Additional Clarifications

RFP NCE 006 2022 – RFP for the establishment oof an LTA to provide digital product design, testing and developing services to meet the needs of the UNDP Nature, Climate and Energy portfolio

No	Question	Response
13	In case of a Joint Venture application, do both companies have to fill in Form B: Bidder Information Form? Because I see, that in the required attached documents there are the Company Profile, Business Registry, and Tax Registration documents, and I would like to know if only the main company has to send it in or the partner company too?	In case of a Joint Venture (JV), bidder's shall incorporate one Form B for each party to the association / Join Venture. This will enable the evaluation team to assess the adherence to the eligibility criteria stated in Section 4 of the RFP. Bidders are further to complete / document in Form D the necessary information that will enable the evaluation team to assess the adherence to the minimum qualification requirements indicated under Section 4 in the RFP, and which, as stated in some instances, apply to all entities / parties to the JV. Bidder's may choose to submit one or several Form Ds, provided the information submitted is complete and in line with the requirements stated in the RFP.
14	Regarding the Power of Attorney documentation, is there a required format or can we use any format?	There is no required format requested for the Power of Attorney documentation.
15	[General – Form B – Bidder Information / Form D: Qualification Form] The bidder is made of different firms that are members allowing to be industry leader – locally, nationally and globally. For this LTA we would suggest contracting the bidder entity to be Deloitte Consulting GmbH. However, this entity will be also sourcing teams globally for each call off based on the technical and regional requirements. Are we right in concluding that we do not require to list the full number of Deloitte global entities due to yet unclear specific requirement of call offs? Instead it will be one Qualification Form representing the global firm filled out from Germany? There will be no further sub-contractors outside of the bidder organization.	In such a case, we would expect one Qualification form, representing the Global firm, as the legal entity submitting the proposal and incorporating all necessary information / documentation to enable the evaluation team to assess adherence to the eligibility and minimum qualification requirements stated in the RFP.

16	[General – Evaluation Criteria] The technical evaluation criteria (2.1. to 2.8.) mentioned in Section 4. do not match the evaluation criteria (2.1. to 2.8) mentioned in Section 6: Returnable Bidding Forms / Checklist - Form E: Format of Technical Proposal - Section 2: Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation plan. Based on which criteria will UNDP evaluate the proposed methodology, approach and implementation plan?	The applicable evaluation criteria is the one outlined in the Evaluation Table included in Section 4 in the RFP. The points mentioned in Section 6, Form E are to be understood as guidance provided to bidders on specific aspects to be highlighted in their respective technical proposals and in line with the applicable evaluation criteria and sub criteria indicated in the referred Evaluation Table.
17	[General – Statement of Satisfactory Performance] All our projects are completed with satisfactory performance, therefore, we do not collect such specific statement from our client. Providing them dated two months or later, before the deadline for submission of bids in response to this RFP is therefore not possible. We can however provide the direct contact details for reference and usually encourage to reach out to the client directly. Would this be viable?	UNDP's preference is for the bidder to provide the corresponding client statements confirming satisfactory completion of earlier relevant activities / projects, as required. Bidders can request their respective clients to issue the corresponding statements as part of the documentation preparation package for their respective proposals. Please note that the direct contact details are already requested as part of the information that bidders need to submit under the table included in Section titled "Previous Relevant Experience" under Form D in the RFP.
18	[Case 1] [Technical] Should modifications to the questions, a summary dashboard for different user and various access rights be available? Or should the product focus on the delivery of the core capability of collecting data only?	The product should include the back-end capabilities that allow UNDP CO and Governments to have access to and use the collected data for further programmatic activities, this includes but is not limited to a dashboard to visualize the data and different levels of access to the data. Capabilities to support the intake questions modification and online updates are not the priority of this product version.
19	We are unsure if we need to create a) one technical proposal (with Form A and E) with three distinct sections for the three case scenarios OR b) prepare three separate technical proposals (that includes 3 forms A and E)?	As stated under BDS Section Nr 24, "bidders are required to submit technical and financial proposals in response to each of the Scenarios described in pages 33-35 of this RFP. Bidders shall, therefore, include 3 technical proposals as part of their submission in response to the RFP". One set of Forms A through D can be submitted, as these correspond to general / non-case scenario related information / documentation.

