Republic of Zambia

Name of the client: Smart Zambia Institute (SZI)
Clarifications No. 04: Issue Date: February 17, 2026
Bid / Reference No. ZM-SZ-505117-GO-RFP
Name of the Request for Proposal (RFP): "System Integrator for Development, Deployment, Customization, and Integration of Foundational Digital ID, CRVS Core Modules Backend Infrastructure and Enrolment Kits"

Clarifications/ ADDENDUM NO. No 04

Purpose: The purpose of this to respond to requests for clarifications and Amendments made that have been received regarding the above-referenced Request for Proposals.

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

Sr No	Min. requirements and Clarifications	Response
1	Can the bidder propose the completed project which is currently not on support but completed successfully and handed over to customer.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 82, Point 1.4.2 Specific Experience. **Requirement remains unchanged.**
2	The requirement to have successfully completed a minimum of two (2) data center projects with primary site replication over disaster recovery (PR & DR) compute, storage, networking, backup, and security	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58, Point 3 **Requirement remains unchanged.**

	infrastructure within the last five (5) years. Each contract must have a minimum value of USD 5 million for supply, implementation, and support. The SI must submit documented evidence for these projects, including at least two (2) separate and fully signed contracts, along with recommendation letters for each. Can this be relaxed as the data center is a generic for any project and not necessarily for Identification system	
3	Can the bidder use the reference of the biometric deduplication process used for SIM card registration process. Can the ABIS manufacturer be as a supplier (not part of the JV) and can the supplier references be used?	Refer to Addendum 01, Point 97, where this clarification has been addressed.
4	The SDI must have implemented, integrated, and supported a database for a minimum of three years. The solution must have managed identity records for at least 30 million individuals as part of a national-scale Functional or Foundational Identity system. The experience must demonstrate capabilities in database configuration, high-volume data handling, and sustained operational support. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project. May this requirement be relaxed to allow broader participation by qualified bidders? The key consideration should be the bidder's proven experience in implementing and operating similar identity systems with all essential functional and technical capabilities. The size of the population managed should not be a determining evaluation criterion, provided the proposed solution is demonstrably scalable to national-	Refer to Addendum 01, Point 133, where this clarification has been addressed.

	level requirements."	
5	Participation as a prime supplier, management contractor, JV member, sub-contractor, in at least One (1) contract within the last seven Years (7) years, with a value of at least Fifteen Million United States Dollars (US $15,000,000), or two contracts each of Eight Million United States Dollars (US $8,000,000), that have been successfully and substantially completed and that are similar to the proposed project Request to relax this requirement to contracts within the last 15 Years	Refer to Addendum 01, Point 10, where this clarification has been addressed.
6	The biometric OEM should own the IP for all three 3 Core Biometric Technologies - Face, Finger and Iris. Can the bidder propose two different OEMs for the ABIS: Finger print and Facial IRIS	Refer to the tender document, Section VI – Fraud and Corruption, (B) Functional Architectural and Performance Requirements. The requirement is for a single OEM to provide all three modalities. **Requirement remains unchanged.**
7	The ABIS should have been fully complied with the MOSIP protocol and been deployed in at least 1 project of MOSIP. Clarifications: Only a few countries have deployed MOSIP platform and only 2 ABIS vendors can meet this requirement. Hence, we request to relax this criteria	Refer to Addendum 01, Annex A, where this clarification has been addressed.
8	Requirement: Not more than 3 JV Members. As the requirements and qualification/eligibility criteria are too many, Can this requirement be relaxed to allow more number of JV members to meet the eligibility criteria?	Refer to the tender document, Section II – Proposal Data Sheet (PDS), Page 44, **ITP 4.1** **Requirement remains unchanged.**
9	Kindly clarify what exactly meaning of Contract withing last 7 years. Can the bidder provide a reference	Refer to **Addendum 1**, Point 13 where this clarification has been addressed.

	of the project prior to December 2018 but completed within last 7 years i.e., completed after December 2018? Request to relax this requirement to contracts within the last 15 Years (15) (December 2010) years	
10	ABIS Requirements, GPU support for faster template extraction. We do not have such a GPU support, as this is not standard and also not necessary on our side. We offer fast and efficient template extraction even without the need of a GPU, which is also much more cost-effective as we utilize standard off-the-shelf CPUs. Some vendors may support it, but this is not standard and usually it is the opposite that the end user mandates that GPUs must not be required by the vendor, as it incurs higher HW costs for the end user. Therefore, is this a mandatory requirement to support GPUs?	Refer to **Addendum 1**, **Annex A**, where this clarification has been addressed.
11	ABIS Requirements. Dynamic nodes scaling during operations without the system being down, we can add nodes but it usually does require at least some minimum downtime, which stems from the architecture of the ABIS whereby it needs to re-balance itself after the change of the number of nodes to secure High Availability and no single point of failure. But such node changes usually happen once every few years, are planned well ahead, and done as part of a wider maintenance of the system where a short downtime is expected and planned for. Is this acceptable?	Refer to **Addendum 1**, **Annex A**, where this clarification has been addressed.

