

**RFP/2018/1178**

**FOR ESTABLISHING FRAME AGREEMENT(S) FOR THE PROVISION OF  
BLOCKCHAIN OR OTHER APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY OPTIONS IN SUPPORT OF A TRUST SCHEME FOR  
REFUGEES**

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**DATE: 24/12/2018**

| No. | Category abbreviation | Question  | Answer   |
|-----|-----------------------|---|--|
| 1   | DAFI                  | What is the expected participation from nation states and other non-government actors during the Pilot phase? | Depending on the country context it can include government (e.g. Ministry of (Higher) Education or Government entities as per the country agreement between the respective Government and UNHCR. (Varying from country to country.) Main non-government counterparts are those partners implementing the DAFI program for UNHCR within a given country and possibly other education related entities such as e.g. universities, national admission boards and the like). |

|   |      |  |   |
|---|------|--|---|
| 2 | TIME | What is the expectation for SLA during the pilot phase? What is the desired timeline for the system to deliver SLA at scale?   | The performance of the system should be comparable to commonly used apps (generally less than 5 seconds per screen) and should be achieved for the pilot and maintained as the application scales up in number of users.  |
| 3 | e-A  | What are the expectations for Decentralized Identity (DID) claims compatible with e-Apostilles? For example, claim types, volumes and SLAs - For more information on DID, please refer to: <a href="http://aka.ms/DIDWhitePaper">http://aka.ms/DIDWhitePaper</a> and <a href="http://aka.ms/ownyouridentity">http://aka.ms/ownyouridentity</a> | We would ideally expect a suggestion from the bidder. Claim types and Volume: Pilot needs to be supported, but clearly project is expected thereafter beyond the pilot. (10.000, 100.000, 1 Mio scenario as per RFP.  |
| 4 | e-A  | Today, e-Apostilles has limited adoption by nation states. How many nation states with support for e-Apostilles should the design expect to support? Can nation states that do not support e-Apostilles participate in the pilot?  | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. |
| 5 | e-A  | Will nation states implement their own scheme for supporting e-Apostilles or is it in scope for pilot implementation?  | This depends very much on the individual nation state. Many initiatives are currently underway in this regard; any final answer provided at this stage would be provided under unproven assumptions. This is very much subject to advocacy by a whole range of actors. Please also note: The pilot is focusing exclusively on the three countries: Jordan, Kenya and Mauretania.      |

|   |      |  |   |
|---|------|--|---|
| 6 | e-A  | Is E-Registers a search service for claims issued by e-Apostilles providers?   | In our view it would go beyond a search service. As per Annex A ToR Point 3.2, UNHCR has already an idea of how e-Registry / Certified Record of Action could possibly take form. A CRoA would be automatically generated within the UNHCR Trust Scheme and made publicly available online. It could contain information such as number, hash number, QR, location code and/or date/time stamp. A CRoA would enable recipients to verify the origin of a documents immediately with e-Apostille. Any entity is more than welcome to submit a proposal independent from where it is geographically located! Also, bidders do not need to match a classic vendor profile. Academia, non-profit organisations, start-ups, consortia, associations and similar are also welcome to submit a proposal. |
| 7 | FUNC | Is it sufficient that DID-based claims are based on agreed upon industry protocols and schemes for digestion beyond the DID ecosystem? | Wherever feasible and meeting the UNHCR specific criteria this is fine; however the very specific context and nature of refugees, stateless and other displaced population might not always be met by Industry standards.   |

|    |              |  |   |
|----|--------------|--|---|
| 8  | Bio          | What are the expectations for individual biometric data being centrally managed with PRIMES biometric system as source of truth during the pilot phase? For example, just during registration, for every authentication request?   | <p>This should not be the core of the pilot; other secure forms of authentication, if so, and in line with the standards set in the RFP would be equally acceptable. However please be aware that UNHCR and (some) partners already use biometric verification against UNHCR Biometrics systems (BIMS/IrisGuard) in multiple country operations. Individual biometric data is, and will continue to be centrally managed by PRIMES. UNHCR biometric IDs are globally de-duplicated so can be considered to uniquely represent individuals but at present not all registered refugees have a biometric ID. Biometrics are not collected for individuals under 5 years old and some operations are still in the early phases of adopting the systems and enrolling the existing registered populations. Biometrics should not necessarily be the core of the pilot; other secure forms of authentication in line with the standards set in the RFP would be equally acceptable.</p> |
| 9  | FUNC         | What are the expectations when it comes to compatibility with existing claims for the prescribed data types – enroll user for the first time or does the system need to support import as well                                     | <p>We would need further clarification to this question. What exactly is meant by prescribed data types? There is a difference between the current users of our PRIMES EcoSystem and the expected new user types; types as required per RFP e.g. sand most importantly refugees themselves.</p>   |
| 10 | Trust Policy | How might we learn more to ensure compliance with trust scheme providers and policies that will participate during pilot phase? And eventually in the known schemes, if such as system were to be deployed at scale in production? | <p>While for the pilot not necessarily required in the longer term an import functionality would be certainly of benefit for a range of data fields, data elements, process and work flow statuses, as also described in the RFP. As what regards the question, and as the users are different, it would rather not be an upload of users, but rather of data subjects, thus individuals registered/recorded in PRIMES (core).</p>  |

|    |         |   |  |
|----|---------|---|--|
| 11 | OFF     | What is the list of scenarios that are subject to offline use during the pilot phase?   | There is no list of clear cut scenarios, but low and non connectivity environments are common in UNHCR operational environments.   |
| 12 | FUNC    | Which network protocols and versions are required to be supported for offline use during the pilot phase?   | Exact protocols and versions will be defined during the pilot phase.   |
| 13 | Devices | What devices and operating systems are to be expected to participate during the pilot phase by the end-users and other actors in the system?                                | We are open to suggestions from the bidders. Also please refer to RFP Annex A 5.9. user devices to be supported as well as 5.2. which describes UNHCR's current environment. |
| 14 | FUNC    | What are the expectations as it relates to support for delegation and/or on-behalf of consent flows?  | There is no expectations by UNHCR regarding a concrete technical solution for this issue; we expect the bidder to propose.   |
| 15 | Devices | What non-device-based authentication scenarios are in scope for the pilot?  | We are open to suggestions from the bidder.  |
| 16 |         | What are the expectations for revocation of claims?   | Revocation of Claims should be possible. We expect the bidder to propose.  |
| 17 | RC      | What are the expectations in terms of recovery of credentials? For example, loss or theft   | Credentials should be recoverable in the event of loss or theft.   |
| 18 | PR/L    | What privacy preserving formats and schemes are required during the pilot phase?  | Whatever format or scheme can be accepted, however it must comply with UNHCR's Privacy and Data Protection standards and policy. Note: UNHCR aligns with the GDPR.           |
| 19 | PROC    | What are the requirements and qualifications for commercial and/or non-commercial entities to participate in deployment and operation of the system during the pilot phase? | Please refer to Annexes C to E of the TOR.   |

|    |       |   |   |
|----|-------|---|---|
| 20 | DAFI  | Would any minors be participating during this phase? If so, what are the expectations around guardianship for such participants?  | DAFI is a tertiary education program and therefore supporting students above 18 years only. (This is also outlined in the DAFI Policy and Guidelines.)  |
| 21 | FUNC  | What are the expectations around nation states or from other participating actors besides UNHCR in terms of auditability?   | Further clarification on the question is required. UNHCR's advocacy and cooperation with Nation States is ongoing. There are no final conclusions up to date in this regard.  |
| 22 | FUNC  | What are the expectations around nation states or from other participating actors besides UNHCR in terms of support for augmenting their existing trust schemes to include support for Decentralized Trust? | The RFP does not have any concrete expectations with regards to decentralized trust.  |
| 23 | Auth  | Is the pilot system expected to interact with existing apps and/or services? if so, what protocols do they support, such as, OAuth, SAML, etc.  | The level of interaction with existing apps and services is dependent on the design of the bidder's solution. PRIMES is based on Microsoft CRM Dynamics, hence any protocol that is recognised by Microsoft will be acceptable.   |
| 24 | Scale | What is the scale for number of users, nation states and applications expected to participate during pilot phase vs. at scale?  | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio; in 2017, over 6,700 students in 50 countries benefitted from a DAFI scholarship, including over 2,582 newly enrolled students (Pilot focus: 3 countries). |
| 25 | FUNC  | What are the expectations around root of trust for identifiers that participate for such a scheme?  | Further clarification on the question is required. Please also refer to the answer to question 10.  |

