

## **Request for Proposals (RfP) for technical support and further development of iucncontributionfornature.org – Responses to Questions**

**Q1. Can “During active developments, conduct regular meetings with IUCN to clarify scopes and objectives, to provide situation points and define next steps” be rephrased as “Scopes and objectives will be finalised in the URS/Design Session”?**

A1. Yes, it would be good to finalise scope and objectives in the URS/Design Session. However, this should be additional to, not instead of, regular meetings with IUCN.

**Q2. What would be the data volume to be migrated to the dashboard?**

A2. About 10,000 contributions have been documented so far.

**Q3. Whether COTS based or open source software is required?**

A3. IUCN has not specified a requirement on this point.

**Q4. Please clarify that whether any training is required? If Yes, please clarify whether it will be onsite/offsite, batches/people how many would be taking the training, Mode of training, days of training etc.**

A4. No training is required.

**Q5. Please clarify whether any onsite resource is required?**

A5. No onsite resource is required.

**Q6. Upgrades will have additional cost according to the nature of the upgrade. IUCN shall accommodate this cost. Please confirm.**

A6. Yes, this is correct: IUCN would accommodate the costs of upgrades.

**Q7. Backup storage will be in AWS. ICUN will bear the expenses of backup storage (Example :storage in AWS). Please confirm**

A7. Yes, this is correct: IUCN will bear the expenses of backup storage.

**Q8. Regarding “Should IUCN require adjustments to the timeline, it will be the responsibility of the Contractor to adjust the project workflow accordingly to maximise the efficiency and delivery under the new deadlines”, This will be subject to the practically possible deadlines. The change in deadline shall be discussed and agreed upon between both parties. Please clarify**

A8. Yes, it is fair to expect that any adjustments in the timeline, and their implications, are addressed and agreed between IUCN and the contractors.

**Q9. How many languages are expected to be available in site? Will IUCN assist in validation of the text done in different languages?**

A9. The site needs to run in EN, ES, FR, the three official languages of IUCN. IUCN will provide translations.

**Q11. Regarding “As an initial step, the Contractor should familiarize themselves with the existing technology and functionality of the Visualization Module, along with the prototype of the new design”, source code of existing Implementations and documents will be shared to contractor? Will there be any Knowledge transfer session for understanding existing functionalities in detail**

A11. Yes, the source code of existing implementations and documents will be shared to contractor. Convening a knowledge transfer session is also a good idea, and IUCN would be open to this.

**Q12. Regarding “Provide a technical proposal, including an effort estimation, to respond to IUCN’s needs for new functionality”, proposal and efforts will be based on the functionalities that are described in TOR for Visualisation module only. Any further new functionalities developments that are identified during maintenance for future development, the efforts will be calculated and presented to IUCN. Please clarify if this understanding is correct**

A12. Yes, the technical proposal, including the estimation of effort, should be based on a response to IUCN’s needs for new design and functionality for the Visualisation Module, as stated in the ToR. If, as, and when new needs arise in the future, the effort required to address these would indeed need to be calculated and presented to IUCN.

**Q13. “The contract will include a yearly number of development hours to implement new functions (in addition from the implementation of the visualisation module). The package of hours dedicated for each development task as well as the timeline will be agreed in advance between IUCN and the contractor once clearly defined. Please provide rate per hour for different package of time.” Please clarify.**

A13. As noted in Q/A12, if, as, and when new needs arise for Contributions for Nature Platform development in the future, the effort required to address these would need to be calculated and presented to IUCN. Thus, it is important for IUCN to understand the contractor’s proposed availability (yearly number of development hours) and approximate hourly rates to deliver likely/anticipated such new developments in the future.

**Q14. Regarding “Description of the team proposed to work on this project including relevant experience and roles of each person (CV and approximative time dedicated to the project to deliver it on time)”, kind provide who are the resource CVs needed? Kindly specify the skill set of resource needed for? Whether any onsite support is needed.**

A14. The resource CVs and skill sets required would be determined based on the proponent’s interpretation of what capacities are necessary to implement the work outlined in the ToR. No onsite support is needed.

**Q15. “Any other attachment of apart for the iucn-24-03-px-1-iucn-cfnplatform-maintenancedevelopment-rfp-final & iucn-24-03-px-1-iucn-cfnplatform-maintenancedevelopment-tor-final.cleaned (1) which we need to see that?”**

A15. No, all the documentation for the RFP and TOR is posted under <https://www.iucn.org/procurement>.