12	ABIS Requirements. IREX Search Speed, we do not meet this specific requirement, but suspect it may actually be an error in the document since we belong to the TOP Tier vendors in the IREX test, including the speed. Such a requirement would then be rather detrimental to the end user significantly limiting their choice, while any of the TOP vendors would still provide an algorithm more than sufficient for any size of the project, including many times larger than this one. Is this search speed mandatory?	Refer to **Addendum 1**, Annex A, where this clarification has been addressed.
13	Bid Submission Deadline, Request to extend the submission deadline.	Pursuant to ITP 8 (Amendment of Request for Proposals Document), the Purchaser hereby notifies all Proposers of the following modifications to the procurement schedule and submission requirements: Amendment of Proposal Deadlines and Submission Mode 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: • *"**New Submission Deadline: February 27, 2026, at 10:00 hours CAT."*** • *"**New Proposal Opening Time: February 27, 2026, at 10:00 hours CAT**. The location for submission and opening remains unchanged as specified in the original PDS"* 2. 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. **3. For any additional requests for clarifications ahead of the new submission deadline above, please refer to Addenda No. 1, 2, 3, and 4.**
14	For the cryptographic system, kindly advise the exact use cases for all the clients.	In a modern National ID deployment, the Hardware Security Module (HSM) has a critical role in securing the entire identity lifecycle and ensuring the highest level of protection for

	And for our encryption platform, we need the exact use case for all connectors (i.e. Brand, Model of the Storages).	sensitive personal data stored within the eco-system. The HSM is responsible for the secure generation and storage of Master Encryption Keys (MEKs), protection of Root Certificate Authority (Root CA) private keys, and the establishment of a trusted national identity cryptographic hierarchy. By introducing HSM-based key management, all critical cryptographic keys remain within the hardware security boundary and are never exposed in plaintext, thereby preventing extraction or misuse even by privileged system administrators. The deployment of HSMs provides FIPS-compliant cryptographic assurance and enforces strong controls over key lifecycle management, including generation, rotation, and revocation. Importantly HSM enables secure encryption of stored biometric and demographic data, ensuring confidentiality at rest, and supports digital signing of identity transactions to guarantee integrity, prevent tampering, and enforce non-repudiation. which establishes trusted communication between system components and reinforces a secure, hardware-rooted trust framework for a national-scale identity ecosystem.
15	Detailed Evaluation Criteria: Could you please confirm that bidders are expected to provide access to their own infrastructure in which the MOSIP sandbox is deployed? In other words, please confirm that SZI will not provide the infrastructure for this demonstration.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. Bidders are required to deploy and provide access to their own infrastructure for deployment of the sandbox demonstration for the proposed ID solution developed on open standards. The Purchaser will not provide infrastructure for this purpose during the demonstration. The SI must deploy the sandbox environment within the Purchaser's country and provide verifiable proof of in-country deployment, including public IP details, security configurations, backend hardware infrastructure specifications, solution management details, and demonstration of all required core modules. As part of validating the proposed project schedules, the Purchaser will utilize this sandbox deployment to assess the Bidder's technical readiness, implementation capability, infrastructure preparedness, and overall understanding of the proposed solution.
15	Detailed Evaluation Criteria: The SDI should share specific information with the evaluation committee. The information to be shared includes VPN (Virtual Private Network) access to on-prem infrastructure, hardware	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. The bidder is required to provide the necessary detailed information and access mechanisms to purchaser for sandbox deployment until evaluation processes are complete.

	management, and software management portals" Please confirm that it is sufficient for the bidder to provide access to all components and functionalities of its on-premises deployment through the bidder's own workstations, which will be made available to SZI during the demonstration. This arrangement is proposed in order to comply with the strict security requirements applicable to this type of system.	The bidder shall share comprehensive deployment details and ensure that the system can be evaluated at any time during the evaluation process.
16	Could you please indicate the date at which the bidder will be requested to demonstrate the sandbox?	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. The demonstration details will be communicated during the evaluation process. The purchaser shall allow a period of seven (7) days for the bidder to prepare and present the sandbox demonstration once formally notified
18	Detailed Evaluation Criteria: The SDI's Prime/ Any of the member in the JV Contractor Should be compliant to Open-Source Identity Platforms such as a MOSIP Accredited Technical and Commercial SI-Partner. The SI's Prime Contractor must have a minimum of three (3) years of experience working in partnership with Open Source Identity Platforms at the time of submitting their response to this document.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. Due to the scale, complexity, and national criticality of the project, the purchaser requires that the System Development Implementer (SDI) Prime Contractor itself meet the open-source identity platform qualification criteria. The Prime Contractor bears full architectural, technical, and contractual responsibility for the successful design, customization, integration, security, and long-term sustainability of the solution. Given that the SDI's experience and direct involvement will play a central role throughout implementation, this requirement cannot be satisfied solely by another JV member or partner. Accordingly, the SDI Prime contractor must be compliant with open-source identity platforms and Commercial SI-Partner or equivalent) and must demonstrate a minimum of three (3) years of relevant experience at the time of submission.
19	The SI, or in the case of a Joint Venture Agreement (JVA), must have successfully completed a minimum of One (1) data center project with primary site replication over disaster recovery (PR & DR) compute, storage, networking, backup, and security infrastructure within the last five (5) years. Each contract must have a minimum value of USD 5 million for supply,	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58, Point 3 . **The requirement remains unchanged.**

	implementation, and support. The SI must submit documented evidence for these projects, including at least two (2) separate and fully signed contracts, along with recommendation letters for each.	
20	The SDI must demonstrate, through a proven track record, the successful delivery of comprehensive IT infrastructure solutions, comprising data center projects with primary and disaster recovery (PR & DR) replication. This should include compute, storage, networking, backup systems, surveillance, access control, and power infrastructure. These projects must have been undertaken within the last five (5) years for national, population-scale identity programs (Foundational or Functional), preferably. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. **The requirement remains unchanged.**
21	The SI must have experience in supplying, installing, and maintaining Hardware Security Module (HSM) systems for at least two projects. The Bidder must provide copies of the award contract and the completion certificate for each relevant project.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58. Point 6 **The requirement remains unchanged.**
22	The SDI must demonstrate, through a proven track record, experience in delivering citizen biometric enrollment kits, including 442 fingerprint scanners, facial cameras, signature pads, and other relevant equipment—for at least one (1) population-scale identity projects, preferably within the Sub-Saharan Africa region. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58. Point 8 **The requirement remains unchanged.**

