

**NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION (NATO)**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

**RFP – 2012/08**

**NOR SYSTEM EVOLUTION PROJECT**

**PROJECT PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT (PPM) SYSTEM ACQUISITION, IMPLEMENTATION  
AND SUPPORT SERVICES**

**Responses to Bidders' Questions – Revision 4**

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	NIL	Is this request related to the previous request of NATO RFI 2011/02 - NOR Project Portfolio Management Software Capabilities? Has the previous request, if unrelated, already been awarded to another vendor?	Yes, the referred Request For Information was issued in preparation of this solicitation of offers (RFP 2012-08). Our Requests For Information do not normally lead to the award of a contract. RFIs are used for market research purposes mainly, to identify potential suppliers and to make sure that the requirements specified in the final solicitation of offers are aligned with market capabilities or customary terms and conditions.
2	NIL	Are you permitted to disclose any policies that require or encourage NATO to select already exiting or preferred vendors?	There are no policies whatsoever that encourage NATO to award contracts to specific firms (other than giving preference to firms from NATO member nations). For further information about the NATO IS procurement procedures Bidders can visit our website ( <a href="http://www.nato.int/structur/procurement">www.nato.int/structur/procurement</a> ) and download our Procurement Manual where applicable procurement policy and procedures are described in detail.
3	Part I, Paragraph 4.2.5 22)	In order to best serve NATO's interests, we are also looking at who should be the prime contractor for this possible relationship. As you may know, we work with a professional services community staffed with internal and external professionals. Accordingly, we would like to request an amendment of the subcontracting limitations established in the contract. We believe that limiting the subcontracting staff to 40 % (or maximum of 2 key personnel positions) might turn in being contra-productive.	NATO understands that the subcontracting limitations specified in the solicitation may cause difficulties for some firms to participate in this business opportunity as prime contractors. However, NATO does not intend to change such limitations since this would not be reasonable in view of the objectives sought through this procurement action and the associated risks.
4	Part IV, Paragraph 3.1.2	In reference to the stated paragraph, we would like also to mention that, at the time of bid submission, none of our consultants are in possession of a NATO security clearance.	Please, understand that NATO cannot waive security requirements which are imposed by applicable NATO Security Regulations. The requirements specified in the solicitation of offers correspond to the minimum level strictly

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
			<p>necessary to access the information, systems, and locations associated with the performance of work under the contract. In reviewing these requirements, we have detected an inconsistency between the security requirements specified in Part I, paragraph 2.3.1.1, and Part IV, paragraph 3.1.2, which unnecessarily establishes more stringent requirements. For the benefit of all Bidders, paragraph 3.1.2 of Part IV will be modified through an upcoming solicitation amendment. The new wording of this paragraph will be as follows:</p> <p><i>“3.1.2 Without prejudice to the enhanced security requirements applicable to Key Personnel, the Contractor or Subcontractor personnel having access to NATO classified information, NATO classified networks, or NATO HQ site must be in possession of a valid Personal Security Clearance up to the NATO SECRET level at least 30 days before beginning work on the project. Such a clearance must remain valid as long as the referred personnel require the stated access to perform work or activities under the Contract.”</i></p>
5	Part IV, Annex C	Looking at the provided documentation, the NATO Architecture document is dated 2009. The mentioned server operating system is Windows 2003! Has Windows 2008 R2 been approved in the meantime (security settings)?	Yes, servers that will be deployed for this project can use Windows server 2008 R2.
6	Part IV, Annex C	Can you also please define which toolset you use for their application security scan?	Due to sensitivity, NATO does not disclose its security testing philosophy nor the tools used to do so outside the limited community involved in these activities.

