

# Republic of Zambia



**Name of the client:** Smart Zambia Institute

**Addendum No 1 Issue Date:** 19<sup>th</sup> January 2026

**Bid / Reference No.** ZM-SZ-505118-GO-RFP

**Name of the Request for Proposal (RFP):** “Design, Reengineering, Development, and Deployment of E-Services and Integration with the Government Digital Ecosystem”

## ADDENDUM NO. 01

**Purpose:** The purpose of this Addendum is to provide responses to requests for clarifications that have been received regarding the above referenced Request for Proposals.

**Note to proposers:** In providing the clarifications, please take note that in some cases certain existing provisions in the RFP have changed. Where a clarification only is provided, please note that the provisions of the RFP as was issued remain unchanged.

Serial Number	Description of Query	AMENDMENT/CLARIFICATION
---------------	----------------------	-------------------------

<p>1.</p>	<p><b>PROPOSAL SUBMISSION TIMELINE</b></p> <p><b>(RFP Section II – Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), ITP 7.1 and ITP 23.1)</b></p> <p>Given the breadth and depth of the requirements — including the need to analyse multiple GSB components for enhancement or possible replacement, prepare cost estimates in the absence of detailed technical specifications, design a realistic Business Process Reengineering (BPR) approach for approximately 1,265 services, plan for the development of 12 National Data Registers, assemble a multidisciplinary delivery team, and develop a Proof of Concept delivery plan pending clarification responses — and noting that bid preparation coincides with the year-end holiday period, we respectfully request confirmation on whether SZI would consider a four-week extension to the proposal submission deadline specified in RFP Section II (PDS), ITP 23.1.</p>	<p>Pursuant to <b>ITP 8 (Amendment of Request for Proposals Document)</b>, the Purchaser hereby notifies all Proposers of the following modifications to the procurement schedule and submission requirements:</p> <p><b>Amendment of Proposal Deadlines and Submission Mode</b></p> <p>1. Section II - Proposal Data Sheet (PDS): ITP 23.1 and ITP 26.1 The deadline for Proposal submission and the scheduled time for the public opening of Proposals are hereby deleted and replaced with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>“New Submission Deadline: February 5, 2026, at 10:00 hours CAT.”</i></li> <li>▪ <i>“New Proposal Opening Time: February 5, 2026, at 10:00 hours CAT. The location for submission and opening remains unchanged as specified in the original PDS.”</i></li> </ul> <p>2. Section II - Proposal Data Sheet (PDS): ITP 7.1 The deadline for the submission of requests for clarification is hereby extended to <i>January 22, 2026</i>.</p> <p>3. Clarification on Submission Mode Proposers are explicitly reminded that only physical submissions shall be permitted. Electronic or online submissions are not authorized for this procurement; any proposal received via electronic means will be deemed non-responsive and rejected.</p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>Is it necessary for each Joint Venture member to meet the required minimum years of firm experience, or can the requirement be satisfied by the combined experience of the Joint Venture as a whole. (Eg: where two JV members each have more than 10</p>	<p>Each JV member must independently meet the general experience requirement. Allowing a single partner to fulfill this requirement would permit firms with no relevant IT experience (for example, construction or trading firms) to participate as JV members and be jointly liable for implementation of an IT contract, which would pose a significant project implementation risk.</p> <p><b><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></b></p>

	years of experience and one JV member has 6 years of experience.) Is this acceptable?	
3.	<p>25. PRESENTATION OF STAFF CREDENTIALS</p> <p>(RFP IV – Proposal Forms: Candidate Summary; RFP X: 10 – Key Experts’ Requirements (29); RFP X: 10 – Section 1.1.1 Profiles of the Project Team Members)</p> <p>RFP IV and RFP X provide multiple, non-identical CV templates for key experts, including the Candidate Summary Form, Key Experts’ Requirements &amp; the Project Team Member Profiles. These templates differ in structure, required fields &amp; level of detail, creating uncertainty regarding the expected format for submission.</p> <p><b>25.1</b> Please confirm whether bidders may select <b>any one</b> of the provided CV formats for all key experts, provided that all required information is included. If not, please indicate which format should be used.</p>	<p>Pursuant to <b>ITP 8 (Amendment of Request for Proposals Document)</b>, the Purchaser hereby notifies all Proposers of the following modifications to the procurement schedule and submission requirements:</p> <p>The purchaser hereby deletes the existing forms provided on <b>RFP X, page 418 AND RFP IV page 419</b> and provides attached an improved CV format. (<b>ANNEX 1</b>) to replace both forms.</p>
4.	As per clause 8.1 Delivery Model and Project Phases, Page No. 188, Point No 5, the timeline for Post-Go-Live Support and Warranty is Month 16–18. However, as per the Implementation schedule the latest	<p>Pursuant to <b>ITP 8 (Amendment of Request for Proposals Document)</b>, the Purchaser hereby issues this amendment to resolve the conflict between the project phase descriptions and the overall Implementation Schedule. The duration for post-implementation activities is hereby extended to align with the 24-month project lifecycle.</p> <p>Amendment of Delivery Schedule and Project Phases</p>

	<p>delivery date is stated to be 24th Month. We therefore request clarification as to whether it should be 24 Months or 16-18 Months</p>	<p>1. Section VII - Requirements of the Information System: Clause 8.1 (Delivery Model and Project Phases) The text under Point No. 5 (Post-Go-Live Support and Warranty) on page 188 is hereby deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <p><i>"5. Post-Go-Live Support and Warranty: Timeline: Month 16 – Month 24. During this period, the Supplier shall provide intensive on-site and remote support, bug fixes, and system fine-tuning following the full rollout. This phase ensures system stability and user adoption through the final completion date of the 24th month as specified in the Implementation Schedule."</i></p> <p>2. Section VII - Requirements: Implementation Schedule (General) To ensure consistency across the bidding document, any reference to the "Project Completion Date" or "Final Acceptance" shall be understood to occur at the end of Month 24. The total duration of the contract for the Supply and Installation phase is confirmed as twenty-four (24) months from the Effective Date.</p> <p>3. Alignment with Recurrent Costs The Post-Warranty Recurrent Cost period (as defined in the Price Schedules) shall commence immediately upon the conclusion of this 24-month period and the issuance of the Operational Acceptance Certificate for the entire system.</p>									
<p>5.</p>	<p>Confirm the authoritative weight for Maintenance &amp; Support (10% or 20%) and indicate which section will govern evaluation.</p> <p>Confirm the correct weight (5% or 15%) and share an updated scoring rubric if totals changed by addendum.</p>	<p>Pursuant to <b>ITP 8 (Amendment of Request for Proposals Document)</b>, the Purchaser hereby issues this comprehensive amendment to resolve discrepancies regarding technical category titles, content alignment, and evaluation weightings. This amendment replaces all previous technical scoring matrices in their entirety to ensure the evaluation framework accurately reflects the functional requirements of the Information System.</p> <p><b>Amendment of Technical Evaluation Framework</b></p> <p>1. Section II - Proposal Data Sheet (PDS): Item ITP 32.2 The technical evaluation categories and weights under ITP 32.2 are hereby deleted and replaced with the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="819 1110 1944 1345"> <thead> <tr> <th>No.</th> <th>Category</th> <th>Weight</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I</td> <td><b>Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements:</b> Evaluates vendor experience, certifications, architecture, standards compliance, and ability to deliver at scale.</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II</td> <td><b>Digital Back-Office &amp; ECM Capabilities:</b> Assesses specialized features including the Document Viewer, Email Integration, Meeting Management, and ECM Records Law compliance.</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	No.	Category	Weight	I	<b>Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements:</b> Evaluates vendor experience, certifications, architecture, standards compliance, and ability to deliver at scale.	40%	II	<b>Digital Back-Office &amp; ECM Capabilities:</b> Assesses specialized features including the Document Viewer, Email Integration, Meeting Management, and ECM Records Law compliance.	20%
No.	Category	Weight									
I	<b>Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements:</b> Evaluates vendor experience, certifications, architecture, standards compliance, and ability to deliver at scale.	40%									
II	<b>Digital Back-Office &amp; ECM Capabilities:</b> Assesses specialized features including the Document Viewer, Email Integration, Meeting Management, and ECM Records Law compliance.	20%									

III	<b>Workflow &amp; Infrastructure Automation:</b> Reviews no-code workflow engines, Identity & Access Management (IAM), and correspondence tracking automation.	5%
IV	<b>Implementation Methodology, Project Schedule &amp; Support Strategy:</b> Evaluates the project plan, risk management, and the <b>Post-Implementation Support &amp; Maintenance Plan.</b>	15%
V	<b>Proposed Team Quality (Resource Qualification):</b> Evaluates Relevance, experience, and availability of the proposed team, especially key personnel and project leadership.	20%
	<b>Total Technical Score</b>	<b>100%</b>

2. Section III - Evaluation and Qualification Criteria: Table 1 (Summary of Categories & Scoring)  
Table 1 (page 66) is hereby amended to reflect the revised titles and weights listed in the PDS above.

3. Section III - Evaluation and Qualification Criteria: Table 2 (Detailed Categories)

The detailed scoring matrix in Table 2 (pages 68-70) is hereby amended as follows:

- **Submission Requirement:** Bidders are no longer required to submit the compliance matrix in **RFP X: 10** in its original isolated form.
- **Category II Replacement:** The title of the original table is deleted and the table is replaced with “*Category II – Digital Back-Office & ECM Capabilities (Total 20%)*” and the original table is deleted and replaced with the following table to amend scoring to 20% while preserving original criterion:

C.No	Criterion	Weight (% of Total)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
10	Document Viewer (annotations, redaction, versions, audit, protection)	6.0%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	List supported formats (PDF, Office, images); demo in-document annotations/redaction; versioning & audit logs; watermarking; disable print/download policies.
14	Email Integration (in/out capture,	4.0%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Cover IMAP/SMTP/Graph API; capture metadata (sender, recipients, subject,

			metadata, OCR, index)			message-ID); OCR pipeline for attachments; full-text indexing; security posture.
		15	Meeting Management (agenda, MoM, approvals, linking)	4.0%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Agenda templates, invitee mgmt, live notes & action tagging, MoM generation with metadata, approval workflow, linkage to correspondences/docs/tasks.
		16	Centralized Repository & ECM compliance	6.0%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Retention schedules, legal hold, classification, permissions/RBAC, audit trail, records law compliance; secure search & access via IAM and audit controls.
		<b>TOTAL</b>		20.0%		Sum of weights in this category
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Category III Replacement:</b> The table title is changed to "<b>Workflow &amp; Infrastructure Automation (5%)</b>" and the original table is deleted and replaced with the table below to correct scoring for the category while preserving the same evaluation criterion: </li> </ul>				
		<b>C.No</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weight (% of Total)</b>	<b>Scoring Method</b>	<b>Guidance Notes</b>
		11	Workflow Automation (no-code designer; dynamic forms)	1.66%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Demonstrate drag-and-drop process designer; conditional fields/validations; data source linking; templating/cloning; documentation of configured processes.
		12	Identity & Access Management	1.66%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Show OIDC/SAML federation; external providers (AD/LDAP/Azure AD; social); MFA;

	(roles, federation, attributes)			custom user fields; attribute mapping and virtual attributes documentation.
13	Correspondence Management (routing, approvals, archiving)	1.66%	$(4/2/0 \div 4) \times 100$	Metadata capture (subject/classification/priority/ref); configurable templates; multi-level approvals; digital signing; archiving to ECM with audit trail.
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>5.0%</b>		<b>Sum of weights in this category</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Category IV Enhancement (Delivery Methodology &amp; Project Schedule):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The original table under this category is deleted and replaced with the table below to add a new sub-criterion, "<b>Item 3: Post-Implementation Support and Maintenance Plan</b>"</li> <li>This item shall be assigned a weight of <b>5.0%</b> (out of the 15% total for Cat IV).</li> <li>Evaluation will focus on the Bidder's proposed Service Level Agreement (SLA) management, helpdesk structure, and the technical approach to recurrent maintenance services.</li> <li>The new table t</li> </ul> </li> </ul>				
<b>C.No</b>	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weight (% of Total)</b>	<b>Scoring Method</b>	<b>Guidance Notes</b>
1	<b>Implementation methodology &amp; risk management plan</b>	5%	$(\text{Score} \div 4) \times 100$	Adopted methodology (Agile/Hybrid), governance, backlog/QA/devops plans; risk register with owners/mitigations; change control; delivery KPIs.
2	<b>Project schedule &amp; milestones</b>	5%	$(\text{Score} \div 4) \times 100$	Detailed timeline with phases/milestones/dependencies; resource plan; critical path; acceptance gates; realistic assumptions & buffer management.

