

Questions RFP-2026-002

1. Is there an existing platform/codebase (prototype, MVP, prior vendor solution) that we will configure and integrate, or are you expecting the vendor to build the MVP integration layer from scratch?

Bidders should assume no existing platform is provided and propose delivery of a pilot-grade MVP within the defined scope and budget.

2. If something exists: where is it hosted, what is the architecture/stack, and what documentation is available (API specs, data model, deployment pipeline, test environments)?

N/A.

3. Which modules are already implemented (AI valuation, marketplace, logistics integration, packaging/safety, compliance dashboard, consumer UI), and which are net-new?

Bidders should assume the modules described in Section 4 are to be delivered as part of the engagement at pilot-grade maturity.

4. Do you expect the vendor to supply the AI models (training, evaluation, ongoing improvements) or just integrate existing services/models?

Bidders may propose either supplying and tuning models or integrating existing services, provided the solution includes explainability/audit logs and human-in-the-loop validation appropriate for an exploratory pilot.

5. Is the requested work only for configuration, integration, testing, i.e. is the to-be architecture, design, governance and change management already in place?

The assignment is primarily technical integration and demonstration; bidders should include a lightweight operational governance approach (roles, validation steps, change control) sufficient for the pilot.

6. For each module, what is the minimum acceptance criteria for the pilot (e.g., “must support photo upload + valuation + pickup scheduling + tracking + payment interaction” — but what does “payment interaction” mean in scope)?

Acceptance is based on delivery of a functional pilot-grade workflow across the modules sufficient for testing, learning, and replication, rather than production-grade maturity.

7. What does “transaction simulation” in the recycler marketplace mean—no real money movement, or actual settlement in pilots?

Transaction simulation means no real-money settlement is required for the pilot; recording and simulating payment events is acceptable unless otherwise agreed.

8. What is explicitly out of scope (e.g., building locker firmware, integrating with national customs systems, full cybersecurity certification, production-grade SLAs, 24/7 support)?

Out of scope includes procurement/operation of hardware fleets, development of locker/kiosk firmware, full production SLAs/24-7 support, and formal external certifications unless explicitly added by written amendment.

9. Will the Minimum Viable Digital Platform (MVDP) be a standalone prototype, or is it intended to be a fully operational platform that can be directly deployed into production environments?

It is intended as a demonstrative, pilot-grade platform with sufficient functional depth for testing and replication—not a full production deployment.

10. Is the integration solution expected to be hosted centrally and configured for each country or is the expectation to deploy it locally for each country, integrate and test in their local environment?

Centralized pilot hosting is acceptable, with flexibility to accommodate country-specific requirements if needed.

11. Have the six countries already been selected? If not, when, and how quickly will we get points of contact in each DO/regulator/recycler?

No; they will be selected by the UPU after award

12. Who is responsible for in-country coordination (stakeholders, data access, local approvals)—UPU or vendor?

The UPU leads stakeholder coordination; the vendor supports technical implementation and working sessions as required.

13. What is the expected depth per country: a light “configured demo” or a true operational pilot with real items moving through postal flows?

The expectation is a pilot-grade demonstration with practical testing; depth will vary by country readiness and availability of systems/hardware.

14. What localisation is required (languages, workflows, regulatory parameters) and who supplies the authoritative requirements?

Bidders should assume heterogeneity and propose modular configuration; authoritative local requirements will be confirmed via UPU-led coordination during implementation.

15. What specific postal systems are in scope: tracking, label generation, routing, counter systems, sorting, address/identity, etc.? Provide API documentation and connectivity constraints.

The scope targets integration where feasible with pickup/label/tracking and operational workflows; country-specific API documentation and constraints will depend on selected DOs and will be shared during implementation where available.

16. “Financial-payment data flows”: are you expecting integration with postal banks/wallets/PSPs, or only recording of payment events? What standards/protocols?

For the pilot, recording/simulating payment events and maintaining audit trails is sufficient; real settlement integrations are not required unless explicitly agreed.

