MINUTES OF PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING HELD VIA CONFERENCE CALL FORMAT ON AUGUST 15, 2017
AT 16:00H KENYA TIME (GMT+3) FOR RFP REF: UNDP-2017-011 FOR DEVELOPMENT AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF AN AID INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (AIMS) FOR SOMALIA

PARTICIPANTS:

Prospective Bidders

1. Ernst & Young LLP
2. LOYS Technologies Ltd and Sonjara
3. Imperium Business Solutions Ltd
4. InfoTech Middle East FZ- LLC
5. RippleNam, Inc.
6. INB Management & IT Consulting
7. Development Gateway
8. Coherent Solutions Ltd
9. MannionDaniels
10. TechnoVista Ltd
11. Catalpa International Ltd
12. GaiaSoft International Ltd
13. Alfasoft SRL

UNDP
1. Debbie Wandera
2. Matthew Geddes

INTRODUCTION

Ms. Wandera welcomed participants to the meeting and stated the objective of the meeting was to
review the tender document and give an opportunity to prospective proposers to seek clarification on
any issues concerning the Request for Proposal (RFP) to facilitate a clearer understanding of the RFP
requirements.

OBJECTIVE OF THE RFP

Ms. Wandera explained that the purpose of the RFP was to identify a company capable of developing
and supporting the implementation of an Aid Information Management System (AIMS) for Somalia
which will be managed by the Ministry of Planning, Investment and Economic Development (MoPIED)
of the Federal Government of Somalia. She further stated that the resulting contract will be for a
period of 12 months.
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REVIEW OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL DOCUMENT

A brief presentation was made on key aspects of the tender document highlighting the importance of specific sections in the document and the need for Proposers to comply with these for their proposals to be responsive. The following is a summary of the important points highlighted during the meeting.

Section 1 Letter of Invitation
Letter from UNDP to prospective Proposers inviting them to participate in this RFP and indicates the documents contained in the RFP document.

Section 2 – Instructions to Bidders
This section is very important because it gives instructions on how Proposers should respond to the RFP, thus, Proposers need to review it thoroughly. It provides information on:

- Definition of key terms
- Contents of Bid
- Preparation of the Bid
- Submission and opening of the bids
- Evaluation of the Bid
- Award of Contract
- Datasheet which complements, supplements, or amends the provisions in the Instructions to Proposers.

Key information emphasised under this section during the meeting include:

- Mode of submission: All bids shall be submitted electronically.
- Mandatory official designated email address for submitting bids as specified in the RFP document: bids.so@undp.org; Please note that this email address is different from the below designated email addresses for requesting clarifications. Proposals sent to or copied to personal emails of UNDP staff will be disqualified.
- Designated Email address for requesting for clarifications: debbie.wandera@undp.org cc: iryna.malykh@undp.org. This contact person and address is officially designated by UNDP. If inquiries are sent to other person(s) or address(es), even if they are UNDP staff, UNDP shall have no obligation to respond nor can UNDP confirm that the query was officially received.
- Deadline for requesting clarifications: 10 working days before deadline for Bid submission.
- Deadline for Bid submission: September 12, 2017, 13:00H Kenya time (GMT+3)
- Eligibility documents required: All eligibility documents must be submitted. Articles of Association must be submitted alongside Company registration certificate. Audited Financial statements for the three years, i.e. 2014, 2015 and 2016.
- Separate emails must be used for submission of Technical and Financial Proposals.
- Technical Proposals can be submitted in as many emails as required but should be numbered accordingly, e.g. 1 of 3, 2 of 3, 3 of 3, etc., in PDF FORMAT but, each email must not exceed 5MB. The UNDP will not be responsible if attachments are in other formats that cannot be opened without additional software. No financial information whatsoever should be included in the technical proposal.
- FINANCIAL PROPOSALS MUST BE PASSWORD PROTECTED. Failure to do so will automatically disqualify the bid. The password for the financial proposals must not be sent to UNDP until officially requested by UNDP if the Proposal is deemed technically qualified. Proposers will have 48 hours to respond to the request for password from UNDP.
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Evaluation Criteria under Section 2 (Instructions to Proposers, DATA SHEET), Terms of Reference (Sections 3) and Section 6 were skipped and were later explained by Matthew Geddes.

Section 4
The Bid Submission Form is the standard template of the cover letter that should be prepared and submitted to UNDP on the Proposing Company’s official letterhead. It should not be changed except as stated because it contains important information required by UNDP. This must be stamped and signed by the Proposer’s authorised signatory.

Section 8
This section contains the contract template and UNDP General Conditions of Contract for services that will govern the Contract that will eventually be entered between UNDP and the successful Proposer.

Section 9
All Proposers (both Somali and International) are required to complete the Gender Questionnaire.