		3	<b>Post-Implementation Support &amp; Maintenance Plan</b>	5%	(Score ÷ 4) × 100	Proposed Service Level Agreement (SLA) management, helpdesk structure, and the technical approach to recurrent maintenance services.
		<b>Total</b>		15.0%		Sum of weights in this category
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Extension Authorization:</b> It is explicitly acceptable (and required) for Bidders to extend the original compliance table format to include rows for any "exclusive" requirements found only in Section III or Section VII.</li> </ul> <p>In the event of any remaining conflict between the technical criteria titles in Section VII (Requirements) and Section III (Evaluation), the revised titles and category structures established in this Amendment shall take precedence.</p>				
6.	The RFP requires all AI models to be hosted locally. However, Section 3.1 states the Proposer is not responsible for the physical supply of computer/storage hardware.	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p163 1.2.10.1)				
		Proposer to guide on hardware requirements required for their AI model. Hardware will be tendered separately, and cost should not be included in the bid.				
		<i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>				
7.	While the RFP states the Proposer is not responsible for supplying hardware, it requires us to "include requirements for hardware sufficient to run the AI model". Could you confirm if the costs for the required AI infrastructure (e.g., high-performance GPU servers) should be excluded from our Financial Proposal?	<b>See item 6</b>				
8.	Do the 12 targeted MDAs currently utilize legacy back-office systems that require API integration, or are they	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p194)				

	currently operating manually (paper-based)?	The purchaser clarifies that some of the existing MDAs might have internal systems that require integration. Other MDAs will operate manually. The Proposer should be flexible enough to handle both scenarios.
9.	The RFP mentions "approx. 1,547" total services and prioritises 12 systems. Is there a defined minimum number of e-services (forms/processes) required per MDA system?	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p150)  The purchaser clarifies that the number of services to be developed per system will vary per MDA assigned. The current systems developed host on average ~8.5 services per system.  The purchaser has attached public statistics (second tab: Authority Stats) for more background on the number of services per system: <a href="https://gemini.google.com/share/390b111e94d0">https://gemini.google.com/share/390b111e94d0</a>
10.	Are these services identified and documented or it need to be covered as par of the scope?	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p150 7.4.1)  The purchaser clarifies that the proposer will be required to do full-business analysis of the services in each MDA as described in the RFP.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
11.	The RFP mandates local hosting. Does "locally hosted" allow for the use of proprietary AI models licensed for on-premises deployment, or is the preference strictly for Open-Source models (e.g., Llama, Mistral) running on bare metal/containers?	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p168 1.3.9)  The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is free to propose licensed models as long as hosting is done on-premises in the facilities listed in the RFP.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
12.	Is there any preferred technology stack? What is the current Tech landscape on place as of now? Shall we consider the current stack or propose a new tech?	SECTION VIII - REQUIREMENTS OF THE INFORMATION SYSTEM -(p173 2.2.1.1)  The purchaser clarifies that the current tech stack is .NET based; the proposer is free to propose re-engineering in other languages.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
13.	Core Platform Upgrades (ZamConnect, ZamPass, ZamSign, ZamPay, ZamPortal): These <b>platform scope details are required</b> since they are part of the first delivery and are tied to the payment terms.	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is expected to provide a proposal for the upgrade of each of these platforms.  See: Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements: page 146 item 8-11 Page 149: 7.4 Scope Of Work and onwards.

		<i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
14.	Can we get the <b>MDAs wise list of System</b> and their <b>Services</b> ?	The purchaser will not provide a fixed list of MDAs for which systems must be developed at this stage. The exact list of MDAs will be determined at the time of award.
15.	Will we get the Source Code with version control history and build instructions?	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer will receive the required access all repositories required.
16.	Assumption: Oracle, MS SQL, PostgreSQL license cost to be part of Government of Zambia. Are we right in assuming the same?	The purchaser clarifies that existing ecosystem database servers are licensed (where required) and are based on Microsoft SQL server, PostgreSQL and MongoDB. The purchaser will remain responsible for all licensing costs of these database servers where applicable.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
17.	At the moment .NET tech stack is being used the platforms. This is quite dated by now. Do we have the flexibility to use any other modern tech stack please, something that is more secure and future ready?	The purchaser highlights page 173 C. SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS – SUPPLY & INSTALL ITEMS item 2.2.1.1.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
18.	Please confirm whether the <b>36-month duration</b> stated in Section III is the authoritative contract period, with Section VII milestones forming part of that period, or whether the timelines in Section VII are the controlling completion dates. If the contract duration is 36 months, kindly provide a reconciled high-level schedule aligning key deliverables within the 36-month period.	Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements Page 144 7.1 List of Goods and Delivery Schedule and Page 145 onwards 7.2 List of Related Services and Completion Schedule” covers this.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>

19.	Please clarify the distinction between an <b>E-Service</b> and a <b>System</b> , and how “quarterly blocks of 10 services” relate to the stated total of “12 systems.” Kindly confirm the expected quantities per quarter and the correct unit of measure for pricing purposes.	Each system will consist of multiple services, the contractor is expected to deliver at least 10 services per quarter. Meaning the contractor can start work on multiple systems as long as they complete at least 10 services from any system within the specified period.  Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements table A. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE TABLE page 194 covers what needs to be delivered and when.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
20.	Please confirm whether all e-services must be deployed and published on <b>GSB/ZamPortal</b> as the primary platform. If alternative low-code platforms are permitted, please clarify integration requirements with ZamPortal and confirm the meaning of the term “ <b>ZIGS.</b> ”	As stated in Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, page 151, 7.4.1 and 7.4.5: All e-services must be made available through ZamPortal/eServices which is a service directory platform for government that lists all active services from ZIGS. The vendor is free to propose his own platform to develop the services.  Zambia Integrated Governmental Services (ZIGS) is the backend of the e-service aggregation platform.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
21.	Please clarify how <b>recurrent cost items</b> should be presented in the financial proposal. Specifically, should recurrent costs be excluded from the main bid price and shown only as indicative costs under separate contracts, and how will such costs be treated for evaluation purposes?	The Proposer must propose separate enforceable contracts for the Recurrent Cost Items not included in the main Contract. See Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, page 76 item 4 (b) Recurrent Costs for scoring.  Indicate the cost in form 3.3 <i>Recurrent Cost Summary Table</i> but exclude cost in overall bid price.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
22.	Please confirm whether <b>full electronic submission</b> is permitted for this RFP. If not, please confirm that hard-copy submission is mandatory and that USB flash drives are for reference purposes only.	Only hard copy submissions will be accepted as stated in Section II – Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), Page 49, ITP 23.1 (second row):  Proposers <b>shall NOT</b> have the option of submitting their Proposals electronically  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
23.	Please confirm the applicable procedure for <b>initialing Financial</b>	Per Section I – Instructions to Proposers (ITP), Clause 33.13, at the opening of the Financial Part, an independent probity auditor must be present. The procedure requires that both the Purchaser’s representative

	<b>Proposal documents at opening</b> , including whether the presence and signature of a <b>probity auditor</b> is required.	and the probity auditor initial the Letter of Proposal, Financial Part and the Price Schedules to verify the integrity of the bid at the time of opening.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
24.	The RFP requires a Proposal-Securing Declaration / Bid Security; however, the amount or percentage is not specified, and we kindly request confirmation of the required value.	Section IV – Proposal Forms Page 124: FORM OF PROPOSAL SECURITY (PROPOSAL BOND)  Bid securing declaration does not have an amount, no bid security is requested.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
25.	RFP does not specify the required number of Full Stack .NET Developer(s); could you clarify whether there is an expected or minimum number to be proposed?	The purchaser clarifies that no specific number of staff has been requested for each position, proposer is free to include multiple resumes for each position and indicate number of staff and costing in their proposal accordingly.
26.	1. GSB COMPONENT ENHANCEMENTS, SCALING & REPLACEMENT SCOPE (RFP VII: Sections 7.4, 7.4.4, 7.1, 7.2) 1.1 RFP VII requires enhancement of multiple core GSB components (including ZamConnect, ZamPay, ZamSign, and National Data Registers), but does not provide detailed functional or non-functional technical specifications for these platforms. As accurate costing and delivery planning of our bid depends on such specifications, please provide detailed functional, architectural, performance, and security	The purchaser has provided sufficient background in the RFP for proposers on all GSB components. Additional information will be provided during implementation.  B. INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS Page 204, item 0.4.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>

	specifications for each GSB component to be enhanced/replaced.	
27.	<b>1.2</b> Enhancement and full replacement of national platforms have materially different cost, risk, and delivery implications. Please confirm whether any full replacement of ZamConnect, ZamPay, ZamSign, NDRs, or other national platforms is envisaged under this contract, or whether such replacements would be contracted separately under future phases.	The purchaser clarifies the proposer is free to propose either upgrades or replacement of some or all of the ecosystem components; in case of replacement case the proposer must ensure interoperability with all existing systems using current ecosystem components. <i>(Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 7.4 Scope Of Work).</i>  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
28.	<b>1.3</b> Please confirm whether the Bidder is expected to submit a costed enhancement plan only, with any replacement options provided strictly as advisory or strategic recommendations without financial commitment under this RFP.	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is allowed to either an enhancement plan or replacement plan and all costing should be made under the current proposal.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
29.	<b>1.4</b> Please clarify whether the Bidder is expected to include costing for scaling or upgrading GSB components that may require enhancement (and, where applicable, optional replacement), such as additional software licenses or capacity expansion to support growth in users, data volumes, or transaction throughput — or whether such scaling costs will be handled separately by the Client.	The purchaser highlights: (Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 7.4 Scope Of Work). The proposer should ensure their proposal is comprehensive and includes all costs.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
30.	<b>1.5</b> Please clarify whether source code access for existing GSB components will be provided to the Bidder for enhancement planning, or whether	Existing code access will be provided.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>