|    |        |  |  |
|----|--------|--|--|
| 26 | PROC   | Human resources for system administration and maintenance: What would be the human resources made available by UNHCR for the maintenance of the ID infrastructure upto and following handover of the project? In what form must these costs to UNHCR be highlighted in the proposal? | UNHCR will identify focal points to work with the supplier during the implementation phase of the contract, however the supplier is expected to provide in their offer the list and profile of Human Resources who will work on the project.<br>The Human Resources related cost must be provided for each segment of the project where it is required – please refer to Financial offer form. |
| 27 | Infras | Server component: Does the winner also have to put in place / make available a server infrastructure or can existing UNHCR infrastructure be used?   | Preference is for bidders to provide a Software As A Service solution in which the hosting is included in the price.   |
| 28 | TIME   | Warranty Period: What is the duration of the Warranty Period highlighted in the TORs?  | 6 months after the pilot goes live.  |

|    |      |  |  |
|----|------|--|--|
| 29 | TIME | <p>Duration of Frame Agreement: Does the price model highlighted in the financial response form cover the 3 year period or the does it include the extendable 1 + 1 year period?</p> | <p>Due to the novelty of the technology, UNHCR will adopt a 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5 years approach. Please note that the 3 + 1 + 1 approach is no longer valid. After each 1 (one) year a review takes place. The annual renewal is subject to adequate performance. The financial proposal, while covering the first one-year period, is expected to also provide an outlook on the potential costs over the next years the scalability element taken into account. Thus and in other words is expected to provide for the “scalable version” of the price aiming at ensuring that the best possible solution in terms of quality is granted from the onset on, the pilot. The information on how to scale the solution over the next years should be indicated in the lines "Additional cost elements related to scalability". The first 1-year period covers the initial DAFI pilot in the 3 countries Jordan, Kenya and Mauritania with about 500 – 1,000 Users. Once the first pilot is successfully implemented, the software platform will need to allow for an incremental increase of users and countries to cover the full DAFI programme and up to 10,000 users in the second 1- year period (over 6,700 DAFI students currently). This should then be steadily increased until a total of 100,000 users in the third 1-year period, but would need to ensure that a minimum of 1 Mio users would be able to use the software by the end of the fourth 1-year period. The goal of the fifth 1-year period would be to make the system ready globally and for all relevant UNHCR users (more than 8 Million refugees).</p> <p>In parallel and as soon as the wallet proved a successful and suitable tool for DAFI and its students, the additional features as per RFP would need to be implemented hand in hand with the incrementally increasing user-base so as to ensure that refugees other than DAFI students can also benefit from the wallet for their purposes. The first amendments are expected to be developed already in the second 1 year period (2020), while others will be made available only in the following years.</p> |
|----|------|--|--|



|    |        |   |   |
|----|--------|---|---|
| 30 | Infras | Handover of source code: What are the licensing conditions for the handover of source code? What form of re-use of the source code is envisioned?   | As was said in the Pitching Event: Open standards are more important than Open Source. The source code is meant to be used to ensure that future updates and modifications of the software and interfaces with new IT-systems can be implemented.   |
| 31 | e-A    | Price per e-Apostille transaction: e-Apostille as with qualified electronic signature comes at a per transaction cost which is defined by the entity issuing the e-Apostille and is consequently beyond the scope of the technology vendor. These costs vary from country to country. How must this be accounted for in the financial proposal? | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. |
| 32 | e-A    | Scope of e-Apostille: The countries selected for the pilot appear not to be signatories to the apostille convention. Who would be the entities authorised to apostille documents in this context?   | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. |
| 33 | PROC   | Clarifications on RFP following supplier conference: Would vendors participating in the RFP be permitted to contact the UNHCR for further clarifications after the supplier conference?   | If we establish that an extended period is required for reviewing more questions, we will communicate the possibility for extension to all interested bidders as well as publishing this information on UNGM and UNHCR websites.  |
| 34 | Scale  | How much authentication volume is expected to be handled in the pilot project?  | The first 1-year period covers the initial DAFI pilot in the 3 countries Jordan, Kenya and Mauritania with about 500 – 1,000 Users. Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio as well as the description of the DAFI pilot in the RFP. Please also refer to questions 29 and 43.             |

|    |        |  |  |
|----|--------|--|--|
| 35 | Lang   | Is multi-lingual support expected for the system? If yes, which all languages should be supported? | Please refer to Annex A Section 4.5. Multi Language Interface of the RFP.  |
| 36 | Infras | Is infrastructure creation a part of this project?   | Preference is for bidders to provide a Software As A Service solution in which the hosting is included in the price. |

|    |        |   |   |
|----|--------|---|---|
| 37 | FUNC   | Page 28, Section 4.2: Does UNHCR plans to implement fraud analytics?  | <p>UNHCR has a Policy “Addressing Fraud Committed by Persons of Concern” as well as Operational Guidelines on Addressing Fraud Committed by Persons of Concern. Through recent updates the scope of it was expanded to address fraud committed not just by refugees but by all persons of concern. It covers fraud across all of UNHCR’s protection, assistance and solutions interventions, and is no longer focused on resettlement primarily – acknowledging that in order to address fraud effectively, measures must be mainstreamed into all processes and procedures. The policy and guidelines adopt a comprehensive approach covering prevention, detection and response to fraud by persons of concern at all stages of their interactions with UNHCR - whether in emergency settings, in protracted situations, or as part of solutions. UNHCR PRIMES and in particular proGresv4 has a module dedicated to fraud and integrity related recording from the identification of inconsistencies up to sanctions for confirmed fraud. As such UNHCR can already quantitatively analyze fraud (statistics and trends); it could also qualitatively analyze such occurrences. UNHCR has also a “Policy for Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) in UNHCR” so as to establish ERM in UNHCR, bridging various risk management policies and formal/informal practices in place. It assists in risk identification and prioritization as well as in developing and implementing appropriate (context specific) treatments. However, Fraud Analytics is not within this RFP although the solution should not prevent UNHCR to identify and analyze potential fraud.</p> |
| 38 | Infras | Page 35, Section 5.1: How do the various systems in IT architecture interact with other? Is this the first time for this integration? | Any technology that can interact with Microsoft CRM Dynamics platform, SQL Server, etc.   |

|    |        |  |   |
|----|--------|--|---|
| 39 | Infras | Is there a system already available which can handle the manual errors (duplication etc. )?  | Within ProGres and BIMS, there is the ability to handle manual errors like duplication. ProGres foresees processes and specific user roles to do so.  |
| 40 | PRIMES | Page 7 Section 3: Kindly confirm whether any Open API's available to interact with Population Registration and Population Management EcoSystem (PRIMES)?                               | Vendors can assume that any OpenAPIs required to access PRIMES will be built by UNHCR and made available.   |
| 41 | PRIMES | Page 7 Section 3.1: What are the integration points to establish communication with other system for the proposed application?   | Vendors can stipulate which systems they need to establish communication with and assume that UNHCR will build the APIs for consumption by their solution.  |
| 42 | Auth   | Page 7 Section 3.2: What is the preferred authentication mechanism to verify the digital identity among the actors like authorities, institutions of higher learning & business?       | There is no preferred authentication mechanism from our side; also DAFI is a global scholarship program and UNHCR operates globally, thus it is impossible to know the preferred authentication system by all cited actors. |
| 43 | Scale  | Page 7 Section 3.2: What are the projections expected by the application to handle for the following; - Volume of transactions, - Expected response time, - Number of concurrent users | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio as well as the description of the DAFI pilot in the RFP.                                 |
| 44 | FUNC   | Page 7 Section 3.2: What is the preferred protocol to store the documents for the proposed application?  | No preference.  |
| 45 | FUNC   | Page 8 Section 3.3: What are the business rules to be considered to enroll UNHCR internal entities, public notaries & institutions of higher education?                                | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |

|    |      |  |   |
|----|------|--|---|
| 46 | FUNC | Page 8 Section 3.4: What is the preferred user access roles expected for the following: - Digital Wallet, - E-Registry, - E-Apostille  | While different roles are required the detailed specification will be elaborated at a later stage.  |
| 47 | e-A  | Page 9 Section 3.4: How the signature of another country to legalize the document is maintained in the proposed e-Apostille?   | This is expected to be part of the proposed architecture by the bidder.   |
| 48 | Dig  | Page 9 Section 3.4: What is the mechanism used digitizing the physical documents required by the proposed application? Is there any requirement of third party software like scanner or OCR? | The digitization of physical documents is not an expectation of this tender. We are open to suggestions regarding the digitization of documents, however, this is not the focus of the pilot. Please be also aware that UNHCR is already looking at options to further enhance its digital file management more holistically, which is outside this RFP. Please also refer to questions 55 and 71.  |
| 49 | DAFI | Page 9 Section 3.4: Who are the potential stakeholders identified for the proposed application like countries, educational institutes, etc.?   | See also Question 1:<br>Depending on the country context it can include government (e.g. Ministry of (Higher) Education or Government entities as per the country agreement between the respective Government and UNHCR. (Varying from country to country.) Main non-government counterparts are those partners implementing the DAFI program for UNHCR within a given country and possibly other education related entities such as e.g. universities, national admission boards and the like). Other members of the refugee community might be also included. |

|    |      |  |   |
|----|------|--|---|
| 50 | PROC | Are we already asked to present our solution / bid?  | Not applicable anymore as the event already took place: The pitching event is sort of a supplier's conference where potential bidders will be given the opportunity to discuss about the Terms of Reference and obtain further clarifications on the requirements. The bids will not be submitted at this meeting, but at a later stage in January 2019 as per specified in the tender documents. Please note that although participation at the pitching event was encouraged, it was not mandatory requirement to submitting a bid. |
| 51 | PROC | Can we assist [participate] through a video-conference?  | Not applicable anymore as the event already took place.   |
| 52 | PROC | Point 2.4.1. of the RFP states that "if your company is not already registered with UNHCR, you should complete, sign and submit with your technical proposal the Vendor Registration Form (Annex C)". Is it correct to understand that there is no need for registration as UNHCR supplier before the deadline of January 18th? In case of a consortium, should each partner be registered to UNCHR, or just the leader of the consortium? | Correct – By the submission deadline of January 2019, you must submit the vendor registration form. In case of a consortium, you must clearly state in the offer the lead company of the consortium and specify who will be the signatory to the Contract with UNHCR. In this case, you include in your offer the consortium agreement documents, while submitting the required vendor registration documents for the company that will enter the contractual relationship with UNHCR.  |

|    |         |   |  |
|----|---------|---|--|
| 53 | PROC    | Annex 5 of the ToR states that “consortia will have to sign a consortium agreement and agree on a leader of the consortium that will act as main point of contact for UNHCR”. Is the consortia to be formed before the submission? In this case, is there a “consortium agreement template”? Shall the consortium be formed as an entity with a legal status? | The consortia must be formed before submitting an offer. We don’t have a consortium agreement template. You should have a consortium agreement that needs to be submitted with the offer. Please also indicate the lead agency in the consortia.   |
| 54 | PROC    | Annex B_- Financial_Response_Form: in case multiple professional profiles are involved in a single task, is it possible to add rows to the table as many times as the different profiles?   | If you will be using multiple professional profiles for the implementation of the project, you may absolutely add rows.  |
| 55 | Records | Clause 3.1 of the ToR states that “there are no digital records maintained in PRIMES”. Does this only refer to specific records on the PoC status like “being married or “holding a degree or diploma”?   | We would require further clarification on the question. There is currently no digitized documents systematically kept on PRIMES. Please be also aware that UNHCR is already looking at options to further enhance its digital file management more holistically, which is outside of this RFP. Please also refer to questions 48 and 71. |

|    |      |  |  |
|----|------|--|--|
| 56 |      | <p>Clause 3.4 of the ToR presents an example of a flow for the capture of biometric data by an UNHCR Trust Entity. The example includes the e-apostille is signed by the UNHCR officer, with the purpose of certifying the data capture process and its outcome? production of an e-apostille.</p>   | <p>Please refer to answer to Question 57.</p>  |
| 57 | FUNC | <p>Clause 3.4 of the ToR presents an example of a flow for the capture of biometric data and an example of digitalization of an academic record by an UNHCR Trust Entity. Both examples includes the production of an e-apostille and the writing of a CRoA on the e-Register. Being the e-apostilles digitally signed by a Trust Entity, data integrity is already granted. What the e-apostille cannot grant is the proof-of-existence of the data. Is it correct to understand that the registration of the CRoA on the e-registry is required as a Proof-of-Existence?</p> | <p>This is just an exemplary architecture meant to illustrate the basic idea. Bidders are encouraged to present their own solutions.</p> |



|    |              |  |   |
|----|--------------|--|---|
| 58 | Trust Policy | Annex 2, point B. of the ToR states that “the following points still need to be designed: trust scheme policy, trust scheme membership, trust anchor, and requirements”. Annex 3, point 3.3 states that Trust policy “will be ready by 15 December 2018”. Is it correct to assume that “trust scheme policy” will be provided by UNHCR, while the other points will be defined in the course of the project? Will the trust policy be made available to the bidding organizations by Dec 15? | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10.   |
| 59 | Trust Policy | Annex 2, point E. Is it correct to assume that the expected LoAs are not defined yet, and that their specification will be part of the project activities?   | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10.   |
| 60 | PRIMES       | Annex 3, clause 4 refer to a set of document management functionalities that are apparently already implemented by proGres. Is it correct to assume that these functionalities are not part of the bid, and that this clause is provided for reference, to allow the bidder to envisage a correct interface to the PRIMES ecosystem? Or is the project expected to release an extension of the proGres system?   | It is not exactly clear to which sub-sections of section 4 the question exactly refers. It is understood that the question enquires about document management functionalities. It is indeed correct that document management is not within the scope of this tender. Please also refer to question/answer 55, which details this further. |

|    |        |   |   |
|----|--------|---|---|
| 61 | TIME   | Annex 3, paragraph 2 - Does UNHCR have any target or estimate dates for each phase to have completed or is it fully at the vendor's discretion to estimate it?  | Bidders should estimate their own dates, assuming a start date in early Q2 2019. Please also refer to questions 2 and 29.   |
| 62 | PRIMES | Annex 3, paragraphs 4.8, 4.9, 4.10 - The section describes in length the capabilities of proGres v4 and the business processes existing today. Could UNHCR clarify for the to-be-built if the system is supposed to leverage those existing functionalities or to build similar separately? | These functionalities are outside the scope of the pilot. These functionalities do effectively and efficiently exist in proGres v4. It is not expected that these function will be rebuilt. |
| 63 | FUNC   | Annex 3, Paragraph 4.13 - As the e-registry would only contain metadata, what does UNHCR envisage as Batch Operations on the e-Registry to be executed?   | This section shows characteristics of the existing proGres system, however, what is needed in the tool/system that the supplier creates for the pilot is up to them.                        |
| 64 | PRIMES | Annex 3, Paragraph 4.14 - The section describes the proGres system only, is the expectation that the system will implement the same level of granularity wherever applicable?   | This section provides what is possible with the proGres system and what could be applied in the bidders solutions.  |

|    |       |  |   |
|----|-------|--|---|
| 65 | PROC  | Proposal is to be submitted through email. This would make the financial proposal insecure. Do you recommend any type of password locking of the financial bid so that it can be kept secured till financials are opened. This password can be sought from technically qualified bidders and then used to open the bids. | All proposals must be submitted to the designated mailbox indicated in the tender. Any submission to a different email address will be disqualified. Please also ensure that the technical is separate from the financial. Any technical offer containing price information will be disqualified. We have a very secure system for the bid opening. The financial information will not be shared with the Technical evaluation team until the financial evaluation is concluded - the latter step occurs after technical evaluation has been conducted and a report is established. |
| 66 | Scale | As per our understanding the current POC is restricted to managing documents for DAFI candidates. Is this understanding correct? If yes, then what would be the approximate numbers of such candidates who would be covered in the POC?  | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio; in 2017, over 6,700 students in 50 countries benefitted from a DAFI scholarship, including over 2,582 newly enrolled students (Pilot focus: 3 countries). Please also refer to question 24.   |
| 67 | Block | 8 million refugee records are existing with UNHCR, is there a need of migrating these existing documents in the blockchain during POC or does the blockchain ledger stores documents going forward for about 6700 DAFI candidates.   | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio as well as the description of the DAFI pilot in the RFP. Please also refer to question 43.   |
| 68 | Scale | How many users will be accessing/using the proposed system during POC?   | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio as well as the description of the DAFI pilot in the RFP. Please also refer to question 43.   |