Thereafter, Ms. Wandera invited Mr. Geddes to take participants through the evaluation criteria and Sections 3, 6 and 7 of the RFP document.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Mr. Geddes gave a brief background on the history and need for a new AIMS for Somalia and explained that Somalia previously had a commercial AIMS which despite not being technically complex, failed, hence, there is need to design and implement an AIMS that meets the needs of the Country.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Evaluation will be conducted based on the combined scoring method using 70%-30% weight distribution for technical and financial proposals respectively, where the minimum passing score of technical proposals is 70%.

Preliminary Evaluation:
Proposals will first be evaluated against the grid shown in Data Sheet (DS No. 32) of the RFP document. Only proposals that satisfy the eligibility criteria specified therein will be admitted to stage 1 of technical evaluation.

Technical Evaluation:
Technical proposals will be evaluated through a two-stage process,

Stage 1: Proposals will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis as stipulated in technical evaluation form 1(a) under the section titled “evaluation criteria for assessment of technical proposals.”

Only proposals that will be found fully compliant with the evaluation criteria stipulated therein, i.e. passed all elements mentioned in the table will be admitted to the stage 2 of the technical evaluation.

Stage 2: Proposals will be evaluated based on their responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR) regarding: Expertise of the Bidder, proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan and, management structure and Key personnel which will be weighted as specified in the tables shown in technical proposal evaluation form 1(b), form 2 and form 3 under the section titled “evaluation criteria for assessment of technical proposals.” Only proposals which attain at least 70% score in the technical proposal will be considered for financial evaluation.
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Financial Evaluation
Financial proposals of Proposers who attain at least 70% at the technical evaluation stage will be admitted for financial evaluation for comparison and review. The maximum number of points will be assigned to the lowest priced proposal based on the combined scoring formula specified in the RFP document.

Award of Contract
The overall evaluation score will be based on the combined scoring method (Data Sheet [DS No. 25]). Thus, award of contract will be made to the Proposer who will achieve the highest combined score based on the formula stipulated in the RFP document.

SECTION 3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

This section outlines the context and Terms of Reference for the development and implementation of an AIMS for Somalia which include background, management, control, data input and storage, Data output, users, design site structure.

SECTION 6: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL FORM

This form provides the format of the technical bid and will be used by UNDP to evaluate the Proposers’ technical capacity to fulfill the requirements. It includes:
- Expertise of the Firm in different respects
- Methodology
- Management Structure/key personnel

SECTION 7: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL FORM

This provides the format for submission of the financial bid.

The Financial Proposal must be submitted in separate email from the Technical Proposal and should be password protected in accordance with instructions provided in the Data Sheet (DS No. 22 and 23) of the RFP document.

