

Questions and answers to tender no. 2026-06-01 EOI Grant management system for WWF

Question no.	RFI section / clause	Clarification question	Answers from WWF
1	A.6 – Language of RFI submissions / Documents comprising the RFI, item (d)	Where a bidder is legally exempt from statutory audit, will WWF Norway accept annual statutory accounts prepared and certified by an independent qualified Chartered Accountant, but not formally audited?	Where a supplier is legally exempt from statutory audit, WWF Norway may accept annual statutory accounts prepared and certified by an independent qualified Chartered Accountant. However, given the strategic importance and anticipated duration of this project, WWF Norway considers the supplier's financial stability and capacity to deliver throughout the contract period to be important. WWF Norway therefore reserves the right to request additional documentation or information where necessary to obtain sufficient assurance regarding a supplier's financial standing.
2	Annex 1, §2 – Background and Context / Paragraph on user numbers	Does the estimate of approximately 50 active users include external users? If not, could you estimate how many external users there would be over the five-year period please? Thank you	50 internal staff. Up to 60 external users.
3	Annex 1, §2 – Background and Context / Final paragraph	Could WWF share any available high-level process inventory or workflow-mapping outputs? If not, please estimate how many workflows are likely to be included in scope and indicate their expected complexity, including the extent to which workflows vary by grant type, donor, project or partner.	For the initial implementation, WWF Norway intends to focus on Norad-funded grants and the main phases of the grant management lifecycle: application, implementation and monitoring, reporting, evaluation, and closure. WWF would like to create two or three other grant types with their own workflows, but at a later time. The Norad workflows are currently being reviewed and streamlined and cannot be shared at this stage, however, WWF will try to include them in the RFP documents. The workflows are relatively detailed and include, among other elements, approval cycles and decision points. We are also open to adapting and standardising our workflows where appropriate to make effective use of standard system functionality and minimise unnecessary customisation.
4	Annex 1, §3 – Existing systems and tools / Annex 1, §6 – Non-functional requirements	Which integrations should suppliers include by go-live, and which may be treated as optional or later within the five-year period? Should suppliers assume integration with WWF's future financial system (please indicate its name if already selected), or will integration with Visma Global and One Stop Reporting be required at go-live? For each of the systems mentioned in the RFI that is expected to integrate with the Digital Grant Management System, please indicate: • the approximate number and types of data entities that will need to be exchanged; and • whether the information flow should be one-way (and, if so, in which direction) or two-way.	WWF Norway does not currently envisage direct integration between the GMS and the finance system, either at go-live or as a defined requirement within the five-year period. Integration with Visma Global and One Stop Reporting is therefore not required at go-live. WWF Norway welcomes suppliers' recommendations regarding integrations that they consider relevant and beneficial. The system must however allow for saving of final versions of key documents, and enable approvals and signatures in the system. The procurement of a new cloud-based finance system has been delayed. However, as direct integration with the finance system is not currently envisaged, suppliers should not assume integration with a future financial system. The GMS must nevertheless allow for the exchange of relevant financial data through controlled exports and imports. At this stage, it is too early to specify the detailed data entities, volumes and direction of information flows. These requirements will be further defined during the RFP and implementation phases.
5	Annex 1, §5 – High-level functional needs / Workflow and process management, bullets 3–4	Does WWF require legally binding electronic signatures, or are recorded system approvals with appropriate permissions, reviewer confirmation and an audit trail sufficient? If legally binding e-signatures are required, does WWF currently use or prefer a particular e-signature service?	WWF Norway requires the system to support both system-based approvals and legally binding electronic signatures. Sometimes the latter is required. WWF Norway does not currently have a preferred e-signature service and welcomes suppliers' recommendations on how best to provide this functionality.