17. Hardware ecosystems: are smart lockers/kiosks/IoT already deployed in pilot countries? If yes, which vendors and what interfaces? If no, is hardware integration just a logical design/adapter layer?

Protocol/API-level integration and simulation are acceptable where devices are not deployed; live integration may be implemented selectively depending on country readiness

18. Are you expecting the vendor to procure or manage any devices/tags (QR/UID), or is this purely “connect where feasible”?

No procurement is expected under this tender.

19. What data will be processed (photos, device identifiers/serials, customer PII, location, payments), and what are the data residency and privacy requirements per country?

Data scope and residency will align with pilot needs and contexts.

20. Who is the data controller/processor (UPU vs DO vs vendor), and what contractual/privacy instruments will be required?

Roles will be clarified during implementation under UPU coordination.

21. What security baseline is expected (pen test, threat modelling, encryption, audit logs, IAM), and is any formal compliance required for pilot environments?

Security expectations follow a proportionate, pilot-appropriate baseline.

22. Who owns the IP for configurations, connectors, and any code produced? The RFP contains broad statements about UPU IP around tender materials, but you need explicit contract language for deliverables and vendor pre-existing IP.

IP arrangements follow standard UPU contractual provisions.

23. Are vendors allowed to use a vendor SaaS component (licence/subscription) within the CHF 30k, or must everything be delivered as UPU-owned artefacts?

Solutions may include third-party components within contractual constraints.

24. Post-pilot, will UPU expect the vendor to provide ongoing maintenance/support, and if so, under what commercial mechanism (separate support contract vs included)?

Post-pilot arrangements may be considered separately, if required.

25. The ceiling is CHF 30,000 inclusive of travel/support/communications. What travel is actually expected, and can delivery be primarily remote?

Remote delivery is anticipated, with travel only if justified.

26. The RFP asks for “at least three consultants”. Confirm whether that is a hard minimum (named people), and what time commitment is realistically expected within CHF 30k.

To be discussed with the selected bidder

27. What is the change control process if the six-country scope expands (new integrations, more languages, extra compliance asks)? Is there any possibility of budget uplift, or must scope be strictly capped?

Scope changes require formal agreement under procurement rules

28. If delivery is blocked due to prerequisites not being available (access, SMEs, environments, documentation, hardware), does UPU accept that the vendor may invoice for reserved capacity / elapsed time where sessions or planned work could not proceed, unless rescheduled with notice?

Delivery and payment follow contractual acceptance provisions.

29. Given the fixed budget and multi-stakeholder integrations, would UPU accept proposals that are based on (i) clearly defined client prerequisites (access, documentation, nominated SMEs, decision cadence), and (ii) a change request / paid extension mechanism if prerequisites are not met or if additional effort is required beyond the agreed scope and schedule?

Structured assumptions and change mechanisms may be proposed.

30. The RFP requests 'at least three consultants'. Please confirm whether this is a requirement for (i) named individuals available on-demand, (ii) part-time involvement, or (iii) full-time allocation. How does UPU expect this to be feasible within the CHF 30,000 ceiling with roll-out across 6 countries over 12 months period?

To be discussed with the selected bidder

31. Please confirm the correct start date and schedule: the document contains conflicting dates (one section references a start date in February 2025 (pg 11), while other sections indicate April 2026 and a 12-month term(pg 9). Which is authoritative?

April 2026 is the start date.

32. What are the milestone gates (MVP ready, first-country live, all six configured, final handover), and what constitutes UPU "acceptance" for monthly invoicing?

Acceptance is based on agreed milestones and UPU validation.

For the M*+1 invoicing cadence, what constitutes 'work delivered' and accepted in a given month (e.g., signed timesheets, milestone acceptance, delivered artefacts, sprint review sign-off)? Who is the acceptance authority, and what is the standard acceptance turnaround time?

*M=Month in which deliverables have been completed

Acceptance follows submission and UPU confirmation of deliverables.

