

	Ymateb	Response
Transition & Operational Boundaries		
Q1. The transition period runs 01/09/2026 to 23/11/2026. Is there a current incumbent supplier, and will they be contractually obligated to support knowledge transfer during transition? Can the Commissioner share the scope of services currently delivered by the incumbent and any known transition risks?	Mae cyflenwr presennol ar waith, a disgwylir iddynt gydweithio'n rhesymol yn ystod y cyfnod pontio, er nid oes gofyniad contractiol penodol yn hyn o beth. Felly, dylai cynigwyr gynllunio ar sail dull pontio rhagweithiol, yn unol ag arfer da. Ni ddarperir manylion manwl am gwmpas y cyflenwr presennol na risgiau penodol, ac felly dylai cynigwyr seilio eu cynigion ar y fanyleb, gan ganiatáu ar gyfer risgiau pontio arferol.	An incumbent supplier is in place, and they are expected to provide reasonable cooperation during the transition period, however, there is no specific contractual requirement in this regard. Therefore, bidders should plan for a proactive transition approach, in line with good practice. Detailed information on the scope of the incumbent supplier or specific risks will not be provided, so bidders should base their proposals on the specification, allowing for typical transition risks.
Q2. The IT Officer handles Level 0, 1, and "some Level 2" support. Could the Commissioner clarify the approximate volume of support tickets per month currently handled, and the typical split between Level 1, 2, and 3? This is essential for accurate pricing of Lot 1 helpdesk services.	Yn y 12 mis blaenorol mae 87 o docynnau cymorth wedi'u codi ar system y cyflenwr a 50 ar ein LOG TG mewnol. Nid yw'r rhain i gyd yn geisiadau am gymorth, gan fod y plattform hefyd yn cael ei ddefnyddio i gyfathrebu gohebiaeth arferol rhwng y ddwy ochr ar gyfer materion nad ydynt yn rhai cymorth technegol (e.e. trafodaethau prosiect, ceisiadau am wybodaeth ac ati). Nid oes data ar gael i wahaniaethu rhwng y lefelau.	In the past 12 months, 87 support tickets have been raised on the supplier's platform and 50 on our internal IT LOG. These are not all support requests, as the platform is also used to convey routine correspondence between both parties for non-technical support matters (e.g. project discussion, request for information etc). No data is available to distinguish between levels.
Q3. For on-site work at Caernarfon and Cardiff offices — what is the expected frequency of on-site visits? Is there a minimum on-site presence requirement, or is the Commissioner comfortable with a predominantly remote delivery model with on-site visits as needed?	Yn seiliedig ar y trefniadau presennol, nid oes disgwyl unrhyw amllder penodol ar gyfer ymweliadau ar y safle yn swyddfeydd Caernarfon a Chaerdydd, ac nid oes gofyniad isafswm am bresenoldeb ar y safle.	Based on the current arrangements, there is no expected set frequency for on-site visits at the Caernarfon and Cardiff offices, and there is no minimum on-site presence requirement. Our expectation is a predominantly remote delivery model, with on-site visits carried out as and when

	Ein disgwyliad yw model cyflenwi sy'n bennaf o bell, gydag ymweliadau ar y safle yn cael eu cynnal yn ôl yr angen. Fel arfer, byddai ymweliadau o'r fath yn digwydd mewn perthynas â gweithgareddau neu brosiectau penodol (e.e. gwaith gweithredu), a chaiff y rhain eu trefnu a'u prasio ar wahân fel rhan o'r gwaith hwnnw.	required. Typically, such visits would relate to specific activities or projects (e.g. implementation work), and these would be arranged and costed separately as part of that work.