6	Annex 2, §4 – Implementation and Support Approach / A.7 – Financial proposal – Indicative Cost Information	For the indicative implementation cost, it would be helpful to know the number of source repositories, approximate numbers of projects, grants, partner and other core records, approximate volumes of financial/results information, and an estimated number of the existing documents which should be migrated to the GMS from their current repositories (if any).	WWF Norway is not replacing an existing GMS. Current grant and project information is primarily stored across Teams and SharePoint, with structured information also maintained in spreadsheets. The exact number of repositories and spreadsheets has not yet been established. For indicative costing purposes, suppliers may assume: - approximately five active Norad grants; - approximately 50–60 projects, some of which form part of larger programmes; and - approximately 30 partner organisations. WWF Norway may introduce two or three additional grant types at a later stage, including grants funded by private donors, WWF consortium arrangements and WWF Norway's own funds.
7		For the listed systems (Visma Global, One Stop Reporting, Dynamics 365, Power BI, SharePoint/Teams), are any integrations considered "must-have" at launch, or "nice-to-have" for a later phase?	Power BI or similar method for creating dashboards/visual presentations of data. Documents must be saved automatically for audit trail. We do not wish to integrate with the finance system. One stop reporting could be used to extract data from the finance system for import into a GMS. The system must enable approvals and signatures. We look forward to hearing the suggestions of suppliers.

8		Are you open to a phased rollout (e.g., internal workflows first, partner-facing features later), or is full scope expected at go-live?	Yes, WWF Norway is open to a phased roll-out.
9		How many grant applications from partners do you process per year?	We do not receive grant applications but work with partners to submit grant applications to donors.
10		What annual disbursement volume, across all funding sources, should the system be sized for going forward?	NOK 100 mill. + annually in total. Annually, WWF disburses twice per agreement to each of its partners (in total 30-40 disbursements).
11		Should the future system also manage incoming funds (e.g., donor/funder relationships), or is scope limited to outgoing grant management?	Both.
12	Scope of grant and project management	Could you clarify whether the intended scope includes both: a) the management of incoming funding agreements from Norad and other donors; and b) the projects, partner agreements or sub-grants through which WWF Norway delivers that funding? Where both are in scope, would WWF Norway welcome suppliers recommending a phased implementation approach?	Both. We are open to a phased approach and welcome suggestions.
13	Workflow-mapping outputs	WWF Norway commissioned a detailed grant-management workflow-mapping exercise in 2025. Will relevant outputs from that exercise - such as current or target process maps, identified pain points, data requirements or recommendations - be made available during the RFP stage or to suppliers selected for presentations?	We are hopeful that these workflow maps will be finalised in time to be included in the RFP.
14	Current and future-state processes	Did the workflow-mapping exercise primarily document WWF Norway's current processes, or were future-state processes and workflows also agreed? Where target processes remain under development, should suppliers assume that process review and design support may form part of the implementation?	The workflow-mapping exercise documented existing processes and provided a basis for further development of the future-state workflows. The target workflows are currently being reviewed, streamlined and further developed in preparation for the GMS implementation. Suppliers should therefore assume that some process review and design support may form part of the implementation. WWF Norway is open to adapting and standardising workflows where appropriate to make effective use of the selected system's standard functionality and minimise unnecessary customisation. Updated workflow diagrams will hopefully be shared during the RFP phase.
15	Initial implementation priorities	The 2025 workflow-mapping exercise considered the full lifecycle from pre-award through implementation and close-out. Does WWF Norway currently expect all lifecycle stages to form part of the initial implementation, or would suppliers be encouraged to recommend an appropriate sequencing or phased approach?	Ideally all, but WWF is open to suggestions.
16	Internal and external users	Does the estimate of approximately 50 active users refer only to WWF Norway staff, or does it also include users from partner organisations? For indicative solution design and licensing purposes, could WWF Norway provide an approximate number of external partner organisations and users that may require system access, together with the main activities they would be expected to undertake?	50 internal staff. Up to max 60 external users. External users are expected to submit narrative, results and financial information, upload supporting documents, respond to feedback and, where appropriate, view the status of their submissions.
17	Existing WWF Network systems	Could WWF Norway clarify whether the future solution will need to align or exchange information with systems used by WWF International or other WWF offices? Where relevant, will information about common WWF processes, data standards or integration requirements be provided during the RFP stage?	No specific integration or information-exchange requirement with systems used by WWF International or other WWF offices has been defined for the immediate scope. Broader WWF Network participation may be considered as an optional future capability, as described in question 18. Any relevant common processes or data requirements identified later may be provided during the RFP or implementation phase.