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
7	Part IV, Annex E, Appendix 2	<p>In the 'Security Requirements' tab of the Excel spreadsheet you state the following :</p> <p>“The system shall support unique user IDs, Microsoft Active Directory single sign-on, role and group based access control and remote access in line with the infrastructure core services provided by NATO. Bidders shall describe other authentication mechanisms (i.e. own application authentication).”</p> <p>Our product does not provide Single Sign On (SSO) in the strict sense of the term. That said it is entirely possible to connect our product to an authentication system such as Microsoft Active Directory so that the ID and the password for connecting to our product is the same as for Windows. During the first connection, the user has to enter his ID and password. He can then tick the boxes so that our product remembers his ID and password avoiding having to reenter this information during the following connection. If the Windows password changes, he will have to reenter the ID and password. To resume, as long as the Window password doesn't change, it is not necessary for him to reenter the ID and password for our product only for the first connection.</p> <p>Could you please confirm whether it is a compulsory requirement that the PPM system has Single Sign-On ?</p> <p>Can you please confirm whether the way in which our product with this element is sufficient?</p>	<p>As far as we understand the explanation you provided, we believe this is acceptable from a usability perspective.</p> <p><b>Remarks:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A first remark concerns the protocol used to communicate between AD and the application. Deployed applications we have use LDAP to do this. If the solution uses a different protocol, please mention it, as there are limitations in the protocols that are allowed on NATO networks.</li> <li>2. From the explanation you provided, it is understood the product you propose will store (save) user ID and passwords. Please provide additional information concerning the security mechanisms that will be used to protect this sensitive information. Explain if this information will be encrypted (if yes, please explain with which tool), will there be cookies on the end user PC's (if yes, will these be encrypted), etc.</li> </ol>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
8	Part IV, Paragraph 1.3.1	<p>The PPM solution will enable NOR to improve and further integrate military common-funded resource management by collecting, analysing and reporting financial and implementation information in a timely and accurate manner.</p> <p>Q1. Is it true that the System shall be on-line integrated with external financial system?</p> <p>Q2. If Q1 is true could you enlist the external financial system to which the System shall be integrated ?</p> <p>Q3. If Q1 is true what kind of data shall be taken or transferred to the financial system?</p> <p>Q4. What is the security classification of data which have to be supported by System?</p>	<p>A1. No, the System will not be on-line integrated with external financial systems.</p> <p>A2. Refer to A1.</p> <p>A3. Refer to A1.</p> <p>A4. The security classification of data that needs to be supported by the System is up to and including NATO SECRET.</p>
9	Part IV, Paragraph 1.3.3	<p>Transparency. Enable quality and timely exchange of information between NATO stakeholders involved in resource management.</p> <p>Q5. What is the highest security of data accessible for NATO stakeholders ? Is it the same highest level as for data mentioned in Q4?</p>	<p>A5. The highest security of data accessible for NATO stakeholders differs. For most of the NATO stakeholders the highest security of data accessible is NATO SECRET. There are, however, NATO stakeholders with only NATO RESTRICTED as the highest security of data accessible.</p>
10	Part IV, Paragraph 1.4.2	<p>The Contractor shall provide the required system and shall support it in terms of software patches, updates and new releases / upgrades for a period of 10 years, starting from the initial Go-live date of the new system.</p> <p>Q6. Is it correct understanding that Contractor shall support delivered System in terms of software patches, updates and new releases / upgrades for a period of 10 years only in case when the patches/updates/new releases will be issued by COTS solution vendor?</p>	<p>A6. As overall approach, only patches, updates, upgrades and new releases issued by the COTS solution vendor will be applied. Therefore, the Contractor shall support the solution for a period of 10 years.</p> <p>Refer to section 9.3.1 in Part IV of the RFP.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
11	Part IV, Paragraph 1.5.3	<p>Initial Go-live is foreseen not later than 1 January 2014 and is planned to include NSIP related functionalities and all compliance, security and technical requirements. The Organisation expects the duration of the system implementation, from the Project Start Date to Initial Go-live, to be between 6 to 9 months. Testing, training and data conversion for NSIP related functionalities and all compliance, security and technical requirements shall be performed before Initial Go-live.</p> <p>Q7. Could you explain the relationship between the System and NSIP? What are the NSIP related functionalities?</p>	<p>A7. The System is intended to support NSIP Business Processes. Sections 2.1 <i>Context</i> and 2.2 <i>Major System Capabilities</i> in Annex E to Part IV of the RFP highlight the relationship between the System and NSIP.</p> <p>The NSIP related functionalities are those included in Section 3 Functional Requirements of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP under the following Functional Areas: AUD, FIN, FIN NSIP, GEN, IntPro, POR, PRO and REP.</p> <p>Additional background information on NSIP Business Processes is included in Appendix 1 to Annex E to Part IV of the RFP: <i>PPM System Requirements Specifications – Context Document</i>. We strongly encourage Bidders to review this document during their bid preparation as a matter of due diligence.</p>
12	Part IV, Paragraph 1.5.10	<p>Constraint: The Contractor will take into account the planned move of applications to New NATO HQ as from end 2015.</p> <p>Q8. Could you elaborate on the additional responsibilities of The Contractor during the move of the applications to NEW NATO HQ ?</p> <p>Q9. If the move of application is performed by the third party, what is the impact on the warranty conditions beyond that point ?</p>	<p>A8. The planning and timelines included in section 1.5 of Part IV of the RFP have been defined taking into account the move of the System to the new NATO Headquarters as from end 2015. Within this move, the Contractor may be required to perform certain migration activities.</p> <p>A9. The potential change in warranty conditions as a result of the migration to new NATO Headquarters will be assessed at a later stage.</p>
13	Part IV, Paragraph 7.1.1	<p>Office space and furniture according to the Organisation standards to accommodate up to 5 members of the Contractor's team.</p> <p>Q10. Is it possible to temporarily, for short periods of time exceed the max. number of team member located at</p>	<p>A10. Yes, it could be possible temporarily, for short periods of time to exceed the maximum number of team members located at Organisation's premises, provided that they meet the security requirements stated in the Contract and that this request is communicated to the Organisation sufficiently in</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
		Organization premises?	advance.
14	Part IV, Paragraph 9.1	<p>The Contractor shall provide all required COTS PPM system components (hardware not included, except for the Initial Application Environment) to build the system that must respond to the System Requirements Specifications described in PART IV.</p> <p>Q11. Is it true that the contractor shall deliver all software licenses including the licenses for testing/training/pre-production/production environments?</p>	A11. The Contractor shall deliver all software licenses including the required licenses for the three foreseen environments: development / testing, training / pre-production and production environments.
15	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.2.2.11	<p>The Contractor shall prepare an Initial Application Environment (i.e. Sandbox environment) on its own technical infrastructure – refer also to section 9.2.11. The Initial Application Environment shall be configured in accordance with security best practices. NATO will then run a vulnerability assessment against it and any high or medium deficiencies shall be corrected by the Contractor. The Contractor can access remote systems from within NATO HQ premises using the provided Unclassified workstation, depending on the technology it plans to use, or via its own laptops, subject to NATO security regulations (establishment of an independent access mechanism) if the provided Unclassified network restrictions do not technically allow such remote connection;</p> <p>Q12. Could you precise what the “security best practices” means? Could you list applicable ISO standards or applicable commercial standards?</p>	A12. The security best practices are a set of security measures, settings or configuration details advised by the System manufacturer. As a minimum, these security best practices should be applied. It might be possible that NATO applies additional security settings depending on the proposed product.

