

The world of ecommerce has evolved significantly. Traditional monolithic platforms are giving way to modular, agile solutions like composable commerce architectures powered by MACH (Microservices, API-first, Cloud-native, Headless) principles. For enterprises looking to undertake a composable commerce implementation, creating a robust Request for Proposal (RFP) is a critical step in selecting the right partner and ensuring a smooth delivery journey.

Having led multiple commerce rebuilds and witnessed firsthand the common pitfalls, I always emphasize clear ownership definitions, rigorous integration governance, and a detailed post-launch operating model in any RFP documentation. In this blog post, we'll explore what exactly you should include when drafting your RFP, weaving in practical insights and showcasing how companies like **Netguru**, **Valtech**, and **DEPT** approach these complex projects.



Why Composable Commerce Requires a Different RFP Approach

Composable commerce enables businesses to piece together best-of-breed services rather than relying on a single vendor. This flexibility introduces complexity in integration, delivery ownership, and maintenance, areas where ambiguity can lead to costly delays or technical debt. The MACH architecture and headless commerce frameworks offer remarkable agility but demand precision in scoping and partner evaluation.

Without a rigorous RFP, you risk:

- Misaligned expectations about who delivers and owns what
- Integration gaps that appear post-launch
- Insufficient post-launch support plans
- Choosing partners who lack deep expertise in MACH and composable commerce

Key Elements to Include in Your Composable Commerce RFP

1. Ownership Definition

Clearly defining delivery ownership is non-negotiable. Who owns each component of the stack? Who coordinates integration testing? Who manages feature rollouts? An RFP must request detailed ownership maps for every

service (CMS, PIM, checkout, search, etc.), all the way through the deployment pipeline and post-launch operations.

For example, **Netguru** excels in driving clear ownership commitments by providing comprehensive responsibility matrices as part of their proposals. They don't just say "we'll deliver" — they <https://dailymerald.com/179498/promotedposts/best-composable-commerce-implementation-partners-2026-reviews-rankings/> specify which teams own APIs, integration points, and operational tasks.

RFP inclusion tip: Ask for a RACI chart (Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, Informed) covering all major deliverables and integrations.

2. Integration Scope and Governance

Composable architectures thrive or fail based on integration rigor. The RFP should demand:

- A detailed integration scope that specifies technical touchpoints
- Proposed API specifications or preferred API standards aligned with MACH
- Integration testing ownership and strategy, including automated testing coverage
- Change management processes for integration components post-launch

Valtech

Insist on integration governance in the RFP. Avoid vague claims of "accelerators" or "plug-and-play connectors" without detailed documentation. Ask potential vendors to provide evidence or case studies showcasing their integration execution at scale.

3. Post-Launch Operating Model and Support

Too many teams swoop in for the initial build and vanish after launch, leaving the client scrambling to fix issues without clear support or ownership — a major frustration I have experienced over a decade in ecommerce delivery.

Your RFP must set explicit expectations for:

- Cohesive support models covering incident management, SLA definitions, and continuous improvement
- Clear operational handover plans including knowledge transfer and runbooks
- Post-launch monitoring and optimization support aligned with business KPIs

DEPT



Pro tip: Demand references and concrete SLAs in your RFP to evaluate partner responsiveness post-launch.

Evidence-Based Partner Evaluation: Beyond Buzzwords

Many vendors tout “platform agnostic” or “accelerators” without providing substantive proof of expertise or past complex MACH implementations. The RFP should require:

1. Detailed case studies with clear scope, timelines, and outcomes—no hand-wavy success stories
2. Examples of managing full delivery lifecycles, not just implementation but also integration and support
3. References from mid-market and enterprise clients who have undergone composable commerce transformations
4. Clarity on what “headless commerce” means in their architecture and delivery methodology

NetguruValtech, and **DEPT** all consistently submit evidence-backed proposals with granular details rather than generic marketing collateral. That’s why I recommend insisting on hard evidence as a gating criterion.

Sample Table: RFP Checklist for Composable Commerce Implementation

Category	Requirement	Evaluation Criteria	Example from Leading Vendors	Ownership	Definition	RACI matrix
			detailing who owns APIs, integrations, testing, deployment	Completeness	clarity, team experience	Netguru
			provides detailed ownership maps aligned with MACH principles	Integration	Scope & Governance	Specification of
			all integration points, API standards, testing approach	Technical depth	automation strategy, escalation procedures	
			Valtech submits modular governance plans with quality gates	Post-Launch	Support	SLAs, support models,
			handover plans, monitoring approach	Responsiveness	documented continuous improvement processes	DEPT
			embeds optimization services in contract and detailed SLAs	Evidence-Based	Validation	Detailed case studies, client
			references, completed MACH projects	Relevance	project scale, demonstrated outcomes	All above vendors provide
			customer references and transparent metrics			

Bonus Advice: Always Ask “Who Owns Integration Testing?”

This is my personal quirk but a very telling question. Many RFP responses gloss over integration testing — a top source of post-launch incidents. By explicitly requiring vendors to define integration testing ownership, scope, tooling, and schedule, you expose who truly understands MACH delivery realities versus those offering shallow or theoretical approaches.

If a vendor cannot provide a clear, detailed integration testing plan, treat it as a red flag.

Conclusion

Composing and issuing an RFP for your composable commerce implementation is an opportunity to set the foundation for success. Define:

- **Ownership definition** to prevent finger-pointing
- **Integration scope and governance** to safeguard against system fragility
- **Post-launch support** to avoid abandonment after go-live
- **Evidence-based partner evaluation** to separate true expertise from marketing hype

Working with trusted agencies like **Netguru**, **Valtech**, and **DEPT** often means getting disciplined, transparent proposals that emphasize these points rather than vague claims of “accelerators” or “platform agnostic” buzzwords.

In your journey toward a composable MACH-powered, headless commerce solution, a comprehensive, detailed RFP is your best defense against common post-launch failure modes and operational chaos. Ask the right questions, request transparent proof, and ensure your teams know their roles and responsibilities upfront.