18	Potential future WWF Network use	The 2025 workflow-mapping exercise referred to WWF Network and partnership considerations. Would WWF Norway welcome suppliers outlining how the proposed solution could, as an optional future capability, support: • participation by other WWF offices in shared projects; • onboarding of additional WWF National Organisations or programmes; • reusable workflows and data structures; or • consolidated reporting across participating organisations? Any such capability would be presented separately from the immediate WWF Norway scope and indicative cost.	This is of interest to WWF Norway as a potential future capability, although it is not part of the immediate scope of this procurement. Suppliers are welcome to briefly outline relevant capabilities in this area. Suppliers selected for presentations may also be given additional time to present ideas and possibilities for how their solution could support broader WWF Network use in the future. Any such capabilities should be clearly distinguished from the immediate WWF Norway scope and indicative cost.
19	Financial system integration	WWF Norway currently uses Visma Global and is in the process of moving to a cloud-based accounting system. Could you provide an indication of the expected timetable for that transition? Would WWF Norway welcome a phased integration approach - for example, using controlled imports and exports initially, followed by API-based integration with the future financial system? Could you also indicate which financial information is expected to be exchanged, such as approved budgets, actual expenditure, commitments, payments and forecasts?	The procurement of a new cloud-based finance system has been delayed. However, as WWF Norway does not currently envisage direct integration between the GMS and the finance system, the timing of this transition is less relevant for the GMS implementation. WWF Norway does, however, need to be able to exchange relevant financial data between systems, for example through controlled data exports and imports. We welcome suppliers' recommendations on how this can be handled efficiently and reliably without direct system integration. Relevant financial information is expected to include, at a minimum, budget and actual expenditure data linked to grants and projects. More detailed requirements regarding the data to be exchanged will be further defined during the RFP and implementation phases.
20	Reporting architecture	Could you clarify the intended roles of the future GMS, One Stop Reporting and Power BI? For example, is the GMS expected to provide the primary operational dashboards and reporting, or to act as the authoritative source of grant and project data for WWF Norway's existing reporting tools? Will representative Norad reporting templates, results frameworks or financial-reporting requirements be provided during the RFP stage?	The future GMS is expected to become WWF Norway's primary and authoritative source of grant and project data, providing an up-to-date view of project and grant status, progress and other relevant management information, while also making this data available for use in WWF Norway's reporting and analytical tools. WWF Norway currently uses One Stop Reporting to make key information available across the organisation. The future role of One Stop Reporting cannot be determined at this stage and will depend partly on the functionality and reporting capabilities of the selected GMS. Easy access to data, and the ability to create useful dashboards and management information, is a key requirement for WWF Norway. We anticipate that Power BI may play a role in this, but we are open to suppliers recommending the most appropriate approach, including the respective roles of the GMS and existing reporting tools. Available final workflow diagrams will be shared with suppliers during the RFP phase. Representative Norad reporting templates, results frameworks and relevant reporting requirements may also be made available during the RFP phase where relevant.
21	Data and document migration	Should suppliers assume that the four current Norad agreements and their associated projects, partner arrangements and reporting information will be migrated into the future system? For indicative costing purposes, could WWF Norway provide an approximate indication of: • the number of active and historic projects or agreements; • the expected depth of historic data migration; and • the approximate volume and current location of associated documents?	WWF Norway currently has five Norad agreements and approximately 50–60 projects, some of which form part of larger programmes. WWF Norway does not currently envisage comprehensive migration of historic data. Migration is expected to focus on essential structured information and selected key documents, such as applications, budgets, agreements, results frameworks and recent reports. Current information is primarily stored in Teams, SharePoint and spreadsheets. Exact document volumes have not yet been established.