|    |              |   |   |
|----|--------------|---|---|
| 69 | Host         | How will the digital wallet be hosted? Will it be hosted inside a Smart Card / Mobile Device existing with the data subject or online within some system?   | We are open to either option.   |
| 70 | Trust Policy | Who will design the trust scheme policy, trust scheme membership, trust anchor, and requirements.   | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10.   |
| 71 | Dig          | Please confirm if the PRIME stores any documents of the individuals in the digital format or not. If not, do we physically store any hard copies of these documents.  | PRIMES does not store digitized documents as is described in the RFP. We are open to suggestions regarding the digitization of documents, however, this is not the focus of the pilot. Please be also aware that UNHCR is already looking at options to further enhance its digital file management more holistically, which is outside this RFP. Please also refer to questions 48 and 55. |
| 72 | FUNC         | Registration of a refugee/displaced person/asylum seeker is the first step for establishing his identity. Assumption is, registration of these individuals would be done using the existing processes (PRIMES) in place and is not in the scope of the current assignment. Please confirm | This is up for the bidders to decide and recommend in their solution. Initial registration is not the focus of the pilot.   |

|    |     |   |  |
|----|-----|---|--|
| 73 | e-A | Assumption: The e-Apostille would be developed for UNHCR, this would not be linked to any other e-Apostille which is hosted in any country. For e.g. Spain has its own e-Apostille process. For countries where e-Apostille registry of records are available, UNHCR will follow the manual route to download the document and then uploading to the individual digital Wallet. | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. Please also refer to question 31, 74 and 76. |
| 74 | e-A | In case a country supports e-Apostille and has already digitally certified a document, will UNHCR again put a second e-Apostille on the same document   | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. Please also refer to question 31, 73 and 76. |
| 75 |     | Will all the data which is currently available in PRIMES have to be moved to e-Registry?  | Please focus on the pilot scenario first. Beyond that, this is up for the bidders to decide and recommend in their solution.   |
| 76 | e-A | Currently 29 contracting states have implemented components of e-App. How will be the documents from the other states be Apostilled?  | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. Please also refer to question 31, 73 and 74. |
| 77 | Dig | Do we need to store both the document in the digitized version of the original document as well as the e-Apostilled format in the Digital wallet?   | This is up for the bidders to decide and recommend in their solution. Digitalization of documents is not the focus of the pilot.   |

|    |        |  |   |
|----|--------|--|---|
| 78 | e-A    | What will be the format of all the documents which will be sent for e-Apostille?   | We're open for recommendations of the bidder.   |
| 79 | PRIMES | It is indicated that we need to keep a record of all the certificates which gets issued/printed from PRIMES. Is this not being tracked currently in PRIMES and we need to develop this functionality as part of the present scope?                                   | This is out of the scope of the RFP, but very importantly out of the scope of the pilot. We are open though for suggestions from the bidders.   |
| 80 | PRIMES | During implementation, we will be allowed to use the existing set of softwares and extend it further? For example: Would we be allowed to create forms and workflows in the existing Sharepoint environment and integrate PRIMES with Posgres4, HRMS and Sharepoint. | This is out of the scope of the pilot. However integration is certainly relevant in the longer run. Please be aware that the existing SharePoint 2013 infrastructure on premise (for forms, workflows) or UNHCR's SP on the cloud within its O365 subscription can be used in this regard. Please also refer to question 97, but also question 103. |
| 81 | PRIMES | Can we assume that during implementation, we will have access to Dev, Test and Staging environment of the various applications that the Pilot / PoC has to integrate with (e.g.PRIMES , Progresv4 , Sharepoint, AWS/Azure )  | Yes.  |
| 82 | Lang   | Can we assume that only the user interfaces would be made multi-lingual. The languages would be limited to English (Default), French, Spanish and Arabic   | Please refer to Annex A Section 4.5. Multi Language Interface of the RFP. Please also refer to question 35.   |

|    |              |  |   |
|----|--------------|--|---|
| 83 | Auth         | Can you please define the various classes of users that would be using the software and also the possible access rights of these users?  | The bidder is supposed to come up with a solution, based on the presented scenario.   |
| 84 | Host         | Who will provide the hardware for hosting the proposed solution?   | Preference is for bidders to provide a Software As A Service solution in which the hosting is included in the price.  |
| 85 | Host         | Can cloud be used to host the proposed solution? If yes, will UNHCR provide the cloud hosting solution separately to the selected vendor?  | Preference is for bidders to provide a Software As A Service solution in which the hosting is included in the price.  |
| 86 | KPI          | 1.1 Overview and objectives of the Terms of Reference - Can you illustrate the key KPIs which would be evaluated to assess the success for the pilot ?                                 | 6.1. UNHCR will periodically review the Service Provider's performance in all aspect of the project implementation to ensure the quality of the services. The KPIs will be defined during the contract establishment stage.                                       |
| 87 | FUNC         | 2. Identity Management and Registration in UNHCR Operations - Can you explain the process of "Claimed Identities " and how do you wish to manage in the pilot system?                  | This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution that they see best.   |
| 88 | Trust Policy | Section 3.3- Who would define the organization , governance, technical and regulatory rules for the entities in the trust scheme blockchain environment?                               | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10. |
| 89 | DAFI         | Annexure 1 DAFI Programme - Can you share a process document illustrating the process of DAFI registration , allocation of scholarships and ecosystem players involved in the process? | Flowcharts for Jordan, Mauretania and Kenya have already been developed and will be shared once the best bidder was selected.   |

|    |              |  |  |
|----|--------------|--|--|
| 90 | Trust Policy | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - The pilot project will deal with a very limited number of data subjects only . Can you illustrate kinds of data subjects to be used in DLT?  | <p>The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger technology".</p> <p>This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution that they see best for the scenarios given in the RFP.</p>   |
| 91 | Block        | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - The Digital Wallet is outside the scope of a public distributed ledger / blockchain given the highly sensitive nature of the identity documents of our caseload . Need more clarification on this point as if wallet is outside the scope of blockchain, how will the peripheral systems interact with wallet. Will the digital wallet be created as an ecosystem point in the Blockchain? | <p>The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger"/"Blockchain".</p> <p>This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution that they see best for the scenarios given in the RFP. UNHCR highlights that due to privacy concerns, sensitive data should probably not be put on a public blockchain/ledger.</p> |
| 92 | Trust Policy | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - Do you want us to do a round of evaluation on all emerging technologies to assess the value in practice, cost effective, and technologically superiority. Does this evaluation needs to be done during the requirement phase or at time of submission of bid?  | <p>This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution within the limits of the proposal.</p>  |



|    |              |   |   |
|----|--------------|---|---|
| 93 | Trust Policy | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - How do you intend to run the digitized process and the paper based process in parallel?   | Digitalization of documents and handling of paper documents is not the focus of the pilot. Please also refer to questions 71 and 77.  |
| 94 | Block        | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - Is the Blockchain protocol to be used suggested in the bid document or it can be finalized once we have detailed functional requirements? | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger"/"Blockchain".<br>As the Trust Scheme will not be available until mid 2019, it is not required to have a finalized protocol. However, this should not hinder the process of establishing a solution. |
| 95 | DAFI         | Annexure 1 DAFI Programme - Will some data for DAFI be migrated on the new platform in the pilot stage or only the new applications or enrolments be routed through this platform?                    | Further clarification is required for this question. The wallet should be able to communicate with proGres. For the pilot phase it is fine if new applications or students are routed through the new platform. For the longer run a close integration with the core of UNHCR PRIMES is envisaged.  |
| 96 | DAFI         | Annexure 1 DAFI Programme - What is the plan to capture the data on missing elements for the DAFI beneficiaries if migration is happening?  | It is not clear, if the question refers to technical data migration or to physical movement (onward movement or secondary migration by refugees). Further clarification on the question is therefore required.  |
| 97 | PRIMES       | 5.1. High Level Overview of IT Architecture in UNHCR - Will the pilot system be integrated into the PRIME's ecosystem?  | Yes. Integration with UNHCR systems in general is encouraged where it makes sense and possible within the scope of a limited pilot such as the one mentioned in the RFP. In any case UNHCR strives to integrate its IT systems in the medium/long run.  |
| 98 | Devices      | 5.9 User Devices - Are we making the digital wallet accessible through a feature phone by USSD mode?  | This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution that they see best for the scenarios given in the RFP.  |