	enhancements must be designed strictly through APIs and documentation.	
31.	<b>1.7</b> Please confirm whether any proprietary third-party components exist within the GSB stack that may require separate licensing, upgrade, or vendor engagement.	The purchaser clarifies that all GSB ecosystem components are government property.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
32.	2. EOFFICE SUITE PLATFORM, HOSTING & NDR CLASSIFICATION  (RFP VII: Sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.4.9) <b>2.1</b> Please confirm whether delivery of the eOffice suite using a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) enterprise platform is acceptable, provided that all functional, integration, security, records management, and governance requirements specified in RFP VII are fully met.	Section X – Contract Forms, Annex C – Proposal Submission Forms p 422  The vendor is free to propose any solution as long as they have manufacturers authorization which is: <i>“Manufacturer Authorisation Letter.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>To be completed by OEM where the project implementer is a distributor or implementation partner</i></li> <li>• <i>Must confirm the project implementer’s right to offer, configure, and support the solution”</i></li> </ul> <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
33.	<b>2.2</b> If a COTS platform is acceptable, please clarify whether software licensing costs (initial and recurring) will be: Provided centrally by the Client, or Required to be included in the Bidder’s financial proposal.	The purchaser clarifies that all costs should be included in the proposal. <i>Section I – Instructions to Proposers (ITP) 17.8</i>  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
34.	<b>2.3</b> RFP VII Section 7.1 lists the delivery destination for the eOffice system and ZamPay upgrade as “N/A”. Please clarify this discrepancy and confirm the actual deployment location, noting that the RFP	The Purchaser clarifies that the "N/A" designation in Section VII, 7.1 for the delivery destination reflects the virtual and decentralized nature of the software deployment. Unlike hardware components that require a specific physical delivery address, the eOffice system and ZamPay upgrade are to be deployed as logical installations across the Government's multi-data center environment.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>

	appendices indicate that Infratel will host all production deployments.	
35.	<b>2.3</b> Please clarify why the 12 new National Data Registers (NDRs) are listed only as services under RFP VII 7.2 and not as goods under RFP VII 7.1, given their platform-level nature and the implications this has for delivery classification, acceptance, and costing.	The Purchaser clarifies that while the development of the twelve (12) National Data Registers (NDRs) is categorized under "Services" in the delivery schedule, they are not intended to be standalone third-party services. Instead, the Proposer is required to develop each NDR as an inbuilt, native component within MDA systems providing central data repositories of information for each specific MDA.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
36.	<b>2.3</b> Please provide detailed functional and non-functional specifications for the 12 NDRs to be implemented, as these are essential for delivery planning and accurate costing.	Each of the 12 systems developed for an MDA by the proposer must share their data and have their own NDR.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
37.	<b>2.3</b> Please confirm whether the 12 NDRs must support bi-directional data exchange with existing national registries (e.g., NIR, PACRA, RTSA), or whether registry data will only be consumed by eServices.	All systems will require data-exchange through various existing NDRs such as NIR, PACRA, RTSA etc.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
38.	<b>2.3</b> Please confirm whether canonical data models for the 12 NDRs will be provided by the Client.	Data models will be availed on commencement of project.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
39.	<b>3. INTEGRATION SCOPE, PAYMENT CHANNELS &amp; THIRD-PARTY DEPENDENCIES</b>  (RFP VII: Sections 7.4.4, 7.2) <b>3.1</b> Please confirm whether integration with third-party systems (e.g. banks, mobile money providers,	Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements page 146 item 8. New payment channels are expected to be integrated.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>

	legacy MDA systems) is limited to those already connected to the GSB, unless separately contracted.	
40.	<b>3.2</b> Please clarify whether onboarding of new banks or mobile money providers, where changes are required on the provider side, is considered out of scope for this assignment.	Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements page 146 item 8. New payment channels are expected to be integrated.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
41.	<b>3.3</b> RFP VII references integration with systems such as IFMIS, NIR, PACRA, RTSA, and GIS registries. Please provide a definitive list and brief description of all external systems to be integrated under this contract, including any known constraints or dependencies.	See provided link to NDP on Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 0.4, p205  More information will be availed upon project commencement  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
42.	<b>3.4</b> RFP VII references onboarding of eight (8) additional payment channels. Please identify and describe these payment channels, including whether they represent new banks, mobile money providers, card schemes, or alternative payment mechanisms.	The Purchaser clarifies that the eight (8) additional payment channels can encompass any of the diverse range of integrations with local Commercial Banks and Non-Bank Financial Institutions (NBFIs). These channels include, but are not limited to, Mobile Money Wallets, Card Schemes (Visa, Mastercard), Point of Sale (POS) / Swipe integrations, and Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) mechanisms.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>
43.	<b>3.5</b> Please confirm whether the Bidder is expected to provide any integration middleware or ESB components, or whether all integrations must be performed directly via ZamConnect APIs.	The Purchaser clarifies that the Proposer is responsible for the comprehensive upgrade of the ZamConnect platform to ensure it functions as the central interoperability hub for the national digital infrastructure. The Proposer must design and implement the necessary integration logic within the new eService systems to facilitate seamless data exchange through the upgraded ZamConnect gateway. This includes ensuring that all built components, such as ZamPass, ZamPay, and various MDA-specific eServices, are fully integrated with each other and with external government platforms.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged</i>

44.	<p><b>4. WORKFLOW, FORM &amp; SERVICE COMPLEXITY BOUNDARIES</b></p> <p><b>4.1</b> Given the wide variation in the number and complexity of services across MDAs, please confirm whether the number of workflows per system may be capped (for example, up to a defined maximum per system) to enable realistic effort estimation, delivery planning, and scheduling.</p>	<p>See number of service estimation provided in <b>answer 9</b> No capping will be permitted at this time as no maximum number of e-Services per system has been stated in the RFP.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged</i></p>
45.	<p><b>4.2</b> Please confirm whether the number of forms, document templates, and output artefacts per system may also be capped for the same reason.</p>	<p>No capping will be permitted at this time.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged</i></p>
46.	<p><b>4.3</b> Please confirm that any requirements exceeding agreed caps would be subject to formal change control.</p>	<p>No capping will be permitted at this time.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged</i></p>
47.	<p><b>5. INFRASTRUCTURE, HOSTING, PERFORMANCE &amp; BUSINESS CONTINUITY</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b> Please confirm whether external cloud-based environments (e.g. Azure) may be used by the Bidder for development and testing, provided that all production environments are hosted within Infratel-managed infrastructure.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is free to use their own cloud based environments for test/staging as long as it is not in violation of the data protection act.</p> <p>All test, staging and production environments will be hosted in the environments stated in the RFP.</p> <p>RFP VII: Section 7.3; Functional, Architectural &amp; Performance Requirements</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>

48.	<p><b>5.2</b> Please confirm whether Infratel will provide non-production environments (development, test, staging) or whether the Bidder must provision these temporarily.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the existing test and staging environments are hosted by the purchaser. Any development environment should be hosted by the proposer unless otherwise agreed with the client.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
49.	<p><b>5.3</b> RFP VII specifies performance, availability, and RPO/RTO targets, while noting that the Bidder is not responsible for physical hardware supply. Please confirm that the Bidder is expected to define architecture, sizing, deployment, and recovery strategies to meet these targets, with hardware provisioning and scaling performed by Infratel.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the proposer should specify what is needed in terms of sizing, architecture, recovery logic, and the purchaser provides the physical/virtual resources to host and run those specifications.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
50.	<p><b>5.4</b> Please confirm the current high-availability parameters in place for the GSB ecosystem, including RPO, RTO, clustering, and disaster recovery arrangements.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the proposer should include documentation stating their own solutions ability to provide automated backup and restore procedures with defined RPO and RTO targets. Further information of the existing environment the purchaser runs can only be shared at the start of implementation. Section VII, 1.3.7.2</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
51.	<p><b>6. DATA CONVERSION, MIGRATION &amp; QUALIFICATION RESPONSIBILITIES</b></p> <p>(RFP VII: Functional, Architectural &amp; Performance Requirements / 2.5)</p> <p><b>6.1</b> Please provide a definitive list of source systems for data migration, including the volumes and characteristics of data to be transferred or replicated (master, transactional, structured, unstructured), covering eServices</p>	<p>The proposer should include the migration of data from the existing e-Office solution. The purchaser will support this effort by providing required access to data.</p> <p>National data registers can remain on their existing environment unless the proposer is proposing a replacement in which case they should include migration.</p> <p>Specific volumes can not be shared at this time however adequate hardware resources to support this migration will be provided by the purchaser.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>

	systems, eOffice, and National Data Registers.	
52.	<b>6.2</b> Please confirm that the Client will be responsible for qualifying and cleansing migration data, using tools and guidance provided by the Bidder.	The purchaser clarifies that the Proposer carries the primary responsibility for the end-to-end migration lifecycle, including the profiling, cleansing, and qualification of data using their own tools and methodologies. The Proposer must ensure that all master and transactional data, whether structured or unstructured, is successfully transformed and replicated into the new environment without loss of integrity, with the cost of these activities inclusive of the fixed-price proposal.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
53.	<b>7. SCOPE BOUNDARIES FOR UNDIGITISED, UNPUBLISHED &amp; EXISTING SERVICES</b>  <b>7.1</b> Please confirm that for undigitised services, the scope is limited to documentation and reengineering artefacts only (BPMN, metadata, workflows), and does not include configuration or development.	The purchaser clarifies the proposer is expected to digitize services for MDAs that may not have any digital system at the moment. As stated in RFP VII: Sections 7.4.2 and 7.4.3, comprehensive business analysis as well as development and testing of the services should happen. All UATs of these services will be done in consultation with the MDA.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
54.	<b>7.2</b> For the 176 unpublished eServices, please clarify whether the Bidder is expected only to diagnose and document the issues preventing publication, or also to resolve the issues and publish these services as part of this assignment.	The purchaser clarifies that proposer is only expected to “provide a detailed report of the ~176 services which have not been published or are disabled, identifying the issues needed to be resolved before these services can be published.” Section VII 7.4.1  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
55.	<b>7.3</b> Please clarify whether implementation of reengineered services that are found to require legislative or policy changes fall outside the scope of this assignment.	The purchaser will handle any legislative or policy changes.

56.	<p><b>7.4</b> Our understanding is that the eServices for the 12 selected systems will be drawn from the 282 already implemented services. Please clarify what will happen to the remaining services not selected under this phase, and whether they will be addressed in later phases of the Digital Zambia Acceleration Programme (DZAP).</p>	<p>Existing 282 live services will remain operational on existing e-service systems. Vendor is expected to develop NEW systems. 12 systems are for new MDAs not existing ones. Please read Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 7.4 Scope Of Work, p149.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
57.	<p><b>8. CHANGE CONTROL &amp; SCOPE GOVERNANCE</b> (General RFP Conditions)</p> <p>8.1 Please confirm that a formal change control process will apply to any additional workflows, integrations, platform-level enhancements, or new requirements beyond the agreed scope.</p>	<p>Pursuant to GCC Clause 39 (Changes to the Information System), the Purchaser confirms that a formal change control process shall apply to any modifications, platform-level enhancements, or integrations that fall outside the definitively agreed scope of the Information System. Any such additions must be formally initiated via a Change Request. <b>See 108.</b></p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
58.	<p><b>8.2</b> Please confirm whether the Bidder may propose a Scope Boundary Register to explicitly manage in-scope and out-of-scope items throughout delivery.</p>	<p>The purchaser welcomes a scope boundary register to explicitly manage in-scope and out-of-scope items throughout delivery as long as all requirements listed in the RFP are met.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
59.	<p><b>9. WORKSHOP &amp; ENGAGEMENT LOGISTICS</b> (RFP VII: Section 7.2 (1))</p> <p><b>9.1</b> Please confirm that the Client will cover the costs of hosting MDA and plenary workshops (including venue, catering, and logistics) for</p>	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that, in accordance with Section VII, Clause 0.5 (Available Training Facilities), the Purchaser will provide the venue (meeting rooms) for stakeholder consultations, MDA service assessment workshops, and training sessions held at the Smart Zambia Institute (SZI) headquarters or Ministry of Finance premises. For engagements held at MDA offices, the respective government entities will provide the necessary space. However, as per ITP 17.8 and the Financial Summary Form (Annex C, Item 7), the Proposer’s price must be all-inclusive of all other incidental costs, including catering, logistics, travel, and subsistence for their own personnel and the execution of the services. Unless otherwise specified, the Proposer is expected to manage and price the logistical arrangements for participants as part of their comprehensive delivery methodology for the 24 assessment workshops and subsequent training sessions.</p>