20	In case we have to prepare three separate technical proposals, the Form E, "SECTION 1: Bidder's qualification, capacity and expertise", needs to be completed only once while the remaining sections sections (2 and 3) need to be repeated separately for the three scenarios. How are the bidders expected to share the Section 1 for all scenarios?	As Indicated under Section 4, Evaluation Criteria, Technical Evaluation Criteria, page 28, "Since the Bidder's qualification, capacity and experience (Section 1 in table above) are NOT evaluated on a case scenario basis, there is no need for bidders to submit three responses incorporating narrative related to Section 1 in the table above. As indicated in Form E, one will suffice".
21	In Form D, section on "Previous Relevant Experience", it asks for "Please provide additional documentation to evidence fulfilment of the minimum qualification criteria stated in Section 4 in the RFP (in the form of copies of earlier contracts, client confirmation of satisfactory / timely delivery of relevant contracts awarded in the past, etc." We wanted to check if it is mandatory to share the complete document of bidder's earlier contracts OR just specific pages that reflect the objectives of the assignment and signatures. This question is mainly asked to preserve the confidentiality of our clients/partners information.	It is not necessary to share the complete documentation. Bidders need to share the documentation that will enable the evaluation team to assess the adherence / fulfilment of the minimum qualification criteria indicated in Section 4 in the RFP (including among others, earlier relevant experience, number of contracts of similar value, nature and complexity implemented over the last 3 years, at least one earlier contract awarded of U\$ 50,000 or more, etc.).
22	Related to the above, the supportive documents such as the contracts, do they have to be shared as an Annexure in the relevant Forms i.e Form D OR or uploaded separately in the e-bidding platform	Bidders are requested to complete the details of information solicited in the tables included in Form D and shall upload the corresponding supporting documentation, including statements of satisfactory performance, evidence of fulfilment of minimum qualification criteria stated in Section 4 in the RFP, etc. as attachments uploaded to their corresponding proposal submissions.
23	In the "Minimum Eligibility and Qualification Criteria> Previous Relevant Experience" it asks for Statement of Satisfactory Performance from 3 relevant Clients. and refers to "Plus, clients' contact details (name, telephone number, email) who may be contacted for further information on those contracts in table format and client statement of satisfactory completion requested under Form B." We wanted to confirm if there is template in the way this criteria has it be documented.	Bidders are asked to provide both the Statement of Satisfactory Performance from 3 relevant Clients, as well as the corresponding Client's contact details that will enable the RFP evaluation team to contact the referees if necessary. Please note that the reference to Form B, under the cited entry in the RFP, should read Form D instead.

