessary. We request, at any one time, a single version of a person’s CV with contact details of two referees included.</p> <p>Each CV should be revised and re-sent to us after a period of time of course, with relevant updates of experience and circumstances.</p>
2	3		<p>When YES then we understand it is one customer contact + our contract manager contact on this project.</p> <p>When NOT per project then we understand it is our HR contact + the hierarchical mgr contact.</p>	<p>The choice of referees is up to yourselves; however, this should follow the usual principles for appointment of referee, that is to say: a person of acknowledged standing who knows the candidate well, both personally and professionally, over a significant time.</p>
1	1	<b>Cybersecurity, Governance, Risk and Compliance</b>	<p>We noticed that the “Cybersecurity, Governance, Risk and Compliance” is part of Lot 2.</p> <p>Would proposing profiles, which are fully experts in cyber security, but do not address finance competencies, e.g. “Financial Risk Management” and “Financial Consolidation”, be accepted for meeting this domain requirements from RFP compliance perspective?</p>	<p>It is mentioned on page 12 that: “It is understood that all expertise / requirements cannot be met by one single person.</p> <p>The range of illustrative CVs submitted should aim to cover all the roles”.</p> <p>However, bidders shall propose a number of complementary profiles sufficient to ensure at least one full year coverage of each area of expertise.</p>
1	2	<b>Draft Contract, Part 1</b>	<p>In the “Draft Contract” section, Part 1, it is mentioned that consultants should have a very good knowledge of French or English, and a good knowledge of the other language.</p> <p>Could you please clarify this statement?</p> <p>The doubt comes from the fact that the requirement is not expressed in Annex B, where only English is required (e.g. PE03, CBF.03).</p>	<p>NATO two official languages are English and French.</p> <p>Fluency in at least one of the languages is essential, and good working knowledge of the other is required.</p> <p>For a selection of specific areas “Good experience in preparing concise and well-structured customer reports in English” is specified.</p> <p>For most areas, either language is acceptable, but a good level of both is necessary to ensure general, quick, clear and effective communications.</p>



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

1	3	<b>Section 4, Table 1 “Minimum Consultants CVs required for your submission”</b>	<p>Section 4, Table 1 “Minimum Consultants CVs required for your submission” – We have noticed that in Table 1 profiles for People Engagement are numbered from 1 to 4, and then profiles for Corporate Business, Corporate Analytics and Digital Core and Digital Platform are numbered from 1 to 10.</p> <p>Please clarify, if there is any specific requirements behind this numbering?</p>	There is nothing specific to be read into this numbering; probably it is only a side effect of the way the tables were originally constructed.
1	4	<b>Section 4, Table 1 “Minimum Consultants CVs required for your submission”</b>	<p>Section 4, Table 1 “Minimum Consultants CVs required for your submission” – Is it possible to propose the same cleared CV on different profiles and back it up with a resource, which has the clearance in progress?</p>	Yes – the same cleared/clearance in progress CV may cover more than one profile.
1	5	<b>Section 6. Subcontracts, Amount and Type of Work to be Subcontracted</b>	<p>Regarding Section 6. Subcontracts, Amount and Type of Work to be Subcontracted, the mandatory requirement states “You are informed that at the bid closing date sub-contracting shall not exceed 30%.</p> <p>In the event of Contract Award, you will be expected to target increasing this to 50% throughout the first 12 months of the Contract duration.”</p> <p>We understand that in case of Contract Award we will be “allowed” (and not “expected”) to reach 50% of sub-contracting.</p> <p>Can you please confirm our understanding?</p>	<p>Your interpretation is fundamentally correct.</p> <p>Bidders are allowed to reach 50%, and furthermore this is somehow this may be expected by us.</p> <p>Two ways to express the same sentiment.</p>
1	6	<b>FBO: 19PAM003 Synopsis of Required Services</b>	<p>We noticed that the 19PAM003 Synopsis of Required Services was received as part of RFI (Request for Information) some months ago, we would like to confirm whether for the Request for Proposal (RFP) the same Synopsis remains effective, or there is an updated version available?</p>	The same Synopsis remains valid.



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

1	7	<p><b>FBO: 19PAM003 Synopsis of Required Services Lot 2, Section 2.1. Finance</b></p>	<p>In 19PAM003 Synopsis of Required Services Lot 2, Section 2.1. Finance contains requirements that are not related to Finance, e.g. Cybersecurity or Environment, Health and Safety.</p> <p>A Finance profile will most likely not be competent in such topics as Cybersecurity or Environment, Health and Safety, which leads to the question whether or not several profiles combined can cover requirement for Lot 2, Section 2.1. Finance?</p>	<p>Please refer to our response to Q1.</p> <p>We do not expect, in general, that one single CV will necessarily meet all requirements, unless differently specified.</p>
1	8	<p><b>Annex B Evaluation Matrix</b></p>	<p>Regarding the Annex B Evaluation Matrix:</p> <p>a. We understand that the notation “Review” means a note between 0 and 10.</p> <p>Is this note our self-evaluation regarding the competencies of the profile, or is there any other definition behind these notes from 1 to 10.</p> <p>b. In the Evaluation Matrix, in column called “Comments” you mention “Minimum X for Standard/ Minimum Y for Senior”.</p> <p>Could you please explain if the “X” and “Y” correspond to the amount of years of experience, notes or it has any other signification.</p> <p>c. Annex B Evaluation Matrix, first line corresponding to G.1. under “SOW Requirements”, the cell contains a text “CV provided, including all elements as PRI”.</p> <p>Could you please clarify what does “PRI” stand for?</p>	<p>Answers:</p> <p>a. “Review” refers to a note assigned by NSPA, based on our internal assessment of the overall strength of the candidate’s CV.</p> <p>NSPA shall appoint an accurate and consistent note, based on proprietary criteria, in order to sort the candidates appropriately, for future information and reference.</p> <p>b. “X” and “Y” correspond to the number of years of experience for the Standard or Senior profile, as the case may be.</p> <p>c. “As PRI” = as Priority.</p> <p>This is to indicate that every element of the CV shall be supplied for consideration.</p>



## QUESTIONS and ANSWERS (Q&A)

### RFP No RMC19AO003 – SAP Support & BI Support

Latest Issue: 14 August 2019 (Issue No.4)

1	9	<b>Outline Agreement</b>	In Page 2 of the RFP, it is mentioned that up to two suppliers will be offered the Outline Agreements. In Part A, Section 4, it is mentioned that suppliers not having enough cleared resources might be appointed and received others opportunities – is this on top of the two suppliers of the Outline Agreements? If yes, does it means that during the 3 to 5 years of the Outline Agreements, more than two suppliers can be present?	Each Outline Agreement will be offered to up to two suppliers during the same timeframe, more than two cannot be present contemporarily.
---	---	--------------------------	---	--