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
16	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.2.1	<p>9.2.2.1 The Contractor shall review previously developed documentation and work with the Organisation's key staff to understand, refine and validate project goals, scope, planning, documentation standards, constraints, success factors, project organization, risks and issues.</p> <p>Q13. Could you list and provide details for previously developed documentation (subject, table of content, scope, volume, impact on the project) which will be provided to the Contractor for initial analyses?</p> <p>Q14. Could you provide the examples of the documentation standards which was used in previously developed documentation and work?</p> <p>Q15. Could you describe the documentation standards (subject, table of content, scope, volume, impact on the project) which was used in previously developed documentation and work?</p>	<p>A13. The previously developed documentation includes the '<i>PPM System Requirements Specifications – Context Document</i>' included as a separate document and referenced in Appendix 1 of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP. Other documentation related to Business Processes, Data Conversion, User Access Roles is currently under development.</p> <p>A14. Microsoft Office and Enterprise Architect applications and standards have been used in preparing the documentation referenced in A13.</p> <p>A15. Refer to A14.</p>
17	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.3.1	<p>The Contractor shall make use of the COTS PPM solution, using the Contractor's provided Sandbox environment with mock-up setup and data, to conduct Analysis and Design workshops in an iterative way.</p> <p>Q16. Is it true that the mock-up data, to conduct Analysis and Design workshops, shall be prepared based on the processes identified in the Organization?</p>	<p>A16. Yes, the mock-up data, to conduct Analysis and Design workshops, shall be prepared based on the processes identified in the Organization.</p>
18	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.3.3	<p>In between and during workshop iterations and following validation by the NATO Project Manager, the Contractor will configure and setup the system according to the specified requirements, the results of the workshops and the additional information provided by the workshop</p>	<p>A17. Yes, the NATO Project Manager is responsible for deciding which requirement is valid, which shall be implemented and, in case of conflict between requirements, he has the authority to decide which requirement prevails.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
		<p>participants.</p> <p>Q17. Is it correct understanding that NATO Project Manager is responsible to decide which requirement is valid, which shall be implemented and in case of conflict between requirements he/she has power to decide which requirement is valid?</p>	
19	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.3.6	<p>The System Design must include at a minimum:</p> <p>Q18. Is it true that the list of areas which shall be covered in the System Design shall include only those mentioned in the 9.2.3.6 subparagraphs, and the possible extension will depend on Contractor proposal ?</p> <p>Q19. Is it true that the UML notation could be used in the System Design documents?</p> <p>Q20. Is it true that the UML notation could be used in the all technical related documents which shall be delivered within this project?</p>	<p>A18. As stated in section 9.2.3 of Part IV to the RFP, the list of areas which must be covered in the System Analysis and Design Phase will include as a minimum those mentioned in the 9.2.3.6 subparagraphs.</p> <p>For more detailed information on the mandatory deliverables required in the System Analysis and Design Phase, please, refer to section <i>9.4 LIST OF REQUIRED DELIVERABLES</i> of Part IV of the RFP, deliverables numbered 13 to 19 in the deliverables table. Bidders can propose additional deliverables.</p> <p>A19. Refer to A20.</p> <p>A20. As suggested in section <i>6.5 Other Technical Requirements</i> of Annex E of Part IV of the RFP, Requirement Number 9 (area APA), UML is an acceptable methodology that can be used in the technical related documents to be delivered under this project.</p>
20	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.3.6.5	<p>Transactions assigned to the process steps that specify how business processes will be handled in the implemented COTS PPM solution.</p> <p>Q21. Could you elaborate what the term "transaction" means in the context "Transactions assigned to the</p>	<p>A21. In this context, transactions refer to the actions (i.e. manual and/or automated) performed during the process steps.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
		process steps...”?	
21	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.3.6.7	<p>Technical and Security Architecture Design (high-level and low-level, both requiring approval from Organisation’s Design Approval Panel), down to protocols specifications and ports required, and including the end-to-end two way traceability for completeness and justification of the architectural components and their corresponding requirements.</p> <p>Q22. What is the Organisation’s Design Approval Panel and what is its responsibility and influence on the project?</p>	<p>A22. The Design Approval Panel is composed of permanent and occasional members, representing e.g. the NATO Information Assurance community, the NATO ICT Operations community, the Business Owner, etc. The panel reviews design documentation upon request of the NATO Project Manager and provides an advice to the project manager in the format of a report. The influence on the project migration can be in terms of timing and quality of the technical and security design deliverables.</p>