CLARIFICATIONS

The following queries received prior to the pre-proposal conference were clarified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query No.</th>
<th>Proposers' Queries</th>
<th>UNDPs Response to Proposers' Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would specifically want to check the status of the previous AIMS, developed and implemented by Synergy and UNDP, called DAD Somalia. I am keen to know whether it is still operational and, if not, what the reasons were behind choosing to implement a new AIMS, which the current RFP asks for.</td>
<td>Since 2015 the FGS has been collecting Aid Data using Excel sheets due to the issues noted in the 2015 study referenced in the ToR. As it was no longer in use, in 2016 UNDP discontinued the contract to host DAD Somalia and, I believe it is no longer online. As a result, Terms of Reference were developed for a new AIMS as there was a new set of requirements developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are UNDP Somalia and the government of Somalia expecting the new AIMS to be built from scratch or will they also consider customized-off-the-shelf (COTS) solutions?</td>
<td>Yes, UNDP and the Federal Government of Somalia will consider customized off-the-shelf products provided they respond to the criteria outlined in the RFP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query No.</th>
<th>Proposers’ Queries</th>
<th>UNDPs Response to Proposers’ Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In the case of a customized-off-the-shelf solution will the government of Somalia fork the code to create their own version of the AIMS separate from the core COTS tool?</td>
<td>The Government of Somalia will require a complete copy of all the code needed to run the AIMS which meets the licensing requirements set out in the RFP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We note that the choice of technical framework is weighted very heavily (100 points) compared to other requirements. Can you please explain why this requirement is so important?</td>
<td>This is based on previous experience which demonstrates that compliance with the criteria is the key for success of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The RFP mentions meeting FGS and other stakeholders in the inception phase and potentially using the Mogadishu Airport as a meeting area. Is it expected that all potential stakeholders could meet at the airport or is there a possibility during this phase that the provider must travel into Mogadishu?</td>
<td>A meeting at the airport can be organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is it expected that the AIMS be delivered in both English and Somali languages (e.g. should the interface be translated upon delivery)?</td>
<td>Yes, because there are both English speaking and Somali speaking users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are there any particular standards or benchmarks for what constitutes “extensively commented” code (1.4 Development Requirements)?</td>
<td>There is no specific standard or benchmark but the comments should be sufficient to allow another programmer who is unfamiliar with the project to read the code and understand what the different functions aim to do, and how they fit/work together. For example, each source file should have a comment indicating its purpose, input, output and any extra notes, and all functions should be commented indicating their function, the arguments they receive and what the possible values of the arguments and returns mean and are used for. Any non-standard/non-obvious arguments (or arguments that will not work), methods or values (along with all static values) should be explained. All variables defined should be commented stating their purpose e.g. 'counter for xx', all conditionals and other logical groupings should state the condition and 'sense'. Comments should use argument names and be in complete sentences (with appropriate capitalisation) but e.g. names of functions are not required where clearly visible in the code. The aim is not to duplicate the code with a that a non-programmer can follow it, but provide sufficient guide for an unfamiliar programmer to read the code, understand the purpose, and be able to contribute themselves. In addition, full instructions for deployment are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query No.</td>
<td>Proposers’ Queries</td>
<td>UNDPs Response to Proposers’ Queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>12. Submission</strong>&lt;br&gt;23.1 The Financial Proposal and the Technical Proposal Envelopes MUST BE COMPLETELY SEPARATE and each of them must be submitted sealed individually and clearly marked on the outside as either “TECHNICAL PROPOSAL” or “FINANCIAL PROPOSAL”, as appropriate. Each envelope MUST clearly indicate the name of the Proposer. The outer envelopes shall bear the address of UNDP as specified in the Data Sheet (DS no.20) and 12 shall include the Proposer’s name and address, as well as a warning that state “not to be opened before the time and date for proposal opening” as specified in the Data Sheet (DS no. 24). The Proposer shall assume the responsibility for the misplacement or premature opening of Proposals due to improper sealing and labeling by the Proposer. <strong>While in the data sheet it states as below:</strong>&lt;br&gt;22 D.23.2 Allowable Manner of Submitting Proposals&lt;br&gt;☑ Electronic submission of Bid only.</td>
<td>Please refer to Data Sheet (DS Nos. 22 and 23). DS No. 22 stipulates the only manner of submitting proposals is “ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF BID ONLY.” DS No. 23 further stipulates the mandatory official designated email address is <a href="mailto:bids.so@undp.org">bids.so@undp.org</a>. Therefore, the only permissible manner of submission of bids is Electronic submission. <strong>IMPORTANT NOTE TO PROPOSERS FROM UNDP:</strong>&lt;br&gt;The UNDP has noted inaccurate numbering of clauses in pages 7 to 17 of section 2: “Instructions to Proposers” in the previously advertised tender document. This inaccurate numbering of clauses from Clause (PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS) to Clause F (AWARD OF CONTRACT) in the above said pages of the previously advertised tender document is now corrected in the document now posted on the UNGM and UNDP websites titled “Correction of inaccurate numbering of clauses starting from Clause C. (Preparation of Proposals) to Clause F (Award of Contract) in pages 7 to 17 in Section 2 of the previously advertised tender document.” This document replaces pages 7 to 17 in the previously advertised tender document with clauses now numbered C.12 to F.39 instead of C.1 to F.28. All other details in the previously advertised tender document remain unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>3.2 Hosting:</strong> No details available regarding the existing AIMS servers/technology. Please specify?</td>
<td>There is no current AIMS. The MoPIED IT unit (the likely hosting unit) currently operates several Microsoft servers and externally hosted websites. Further information should be obtained from the initial scoping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>3.3 Deployment:</strong> All Configuration Management, Repository management, Build environments, Automated deployments are part of scope? Please confirm.</td>
