

**TENDER FOR BUDGET ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (“BEMS”)**

**Questions & Answers**

**1. Scope of Work**

No.	Question	Answer																
1	Does the tenderer allowed to propose COT solution which is not Oracle -Based solution?	We will still evaluate any proposal even for non-Oracle.																
2	Does the tenderer allowed to propose solution run on database other than Oracle like MYSQL or MSSQL?	We are allowing the tenderer to propose database other than Oracle.																
3	If Item 1 or 2 is allowed, can the tenderer submit certified project team which relate to propose solution which non-Oracle certification?	Non-certified oracle consultant can be proposed by the tenderer, but if the solution is from Oracle it must include consultant with Oracle certification.																
4	Is the proposed BEMS system preferred to be hosted on on-premises infrastructure or cloud-based environment?	The preferred solution is on-premises deployment. If a cloud-based solution is proposed, the application may reside in the cloud (Malaysia region), but all associated data must remain hosted within the MCMC Data Centre to ensure data residency compliance.																
5	For MCMC’s existing systems (e.g. HR System, Procurement System, Financial System), are these systems currently hosted on cloud or on-premise servers? Kindly advise the operating system platform being used.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1043 887 1128 927">No.</th> <th data-bbox="1128 887 1581 927">Systems/Applications</th> <th data-bbox="1581 887 1843 927">Environment</th> <th data-bbox="1843 887 2045 927">OS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 927 1128 1007">1.</td> <td data-bbox="1128 927 1581 1007">HR System (Employee Data)</td> <td data-bbox="1581 927 1843 1007">Cloud AWS</td> <td data-bbox="1843 927 2045 1007">Debian 11 (Linux)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 1007 1128 1046">2.</td> <td data-bbox="1128 1007 1581 1046">Procurement System</td> <td data-bbox="1581 1007 1843 1046">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1843 1007 2045 1046">Windows</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1043 1046 1128 1126">3.</td> <td data-bbox="1128 1046 1581 1126">Financial System</td> <td data-bbox="1581 1046 1843 1126">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1843 1046 2045 1126">Oracle (Linux)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS	1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)	2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows	3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)
No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS															
1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)															
2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows															
3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)															
6	Are all current system servers hosted on VMware virtual machines (VMs), or are there any physical servers currently in operation?	All MCMC applications/systems are hosted on VMware virtual machines (VMs).																
7	What database platform is currently being used for MCMC’s existing systems?	Currently, MCMC utilizes multiple databases in the current environment, including both open-source and licensed ones.																
8	Is MCMC currently using Oracle E-Business Suite? If yes, please specify the E-Business Suite modules/products in use.	Yes. The modules in SIFS are as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Ledger</li> </ul>																

No.	Question	Answer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accounts Payable</li> <li>• Accounts Receivable</li> <li>• Fixed Assets</li> <li>• Oracle Internet Expense</li> <li>• Cash Management</li> <li>• Staff Advance Module</li> </ul>
9	Is MCMC currently using Oracle ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning)?	MCMC currently using Oracle E-Business Suite (EBS)Release 12.2.8
10	Does this tender scope include the provision of any hardware components?	Hardware (Servers) for Staging and Production will be provided by MCMC. The tender's scope is limited to the provision, installation, and optimization of all necessary software.
11	<p><i>Referring to Appendix I, under System Architecture - 40.2.1, item (f), which mentions the conversion of unstructured data into a structured system (new system):</i></p> <p>Is this requirement intended as a one-time data migration exercise or a continuous, ongoing process?</p>	Data migration should include all database on the cut over and post cut over until Go Live.
12	<p><i>Section 5, para 39.5 (Oracle-based COTS and middleware)</i></p> <p>Please confirm whether MCMC has a preferred Oracle product stack (e.g. specific Oracle EPM/Budgeting modules and Oracle Integration products), or whether Tenderers are free to propose any Oracle-based COTS and middleware that meet the stated requirements.</p>	The Tenderers are free to propose any Oracle-based COTS and middleware that meet the stated requirements.
13	<p><i>Section 5, para 39.5 (customisation limits)</i></p> <p>How does MCMC define an acceptable level of customisation versus configuration for the BEMS and middleware (e.g. percentage or type of custom objects), and will there be any explicit cap on custom developments?</p>	We assume there is a customization towards our requirements. It depends on the Tenderer to justify if it considers part of the system deliverable of customization. Customization applies only to requirements that cannot be fulfilled through standard configuration or existing system capabilities and where no practical workaround is available. Such customization would require direct modification to the underlying Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product. We would like to maintain product integrity and long-term viability, with the acceptable level of customization not exceeding 15% of the overall solution design (from original product design) or total implementation cost. This limit is intended to prevent excessive modifications that could compromise the core product, increase technical debt, or create challenges for future upgrades and vendor support

