

RISK, COMPLIANCE AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY MANAGEMENT IT SOLUTION

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES FOR RFP CBL/FNC/C/TC/04/2022

SET 1

Date: 06th April 2022

PROPONENT(S) QUESTIONS	RESPONSE
<p>1. We do not offer a cloud based solution or SaaS offering. Our installation is on premise and can be installed in your own hosted cloud environment; however we will not be hosting or maintaining your cloud environment.</p>	<p>CBL prefers a fully-managed cloud based solution for ease of updates and maintenance. However, all proposals shall be subjected to the same evaluation criteria and CBL reserves the right to accept, reject any proposals. So yes, you can still submit your proposal.</p>
<p>2. We do not provide any Business Continuity functionality. We are able to categorise BCM risks and address as part of a Risk management process, but no BCM offering. A large portion of your requirements are around BCM so our response would be limited to the RM, CM and IM only.</p>	<p>It is CBL's preference to have an integrated system encompassing all the prescribed modules for ease of maintenance and support. However, all proposals shall be subjected to the same evaluation criteria and CBL reserves the right to accept, reject any proposals. So yes, you can still submit your proposal.</p>
<p>3. X Company does not provide any functionality for quantitative cost risk analysis (QCRA) techniques such as Monte Carlo simulation, scenario analysis and sensitivity analysis</p>	<p>CBL prefers a system that also have a quantitative cost risk analysis (QCRA) technique. However, it is not a "must have" requirements.</p>
<p>4. If we are able to respond to the RM, CM and IM only please could you confirm the following</p>	
<p>a) Are there any overlaps of users for all the following unique individuals? May I assume the total users are 3 Admin and 30 user access rights for all 3 modules?</p> <p>i. RM - 3 Admin, 30 user access rights</p> <p>ii. IM - 3 Admin, 30 user access rights</p> <p>iii. CM - 3 Admin, 30 user access rights</p>	<p>No, there aren't any overlaps. These are three separate modules with differing license requirements.</p> <p>i. RM- 3 admin licenses and 30 user licenses.</p> <p>ii. IM- 3 admin licenses and 30 user licenses.</p> <p>iii. CM- 3 admin licenses and 10 user licenses.</p> <p>iv. BCM- 3 admin licenses and 12 user licenses.</p> <p>The exception would be where licenses are not priced per user, and the limits of users must be stated.</p>

<p>b) Please could you clarify what a ‘user access rights’ would be required to do in the software?</p>	<p>Please refer to 10.4 system features (e) Inputs and view information by nominated business unit Risk, Compliance and BCM Champions to granular level functionality. Receive and send notifications, retrieve and store information</p>
<p>c) Under risk reporting on page 8 you mention ‘advanced analytics’: i. Are you requiring actual Data analytic functionality and if so please provide requirements such as number of users, data sources to connect to etc? If not please indicate that it falls within standard reporting requirements?</p>	<p>Currently there are no data sources to connect to, but the system should have functionality to connect to one, should there be a need. So, for now it may be considered under standard reporting requirements.</p>
<p>d) Under IM on page 9 – how many people will be required to log incidents? All CBL staff or a smaller defined amount?</p>	<p>Only 30 Risk Champions will be required for now unless, the system provides unlimited licenses.</p>
<p>e) Under CM on page 10 – we partner with a company that provides CRMP compliance content that can import into BarnOwl, however they do not have Lesotho legislation. Please could you provide the following information i. Confirmation that CBL has a regulatory library already and it needs to be imported into the software – if so please provide an example and the amount of acts OR ii. List of Lesotho acts you require in your regulatory register. iii. If possible a definition of which ones are high/med/low in terms of priority.</p>	<p>i. Yes, CBL has its compliance universe that can be imported into the system ii. The list shall be provided during the implementation iii. The Compliance profile shall be provided during the implementation stage of the project.</p>
<p>f) Under CM on page 10 – an update/notification service is not provided.</p>	<p>This one is not a must, but if available its fine</p>
<p>g) Under CM on page 11 – part v. – no artificial intelligence with breaches and notifications provided.</p>	<p>This one is not a must, but if available its fine</p>
<p>5. Form 2: Company Background – are we do answer in the Description field provided?</p>	<p>Not necessarily, even if its attached to the proposal its fine.</p>
<p>6. Form 3: How does this table differ from the System Functional Requirements? Do we provide a response to the table items only and</p>	<p>They are mostly the same, the difference is that the system requirements want you to state how your proposal will meet the requirements. But</p>

<p>can we do so in our own response document that has more space for a response?</p>	<p>the Form 3, provides for precise responses to availability or non-availability of a specific function.</p>
<p>7. X company does not integrate with other systems apart from MS Active Directory.</p>	<p>The preference is to acquire the system that integrates with others like emails for notification purposes.</p>
<p>8. Please provide "Form 5: Instruments Worksheet" as this appears to be missing from the RFP document</p>	<p>It has been an error here. There should not be a Form 5</p>
<p>9. For requirement IT-ITF-02, there are sub-requirements IT-ITF-02.5 and IT-ITF-02.6. Should there also be sub-requirements IT-ITF-02.1 to IT-ITF-02.4?</p>	<p>No, it's actually an error, it supposed to be IT-ITF-02.1 and ITF-02.2. only</p>
<p>10. We can provide quotations in GBP, EUR and USD; would any of these be acceptable?</p>	<p>Currently we are looking for technical proposals, but it will be allowed to quote in USD when we invite the financial proposals from the qualifying proponents</p>
<p>11. Can the pitch be remote?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>12. We have some concerns regarding the wording of section 13.6 and our lawyers have suggested that it should be changed to "<i>All proposals, including supporting documents, submitted to the Bank become the property of the Bank, with the exception of any intellectual property rights contained within the proposal, which shall at all times remain the property of the prospective supplier. Where any intellectual property rights of the prospective supplier is contained within the proposal or any supporting document ("Relevant IP"), the Bank understands and agrees that all right, title, and interest in and to the Relevant IP, shall be, and shall remain, vested in the prospective supplier. The Bank shall not be granted any right, interest, option or licence of any kind, with respect to the Relevant IP or any portion thereof.</i>". Would it be possible to change this and reissue the RFP?</p>	<p>NO.</p>
<p>13. If you are happy with the above, would you be willing to sign and return an NDA?</p>	<p>The NDA shall be signed with proponent(s) not at the tender submission stage rather at relevant subsequent stages.</p>
<p>14. For the implementation we would also perform this remotely - with remote workshops etc. This has worked successfully over many projects. Is this method acceptable to the Bank?</p>	<p>Yes, definitively remote implementation and workshops will be acceptable</p>

15. I have not been able to find response to clarification questions posed by other bidders on your website yet. Will these not be available until after 13th?

Yes, there has been some delays in posting response but surely going forward there will be prompt responses.