Pricing Structure & Commercial Model		
Q1. The pricing table asks for "No. of Units (state the pricing units)" but doesn't prescribe whether Lot 1-line items (standard support, helpdesk, out-of-hours, emergency) should be priced per month, per annum, or for the full 3-year term. What pricing period should the total cost column reflect — annual cost, or the full initial 3-year contract term?	<p>Mae cynigwyr yn rhydd i bennu eu strwythur prasio dewisol (e.e. yn fisol, yn flynyddol, neu fel arall), ar yr amod bod:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uned y prasio wedi'i nodi'n glir yn y maes "Nifer yr Unedau", a bod ▪ Y golofn Cyfanswm y Gost yn adlewyrchu'r gost lawn dros gyfnod cyfan y contract (sef 5 mlynedd gan gynnwys estyniad posibl o 2 flynedd). <p>Mae hyn yn sicrhau hyblygrwydd o ran sut y mae cynigwyr yn cyflwyno eu prasio, er mwyn cael sail gyson ar gyfer gwerthuso ar draws pob cais.</p>	<p>Bidders are free to determine their preferred pricing structure (e.g. monthly, annual, or otherwise), provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The pricing unit is clearly stated in the "No. of Units" field, and ▪ The Total Cost column reflects the full cost over the entire contract term (being 5 years including 2 year potential extension). <p>This ensures flexibility in how bidders present their pricing, in order to have a consistent basis for evaluation across submissions.</p>
Q2. For the price evaluation formula (Lowest price / Your price × 10), will Lots 1, 2, and 3 be scored independently against the lowest price within each lot, or will a combined total price across all lots be used for bidders applying for multiple lots?	<p>Bydd pob lot yn cael ei gwerthuso'n annibynnol. Bydd y fformiwla (<i>Pris isaf / Eich pris × 10</i>) yn cael ei chymhwyso o fewn pob lot, nid ar draws ceisiadau cyfunol, ac felly ni fydd unrhyw grynhoed o brisio ar draws Lotiau 1, 2 a 3 at ddibenion sgorio.</p> <p>Felly, bydd cynigwyr sy'n gwneud cais am sawl lot yn derbyn sgoriau masnachol ar wahân ar gyfer pob lot.</p>	<p>Each lot will be evaluated independently. The formula (<i>Lowest price / Your price × 10</i>) will be applied within each lot, not across combined submissions and therefore there is no aggregation of pricing across Lots 1, 2, and 3 for scoring purposes.</p> <p>Bidders applying for multiple lots will therefore receive separate commercial scores per lot.</p>
Q3. The Lot 1 pricing table includes a line for "Request for Change (day rate)" (line 5). However, Request for Change delivery is a core Lot 3 requirement, and Lot 3 already has a "Project Consultant (day rate)" line. Could you clarify the	Bwriedir i geisiadau newid o dan Lot 1 gwmpasu newidiadau mân, risg isel ac o natur gefndirol i'r amgylchedd presennol sy'n cael ei gefnogi, sydd fel arfer yn gofyn am ymdrech gyfyngedig ac sy'n cael eu cyflwyno o fewn amserlenni byr.	Lot 1 change requests are intended to cover minor, low-risk, and discrete changes to the existing supported environment, typically requiring limited effort and delivered within short timescales.

<p>distinction — is the Lot 1 day rate intended for minor/operational changes only, with Lot 3 covering larger change requests? Is there a threshold (e.g. hours/days of effort, or financial value) that determines which lot a change request falls under?</p>	<p>Mae gwaith prosiect Lot 3 yn ymwneud â gweithgareddau mwy sylweddol, cymhleth neu drawsnewidiol, gan gynnwys gwelliannau ar raddfa fwy, newidiadau system, neu fentrau sy'n gofyn am strwythurau rheoli prosiectau, llywodraethu a chyflawni ffurfiol.</p> <p>Nid oes trothwy ariannol nac ymdrech benodol, ond dylai'r dosbarthiad ddilyn natur a graddfa'r gwaith.</p>	<p>Lot 3 project work relates to more substantial, complex, or transformational activities, including larger-scale enhancements, system changes, or initiatives that require formal project management, governance, and delivery structures.</p> <p>There is no fixed financial or effort threshold, but classification should follow the nature and scale of the work.</p>