No.	Question	Answer
14	<p><i>Section 5, para 39.4 and 40 (end-to-end scope)</i>            Beyond the items listed in Appendix G and Appendix I, are there any additional implicit business processes (e.g. ad-hoc budgeting workflows, special funds, or exception processes) that MCMC expects to be in scope for BEMS?</p>	<p>MCMC currently does not have ad-hoc budgeting workflows, special funds, or exception processes; however, we are open to exploring any features that may be applicable and beneficial for future readiness.</p>
15	<p><i>Section 5, para 39.1–39.4 (budget lifecycle)</i>            Does MCMC intend the BEMS to be the single authoritative system for all budgeting-related activities, or will certain steps (e.g. final approvals or specific reports) remain in existing tools outside BEMS?</p>	<p>MCMC requires BEMS to be the centralized budget platform. All budgetary planning figures, verification, movement, approvals and balances should be tracked in BEMS. Only actual figures will be integrated and encumbrance information will be obtained from our Procurement system. (additional notes: employee data will be maintained and interface from HRIS)</p>
16	<p><i>40.1.1.2(a–d, i), 40.1.1.4(d), 40.1.1.5 (Oracle GL, ERP integration)</i>            Please confirm the current Oracle ERP type (e.g. Oracle E-Business Suite / Oracle Fusion Cloud) and its corresponding versions and environments (DEV/UAT/PROD) that BEMS must integrate with, including any existing integration platforms currently in use.            We need to know how many environments (DEV/UAT/PROD) that BEMS must integrate with, including any existing integration platforms currently in use.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MCMC currently operates on Oracle E-Business Suite (EBS) Version 12 and is in the process of upgrading to Version 19. Both versions are hosted on-premises.</li> <li>2. We have proposed a three-environment consisting of DEV, Staging, and Production environments.</li> </ol> <p>For environment that needs to connect with BEMS we are open to Tenderer’s proposal, we define as of now what we have, example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. SIFS - 3 environment (DEV for development /UAT - for testing /PROD - for production)</li> <li>2. HRIS - to define how many environment and the purpose</li> <li>3. PROCUMENT - to define how many environment and the purpose</li> </ol> <p>Refer to the essential integration touchpoints below. This ensures the tenderer has the necessary context for their tasks without exposing the entire MCMC environment unnecessarily:</p>

