



REPUBLIC OF KENYA
THE NATIONAL TREASURY
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR ECONOMIC PLANNING

TOR CLARIFICATIONS FOR

**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT FOR END-TO- END ELECTRONIC PLANNING,
MONITORING AND EVALUATION (E-NIMES/E-CIMES)**

TENDER NUMBER: TNT/SDEP/RFP/002/2025-2026

Issue Date: 31ST MARCH 2026

Close Date: 15TH APRIL 2026

The State Department for Economic Planning confirms receipt of requests for classifications on the following issues.

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
Q2	<i>General</i>	The RFP does not specify the number of on-site missions expected from the vendor (e.g. for needs assessment, workshops, training delivery, or go-live support). Could you please clarify the anticipated number and purpose of vendor on-site visits to Nairobi and/or county locations over the project duration?	Refer to Pages 105 –108 and Page 124 on needs assessment, training of various groups and change management
Q3	<i>General</i>	The TOR includes a 12-month post-deployment warranty/support period. Could you please confirm whether the cost of this support period should be included within the main financial proposal, or whether it should be presented as a separate line item or separate SLA agreement?	12months warranty period is free but Post-deployment support of 36months should be part of the financial proposal (SLA proposal basis)
Q4	<i>Hosting & Infrastructure</i>	The RFP designates the Kenya ICT Authority Government Cloud as the hosting environment. Could you please clarify whether hosting and infrastructure costs are to be priced by the vendor within the proposal, or whether they will be procured and covered separately by the Government?	Hosting costs during development will be met by the Vendor. Hosting infrastructure upon deployment will be provided by Government
Q5	<i>Hosting & Infrastructure</i>	The RFP references a non-functional requirement of 10,000 concurrent users but does not provide a breakdown by user type or role. Could you please provide an estimated number of users segmented by category (e.g. internal government staff, MDA users, county officials, external/public users) and by functional role (e.g. data entry, reviewer, Approver, administrator, read-only)?	Estimated 7,000 concurrent internal government users (mixed roles) and 3,000 concurrent public users (read-only)
Q6	<i>Integration, Legacy & Data Migration</i>	The RFP references the existing e-NIMES and e-CIMES systems and related MDA/County M&E systems as sources for data migration. Could you please provide details on the volume of legacy data (record counts), the formats in which it is stored, and the scope of content to be migrated? This is required to accurately estimate migration effort and risk.	Refer to earlier Responses on e-NIMES/e-CIMES Migration
Q7	<i>Integration, Legacy & Data Migration</i>	Could you please share a description of the existing legacy system database, including its structure, key entities, and what data it currently stores? A data dictionary or schema,	Refer to earlier Responses on e-NIMES/e-CIMES Migration

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
		even at a high level, would be very helpful for migration planning.	
Q8	<i>Integration, Legacy & Data Migration</i>	The TOR lists a number of systems requiring integration (IFMIS, PIMIS, eGP, NEMIS, IPRS, HMIS, NALM, SSN, SRI, KSG, etc.) but does not define the total number of required integrations or the data flow direction for each. Could you please confirm: (a) the complete list of systems requiring integration; and (b) the data flow direction for each (inbound, outbound, or bidirectional)?	Refer to Section 4.1 on page 100 but the vendor can propose additional systems.
Q9	<i>Integration, Legacy & Data Migration</i>	The RFP does not specify whether integration development costs should be included in the vendor's financial proposal. Could you please confirm whether integration costs are to be priced as part of the proposed budget?	Integration cost for the key systems in Section 4.1 on page 100 should be included in the vendor financial proposal
Q10	<i>System Entities & Data Forms</i>	The TOR references budget tracking at the project level and integration with IFMIS/PIMIS for reporting purposes, but does not define the specific financial data types the system must capture. Could you please clarify what types of financial data are required (e.g. budget allocations, commitments, disbursements, expenditure actuals) and at what level they should be recorded?	Financial data are required on budget allocations, actuals, revised, commitments, disbursements, absorptions and actual expenditures at project and programme levels
Q11	<i>System Entities & Data Forms</i>	The RFP references budget tracking at project and programme levels but does not define the required granularity. Could you please confirm at what level budget planning should be recorded — for example, at the Programme level, Project level, or down to individual Budget Line Items?	Programme and Project Levels
Q12	<i>System Entities & Data Forms</i>	The TOR mentions expenditure data and IFMIS integration in the context of reporting, but does not explicitly state whether full budget execution tracking (actuals, commitments, and disbursements) is within the current scope of this engagement. Could you please confirm whether budget execution functionality is in scope?	Only financial data on Programmes and Projects
Q13	<i>System Entities &</i>	Could you please provide an indication of the total number of programmes and projects	Refer to earlier Responses on e-NIMES/e-CIMES Migration