<p>Q4. For Lot 2, several line items bundle delivery with certification costs (e.g. CE, CE Plus, IASME L2 include "whole cost of delivering the audit and accreditation, including certification"). Is it same to assume that the certification costs for the same would be borne by Welsh commissioner and we don't need to price them.</p>	<p>Na — dylai cynigwyr gynnwys costau ardystio yn eu priso lle y'u nodir. Cyfeiriwch at y tabl ym mharagraff 5.18 o'r ddogfen 'Manyleb', yn benodol eitemau xix, xxiii, a xxx.</p>	<p>No — bidders should include certification costs in their pricing where specified. Please refer to the table in paragraph 5.18 of the Specification document, specifically items xix, xxiii, and xxx.</p>
<p>Q5. Line 15 ("Any other costs not included elsewhere") — does the Commissioner expect to see transition/onboarding costs here, or should transition be absorbed into the lot pricing? Similarly, should tooling/licensing costs for monitoring, backup, vulnerability scanning platforms be itemized here or embedded in the respective lot line items?</p>	<p>Dylid ond defnyddio Llinell 15 ("Unrhyw gostau eraill") ar gyfer costau gwirioneddol arall na ellir eu dyrannu yn rhywle arall. Disgwylir i gostau pontio/ymsefydlu a chostau offer neu drwyddedu cael eu cynnwys o fewn priso'r lot perthnasol oni bai eu bod yn gwbl ar wahân ac yn sylweddol. Dylai'r priso fod yn gwbl gynhwysol, yn dryloyw ac yn gymaradwy, gyda Llinell 15 yn cael ei defnyddio fel dewis olaf yn unig.</p>	<p>Line 15 ("Any other costs") should be used only for genuinely standalone costs that cannot be allocated elsewhere. Transition/onboarding and tooling or licensing costs are expected to be included within the relevant lot pricing unless they are clearly separable and material. Pricing should be fully loaded, transparent, and comparable, with Line 15 used only as a last resort.</p>
<p>Technical Solution & Innovation</p>		
<p>Q1. The specification references a Microsoft Dynamics Case Management System that went live in May 2026, with an "interim support package" in place and "an intention to establish a support service on a longer-term basis." Is the Commissioner expecting the Lot 1 supplier to potentially absorb Dynamics CMS support responsibilities during the contract term, or will this remain with the specialist Dynamics</p>	<p>Na — nid yw cymorth ar gyfer System Rheoli Achosion Microsoft Dynamics ar hyn o bryd o fewn cwmpas Lot 1, ac nid yw'n ofynnol i gynigwyr ragdybio na phrisio ar gyfer ysgwyddo'r cyfrifoldebau hyn.</p> <p>Ar hyn o bryd, mae'r trefniadau dros dro yn parhau mewn grym, ac nid yw'r dull gweithredu ar gyfer cymorth Dynamics yn y tymor hwy (gan gynnwys a fydd yn parhau gyda darparwr arbenigol neu'n cael ei gaffael ar wahân) wedi'i</p>	<p>No — support for the Microsoft Dynamics Case Management System is not currently in scope for Lot 1, and bidders are not required to assume or price for taking on these responsibilities.</p> <p>At this stage, the interim arrangements remain in place, and any future approach to longer-term Dynamics support (including whether it is retained with a specialist provider or procured separately) has not been finalised. Bidders should therefore</p>

<p>developer? If it's in scope, should it be priced, and under which lot?</p>	<p>gadarnhau eto. Felly, dylai cynigwyr seilio eu cyflwyniadau yn unol â chwmpas diffiniedig Lot 1 yn unig.</p>	<p>base their submissions solely on the defined Lot 1 scope.</p>
<p>Q2. For the monitoring and reporting requirements under Lot 1, does the Commissioner have existing monitoring tooling in place (e.g. Azure Monitor, Defender for Business, Sentinel, third-party RMM) that the supplier is expected to continue using, or is the supplier expected to propose and deploy their own tooling suite? If the latter, are there budget or approval constraints on deploying agents on endpoints?</p>	<p>Mae'r gwasanaethau hyn yn cael eu darparu ar hyn o bryd gan y cyflenwr presennol. Nid yw'n briodol datgelu'r offer, y gwasanaethau neu'r cymwysiadau a ddefnyddir gan y cyflenwr hwnnw.</p> <p>Ni ddisgwylir i ddarpar gyflenwyr ddefnyddio'r offer y cyflenwr presennol, gallent ddarparu eu datrysiad eu hunain. Pan fo costau i ddarparu'r offer/datrysiad hwn, dylid ymgorffori'r costau hyn yn y cynnig prasio a fanylir ar y 'Tabl Prasio'.</p>	<p>There are services provided within the Commissioner and by the incumbent supplier. It is not appropriate to disclose the tools, services or applications used by that supplier.</p> <p>Potential suppliers are not expected to use the current supplier's tooling suite, and can provide their own solution. Where there are costs to providing these tools/solutions the costs should be incorporated in the pricing proposal detailed on the 'Pricing Table'.</p>