No.	Question	Answer																								
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1055 156 1111 209">No.</th> <th data-bbox="1111 156 1391 209">Systems/Applications</th> <th data-bbox="1391 156 1554 209">Environment</th> <th data-bbox="1554 156 1682 209">OS</th> <th data-bbox="1682 156 1984 209">Integration Environment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 209 1111 389">1.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 209 1391 389">HR System (Employee Data)</td> <td data-bbox="1391 209 1554 389">Cloud AWS</td> <td data-bbox="1554 209 1682 389">Debian 11 (Linux)</td> <td data-bbox="1682 209 1984 389">           1. Pre-Prod (to perform testing)            2. Production (Live data)         </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 389 1111 569">2.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 389 1391 569">Procurement System</td> <td data-bbox="1391 389 1554 569">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1554 389 1682 569">Windows</td> <td data-bbox="1682 389 1984 569">           1. Staging (to perform testing)            2. Production (Live Data)         </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 569 1111 750">3.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 569 1391 750">Financial System</td> <td data-bbox="1391 569 1554 750">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1554 569 1682 750">Oracle (Linux)</td> <td data-bbox="1682 569 1984 750">           1. UAT (to perform testing)            2. Production (Live Data)         </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS	Integration Environment	1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)	1. Pre-Prod (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live data)	2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows	1. Staging (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live Data)	3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)	1. UAT (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live Data)
No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS	Integration Environment																						
1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)	1. Pre-Prod (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live data)																						
2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows	1. Staging (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live Data)																						
3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)	1. UAT (to perform testing) 2. Production (Live Data)																						
17	<p><i>40.1.1.2(c, f, g), 40.1.1.3(g), 40.1.2.1 (COA and budget structure)</i>            Will MCMC provide a definitive master Chart of Accounts (COA), allowed combinations, and mapping rules before the design phase, or does MCMC expect the Tenderer to assist in the redesign/cleanup of COA and mapping rules as part of the project scope?</p>	<p>Yes, we will provide the successful tenderer our Chart of Accounts (COA) that is currently maintained by MCMC. At this point, we do not have any plans to restructure or redesign our COA. However, should the proposal require a redesign to meet MCMC's requirements, we are open to understand the rationale, impacts and the potential benefits to MCMC.</p>																								
18	<p><i>40.1.1.2(j), 40.1.1.4(a-c), 40.1.1.5(e, h) (HR and licensing data)</i>            For integrations with HR and licensing/revenue systems, please confirm the list of source systems, their technology stacks (on-prem / cloud), and whether APIs or flat-file interfaces are already available and governed by existing standards.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1055 981 1111 1091">No.</th> <th data-bbox="1111 981 1391 1091">Systems/Applications</th> <th data-bbox="1391 981 1554 1091">Environment</th> <th data-bbox="1554 981 1760 1091">OS</th> <th data-bbox="1760 981 1895 1091">Integration Methods</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 1091 1111 1193">1.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 1091 1391 1193">HR System (Employee Data)</td> <td data-bbox="1391 1091 1554 1193">Cloud AWS</td> <td data-bbox="1554 1091 1760 1193">Debian 11 (Linux)</td> <td data-bbox="1760 1091 1895 1193">API</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 1193 1111 1267">2.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 1193 1391 1267">Procurement System</td> <td data-bbox="1391 1193 1554 1267">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1554 1193 1760 1267">Windows</td> <td data-bbox="1760 1193 1895 1267">API</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1055 1267 1111 1345">3.</td> <td data-bbox="1111 1267 1391 1345">Financial System</td> <td data-bbox="1391 1267 1554 1345">On-Premises</td> <td data-bbox="1554 1267 1760 1345">Oracle (Linux)</td> <td data-bbox="1760 1267 1895 1345">API</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS	Integration Methods	1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)	API	2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows	API	3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)	API
No.	Systems/Applications	Environment	OS	Integration Methods																						
1.	HR System (Employee Data)	Cloud AWS	Debian 11 (Linux)	API																						
2.	Procurement System	On-Premises	Windows	API																						
3.	Financial System	On-Premises	Oracle (Linux)	API																						

No.	Question	Answer
19	<p>40.1.1.2(e), 40.1.1.5(e), 40.1.2.3(e), 40.1.2.4(i) (exception and error handling)</p> <p>Does MCMC have standard enterprise guidelines for error/exception handling and notification (e.g. specific monitoring tools, email gateways, or incident ticketing system) that BEMS and middleware must integrate with?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ticketing: No integration required between BEMS and MCMC's ticketing system.</li> <li>• Application Monitoring (Manage Engine): Installation of monitoring agents on all servers.</li> <li>• Email: BEMS must support OAUTH 2.0 for email gateway integration.</li> </ul>
20	<p>39.6 (AI-assisted budgeting, anomaly detection, variance explanations)</p> <p>Please clarify MCMC's expectations on AI scope: does MCMC require embedded AI specifically within Oracle products only, or is the Tenderer allowed to propose external AI services as long as they are securely integrated and compliant with MCMC's policies?</p>	<p>If the product platform proposed for BEMS is Oracle, MCMC's preference is to leverage Oracle's embedded AI features, aligned with the budget allocated by MCMC. Nevertheless, MCMC allows the Tenderer to propose external AI services, provided that they are securely integrated with the solution and fully compliant with MCMC's security, governance, and policy requirements.</p>
21	<p>39.6 (governance and security for AI)</p> <p>Are there existing internal AI governance, data residency, and model usage policies (e.g. prohibition on sending personal/sensitive data to external AI services) that the proposed AI features must comply with? If yes, can MCMC share these policies during the design phase?</p>	<p>Yes, we do have AI ethic and usage policy, however tenderer may propose and discuss with MCMC should there are any public term that needs to be included in utilizing the AI product supplied, subject to the Commission approval. It is feasible to share with the appointed successful tenderer during implementation phase.</p>
22	<p>39.6 (analytics and insights)</p> <p>How does MCMC prioritise AI use cases for Phase 1 versus Phase 2 (e.g. anomaly detection, variance narrative generation, forecasting support), and is MCMC open to a phased AI roadmap approach instead of implementing all AI features in the initial release?</p>	<p>MCMC prioritises Phase 1 by focusing on the budget's main features, ensuring that critical functionalities are addressed first. We are open to having AI roadmap phase approach rather than implementing all AI features in the initial release. The expectation is that configuration and AI capabilities will be completed in a phased manner, with features able to respond effectively and deliver meaningful results based on MCMC's existing case studies and scenarios.</p>
23	<p>40.1.1.1(a-f) (templates, multiple budget types, AWP linkage, scenario planning)</p> <p>Will MCMC provide sample official budget templates and AWP formats, together with existing scenario planning methodologies, so that the Tenderer can configure templates and planning methods to match current practice?</p>	<p>Yes, during implementation requirement study phase.</p>
24	<p>40.1.1.3(a-h), 40.1.2.3(g-i), 40.1.2.4(f-h) (versioning, locking, carry-forward)</p> <p>Please confirm whether MCMC intends to standardise the</p>	<p>Across all divisions. MCMC maintains budget templates and the AWP in a single standardized format, ensuring that the numbering and naming of budget and forecast versions are consistent across the platform.</p>

