

Q&A 2 Provision of an Operational Risk Management Software
PRC0003791

<p>Q1: Can ESM confirm what system(s) are currently used for operational risk management — is this Excel/manual?</p>	<p>The ESM currently uses an existing Operational Risk Management software solution. Historical data can be extracted from the current solution in structured formats (e.g. Excel or equivalent flat files) for migration purposes. No further information regarding the current solution will be provided.</p>
<p>Q2: If a system is in place today, is the intent to replace it entirely, or to run a parallel/phased migration?</p>	<p>The successful Service Provider will be required to implement the proposed solution and migrate the existing historical operational risk data. A parallel phase migration is expected until the new tool is ready for use</p>
<p>Q3: Beyond operational risk, do other functions (corporate risk register, compliance, audit) use any GRC, ERM, or point-solution tools today, and if so, is there an expectation that the new platform would eventually connect with or absorb these?</p>	<p>Yes, some other ESM functions currently use GRC, ERM or other specialised point-solution tools for their respective activities. However, the scope of this procurement is limited to Operational Risk Management. At this stage, there are no plans or requirements to consolidate, replace, absorb, or integrate other functions' existing GRC solutions into the platform procured under this RFP. Candidates should therefore assume a standalone Operational Risk Management implementation based on the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference.</p>
<p>Q4: Is the primary scope of this RFP limited to Operational Risk Management, or is ESM open to evaluating an integrated solution spanning ICT risk, BCM, and Policy & Document Management (PDMS) as part of this process — even if priced as optional/modular?</p>	<p>The primary scope of this procurement is the provision of an Operational Risk Management Software meeting the mandatory and optional requirements set out in the Terms of Reference. Candidates may propose additional capabilities that complement their solution. However, the proposal should</p>

	clearly distinguish between the requirements requested in the RFP and any additional functionalities offered
Q5: Could ESM clarify how scenario analysis is envisioned: is this a capability the platform itself should natively support, or does ESM intend to integrate with an existing third-party scenario analysis tool/provider they already use?	Scenario Analysis is listed as an optional functionality in the Terms of Reference. Candidates should describe how their proposed solution supports this functionality. No integration with an existing third-party scenario analysis solution is required by the RFP.
Q6: Can ESM clarify how their internal risk, compliance, audit, and controls functions are currently structured/connected today, as this would inform whether additional modules beyond Risk should be priced as core or optional?	Candidates should prepare their proposals based on the mandatory and optional functionalities described in the Terms of Reference. The ESM will not provide additional information regarding its internal organisational structure beyond the RFP documentation.
Q7: Is the requirement to integrate with Tableau driven by an existing investment in Tableau dashboards/templates that need to be preserved, or would ESM be open to a platform's native advanced reporting capability as an alternative?	The reference to Tableau/Power BI is intended only to describe the ability to export data in flat-file formats for consumption by external reporting and analytics tools. It does not imply a requirement to preserve existing Tableau dashboards, templates, or reporting assets. The reporting requirements are those set out in the Terms of Reference, including the ability to produce predefined reports and dashboards, allow ESM users to create customised reports (REP01), and generate graphics and heatmaps (REP02). Candidates may therefore propose solutions with native reporting capabilities, provided that the reporting requirements defined in the Terms of Reference are met and that data can be exported in suitable flat-file formats for use by external tools where required.
Q8: Could ESM confirm whether the chat/discussion requirement on incidents is intended purely as threaded commentary tied to a risk/incident	The requirement refers to a chat room associated with each incident to facilitate communication between the incident owner and the Operational

record, or whether a separate standalone messaging capability is required?	Risk Officer, as described under requirement ORI12. A separate standalone messaging platform is not required.
Q9: Can ESM confirm the anticipated timeline for vendor down-selection, POC, and contract signature?	The anticipated procurement timeline is set out in the RFP in section 4.2. There is currently no change in the timeline.
Q10: Is a POC/pilot phase confirmed as part of the evaluation process, and if so, can ESM share anticipated timing and scope expectations for this stage?	Please refer to Section 4.6 of the RFP (Demonstrations) and Annex I to the Terms of Reference of the RFP, as well as the response to Q4 of the Q&A 1, which describe the Proof of Concept (PoC) process, including the anticipated timing and scope of the demonstration.