22	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.8.1.1	<p>The main legacy application is built on an Oracle Database; its data model will be provided and explained to the Contractor at the beginning of the PPM system implementation. Another legacy application is built in MS Access. ANNEX A to Part IV provides more information on current applications used by NOR.</p> <p>Q23. Could you explain how the data model in the legacy systems are described?</p> <p>Q24. Could you provide a table of content of the legacy system documentation?</p>	<p>A23. The legacy Oracle based application data model is described in Oracle Design. The other legacy application has the data model based on standard MS Access tables, queries and reports.</p> <p>A24. The legacy Oracle based application system (which is the main application system to be replaced) documentation includes information on the following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 1: Business Process</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 2: Defence Planning</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 3: Resource Planning</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 4: Incoming Requests</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 5: Prefinancing</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 6: Programming</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Section 7: Implementation</li> </ul>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
			<input type="checkbox"/> Section 8: Validation and Acceptance <input type="checkbox"/> Section 9: Summary Screens <input type="checkbox"/> Section 10: Financial <input type="checkbox"/> Section 11: Implementation Management <input type="checkbox"/> Section 12: Navigation <input type="checkbox"/> Section 13: Administration <input type="checkbox"/> Section 14: Information Transfer <input type="checkbox"/> Section 15: Military Budget and Manpower <input type="checkbox"/> Section 16: Reports
23	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.8.1.2	<p>The Organisation estimates that from the legacy Oracle based application approximately 20,000 NSIP projects and associated master and transactional data residing in 183 tables will need to be transferred to the new system.</p> <p>Q25. What is the expected number of projects in coming 1, 2, 5, 10 years?</p> <p>Q26. What is the average volume of data (file size, records number) for each project?</p> <p>Q27. Is the legacy Oracle database data model the relationship data base or object database?</p> <p>Q28. Is the data collected in the legacy systems data bases coherent and normalized?</p> <p>Q29. In case the legacy system data bases data are denormalized what kind of normalization is applicable for it?</p>	<p>A25. The expected number of projects in the coming years depends on a multitude of factors and are subject to NATO nations decisions. The System however should not have a dependency or limitation in relation to the number of future projects.</p> <p>A26. The total size of data is currently around 5 Gb. On average a project has approximately 250 Kb of data.</p> <p>A27: The legacy Oracle database data model is a relationship database.</p> <p>A28: Yes, the data is coherent and normalised.</p> <p>A29: Not applicable.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
24	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.10.4	<p>The Organisation will run its own security tests to independently measure the overall security of the solution, informing the Contractor of the results. The solution's security deficiencies (if any) shall then be corrected by the Contractor at no cost.</p> <p>Q30. Is it correct understanding that the security test plan and approach provided by the Organization will be delivered to the Contractor at the initial phase of the project?</p>	<p>A30. The security test approach can be explained to the Contractor early in the project. Usually this is done in a working group dedicated to security aspects. The security test plan to be used by the Organisation can only be developed based on the Technical &amp; Security Architecture Design (refer to deliverable #18 in section 9.4 <i>LIST OF REQUIRED DELIVERABLES</i> of Part IV of the RFP). This design is a deliverable of the Contractor.</p>
25	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.10.9.5	<p>All tests shall encompass security functionality called for by the Security Accreditation Authority and include:</p> <p>Q31. What is the "Security Accreditation Authority" entity and what is its influence and function in the project?</p>	<p>A31. The Security Accreditation Authority (SAA) is the organisational body that has the authority to grant security accreditation for a system. The non-functional requirement for every system that will be deployed is to achieve the status of security accredited. If the SAA does not grant security accreditation for the system to be deployed, in principle it cannot be used in production.</p>