22	Implementation timetable	Is there a target date by which WWF Norway would like the initial solution to be operational, particularly in relation to the current Norad-funded portfolio? Would WWF Norway consider an initial implementation covering priority live agreements and processes, followed by subsequent phases?	WWF Norway aims to commence implementation as soon as the supplier has been selected and the contract signed, which is currently anticipated in February 2027. In this context, commencement of implementation means beginning the process of designing and configuring the system to meet WWF Norway's requirements; it does not refer to go-live (more likely fall/winter 2027). Ideally, all phases will be implemented simultaneously, however, we are open to a phased approach and keen to hear suppliers' thoughts on approaches.

23	Hosting, security and support requirements	Are there any anticipated requirements concerning: • Norwegian or EEA data residency; • information-security certifications; • accessibility standards; • support hours or support-team location; or • business continuity and disaster-recovery arrangements that suppliers should reflect in their proposed approach and indicative five-year cost?	Data residency: Preference should be given to solutions that support data residency within Norway, the EEA or other jurisdictions compliant with applicable GDPR and data protection requirements. Information security certifications: Suppliers should describe relevant security certifications and compliance frameworks applicable to the solution, such as ISO 27001, SOC 2 or equivalent standards. Accessibility: Suppliers should describe how the solution supports relevant accessibility standards and provides an inclusive user experience for both internal and external users. Support model: Suppliers should describe support availability, support locations, escalation procedures and any assumptions regarding service levels included within the proposed cost model. Business continuity and disaster recovery: Suppliers should describe backup arrangements, disaster recovery capabilities, business continuity measures, service availability commitments and any recovery objectives associated with the solution. We recommend that suppliers include any costs related to these requirements within their indicative five-year total cost of ownership and clearly identify any assumptions, limitations or optional services that may influence long-term costs.
24		Could WWF provide indicative volumes for: Active grants, annual grant applications, partner organisations, grant amendments, reporting submissions per year. In your RFI, number of users is 50, and that you work with 80 partner organisations, but your volumes and not provided.	WWF Norway currently has approximately five active Norad grants, 50–60 projects and approximately 30 partner organisations. The reference to 80 partner organisations is not an estimate of the number expected to use the GMS. WWF Norway does not receive grant applications from partners; rather, it works with partners to prepare and submit applications to donors. Donor-funded programmes and projects typically require quarterly and annual reporting, together with one updated annual workplan. Grant or agreement amendments normally occur approximately one to two times per project per year. Projects funded by WWF Norway typically require two reports per year and approximately one agreement amendment.
25	1.1 Future-state process standardisation	Could WWF share: • Which grant lifecycle stages are expected to be standardised across all programmes? • Which processes are expected to remain programme-specific? • Whether there is an intention to harmonise processes before system implementation, or use the system to drive process standardisation? This will help us to determine configuration complexity and custom development requirements and therefore be more accurate in our indicative effort estimations.	WWF Norway intends to standardise the core stages of the grant lifecycle where practical, including application development, implementation and monitoring, reporting, evaluation and closure. The Norad-funded portfolio will be the initial priority. WWF Norway may introduce two or three additional grant types at a later stage, and their workflows differ from those applicable to Norad-funded grants. The Norad target workflows are currently being reviewed and streamlined. WWF Norway expects the system to support standardisation primarily through configurable standard functionality and suppliers should assume that some process review and design support may form part of the implementation.
26	1.3 Internal vs external users	Can WWF provide anticipated numbers of: • Internal users • Partner organisation users • Approvers/reviewers • Occasional users Would external partner organisations require direct self-service access? This has licensing and architecture implications.	WWF Norway anticipates approximately 50 internal users and up to 60 external users across approximately 30 partner organisations. Approvers, reviewers and occasional users are included within these estimates, but a detailed breakdown by role has not yet been finalised. External partners are expected to have secure direct access for defined activities, such as submitting reports, financial information and supporting documents, and responding to feedback.
27	2.1 Partner portal expectations	WWF notes a desire for direct partner submission of reports and documentation. Could WWF clarify whether they envision: • A secure partner portal • Structured online forms • Document upload only • Full self-service grant management. There is a significant difference between a full Power Pages-style portal and a lighter collaboration/document submission model.	WWF Norway expects partners to have secure access for submitting reports, financial information and supporting documentation. Suppliers are welcome to recommend whether this should be provided through a dedicated partner portal or an equivalent secure solution, and the appropriate balance between structured forms, document uploads and broader self-service functionality.