	engagement sessions held both within and outside Lusaka	<i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
60.	<p>10. PROOF OF CONCEPT (POC) HOSTING &amp; ACCESS (RFP X – Annex B)</p> <p><b>10.1</b> Please clarify the expected hosting arrangement for the PoC, including whether the Bidder is expected to host the PoC, use SZI-provided infrastructure, or deploy to a temporary environment provided by SZI.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the PoC environment is only required when a bidder has been selected to proceed passing the initial technical evaluation stage. The PoC environment arrangements will be provided at such time.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
61.	<p><b>10.2</b> Please clarify what is meant by “Access Credentials” for the PoC (e.g. evaluator access, mock integrations, sandbox credentials).</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies this means Authorization credentials to APIs.</p>
62.	<p><b>10.3</b> If the PoC requires integration with mock versions of ZamConnect, ZamPass, ZamPay, ZamSign, or NDRs, please confirm whether SZI will provide mock APIs, test data, and authentication tokens.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the PoC environment is only required when a bidder has been selected to proceed passing the initial technical evaluation stage.</p> <p>The purchaser will provide a test environment for PoC integration including integration guides.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
63.	<p><b>10.4</b> Please confirm whether the PoC environment must be publicly accessible or may be secured behind VPN or restricted access.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the PoC environment must be made available to the purchaser in a method directly available through a web browser, login credentials may be provided to secure the environment and prevent outsider access.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
64.	<p>11. POST-GO-LIVE SUPPORT, SERVICE DESK SCOPE &amp; HYPERCARE TIMING</p>	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the three-month Hypercare period applies to each subsystem individually, commencing immediately upon its respective Go-Live date or the issuance of its Interim Operational Acceptance Certificate. This phased approach ensures that intensive technical support, on-site presence,</p>

	(RFP VII: Section 7.2 (22); Annex 9) <b>11.1</b> Please confirm whether the three-month hypercare period applies per subsystem from its individual Go-Live date, or only once all in-scope subsystems have been deployed.	and prioritized incident resolution are provided to stabilize each module as it is integrated into the national digital ecosystem. All individual Hypercare periods are to be executed within the overarching 8-month Post-Go-Live Support and Warranty window (Month 16–24). The successful completion of Hypercare for each component is a prerequisite for the component's transition into the standard maintenance phase and contributes toward the final Operational Acceptance of the Integrated System at Month 24.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
65.	<b>11.2</b> Please define the Go-Live date(s) for support planning purposes — whether there are distinct Go-Live dates per system or quarterly batch, or a single consolidated Go-Live date.	The Purchaser clarifies that the project adopts a phased implementation and rollout model with distinct Go-Live dates for individual subsystems and e-Services, rather than a single consolidated launch. In accordance with the Implementation Schedule in Section VII, Go-Live dates are triggered incrementally following the successful completion of User Acceptance Testing (UAT) and the issuance of Interim Operational Acceptance for specific systems. Proposers must ensure that the integrated support ecosystem, including the ticketing platform, helpdesk facilities, and technical personnel, is fully active and functional for each specific system starting from its individual Go-Live date. This staggered strategy facilitates early service delivery and ensures that each module receives dedicated support throughout its initial operational phase, culminating in the final integrated system acceptance at Month 24.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
66.	<b>11.3</b> Please confirm whether the Bidder is expected to provide an end-user service desk for public users (e.g., citizens and businesses), or whether support is limited to internal MDA users.	The Purchaser clarifies that the Supplier’s support and maintenance obligations are strictly limited to providing technical and operational assistance to Smart Zambia Institute (SZI) and MDA staff (Tier 2 and Tier 3 support). The Bidder is not expected to provide an end-user service desk or direct support facilities for the general public, citizens, or business applicants. Direct interaction with service applicants and Tier 1 helpdesk functions remain the responsibility of the Government of Zambia; the Bidder's scope is confined to ensuring platform stability and resolving complex technical issues escalated by internal government administrators and technical teams.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
67.	<b>11.4</b> To support continuity, sustainability, and alignment with existing government operational practices, please provide information on the technologies, tools, and platforms currently in use across the	The Purchaser clarifies that access to supplementary technical assets, including detailed system documentation, source code repositories, and CI/CD pipeline configurations and support systems, will be granted exclusively to the successful Proposer upon Contract Award. For the purposes of proposal preparation, the functional and technical specifications provided in Section VII of the RFP are considered sufficient for the development of a responsive bid.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>

	<p>GSB ecosystem and participating institutions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ An architectural overview, that describes the solution architecture of the existing GSB Ecosystem, including all digital systems and installations covered by the RFP,</li><li>▪ Cross-agency collaboration and content management tools, such as email platforms, Enterprise Content Management (ECM) systems, and intranet/extranet solutions,</li><li>▪ Existing helpdesk and support arrangements, including tools in use, organisational structures, support processes, and available operational statistics (e.g. number and types of users, ticket volumes, issue categories),</li><li>▪ Service management and monitoring tools, covering performance monitoring, availability management, incident tracking, and SLA measurement,</li><li>▪ DevOps toolchains and operational processes, including source code management, CI/CD pipelines, environment promotion controls, and release management practices, and</li><li>▪ Project management and governance platforms, used for planning, tracking, reporting, oversight, content management and collaboration around digital initiatives.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

68.	<p><b>20. INTERNATIONAL VENDOR REQUIREMENT</b></p> <p>RFB X: 10.1(16) states: “The solution must be provided by an international vendor and must not be locally developed.”</p> <p>This clause appears to exclude even qualified local solutions for all GSB ecosystem components (i.e., the eServices Framework, ZamConnect, ZamPass, ZamPay, ZamSign, ZamDocs, and NDRs), which has significant implications for local industry participation, sustainability, and long-term national capacity.</p> <p>20.1 Please justify the rationale for this exclusion clause.</p> <p>20.2 Please clarify the qualification criteria for “international vendor.”</p> <p>20.3 Please clarify the meaning of “locally developed” in this context.</p> <p>20.4 Please confirm that this exclusion clause applies to ALL GSB Ecosystem components</p>	<p>The Purchaser hereby clarifies that the requirement stipulated in RFB X: 10.1(16), mandating that the solution be provided by an international vendor and not be locally developed, is established to ensure the strategic criticality, proven maturity, and global scalability of the Government Service Bus (GSB) ecosystem, which serves as the foundational infrastructure for Zambia’s digital public services. An "International Vendor" is defined as a legal entity duly constituted and registered in a country other than Zambia, and "locally developed" refers to a solution where the core software development, engineering, or major assembly occurred within the Purchaser’s Country, in accordance with the principles of ITP 5.3. This requirement applies to all GSB ecosystem components (including ZamConnect, ZamPay, ZamPass, and NDRs) to mitigate operational risks associated with non-standardized architectures and to ensure long-term sustainability; however, this requirement is part of a hybrid delivery model that explicitly mandates the involvement of a certified local partner for ongoing maintenance, support, and institutional knowledge transfer to foster national capacity and ensure the system's long-term technical sovereignty.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
69.	<p><b>21. BIDDER TEAMING AGREEMENTS</b></p> <p>(RFP X: C (10); RFB X: Proposal Forms)</p> <p>RFP X: C (10) requires submission of an MOU to confirm teaming</p>	<p><i>Local Partner MOU (Annex C, Item 10.5) and Subcontractor’s Agreement &amp; List (Section IV):</i> Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for local partners and the Subcontractor’s Agreement / List of Proposed Subcontractors are complementary requirements and should be submitted in addition to each other if your local partner is acting as a subcontractor.</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>

	<p>arrangements for local partners. However, RFP X: Proposal Forms separately require a “Subcontractor’s Agreement” and a “List of Proposed Subcontractors,” creating potential duplication or conflict in required documentation.</p> <p><b>21.1</b> Please confirm whether the MOUs required under RFP X: C (10) replace the “Subcontractor’s Agreement” and “List of Proposed Subcontractors” required in RFP X: Proposal Forms, or whether they are required in addition to these forms.</p>	
70.	<p><b>22. ALIGNMENT OF EVALUATION/COMPLIANCE CRITERIA ACROSS THE RFP</b></p> <p>(RFP III: 1.3; RFP X: 10; RFP VII)</p> <p>RFP III: 1.3 provides detailed evaluation criteria that do not align exactly with the compliance matrix in RFP X: 10, with some requirements appearing only in RFP III: 1.3 and not in RFP X: 10. In addition, RFP III: 1.3, RFP X: 10, and RFP VII contain overlapping but non-identical requirement sets, creating uncertainty regarding how bidders should demonstrate compliance and which document takes precedence for evaluation purposes.</p>	<b>See item 5.</b>

	<p>22.1 Since bidders are required to submit only the compliance matrix in RFP X: 10, please confirm how bidders should demonstrate compliance with requirements that appear exclusively in RFP III or RFP VII.</p> <p>22.2 Is it acceptable to extend RFP X: 10 with an additional table addressing these requirements, or will SZI issue an updated consolidated matrix?</p> <p>22.3 Please clarify whether RFP X: 10 takes precedence over RFP III: 1.3 and RFP VII where requirements differ or are not aligned.</p>	
71.	<p>23. FINANCIAL CREDENTIALS (RFP III: 1.3.3)</p> <p>RFP III: 1.3.3 specifies a financial resource threshold that may be disproportionately high relative to the scope of this assignment.</p> <p>23.1 Please confirm whether a reduction in the financial resource requirement to USD 2 million can be considered, as this level is adequate to support the cash flow requirements for this contract.</p>	<p>No adjustment will be made to financial eligibility scoring criteria at this point.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
72.	<p>24. EXPERIENCE CREDENTIALS (RFP III: 1.4.2)</p>	<p>No adjustment will be made to financial eligibility scoring criteria at this point.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>

	<p>RFP III: 1.4.2 requires evidence of either (a) one contract of USD 8 million, or (b) two contracts of USD 5 million each.</p> <p>24.1 Please confirm whether this requirement may be reduced to one contract of USD 4 million or two contracts of USD 2.5 million, to ensure greater accessibility for qualified Zambian firms.</p>	
73.	<p><b>25.2</b> Please confirm whether <b>moderate adjustments</b> to the selected CV structure are acceptable (e.g., re-ordering sections, improving readability, consolidating duplicative fields), provided that all mandatory information from the RFP is clearly presented.</p>	<p>See <b>ANNEX 1</b> for an easier to use approved format. And <b>item 3</b> for amendment.</p>
72.	<p>1. E-Services Coverage: Can the Purchaser confirm whether the list of e-services to be designed and re-engineered is fixed, or whether additional services may be introduced during contract execution under the same contract framework? If so how would this be done.</p>	<p>The RFP is requests for 12 e-service systems, each system can have any number of services. See answer 4 for an average. The proposer should be flexible enough to deliver the required services with the particular MDA that will be assigned.</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>
73.	<p>2. Re-engineering: For existing services, should bidders assume full business process re-engineering (end-</p>	<p><i>Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 7.4.2 Business Process Discovery and Reengineering. P151</i> Read above section</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>

