



eTenders CFT 8799836 – BIM 2026-09

Call for Tender for the Provision of Development and Support Services for an Upgrade to the Finance Management System (FMS)

Closing date for tender responses: 12 noon (Irish Standard Time) – Monday, 28th September 2026

Responses to queries/clarifications received (Version 1 of 1)

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:												
1.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, 'Scoring Tab' Question: The Scoring tab states that each Category Type is assigned a corresponding weight factor, giving 'S = 5.0, C = 4' as examples. Could BIM publish the complete weight factor table for all six categories — Standard Business Central (SBS), Standard Partner Developed Application (SPDA), Customisation (C), Workaround (W), Development (D) and Not Available (N)? Context: The relative weighting of SPDA against SBS and Customisation materially affects how tenderers describe solutions that are met by established, deployed extensions rather than by unmodified product. Publication would support consistent and comparable responses.	Please see updated Scoring tab in Appendix 1.1. The weighting factors for each Category Type are outlined below also: <table><tr><td>SBS</td><td>5.0</td></tr><tr><td>SPDA</td><td>4.5</td></tr><tr><td>W</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>C</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>D</td><td>1.0</td></tr><tr><td>N</td><td>0.0</td></tr></table>	SBS	5.0	SPDA	4.5	W	3.5	C	3.5	D	1.0	N	0.0
SBS	5.0													
SPDA	4.5													
W	3.5													
C	3.5													
D	1.0													
N	0.0													
2.	Reference: CPD Part 4.2, 'System Selection Criteria'; Appendix 1.1, 'Information Note' tab Question: CPD Part 4.2 states that responses will be 'assessed and scored based on the Priority and Category Type attributed to each requirement'. The Information Note defines Priority as Requirement (R) or Desirable (D), but no weighting is published for Priority. Could BIM confirm whether Priority carries a separate weighting factor and, if so, publish it?	Priority Type does not carry a separate weighting factor. Both categories will be scored equally based on the weightings of the Category Types in Appendix 1.												
3.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, Column D (Tabs F1–F8) / Column E (Tabs N1–N6) Question: The 'Category Type' column is presently blank against each individual requirement. Could BIM confirm whether tenderers are required to complete this column for every individual requirement at pre-qualification stage, or whether it is completed by BIM's evaluation team, or whether it is deferred to Stage 2? Context: CPD Part 4.2 asks for an overview response at section level, while the Category Type column is presented at individual requirement level. Clarity on which	Tenderers are required to fill in the 'Category Type' column at the PQQ stage (Stage 1).												

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:
	party completes this column, and at what stage, would avoid inconsistent submissions.	
4.	Reference: CPD Part 4.2; Appendix 1.1, 'Scoring' tab Question: The Scoring tab describes a weighted score calculated per requirement (qualitative score multiplied by category weight factor), whereas CPD Part 4.2 allocates marks at section level (for example F1 Core Finance, 100 marks). Could BIM clarify how per-requirement weighted scores are aggregated to produce the section-level marks and the 60% minimum qualifying thresholds?	The scoring mechanism has been updated. Please see the new mechanism including in the Scoring tab of Appendix 1.1.
5.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, 'Information Note' tab Question: Where a requirement is marked Desirable (D) and a tenderer's solution does not support it, could BIM confirm the scoring treatment of a 'Not Available (N)' categorisation against a Desirable requirement, and whether this affects the section-level minimum qualifying threshold?	The treatment of Requirements (R) and Deliverables (D) is equal. Both categories will be scored based on the weightings of the Category Types in Appendix 1.
6.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, Tab F7 (Budgeting and Forecasting) Question: Could BIM confirm whether any existing budgeting or corporate performance management application is currently in use alongside Microsoft Dynamics NAV 2018, and if so, whether it is to be retained and integrated with Business Central, replaced by native Business Central budgeting functionality, or is outside the scope of this contract? Context: Tab F7 requires budget preparation through Excel-based templates with import and export to 'external reporting tools' (F7.3), but no budgeting application is named in Tab N2. The answer materially affects both the F7 response and the Stage 2 pricing schedule.	This is outside the scope of this contract.
7.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, Tab F2-1, requirements F2-1.18 to F2-1.26 Question: The Contract and Procurement Management requirements — contract register, procurement approval references, cumulative purchase order values against contracts, framework agreements, procurement methods, insurance records with expiry alerting — extend beyond standard Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central functionality. Could BIM confirm whether it anticipates these being met by an established partner-developed application, by bespoke development within this engagement, or by a third-party application integrated to Business Central? Context: This is the highest-weighted functional category (200 marks). Confirmation of BIM's expectation would support consistent and comparably priced responses.	It is responsibility of tenderers to propose the best value for money solution to implement this contract register.