28	2.2 Multi-partner grant arrangements	Do grants typically involve: • One partner per grant? • Multiple delivery partners? • Sub-granting arrangements? If yes, how should responsibility and reporting be managed? This affects the data model, permissions model, reporting hierarchy and partner collaboration design.	Multiple delivery partners per grant is common for Norad grants. For other grant types it varies. The solution should therefore support a hierarchy linking donor agreements, programmes or projects. Suppliers are welcome to recommend an appropriate structure and workflow based on best practice.

29	2.3 Partner due diligence	Does WWF expect the future solution to manage: • Partner assessments • Compliance checks • Risk ratings • Safeguarding documentation • Capacity assessments. This is a common NGO/grants requirement that is not explicitly described in the RFI.	WWF Norway is interested in functionality supporting partner assessments, compliance checks, risk ratings, safeguarding documentation and capacity assessments. Suppliers should describe the functionality available as standard or configurable, and clearly distinguish any optional functionality and associated cost. The detailed scope will be further defined during the RFP and implementation phases.
30	3.1 Financial integration scope	WWF mentions Visma Global and a potential move to a cloud finance platform. Can WWF clarify: • Which target finance platform is under consideration? • Whether finance data should be real-time or periodic synchronisation? • Whether budget management will sit in the GMS or remain in the finance system? This determines integration scope, data ownership, implementation complexity and assumptions for the indicative five-year TCO.	The procurement of a new cloud-based finance system has been delayed, and suppliers should not assume a specific target platform. Direct or real-time integration with the finance system is not currently envisaged. Relevant financial data should instead be exchanged through controlled periodic imports and exports. The finance system will remain the authoritative source for accounting transactions, while the GMS should support grant and project budgets, approved revisions and budget-versus-actual monitoring.
31	3.2 Donor reporting	Would WWF expect: • Financial reporting by donor • Multi-currency support • Budget revisions • Actuals vs budget tracking • Cost allocation across multiple grants. These are commonly critical for grant management but are not explicitly stated in the RFI.	WWF Norway expects the solution to support financial reporting by donor and grant, multi-currency information, budget revisions and actual-versus-budget monitoring. Relevant actual expenditure data is expected to be imported periodically from the finance system. Detailed requirements concerning cost allocation across multiple grants will be further defined during the RFP and implementation phases. Suppliers are welcome to recommend an appropriate approach.
32	3.3 Norad-specific requirements	Given the significance of Norad funding, are there: • Specific compliance requirements • Templates • KPIs • Approval workflows • Audit requirements that the future solution must support? Norad is stated as the main donor, so specific donor compliance and reporting needs could materially shape the solution.	The system must be configurable to support requirements arising from Norad agreements, including applications, workplans, budgets, results frameworks and indicators, reporting templates and schedules, approval workflows, amendments, audit trails, version control and retention of key documentation. Relevant workflows and representative templates will be shared during the RFP phase where available.
33	4.1 SharePoint strategy	WWF already uses Microsoft 365, Teams and SharePoint extensively. Is the preference: • SharePoint as the system of record for documents? • Documents stored within the GMS? • A hybrid approach? This is the single most important architecture question for a Microsoft-based solution.	WWF Norway has not prescribed a specific technical architecture for document storage. The GMS should become the authoritative source of grant and project information, and final versions of key documents must be stored or linked automatically with appropriate access controls, versioning and audit trails. Documents may be stored within the GMS, in SharePoint through an appropriate connection, or through a hybrid approach. Suppliers should recommend the architecture that provides the best combination of usability, security, document control and maintainability.