	to-end), or incremental digitisation of current workflows?	
74.	3. Service Ownership : Will individual MDAs retain ownership of service definition and approvals during implementation?	Smart Zambia retains ownership of platforms however as stated in 7.4.6 p153, UATs are conducted in collaboration with the MDA.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
75.	4. Government Digital Ecosystem Components: Please confirm which core platforms are currently operational and mandatory for integration	<i>Section VII, 7.4.4 Integration with GSB Ecosystem Components p152.</i> All stated components are operation and are required to be integrated.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
76.	5. Readiness of External Systems: Are all external systems to be integrated already live in production, or should bidders plan for integration with systems still under development? If so how would this be sequenced.	<i>Section VII, 7.4.4 Integration with GSB Ecosystem Components p152.</i> All listed components are in production. Test and staging environments are available as well.
77.	6. Interoperability Standards :Are there defined national interoperability, data exchange, or API standards that bidders must comply with, and can these be shared?	<i>Section VII, 7.4.4 Integration with GSB Ecosystem Components p152. 1.3.2 Interoperability and Integration p 167. Etc.</i>
78.	7. Target Hosting Model: Does the Purchaser expect solutions to be deployed on government-owned	Read Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, item 0.6.1, p205 as well as 7.3 Background and Strategic Context p148

	infrastructure, government cloud, or a hybrid architecture with a mix between public and private cloud?	
79.	8. Environment Provisioning: Will development, testing, staging, and production environments be provided by the Purchaser, or must bidders cost and provision these?	<i>Section X, item 2, Infrastructure Requirements p409.</i> Proposer must ensure the use of the existing environments provided by the purchaser.
80.	10.Security Baselines: Are there prescribed cybersecurity frameworks or standards (e.g. ISO 27001, NIST) that the solution must comply with?	The proposer is free to propose frameworks or standards in the required <i>Cyber security risks, management strategies and implementation plan</i>
81.	11.Data Protection Requirements : Should bidders assume that all citizen data must remain within national borders, or is cross-border hosting permitted under defined safeguards?	Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 1.1.1.1: <i>“Data Localization: All personally identifiable information must be stored within Zambia, no data should be processed outside of Zambia.”</i>  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
82.	13.Dependencies :Are there known dependencies on parallel government programmes or third-party vendors that may affect delivery timelines?	All dependencies will be managed by the purchaser. If timelines are affected this will be negotiated with the successful proposer at such time.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
83.	14.Change Management:What level of organisational change management and user adoption support is expected from the Supplier?	Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements, 5.3.1 p186: <i>“The Supplier MUST maintain an active technical support team post operational acceptance to support all recurrent activities, enhancement requests, and change management tasks.”</i>  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>

84.	15.Joint Ventures: Are there any restrictions on the number of JV partners or minimum percentage of scope that must be executed by the lead partner?	<p><i>ITP 4.1: Maximum number of members in the JV shall be: Not more than 3 (three).</i></p> <p>The RFP does not specify a minimum percentage of scope that must be executed by the lead partner. However, the JV agreement or letter of intent must clearly indicate the specific parts of the Information System to be executed by each member. (Section I – Instructions to Proposers (ITP), p15, item 11.5.) Requirement remains unchanged.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
85.	16.Subcontractor Credentials: Can the experience of specialised subcontractors be used to meet technical qualification criteria, or only that of JV partners?	<p><i>Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, 1.1, p78</i></p> <p>Subcontractors are not considered towards: Eligibility/Nationality, General Experience, Specific Experience or Financial Resources.</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>
86.	23.Post-Submission Clarifications: Will bidders be allowed to clarify or demonstrate aspects of the proposed solution without modifying substance or price?	<p>Selected proposers will be asked to show a proof-of-concept system.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
87.	We request you to allow firm that is Limited Liability Partner (LLP).	<p>An LLP is a private entity and is not excluded as long as it can provide all required registration documentation and articles of association.</p> <p><i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i></p>
88.	Please confirm definitive contracting approach for recurrent costs (separate-only vs main/separate) and how evaluation/award handles multi-contract structure. Requesting an indicative list of recurrent cost items to be supplied to us.	<p>ITP 17.2: The RFP specifies a separate-only approach for recurrent costs</p> <p>“The Proposer MUST PROPOSE separate enforceable contracts for the Recurrent Cost Items not included in the main Contract.</p> <p>They will NOT be included in the main contract.”</p> <p>3.5 Recurrent Cost Sub-Table p135 already provides this list of items.</p>

		<i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
89.	We request you to allow Board Resolution also as alternative of Power of Attorney	A board resolution is not sufficient
90.	Please extend the proposal submission date by at least four (4) weeks	The proposal submission date and time remain unchanged. <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
91.	Since executing the project requires a high level of technical knowledge and competency, we request you to modify the clause as under" "The weighting to be given for Rated Criteria (including technical and non-price factors) is: 70 %"	The scoring will not be changed. <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
92.	Please modify the clause as under: "The weight to be given for technical is 0.7, and The weight to be given for cost is: 0.3."	The scoring will not be changed. <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
93.	Please clarify the selection procedure and the modalities of finalizing the 12 systems. We would also request you to kindly share a overall list of such systems that needed to be studied/covered under this project. Also, the entire effort estimation is dependent on the number of services to be covered under one system. We therefore. Request to let us know in advance, the approximate numbers of e-services to be covered under the 12 systems	The purchaser (SZI) will provide a list of systems to be developed at which point the proposer can start Business Analysis and onward work. No specific list will be provided at this time.  <b>See item 9</b> for the expected average number of services per system as well as some further statistics to assist in providing a comprehensive proposal.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
94.	Please clarify on what basis these 24 Stakeholder consultations and MDA service assessment workshops will be conducted. We would really require	At least two stakeholder consultation workshops are expected for each system (12x2=24). The proposer is free to propose more workshops however this is a minimum.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>

	the list of services that will be undertaken as a part of requirement gathering study for this engagement	
95.	We understand that all the e-services will be made available through the ZamPortal. We therefore request to provide details of ZamPortal in terms of functionalities, technology stack, current operational services please	Section VII, 7.3 Background and Strategic Context, p148 and 7.4.1, 7.4.5. 0.4.2 provide sufficient information on ZamPortal.  Additional statistics included in <b>See item 9</b>  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
96.	We understand that this is the most crucial phase where all e-services will be finalized. Further, the AS-IS, TO-BE will be finalized. We therefore request to increase the timeline for this crucial phase to 6 months (i.e., Month 1-7)	The purchaser has reserved 4 Months for BPAR which should be sufficient for AS-IS and TO-BE re-engineering of the 12 systems.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
97.	Since this is an IT application development project, request to remove ISO 14001 and ISO 10015 as it becomes very limiting in nature.	Current ISO requirements remain. ISO10015 is critical for quality management, ISO 14001 ensures environmental compliance of the proposer.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
98.	Clarify whether prices are strictly fixed or subject to adjustment when validity is extended beyond 56 days; provide mechanism/indices for adjustments.	The Purchaser clarifies that, pursuant to ITP 19.3(a), all proposal prices shall remain fixed and firm; however, in the event that the contract award is delayed beyond fifty-six (56) days past the expiration of the initial 120-day validity period, a price adjustment shall be applied to the contract price of the successful Proposer. This adjustment shall be calculated based on the prevailing annual inflation rates in Zambia for the local currency portion and the relevant international inflation indices for the foreign currency portion, pro-rated for the period of extension. Proposers are reminded that such adjustments are intended solely for contract finalization and will not be factored into the financial evaluation or the determination of the Evaluated Proposal Price.  <i>Requirement remains unchanged.</i>
99.	Clarify whether 'full-source' is required only for custom components or also COTS; if COTS, is source escrow acceptable? Define IP/license/escrow expectations.	The Purchaser clarifies that the requirement for "Full-source code" under PDS ITP 16.3 and Section VII applies specifically to all Custom Software and modifications developed for the Project, which must be handed over with full repositories and version history by the Month 24 completion deadline. For Standard Software (COTS), the delivery of source code is not required; however, the Supplier must grant the Purchaser a non-exclusive, fully paid-up, and irrevocable license to use the software as defined in GCC

		<p>Clause 15. Intellectual Property (IP) rights for all custom-developed components shall vest entirely in the Purchaser (Smart Zambia Institute), while IP for Standard Software remains with the Supplier or the original owner. While source code escrow for COTS is not a mandatory requirement under the current SCC, Bidders are permitted to propose escrow arrangements as part of their technical response to demonstrate long-term sustainability and the mitigation of vendor lock-in.</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>
100.	Clarify whether MAF is required for purely software deliveries (no hardware). For proprietary software, is OEM relationship mandatory or will standard partner/reseller authorization suffice?	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that a Manufacturer’s Authorization Form (MAF) is mandatory for all proprietary software components (COTS) not developed by the Proposer, even in the absence of hardware delivery, as per ITP 17.2(a) and Section IV (Proposal Forms). While a direct relationship with the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) is highly preferred to ensure long-term support and system sustainability, a standard partner or authorized reseller certification is sufficient provided it explicitly confirms that the Proposer is authorized to supply, install, and provide warranty support for the software in the Purchaser’s country. For any Custom Software or components developed in-house by the Proposer, a MAF is not required; however, the Proposer must provide a formal declaration of ownership and the commitment to transfer the source code and Intellectual Property rights to the Smart Zambia Institute upon completion.</p> <p>Requirement remains unchanged.</p>
101.	Given discrepancies between Section II and Section III totals, provide the authoritative scoring methodology, feature weights, and minimum technical score. Kindly clarify which weightage shall be considered for evaluation	<b>See item 5</b>
102.	ITP 44 / PDS ITP 44 Clarify what is meant by all Item “Purchaser’s right to vary quantities ±20% for 'all items'.”	<p>The purchaser reserves the right to increase or decrease any requested quantities by at most 20% as stated. ITP 44.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>

103.	Define what constitutes a 'substantial modification' and provide examples; confirm if local SEA/SH reporting channels must be embedded verbatim.	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that a "substantial modification" to the Code of Conduct for Supplier's Personnel is defined as any alteration, deletion, or amendment that results in the dilution or weakening of the minimum Environmental and Social (ES) standards mandated by the World Bank. Specifically, modifications that remove protections against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), Sexual Harassment (SH), child labor, or workplace discrimination are strictly prohibited. The code of conduct is required to be signed at contract award.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
104.	Please confirm whether a purchaser-provided template exists for the checklist and how to attach purchaser evaluations to the PER; provide file naming conventions for attachments.	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that Proposers are required to utilize the Technical Responsiveness Checklist (Format) provided in Section IV (Proposal Forms) to provide a detailed, item-by-item commentary on the Technical Requirements. In accordance with standard evaluation procedures, the Proposal Evaluation Report (PER) will incorporate these submitted checklists with additional assessment rows appended by the evaluation committee to document compliance determinations and supporting rationale. While the RFP does not mandate a specific character-string naming convention, all electronic attachments must be submitted in a searchable format and clearly labeled according to their corresponding RFP section or form name to facilitate accurate cross-referencing. Proposers must ensure that electronic media are organized into distinct, password-protected directories for the Technical and Financial parts as stipulated in the Proposal Data Sheet (PDS).</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
105.	We request clarity on the definition of Go-Live. Kindly state what will constitute as a Go Live of the applications in case of this engagement.	<p>The purchaser clarifies that go-live of the individual components such as: e-Office and the 12 e-Service systems as well as upgraded ecosystem components means a platform has been deployed on the production environment accessible to the respective end-users following successful UAT sign-off.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
106.	We request clarity on what will be constituted as change Request. Can you kindly definite how the change request will be treated. Also can you kindly share the format of the Change request form that is been stated in page number 190 of the RFP	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that, pursuant to GCC Clause 39 and Section VII (8.6), a Change Request constitutes any modification, addition, or deletion to the System's scope, functionality, or delivery timelines, provided such changes are technically practicable and fall within the general scope of the Information System. Change Requests are treated through a structured governance process: changes are initiated via a formal form, followed by a mandatory Impact Analysis assessing effects on cost, schedule, and technical integrity; approvals must be granted by the Project</p>