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
	<i>Data Forms</i>	currently being managed under the e-NIMES/e-CIMES systems? This is required to estimate data migration volume and system sizing accurately.	
Q14	<i>System Entities & Data Forms</i>	The RFP references existing data entry forms within the system portals but does not provide any sample forms or templates. Could you please share copies of the currently used data entry forms in any available format (e.g. PDF, Excel, screenshots)? This will help us ensure the redesigned system captures all required fields and workflows.	Part of the information is provided under the Business Processes section on Page 68-84. However, additional information maybe be provided during development.
Q15	<i>Training</i>	The TOR provides a detailed training schedule for end-user groups (management, MDAs, counties, cities, and stakeholders) but does not mention a train-the-trainer approach. Could you please confirm whether train-the-trainer methodology is expected as part of the training deliverables, in addition to or instead of direct end-user training?	This is explained in section 6.2 on page 108 where train-the-trainer methodology is expected for 200pax
Q16	<i>Training</i>	The TOR training table indicates conference and on-site arrangements with DSA and transport logistics for most participant groups. Could you please confirm whether any training sessions may be delivered remotely (e.g. online or hybrid), or whether all training is expected to be conducted fully on-site?	Training modalities are already prescribed in the TOR to be in on site
Q17	<i>Hosting & Infrastructure</i>	The TOR states that the system shall be deployable on "government cloud platforms" and emphasizes sovereign-compliant hosting with data residency in Kenya. However, other sections appear to reference approved commercial cloud infrastructure. Could you please clarify the intended hosting environment: (a) exclusively the Kenya ICT Authority Government Cloud; (b) any sovereign-compliant data centre within Kenya; or (c) approved commercial cloud providers (e.g. AWS, Azure, GCP) subject to data residency requirements? This is essential for infrastructure architecture design and pricing.	Hosting will be in a Government Cloud or as maybe approved by Government.
Q18	<i>Scope & Delivery</i>	The TOR defines a very comprehensive scope spanning Development Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation, Project Management, Business Intelligence/GIS, AI/ML analytics, Mobile	Development should be as per the given time frames and full system readiness before go-live.

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
		<p>Applications, Document Repository, Public Portals, and multiple external integrations. The milestones show a single Deployment & Go-Live phase (Phase 7, Months 15–16). Could you please confirm whether all modules are expected to go live simultaneously, or whether an incremental/phased go-live approach — releasing individual modules to production progressively — is also acceptable? This will significantly affect our proposed development methodology and risk management approach.</p>	
Q19	<i>Hosting & Infrastructure</i>	<p>The TOR specifies a one-time licensing model and states the system shall accommodate an “unlimited” number of users. Could you please clarify what “unlimited” means in practical and contractual terms: (a) are there any technical constraints on concurrent sessions, data storage quotas, or API call volumes that the vendor must provision for during the contract period? (b) as user numbers and data volumes grow beyond initial estimates, who is responsible for provisioning additional infrastructure capacity — the Government or the vendor?</p>	<p>This system will fully belong to the Government with a perpetual license that allows unlimited number of users</p> <p>Vendor should advise on the likely technical constraints and provide recommendations for mitigation.</p>
Q20	<i>BI, GIS & Geospatial</i>	<p>The TOR requires a Business Intelligence, GIS and Visualization Module with integrated geodatabase, spatial mapping, geospatial aggregation, and a Satellite-Based Project Monitoring Module. Could you please confirm: (a) whether there is an existing GIS-based legacy system or spatial/geospatial database currently in use for project geo-referencing or spatial monitoring? (b) if so, please share details of the platform, data formats, coordinate reference systems used, and the approximate volume of spatial records that would need to be migrated or integrated into the new system.</p>	<p>There is no existing GIS-based legacy system or spatial/geospatial database</p>
Q21	<i>Hardware Requirements</i>	<p>The TOR highlights minimum hardware requirements necessary to support the secure, reliable and scalable operations. Please advise if the bidder will be required to provide this. Data Center/Hosting, End User Devices, WAN/LAN, Internet</p>	<p>Hardware will be provided by Government. Vendors need to take cognizance of the environment where the system is expected to operate</p>