<p>Q3. For Lot 2 penetration testing, the spec references "CREST or CHECK (or UK recognized equivalent)." Does the Commissioner require the testing to be carried out by a CREST-accredited or CHECK-approved individual/company specifically, or is it sufficient that the testing methodology follows these standards? This has a significant cost implication.</p>	<p>Fel y nodwyd yn eitem xiii ym mharagraff 5.18 o'r ddogfen 'Manyleb', nid oes angen defnyddio cyflenwyr achrededig CREST neu CHECK, dim ond bod safonau cyfatebol yn cael eu dilyn.</p>	<p>As noted in item xiii of paragraph 5.18 of the 'Specification' document CREST or CHECK accredited suppliers are not required, simply that equivalent standards are followed.</p>
<p>Personnel – Skills & Experience</p>		
<p>Q1. The criterion asks for "names of key staff who will deliver the contract along with their CVs." For a managed service of this nature, is the Commissioner expecting named individuals who will be personally assigned to the account, or is it acceptable to name a team lead/account manager with CVs and describe the broader support team structure by role? This affects how we present our delivery model.</p>	<p>Byddai'n dderbyniol enwi arweinydd tîm neu reolwr cyfrif, ynghyd â'u CV perthnasol, a disgrifio strwythur y tîm cymorth ehangach yn ôl rôl.</p> <p>Mae'r Comisiynydd yn bennaf yn ceisio dealltwriaeth ar lefel uchel o bwy fydd yn gweithio gyda hwy a sut y caiff y gwasanaeth ei ddarparu, yn hytrach na bod angen enwi pob unigolyn a fydd yn cael ei neilltuo'n benodol ar hyn o bryd.</p>	<p>It would be acceptable to name a team lead or account manager, supported by relevant CVs, and to describe the broader support team structure by role.</p> <p>The Commissioner is primarily seeking an understanding at a high level of who will be working with them and how the service will be delivered, rather than requiring all individually assigned personnel to be named at this stage.</p>
<p>Q2. Given the 10,000-word limit applies to the entire bid — if bidding for all 3 lots, is the word limit 10,000 total, or 10,000 per lot? CVs alone for</p>	<p>Gan fod cynigwyr yn gallu gwneud cais am un neu ragor o Lotiau, dylid trin pob Lot fel ymateb ar wahân gyda'i derfyn geiriau ei hun. Felly, os</p>	<p>As bidders may apply for one or more Lots, each Lot should be treated as a separate response with its own word limit. Therefore, if bidding for multiple</p>

multiple personnel could consume a substantial portion of the allowance.	yw cynigwyr yn ymgeisio am sawl Lot, mae'r terfyn o 10,000 o eiriau yn berthnasol i bob cyflwyniad ar gyfer pob Lot unigol.	Lots, the 10,000-word limit applies to each individual Lot submission.
Management & Communication		
Q1. The spec says contract management meetings must occur "at least annually," but also references periodic SLA reporting. Is the Commissioner open to monthly or quarterly service review meetings as standard, or is there a preference for minimal governance overhead given the small scale?	Mae'r Comisiynydd yn agored i gyfarfodydd adolygu gwasanaeth chwarterol. Bydd yr amllder yn cael ei gytuno rhwng y Comisiynydd a'r cyflenwr, a gellir addasu'r amllder yn ystod tymor y contract, yn ddibynnol ar berfformiad y contract. Mae'r ddogfen fanyleb yn nodi'n syml bod rhaid i gyfarfod adolygu contract a gwasanaeth ffurfiol ddigwydd o leiaf bob blwyddyn.	The Commissioner is open to quarterly service review meetings. The frequency will be agreed between the Commissioner and the supplier, and the frequency may be modified during the contract term, dependent on contract performance. The specification document simply states that formal contract and service review meeting must happen at least annually.