33. If UPU pauses or terminates the project for convenience, what notice period will apply, and will there be payment for (i) committed capacity during the notice period, and (ii) non-cancellable costs already incurred?

Termination and payment follow UPU contractual terms.

34. Which activities, if any, does UPU consider to require on-site presence (e.g., stakeholder workshops, hardware integration/testing, go-live support, training)?

Remote delivery is anticipated, with travel only if justified.

35. How many trips (and to which locations/countries) should vendors assume are 'necessary' over the 12-month period?

No specific travel assumptions are set at this stage.

36. Are remote delivery and virtual training acceptable as the default, with on-site visits only by exception and prior written approval?

Yes, remote delivery is acceptable as the default approach.

37. If travel is required beyond the assumed baseline, should it be handled via a change request / separate budget line?

Any additional travel would require prior agreement.

38. Hosting: Will the digital platform be hosted on the Vendor's infrastructure for the duration of the pilot, or will the UPU provide a dedicated environment (e.g., UPU Cloud)?

Delivery via a secure public cloud environment is acceptable for the pilot, subject to compliance with data protection, security and UPU requirements.

39. AI & Cloud Consumption: Are variable operational costs—specifically Cloud hosting fees and AI API/Token consumption charges—expected to be included within the 30,000 CHF fixed-price budget ceiling, or can they be treated as "unavoidable costs" subject to reimbursement with prior written consent under section 4.8?

All costs are expected within the fixed budget.

40. Section 4.1 mentions connectivity with "relevant hardware (e.g., smart lockers, kiosks, IoT sensors)". Could the UPU clarify if the Vendor is responsible only for providing the software API and integration layer, or if the Vendor is expected to procure or provide the physical hardware units within the 30,000 CHF budget?

Hardware procurement is not expected under this tender.

41. Definition of Deployment: For the six-country pilot, does "deployment" refer to the technical availability and configuration of the platform for those regions, or does it include localized on-site training and physical logistics management?

Deployment refers primarily to technical configuration and availability.

42. Remote Work: Given the budget ceiling and the requirement to support six member countries, does the UPU anticipate that these services can be delivered remotely, or are physical site visits to all six countries mandatory for the Vendor?

Remote delivery is acceptable as the default.

43. The tender refers to "existing implementations". Does the UPU allow for a solution based on a Vendor's proprietary AI modules provided via a SaaS/licensing model, or does the UPU require full ownership of the underlying code developed during the pilot?

Solutions may include proprietary components under contractual terms.

44. Section 3.7 mentions a start date of February 2025, while Section 2.20 and 4.5 refer to April 2026. Could you please confirm the intended start date for this 12-month engagement?

April 2026 is the start date.

45. The RFP specifies integration with postal logistics systems, APIs, and operational workflows of participating Designated Operators (DOs), but does not clarify the current level of system readiness. Could the UPU confirm whether the participating DOs already expose accessible and documented APIs (e.g., REST or SOAP) for their core systems (such as IPS and CDS), or

whether the selected vendor is expected to design and implement the required integration layers as part of the scope?

Integration readiness will vary; pilot solutions should accommodate differing DO capabilities.

46. The RFP requires interoperability with hardware and IoT ecosystems, including smart lockers, kiosks, and automated drop-off points. Could the UPU clarify whether such hardware has already been procured and deployed by the participating DOs, or whether this will vary by pilot country? Additionally, will the hardware vendors provide official API documentation and/or SDKs, or should the selected vendor anticipate developing middleware solutions and covering any related licensing or integration costs?

Hardware availability will vary; interoperability should be addressed flexibly.

47. While the RFP outlines a multi-country pilot deployment, it does not specify hosting or data residency requirements. Could the UPU clarify whether any of the pilot countries require local data hosting (i.e., servers physically located within national borders), or whether a centralized cloud-based deployment (e.g., AWS or Azure hosted in a neutral region such as EU–Frankfurt) would be acceptable from a data protection and sovereignty perspective?

Centralized cloud deployment is acceptable for pilot purposes.