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
Q22	<i>Cloud infrastructure costs — during and after project</i>	The RFP does not explicitly allocate responsibility for the recurring costs of cloud infrastructure (AWS, Microsoft Azure, and/or Google Cloud Platform) during either (a) the project implementation phase or (b) the post-handover operational period. Kindly confirm: (i) which party — the Consultant or the Government of Kenya — bears these costs during implementation; (ii) who is responsible post-completion; and (iii) whether a Government-provisioned cloud environment (e.g. the Kenya National Data Centre / e-Government cloud) will be made available to the Consultant, and if so, on what terms.	<p>During development the vendor will incur the cost of hosting the system.</p> <p>Post-completion the system will be transferred to Government Cloud or as maybe approved</p>
Q23	<i>Satellite imagery data subscription costs</i>	The E-NIMES/E-CIMES system scope appears to contemplate the use of geospatial and satellite imagery data. Please clarify whether the cost of satellite imagery data subscriptions (e.g. from Planet, Maxar, SPOT, or similar commercial providers) is to be borne by the Consultant within the engagement budget or procured and provided by the Government. If borne by the Consultant, please confirm whether such costs should be included as a discrete line item in the Financial Proposal, and whether there is a ceiling or indicative benchmark applicable.	The functionality will be built into the the system as per the ToR and end points should be able to interact with the module as necessary.
Q24	<i>Criterion 7 demonstration stage — format, date, venue & evaluation criteria</i>	The RFP references a Demonstration as Criterion 7 in the technical evaluation framework but does not provide complete guidance on the following: (i) Format and duration — what the Demonstration is expected to cover and for how long; (ii) Evaluation sub-criteria and weightings — the specific criteria against which the Demonstration will be scored; (iii) Indicative date(s) — when shortlisted firms should expect to be invited for the Demonstration; and (iv) Venue / modality — whether the Demonstration will be conducted in-person, virtually, or in hybrid format. We request full details on all four points so that firms may adequately prepare.	<p>Demonstration will be for the few vendors who have met the technical requirements.</p> <p>Demonstration will be in-person at an appropriate venue to be decided</p> <p>Demonstration will focus on technical functionalities of the system</p> <p>This will enable vendors demonstrate technical capability either through similar systems they have deployed elsewhere, prototypes or as they may choose. This will be done during evaluation or before the award at</p>

#	Category	Clarification Question	Response
			a venue and time to be communicated.
Q25	MINUTES / RECORD OF THE PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE — 8 APRIL 2026	The pre-proposal conference for this RFP was convened today, 8th April 2026. We respectfully request that the official minutes or record of proceedings of that conference — including all questions raised by attendees and responses provided by the Procuring Entity — be formally circulated to all registered bidders at the earliest opportunity and in any event no later than 48 hours prior to the submission deadline of 15th April 2026. Please confirm the expected date of circulation and the channel through which the minutes will be distributed.	This was responded to through the Response to Query No.1

David Mamati
For: PRINCIPAL SECRETARY

