Questions and Answers for RFP/2015/105

General

1. **Is there any advantage to propose all three LOTs together? (Any disadvantage when propose only A, B or C?)**
   Response: That choice by the Tenderers will not have any impact on the scoring during the selection process.

2. **For LOT B and C, if you make a contract, will you implement the proposed items during the three years? What would be the guaranteed minimum contract amount or estimated budget during the three year for LOT B and C?**
   Response: Chances are high that each and many other projects will actually be implemented with same or similar specifications. Considering that the GCF is still in its start-up and rapid growth phase, it is very difficult to predict the IT project volumes for three years out. Very basic project budgets in the context of Lot B and C will in 2016 be in the range of USD 2 million from GCF's administrative budget. Those projects (at least two of the examples given in the RFP) with a nature of infrastructure/systems wise serving the efficiency/effectiveness of individual climate programme executions will with a high likelihood attract separate funding.

3. **Is there any project implementation schedule for LOT B or C?**
   Response: As explained in the RFP text, those cases are used for checking your company's competencies, not for expecting each other to immediately sign order sheets with same specs and binding prices. Some of the examples will likely almost identically be pursued, others will require considerable consultations within GCF or even our climate business partners in governments and industry before finalizing specs and terms for specific ICT technical implementation projects.

   Here therefore some indications only about the desirable execution windows:
   B.1 Cloud Migration: Instant need, work will commence at the earliest in Q4 2015.
   B.2 Information Security: Timely implementation waves needed, currently mostly constrained GCF manpower shortages. Intensive project work expected to happen in H1 2016.
   B.3. Real-time data from Climate mitigation and adaptation initiatives: This is of a strategic nature and will require rich consultations with our external stakeholders before getting into the work execution phase. Subject to the quality and convincingness of incoming concepts by the Tenderers, the lead time till implementation could be less than one year from now, or take two years for developing a compelling enough business case.
   C.1. Information Architecture for compelling analytics: Instant need, works should ideally commence already in Q4 2015. Considering the fact of many key business systems still to be

introduced/integrated/custom-made during the next 1-2 years, the information architectural planning will likely have to take place in several phases.

C.2. eDemocracy in governance: See the comments under B.3.

C.3. Intelligent use of content for informing, engaging and listening: The needs are acute, project execution schedules will likely again be somewhat constrained by disposable quality time of GCF internal actors. It is therefore desirable to have some people time wise light work already happening in Q4 2015, with several subsequent work package iterations throughout 2016 and even beyond.

4. **Is there any site visit / physical briefing plan before the proposal submission date? If so, is it mandatory to participate?**

   Response: We have decided to accommodate a chance for visiting our G-Tower site in Songdo, hosting the offices and meeting rooms and the related on premise infrastructure parts. The time for that has been determined to be 22nd September, 10:00 in the morning. That same occasion can also be used for eventual last minute questions in relation to the RFP. Those potential Tenderers interested in making use of that site visit opportunity shall kindly notify us by email to secretariat@gcfund.org by no later than midday Monday, 21st September 12:00 Korean Standard Time. Your participation or absence would have no influence on the evaluation process. We will write up questions and answers from that occasion and upload the material onto our web site within 1 or 2 business days.

5. **Would GCF consider the annual inflation rate and other economic considerations when negotiating yearly cost for three years?**

   Response: GCF will consider a yearly negotiation in case of any inflation announced by an organism as the World Bank GDP deflator.

6. **Is there any additional points/advantage to be counted during evaluation for additional proposal?**

   Response: It would distort the competition if we would award extra points for projects not described. Keep your answers thus related to the tasks provided. The aimed for Long Term Agreement will allow us GCF to pursue many other undertakings, internally already known about, or materializing as the GCF business needs evolve.

7. **Who would bear the remaining cost of the leased items from the current service provider, IUCT?**

   Response: The remaining costs of the leased items will be part of the detailed analysis and negotiation with the selected provider for Lot A.

8. **In addition to the written proposal, do we have a time for the verbal presentation?**

   Response: GCF will offer each of the participating Tenderers an opportunity to present their proposal orally in a video call. Such call will be organised as part of the Evaluation Panel work that is expected to take place and conclude in October. A mutually acceptable time will be

identified for it (respecting GCF's business hours). Each session should last about 1 hour. We will reach out to those submitting a Tender for organising it.

