



CT 2225/2012

11 March 2014

To all Prospective Bidders:

Corporate Financial Management Solution for the Government of Malta.

Clarification Number 4

Reference is made to the above-mentioned tender with closing date being 10th April 2014 at 10.00hrs.

Enclosed herewith please find a set of clarification requests as posed by potential bidders; which are construed to form an integral part of the Tender Document.

Question 1: In view of the fact that the tender submission deadline has been moved forward and is now reading 10th April 2014, kindly confirm that the clarification period has also been extended accordingly, and therefore bidders have up to the 25th March 2014 (this date inclusive) to put forward their clarifications.

Reply 1: Please refer to Clarification 2 issued on the 31st January 2014.

Question 2: Page 82 (Section 2.2.3) What does 'Procurement and installation of Hardware and Segregated Environment' mean?

Reply 2: "Section 2.2.3 – The Corporate Financial Management Solution roadmap" makes reference to the delivery milestones once the successful Tenderer has been selected. In this section, reference to the "Procurement and Installation of Hardware and Segregated Environment" is necessary since the Tenderer is expected to present a total Solution including potential hardware and segregated environment (refer to Mandatory requirements [Volume 3 sec 1 sub section 21], Response Section [Volume 3 Sec 2 – Part 2 – Technical requirements]; and Hosting Environment and Security requirements [Volume 4, Section 2, Schedule 6 and Volume 4, Section 2, Schedule 7]). The Tenderer is required to quote for hardware and segregated environment (Volume 3 Section 3) as these are a prerequisite for any hosting and implementation. The Government however reserves the right to opt for alternative solutions.

Question 3: Page 88 (sections 2.3.1.3.3 and 2.3.1.3.4) What differentiates the StoreIT system and the Stock Ledger?

Reply 3: StoreIT is a more complete stock control application for medium to large departments. The application is considered as a legacy application since its underlying technology is Dataflex V3.2. Stock Ledger is a more recent development of an

MsAccess application for small departments with low volume transactions. Both applications will be phased out once the new Solution is implemented.

Question 4: Page 287 (Volume 5 Section 1A) Are the user numbers listed by section distinct or do they overlap? i.e. with reference to the office of the President; There are 4 Budgetary management users and 2 Nominal Ledger users. are these 6 distinct users or potentially 4 users in total (2 with access to both budgeting and the Nominal Ledger).

Reply 4: The user list in Volume 5 Section 1A specifically refers to Active Users since individual users change from time to time and consequently it is essential to establish active users rather than registered users. In the example referred to relating to the Office of the President, both scenarios presented in the question are possible, i.e. the active users in both Budgetary Management and Nominal Ledger may be the same users as much as they can all be potentially different. This may also vary from Solution to another depending on the way licences are defined by prospective bidders. The definition of Active Users is quite clear. Please refer to Volume 1 Section 5 for definitions of active, registered and current users and be guided accordingly.

Question 5: Page 287 (Volume 5 Section 1A) With reference to the above and to the column Enquiry and Report users can these be considered as unique and therefore only requiring access to the system via a reporting or BI platform?

Reply 5: The Enquiry and Reporting users may be unique to the specific systems / application but may re-appear as other users under other systems. Hence, in the case of Nominal ledger and Cash Management, users under Enquiry and Reporting may have direct access to the Cash Management system within the proposed solution. Whether this functionality is provided to via the system or the BI platform it is up to the bidder to determine, so long the same functionality, reporting and access control offered to by either the system or the BI platform are not compromised.

Question 6: Page 287 (Volume 5 Section 1A and Volume 1 Section 5 Glossary) Active users are described as user who will access the system more than once within a period of at least three months. How do such users relate to the other columns of the Current User Profiles table (Volume 5 Section 1A/B) are they potentially the same?

Reply 6: Active users identified in Volume 5 Section 1A are potentially the same users as defined in the other columns of the Current User Profiles table. User Profiles represent the functional access requirement for each of the systems by department as outlined in the table. However, access requirements may vary from time to time during the implementation and maintenance and support. Consequently, registered users are not necessarily equal or less than the total no of users by profile since people move in and out over time depending on the exigencies of the Public Service.

Question 7: Page 91 (Section 2.3.7) - The number of end users. In the context of the breakdown on page 288 and the questions as to access to only a reporting BI platform would some of the 2,000 + 500 users mentioned only require access to Reporting / BI platform. Pricing will be affected greatly by reducing the user requirements for the full system.

Reply 7: The numbers quoted in Section 2.3.7 of a minimum 2000 Core users and 500 minimum Potential users refer to registered users for the Core Systems and the Potential systems, respectively. Some Solutions do not provide such a limit but concentrate their licences on active users as highlight in the Pricing Schedule Volume 3 Section 3. Hence, the tenderer is free to offer unlimited or higher limits of registered users, if its licensing policy permits.

With regard to the Report / BI platform, reply to number 5 above refers.

Question 8: Page 91 (Section 2.3.7) Are we correct to assume that the pricing for a 25% user increase over 5 years should be excluded from our Proposal Pricing?

Reply 8: Section 2.3.7, third paragraph, clearly states that "the tenderer is to consider a growth potential of up to 25% in terms of users and transaction volume over a period of 5 years from implementation". This clearly states that this growth has to be contained by the tenderer during such period of time.