23	The SDI must have successfully delivered at least one deduplication project involving a minimum of 25 million records. This experience should include large-scale deduplication and identity resolution for national or electoral databases. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58. Point 10 **The requirement remains unchanged.**
24	The SDI must have executed a minimum of two contracts for the supply, implementation, and support of secure physical/ demographic identity personalization systems. These projects must have been for national-level Functional or Foundational Identity programs and must have supported large-scale personalization and issuance of secure identity credentials. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project.	Refer to the tender document, **Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 58. Point 4** **The requirement remains unchanged.**
25	The SDI must have at least five (5) years of experience providing technical operations like deployment infrastructure monitoring under a Managed Services model. This support must include Level 1 services for national population-scale identity systems. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project.	Refer to the tender document, Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, Page 57. Point 1 **The requirement remains unchanged.**
26	Considering the three (3) Clarifications/Amendments issued so far and the various revisions made across multiple sections of the document, we kindly request you to confirm that the revised Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria reflect the final and consolidated requirements that will be applied during bid evaluation.	In accordance with ITP 8.1 the Purchaser hereby amends part of the RFP under ***SECTION III - EVALUATION AND QUALIFICATION CRITERIA***, The part being replaced is all the contents under **"2. Technical Evaluation Criteria"** starting from page 55 of the RFP bidding document, specifically the sections Indicated in Annex 1 as "TO BE REPLACED".

		The new contents of the replacement under **"2. Technical Evaluation Criteria of SECTION III - EVALUATION AND QUALIFICATION CRITERIA has been shared as Annex 2. The content for the new part is all in *Italics***

Percy Chinyama
National Coordinator
SMART ZAMBIA INSTITUTE, E-GOVERNMENT DIVISION

Annex 1: REVISED SECTION III – EVALUATION AND QUALIFICATION CRITERIA

[This part of the RFP which has been reproduced below is being replaced with corresponding revised content under Annex 2 with all wording provided in *Italics*]

PART BEING REPLACED:

---

2. Technical Evaluation

2.1 Assessment of adequacy of Technical Proposal with Requirements in accordance with ITP 32.1 and specified in Section IV, (B) Functional, Architectural and Performance Requirements

2.2 Technical Evaluation (ITP 32.2)

The technical features to be evaluated are generally defined below and specifically identified in the PDS:

(i) to which extent that the performance, capacity, or functionality features meet or exceed the levels specified in the performance / functional requirements and/or influence the life-cycle cost and effectiveness of the Information System;

(ii) usability features, such as ease of use, ease of administration, or ease of expansion, which influence the life-cycle cost and effectiveness of the Information System;

(iii) quality of the Proposer's Preliminary Project Plan as evidenced by the thoroughness, reasonableness, and responsiveness of: (a) the task and resource schedules, both general and specific, and (b) the proposed arrangements for management and coordination, training, quality assurance, technical support, logistics, problem resolution, and transfer of knowledge, and other such activities as specified by the Purchaser or proposed by the Proposer based on the Proposer's experience;

(iv) Any sustainable procurement requirement if specified in Section VII- Requirements of the Information System.

The total technical points assigned to each Proposal in the Evaluated Proposal Formula will be determined by adding and weighting the scores assigned by an evaluation committee to technical features of the Proposal **in accordance with the PDS** and the scoring methodology below.

Technical 60% and 40% Cost

Evaluation Criteria
Proposals which do not satisfy all Mandatory requirements will be excluded from further consideration. Technical scoring below will apply to desirable features and sub-features as listed in the tables for each category below

Scoring Approach – Categories I to III

Each sub-feature under **Category I** (Effectiveness in Meeting Digital ID Requirements),

Category II (Maintenance & Support), and **Category III** (Change Management, Training & Documentation) is scored using a 5/3/1/0 scale:

Score	Meaning
5	Fully Compliant - Feature present and meets all requirements with Clear Evidence
3	Partially Compliant - Partially meets requirements or has gaps/limited. Clear Evidence
1	Minimally Compliant - Meets the requirement only at a basic level or with major gaps.
0	Non-Compliant - Feature absent or no supporting evidence provided.

Normalization: Each score is divided by 5 and converted to a percentage to reflect proportional compliance. The normalized score is then multiplied by the feature weight (% of total) and summed within the category to get the Category Technical Score.

Scoring Approach – Category IV (Delivery Methodology & Schedule)
Category IV uses a 0–4 scale to allow differentiation between acceptable and exceptional delivery approaches:

Score	Meaning
0	Missing or inadequate methodology/schedule.
1-2	Adequate methodology meets basic requirements but lacks detail.
3	Clear and robust methodology marginally exceeds requirements.
4	Comprehensive, detailed methodology and schedule with strong risk management and value addition.

Normalization: Divide the score by 4 and convert to a percentage, then multiply by weight (7.5% for each sub-feature) to calculate its contribution.

Scoring Approach – Category V (Proposed Team Quality)
Category V uses a 0–3 scale per key resource:

Score	Meaning
0	Team members do not meet requirements is missing.
1	Meets the minimum requirement (education, certifications, experience).
2	Exceeds required experience up to ~50% more years or brings extra relevant skills.
3	Significantly exceeds requirements (e.g., double experience years, exceptional domain expertise).

Normalization: Divide by 3 and convert to a percentage, then multiply by the role weight to compute its contribution to the category total.