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:
8.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, F3.6, F3.8, F2-2.20, N2.18 and N2.19 Question: Several requirements refer to dynamic access to Revenue Online Service — validation of supplier tax clearance status prior to payment, and validation and upload of PSWT payments. Could BIM confirm whether a live, direct system-to-system integration with ROS is required, or whether the requirement is satisfied by the generation of structured files in Revenue-compliant format for upload by BIM staff through the ROS portal? Context: The two approaches differ materially in implementation effort, delivery risk and ongoing maintenance exposure, and therefore in price. Confirmation would allow tenderers to price the requirement accurately and comparably. If a live integration is required, could BIM also confirm whether it holds, or will obtain, the necessary ROS digital certificate and API access, and which party is responsible for procuring and maintaining it?	A live, direct system-to-system integration with ROS is not required. Generation of structured files in Revenue-compliant format for BIM staff use is sufficient.
9.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, F2-2.15 and N2.6 Question: Both requirements reference Continia for OCR-based invoice and credit note capture. Could BIM confirm whether Continia is currently licensed and in use at BIM, and whether Continia licence costs fall within the scope of this tender or are excluded alongside the Business Central licences referenced at CPD 1.2?	Continia is currently in use by BIM; however, alternative solutions will be accepted as long as the functionality is not lost.
10.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, F8.1 Question: Requirement F8.1 refers to customer master records including vessel number links to the Irish Fleet Register. Could BIM clarify whether a live system interface to the Irish Fleet Register is required, or whether the vessel number is held as a reference data field maintained within the finance system? Context: No corresponding interface appears in Tab N2, which otherwise lists each required third-party integration.	A live system interface to the Irish Fleet Register is not required. A CSV or equivalent file upload function will be sufficient.
11.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, N4.9 and N4.10 Question: Requirement N4.9 specifies that the solution shall be delivered as a Microsoft-hosted SaaS service. Requirement N4.10 specifies that the solution should store all BIM data on 'its own dedicated, encrypted server'. Microsoft Dynamics 365 Business Central Online is a multi-tenant SaaS platform in which customer isolation is achieved logically — a dedicated tenant with its own database and encryption — rather than by dedicated physical or virtual server infrastructure. Could BIM confirm that tenant-level logical isolation with per-tenant encryption satisfies the intent of N4.10?	Can confirm that it is suitable, however a test environment must be available as part of the solution.

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:
12.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, N2.11, N2.12, N2.13 and N2.16 Question: Could BIM confirm whether file specifications, API documentation or interface control documents are available for the Micropay (Europay) payroll interface, the SmartSimple Grants Management interface, the Strandum Expenses interface and the Bank of Ireland Online Banking flat-file payment format, and whether these will be made available to shortlisted tenderers at Stage 2?	More information for this will be provided at Stage 2 of the procurement process.
13.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, N2.12 and 'Volume Analysis' tab Question: The Volume Analysis tab records an average of 159 grantee transactions per month. Could BIM confirm whether grant administration and grantee management will remain within the SmartSimple platform with payment files exchanged to Business Central, or whether any element of grant processing is expected to move into the finance system?	Only payment files will be exchanged to Business Central. BIM must use SmartSimple for all grant administration and grantee management.
14.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, F2-2.4 and F3.5 Question: Requirement F2-2.4 requires electronic invoicing compliant with applicable EU Directives and Irish Government e-Invoicing requirements, and F3.5 requires ViDA readiness including EN16931 and PEPPOL compatibility. Could BIM confirm its current e-invoicing position — whether BIM currently receives or issues structured electronic invoices, through which access point if any, and whether onboarding to a PEPPOL access point forms part of this contract?	No invoices are issued or received by a structured e-platform. Onboarding to a PEPPOL access point does not form part of this contract.
15.	Reference: CPD 1.2 and Appendix 1; Appendix 1.1, N5.1 Question: Could BIM provide details of the extent of customisation present in the current Microsoft Dynamics NAV 2018 environment — for example an object or customisation inventory, the number of modified and bespoke objects, and details of any third-party add-ons or ISV solutions currently deployed? Context: The volume of existing customisation is the single largest determinant of upgrade effort, since customisations must be assessed, redeveloped as Business Central extensions, or retired. Without this information, tenderers must price on assumption, which risks non-comparable submissions and subsequent variation.	Some customisations previously made on BIM's Microsoft Dynamics NAV 2018 environment are now standard features of Business Central's environment. Details will not be provided of previous customisations, as we are now looking to start with a clean slate for Business Central.
16.	Reference: CPD 1.2; Appendix 1.1, N5.1 Question: Could BIM confirm the number of legal entities or companies configured within the current NAV 2018 environment that are in scope for migration, and whether any consolidation or intercompany processing is required?	Only one intercompany within the current NAV 2018 environment.