No.	Question	Answer
	number and naming of budget/forecast versions (e.g. Draft 1, Draft 2, Final, Revised) across all divisions, or whether different divisions may maintain their own version structures within BEMS.	
25	<p><i>40.1.1.4(a–h) (income and revenue planning)</i>            For licensing-related income and other income classes (e.g. rentals, interest, training), will MCMC provide standard forecasting methodologies and parameters, or does MCMC expect the Tenderer to propose industry-standard forecasting methods for MCMC’s review and approval?</p>	MCMC have standard forecasting methodologies and will provide during requirement study. However, MCMC is still open for Tenderer’s proposal on the industry-standard forecasting methods for MCMC’s review and approval if there are potential benefits to MCMC.
26	<p><i>40.1.1.5(a–g) (analysis, dashboards, trend reports)</i>            Are there any mandated reporting formats or tools (e.g. specific layouts for management and Board reports, use of PowerPoint formats) that the dashboards and analytics outputs must support beyond what is stated (Word, PDF, Excel, CSV, PowerPoint extraction)?</p>	Currently, the mandated reporting formats that dashboards and analytics outputs must support are Word, PDF, Excel, CSV, and PowerPoint extraction. There are no additional prescribed layouts or tools for management or Board reports beyond these formats.
27	<p><i>40.1.2.2(a–c) (periodic review budgets)</i>            Does MCMC intend to reuse the same annual budget structures and workflows for quarterly/mid-term reviews, or will there be separate review-specific forms, approval flows, and reporting layouts that need to be configured?</p>	MCMC intends to maintain minimum level of workflow as per documented. However the system is expected to be flexible to accommodate additional workflow scenarios. Referring to forms, and reporting layout will be confirmed during implementation phase.
28	<p><i>40.1.2.3(a–i) (workflow lifecycle, dashboards, LOA enforcement)</i>            Please confirm whether the Financial Limit of Authority (LOA) will be provided as a formal matrix (by amount, account type, project classification, etc.), and whether BEMS is expected to be the primary system of record for LOA rules or to reference an external LOA master.</p>	At this stage, it is expected that BEMS will either serve as the primary system of record for LOA rules or reference an external LOA master, depending on the final design and to be confirmed during implementation.
29	<p><i>40.1.2.3(b, d, h), 40.1.2.4(c–e) (sequential/parallel routing, cross-boundary approvals)</i>            Are there any special approval scenarios (e.g. emergency approvals, acting roles, dual signatories) that must be supported in the workflow design beyond standard LOA-based routing?</p>	The workflow design will primarily follow standard LOA-based routing, with the flexibility to accommodate additional approval scenarios if required and confirmed by the relevant stakeholders.
30	<p><i>40.1.2.3(c, e, g, i), 40.1.2.4(b, i) (audit trails and justification)</i>            For audit trail and justification records, does MCMC have specific</p>	At this stage, MCMC has not specified any particular retention periods or formats for audit trail and justification records. The system is expected to capture sufficient details