		<p>Implementation Unit (PIU) and the Project Steering Committee (PSC) before being formalized through a Change Order or Contract Amendment . As per the requirements on page 190 and the templates in Section X (Form 4.1 and 4.6), the standard format for a Change Request will be provided by the purchaser at contracting stage. Note that any modification resulting from a default by the Supplier in performing its obligations shall not be deemed a Change and will not entitle the Supplier to any adjustment in price or time.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
107.	<p>Question 1: The RFP refers to "over 1,089 services" requiring digitization and "~176" developed but unpublished services. Please provide the definitive, exact counts for these two categories to ensure accurate scoping of assessment, documentation, and potential remediation work.</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that only 12 systems are expected to be developed under the scope of the project and that each eService system should be capable of handling any number of services. See item 9 for a background on existing systems. The 1,089 refers to all services across government not yet digitized.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
108.	<p>Question 2: Regarding the ~176 unpublished services, is the scope of work limited to reporting on the issues preventing publication, or does it include the remediation and activation of these services?</p>	<p><b>See item 54</b></p>
109.	<p>Question 3: The RFP mandates the selection and implementation of 12 systems, equally distributed as "simple," "medium," and "complex." Please provide the Purchaser's predefined classification criteria or rubric for "simple," "medium," and "complex" systems. Who will perform the initial classification, and what is the process and timeline for the final selection of the 12 systems?</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies the wording of Simple, Medium and Complex as follows: Simple systems are systems with a few <math>\leq 5</math> services that require little process customization, data migration, integration of external registries etc. Medium complexity refers to a system that has 5-10 services that require integration with external registers, and customization of specific workflows. Complex systems require more customization and would require integration of various data registers or external systems, host a larger number of services.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
110.	<p>Question 4: For the core platforms (ZamConnect, ZamPay, ZamSign, GSB framework), who has the authority to decide between upgrading/enhancing the existing</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that the decision will be based on the quality of the proposal and the ability of the proposer to ensure a smooth transition of existing platforms and systems relying on these components.</p>

	system versus procuring a complete replacement? Please specify the decision-making body or role.	<i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
111.	Question 5: When is this decision expected to be made (e.g., pre-award, during design phase)? Will it be based on vendor proposals? Please clarify the timeline and process.	<b>See item 110, 112</b>
112.	Question 6: Should our proposal and pricing be based on: A. Assume an upgrade path for all platforms? B. Assume a replacement path for all platforms? C. Present and price both scenarios separately?	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer should include a comprehensive proposal that covers the entirety of the scope of work in the RFP. The proposer is free to outline either upgrade or replacement for the components that have been listed as either.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
113.	Question 7: If replacement of a core platform is chosen, what are the expectations for the 282 live services and ~60 integrated systems that depend on it? Is there an expectation for parallel run periods? What is the acceptable downtime window for cutover/migration?	The expectation of government remains that all existing e-Service platforms remain functional and that, if the technical layer of ZamPay, ZamSign, ZamConnect or other underlying components is replaced the proposer must ensure the continued operation of existing systems utilizing these ecosystem components. The proposer should ensure that a smooth transition happens utilizing the test and staging environment to ensure that no significant downtime occurs.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
114.	Question 8: Please provide a list or dependency map of all known systems integrated with ZamConnect and ZamPay. Beyond the 60+ integrated systems mentioned, what other government systems depend on these platforms? Who is responsible for coordinating the transition with these third-party system owners?	ZamConnect, the government service bus is a data exchange platform, any new data exchange platform should be able to handle the same integrations already present. Any external systems relying on ZamConnect will be visible to the selected proposer once access has been provided.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
115.	Question 9: If a platform is replaced, is there a requirement for the new system to maintain backward compatibility with existing	<b>See item 113</b>

	integration patterns or APIs? Please clarify compatibility requirements for ZamConnect and ZamPay.	
116.	Question 10: To plan effective integration or migration, please provide any available technical architecture documentation, data models, and API specifications (e.g., OpenAPI/Swagger) for: The two versions of the GSB e-service framework ZamConnect, ZamPass, ZamPay, ZamSign, and ZamNotify.	<b>See item 67</b>
117.	Question 11: Are there specific, mandatory protocols or standards (e.g., specific OIDC/SAML profiles, API security standards like TLS versions) required for integration with the GSB ecosystem? Please specify required standards and share available API documentation, data models, and architecture diagrams.	<b>See item 67</b>
118.	Question 12: Beyond the Data Protection Act's requirements for PII, are there government-wide policies regarding cloud usage, data residency for non-PII data, or preferences for sovereign cloud solutions?	<b>See item 47</b>
119.	Question 13: For legacy MDA systems without APIs, is there a preferred integration pattern or middleware already in use or mandated? Please clarify the integration approach for non-API systems.	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer can propose solutions to for non-API availing systems for example where database access is possible.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>
120.	Question 14: What is the strategic direction for the existing 458 services? Are they to be: a) Maintained indefinitely on the old framework? b) Migrated to the new platform (is this in scope)?	The purchaser clarifies that migration of all existing services is not included in the current scope of work.  <i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i>

	c) Replaced gradually over time? Please confirm the intended migration path.	
121.	Question 15: What is the current technology stack (programming languages, frameworks, databases, middleware) used for: The 282 live e-services currently in production? The ~176 developed but unpublished services? The existing 458 services on the old framework? Please provide details on technologies, versions, and any standardization that exists	<b>See item 12 &amp; 148</b>
122.	Question 16: Regarding the existing developed services, should the vendor: a) Maintain the current technology stack and build upon it? b) Migrate/refactor services to a standardized new technology stack? c) Preserve services as-is while only addressing functional issues? Please clarify the expected approach to existing service technology.	<b>See item 12 &amp; 148</b>
123.	Question 17: Is there a preferred or mandated technology stack for new service development considering: Compatibility with current legacy systems? Existing infrastructure and hosting environment? Skills availability within government technical teams? Long-term maintainability and support considerations?	<b>See item 12 &amp; 148</b>

	If yes, please specify the preferred technologies, frameworks, and architectural patterns.	
124.	<p>Question 18: For the core national platforms (ZamConnect, ZamPay, ZamSign, ZamNotify, GSB framework), please provide:</p> <p>Current technology stack details (languages, frameworks, databases, integration middleware)</p> <p>Known technical limitations or constraints</p> <p>Any ongoing technology refresh initiatives</p>	<b>See item 12 &amp; 148</b>
125.	<p>Question 19: If replacement of core platforms is chosen (per Questions 4-6), are there:</p> <p>Mandatory technology requirements or preferences?</p> <p>Constraints based on existing infrastructure (e.g., data center capabilities, network architecture)?</p> <p>Required compatibility with existing government enterprise systems (ERP, HRIS, etc.)?</p> <p>Preferences regarding commercial vs. open-source solutions?</p>	<b>See item 12 &amp; 148</b>
126.	<p>Question 20: For the GSB e-service framework specifically, if a vendor proposes a "similar e-service platform" as an alternative:</p> <p>What are the minimum functional and technical requirements this platform must meet?</p> <p>Must it be compatible with services already built on the existing GSB framework?</p>	<b>See item 28</b>

	Are there restrictions on licensing models (open-source, commercial, subscription based)?	
127.	Question 21: Are there existing standard templates, formats (e.g., for BPMN), or metadata schemes required for business process documentation and the "Documentation of remaining non-implemented systems"? Please provide required templates or schemas.	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is free to introduce their own BPMN formatting as long as global BPMN standards are followed.
128.	Question 22: For the "Documentation of remaining non-implemented systems," what is the minimum required information set per system? Please specify the required documentation fields.	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the "Documentation of remaining non-implemented systems" refers to the comprehensive assessment of identified MDA services and subsystems that are profiled but not scheduled for full development within the current 24-month contract. This documentation must be of sufficient technical and operational depth to serve as a definitive baseline for future phased development and ensure total architectural alignment with the broader National Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) framework.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
129.	Question 23: How will the successful training of "30 local developers" and the effectiveness of "Trainer-of-Trainers" programs be measured and verified (e.g., through testing, certification, project deliverables)?	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the effectiveness of the training programs for the 30 local developers and the Trainer-of-Trainers (ToT) initiatives will be verified through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Formal Assessment &amp; Certification, requiring participants to pass a technical evaluation or achieve a recognized professional certification relevant to the platform's stack;</li> <li>(ii) Practical Application, where local developers must successfully contribute to and sign off on specific project deliverables, such as code commits, API integrations, or unit testing modules under the supervision of the Proposer's experts; and</li> <li>(iii) Post-Training Performance Audits, involving a structured evaluation of the ToT participants' ability to independently conduct subsequent training sessions for MDA staff.</li> </ul> <p>The Proposer is required to include a Training Verification Matrix in their Project Plan, detailing the specific KPIs, evaluation rubrics, and the "Skills Transfer Log" that will be used to track individual progress and authorize the transition of system maintenance responsibilities to the local technical team.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>

130.	<p>Question 24: What is the formal process, expected timeline, and escalation path for obtaining MDA validation and sign-off on reengineered processes and service designs? Please describe the sign-off process and escalation path for disputes.</p>	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the validation and sign-off process for reengineered processes is governed by the Implementation Schedule (Section VII) and the governance framework outlined in the General Conditions of Contract (GCC). Pursuant to Section VII, 7.2 (1), the Proposer must conduct "Detailed Assessment and Service Re-engineering" for 24 MDA services. The formal sign-off process follows the procedure for Project Plan and Deliverable Approval as stipulated in GCC Clause 19, which requires the Purchaser to review and provide notice of approval or deficiency within fourteen (14) days. In practice, the Proposer shall submit reengineered designs to the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), which coordinates the "Stakeholder Engagement and MDA validation" workshops to achieve technical consensus before final sign-off.</p> <p>The escalation path for delays or disputes during the design and validation phase shall be defined as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Technical Level: Disputes are first addressed between the Proposer's Project Manager and the PIU Project Coordinator.</li> <li>2. Management Level: In accordance with Section VII, 8.5 (Project Governance), unresolved issues are escalated to the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which holds the final authority for "resolution of any issues that may arise during implementation."</li> <li>3. Formal Adjudication: If a dispute persists, the parties shall refer to GCC Clause 6.1.2, which states that the Adjudicator (appointed by the Lusaka International Arbitration Centre as per the PDS) "shall give a decision in writing within twenty-eight (28) days of receipt of a notification of a dispute."</li> </ol>
131.	<p>Question 25: What business criteria (not technical) are used to designate workflows as "key" for mobile/offline access? Please clarify the definition of "key workflows."</p>	<p>The purchaser clarifies that offline access references to Section VII on This speaks to key workflows within the e-Office solution that should be offline accessible. The proposer should demonstrate that certain functionality should be accessible offline within their solution.</p>
132.	<p>Question 26: Please provide the draft SLA framework (defect severity levels, response/resolution times) that will govern the 12-month warranty period. What constitutes a "warranty defect" versus a "change request" during the warranty period?</p>	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the specific Service Level Agreement (SLA) framework, including defect severity levels and response/resolution times, must be proposed by the Proposer as part of their Technical Proposal. This framework will be reviewed and finalized during contract negotiations.</p> <p>In accordance with GCC Clause 27 (Warranty) and Section VII (Technical Requirements), the distinction between a "warranty defect" and a "change request" is defined as follows:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Warranty Defect: Pursuant to GCC Clause 27.2, a warranty defect is any failure of the Information System to function in accordance with the Technical Requirements or Operational Acceptance criteria. This includes bugs, security vulnerabilities, or performance issues arising from the Proposer's design or implementation. These must be remediated by the Proposer at no additional cost to the Purchaser.</li> <li>▪ Change Request: A change request constitutes any modification, enhancement, or new functionality that falls outside the definitively agreed and signed-off Functional Specifications. As outlined in GCC Clause 39 (Changes to the Information System), these are subject to the formal Change Control Process and may involve additional costs if they represent a material expansion of the project scope.</li> </ul> <p>The Proposer is required to submit a Draft SLA and Maintenance Plan as part of their delivery methodology, which must explicitly categorize incident severity (e.g., Critical, Major, Minor) and define the associated escalation paths for the duration of the 24-month contract.</p>
133.	Question 27: What is the expected support model post-warranty? Will the vendor be expected to bid separately for ongoing support? Please clarify the long-term support expectations.	The Purchaser clarifies that the support model is strictly governed by the Implementation Schedule (Section VII) and the General Conditions of Contract (GCC). Pursuant to Section VII, 7.2 (22), the Proposer is responsible for "Post-Go-Live Support and Warranty" specifically from Month 16 to Month 24. This aligns with GCC Clause 27.1 (Warranty), which stipulates that "the Warranty Period shall commence from the date of Operational Acceptance of the System and shall extend for twelve (12) months." Regarding long-term expectations, the project is designed for sustainability through Section VII, 7.2 (23), which mandates "Training and Capacity Building" for 30 local developers and SZI staff to facilitate the transition of operational maintenance to the Government. Therefore, Proposers are not required to bid separately for ongoing support beyond the 24-month contract period within this RFP; any requirements following the expiration of the Warranty Period would be subject to a separate procurement or a future Service Level Agreement (SLA).
134.	Question 28: The PDS states the Adjudicator is "to be appointed by the Lusaka International Arbitration Centre (LIAC)." Please clarify the process for this appointment and how the Adjudicator's costs will be allocated between the parties.	The Purchaser clarifies that, pursuant to GCC Clause 6 and the Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), the Lusaka International Arbitration Centre (LIAC) serves as the Appointing Authority for the Adjudicator. In the event that the Purchaser and the successful Proposer fail to mutually agree on an Adjudicator within twenty-eight (28) days of the Contract's effective date, either party may formally request the LIAC to nominate a qualified expert from its panel. The LIAC will then conduct an independent appointment process based on the technical requirements of the contract. In alignment with standard World Bank procurement practices, the Adjudicator's remuneration, including hourly fees and reimbursable expenses, shall be shared equally (50/50) between the