24	We request an extension of 3 weeks for submitting our response for the RFP. Kindly confirm whether it is possible	Bidders are required to take note of Amendment Nr 2 to the RFP, through which the deadline for submission of proposals in response to the RFP has been extended until Thursday 10 th November 2022, 10.00 AM New-York Time, and as reflected in the UNDP E-tendering system.
25	The LTAs will be established for an initial period of 2 years with possibility for extension of 1+1 additional years subject to suppliers' performance review	At the time of negotiation of the possible extension, beyond the initial two years LTA duration, there will be a possibility to revise the maximum applicable financial rates, if there are sufficient justified market circumstances that merit such revision.
	Can the bidder revise the financial rates after the initial period of 2 years? Or will the same rate be continued during the extension as well? Please confirm	
26	Payment to the awarded vendor will be processed upon completion of the assignment We request that the payment be made either on Time and Material based or on Deliverable based? Currently its upon the completion of the assignment.	The corresponding payment milestones will be agreed for each specific assignment / contract routed through the resulting Long-Term Agreement. Typically, each assignment will include a set of deliverables that the awarded LTA holder will be asked to produce, and the disbursement of payments can be linked to the satisfactory production of the required deliverables.
27	Organization is compliant with ISO 14001 or ISO 14064 or equivalent; Please confirm if ISO 9001:2015 and ISO 27001:2013 would be considered for full marks allocated to this criteria?	ISO 14001 and ISO 14064 Certifications take into account diverse aspect related to the adoption of sustainable business practices, mainly in regard to environmental matters and their management. ISO 9001 specifies requirements for a quality management and information security management systems.
		Bidders are required to ignore the statement "mandatory weight" included under Sub-criteria 1.5, Section 1, Bidder's Qualification, capacity and experience, as the cited commitments, standards, certifications, etc. do not constitute minimum qualification requirements but instead, applicable scorable criteria.

28	Language Qualifications: Can you please clarify what this is?	This refers to any language capabilities that the proposed pool of resources may incorporate, in addition to the minimum requirements. Given the wide geographical base of UNDPs work, such expertise/knowledge, will be positively considered for evaluation purposes, as indicated in the Technical Evaluation Criteria under Section 4 in the RFP.
29	It is expected that the volume/budget for the services required under each specific project/request will vary from 20,000 USD/service to 200,000 USD/service approximately. Does this cost include Travel and other expenses? Or would they be reimbursed on actuals?	This estimate factors only staff/personnel/expert time expected to be devoted to the provision of the services required under each specific project/request. As indicated in the RFP, it is expected that, in principle, the service provision to meet the services required under each specific project / request will be home / HQ base, mainly.
30	Once the LTA is established, call-offs will be issued throughout the LTA life span on a need basis. Will the bidder have the option of not responding to the subsequent call-offs which would be issued by UNDP?	The objective of establishing the LTA is for UNDP to preferably channel the corresponding upcoming requirements, corresponding to related set of ToRs, through the resulting LTA. It is therefore expected that, in principle, the awarded LTA holder shall be able to entertain the corresponding requests through the LTA.
31	The awarded contractor is expected to support the full cycle of digital product design and testing including needs assessment, feature list development and prioritization, and development and user testing of mockups, prototypes, and MVPs. Can you please define what MVP would consist of ? for all 3 case scenarios. It would help if a specific defination of the MVP is provided for each of the case scenarios. This would help in arriving at the estimates for this engagement	MVP development is only part of the case scenarios 2 and 3. MVP is defined as a version of the product which allows to collect the maximum amount of learning about the users with least effort. Definition of the concrete scope of each MVP is a part of the services offered by contractors and should be a part of the proposed approach.

32	It should be noted that the number of person-days, indicated for each Case Scenario is indicative only and serves to provide a reference on the level of detail and scope of work expected	The actual duration for delivery of each of the case scenarios should be defined by the contractor using the person-days indicated for each case scenario is an indication of expected level for effort and detail.
	We would request UNDP to clarify the below points:	The actual duration for each delivery estimated by the contractor should be used as a base for Financial proposal.
	1. What is the actual duration for delivery of each of the Case Scenarios?	
	2. Is the bidder expected to use the person-days mentioned against each of the case scenarios, for arriving at the Financial Proposal and estimates?	
33	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform;	Correct, any related hardware costs should not be included in the bidders Financial Proposal.
	Please confirm if the bidder can make cost free assumptions that UNDP can purchase Drones/CCTVs and other IoT devices on their own.	
34	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Correct. The Country Office has a stable access to internet and multiple mobile devices.
	Please confirm if the UNDP Country Office of Ecuador has access to Web applications and Mobile devices with internet.	
35	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Please assume that the solution is built from scratch, all data available to Ecuador CO is paper based or in unusable state.
	Please let us know if any digital data is currently available with UNDP Country Office of Ecuador that can be used for this case scenario	
36	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Examples of errors in manual data collection can include – inaccurate and/or incomplete capturing of the farmers PII, farm boundaries, etc.
	Please give some illustrative examples of errors in manual data collection which the Digital solution is expected to solve. Examples could be duplicate farmer details, incorrect Land data, incorrect crop data, incomplete data, etc.	