Combining Category Scores:

Finally, the Category Technical Scores are combined using the category weights to
Calculate the Total Technical Score (out of 100%):

Total Score = (C.I × 50%) + (C.II × 30%) + (C.III × 5%) + (C.IV × 5%) + (C.V × 5%) + (CVI × 5%), where C represents Category

Technical 60% and 40% Cost

MAPPING OF EVALUATION CRITERIA TO RATED CRITERIA

Rated Criteria Category	Weight	Linked Evaluation Criteria	Key Focus / Description
I. Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements	40%	1–12,15,17,18	Evaluates the bidder's demonstrated ability to meet core technical and functional requirements, including biometric systems, MOSIP integration, data center readiness, ABIS, HSM, SDK integration, biometric kits, and sandbox demonstration. Focuses on proven experience, production- grade delivery, and readiness to implement the Digital ID solution.
II. Maintenance and Support	20%	13, 21.1	Assesses the bidder's experience in providing lifecycle support, managed services, helpdesk, and SLA-driven technical operations for national-scale systems. Focuses on the bidder's capacity to maintain, monitor, and sustain the system post-deployment.
III. Change Management, Training & Documentation	5%	14, 20, 21.2 *(knowledge transfer and documentation aspects)*	Reviews the bidder's approach to institutional capacity building, documentation, and change management. Covers transparency in sandbox setup documentation (14), comprehensive training and mentoring plans (20), and joint knowledge transfer and collaborative development practices (21).
IV. Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule	15%	16, 21.3 *(implementation methodology aspects)*	Evaluates the implementation plan, sequencing, rollout strategy, and risk management. Assesses the practicality and feasibility of the proposed project schedule, adherence to timelines, and coordination with SZI and MoHAIS during rollout and testing.
V. Proposed Team Quality	20%	19	Evaluates the qualifications, certifications, and experience of key personnel (Project Manager, Technical Lead, Developers, Security, Network, Database, ABIS, and Legal Experts). Ensures the proposed team possesses the technical and management expertise to deliver the project.

Table 1: Summary of Categories and Scoring

Category	C.No	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Purpose	Category Total
I. Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements	1-12, 15,17,18	40%	(5/3/1/0 ÷5) × 100	Assesses ability to meet DID technical requirements: ABIS, MOSIP, DC, SDK, HSM, kits, sandbox	40%
II. Maintenance & Support	13, 21.1	20%	(5/3/1/0 ÷ 5) × 100	Evaluates operational support, SLAs, managed services readiness	20%
III. Change Management Training & Documentation	14, 20, 21.2	5%	(5/3/1/0 ÷ 5) × 100	Evaluatescapacitybuilding,mentoring,documentation clarity	5%
IV. Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule	16, 21.3	15%	(Score ÷ 4) × 100	Quality of implementation plan, rollout, sequencing, risk control	15%
V. Proposed Team Quality (Resource Qualification)	19	20%	(Score ÷ 3) × 100	Evaluates qualifications and experience of key personnel	20%

Category I – Effectiveness in Meeting Requirements (40%)

Evaluates the bidder's ability to deliver a national-scale, production-grade Digital Identity ecosystem including MOSIP, ABIS, PR/DR datacenter, biometric devices, SDK integration, enrollment kits, and sandbox readiness.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
1	National-scale biometric ID system with ABIS + PR/DR	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must demonstrate national- scale ABIS with PR/DR deployment; include evidence of dedupe throughput, uptime, and architecture.

2	MOSIP accredited SI partner ≥3 years	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must be listed on MOSIP partner registry; show ≥3 years of MOSIP or other Open Source Identity Platform experience and successful implementations.
3	Two PR/DR DC projects ≥ USD 5M	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evidence required of complete PR/DR integration (infrastructure + application + security); not just equipment supply.
4	Biometric SDK + manual adjudication experience	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must include face, fingerprint, iris SDK integration AND adjudication workflows used in national ID programs.
5	National identity data center experience	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Experience must include secure hosting, HA, application clustering, and monitoring for foundational ID systems.
6	HSM supply, deployment & maintenance	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Requires ≥2 national deployments; must include PKI integration and key management procedures.
7	Device SDK integration experience (fingerprint, iris, face)	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Demonstrate integration with certified devices (IEC/ISO/ICAO), including drivers, firmware, and APIs.
8	Biometric enrollment kits for national-scale projects	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must include evidence of field deployment and compliance with ISO biometric capture standards.
9	Mobile enrollment kit deployment	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Provide examples of mobile/portabl kits deployed nationally, including battery-backed or field-grade kits
10	Biometric deduplication ≥ 25 million records	3%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evidence must include throughput benchmarks, FNIR/FPIR performance, and scaling capability.
11	Secure physical personalization systems	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Includes card, credential, or document personalization with full chain of custody and QC processes.

12	Database for ≥ 30 million identity records	4%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must demonstrate performance at national scale (replication, high availability, disaster recovery).
15	Sandbox demo within 7 days: Pre-reg, Enrollment, Issuance	4%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must show functional workflow; static demos or simulations score lower.
17	Customization & alignment to DID requirements	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evaluate modular design, localization capacity, integration flexibility, and compliance with DID specs.
18	On-prem sandbox access (VPN, rights, logs)	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must provide real access with logs, configuration files, workflows; remote- only demos score lower.