|     |        |  |  |
|-----|--------|--|--|
| 99  | FUNC   | 3.6 Registration Principles - For conceptualization of a group led registration system , please let us know the enrolment , data sets & tracking mechanism for the group centered processes.   | When registering individuals in proGres, each individual is associated with (belongs to) a group. An individual registered alone is the only member of a "one-person group". Inclusion of additional individuals into an existing group is possible. Each group foresees a focal point. Relationships of group members are defined in relation to the focal point. Certain UNHCR processes are conducted with groups other details or processes might be recorded for/applied to individuals only. |
| 100 | FUNC   | 3.7 Registration Data - Who are the partners that can do the registration of the refugees? [ Are these partners also to be moved to blockchain]  | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger"/"Blockchain".  |
| 101 | PRIMES | 3.8 Status Determination - The current status/status evaluation of a refugee would be done outside the pilot system and only the data flow would happen from proGres into the pilot system. Please validate our understanding.   | This is out of the scope of the pilot. The actual status determination case management processes and their recording will indeed be effectuated in proGres v4. Over the longer run case management statuses and result might be relevant.  |
| 102 | FUNC   | 3.10 Assistance - As the pilot is mostly about the distribution of education grant and you have asked for inclusion of other grants such as food, non food etc. Please let us know at this point do you want us to consider these grants during the functional and technical design of the pilot system. | This is for the bidder to include in their proposed solution and to expand on the scalability and expansion of their solution.   |

|     |       |   |   |
|-----|-------|---|---|
| 103 | FUNC  | 4.2. Reporting and Digital Document Production - Can you please share some more context around the requirements for predictive views of business operations and benchmarking?   | proGres v4 well supports UNHCR's reporting requirements. Most of the requested reports are not within the scope of the pilot, but relevant in the longer run. UNHCR is open to suggestions from the bidders how best to go about reporting, while beyond the pilot scope. As what regards digitization of documents, UNHCR is open to suggestions from bidders.   |
| 104 | DAFI  | General Question - Please confirm that the initial registration of the data subjects related to the DAFI Programme will still be performed by your PRIMES application(s) and should thus be inherited by the new Trust Scheme Platform for the subsequent (1) Document Verification Register (CRoA / e-Apostilles) and the (2) Self Managed Digital Wallet functions. | This can be confirmed for the DAFI program. Initial registration is not in the scope of the pilot.  |
| 105 |       | General Question - Have you any preference between a bespoke solution vs an off-the-shelf platform ?  | The bidder should propose a convincing solution for the scenarios given along with support to why this is the best solution.  |
| 106 | BLOCK | 3.4 Architecture and Transactions within the Trust Scheme - Could you please elaborate more on the sentence "The Digital Wallet is outside the scope of a public distributed ledger / blockchain given the highly sensitive nature of the identity documents", since the distributed ledger could also be of a private nature.  | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger"/"Blockchain".<br>This is for the bidder to decide and present their solution that they see best for the scenarios given in the RFP. UNHCR highlights that due to privacy concerns, sensitive data should probably not be put on a public blockchain/ledger. Please also refer to question 91. |

|     |      |   |  |
|-----|------|---|--|
| 107 | TIME | General Question - While you have provided an overall methodology and project phases, we would like to understand the overall timing window of this PILOT, in terms of commencement and duration. | Assuming that the award of the contract will be made by Q1 2019, the development of the PILOT will be expected to start in Q2 2019. The goal is to have the pilot phased implemented in 2019. This question also relates to questions 28 and 29. |
|-----|------|---|--|

|     |      |  |  |
|-----|------|--|--|
| 108 | TIME | <p>Main RFP 1. Requirements - Why is the initial duration of the Framework agreement 3 (three) years, when the Implementation of project is planned for 2019 (1 year)?</p> | <p>Due to the novelty of the technology, UNHCR will adopt a 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5 years approach. Please note that the 3 + 1 + 1 approach is no longer valid. After each 1 (one) year a review takes place. The annual renewal is subject to adequate performance. The financial proposal, while covering the first one-year period, is expected to also provide an outlook on the potential costs over the next years the scalability element taken into account. Thus and in other words is expected to provide for the “scalable version” of the price aiming at ensuring that the best possible solution in terms of quality is granted from the onset on, the pilot. The information on how to scale the solution over the next years should be indicated in the lines "Additional cost elements related to scalability". The first 1-year period covers the initial DAFI pilot in the 3 countries Jordan, Kenya and Mauritania with about 500 – 1,000 Users. Once the first pilot is successfully implemented, the software platform will need to allow for an incremental increase of users and countries to cover the full DAFI programme and up to 10,000 users in the second 1- year period (over 6,700 DAFI students currently). This should then be steadily increased until a total of 100,000 users in the third 1-year period, but would need to ensure that a minimum of 1 Mio users would be able to use the software by the end of the fourth 1-year period. The goal of the fifth 1-year period would be to make the system ready globally and for all relevant UNHCR users (more than 8 Million refugees).</p> <p>In parallel and as soon as the wallet proved a successful and suitable tool for DAFI and its students, the additional features as per RFP would need to be implemented hand in hand with the incrementally increasing user-base so as to ensure that refugees other than DAFI students can also benefit from the wallet for their purposes. The first amendments are expected to be developed already in the second 1 year period (2020), while others will be made available only in the following years.</p> |
|-----|------|--|--|

|     |      |  |  |
|-----|------|--|--|
| 109 |      | Main RFP 2.4.1 Content of the TECHNICAL OFFER - What information is required on similar successfully completed and ongoing projects? Can you give an indication of the level of detail required on these projects?                                       | As much as needed to gain a judgement on the expertise gained in these projects. Suppliers should keep in mind the page limit for their proposal and weight of importance per section. |
| 110 | PROC | Main RFP 2.4.1 Content of the TECHNICAL OFFER - Can the information on prior and ongoing projects be anonymized (client name removed)?   | Information can of course be anonymized. It is evident, that this makes it harder to judge those projects.   |
| 111 | PROC | Main RFP 2.4.1 Content of the TECHNICAL OFFER - Vendor Registration form: is a separate form required for each company, in the case of bidding with a consortium?  | If you are bidding as a consortium, the lead company should fill out the vender registration form. However, it should be clear that you are submitting as a consortium.                |
| 112 | PROC | Main RFP 2.4.2 Content of the FINANCIAL OFFER - Price to be given without VAT: For our tax administration, we need a certificate from clients provided by their tax authority showing their tax exempt status. Can UNHCR provide such a certificate?     | UNHCR can provide proof of their tax exemption status. The status is also highlighted in the General Conditions of Services. Please also refer to question 29.                         |
| 113 | PROC | Main RFP 2.5.2 Technical and Financial evaluation - Can you provide an example with numbers for the calculation of points for the price component? It is not clear by the current wording how a certain offered total price leads to a number of points. | The financial evaluation will represent 40% of the overall score. As mentioned in the tender documents.  |

|     |              |   |   |
|-----|--------------|---|---|
| 114 | PROC         | Main RFP 2.7 Bid acceptance - If UNHCR chooses to extend the deadline for submission, in what way will this be communicated in writing to all prospective suppliers?  | If the deadline is to be extended, it will be published on UNHCR and UNGM websites and will be shared with all interested bidders.  |
| 115 | Trust Policy | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 1: 3.3 - Other potential trust providers such as other UN agencies may join if pilot is successful. Is the trust scheme still intended to remain a UNHCR trust scheme in that case? Or should the design take into account a model where there will be multiple organization's jointly running the system? | The system should be designed to support more than one trust scheme. A flexible architecture is as such appreciated.  |
| 116 | FUNC         | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 1: 3.4 – Data flow examples: are these data flow examples part of a larger document describing data flows for the system? If so, can this document be made available to potential bidders?   | This is just an example. No such document exists. We expect the bidder to come up with a solution.  |
| 117 | Trust Policy | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 2: G - Only a small selection of suited requirements [...] is needed, which needs to be specified and defined by UNHCR: When is this specification to take place?  | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10. |