37	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Correct, examples of the data will be available to the bidders.
	Can we consider that PIIs of Farmers/Land records would be available to the Bidder for designing the solution?	
38	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	The solution should be in local language and design to be easily translatable to other languages.
	Is UNDP looking for a Multilingual solution? Or would it be purely English?	
39	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	You can assume the ongoing enrolment of farmers throughout the year.
	What is the frequency of the data collection exercise?	
40	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	The interviews with the stakeholders are for the user research and product design, they are not a direct part of the digital solution, and should not form a
	Are the Interviews with relevant local stakeholders will be	part of it.
	facilitated by UNDP and conducted via video calls also to be	
	included in the scope of the Digital Tool?	
	Alternatively, is UNDP expecting videos to be stored as part of the Digital Tool?	
41	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	The solution should be design for scale and implementation in other context in the future.
	Please confirm if these are applicable for this case scenario?	Capturing additional data is out of scope of this case scenario.
	Is it expected to export this tool to other countries apart from	Easy integration with other software tools is a must. Sharing data with external agencies is out of scope of this case scenario.
	Ecuador?	MIS or dashboard – should be defined during the design process.
	Use this to capture additional data apart from Farmer and	
	Crop/Land data?	
	Integration with 3rd party software?	
	Sharing data with external agencies? MIS or Dashboard?	
	וט פוועו וט פוועו:	

42	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	As per the RFP: It should be noted that the number of person-days, indicated
		for each Case Scenario is indicative only and serves to provide a reference
	Is 60 person days flexible?	on the level of detail and scope of work expected.
43	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	The purpose of data collection is to enable implementation a variety of
		programmatic activities related to farmers. Those include but not limited to
	Could you please highlight the purpose for which Farmer's data	payment for ecosystem services program, deforestation free commodities
	will be used?	certification, etc.
44	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Identifying and evaluating existing open-sourced tools is a part of the scope of
	C	the case scenario. The most widely used tool for farmers data collection is kobo
	Could you please highlight some of the open data sources tools that exist?	toolbox.
45	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	Traceability is the primary objective.
43	Case scenario 2 – cocoa supply chain fraceability	Traceability is the primary objective.
	Besides traceability are there any further objectives of this	
	platform like efficiency etc?	
46	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	As per the RFP: It should be noted that the number of person-days,
		indicated for each Case Scenario is indicative only and serves to provide a
	Is the 300 person hours flexible	reference on the level of detail and scope of work expected.
47	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	Infrastructure requirements are also to be covered.
	Is the bidder expected to only provide the application Tech	
	Requirements? Or does UNDP expect that Infra requirement	
	and Data Migration requirements and Hosting/Cloud	
	Requirements or Security/Firewall requirements are also to be	
	covered?	
48	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	Correct, any related hardware costs should not be included in the bidders
		Financial Proposal.
	Please confirm if the bidder can make cost free assumptions	
	that UNDP can purchase Drones/CCTVs and other IoT devices	
	on their own.	