No.	Question	Answer
	retention requirements or formats (e.g. minimum fields, mandatory justification templates) that must be enforced by the system?	to support audit and compliance requirements, including key fields and justifications, with final retention rules and templates to be confirmed during implementation.
31	<p><i>40.2.3, 40.2.10, 40.2.11, 40.3.1–40.3.4 (project phases, handover, PMF)</i></p> <p>Can MCMC share its Project Management Framework (PMF) templates and required document list (e.g. PMP, risk register, configuration management plan) so that the Tenderer can align deliverables and formats from the outset?</p>	Details information will be provided during implementation.
32	<p><i>40.3.3 and Table 2 (phases and 29-month duration)</i></p> <p>Within the 17-month implementation timeline, are there internal target dates (e.g. specific quarters) for Phase 1 Go Live and Phase 2 Go Live, and is MCMC open to jointly refining the detailed milestone plan during the initiation phase?</p>	Yes. As shared in the previous briefing session, Phase 1 is targeted to Go-live on Dec-26 and Phase 2 on Jun-27
33	<p><i>40.2.6–40.2.9 (testing, UAT, Pentest, SIT)</i></p> <p>Please confirm whether MCMC will provide and manage the independent security/penetration testing team, or whether the Tenderer is expected to include third party penetration services in the proposal.</p>	The Tenderer is responsible for providing third-party Penetration Testing services as outlined in the Tended document. All associated costs must be included into the total project fees.
34	<p><i>40.4 and 41.2–41.3 (training, knowledge transfer)</i></p> <p>What are MCMC's expectations on training coverage (e.g. train-the-trainer only vs. end-user trainings for all divisions), preferred language(s), and target number of training sessions/classes per user group?</p>	This will be defined during the implementation phase.
35	<p><i>40.5.1–40.5.3, 40.5.7–40.5.8 (support, maintenance, IP, extension quotation)</i></p> <p>For the support and maintenance period, does MCMC prefer an on-site, hybrid, or fully remote support model, and what are the expected support coverage hours (e.g. business hours only vs. 24x7 for critical incidents)?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We propose a hybrid support model: standard issues will be managed via remote access, while critical or urgent incidents will receive immediate onsite intervention to ensure rapid resolution.</li> <li>2. Expected support coverage based on Severity. Please refer to the Tender document for the details of the SLA.</li> </ol>

No.	Question	Answer														
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1032 164 1184 228">Severity</th> <th data-bbox="1196 164 1406 228">Resolution Time (includes Response Time)</th> <th data-bbox="1406 164 1906 228">Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1032 236 1184 339">Critical</td> <td data-bbox="1196 236 1406 339">4 Continuous Hours</td> <td data-bbox="1406 236 1906 339">Incident causing severe disruption to business operations (e.g, System down/ single or multiple module unusable, intermittent issue, etc.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1032 339 1184 419">Major</td> <td data-bbox="1196 339 1406 419">24 Continuous Hours</td> <td data-bbox="1406 339 1906 419">Incident causing a significant impact on services or operations (e.g, the same issue symptom occurs in several users)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1032 419 1184 499">Low</td> <td data-bbox="1196 419 1406 499">72 Continuous Hours</td> <td data-bbox="1406 419 1906 499">Incident causing minimal impact on operations (e.g, issue occurs to a single user)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Severity	Resolution Time (includes Response Time)	Description	Critical	4 Continuous Hours	Incident causing severe disruption to business operations (e.g, System down/ single or multiple module unusable, intermittent issue, etc.)	Major	24 Continuous Hours	Incident causing a significant impact on services or operations (e.g, the same issue symptom occurs in several users)	Low	72 Continuous Hours	Incident causing minimal impact on operations (e.g, issue occurs to a single user)		
Severity	Resolution Time (includes Response Time)	Description														
Critical	4 Continuous Hours	Incident causing severe disruption to business operations (e.g, System down/ single or multiple module unusable, intermittent issue, etc.)														
Major	24 Continuous Hours	Incident causing a significant impact on services or operations (e.g, the same issue symptom occurs in several users)														
Low	72 Continuous Hours	Incident causing minimal impact on operations (e.g, issue occurs to a single user)														
36	<p><i>40.5.6 (SLA, monitoring, penalties, log retention)</i> Please confirm whether MCMC has existing enterprise monitoring/logging tools that BEMS must integrate with to achieve the 99.95% availability and 3-year log retention requirement, or whether the Tenderer should propose a complete monitoring approach within the solution.</p>	MCMC has application monitoring tools (Manage Engine) that shall onboard with BEMS later.														
37	<p><i>40.2.4–40.2.9 (data conversion, cleansing, loading)</i> What is the expected historical data scope for migration into BEMS (e.g. number of years of past budgets, actuals, and virement records) and are there any legal/operational constraints on the minimum history to be retained online?</p>	The minimum data migration requirement shall cover ten (10) years of historical budget data, backdated accordingly. This includes budget records, encumbrances, actual expenditures, and virement records, based on General Ledger (GL) extractions.														
38	<p><i>40.2.3, 40.2.9, 40.5.1 (environments and cutover)</i> How many environments does MCMC expect for BEMS (e.g. DEV, SIT, UAT, TRAIN, PROD), and are there any internal constraints on environment provisioning timelines that the Tenderer should take into account in the project plan?</p>	We have proposed a three-environment consisting of DEV, Staging, and Production environments. The provisioning of the environment shall be following the agreed spec with the awarded supplier. Tenderer may propose the suitable environmental strategy that suit their proposal and implementation costing.														
39	<p><i>40.2.1.1 (System Architecture)</i> 1. Is there any preferred hardware specification?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hardware (Servers) for Development, Staging and Production will be provided by IT MCMC.</li> <li>2. Hardware pricing should be excluded from this proposal. The tender's scope is limited to the provision, installation, and optimization of all necessary software.</li> </ol>														
40	<p><i>40.3.e (Project Management Requirements- Methodology and Planning- Configuration Management Plan)</i> 2. Do we need to include the hardware pricing in proposal? Or does MCMC will provide the hardware, and we do the installation and configuration only?</p>															