26	Part IV, Paragraph 9.2.11.3.8	<p>Application integration products;</p> <p>Q32. Is it correct understanding that the System shall be integrated with other 3rd party tools or systems?</p> <p>Q33. What is the purpose of this subchapter?</p>	<p>A32. Refer to section 4.3 of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP.</p> <p>A33. Refer to A32.</p>
27	Part IV, Annex E, Section 4.1	<p>Interfaces with any other application systems (e.g. ERP) providing information from or to the PPM system, at least in a first phase, is not in the scope of the Project. However, the System Requirements should envision the long term; hence section Technical Requirements contains requirements about technical interfaces capabilities.</p> <p>Q34. Is it correct understanding that "first phase" means this the entire scope of this project.</p> <p>Q35. Is it correct understanding that the interfaces to other</p>	<p>A34. In relation to section 4.1 of Annex E to Part IV the 'first phase' includes both Phases 1 and 2 referenced in section 1.5 of Annex E to Part IV.</p> <p>A35. The interface foreseen as part of the project is referenced in section 4.3 of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
		application systems will not be implemented within this project?	
28	Part IV, Annex E, Section 4.2	Exchange of information between the NOR PPM system and the Host Nations or the Strategic Commands can in many cases imply great volumes of data. This means that mass upload of information must be possible to feed the PPM system. These uploads will be based on standard exchange formats such as CSV, XML, XLS, etc. Q36. Could you estimate the possible volume of files and number of records which have to be imported to the System in mass scale?	A36. The volume and number of records which have to be imported to the System cannot be reliably estimated at this stage. Early estimates could however indicate multiple files by entity, some including thousands of lines.
29	Part IV	Can we offer a solution which entirely or partially based on a Software-as-a-Service approach?	There are NATO security requirements and limitations preventing the use of Software as a Service. As explained in paragraph 6.2 of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP, the System must be hosted on NATO infrastructure.
30	Part I, Annex	Where do you expect the optional section B support costs to be mentioned? Is the limit of € 2,400,000 cumulative (A+B+C+D+E)?	Support costs associated with the purchase option specified in Section B of the schedule must be included within Section D but showing clear separation (as a separate line item) with respect to the support costs associated with the firm requirements listed Sections A and C. Regarding price limitations, there are two limitations stated in Part I, paragraph 8.1.2.2 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The total of Sections A and C of the Price Schedule must not exceed the amount of € 1,800,000</li> <li>- The total evaluated price (total of Sections A thru E plus any required adjustments) must not exceed the amount of € 2,400,000.</li> </ul>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
31	Part IV, Annex E	<p>You have indicated the current and the emerging or recommended versions of a range of client and server software installed and in use within your organisation. Our interpretation of this for some of the software we are particularly interested in is the latest versions we can assume are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SQL Server : version 2000</li> <li>• Microsoft Project: version 2007</li> <li>• SharePoint Portal Server: version 2007</li> <li>• Internet Explorer: version 6</li> <li>• Windows Server: 2008</li> <li>• Windows client: Vista SP1</li> <li>• Windows Office: version 2007</li> </ul> <p>Could you please confirm this?</p> <p>In addition you have referenced “Possible changes under EIM”. Could you please provide more detail on this, specifically around the above software?</p> <p>We believe newer versions of the Microsoft software will provide additional functionality which would offer a more effective platform for both development and on-going support.</p>	<p>NATO Technical Context is stated in section 6.1 of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP. In relation to the requested clarification, these are the latest versions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SQL Server : version 2008 R2</li> <li>• Microsoft Project: version 2007</li> <li>• SharePoint Portal Server: version 2007 is deployed as well as version 2010. Preferably version 2010 is used.</li> <li>• Internet Explorer: version 8</li> <li>• Windows Server: 2008</li> <li>• Windows client: Windows 7</li> <li>• Windows Office: version 2007</li> </ul> <p>The EIM project is not specifically referenced in the PPM RFP, other than through section 4.3 of Annex E to Part IV – ‘Integration with Document Management System’. To benefit from some of the advantages that the EIM project will bring, a migration towards Windows 7/Office 2007 is ongoing. While this migration is not yet fully completed for NATO HQ, NOR is already operating on the Windows 7/Office 2007 environment.</p>
32	Part IV, Annex A	<p>There is a need to migrate data from two existing applications. Could you provide more detail about these applications and their data structures e.g. a data / table mapping?</p>	<p>The ‘Current Applications Overview’ is provided in Annex A to Part IV of the RFP. Additional information on the current applications has been provided in the Responses to Bidders’ Questions – items no. 22 and 23.</p>