		Purchaser and the successful Proposer. These costs are treated as administrative expenses for the resolution of potential disputes and are not dependent on the outcome of any specific adjudication. LIAC fees are posted on their website
135.	Question 29: The PDS (ITP 17.2) requires "separate enforceable contracts" for Recurrent Cost Items. Please clarify the intended parties to these contracts and the mechanism for their execution.	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the requirement for "separate enforceable contracts" for Recurrent Cost Items is a structural necessity to ensure long-term operational sustainability beyond the initial development phase.</p> <p>Pursuant to ITP 17.2 of the Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), which specifies that "separate enforceable contracts shall be entered into for the Recurrent Cost items," the intended parties to these contracts are the Purchaser (Smart Zambia Institute) and the successful Proposer (or their authorized local service partner). While the main contract covers the supply and installation of the system, these separate agreements specifically govern the post-warranty phase or specialized ongoing services such as cloud hosting, third-party licenses, or advanced technical support.</p> <p>The mechanism for execution is governed by GCC Clause 1.1 (a) (ii), which defines the "Contract" to include the various documents that form the agreement between the parties. In accordance with Section IV (Proposal Forms), specifically the Recurrent Cost Summary Table, the Proposer must detail all necessary ongoing costs. These figures serve as the basis for the separate maintenance or service level agreements (SLAs) that are finalized during the Contract Negotiation phase, as outlined in ITP 47.</p> <p><i>Requirements remain unchanged.</i></p>
136.	Question 30: For experience-based criteria in Section III (e.g., "processes over 1 million records"), what specific documentary evidence is required to substantiate the claim (e.g., system audit reports, signed client attestations, performance logs)?	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that to substantiate technical claims under Section III (Evaluation and Qualification Criteria), such as processing volumes exceeding 1 million records, Proposers must provide verifiable and objective evidence. Pursuant to ITP 34.2, the Purchaser reserves the right to "verify any information provided in the Proposal." To ensure compliance, the any of the following specific documentary evidence is permitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Signed Client Attestations: Formal Completion Certificates or reference letters from previous clients explicitly stating the system's scale and performance metrics.</li> <li>▪ System Audit or Performance Reports: Extracts from independent technical audits or system-generated performance logs that demonstrate high-volume transaction processing.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Technical Documentation: Screenshots of system dashboards or database schemas, provided they are accompanied by a Functional Design Document that provides context for the processing capability.</li> <li>▪ Contractual Proof: Relevant excerpts from previous contracts (redacted for confidentiality where necessary) that outline the scope and scale of the implemented solution.</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with ITP 41.1, the Purchaser will conduct a Post-Qualification review of the successful Proposer. Any claims that cannot be substantiated through the aforementioned documentation or during a physical or virtual "due diligence" demonstration may result in the rejection of the Proposal.</p>
137.	Question 31: For the requirement of "at least 10 governmental references," are signed reference letters from clients sufficient, or are evaluator contact details mandatory?	The Purchaser clarifies that, pursuant to Section III (Evaluation and Qualification Criteria) and the requirements of Section IV (Proposal Forms: Form EXP-1 and EXP-2), providing complete and accurate evaluator contact details (inclusive of name, designation, official email, and telephone number) is mandatory for all listed references. While signed reference letters from clients are strongly recommended as primary documentary evidence to substantiate the successful execution and quality of the projects, they do not substitute for the requirement of verifiable contact information. In accordance with ITP 34.2 (Examination of Proposals and Determination of Responsiveness), the Purchaser reserves the right to contact the provided references to independently verify the Proposer's claims and past performance. Failure to provide mandatory contact information for the minimum ten (10) governmental references may hinder the Purchaser's ability to complete the due diligence process and could result in the Proposal being determined non-responsive.
138.	Please confirm which Section III applies to this RFP and confirm that the alternative reference should be disregarded. (Applicable Evaluation Regime (Section III)Table of Contents; Section III)	<b>See item 5.</b>
139.	Please confirm whether the scope of digitisation is strictly limited to the 12 systems listed, or whether additional systems from MDAs may be introduced during contract execution.	<p>The Purchaser clarifies that the scope of development and implementation for this contract in relation to the twelve (12) MDA e-Service systems as defined in Section VII (Technical Requirements) is fixed.</p> <p>Pursuant to GCC Clause 39 (Changes to the Information System), the introduction of additional MDA systems not explicitly listed in the current scope would constitute a material contract variation. Because such additions would significantly alter the project's technical baseline,</p>

		resource allocation, and implementation schedule, they cannot be handled through the standard change control process alone.
140.	Recurrent Costs – Embedded vs Separate Contracts Section VII – Recurrent Cost Tables; ITP 17.2; PDS Please confirm whether: a) All recurrent costs are fully embedded in the Supply and Installation Price, orb) Proposers are required to submit separate enforceable contracts for any recurrent cost items.	<b>See item 21, 88, 135</b>
141.	ZamSign Duplication in System Inventory Section VII – System Inventory Tables. Please confirm whether this duplication represents: a) Distinct and separate scope items, orb) An editorial duplication to be treated as a single system upgrade.	Clarification regarding "ZamSign" Duplication Pursuant to the query regarding the duplication of "ZamSign" within the System Inventory Tables of Section VII, the Purchaser clarifies that this entry was an editorial duplication. ZamSign is to be treated as a single system upgrade within the scope of the contract. The Proposer is expected to deliver a single, unified upgrade to the national electronic signature infrastructure as part of the integrated GSB ecosystem.
142.	Please confirm which schedule attributes (other than total duration) are evaluated under Category IV. Schedule Evaluation vs “No Credit for Early Completion” Section III – Category IV; Time for Completion Clause	The Purchaser evaluates the schedule under Category IV based on the realism of milestone sequencing, critical path logic, and resource alignment as defined in Section III (Category IV) and ITP 34.4, noting that no additional credit is awarded for completion in less than the mandated 24 months.
143.	Please confirm that the use of different scoring scales across categories is intentional, and that no additional normalisation will be applied beyond the formulas stated in Section III. Mixed Technical Scoring Scales Section III – Scoring Matrices	<b>See item 5</b>
144.	Please confirm the acceptance testing and performance validation framework that will be applied during implementation and commissioning. Acceptance Testing & Performance Benchmarks ITP 39.9; Integration Responsibility Clauses	<b>See item 130 and 132</b>

145.	Please confirm whether the appointment of an adjudicator is mandatory or optional for this contract.	<b>See item 134</b>
146.	What is the architecture of Zambia Integrated Government Services (ZIGS)?	<b>See item 67</b>
147.	What is the technology stack of all the components under ZIGS?	<b>See item 67</b>
148.	Which low-code / no-code platform is currently being used?	The purchaser clarifies the current low-code/no-code platform is called dotGov Framework ( <a href="https://www.dotgovsolutions.net/framework.html">https://www.dotgovsolutions.net/framework.html</a> )
149.	What are the technical limitations for integration with ZIGS?	<b>See item 67</b>
150.	What is the architecture of GSB?	<b>See item 67</b>
151.	What is the technology stack of ZamPass	<b>See item 67</b>
152.	What is the technology stack of ZamConnect	<b>See item 67</b>
153.	What is the technology stack of ZamPay	<b>See item 67</b>
154.	What is the technology stack of ZamSign	<b>See item 67</b>
155.	Please provide us with the list of systems and corresponding list of services.	<b>See item 9</b>
156.	Is the current Zam portal support provided in either of the the local languages: Bemba or Nyanja? – Please clarify	The purchaser clarifies that citizen support is not expected to be provided as part of this project. Support to the purchaser and supported MDAs shall be provided in English.
157.	Please clarify whether the prioritization and selection of the minimum 12 high-value eservice systems will be conducted solely by the Contractor based on the defined evaluation criteria, or whether final selection and approval will be made by Smart Zambia Institute and/or respective MDAs. Section VII, Clause 7.4 – Scope of Work	The Purchaser will specify which 12 MDAs will be assigned.
158.	With reference to the approximately 176 services developed but not published on ZamPortal, please clarify whether the Contractor is expected to remediate,	<b>See item 54</b>

	upgrade, and publish all such services within the scope of this contract, or only to assess and report on their readiness and required remediation actions. Section VII, Clause 7.4.1 – Existing Services on ZIGS	
159.	Please clarify whether the 12 selected eservice systems must be equally distributed across different MDAs, or whether multiple systems may be selected from the same MDA based on impact and readiness. Section VII, Clause 7.4 – Selection of 12 E-Service Systems	The Purchaser will specify which 12 MDAs will be assigned.
160.	Please confirm whether the Contractor is required to exclusively use the existing GSB low-code platform for e-service. Section VII, Clause 7.4.3 – Low-Code Platform development, or whether the use of an alternative low-code/no-code platform supplied by the Contractor is permitted, subject to full interoperability with the GSB ecosystem.	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer may introduce their own low-code platform for e-Service development meeting the stated requirements.
161.	Please clarify whether the enhancement or replacement of ZamConnect is expected to be delivered as part of the same contract and timeline as the e-services implementation, or whether it may be delivered as a parallel or phased activity. Section VII, Clause 7.4.4 – ZamConnect	<b>See item 13</b>
162.	Please clarify whether the onboarding of all banks listed on the Bank of Zambia website (boz.zm) and the expansion of ZamPay to support G2P, G2B, refunds, and non-TSA	<b>See item 42, 40</b>

	revenue distribution are mandatory deliverables under this phase, or whether they are subject to phased implementation. Section VII, Clause 7.4 – ZamPay Enhancements	
163.	Please confirm whether the eOffice Digital Back-Office Suite is considered a core mandatory deliverable under this contract, or whether it may be proposed as an optional or phased component. Section VII, Clause 7.4.9 – eOffice Digital Back-Office Suite	The eOffice Digital Back-Office Suite is a core mandatory deliverable that must be fully implemented within the 24-month contract period as established in Section VII, Clause 7.4.9 and the System Inventory Tables, and cannot be treated as an optional or phased component.
164.	Please clarify whether the requirement of minimum 100 concurrent sessions per service applies individually to each eservice or collectively across the platform during performance testing. Section VII, Clause 7.4.6 – Testing and Quality Assurance	The purchaser clarifies that Section VII, Clause 7.4.6 of the RFP, states the requirement for performance testing using synthetic load testing tools is specified as a minimum of 100 concurrent sessions per service.
165.	Please clarify whether the requirement to train at least 30 local software developers refers to unique individuals over the full contract duration, and whether such training is expected to be delivered through formal classroom sessions, on-the-job training, or a combination of both. Section VII, Clause 7.4.7 – Knowledge Transfer	<b>See item 129</b>  The proposer should provide a training plan to meet the requirements set out. 30 individual developers should be trained which will be assigned by the purchaser.
166.	Please clarify whether the 12-month warranty period commences upon final acceptance of all services under the contract or individually upon acceptance of each batch of deployed services. Section VII, Clause 7.4.8 – Go-Live, Support and Warranty	<b>See item 133</b>