Category II – Maintenance & Support (20%)

Evaluates SLA-based support, helpdesk, PR/DR readiness, and operational maturity.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
13	Managed services support	10%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evaluate SI's capability to provide L1–L3 support; must include 24/7 helpdesk, escalation matrix, onsite/offsite support, SLA compliance, monitoring tools (SIEM/ITSM), service quality reports, and incident management processes. Evidence of ≥5 years of managed services on national systems is required.
21.1	Operational Support & Joint Operations with SZI and MoHAIS	10%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	SI technical staff must be fully accessible to SZI & MoHAIS. All activities must be performed jointly with SZI & MoHAIS: installation, configuration, troubleshooting, tuning, deployment, mapping, merging, integration of ABIS (face, fingerprint, iris), ensuring biometric data integrity, compliance with ICAO & ISO/IEC 19785. Higher scores require detailed joint-operations procedures, workflow clarity, and structured collaboration plans.

Category III – Change Management, Training & Documentation (5%)

Evaluates clarity of documentation, quality of training, and capacity building measures.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
14	Sandbox documentation & transparency	1.5%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Documentation must clearly describe sandbox architecture, deployment steps, access control, APIs, logs, user flows, and alignment with MOSIP configuration.
20	Training, capacity building, mentoring	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evaluate ToT, structured curricula hands-on sessions, operational training for Open Source Identity Platforms such as MOSIP/ABIS/SDK components, and SZI and MoHAIS capacity uplift plan.
21.2	Knowledge Transfer, Joint Development & Code Governance	1.5%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Must demonstrate GitHub-based joint development, SZI and MoHAIS oversight, code review/approval process, joint customization workflow, and confirmation that all code belongs to MoHAIS

Category IV – Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule (15%)

Evaluates feasibility, sequencing, methodology, risk management, and milestone planning

C.No	Criterion	Weight (% of Total)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
16	Implementation methodology & risk management plan	7.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	Must show detailed implementation methodology for Open Source Identity Platform such as MOSIP integration, ABIS alignment, SDK integration, PR/DR rollout, testing, risk management, work sequencing, and acceptance gates.

21.3	Implementation Execution & Integration Workflow	7.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	Must describe step-by-step execution: mapping/merging biometrics, configuring MOSIP modules, ABIS integration steps, field deployment plan, migration of old and new data, system cut-over plan or other Open Source Identity Platform modules.

Category V – Proposed Team Quality (20%)
Evaluates qualifications, certifications, and experience of all required personnel.

Role	Description	Weight (%)	Scoring (0–3)	Guidance Notes
Project Manager	PMP/PRINCE2, ≥10 years on large national IT/ID projects	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must show experience with national digital ID, Open Source Identity Platform, ABIS, large-scale government ICT projects.
Technical Lead	MOSIP/ABIS/SDK/Integration Specialist	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must have MOSIP experience + ABIS integration + SDK integration + PR/DR expertise or other Open-Source Identity Platform.
Full Stack Lead	Java/J2EE, Spring, Angular, microservices	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Experience with MOSIP codebase preferred or other Open-Source Identity Platform.
Developers (4)	Full-stack, frontend, backend, DevOps	4%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must demonstrate experience with MOSIP modules, containerization, CI/CD, and API integrations or other Open Source Identity Platform.

Database Expert	Postgres/Oracle DB admin for ≥30M records	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must show experience with high-availability clusters, replication, and tuning for identity systems.
Data Architect	ABIS/MOSIP data models & mapping	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must understand demographic + biometric schemas, mapping/merging, and CBEFF structures.
Security Expert	HSM, PKI, IAM, MOSIP security	2%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must show hands- on PKI, HSM integration, ISO/IEC 19792/19785 compliance.
Network & Infra Expert	PR/DR, virtualization, networking	1%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Experience with identity infrastructure, load balancing, VPN, firewalls, routing, K8s.
Business Analyst	Requirements gathering, MOSIP workflows	1%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must show experience mapping registration → ABIS → issuance processes.
ABIS Specialist	Deduplication, biometrics, matching	1%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Hands-on experience configuring thresholds, FNIR/FPIR tuning, ABIS performance optimization.
Legal Advisor	Digital ID law & data protection	1%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Must understand DPI, identity legislation, data privacy, foundational ID frameworks.

Minimum Qualifying Technical Score: Bidders must score a **minimum of 70%** to qualify for financial evaluation.

■ END OF SECTION TO BE REPLACED --

Annex 2: REVISED SECTION III – EVALUATION AND QUALIFICATION CRITERIA.

[This Annex 2 part of the RFP is the Revised Section III – "Evaluation and Qualification Criteria". It replaces Contents of the RFP in the aforementioned Section which has also been reproduced above as Annex 1. The wording or contents of the entire new replacement of Section III under this Annex 2 is provided in *Italics*]

The section below presents Section III – Evaluation and Qualification Criteria, ***as revised pursuant to Addenda 1, 2, and 3.***

---

2. Technical Evaluation

2.1 Assessment of adequacy of Technical Proposal with Requirements in accordance with ITP 32.1 and specified in Section IV, (B) Functional, Architectural and Performance Requirements

2.2 Technical Evaluation (ITP 32.2)

The technical features to be evaluated are generally defined below and specifically identified in the PDS:

(i) to which extent that the performance, capacity, or functionality features meet or exceed the levels specified in the performance / functional requirements and/or influence the life-cycle cost and effectiveness of the Information System;

(ii) usability features, such as ease of use, ease of administration, or ease of expansion, which influence the life-cycle cost and effectiveness of the Information System;

(iii) quality of the Proposer's Preliminary Project Plan as evidenced by the thoroughness, reasonableness, and responsiveness of: (a) the task and resource schedules, both general and specific, and (b) the proposed arrangements for management and coordination, training, quality assurance, technical support, logistics, problem resolution, and transfer of knowledge, and other such activities as specified by the Purchaser or proposed by the Proposer based on the Proposer's experience;

(iv) Any sustainable procurement requirement if specified in Section VII- Requirements of the Information System.