|     |      |  |  |
|-----|------|--|--|
| 118 | TIME | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - Implementation of project is given as 2019. Should this be read as completion by end of 2019? If not, what is the intended completion date of the project? How long is the warranty period expected to last after 2019?   | Start date of development is Q2 2019, Pilot is expected to go live by end 2019 and warranty should last 6 months from date of go live. Please also refer to question 29. |
| 119 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - General information: What are the evaluation criteria relating to economic and financial capacity that are mentioned?   | The evaluation will be conducted on a 60 Technical offer/ 40 Financial offer ratio. Under the technical evaluation segment, there is the criteria description.           |
| 120 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference - Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - 'see point 4 below': to which point is this referring?  | Please refer to question no. 119.  |
| 121 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - Pitching Event in Copenhagen: Is it possible to attend the pitching event without presenting our approach? Is it possible to present our approach but without having it recorded or shared with other applicants, as the presentation can be considered non-public intellectual property of the bidding firm? | All intervention during the pitching event will be recorded and shared publicly.   |



|     |      |   |   |
|-----|------|---|---|
| 122 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - offer should not exceed 30 pages: Does this include or exclude information in an Annex to the proposal?                                    | You can include an annex with supporting documents to your proposal. The 30 page (max.) core-proposal will be the primary document for the evaluation.  |
| 123 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - The structure given for the Technical offer differs from the structure given in the main RFP document. Which structure should be followed? | <p>This point relates to RFP, page 3, and Annex A of the ToR, page 47. Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers provides a breakdown of the evaluation criteria, whereas the RFP cover page 3 covers the same information in a different structure. Both documents are requesting the same information. Bidders should follow the structure outlined in Annex A ToR, page 47 so as to ensure that the innovative character of the strategy and the technical approach are clearly addressed and emphasized in the technical proposal.</p> <p>However, the supporting documents requested as per RFP, page 3 (Description of the company and the company's qualifications, Vendor Registration Form, UNHCR General Conditions for Provision of Goods and Services), are certainly also relevant and need to be taken into consideration when structuring the bid. Please also refer to question 191 and 192.</p> |

|     |      |   |   |
|-----|------|---|---|
| 124 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - criteria 1-3 mentioned above': which criteria is this referring to? Are these the criteria in the table with Criteria Descriptions on page 46? If so, how are the other parts of the offer (Strategy, Implementation, Organization and Management) scored? | Criteria 1-3 are the criteria 1-3 listed in the table on page number 46. Please also refer to question /answer 123. On page number 47 a structure for the proposal document is given. On page number 46 evaluation criteria are given.  |
| 125 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - Letters of Intent: what information is required in these Letters of Intent?  | As long as the company agrees to adhere to our General Conditions on Contract that should fulfill this requirement. If you are part of a consortium or corporate group, please provide the relevant documents attesting to the status of your company in relation to the group. |
| 126 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - 'ideally in EXCEL as per below': how is this to be interpreted next to the requirement in the main RFP to provide all the documents in PDF format?   | Please refer to answer to question 124.   |
| 127 | PROC | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - Does the description of each team member need to include the name, or is it sufficient to list roles?  | You may only describe the role and level of each member of the team.  |

|     |        |  |   |
|-----|--------|--|---|
| 128 | PROC   | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - Does the bidder need to guarantee the availability of specific named team members, or is it allowed to substitute team members of equal or greater experience/skill and for the same rates prior to/during the project? | If supplier decides to substitute proposed teams in the offer from the actual implementation phase of the project, they must provide prior notification to UNHCR.   |
| 129 | Infras | Annex A Terms of Reference Annex 5 Tender Process and Evaluation of Offers - What commitment in human resources can be expected from UNHCR during this project? E.g. availability of project members, experts, local contacts.   | As indicated in Annex 3 Detailed Specification/ Detailed Requirements, in its Section 2. Project Methodology and Phases it is clarified that UNHCR will participate in both the requirements confirmation phase as well as the finalization of the ToR.<br>UNHCR will throughout the pilot make Focal Points available to closely collaborate with the selected bidder aiming at ensure a smooth development process and importantly a successful pilot implementation. UNHCR will support the pilot project through contact persons for the project, experts and local contacts. |
| 130 | PROC   | Annex B Financial Response Form - List of cost elements / Warranty period: how long is the warranty period expected to be?   | Warranty should last 6 months from date of go live, please also refer to questions 29 and 118.  |
| 131 | PROC   | Annex C Vendor Registration form Section 3 - Is it required to fill out technical capabilities and information on services offered? Or can we reference the technical part of the offer here?  | You can just provide a brief summary on technical capabilities or services offered.   |

|     |              |   |   |
|-----|--------------|---|---|
| 132 | PROC         | Annex C Vendor Registration form Section 4 - Experience: is it necessary to list experience here, or can we reference the qualifications in the technical part of the offer here? | On the Vendor Registration, please provide as many details and submit as many documents as possible since the team evaluating vendors' application is different from the team awarding contracts.   |
| 133 | Scale        | Annex A Chapter 3.1 - Paragraph 1 - How many persons are expected to participate in the pilot study?  | Please refer to RFP Annex 1 of Annex A; and Annex 5 "Financial Evaluation" section - Scalability Scenarios: 10.000; 100.000; 1 Mio; in 2017, over 6,700 students in 50 countries benefitted from a DAFI scholarship, including over 2,582 newly enrolled students (Pilot focus: 3 countries). This also relates to question 43. |
| 134 | FUNC         | Annex A Chapter 3.2 - Paragraph 4 - What alterations (management) is the data subject allowed to make in the digital wallet?  | We expect the bidder to come up with a viable proposal.   |
| 135 | KPI          | Annex A Chapter 3.3 - Paragraph 6 - What determines a successful pilot? What are the KPI's that UNHCR will score this on?   | The Key performance Indicators for the pilot will be based on the functional requirements as outlined in the RFP. They will be defined with the bidders and be part of the service agreement. it is normal practice that KPIs can be established at different stages in the process. Please also refer to question 86.          |
| 136 | Auth         | Annex A Chapter 3.4 - Paragraph 3 - Who is allowed to access (see the details) of the information (CRoA) stored in the e-Registry; which party has which authority?               | We expect the bidder to come up with a viable proposal that delivers value for UNHCR processes as well as respects privacy and security needs.  |
| 137 | Trust Policy | Annex A Annex 3 - Paragraph 3.3 - Is the UNHCR Trust Scheme the same as the UNHCR Trust Policy that will be released on the 15th of December?                                     | No. Please also refer to question 10.   |

|     |        |  |   |
|-----|--------|--|---|
| 138 | DAFI   | Annex A Annex 3 - Section 3.10 - Paragraph 1 - Besides DAFI which parties are involved in the assessment of scholarship applications -Is it necessarily to interact with these parties?  | As per the DAFI Policy and Guidelines entities involved in the application and selection process are/ could be depending on the context: UNHCR, DAFI partners, German Embassy, Universities, Ministry of (higher) Education, refugee community. For the bidders we do not foresee any interaction with the selection committee members. The solution should however foresee the possible access by actors other than the refugee as specified in the RFP. |
| 139 | Lang   | Annex A Annex 4 - Section 4.7 - Paragraph 3 - What is ment with initially? Does the first version of the product (POC) need to have all the required languages (English, French, Spanish and Arabic) or is English sufficient? | Please refer to Annex A Section 4.5. Multi Language Interface of the RFP. This also relates to question 35.   |
| 140 | PRIMES | Annex A Section 3.2 - Will the digital wallet in any way be connected to the already existing PRIMES application backend?  | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 141 | PRIMES | Annex A Annex 3 - Will ProGres handle user management and authentication, whereas the system would handle authorization?   | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 142 | PRIMES | Annex A Annex 3 - chp 3 - Is the form builder functionality of ProGres to be integrated in the system in the pilot phase already?  | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 143 | FUNC   | Annex A Chapter 3 - Is production of formal printed documents (certificates, ID cards, certificates, etc) part of the scope for the pilot?   | This is not the focus of the pilot.   |

|     |       |  |  |
|-----|-------|--|--|
| 144 | Scale | Annex A Annex 3 - In the first part of Annex A the requirements pertain to a pilot implementation. In Annex 3 the functional and non-functional specifications seem oriented at a full production implementation. Which scope should the proposal be focused on? | This RFP refers to a pilot project that has the potential to be extended into a full production system. We are aware that a pilot system would not fulfil all requirements of a full production system. However, the pilot should have the potential to demonstrate how we could get to the full production system if the pilot is successful. |
| 145 | Scale | Annex A 3 - How many Trusted UNHCR entities are in scope of the pilot and the project as a whole?  | Further clarification on the definition of a "trusted UNHCR entity" would be required. You might also want to refer to answer to question 138.   |
| 146 | Scale | Annex A 3 - How many of these UNHCR trusted entities have technology capabilities that enable them to host a full blockchain stack?  | Further clarification on the requirements to "host a full blockchain stack" would be required.   |