49	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	Please assume no digital data is currently available.
	Please let us know if any digital data is currently available with UNDP Country Office of West Africa that can be used for this	
	case scenario	
50	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	Correct, examples of the data will be available to the bidders.
	Can we consider that PIIs of Farmers/Forest records would be available to the Bidder for designing the solution?	
51	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	The solution should be in local language and design to be easily translatable to other languages.
	Is UNDP looking for a Multilingual solution? Or would it be purely english?	
52	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	The interviews with the stakeholders are for the user research and product design, they are not a direct part of the digital solution, and should not form a
	Are the Interviews with relevant local stakeholders will be	part of it.
	facilitated by UNDP and conducted via video calls also to be	
	included in the scope of the Digital Tool?	
	Alternatively, is UNDP expecting videos to be stored as part of the Digital Tool?	
53	Case scenario 2 – Cocoa Supply Chain Traceability	The solution should be design for scale and implementation in other context in the future.
	Please confirm if these are applicable for this case scenario?	Capturing additional data is out of scope of this case scenario. Easy integration with other software tools is a must.
	Is it expected to export this tool to other countries apart from West Africa?	Sharing data with external agencies is out of scope of this case scenario. MIS or dashboard – should be defined during the design process.
	Use this to capture additional data apart from Cocoa	
	Production and Forest data?	
	Integration with 3rd party software?	
	Sharing data with external agencies?	
	MIS or Dashboard?	

54	Case scenario 1- Digital Data Collection Platform	Infrastructure requirements are also to be covered.
	D1. Comprehensive list of technical requirements for the system: Is the bidder expected to only provide the application Tech Requirements? Or does UNDP expect that Infra requirement and Data Migration requirements and Hosting/Cloud Requirements or Security/Firewall requirements are also to be covered?	
55	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	MRV stands for Monitoring, Reporting and Veryfication
	Can you please explain what is MRV	
56	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	Infrastructure requirements are also to be covered.
	Is the bidder expected to only provide the application Tech Requirements? Or does UNDP expect that Infra requirement and Data Migration requirements and Hosting/Cloud Requirements or Security/Firewall requirements are also to be covered?	
57	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	The solution should be in local language and design to be easily translatable to other languages.
	Is UNDP looking for a Multilingual solution? Or would it be purely English?	
58	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	The solution should be design for scale and implementation in other context in the future.
	Please confirm if these are applicable for this case scenario?	Capturing additional data is out of scope of this case scenario. Easy integration with other software tools is a must.
	Is it expected to export this tool to other countries apart from West Africa?	Sharing data with external agencies is out of scope of this case scenario. MIS or dashboard – should be defined during the design process.
	Use this to capture additional data apart from Cocoa Production and Forest data?	
	Integration with 3rd party software?	
	Sharing data with external agencies?	

	MIS or Dashboard?	
59	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	Identifying interoperability requirements is a part of the case scenario scope and will vary from country to country.
	Is the Carbon Registry platform required to be designed as an	
	Interoperable Platform? If so, please let us know the other	
	system with which this would be linked to?	
60	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	No, any country that wants to have a national carbon registry can have access to the platform.
	Are we to consider that only those countries who participated in the The Paris Agreement are eligible to use this platform?	
61	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	As per the RFP: It should be noted that the number of person-days,
	Is 600 person hours flexible?	indicated for each Case Scenario is indicative only and serves to provide a reference on the level of detail and scope of work expected.
62	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	To define the list of features and their prioritization is the core of the scope of
	What features should the POC cover? What additional features should the MVP cover?	work of this (and others) case scenarios.
63	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	No, those countries want to establish their own national carbon registries.
	We are assuming that the 5 countries for whom we will define	
	the the core systems requirement, have existing national carbon registries. Please confirm	
64	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform Can you help us with the parameters currently being tracked in the global Carbon Registry in line with the Paris Agreement.	Please assume this information is not available.
65	Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform	This is highly context depended, currently any governmental and non-governmental body can start a carbon registry, there are also context there no
	Who currently governs country level carbon registries, SDG goals and other sustainability measures?	registries available.