Any growth after 5 years will be in addition to the current tender requirements. However, for purpose of licence fee computation it shall be regulated in accordance to the terms and conditions of the tender and the underlying contract.

Question 9: Term DBMS - In general it is assumed that that DBMS refers to Data Base Management system. But it also seems to be used to refer to 3 specific peripheral systems namely Vendor Registration, Bank Reconciliation / Corporate Financial Repository. If our proposed solution accommodates the functionality of these platforms would it be an option to implement this functionality within our CFMS solution rather than to integrate to the existing solution? Or would integration be necessary due to other interdependencies?

Reply 9: The diagrammatic models (Volume 2 Sec 2.3 [diagrams 2, 3 and 4]) outline the functional requirement of each, Vendor Registration, Bank Reconciliation (BRS) and corporate Financial Repository. Each functional system can be part of the core CFMS so long the function requirements of each system are not compromised. The Vendor Registration can be accessed not only by the Core CFMS but also by Potential systems as well as other services falling under the "Corporate Data Sharing and Provisioning Services". Refer to mandatory requirements [Volume 3, Sec 1 Sub-section 9] and to Response Section [Volume 3 Sec 3, para 1.287 to 1.340].

The BRS can equally form part of Core CFMS but any external access to Central Bank, Malta Stock Exchange and departmental data may have to be contained within BRS restricted environment. Remote transmission of data to and from Central Bank, Malta Stock Exchange and other non-Public Service organisation are restricted through the deployment of higher degree of security at network and Hosting server levels within the segregated environment.

Question 10: In page 33 of the tender document the following paragraph refers: The Tenderer must have implemented Solutions of International Standard and in the nature of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) or Management Information Systems (MIS) or Corporate Financial Management Systems (CFMS) within client sites comparable to the Malta Government as outlined in the usage matrix (Volume 5, Section 1A and Section 1B). The Tenderer is to submit information on at least two (2) successful implementations that have been implemented over time and remained operational over the last (5) years and of which one (1) must have been implemented in one of the European Union member states and exceeded the value of €2 million over its lifetime. The Tenderer must convey the technologies used in the implementation of these Solutions.

May you kindly clarify further how this should be interpreted please, for example:

- The Tenderer must have implemented Solutions within client sites comparable to the Malta Government, in Size (number of users);
- The Tenderer must have implemented Solutions within client sites comparable to the Malta Government, in Structure (similar structure and similar number of users);
- The Tenderer must have implemented Solutions within client sites comparable to the Malta Government, which involve same Functional Scope;
- Any of the statements above with an additional requirement that the Proposed Solution must have been implemented in Public Sector organizations;
- Combination of any of the above statements

Reply 10: A tenderer must convey its experience in implementing a Solution(*); a) of comparable size b) of similar functional scope and c) similar organisational and implementation structure. Contractor experience within a Public Sector organization is

the preferred option but it is not mandatory. However, tenderers with experience in implementing within Public Sector organisations receive additional marks as outlined in Response Section 3.2. – Part 2, item 2.11.

In addition, by virtue of mandatory requirement (volume 3 sec 1, subsection 14C. the Solution must have been implemented within at least one EU member state other than Malta.

Note (*): In form 1.4.2 – 'Experience as Contractor'; a Solution is defined as "*of International Standard and in the nature of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) or Management Information Systems (MIS) or Corporate Financial Management Systems (CFMS)*"

Question 11: We assess that the eligibility requirements in form 1.4.2 of Volume 1 Section 4, limit significantly competition and the open nature of the tendering process. This is due to the fact that very few EU member states have actually implemented a country-wide GFMS, comparable to the one requested by the Government of Malta. We kindly request that the Ministry revising the requirement in form 1.4.2 of Volume 1 Section 4 stating "; which one (1) must have been implemented in one of the European Union member states .". In our view, it is best if the Ministry widens competition by revising the particular requirement to a requirement concerning the functionality and/or the capabilities of a previous implementation such as "...which one (1) must the implement Accrual Accounting methodologies as part of the implementation of the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS)".

Similarly, one of the conditions of the tender is for the vendor to have done a project in a country EU member. Can you please reconsider this MANDATORY condition since this presents a discrimination between countries who are members of the EU and the others who are also part of Europe. Please appreciate that there are other very valid countries who are not yet a member of the EU. It is acceptable that there are extra points for having a project in an EU country but its is not fair that this is mandatory.


Reply 11: The requirement for the Government Financial Management Solution to be one that has been implemented within an EU member state, is there for several reasons, namely:

- a) the Government financial reporting requirement needs to comply to the EU directives, regulations and standards in place (refer to volume 2 secs 1&2, and mandatory requirements volume 3 sec 1),
- b) other mandatory requirements include, but not limited to:
 - i) EU co-financing system, (volume 3, sec 11.5)
 - ii) EU financial report and accounting standards (vol 3, sec 8.17&18)
 - iii) E-Government services are to be based on EU e-procurement directives, regulations and EU technology standards (vol 3, sec 10.10)

In view of the above, a Tenderer is to propose a Solution which can provide evidence that it has been successfully implemented with existing EU requirements within an EU member state in either the Public or in the Private sector. In the case of the latter, it is to be for an organisation of similar size and structure.

Any pending clarification not answered through this clarification will be replied to shortly.

All other tender documents, conditions and requirements, which are not superseded by this Clarification, remain in place.



Ms. Lorraine Mangion Duca
f/Director General (Contracts)