<td>Yes, the bidder will be responsible for setting up and managing all aspects of the development and deployment within the requirements outlined in the ToR e.g. use of a public Github repository, deployment possible using tools without paid licences etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>2.6.4 Deployment:</strong> A single download to cover all necessary components (server, app, etc.) to deploy the AIMS? Does this mean will it be available on some repository page to setup the complete environment as a downloadable package?</td>
<td>Yes, we anticipate the components necessary to setup the environment and deploy the AIMS will be available for download from a public repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>2.6.4 Deployment:</strong> Any Preference of Client for Deployment Methodology i.e. Cloud based or Centralized etc.</td>
<td>The AIMS should be designed to be suitable for a variety of deployment methodologies, with the FGS able to select the most appropriate for implementation at the present time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query No.</td>
<td>Proposers' Queries</td>
<td>UNDPs Response to Proposers’ Queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5: Business Analyst and Scrum Master Resources will be there who will participate in Sprints from FGS side.</td>
<td>This should be discussed with the FGS at the appropriate time. It is likely to include representatives across the FGS the data entry users. There will be some support for them to contribute from a Somali consultant employed by UNDP who helped with the specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6 Security: Does HTTPS support is mandatory requirement? Does FGS infrastructure supports desired environment?</td>
<td>No requirement is mandatory but all are scored. One of the initial tasks will be to scope out the current and potential FGS infrastructure for hosting the AIMS, they may host it on their own hardware in Mogadishu, or somewhere else, or on shared hardware.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15        | Section 3 TOR, Sub Section 1.7 Page 39  
- Please specify the warranty and post-warranty period?  
- We also have an understanding that the proactive support mentioned in the post development/launch process (TOR sub section 1.7) is a part of solution and should not be considered as warranty. Kindly confirm? |  
- Post implementation warranty period of six months is required.  
- Correct. |
| 16        | Page 37, Development Requirements:  
In this section, it is stated that lead developer will be responsible for supplying their own staging, testing, build servers and similar during the development process. While this section also states that AIMS code will be managed on a public Github repository.  
Do we need to propose the infrastructure with the solution? Should it be priced separately in the financial proposal? Please confirm. | No, the proposer should not include costs for the final hosting infrastructure. The requirements for the final hosting infrastructure required will be defined during the implementation process to fit the ultimate solution for the software, as without the details of the software solution, it is not really possible to define the hardware requirements. As soon as this is defined a dedicated procurement action will be implemented to ensure availability of the infrastructure. |
| 17        | We have an understanding that UNDP shall be responsible to arrange all the training facilities i.e. training venue, equipment’s etc. Please confirm? | UNDP has no responsibility to organise training facilities etc. However, it is assumed the training facilities will be available at the Ministry premises |
| 18        | Page 86, Section 9: Gender Questionnaire:  
We have an understanding that this questionnaire needs to be filled by Somali vendors only and it is not for the International vendors? Please confirm our understanding. | The form should be completed by all Proposers, both Somali and International. |
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The following questions were asked during the pre-proposal conference and were clarified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query No.</th>
<th>Proposers' Queries</th>
<th>UNDPs Response to Proposers' Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Is it mandatory to engage a Somali based company?</td>
<td>All bids must include some Somali speaking developers in some development capacity. This means that for a Proposer not based in Somalia, it is mandatory to engage a Somali based partner with Somali based developers which shall be evidenced by way of an MoU Agreement which must be submitted together with the Proposal. The RFP contains an Annex which lists a selection of Somali IT firms which may be of assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We are partnering with a US based company. Which should be the bidding company?</td>
<td>This is up to the proposer to decide, as long as full compliance with the RFP requirements is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Will Minutes of the conference be circulated to Proposers?</td>
<td>Yes, minutes of the pre-proposal conference will be circulated directly to proposers who participated in the conference and all those who have expressed interest in participating in the RFP. The minutes will also be posted on the UNDP Procurement Notices and UNGM Websites. Proposers are also advised to frequently check the following websites for any addenda/clarifications that may be posted. <a href="http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=39750">http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=39750</a> or <a href="http://www.ungm.org/Public/Notice/60182">http://www.ungm.org/Public/Notice/60182</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4         | What is the anticipated start date of the contract? What is the expected duration of the contract? | - It is envisioned that it will take a maximum of 120 days to finalise the procurement process.  
- The contract term will be for a period of 12 months.                                                                                                                                 |
| 5         | Will support of the system be required after the 12-month contract period? | This is yet to be decided upon.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

CONCLUSION.

There being no other issues, the meeting adjourned at 16H35 Kenya time (GMT+3).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION TO THE MINUTES

Section 5 - Documents establishing the eligibility and qualifications of the Proposer

This form and supporting documents enable UNDP to ascertain that the Proposer meets the qualifications set out by UNDP for participation this this bid, hence, must be completed and all relevant supporting documents attached to qualify for technical evaluation. Proposers must satisfy the preliminary evaluation eligibility criteria set forth in DS 32 (p23) of the RFP document to qualify for technical evaluation.
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The following query was received soon after the conference and is clarified as follows; -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query No.</th>
<th>Proposers' Queries</th>
<th>UNDPs Response to Proposers' Queries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Has a maximum budget been specified for this work?</td>
<td>UNDP cannot disclose the allocated budget. Proposers are advised to conduct research and submit proposals that meet the Terms of Reference within market prices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE:
PARTICIPATION IN THE PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE IS NOT A MANDATORY REQUIREMENT FOR THIS RFP, THEREFORE, PROSPECTIVE PROPOSERS WHO DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE ARE PERMITTED TO SUBMIT THEIR PROPOSALS.