9. **Does everyone who performs the services need to speak English well?**

Response: Those people who are assigned for direct interactions with GCF's staff must be capable to communicate in English (the current day to day working language of the organisation) without the presence of an interpreter.

10. **Can you provide us your budget for ICT service of last year?**

Response: Last year, meaning 2014, was GCF's very start of operational activities, with first regular ICT staff taking up duty as late as August. Rather than you taking that year as reference, we are recommending to refer to our answer to question number 2 from above.

11. **Is there any form to use for our proposal? If yes, we want that.**

Response: Please refer to Annex V for your Technical Proposal and to Annex VI for your Financial Proposal. And don't forget to fill in the details concerning your company in Annex VII.

12. **Can we have contact information of IUCT? We need to negotiate lease.**

Response: Please refer to
Mr. Heejae Chang
Development Team, Assistant Manager/Development HQ
Tel. +82 32 4586099
Fax: +82 32 4585759
Mobile: +82 10 26672472
Email: Heejae.Chang@IncheonUCity.com

LOT A

1. **During the three years, what would be the rate would be for the staff increase? Is there any mid- and long-term staffing plan?**

Response: The current workforce level is 55 regular staff plus 30 onsite consultants and another 40 consultants working remotely. During 2016 those number should increase to about 150-200 workers at any given time. It will heavily rely on the uptake and success of climate change related work, how staffing levels will evolve beyond 2016. Tenderers should not forget that an increasing number of externally facing business systems and collaborative environments for and with our partners are entering into production use. GCF's true ICT customer base across time zones will thus soon count in the thousands, with respective consequences for support call regimes, change management etc.

2. **If a company proposed solutions required to LOT A and GCF deems it to be needed, who would have an exclusive right to implement the solution? Would it be external software developer, or the company who proposed the solution? If there is no exclusive right to implement, then what would be the incentive for company who proposed solutions for LOT A?**

Response: The nature of Lot A is about ICT operations and support, not about software development and systems engineering/reengineering. That said, solicited and unsolicited ideas and proposals for optimizing GCF's operations and support are not only welcome, they are even expected to come from the successful Tenderer for Lot A. We are demanding that our service providers are showing us that they are truly customer oriented. Subject to the nature and magnitude of any given adjustment/change, the demonstrated track record over time, GCF may choose to have the contractor for Lot A taking care of the implementation.

In a similar way the winners of Lot B and C shall not assume that they will gain exclusivity for each and every systems engineering or software development project that the GCF will pursue in the next 3+ years.

3. **What would be the standards applied for evaluating financial proposal? (for example, how would you compare the cost for LOT A? Do you have any standard service operation staff requirements? (Minimum number of people, minimum qualifications for service operation staffs, etc.)**

Response: The vendor shall provide a realistic proposal, explaining the number of staff and its qualifications to cover the infrastructure and services running in GCF. Part of these services and qualification can be extracted from Annex III. In principal, it is important for us to see a rational balance of manpower with the right qualifications to provide satisfactory service to our workforce and close business partners.

The vendor shall suggest a suitable SLA for the number of ICT users and services running in GCF and make it scalable for the next three years. It is the responsibility of the vendor to balance their resources keeping always the quality, scope and its responsibilities described in the Service Level Agreement.

4. **What would be the payment term for maintenance and warranty? Monthly payment, or yearly payment? (In Korea, most of the maintenance and warranty would be yearly payment.)**

Response: The suggested maintenance and warranty arrangement shall be explained in the proposal, including the covered vendor/provider companies and conditions, for allowing GCF a better understanding during the evaluation. GCF would normally prefer to have monthly payments, as long as there are no discounts for yearly payments.

5. **If there is need for additional service, would it be possible for the proposed company to request additional cost?**

   Response: GCF's need in that service domain will surely not remain static for 3 years, as the organisation as a whole will develop. And many matters will simply not be predictable upfront. The Tenderer needs therefore to be capable to scale up and out, as soon as the demand situation evolves. New services (and their costs) will be negotiated and added to the original SLA.

6. **What's the SLA for normal service requests during the core hours?**

   Response: We have quite a good sense of what our new SLA will have to look like, but want to see the in how far the Tenderers are familiar with customer settings such as ours. Your proposal should therefore provide a professional recommendation of covering our assumed needs, and explain the reasons for it.