The total technical points assigned to each Proposal in the Evaluated Proposal Formula will be determined by adding and weighting the scores assigned by an evaluation committee to technical features of the Proposal ***in accordance with the PDS*** *and the scoring methodology below.*

Technical 60% and 40% Cost

Evaluation Criteria

Proposals which do not satisfy all Mandatory requirements will be excluded from further consideration. Technical scoring below will apply to desirable features and sub-features as listed in the tables for each category below

Scoring Approach – Categories I

Each sub-feature under Category I (Technical and Functional Requirement) is scored using a 3/1/0 scale.

Score	*Meaning*
3	*Fully Compliant - Feature present and meets all requirements.*
1	*Partially Compliant - Partially meets requirements or has gaps/limited.*
0	*Non-Compliant - Feature absent or no supporting evidence provided.*

Scoring Approach – Categories II

Each sub-feature under Category II Effectiveness in Meeting Evaluation and Qualification Requirements) is scored using a 5/3/1/0 scale:

Score	*Meaning*
5	*Fully Compliant - Feature present and meets all requirements with Clear Evidence*
3	*Partially Compliant - Partially meets requirements or has gaps/limited. Clear Evidence*
1	*Minimally Compliant - Meets the requirement only at a basic level or with major gaps.*
0	*Non-Compliant - Feature absent or no supporting evidence provided.*

Scoring Approach – Categories III and IV

Each sub-feature under Category III (Maintenance & Support), Category VI (Change Management, Training & Documentation), *is scored using a 5/3/1/0 scale:*

Score	*Meaning*
5	*Fully Compliant - Feature present and meets all requirements.*

3	*Partially Compliant - Partially meets requirements or has gaps/limited.*
1	*Minimally Compliant - Meets the requirement only at a basic level or with major gaps.*
0	*Non-Compliant – Feature absent or no supporting evidence provided.*

Normalization: *Each score is divided by 5 and converted to a percentage to reflect proportional compliance. The normalized score is then multiplied by the feature weight (% of total) and summed within the category to get the Category Technical Score.*

Scoring Approach – Category V (Delivery Methodology & Schedule)

Category IV uses a 0–4 scale to allow differentiation between acceptable and exceptional delivery approaches:

Score	*Meaning*
0	*Missing or inadequate methodology/schedule.*
1	*Adequate methodology meets basic requirements but lacks detail.*
3	*Clear and robust methodology marginally exceeds requirements.*
4	*Comprehensive, detailed methodology and schedule with strong risk management and value addition.*

Normalization: *Divide the score by 4 and convert to a percentage, then multiply by weight (7.5% for each sub-feature) to calculate its contribution.*

Scoring Approach – Category VI (Proposed Team Quality)

Category VI uses a 0–3 scale per key resource:

Score	*Meaning*
0	*Team members do not meet requirements is missing..*
1	*Meets the minimum requirement without evidence documents.*
3	*Meets the minimum requirement (education, certifications, experience).*

Normalization: *Divide by 3 and convert to a percentage, then multiply by the role weight to compute its contribution to the category total.*

Combining Category Scores:

Finally, the Category Technical Scores are combined using the category weights to
Calculate the Total Technical Score (out of 100%):

Total Score = (C.I × 50%) + (C.II × 30%) + (C.III × 5%) + (C.IV × 5%) + (C.V × 5%) + (CVI × 5%), where C represents Category

MAPPING OF EVALUATION CRITERIA TO RATED CRITERIA

Rated Criteria	*Weight*	*Key Focus / Description*
I.Technical and Functional Requirements	*50%*	*Technical and Functional Requirement of National ID System, Civil Registry, ABIS, Enrollment Kit, HSM, IT Infrastructure.*
II. Effectiveness in Meeting Evaluation and Qualification Requirements	*30%*	*Evaluates the bidder's demonstrated ability to meet core technical and functional requirements, including biometric systems, INRIS Solution, data center readiness, ABIS, HSM, SDK integration, biometric kits, and sandbox demonstration. Focuses on proven experience, production-grade delivery, and readiness to implement the Digital ID solution.*
III. Maintenance and Support	*5%*	*Assesses the bidder's experience in providing lifecycle support, managed services, helpdesk, and SLA-driven technical operations for national-scale systems. Focuses on the bidder's capacity to maintain, monitor, and sustain the system post-deployment.*
IV. Change Management, Training & Documentation	*5%*	*Reviews the bidder's approach to institutional capacity building, documentation, and change management. Comprehensive training and mentoring plans and joint knowledge transfer and collaborative development practices.*
V. Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule	*5%*	*Evaluates the implementation plan, sequencing, rollout strategy, and risk management. Assesses the practicality and feasibility of the proposed project schedule, adherence to timelines, and coordination with SZI and MoHAIS during rollout and testing.*
VI. Proposed Team Quality	*5%*	*Evaluates the qualifications, certifications, and experience of key personnel (Project Manager, Technical Lead, Developers, Security, Network, Database, ABIS, and Legal Experts). Ensures the proposed team possesses the technical and management expertise to deliver the project.*

Table 1: Summary of Categories and Scoring

Category	*Weight (%)*	*Scoring Method*	*Purpose*	*Category Total*
I.Technical and Functional Requirements	*50%*	*(3/1/0 ÷5) × 100*	*Technical and Functional Requirement of National ID System, Civil Registry, ABIS, Enrollment Kit, HSM, IT Infrastructure*	*50%*
II. Effectiveness in Meeting Evaluation and Qualification Requirements	*30%*	*(5/3/1/0 ÷5) × 100*	*Assesses ability to meet NID technical requirements: ABIS, INRIS Solution, DC, SDK, HSM, kits, sandbox*	*30%*
III. Maintenance and Support	*5%*	*(5/3/1/0 ÷ 5) × 100*	*Evaluates operational support, SLAs, managed services readiness*	*5%*
IV. Change Management, Training & Documentation	*5%*	*(5/3/1/0 ÷ 5) × 100*	*Evaluates capacity building, mentoring, documentation clarity*	*5%*
V. Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule	*5%*	*(Score ÷ 4) × 100*	*Quality of implementation plan, rollout, sequencing, risk control*	*5%*
VI. Proposed Team Quality	*5%*	*(Score ÷ 3) x 100*	*Evaluates of key personnel*	*5%*