No.	Question	Answer
		<p>Note: The provided hardware is for on-premise deployment and does not covers for cloud solutioning. Tender will need to include the licensing or any subscription fees as part of the final price for cloud solution.</p> <p>The preferred solution is an on-premise deployment. If a cloud-based solution is proposed, the application may reside in the cloud (Malaysia region), but all associated data must remain hosted within the MCMC Data Centre to ensure data residency compliance.</p>
41	<p><i>40.5.1.e (Support and Maintenance)</i>            During the implementation, is it mandatory for the manpower to be fully onsite, or can we do it remotely?            We understand that during the post-implementation, manpower need to be there for critical issues resolution only. Can we also do remotely during the post-implementation?</p>	<p>For implementation, we will require full onsite resources for the successful tenderer/consultant including the project management team. This is to ensure the elimination of communication gaps and efficient requirement gathering.            We will require an onsite consultant to provide support during the post-implementation and go-live phases, including the hypercare transition period. However, tenderers may propose their own support structure and communication approach, provided that it delivers equal or greater added value to the project.</p>
42	<p>As stated on Page 3 of the tender document, the company must be an OPN Member. As we are a partner with Oracle directly, we would appreciate your clarification on the specific type of Oracle solution required under this tender</p>	<p>We are open to any type of Oracle solution from Tenderer's proposal.</p>
43	<p>Based on this requirement stated in the tender document, may we kindly seek clarification on the required flowchart configuration?</p>	<p>We seek further clarification on the flowchart configuration mentioned as it is unclear. Kindly elaborate on the relevant section to enable us to respond accurately.</p>
44	<p>May we kindly clarify whether MCMC is looking for a solution strictly within the Oracle ecosystem, or whether solutions outside the Oracle ecosystem are acceptable, provided they can be integrated with Oracle solutions</p>	<p>Our preference is within the Oracle ecosystem, as our current systems are mainly Oracle-based. However, we remain open to considering solutions outside the Oracle ecosystem, provided they can be integrated effectively with existing Oracle systems and fully meet the functional, technical, and security requirements outlined in the tender.</p>

**2. General**

No.	Question	Answer
1	<p>27. PERFORMANCE BOND (Page 20 of 110)            We kindly request a waiver of the performance bond requirement. The scope of work under this tender involves the provision of Software-as-a-Service (SaaS), which does not involve physical deliverables, construction works, or on-site implementation. As such, the associated delivery and performance risks are minimal.</p>	<p>No waiver is applicable for this item</p>
2	<p>31. INSURANCE (Page 22 of 110)            We respectfully request a waiver of the insurance requirement stated in the tender. As the scope of work is limited to SaaS subscription services, there are no physical assets, manpower deployment, or operational activities that would warrant coverage under conventional insurance policies</p>	<p>No waiver is applicable for this item</p>