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:								
17.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, N4.8 and 'Volume Analysis' tab Question: Requirement N4.8 refers to 10–25 concurrent users. Could BIM confirm the total number of named users expected to require access, broken down by role type where possible — for example full finance users, requisitioners and approvers, and read-only or reporting users? Context: User numbers and role mix drive the training, testing and change management effort at N5.5, which is a 275-mark category, and are required to size the Stage 2 pricing schedule.	Please see number of users required below: <table><tr><th>Type</th><th>Units</th></tr><tr><td>BC Essential</td><td>18</td></tr><tr><td>BC Team Member</td><td>80 +</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1/2 Support</td><td>5</td></tr></table> We would anticipate training of trainers approach with in-house resourcing being applied to the end users to the team member training. Reminder that user licences are not required as part of this tender.	Type	Units	BC Essential	18	BC Team Member	80 +	Level 1/2 Support	5
Type	Units									
BC Essential	18									
BC Team Member	80 +									
Level 1/2 Support	5									
18.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, N5.1 and F1.1 Question: Could BIM provide indicative sizing of the current NAV 2018 environment — approximate database size, number of active General Ledger accounts, and the number and structure of dimensions currently in use? Context: CPD 1.2 limits migration to the running year plus the previous three years of transactions and balances; the above informs the volume of data within that window.	The current LIVE database size is currently 14GB. Please note that this includes all historic data. However, please refer to Section 1.2 of the CPD as to how much of this data will be brought across. Please refer to the updated Volume Analysis tab in Appendix 1.1.								
19.	Reference: CPD 1.2; Appendix 1.1, N5.1 Question: Could BIM confirm the intended treatment of the following within the agreed migration scope: open purchase orders and requisitions; unapplied and partially applied transactions; document attachments and supporting documentation held against existing records; and full master data history for vendors, customers and fixed assets irrespective of the four-year transaction window?	Yes, open purchase orders and requisitions, unapplied and partially applied transaction will be part of the migration scope. Options will need to be discussed at Stage 2 for the document attachments and supporting documentation. Full master data history of active vendors, customers and fixed assets over the 4yr duration.								
20.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, F6.7 and F5.1 Question: Could BIM confirm the number of bank accounts to be configured and the currencies in use and provide an indicative count of records currently held in the Fixed Asset Register and, separately, in the ICT asset register referenced at F5.10?	BIM currently has only one bank account, however, there must be an option or functionality to include others in the future. There are approx. 1220 items currently listed on the Fixed Asset Register. The ICT Asset Register referenced in F5.10 – F5.12 has now been amended to Desirable rather than a Requirement.								