34	4.2 Knowledge retention	WWF identifies knowledge retention as a key challenge. Could they clarify: • Whether structured knowledge capture is required? • Whether lessons learned and project outputs should be searchable? • Whether AI-enabled search and summarisation is of interest? Clarifying this would help position Microsoft 365, SharePoint, Power Platform and possible AI-enabled discovery capabilities appropriately.	WWF Norway would like project outputs, lessons learned and other relevant knowledge to be captured in a structured and searchable way. Suppliers are welcome to suggest suitable functionality, including any relevant AI-enabled search or summarisation capabilities. Any AI-enabled functionality should be clearly identified, together with associated costs and data-protection or security considerations.
35	5.1 Existing Power BI investment	WWF already uses Power BI. Can WWF clarify: • Whether Power BI should remain the primary reporting layer? • Whether embedded reporting is sufficient? • Whether executive dashboards are required within the GMS? This is a strong positioning opportunity for a Microsoft-centric solution and avoids duplicating reporting capability.	Executive dashboards are required within the GMS. WWF Norway has not yet determined whether Power BI should remain the primary reporting layer or whether embedded reporting would be sufficient. Suppliers are invited to recommend the most appropriate approach.

36	5.2 Outcome management	Is WWF looking to track: • Activities • Outputs • Outcomes • Impact indicators • Logframes/results frameworks And should these be linked directly to grants and donor reporting? This determines whether the solution needs to support simple operational reporting or a fuller monitoring, evaluation and learning model.	WWF Norway expects the solution to support the tracking of activities, outputs, outcomes and relevant impact indicators, including logframes and results frameworks. These should be linked to the relevant donor agreements, programmes, projects and partner agreements, and should support aggregation of results from partner and project level to programme and donor level.
37	6.1 Data residency	Can WWF confirm: • Preferred hosting location • Whether EU hosting is mandatory • NIS2 requirements • Any restrictions on non-EU processing. The RFI references data hosting but does not define specific residency or regulatory requirements.	Preference should be given to solutions supporting data residency within Norway, the EEA or another jurisdiction that complies with applicable GDPR and data-protection requirements. Hosting exclusively in Norway is not currently a mandatory requirement. No additional WWF-specific NIS2 requirement has been defined at this stage. Suppliers should describe hosting locations, subprocessors, international data transfers, security certifications and the safeguards applied to any processing outside the EEA.
38	6.2 External organisation access	Can WWF describe: • Segregation requirements between partner organisations • Requirements for guest users • Single Sign-On expectations • MFA requirements. External access design will influence identity architecture, security model, licensing and support arrangements. Can you please confirm approximate partners volumes and confirm access would be via a Portal. What input scope will partners have (i.e. Financial, Outcomes, etc)	WWF Norway anticipates approximately 30 partner organisations and up to 60 external users. Each partner organisation must be securely segregated and able to access only its own information. External access should be provided through a secure portal or equivalent partner-facing solution. MFA is expected, while the appropriate identity and sign-on model may differ between internal and external users. Partner input is expected to include narrative and results reporting, financial information, budgets or forecasts where relevant, and supporting documentation.
39	7.1 Data migration expectations	Could WWF provide: • Number of existing spreadsheets • Existing databases • SharePoint repositories • Historical records intended for migration. This will help us determine migration activities required. It would also be useful to understand if the intention is to migrate inflight\historical grants and volumes to help determine the data migration strategy.	Current information is held mainly in spreadsheets, Teams, SharePoint and associated documents, and exact volumes have not yet been established but the volume to be brought into the system is limited as the initial migration is expected to prioritise key information and documents for active agreements and projects only. WWF Norway does not currently envisage a comprehensive migration of all historical files. The detailed migration scope should be confirmed during the RFP stage.
40	7.2 Phased delivery	Would WWF consider: • Phase 1 – grant administration • Phase 2 – partner collaboration • Phase 3 – reporting and analytics • Phase 4 – advanced automation rather than a single deployment? Would WWF Norway entertain a phased approach to delivery of the project, the rationale is on occasion certain internal cohorts may not be available and organisational delivery calendar may dictate that certain actions (i.e. financial transaction processing) cannot happen at certain times of the year.	Yes. WWF Norway is open to phased delivery and welcomes suppliers' recommendations regarding the most appropriate sequencing. WWF Norway would ideally like the core grant lifecycle to be covered as early as practical, with priority given to the active Norad-funded portfolio. The phases suggested in the question may provide a useful starting point, but suppliers should recommend a sequence based on dependencies, organisational capacity, risk and the annual reporting calendar.