Beyond the buyer, seller and governance (approver)'s is there any other perspective we need to think of when designing the market place? Case scenario 3 – Carbon registry platform Would you require our assistance in pulling country level cleansed data into the global portal or is there an existing system for the same?	Global portal is out of the scope of this case scenario.
Would you require our assistance in pulling country level cleansed data into the global portal or is there an existing system for the same?	Global portal is out of the scope of this case scenario.
cleansed data into the global portal or is there an existing system for the same?	
Documentation	Yes, this will be acceptable
Can we use Board Resolution for Authorized Signatory document instead of POA	
Documentation Can we repeat the personnel across case studies?	Yes, this is acceptable, and particularly considering that each bidder is expected to propose a pool of resources including a Team Lead and one or more Senior and Junior Expert(s) to resolve each of the three case scenarios presented in the RFP ToRs.
Section A. Rate per Key Experience Position (s)	Bidders are required to indicate the applicable daily rates in USD, applicable for each of the five Levels of Expertise described in the table in page 51 of the RFP.
Is the bidder expected to provide On-site per-day rate against each resource? How is the distinction of on-site and off-site being maintained?	As indicated in the RFP, the expectation is that the engagement will be remote / HQ/off-site, for the provision of the required services under each activity / project that will be routed through the resulting LTA.
We understand from the RFP that work shall involve a management team (project team) for all the case scenarios and a team of key personnel (experts). The TOR states that we should propose:	Under Form G, Section A, bidders are required to quote the applicable daily rates for each of the five Levels of Expertise (measured against years of working experience) detailed in the table.
 A Project team of managerial positions Key Technical Experts Additional Experts The RFP also states under <i>Technical Evaluation Criteria</i> > 	Under Form G, Section B, bidders are expected to indicate/ detail what is the specific pool of resources that they allocate to delivering against each of the three case scenarios described in the RFP ToRs.
	Can we use Board Resolution for Authorized Signatory document instead of POA Documentation Can we repeat the personnel across case studies? Section A. Rate per Key Experience Position (s) s the bidder expected to provide On-site per-day rate against each resource? How is the distinction of on-site and off-site being maintained? We understand from the RFP that work shall involve a management team (project team) for all the case scenarios and a team of key personnel (experts). The TOR states that we should propose: 1. A Project team of managerial positions 2. Key Technical Experts 3. Additional Experts

	team should include a Team Leader, Senior Expert(s), Junior	Specifically, bidders are required to indicate in the Table included Under Form G,
	Expert(s), and Additional Expert(s)	Section B (tables 1b, 2b and 3b respectively) the following information a) the name of each expert assigned/proposed by the bidder to deliver the products
	However in Form G of the financial form you are only quoting prices of the project team: Section A. calls for pricing the Key Experience Positions and in Section B, Table 1.b the look-up lists only include the Key Experience Position(s) (the project team) There is no accommodation for pricing the technical experts (team leader and senior and junior experts and additional experts.	and outputs described in each of the corresponding three Scenarios described in the RFP ToRs (under column Name), b) the proposed position and role for each of the expert assigned/proposed (under column Proposed Position/Role), identifying in this column both the role to be played by each expert (software engineer, product designer, manager, quality coordinator, etc), as well as the corresponding matching Key Personnel position, WHICH SHALL BE EITHER Team Lead, Senior Expert(s) o Junior Expert (s), under which each expert is proposed
	We kindly need to know the difference between Section A and Section B, table 1.b (in Form G) Can we add all types of resources in the same table 1.b?	c) the matching equivalent Key Experience position for each expert assigned/proposed (under column titled "Matching equivalent under Table in Section A", d) the applicable Fee Rate (which as per footnotes 6, 9 and 12 shall match the respective applicable rate quoted in the Table in Section A for the corresponding matched Level of Expertise), e) the effort, measured in number of days that each expert will devote to each case scenario (under Column Nr. Of Days) and f) the total amount in USD resulting from multiplying the number of days times the applicable daily fee.
		See also footnotes 4 through 12 in pages 53 to 57 in the RFP (and please also refer to Amendment 1 earlier posted to the UNDP E-Tendering system).
		Bidders are requested to note that there is a typo under the column titled Total Amount in Tables 1b, 2b, and 3b, as where it reads C = A + B, it should read C = A * B instead.
	Case Study #1 Questions:	
72	What is the purpose of the data collected from Ecuadorian farmers? How will the UNDP or local implementing agency use this data? Will the Ecuadorian government be leveraging this data for other purposes, and if so, what?	The purpose of data collection is to enable implementation a variety of programmatic activities related to farmers. Those include but not limited to payment for ecosystem services program, deforestation free commodities certification, etc. The government has a full ownership of the collected data and may use it for other purposes unknown to UNDP.