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:
21.	Reference: CPD 1.2; Appendix 1.1, N5.1 Question: Could BIM confirm the level of access and co-operation that will be available from the current NAV 2018 support provider during the implementation period, including the provision of environment access, data extracts and technical documentation, and confirm which party is responsible for procuring that co-operation?	Required access will be provided to existing Microsoft NAV data required for the transition, this will be coordinated through BIM.
22.	Reference: CPD 1.2 Question: Could BIM indicate its preferred or required go-live timing — for example alignment with a financial year end or a specific cutover window — and confirm whether any period of the year is excluded from cutover for operational reasons? Context: CPD 1.4 provides a twelve-month implementation period; confirmation of the target cutover point would allow tenderers to propose a realistic plan within that period.	It would be anticipated that a go-live date would commence in summer 2027 from May onwards. There is no fixed go-live date, however, it would be best to avoid the period between January and April as this would be incompatible with operations during this time.
23.	Reference: CPD 1.5 Question: Paragraph 1.5 is headed 'Not used', but the text beneath it refers to extending the Term for a period or periods of up to [insert number] months with a maximum of [insert number] such extensions. Could BIM confirm whether any option to extend the Term exists, and if so the maximum duration and number of extensions?	Section 1.5 of the CPD is not used for this tender, therefore, no extensions will be utilised. Maximum duration of the contract will be 24-months.
24.	Reference: CPD 1.4 and 1.6 Question: Paragraph 1.4 states that the Services Contract will be issued for a term of 24 months and will not exceed 24 months. Paragraph 1.6 provides a justification for 'an extended Term longer than the standard 4 years'. Could BIM confirm the intended contract term?	Section 1.6 is not applicable to this tender and should be stated as 'Not Used'. Please see updated CPD document.
25.	Reference: CPD 1.2, 1.7 and Appendix 1 Question: Paragraph 1.7 estimates expenditure of some €425,000 excluding VAT over the first twelve months, followed by Year 2 support with an estimated value of up to €50,000 excluding VAT 'for the remainder of the contract'. Could BIM confirm whether the €50,000 represents the total value for the remaining contract period or an annual value? Could BIM also reconcile the reference to 'Yr2' at paragraph 1.2 with 'Yr2+' at Appendix 1, given the 24-month term at paragraph 1.4?	The €50,000 is applicable to Yr2 of the contract (or the remainder of the contract after the go-live date). There was an error in Appendix 1 stating "Yr2+" which has now been rectified. Please see updated CPD document.

No:	Query/clarification received:	Response:
26.	Reference: Appendix 1.1, Tab N4 header Question: The header of Tab N4 states that 'The Tenderer should detail all hosting costs in the Pricing Schedule', while CPD 1.2 expressly excludes ongoing Business Central licence fees from this tender. Given that Business Central Online hosting is provided by Microsoft as part of the subscription, could BIM clarify what hosting costs it expects tenderers to detail separately in the Stage 2 Pricing Schedule?	This was an error in Appendix 1.1. Any reference to the Pricing Schedule has now been removed. Please see updated version of Appendix 1.1.
27.	Reference: CPD 3.18.2 and Appendix 3, clause 8 Question: Both provisions refer to insurance requirements 'as specified at paragraph 2.21.1' and 'as required by paragraph 2.21.1 of the RFT'. The insurance requirements appear at paragraph 3.18.1 of the CPD. Appendix 3 also refers to Selection and Award Criteria 'as set out in Part 3 of the RFT' and to a Tender Deadline 'specified at paragraph 2.10.3 of the RFT', whereas these appear at Part 4 and paragraph 3.10.2 respectively. Could BIM confirm that these are cross-referencing errors and that the substantive requirements are those set out in the CPD as issued?	CPD 3.18.2 is incorrect and should reference section 3.18.1 instead of 2.21.1. Please see updated CPD document. Appendix 3: Tenderers' Statement is only to be completed by successful tenderers who are invited to Stage 2 of the procurement process. The references included in Appendix 3, tie back to the clauses that will be set in the tender document of Stage 2.
28.	Reference: CPD 3.18.1 Question: The insurance schedule requires Product Liability cover of €6.5 million. Given that the subject matter of this contract is the provision of software implementation, development and support services rather than the supply of goods, could BIM confirm whether Product Liability cover is required, or whether Professional Indemnity and Cyber Liability cover are considered to address the relevant risk?	All insurances stated in the CPD are required.
29.	Reference: CPD 2.2.2 and 4.2 Question: Could BIM confirm that exactly four tenderers will be invited to Stage 2, and clarify the approach BIM will take in the event that fewer than four tenderers exceed the minimum Selection Criteria, or that two or more tenderers are tied at the fourth position?	The maximum number of tenderers that will be invited to Stage 2 of the procurement process is four (4). There is also a requirement to invite a minimum of three (3) tenderers. If two tenderers are tied at 4th position, a fifth spot may be opened to allow both tenderers to proceed to Stage 2 of the procurement process.
30.	Are we correct that the PQQ stage does not require a written response to Appendix 1.1 and we only need to review these requirements?	Appendix 1.1 will need to be completed. The 'Tender Response' columns are the areas that need to be completed.
31.	On review of Appendix 1.1 we wanted your feedback on how you define the category types Development and Customisation?	Please see definitions included in updated Appendix 1.1 spreadsheet.

Issue date: Thursday, 27th August 2026 (via www.etenders.gov.ie)