41	8.1 Preference for configurable solutions	Given the stated objective to minimise unnecessary customisation, is WWF actively seeking: • Commercial off-the-shelf software • Low-code platforms • Configurable CRM platforms • Specialist NGO grant systems or are all options considered equally? This clarifies how WWF may compare configurable Microsoft platform solutions against specialist grant-management products.	WWF Norway is technology-neutral and will consider specialist grant-management systems, configurable commercial solutions, low-code platforms and CRM-based solutions. Preference will be given to a cloud-based solution that meets the functional requirements through standard, configurable functionality and minimises unnecessary customisation. Solutions will be assessed based on overall fit, usability, security, implementation risk, maintainability and five-year total cost of ownership.

42	8.2 Existing Dynamics investment	WWF already operates Dynamics 365 in parts of the organisation. To what extent would reuse of existing Microsoft investments be considered beneficial within the future evaluation criteria? This will help us gauge to what degree WWF Norway feels that the reuse of Dynamics 365, Microsoft 365 and Power BI investments is of value or is there a driver to migrate components onto a entirely new environment.	Reuse of WWF Norway's existing Microsoft investments may be beneficial where it provides demonstrable advantages in usability, information management, administration or total cost of ownership. However, the use of Dynamics 365 or other Microsoft components will not in itself be given preference over a specialist solution.
43		Are there any fixed dates, deadlines, or business events the implementation must align to? This will help us to understand the resource needs and planning constraints including any change freeze periods.	WWF Norway aims to commence implementation as soon as the supplier has been selected and the contract signed, which is currently anticipated in February 2027. In this context, commencement of implementation means beginning the process of designing and configuring the system to meet WWF Norway's requirements; it does not refer to go-live. Suppliers should propose a realistic implementation plan and clearly identify activities requiring substantial participation from WWF Norway. The detailed schedule should take account of reporting deadlines, public holidays, and the availability of key internal staff and partners. July is the main summer holiday period in Norway, with generally reduced staff availability from mid-June to mid-August.
44		What are your expectations for project reporting, meeting cadence, and status updates? This will help us to understand the level of project management support required	WWF Norway expects suppliers to propose a proportionate project governance and reporting approach. For indicative purposes, suppliers may assume regular working-level meetings during active implementation, supported by written status reporting and periodic steering-group meetings. Status reporting should cover progress against milestones, decisions, risks, issues, dependencies, budget and required actions. Meeting frequency may increase during testing, data migration and go-live.
45		What level of post-go-live support do you expect after implementation? This will help us to understand the level of resource required to deliver this	WWF Norway expects implementation support, user and administrator training, a defined period of post-go-live hypercare and ongoing support throughout the proposed five-year period. Suppliers should describe their support hours, service levels, escalation procedures, incident management, release and upgrade arrangements, security maintenance and the support available to system administrators and users.
46		Does WWF have the internal resource in place for the project?	WWF Norway has established an internal project organisation comprising a Steering Group, Project Manager, System Administrator, Project Group, Procurement Committee and Reference Group, with representation from relevant functions and user groups. The allocation of roles and capacity during implementation is still being finalised. Suppliers should not assume unlimited or full-time availability of internal resources and should clearly specify the roles, expertise and estimated time commitment required from WWF Norway for successful implementation.
47		What is the budget for the project	A final budget envelope has not been disclosed at the RFI stage. One purpose of the RFI is to improve WWF Norway's understanding of available solutions, implementation approaches and indicative five-year total cost of ownership. Suppliers should therefore provide transparent indicative pricing, including assumptions, licensing, implementation, migration, training, support and optional functionality.
48		How many partners and solutions have been invited to respond	Six suppliers have been directly invited to respond. In addition, the RFI has been published on the websites of WWF Norway and WWF International and shared widely on LinkedIn. The process is therefore open to other interested suppliers, and the final number of respondents and proposed solutions will not be known until the submission deadline.