Category I – Technical and Functional Requirement (50%)

C.No	*Criterion*	*Weight(%)*	*Scoring Methods*	*Guidance Notes*
1	*Technical and Functional Requirement*	*50%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*As per the Purchaser's Technical and Functional Requirement of National ID System, Civil Registry, ABIS, Enrollment Kit, HSM, IT Infrastructure requirements.*

Category II – Effectiveness in Meeting Evaluation and Qualification Requirements (30%)

Evaluates the bidder's ability to deliver a national-scale, production-grade Digital Identity ecosystem including ABIS, PR/DR datacenter, biometric devices, SDK integration, enrollment kits, and sandbox readiness.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
1	National-scale biometric ID system with ABIS + PR/DR	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	This solution must include the integration of an Automated Biometric Identification System (ABIS), along with its associated biometric enrollment kits, primary and disaster recovery (PR & DR) compute, storage, networking, backup, and security infrastructure, to host and process biometric deduplication across a multi-site network. There must be demonstrable proof that the system is maintained with ongoing operational support.
2	Two PR/DR DC projects ≥ USD 5M	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	The SI, or in the case of a Joint Venture Agreement (JVA), must have successfully completed a minimum of two (2) data center projects with primary site replication over disaster recovery (PR & DR) compute, storage, networking, backup, and security infrastructure within the last five (5) years. Each contract must have a minimum value of USD 5 million for supply, implementation, and support
3	Biometric SDK + manual adjudication experience	1%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	The SI should demonstrate that have successfully implemented at least one solution that involves both automated biometric software development kits (SDK) and manual adjudication in Sub-Saharan Africa region
4	Previous Implementation of Open Source ID System in Africa	2%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	The proposed solution shall be fully open source and compliant with open standards and must have been successfully implemented in at least three (3) countries within Africa. The Purchaser reserves the right to verify the implementation references and confirm source code ownership and usage rights directly with the respective countries.
5	HSM Experience	1%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	The SI must have experience in supplying, installing, and maintaining Hardware Security Module (HSM) systems for at least two projects within the Sub-Saharan Africa region.

6	*Database for ≥ 30 million identity records*	*1%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The SI must have implemented, integrated, and supported a database for a minimum of three years. The solution must have managed identity records for at least 30 million individuals as part of a national-scale Functional or Foundational Identity system. The experience must demonstrate capabilities in database configuration, high-volume data handling, and sustained operational support. The Bidder must enclose copies of the award contract and completion certificate for each relevant project.*
7	*Hardware Experience*	*3%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The SI must demonstrate experience in at least two (2) sites involving the proposed infrastructure stack (Compute, Storage, Backup, Tape Library, and Virtualization) to ensure proven and repeatable delivery capability in enterprise environments. Additionally, the SI must have a certified team with valid OEM certifications to confirm authorized technical competency*
8	*Mobile enrollment kit deployment*	*1%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The SI must demonstrate, through a proven track record, experience in delivering citizen biometric enrollment kits—including 4-4-2 fingerprint scanners, facial cameras, signature pads, and other relevant equipment—for at least two (2) population-scale identity projects, within the Sub-Saharan Africa region.*
9	*Biometric deduplication ≥ 25 Million Records*	*3%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The System Integrator (SI) must have successfully delivered at least one biometric deduplication project involving a minimum of 25 million biometric records within the Sub-Saharan Africa region. This experience should include large-scale deduplication and identity resolution for national databases*
10	*personalization systems*	*2%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The SI must have executed a minimum of two contracts for the supply, implementation, and support of secure physical identity personalization systems, for national-level Functional or Foundational Identity programs, including support for large-scale personalization and issuance of secure identity credentials.*
11	*Proposed ABIS Experience*	*2%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The Systems Integrator (SI) must demonstrate experience in implementing the proposed ABIS solution within the last three (3) years, with a minimum scale of at least 15 million ABIS records*

12	*Sandbox demo within 7 days: Pre-reg, Enrollment, Issuance*	*5%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The Systems Integrator (SI) must provide a demonstrable implementation sandbox of the proposed Open-Source Platform within a strict timeline of seven (7) working days from the date of request by the Purchaser, as part of the bid evaluation process. This demonstration is essential to enable the Purchaser to assess the SI's technical competence, deployment readiness, and capability to effectively adapt and implement the proposed Open-Source framework, particularly considering the stringent project delivery timelines.* *The SI shall demonstrate the ability to deploy the sandbox environment in alignment with the Purchaser's administrative and operational structure, including end-to-end configuration and customization of the proposed solution's core modules and citizen enrollment using three (3) biometric modalities (4-4-2 fingerprint capture, portrait, and iris). The demonstration must include issuance of a customized Digital ID, authentication services (including online authentication and eKYC workflows), and support for both online and offline verification of digital ID credentials. Additionally, the SI shall demonstrate the configuration of enrollment workflows, customization of registration procedures, and secure issuance and verification of Digital National IDs in full compliance with the Purchaser's functional and technical requirements.*
13	*On-prem sandbox Deployment*	*5%*	*(Score ÷ 5) × Weight*	*The SI must deploy the sandbox environment, on-Soil within the Purchaser's country. The Bidder shall provide verifiable proof of in-country deployment, including public IP details, security configurations, backend hardware infrastructure specifications, solution management details, and demonstration of all required core modules.* *As part of confirming the project schedules, the Purchaser intends to assess the Bidder's turnkey readiness, technical preparedness, and clear understanding of the proposed solution through this sandbox deployment.*