73	Are there existing open-sourced solutions that the UN currently leverages or have a preference for?	No, full analysis of the existing solutions and how well they address present problem is a part of the scope of this case scenario.
74	Aside from Personal info, land title documentation, farm coordinates & outline, and outline of forest on the farm, what other types of data are required to be captured?	The type of the data that is required to be captured is described in the case scenario: The necessary data includes personal information about the farmers (ID, name, household size, etc.), land title documentation, farm coordinates and outline, and the outline of the forest on the farm. Other types of data are out of the scope of this case scenario.
75	Are there existing measures in place to verify accuracy/validity of data that is self-reported?	No, designing those is a part of the scope of the case scenario.
76	What level of technology would be an acceptable common denominator among end-user farmers to ensure adoption and usage?	The level of digital literacy and access to internet is described in the case scenario: It is also important to note that the farmers are in very rural areas where internet coverage is poor and have very limited access to and knowledge of digital technologies.
77	Would farmers expect to continue a two-way conversation with local implementing agencies, or UNDP or government via the solution to complete the process, or is the expected functionality of the solution submission-only?	Two-way communication is out of the scope of this case scenario.
78	What is the expected next step after the information is submitted?	All proposal will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria provided in the RFP
	Case Study #2 Questions:	
79	Which 3 countries are in scope for West African region?	The selection of the countries is to be determine and may be subject to last minute changes.
80	Does the system scope end at inventory availability to purchase? Meaning, once it is deemed 'allowable to purchase' and then purchased by chocolate manufacturer, the UNDP does not need to track it anymore? Or should the lot be tracked all the way to 'Goods Receipt' at the chocolate manufacturer? This helps us create an accurate approach to	In best case scenario, the cocoa should be traceable all the way to the manufacturer.

	gathering all required information and account for time needed to interview all parties (e.g., growers, processing for purchasing, distributors, buyers)	
81	Could you share with us any available discovery/assessment work completed with the future users of the MVP to better inform and accurately create a timeline for deliverables?	Please assume such information is not available and make your best possible assumption regarding the timeline and deliverables.
82	Will there be a dedicated UNDP team located in-country, with ability to be an extension of our remote team to gather required information on the ground?	UNDP has Country Offices and people on the ground that could support the work if required, please assume the people on the ground don't have any specific design or digital product development expertise.
83	Does the UNDP have engineering persons to support the 'iterative development' of an MVP, or is it expected that the vendor would provide those skills and persons?	The vendor is expected to provide MVP development support including developers, those skills can be subcontracted by the vendor.
84	Are there any existing systems that UNDP uses to support supply chain traceability today and/or a preference to use an existing system (with expanded functionality) to achieve this desired traceability?	Research and analysis of existing solutions is a part of the scope of the case scenario. Please assume that UNDP does not have any preferred solutions.
85	Are there any existing roadmaps that UNDP has created themselves or with other partners to help inform the strategic direction and desired capabilities related to physical traceability of goods?	Please assume you are doing it from scratch.
	Case Study #3 Questions:	
86	Back-End development currently shows as an optional deliverable in the RFP – Can we get any architectural diagrams or similar documents that describe the current "central code base" as described on page 34 of the RFP per Case Study 3. This will help us right size the solution based on what UN already has in place.	Please make your best possible assumption regarding the complexity of the solution and assume no architectural diagrams are available.