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
33	Part IV, Annex E	The PPM solution eventually will have to interface the financial system. Could you provide the technology in which the financial system was delivered (SAP, Oracle etc) ?	As stated in section 4.1 'Technical Interfaces' of Annex E to Part IV of the RFP, the PPM system will not be interfaced with ERP application systems as part of this project. As a clarification and as explained in the Appendix 1 to Annex E to Part IV ('PPM System Requirements Specifications – Context Document'), the (financial) data to be stored in the PPM system does not come from only one system, but from the systems of the 32 Host Nations and those of the Strategic Commands. The preferred way of NOR receiving this data is through direct data entry in PPM by users located in the Host Nations. When a greater volume of data is involved, this could be done through data file uploads, as explained in section 4.2 'Data File Uploads and Extractions' of Annex E to Part IV.
34	Part I, paragraph 8.1.3.4	Regarding evaluation of bids, could you be more specific what does it mean (8.1.3.4): Non - cost factors considered together will be strongly more important than cost factors ? Can strongly more be put in numbers, e.g. 3 times ?	As stated in paragraph 8.4.1, NATO will award the contract to the responsible Bidder whose conforming proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors and sub-factors specified in the solicitation. The evaluation team and the source selection authority will be responsible for independently determine whether non-cost advantages are worth the cost that might be associated with a higher rated proposal. Although evaluation team members and the source selection authority will be assisted in this process through a numerical rating system, numerical ratings obtained through the application of this numerical rating system will be just guides for decision making to help aggregating evaluations and ranking the different alternatives. The decisive element will not be the difference in ratings (and numerical weights), but the rational judgement of the significance of that difference, based on an integrated

No	RFP REF	QUESTION	ANSWER
			comparative assessment of bids. For these reasons, NATO prefers not to disclose the exact parameters of the model and also believes that the narratives provided in the solicitation regarding the relative importance of non-cost factors are sufficient to develop a optimal proposal strategy.