7. **How many IT service operation staffs are you thinking to be optimal?**

   Response: GCF distinguishes between staff and non-staff categories of IT workers. We assume that your question is about the service provider side, and thus from GCF perspective non-staff workers. We expect that the Tenderers will themselves calculate an adequate number of onsite and remote actors, be that of dedicated or non-dedicated to GCF services nature. Our focus is about getting quality and continuity of services, for a reasonable cost, not targeting any specific assistance headcount.

8. **For Azure administration, is operation of OAS included as a part of the scope of proposal?**

   Response: The proposal should include the administration of GCF's Cloud infrastructure – currently Azure based - and ensure that business systems operating on it are in a minimal fashion impacted by vendor imposed or GCF required maintenance activities. The Tenderer is expected to plan for and handle any problems that may come from the virtual machines (servers) or network infrastructure, including the management of and the creation of new users that require access to the system (Active Directory, SharePoint etc.). That includes power users and administrators. Activities in the context of Lot A do not include debugging or code-changes of OAS. Those principles apply to all other current and upcoming custom made business systems.

LOT B - Especially B.2

1. **Which statement would be true? A) The scope is only to protect the security during the transmission of the data, B) The scope is also to protect data stored in the client (PC or mobile device) by encrypting the data.**

   Response: The scope is also to protect data stored in the client mobile devices by encrypting the data. You want to further on write about your suggested recipe for of making the device itself trustworthy (firmware etc) enough against third party manipulations for gaining data

access. It is fully understood that client side devices are a challenge on their own, considering for example the bring-your-own-device and work from home reality. Your concept should explain an intelligent approach. You might want to split project work for Cloud plus data transit from storage at the client device end.

2. **Is it mandatory to have "Cloud Storage" where data is encrypted and stored, just like Qabel's solution you showed as example? If so, are you expecting the architecture that the client should not store real data? Or, is it just one way to implement the security and it is basically up to the proposing company to suggest different types of solutions if only the solution is suitable for cloud security?**
Response: It is up to the Tenderers to suggest similar or different types of solutions that are suitable for achieving the advantages of modern mainstream tools relying on Cloud usage, while at the same time closing the backdoors for no matter what perpetrators. Latter including national government administrations acting unethically and disrespecting their obligations from international treaties.

3. **What would be the nature of the proposal? Is it guaranteeing only the consultation work to be awarded? Or also the implementation work would be awarded as a part of contract?**
Response: Our assumption is that our future contractor under Lot B would typically take the lead integrator and implementer role for any of the projectised undertakings. Case by case that might include working with several other own subcontractors or GCF arranged service providers.

4. **The scope of proposal: Is it only for architecture of the security, or entire scope and cost of implementation as well?**
Response: Both. Please take as reference the table included in Annex V mentioning the number of hours for each specialist. Over there it is also foreseen to add and explain other costs that are not in the table or other skills to be added to the list.

5. **The scope of proposal: Is it only for MS-based cloud systems? Or security architecture for Non-MS Solution is also included?**
Response: As far as the Cloud part for holding GCF's business data is concerned, we will for the next 1-2 years stay with our current Microsoft centric approach (subject to receiving no compelling arguments for a switch during very busy years for GCF). Please do in your concept not oversee the specific Cloud storage concerns for business phones running Android and iOS.

6. **As for B.2, should the proposing company limit itself within Java-based open-architecture? Or is it okay to propose proprietary solutions?**
Response: The focus is here on "open source", not from the licensing perspective, but from the code-inspectability angle. As long as it can be proven that there is no realistic way for the code containing hidden backdoors, or for having an authority secretly stepping in and forcing

a vendor to surrender our data without prior knowledge of and permission by GCF, we are good.

LOT C

1. **As for C.1, The scope of proposal: Is it only for architecture of the solution, or entire scope and cost of implementation as well?**
   Response: Both. Please take as reference the table included in Annex V mentioning the number of hours for each specialist. Comments are allowed in the proposal to justify other costs that are not in the table or other skills needed beyond those in the list.

2. **As for C.2, do you mean general voting system with voting process and result of vote process? Or, is it more like broader concept of opinion polling system?**
   Response: This is not about random opinion polling, but at the level of casting a vote. The concept and project outline should also somewhat touch on the aspects beyond the tech tools alone. Being realistic about the scope of your effort as part of this RFP exercise, we don't expect you to plan, cost and describe the wider logistical concerns around organisation and execution of electronic elections. But you might in that context want to study the available offerings by the current market leader for e-Election solutions (http://www.scytl.com/en/e-election-platform).