



Pre-proposal Conference Minutes
RfP “Development of the Petition Information Management System of the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova (E-Petition)”
RfP13/00703
03 September 2013, 11:00
UN Conference Room

Introduction:

The Pre-proposal conference was opened by Mr. Sergiu Galitchi, Project Manager within the UNDP Programme “Improving the quality of Moldova democracy through parliamentary and electoral support”, who presented the team and welcomed the participants. The meeting was attended by 4 companies that expressed the interest to participate at the Pre-proposal.

Mr. Galitchi underlined the scope of work and importance of developing the e-Petition Information System for the Parliament of Moldova as well as for the citizens of the R. Moldova.

An important point to note was the Warranty period for the product and post-delivery service which, according to the ToR, has to be of minimum 12 (twelve) calendar months. Since last competition (RfP13/00665), which has been cancelled, this period has been decreased.

Questions and Answers:

Q1: From the ToR there is understood that an old software for maintaining the petition system exists, however there was not mentioned is there need to migrate from the old system to the new one that will be developed?

A: During the previous RfP13/00665 that was announced on 29 May 2013 the migration from the old system (based on Lotus Notes platform) to the new one was planned that is why the costs increased considerably. The old system is more sophisticated and the biggest 2 issues are that i) the old system is not connected to the Web and ii) the system needs usual assistance from a professional to un-archive the previous year, to open the archive for the upcoming year etc. All these make the migration process be problematic, that is why it was decided to have a completely new system. In case the personnel will need the old information the old system/application will be used to identify it. Also, by excluding migration it will reduce considerably the efforts of the developer.

Q2: According to the RfP document, the business model for identifying petitions indicates that afterwards the citizen may be invited for an audience?

A: That is not right. Actually there are 2 basic work flows, where the 1st flow is for Submitting and Examining petitions, consisting of 3 options for its submission. The person has the right to submit it electronically without any visits to the office in case it has capabilities to authenticate its identity through a digital signature, or digital identification card etc., which is also in accordance with the local laws. In this case the issue is the mode of petition’s submission: whether the person comes to the Bureau for petition’s submission and the operator is filling in the form which is signed by the petitioner in person; whether it may be sent by mail with Priority mode, or it may be submitted electronically as it was mentioned above. Regardless of how the petitions will be submitted, the same route of its examinations will be followed.

Q3: Is there any system used by the operators who are assisting audience to submit petitions and is there need to integrate it into the new one?

A: No, there is no any special system. For this purpose a special document named Fiche for Audience has been developed. However, there are people that come to the Bureau for petition's submission in the last moment and insist to be assisted. That is why it is important to make the petitions' submission process automated thus making it be faster. Logically it might be to make a System for managing the documents flow where petitions would be the normal documents to be examined. However, because of the fact of funds for such a system, while the management of documents flow is an acute issue, it was decided to have a Web integrated system that will be further integrated into the Documents Flow Management System. Talking about constraints towards the soft that exists in the Parliament at the moment, this is to mention that there are no compulsory constraints, only desirable. We would prefer keeping the existing constraints, however, if you have better solutions, then, please, make a breakdown of all the costs (user license costs, Delta costs in case of additional users or equipments). Please, take as a basis the model of the existing Informational System of the Parliament when designing the new system and keep in mind that there might be other things that further will have to be integrated into the new system. Indeed, we'd be grateful to receive better solutions.

Also it is important to be mentioned that the Archive module has been excluded. Hence we'd like to keep a virtual archive, maybe with some links sorted based on timing parameters or others. Further, when the digital archive will be developed, a solution for extracting the file from petitions system and incorporating it into archive will be designed.

Just to underline, the main issue is digitizing the petition when it is received in hard. The system has no the OCR mechanism implemented, digitizing will be made using external mechanisms (e.g. ABBY Fine Reader, multifunctional devices).

One more important thing has been stressed out that the information content must be indexed, thus facilitating the search. It would be an advantage if the content might be indexed not only by key words, but also by relevance.

Referring to the 2nd flow of information – Requests for audience, where citizens may require meetings. But that is a separate and special flow, because the people must be verified from security point of view and also if the relevance of the subject really needs to be discussed with the official/public servant with whom the citizen wants to meet.

Talking about external institutions, the examination of the petition may be not in the competence of the Parliament, thereby it will be redirected to the competent institutions.

Q4: Is there need to develop and maintain the cards of external institutions to which the petitions will be redirected?

A: There is a need to configure into the system the possibility to show that for examining a certain petition is responsible a certain institution, person or public actor. Also, if the petition is taken to control then it must be possible to see the result of its examination.

In case the petitioner has left his/her e-mail address the System must be able to send notifications to the petitioner that a certain level has past by itself. A Web interface is preferably to be developed in this case. The Web interface makes the work much easier regardless of the physical location of the petitioner, Bureau for petition's submission and examining bodies/offices.

Q5: Is the list of reports to be generated by the system stated in the RfP document complete?

A: The most important is that the reports are universalized, meaning that there is a list of parameters by choosing which the right report may be generated (by region, by topic, by result of the examination etc.) according to metadata of the petition. Also, it is important enabling that KPIs (Key Performance Indicators) are generated, by this enabling the Parliament keep the statistics of the data by different parameters (petitions received, solved, postponed etc.).

The Service Oriented Architecture will be followed thus enabling the Parliament integrating all the data piece by piece when the new Parliament building is finished so as to finalize the Information Management System and make it feasible.

Q6: Is there available any Documents Management System?

A: At the moment there is a Documents Management System referring to legislative business processes. It is a solution developed based on Microsoft SharePoint. It is desirable if the e-Petition system will be integrated with the Microsoft SharePoint. This point has been set as desirable in the TOR, so it's integration is welcomed.

Referring to the submission requirements and methods, it has been underlined that technical documentation must be submitted whether in Romanian or English. The Offerors were encouraged to develop the technical documentation as explicitly as possible such as the company, whichever it will be (the developing company or other vendor), who will be dealing with the information integrating may do it well.

Q7: Is the maintenance period 24 months?

A: No, when the ToR has been revised the maintenance period has been decreased to 12 calendar months. From experience, for an Informational system that is used on regular basis 6 (six) months are enough to identify all the issues. Sometimes, there may appear specific problems and after 6 months period, but usually 12 months is enough time to solve the most of them. The most important is feasibility of the software that will be developed. Thereby the companies must have a local representative in Moldova in order to be able to solve all technical issues that may arise during the 12 months of maintenance period.

General Comments

Talking about the evaluation criteria stated on pages 19-20 some tips to be taken into consideration has been underlined as follows:

- Referring to the staff whose resumes shall be submitted in the proposal's package state explicitly which person what position will hold;
- Taking into consideration the personnel evaluation criteria (page 20 of the RfP document) explicitly state in the resumes whether the person possesses the competencies/capabilities that must be evaluated or not;
- If, for developing the product and services required, there are proposed more persons than required, don't forget, there are also criteria for evaluating the Expertise of the Firm/Organization;
- Please, state if you have any experience with state institutions, since this is different from that with the business sector.

In the conclusion the attention of Offerors was drawn to the deadline and instructions for submitting proposals, specifically related to electronic submission of proposals and technical volume of the mails that shall be sent as they have not to exceed 5 MB. Also, it has been underlined that even 1 (one) minute late submission will not be considered. Any other questions that may arise may be submitted to the contact person indicated in the RfP document the latest 5 days before proposal submission.