|     |         |  |   |
|-----|---------|--|---|
| 147 | Records | <p>“Currently, UNHCR holds identity records of more than 8 million refugees globally. UNHCR’s Population Registration and Population Management EcoSystem (PRIMES) records the bio data (or foundational data), such as names, birth date, nationality, place of residence, but also a passport size picture and biometric imprints. None of these data elements is currently accessible, neither in parts nor in total) to the data subject. While the current system records status, e.g. somebody being married or holding a degree or diploma, these supporting documents are not uploaded into the system. Likewise, the documents produced by the system, such as ID cards, family attestations, are printed on paper and handed out to the individual. There are no digital records maintained in PRIMES.” [Page 7] - Are identity records recorded by UNHCR, but as soon as documents are printed these are not available? And accordingly, does it exist -or not- , currently, any type of digital registry on refugees identity and bio data, whatever the depth of information level?</p> | <p>Identity records continue to be available in PRIMES even after documents are printed. These constitute the digital registry on refugees identities'.</p> |
| 148 | FUNC    | <p>How many trusted parties are required to be included in the pilot for their data e-apostille? Is there a minimum number required?</p>   | <p>The number should fit the pilot scenario as sketched out in the RFP.</p>   |

|     |              |  |   |
|-----|--------------|--|---|
| 149 | Dig          | <p>“As UNHCR intends to develop a specific application for the management of currently more than 6,700 students in 50 countries that receive tertiary education grants (DAFI)3, the project outlined here, will be of specific significance: refugees that apply for scholarships and those that are awarded scholarships will be part of the pilot group managing their own digital wallets.” [Page 7]</p> <p>- Students across countries are referred as part of the pilot group. Is the documentation regarding scholarships digitized?</p> | <p>Within the pilot project it should be possible that documents can be digitized, although the actual document digitization is out of the scope of the RFP. However we are open for suggestions from the bidders. Please be aware that UNHCR is already looking at options to further enhance its digital file management more holistically, which is outside of this RFP. Please also refer to questions 48 and 71.</p> |
| 150 | PRIMES       | <p>To what extent is PRIMER integration required?</p> <p>With which of the systems defined is such integration required?</p>   | <p>It depends on the design of the bidder's solution. Integration with UNHCR systems in general is encouraged where it makes sense and possible within the scope of a limited pilot such as the one mentioned in the RFP. In any case UNHCR strives to integrate its IT systems in the medium/long run.</p>   |
| 151 | FUNC         | <p>Does data synchronization need to be real-time?</p>   | <p>This is of course dependent on the particular use case(s) and up to the bidder to come up with a proposal.</p>   |
| 152 | Bio          | <p>Is biometric identification included as part of the pilot?</p>  | <p>Biometric Identification is not the focus of the pilot; biometrics may be included as part of a potential design in a modular fashion. UNHCR has its own biometrics systems.</p>   |
| 153 | Trust Policy | <p>Trust Scheme - Which institutions will be part of the third party UNHCR Trust agent?</p>  | <p>UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. This is also related to questions 10 and 138.</p>  |



|     |              |  |   |
|-----|--------------|--|---|
| 154 | Trust Policy | Trust Scheme - Is the Trust Scheme will be based only on decentralized data bases ? Can it be a DLT ? A public blockchain ?  | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications.  |
| 155 | Trust Policy | Trust Scheme - Will there be a trusted third party (that verifies and certifies the documents) in each location of registering the refugees?                                   | This could be one way to organize verification and certification of documents. We are open to suggestions from the bidders.   |
| 156 | FUNC         | Functional - Are there restrictions to what can be stored in the digital wallet? (e.g. could CRoAs be recorded inside the digital wallet)                                      | Everything that the bidder regards as valuable and at the same time in accordance with the privacy and security requirements could be stored.   |
| 157 | Trust Policy | Trust Scheme - Is the Trust Scheme roadmap will be govern by a governance body ? If yes, do we need to propose and include a governance process in the deliverable ?           | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10. |
| 158 | Trust Policy | Trust Scheme - How the e-Registry will be govern in term of operational process ?  | This is up to the bidder.   |
| 159 | Infras       | Infrastructure - For signing e-Apostille and "Proof of X", does UNHCR plan to use a decentralized PKI or centralized PKI model ? What about key storage and management ? HSM ? | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 160 | Infras       | Infrastructure - Is there any plan to have a Key management custody system in place ?  | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 161 | Infras       | Infrastructure - Is there any plan to use a Time Stamping Authority from a third party to timestamp the CroA transaction ?   | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |

|     |              |   |  |
|-----|--------------|---|--|
| 162 | PR/L         | Privacy & Risk - Who are the adversaries against whom the migrants' (directly or indirectly) identifiable information has to be protected? Can the verifier and the nodes hosting the e-Registry collude? Is the UNHCR the only "writer" to the registry? | The system should be designed as to protect the personal data of the refugees against various attackers and attack forms. The bidder should propose an architecture that is both, privacy friendly and of practical for the pilot and potentially beyond. This is also related to question 163.  |
| 163 | PR/L         | Privacy & Risk - Has the system need to be coercion-resistant? Coercion, e.g., whether migrants can be forced to give up or share their credentials.  | The system should be designed as to protect the personal data of the refugees against various attackers and attack forms. The bidder should propose an architecture that is both, privacy friendly and of practical for the pilot and potentially beyond.  |
| 164 | Trust Policy | Global view - How many entities form the Trust Scheme?  | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. This is also related to questions 10, 166, 181 and 182.  |
| 165 | Block        | What constraints do you have, with respect to the distributed ledger, in the potential context that other programs of UN (e.g. World Food Program) will join the programme (RfP page 9m)?   | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger". A system with the potential to be extended beyond the pilot programme (DAFI focus) to other UNHCR systems or missions and an integration of other UN programmes or other partners would of course be appreciated. |

|     |              |  |   |
|-----|--------------|--|---|
| 166 | Trust Policy | Documents - Where will the Trust Policy be made available (RfP page 23) ?  | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. This is also related to question 10, 181 and 182. |
| 167 | PRIMES       | Infrastructure - How is the data exchanged between the PRIMES modules and the UNHCR partners up to now (RfP page 23)?  | Restful APIs, Secure FTP.   |
| 168 | RC           | Functional - What is the envisioned procedure in case of a lost of the Digital wallet?   | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 169 | PRIMES       | Functional – PRIMES - Does the enhancement of proGRES can be done directly in MS CRM ? As plugin ? As an API ?   | We are open to suggestions from the bidders.  |
| 170 | RC           | Digital Wallet - Does the biometric data is encrypted in UNHCR DB ? If yes, which key management system is used ? Do we need to include a complete security and encryption system that allow key recovery/compromise/destruction .. of the key used in the wallet to encrypt biometric data? | Biometric Identification is not the focus of the pilot. It is however up to the bidder to come up with a solution regarding the management of lost/compromised/destroyed keys.  |
| 171 | FUNC         | Infrastructure - Does all UNHCR Trust agent will need to have to generate/manage their key pair to sign CroA ? Or this is managed by a key management system we need to provide ?  | Please specify your understanding of a "UNHCR Trust agent". If an architectural aspect such as key management is an integral part of the bidders proposed system, the bidder should come up with a solution.  |
| 172 | FUNC         | Infrastructure - Does all UNHCR Trust agent will need to integrate a Verification API ?  | Please specify your understanding of a "UNHCR Trust agent". It is up to the bidder to come up with a solution.  |