Q2. For Lot 3 where Management & Communication is weighted at 20%, is the Commissioner looking for project management methodology specifics (e.g. PRINCE2, Agile) or is methodology-agnostic delivery acceptable provided outcomes are met? Does the Commissioner have an internal preference?	Dylai cyflenwyr nodi'r Amod Cymryd Rhan mewn perthynas â chymhwyster/achrediad Rheoli Prosiect ar gyfer Lot 3. Nid oes gan y Comisiynydd fethodoleg rheoli prosiect penodol na gorfodol. Mae dull sy'n niwtral o ran methodoleg yn dderbyniol, ar yr amod bod cynigwyr yn dangos yn glir sut y byddant yn rheoli'r ddarpariaeth, y llywodraethu, y cyfathrebu a'r canlyniadau yn effeithiol. Gall cynigwyr gyfeirio at fethodoleg sefydledig (e.e. PRINCE2, Agile) i gefnogi ac i ddangos eu dull gweithredu. Y prif ofyniad yw bod y model darparu arfaethedig yn gadarn, yn gymesur â graddfa'r gwaith, ac yn cefnogi canlyniadau llwyddiannus yn hytrach na chydymffurfio â methodoleg benodol.	Suppliers should note the Condition of Participation regarding Project Management qualification/accreditation for Lot 3. The Commissioner does not have a prescribed or mandated project management methodology. A methodology-agnostic approach is acceptable, provided that bidders clearly demonstrate how they will effectively manage delivery, governance, communication, and outcomes. Bidders may reference an established methodology (e.g. PRINCE2, Agile) to support and evidence their approach. The key requirement is that the proposed delivery model is robust, proportionate to the scale of work, and supports successful outcomes rather than adherence to a specific methodology.
Welsh Language Capability		
Q1. The criterion asks about verbal, written, and reading capability in Welsh. Is there a minimum threshold the Commissioner considers acceptable (e.g. at least one Welsh-speaking member on the account team), or will any demonstrable	Nid oes trothwy penodol, ac nid yw gallu yn y Gymraeg yn Amod Cymryd Rhan.	There is no specific threshold, and Welsh language capability is not a Condition of Participation.

<p>effort/plan to develop Welsh capability be scored? Specifically, would a commitment to recruit or train Welsh-speaking staff score above zero, or does the Commissioner expect existing capability at bid submission?</p>	<p>Dylai cynigwyr ddangos sut y byddant yn bodloni'r gofyniad; gall hyn gynnwys gallu presennol neu gynllun credadwy i'w ddatblygu.</p>	<p>Bidders should demonstrate how they will meet the requirement; this may include existing capability or a credible plan to develop it.</p>
<p>Q2. For routine operational support (e.g. helpdesk tickets, monitoring alerts), is it acceptable for day-to-day communication to be in English, with Welsh capability reserved for formal reporting, meetings, and documentation? Or is there an expectation that helpdesk interactions should be available in Welsh?</p>	<p>Nid yw gallu yn y Gymraeg yn Amod Cymryd Rhan. Dylai cynigwyr egluro'n glir pa allu maent yn meddu ar i ddarparu gwasanaethau yn y Gymraeg, a sut y caiff hyn ei gyflawni'n ymarferol ar draws y gwasanaethau. Bydd gallu yn y Gymraeg yn rhan o'r broses werthuso ac yn cael ei sgorio'n unol â'r dystiolaeth a gyflwynir.</p>	<p>Welsh language capability is not a Condition of Participation. Bidders should clearly explain what capabilities they have to deliver services in the Welsh language, and how this will be implemented in practice across the services. Capability in the Welsh language will form part of the evaluation and will be scored according to the evidence presented.</p>