Category III – Maintenance & Support (5%)

Evaluates SLA-based support, helpdesk, PR/DR readiness, and operational maturity.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (%)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
1	Sandbox documentation & transparency	2.5%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Documentation must clearly describe sandbox architecture, deployment steps, access control, APIs, logs, user flows, and alignment with INRIS Solution configuration.
2	Training, capacity building, mentoring	2.5%	(Score ÷ 5) × Weight	Evaluate ToT, structured curricula hands-on sessions, operational training for open source ID solutions compliant with open standards /ABIS/SDK components, and SZI and MoHAIS capacity uplift plan.

Category VI – Change Management, Training & Documentation (5%)

Evaluates clarity of documentation, quality of training, and capacity building measures.

C.No	Criterion	Weight (% of Total)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
16	Implementation methodology & risk management plan	2.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	Must show detailed implementation methodology for Identity platforms which are open-source and compliant with open standards, ABIS alignment, SDK integration, PR/DR rollout, testing, risk management, work sequencing, and acceptance gates.
21.3	Project Plan	2.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	A comprehensive Project Implementation Plan shall be provided, clearly outlining all activities involved in the implementation. The plan must detail both parallel and sequential tasks to enable the Project Committee to fully understand the execution flow, dependencies, and overall timeline.

Category V – Delivery Methodology & Project Schedule (5%)

Evaluates feasibility, sequencing, methodology, risk management, and milestone planning

C.No	Criterion	Weight (% of Total)	Scoring Method	Guidance Notes
16	Implementation methodology & risk management plan	2.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	Must show detailed implementation methodology for open-source ID solutions compliant with open standards, ABIS alignment, SDK integration, PR/DR rollout, testing, risk management, work sequencing, and acceptance gates.
21.3	Project Plan	2.5%	(Score ÷ 4) × Weight	A comprehensive Project Implementation Plan shall be provided, clearly outlining all activities involved in the implementation. The plan must detail both parallel and sequential tasks to enable the Project Committee to fully understand the execution flow, dependencies, and overall timeline.

Category VI – Proposed Team Quality (5%)

Evaluates qualifications, certifications, and experience of all required personnel.

C.No	Role	Weight (%)	Scoring (0–3)	Guidance Notes
1	Project Manager	1%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Educational Qualification - Minimum Bachelor's Degree or Higher Professional Qualification - PMP certified or PRINCE 2 Certified. No. Of Years Experience : Minimum 10 Years Minimum 3 Previous Project Experience (Projects delivered successful on time and cost)
2	Technical Lead	0.50%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Educational Qualification – Minimum Diploma / Bachelor's Degree No. Of Years Experience : Minimum 5 Years Software Engineering Experience - Please provide information below for experience in the last five years Integration Experience - Experience in full system integration with evidence of hardware, virtualization, storage and data center infrastructure integration, Infrastructure technologies involved ,Database Technologies used
3	Full Stack Lead	0,5%	(Score ÷ 3) × Weight	Educational Qualification - Minimum Bachelor's Degree No. Of Years Experience : Minimum 5 Years

				Professional Experience: Previous Experience in Java or J2EE Web Services, Front End or Web Development Technologies, Angular or similar tech stack as the provider may propose. *Previous Experience: Minimum 2 Previous Project Experience Includes above Professional Experience.*
4	*Developers (4)*	*0.50%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Educational Qualification - Minimum Bachelor's Degree* *No. Of Years Experience : Minimum 5 Years* *Professional Experience: Previous Experience in Java or J2EE Web Services, Front End or Web Development Technologies, Angular or similar tech stack as the provider may propose.* *Previous Experience: Minimum 2 Previous Project Experience Includes above Professional Experience.*
5	*Database Expert*	*0.25%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Educational Qualification – Minimum Diploma / Bachelor's Degree* *No. Of Years Experience : Minimum 5 Years* *Professional Qualification: RDMS Technology Certifications e.g. Oracle or SQL Server or equivalent* *Previous Experience :Minimum 3 Previous Project Experience - at least Two project should be in functional ID solution.*
6	*Data Architect*	*0.50%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Onsite full-time during Design Phase and on need basis during the project.* *Open-Source/open standards knowledge, Governance skills, Strategic planning skills, analytical thinking and innovation; not less than 5 years. Minimum of a degree in a computer software related course*
7	*Security Expert*	*0.25%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Onsite full-time during Design Phase and on need basis during the project.* *Opensource Architecture Security knowledge and practical skills; not less than 5 years*
8	*Network & Infra Expert*	*0.50%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Onsite full-time during Design Phase and on need basis during the project.* *Open Source/open standards Architecture knowledge and practical skills; not less than 5 years.* *Minimum of a degree in a computer engineering related course with expert certificates in networks*
9	*Business Analyst*	*0.25%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Leadership skills and Agile Software Development Skills with a bias in data analytics; not less than 5 years*

10	*ABIS Specialist*	*0.50%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Experience in deployment of Biometric configurations; not less than 5 years*
11	*Legal Advisor*	*0.25%*	*(Score ÷ 3) × Weight*	*Experience in Legal and Advisory; not less than 5 years*

Minimum Qualifying Technical Score: *Bidders must score a* ***minimum of 80%*** *to qualify for financial evaluation.*