|     |              |   |  |
|-----|--------------|---|--|
| 173 | FUNC         | Infrastructure - How the document will be stored in the UNHCR DB ? Do we need to get their hashed value stored in the e-Registry ?  | As described in the RFP, no digitized documents are currently stored in the UNHCR Databases. It is up to the bidder to come up with a solution.          |
| 174 | FUNC         | Digital Wallet - Do you need to have a "paper version" of the digital wallet ?  | This depends on how you envision the functionalities of the wallet. Creation/handling of paper documents is not the focus of the pilot.                  |
| 175 | FUNC         | Regarding the Digital Wallet, should we aim to provide a web wallet Or some form of connected hardware wallet?  | It is up to the bidder to come up with a solution.   |
| 176 | e-A          | How are the existing e-App system components & e-registries going to be leveraged?  | It is up to the bidder to come up with a solution.   |
| 177 | FUNC         | Generally, the purpose of the wallet to give control to users on what they want to share and take their consent. In a case where validity of a document has been revoked, why would the user want to share it. Currently, it looks to be more about making the data available to the users for further usage. Please confirm. | It is up to the bidder to decide how they want to address the scenario described in the RFP and its potential future extensions.                         |
| 178 | Trust Policy | How is CRoA used downstream for identification ? The RFP talks more about identity creation and registration through the trust scheme. Is the usage of Identity per the trust scheme outside of the network out of scope?   | RFP focuses on a limited pilot solution. However, it has been made clear that it is envisioned to build a solution that is scalable and can be extended. |
| 179 | PRIMES       | Where is PRIMES deployed? During dev and test phases will this system be accessible remotely?   | PRIMES is accessible via the Internet.   |

|     |              |  |   |
|-----|--------------|--|---|
| 180 | PRIMES       | Who is responsible for managing PRIME? Do we have to collaborate with the team for any change / modifications?                                     | As per RFP, collaboration with the team is expected once the proposal is selected so as to fine-tune some very specific details jointly. For the initial pilot this is of less relevance; however in the longer run collaboration as what regards e.g. interoperability with the core of UNHCR PRIMES a minimum of collaboration might be required. |
| 181 | Trust Policy | Will the UNHCR Trust policy require Trust anchors? Will they be part of this solution? Who will be responsible for onboarding these Trust anchors? | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10 and 182.   |
| 182 | Trust Policy | When will the UNHCR Trust Policy and SOP be shared?  | UNHCR will provide you transparently with updated information, as it is developed (E.g. Expected Trust Policy: to be expected by 2nd half 2019), but also new developments as regards UNHCR as a trusted E/Digital-ID provider. Please also refer to question 10 and 181.   |
| 183 | FUNC         | What functionality needs to be provided for Group registration as part of the POC scope?   | Further clarification is needed.  |
| 184 | FUNC         | Individuals can be registered either by UNHCR, a government or another partner. - does that mean that refugees can't do self-registration?         | For now, self-registration is not possible for refugees.  |
| 185 | FUNC         | Can we assume that RSD service will be made available for the POC for status determination? Or does it need to be simulated?                       | If this is required for the scope of the pilot it could be made available.  |

|     |        |   |   |
|-----|--------|---|---|
| 186 | Infras | Which BI system is the POC supposed to integrate with for generating the reports mentioned in section 4.2? Are all the reporting requirements to be covered in the POC ?  | Microsoft BI. Core operational reports to be included in the PoC. Other reports to be generated from a PowerBI interface into the solution.   |
| 187 | PRIMES | In the section "Other business processes" in the RFP, the processes mentioned are outside the distributed ledger and seem to be part of extending existing functionalities of proGres. Apart from implementing Blockchain for sharing CroA, extension of proGres seems to be a key component for this initiative ?Is the POC supposed to leveraged existing proGres system for authentication and authorization of end user? If yes, kindly provide details of the system | Currently partners are authenticated against a separate Active Directory forest (on premise) when accessing ProGres. (Authorization is controlled within ProGres). Vendors are not compelled to use this and may propose other ways of authentication and authorization.  |
| 188 | e-A    | How are the e-Apostilles issued ? Do we need to interface with the system issuing the e-Apostilles?   | The RFP when referring to E-Apostille does not refer to the HCCH e-Apostille ( <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945">https://www.hcch.net/en/publications-and-studies/details4/?pid=4945</a> ). Therefore a compatibility is not a mandatory condition. The term E-Apostille was used because of its principle and power to meet the purpose. Please also refer to question 31. |

|     |       |   |   |
|-----|-------|---|---|
| 189 | Block | UNHCR already holds data for millions of Refugees along with the RSDs. Would all of these be needed to pre-loaded on the blockchain?  | The RFP clearly states that it is open to any technology and architecture that is capable of enabling the envisioned use case for the pilot and future applications. Thus, no specific answer can be given regarding a "distributed ledger". A system with the potential to be extended beyond the pilot programme (DAFI focus) to other UNHCR systems or missions and an integration of other UN programmes or other partners would of course be appreciated.  |
| 190 | PROC  | We have a framework agreement with the World Food Program. Our understanding of that agreement is that it also gets us approved supplier status with the rest of the UN. Can you confirm this is correct please, and let us know if it simplifies the bidding process in any way (less paperwork for example?). | If you are already registered in UNGM, you may not have to upload all the administrative documents, however you must fill out the vendor registration form.   |
| 191 | PROC  | The structure for the Technical Officer differs between page 3 in RFP and page 47 in Annex A ToR.   | Bidders should follow the structure mentioned in Annex A ToR, page 47, so as to ensure that the innovative character of the strategy and the technical approach are clearly addressed and emphasized in the technical proposal. However, the supporting documents requested in RFP page 3 (Description of the company and the company's qualifications, Vendor Registration Form, UNHCR General Conditions for Provision of Goods and Services) are certainly also relevant and need to be taken into consideration when structuring the bid. Please also refer to questions 123 and 192. |

|     |      |  |  |
|-----|------|--|--|
| 192 | PROC | The ToR restricts the number of the Proposal to 30 pages (Annex A (ToR) page 47), whereas the RFP states "Venders are expected to provide as much as detail as possible".  | The page limit of 30 pages in Annex A (ToR), page 47, exclusively applies to the description of the actual solution (Point 1, 2 and 3 in Annex A ToR). Background information (Point 3 in Annex A of the ToR and in the RFP, page 3 "Description of the company and the company's qualifications, Vendor Registration Form, UNHCR General Conditions for Provision of Goods and Services) are not included in the 30 page limit. Please also refer to questions 123 and 191. |
| 193 | PROC | Are 3 years of audited financial statements required to participate in the process (per vendor registration requirements)?   | We will exceptionally accept proposals even if they do not have 3 years of audited financial statements, however the company must demonstrate that it is financially sound.  |
| 194 | PROC | I understand from the Vendor Registration Form that the bidder must display a minimum of 3 years in operation. I wish to clarify if this is a hard requirement for the bid to be considered. Further, I have noted that an acknowledgement of the General Conditions of Contract must be attached as part of the technical offer. What form must this take? Would it be in the form of a letter or a signature on the General Conditions of Contract document? | The minimum requirement of 3 years in operation is not a 'hard' criteria and bidders may submit a proposal in case of less than 3 years in operation. By submitting an offer, you acknowledge that you have read and agreed to the General Conditions of Contract (Annex D of the documents).  |



|     |      |  |  |
|-----|------|--|--|
| 195 | PROC | Are you looking for companies that are based out of Europe to bid on this RFP?   | Any entity is more than welcome to submit a proposal independent from where it is geographically located! Also, bidders do not need to match a classic vendor profile. Academia, non-profit organisations, start-ups, consortia, associations and similar are also welcome to submit a proposal. |
| 196 | PROC | We see that the pricing sheet is structured in a time and material format, are you open to receiving bids from Skas companies? | In order to provide an answer, please clarify what Skas companies are?   |

| <i>Abbreviation</i> | <i>Explanation</i>           |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Auth</b>         | Authentication Authorization |
| <b>Bio</b>          | Biometrics                   |
| <b>Block</b>        | Blockchain                   |
| <b>DAFI</b>         | DAFI                         |
| <b>Devices</b>      | Devices                      |
| <b>Dig</b>          | Digitalization of Documents  |
| <b>e-A</b>          | e-Apostille                  |
| <b>FUNC</b>         | Functionality                |
| <b>Host</b>         | Hosting                      |
| <b>Infras</b>       | UNHCR IT Infrastructure      |
| <b>KPI</b>          | Key Performance Indicators   |
| <b>Lang</b>         | Language                     |
| <b>OFF</b>          | Offline Use                  |
| <b>PR/L</b>         | Privacy/Legal Aspects        |

|                     |                                     |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>PRIMES</b>       | PRIMES                              |
| <b>PROC</b>         | Process                             |
| <b>ProGres</b>      | ProGress                            |
| <b>RC</b>           | Revocation of Credentials           |
| <b>Records</b>      | Records of Entries in UNHCR Systems |
| <b>Scale</b>        | Scalability                         |
| <b>TIME</b>         | Time/Project Plan                   |
| <b>Trust Policy</b> | Trust Policy                        |