167.	Please clarify that one JV member has purchased the RFP. However, since it is not the Lead Partner, the Lead Partner also needs to purchase the RFP?	The purchaser clarifies that only one member of the JV needs to buy the RFP
168.	<p>Please clarify regarding the Post-Warranty Services mentioned in the RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RFP states that the Post-Warranty Services Period is 2 years following the completion of the Warranty Period.</li> <li>• It also mentions that these services “shall be provided for information purposes and shall be evaluated but shall not be part of this RFP.”</li> </ul> <p>Could you please confirm whether the Post-Warranty Services are intended for evaluation purposes only (e.g., for pricing, planning, or reference), or if any specific deliverables or obligations are expected from bidders during this period? GCC 1.1 (e) (xiii)</p>	<b>See item 133</b>
169.	<p>Please clarify regarding the IT infrastructure mentioned in the RFP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RFP states that “the vendor is not responsible for the physical supply of all compute, storage and network hardware required for the implementation of the project.”</li> </ul> <p>Could you please confirm that the Purchaser will be responsible for providing all required IT infrastructure, including third-party hardware, software and services, and will arrange it as needed, while</p>	<b>See item 49</b>

	the Vendor/Bidder will only provide IT Infrastructure Sizing required for deployment of the solution and for the operation of the project? Section VII, Clause 3.1 – Hardware Specifications	
170.	Please clarify the requirement for Cyber Security as we understand that the vendor is not providing any IT infrastructure, so we would like to confirm the scope of this requirement. ITP 11.2 (j)	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is responsible for the security of the software they develop. The security at the operating system/network level will be managed by the Purchaser.
171.	What are the applicable withholding tax rates in Zambia when making payments to a foreign company/international bidder?	As stated in the RFP foreign Suppliers are responsible for all taxes levied outside the Purchaser’s country, whereas the Purchaser handles local duties and taxes unless they are explicitly included in the Contract Price, with provisions for equitable price adjustments if prevailing tax rates change during the performance of the Contract. Any information regarding taxation can be found on the Zambia Revenue Authority website. <a href="https://www.zra.org.zm/">https://www.zra.org.zm/</a>
172.	Page 82 of the RFP begins with section 1.3.3, however sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 are missing from the document. Kindly provide the missing sections. Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria	The purchaser amends Section III, table 1.3 page 82: removing the “1.3.3” item numbering and replacing it to read “1.3.1” correcting the wrong numbering.
173.	What is the estimated volume of data (TB) and the number of records to be migrated from existing legacy systems? “Statement ‘Data migration of legacy correspondences and records’ Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements”	The purchaser clarifies that the amount of data is around 4TB for the existing e-Office solution.
174.	Is there a specific maximum number as well for the high-level e-service systems as minimum number is 12 for the selection. Section VII - 7.4 Scope of Work	The purchaser clarifies that the proposer is expected to develop 12 e-Service systems.
175.	Need clarity on, “To enhance or replace the national payment gateway, ZamPay” Is	The purchaser must propose an alternative if the route of replacement is chosen.

	there any alternative gateway? Section VII - 7.4 Scope of Work	
176.	Does the development team should provide a detailed report of the 176 developed but not deployed services Section VII - 7.4.1 Scope of Work	See item 54

### 179. POSITIONS/QUALIFICATIONS

It was noted that positions were listed in three places in the RFP, for clarity to all proposers the positions and qualifications have been merged into one table and redundant positions have been removed or merged.

**THIS TABLE REPLACES THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN THE RFP:**

- PAGE 62-64, ITEM 17.1 TO 17.8 (Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria - Resource Qualification),
- PAGE 175-176, ITEM 2.7.1.1 TO 2.7.1.10 (Section VII – Purchaser’s Requirements)
- PAGE 412-417, ITEM 1 TO 29 (10. Functional and Technical Compliance Matrix)

An updated scoring matrix for the positions has been included with the table, total score for CATEGORY V remains unchanged at 20% of total, as described on page 65 (TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF CATEGORIES & SCORING) of the RFP.

**AMMENDED SECTION TO READ:**

K-1 - Project manager		Scoring
1.	PM Education: must hold a minimum of a Master’s Degree (IT/Management) or equivalent	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
2.	PM Certification: must be: PMP or PRINCE2 certified	
3.	PM Experience: Minimum 8–10 years managing software projects	

4.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references. (Project Experience: At least 3 successfully delivered software development projects (on time and within budget))	
<b>K-2 - Technical Lead</b>		<b>Scoring</b>
5.	TL Education: Bachelor's Degree in Computer Science/Software Engineering	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
6.	TL Experience: 7+ years in software engineering, with 3+ years in .NET Core/ASP.NET	
7.	The team leader should lead a team of Software Engineers in the creation of high-quality software within agreed project deadlines.	
8.	TL must be responsible for allocating technical resources when needed.	
9.	TL must be responsible for making important technical decisions as he/she is the main technical reference on the project.	
10.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references. (Evidence: At least 2 large-scale .NET projects delivered successfully)	
<b>K-3 - Business Analyst</b>		
11.	BA Education: must hold a degree in Computer Science or equivalent	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
12.	BA Experience: 7+ years in the IT application and software fields and minimum 5 years of relevant experience as business analysis.	
13.	BA must be responsible for documenting collected requirements as part of the statement of work.	

14.	BA must be responsible for conducting frequent meetings for requirement gathering and responsible for business requirements analysis.	
15.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references.	
<b>K-4 - Software Engineer(s) (Full-stack)</b>		<b>Scoring</b>
16.	SE Education: Bachelor's Degree in Computer Science/Engineering	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
17.	SE Experience: 5+ years in full-stack development with .NET Core, ASP.NET MVC/Web API, Angular/React, and SQL Server	
18.	SE must be responsible for project implementation, testing and integration to meet the customer's needs.	
19.	SE must be responsible for customizing the various modules, based on the detailed project specifications.	
20.	SE must have extensive knowledge of programming concepts and design.	
21.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references.	
<b>K-5 - Quality Assurance Lead</b>		<b>Scoring</b>
22.	The QC must be responsible to develop test plans, test cases, test scripts and test reports, perform testing on various software, systems and reporting systems and validate that user expectations are achieved during the testing process.	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
23.	QC must hold a degree in Computer Science or equivalent with a minimum experience of 5+ years in the IT application and software fields with minimum 3 years of experience as Quality Control/Assurance Analyst or Tester rol.	

24.	QC must ensure that defects uncovered in the test are recorded, summarized and utilized in post project reviews in an effort to improve the development and test processes.	
25.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references.	
<b>K-6 – Front-end Developer/Graphic Designer</b>		<b>Scoring</b>
26.	The Graphic Designer must have extensive experience in Portal Concept, Themes, Graphics Design and Optimization, E-services, Newsletter, Forms, Reports, Ads, Advertising Banners, Graphical User Interfaces (GUI) Design and Implementation.	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
27.	The Graphic Designer must be responsible of designing the software interface with its different components.	
28.	The Graphic Designer must hold a bachelor degree in graphic design or equivalent with a minimum 5+ years of experience as graphic designer.	
29.	Project implementers must provide detailed CV highlighting past experience and key achievements in a similar environment with credible references.	
<b>K-7 – Database Expert</b>		
30.	Education: Bachelor’s Degree in Computer Science/IT	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
31.	Experience: 5+ years with RDBMS (MS SQL Server, Oracle, PostgreSQL)	
32.	Certifications: Microsoft SQL Server or equivalent certification	
33.	Evidence: At least 3 previous projects in database design/optimization	
<b>K-8 – Security Expert</b>		<b>Scoring</b>

34.	Education: Bachelor's Degree in IT/Security	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
35.	Experience: 5+ years in application and infrastructure security	
36.	Skills: OWASP, secure coding practices, penetration testing, Azure Security	
37.	Certifications: CISSP, CEH, or Microsoft Security certifications preferred	
<b>K-9 – Training Expert</b>		<b>Scoring</b>
38.	Certified Instructional Designer or professional trainer.	Fully Compliant = 3 Partial Compliant = 1 None-Compliant = 0
39.	5+ years in IT capacity building, curriculum design, and hands-on training delivery.	
<b>TOTAL SCORING CATEGORY V (Proposed Team Quality (Resource Qualification))</b>  <b>Category Weight: 20%</b>  <b>Max section points: 27</b>		<b>(PROPOSER SCORE / MAX SECTION POINTS) * 20 = <u>OVERAL SECTION SCORE</u></b>  <i>For example:</i>  <i>If proposer scores <u>24</u> points:</i>  <i><math>(24/27)*20= 17.78\%</math></i> <i>towards overall score in Category V.</i>

**ANNEX 1: IMPROVED CV FORMAT:**

---

**CURRICULUM VITAE (CV)**

<b>Position Title and No.</b>	
<b>Name of Expert:</b>	
<b>Date of Birth:</b>	
<b>Citizenship/Residence</b>	

**Education:**

<b>School, college and/or University Attended</b>	<b>Degree/certificate or other specialized education obtained</b>	<b>Date Obtained</b>

**Employment record relevant to the assignment:**

<b>Period</b>	<b>Employing organization and your title/position. Contact information for references</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Summary of activities performed relevant to the Assignment</b>

**Membership in Professional Associations and Publications:**

- ...

**Countries of Work Experience:**

- ...

**Language Skills (indicate only languages in which you can work):**

- ...

**Adequacy for the Assignment:**

<b>Detailed Tasks Assigned on Consultant's Team of Experts</b>	<b>Reference to Prior Work/Assignments that Best Illustrates Capability to Handle the Assigned Tasks</b>

**Expert's contact information:**

- e-mail: ...
- phone: ...

**Certification:** I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, this CV correctly describes myself, my qualifications, and my experience, and I am available, as and when necessary, to undertake the assignment in case of an award. I understand that any misstatement or misrepresentation described herein may lead to my disqualification or dismissal by the Client, and/or sanctions by the Bank.

.....

22 Jan 2026

---

Name of Expert	Signature	Date
----------------	-----------	------

.....

22 Jan 2026

---

Name of authorized Representative of the Consultant	Signature	Date
--	-----------	------