48. Will the UPU or participating postal operators provide any existing platform, APIs, or technical infrastructure to build upon, or is the vendor expected to develop the entire solution from scratch?

No existing platform is assumed for the pilot.

49. Can you provide preliminary information about which regions or countries are being considered for the pilot? What is the current level of digital infrastructure maturity among these postal operators?

Countries will be selected by the UPU post-award; digital maturity will vary.

50. Who is responsible for procuring and deploying physical hardware (smart lockers, kiosks, IoT sensors)? Is the vendor expected to integrate with existing hardware only, or also source new equipment within the budget?

Hardware procurement is not expected under this tender.

51. Will participating postal operators provide API documentation and sandbox environments for integration testing? What is the expected timeline for obtaining such access?

Access depends on participating operators' readiness.

52. Will recyclers be located within each pilot country (domestic), or will the platform facilitate cross-border shipments to foreign recyclers? If international, which countries or regions are anticipated as recycler destinations?

Recycler arrangements may vary by pilot context.

53. Will the UPU pre-identify certified recyclers for the pilot, or is the vendor responsible for sourcing and vetting compliant recyclers in each market?

Recycler identification will be confirmed during implementation.

54. For international shipments, who bears responsibility for origin and destination customs clearance? Will the postal operators handle this, or must the platform integrate customs brokerage functionality?

Customs handling follows existing postal arrangements.

55. How should used electronics be classified for customs purposes—as goods, waste, or recyclable materials?

Different classifications carry different duty and documentation requirements.
Classification follows applicable national practices.

56. Will the platform serve individual consumers (C2B), businesses (B2B), or both? Customs requirements, documentation, and tax treatment differ significantly between personal sellers and commercial entities.

The pilot may support multiple transaction models.

57. At what point in the logistics chain will sellers receive payment—upon drop-off at the post office, upon arrival at the recycler, or after the recycler verifies and accepts the device?

Payment timing will be pilot-defined and configurable.

58. What payment rails should the platform support (postal financial services, mobile money, bank transfer, etc.)? Will this vary by country?

Payment approaches may vary by country.

59. Who is responsible for verifying that the physical device shipped matches the device photographed during the AI valuation? Will this occur at postal acceptance, at the recycler, or both?

Verification workflows will be pilot-defined.

60. What process should the platform support if the received device differs from the valuation (e.g., wrong device, undisclosed damage, missing components)? Who bears the financial risk?

Discrepancy handling follows agreed pilot rules.

61. How should the platform handle suspected fraud cases (e.g., stolen devices, counterfeit products)? What verification against IMEI blacklists or stolen device databases is expected?

Fraud safeguards should be proportionate to pilot scope.

62. For international shipments, does the platform need to be certified for integration with the UPU's International Postal System (IPS) or Delivery and Post System (DPS)? If so, will the UPU cover certification costs separately from the 30,000 CHF budget?

Formal certification is not expected for the pilot.

63. What postal EDI message standards must the platform support (e.g., ITMATT, EMSEVT, PREDES)? Will technical specifications be provided?

Standards support will be clarified during pilot implementation.

64. Should the platform generate CN22/CN23 customs declarations automatically? What level of HS code classification support is expected?

Customs documentation may be configured at pilot level.

65. Electronics containing lithium batteries are classified as dangerous goods under IATA/ICAO and ADR regulations. What level of dangerous goods compliance must the platform support for air and surface transport?

Dangerous goods handling is expected at pilot-appropriate level.

66. Will the platform need to identify and flag devices with damaged, swollen, or recalled lithium batteries? What rejection or special handling workflows should be built for such items?

Basic identification and handling logic is sufficient.

67. Must the platform enforce UN-certified packaging requirements for lithium battery shipments (e.g., UN3481 compliance)? Who provides or certifies compliant packaging materials?

Packaging practices follow existing postal arrangements.

68. Will postal operators provide dangerous goods handling training to counter staff, or should the platform include training modules and certification tracking?

Training responsibilities align with existing postal practices.

69. Some damaged electronics cannot be transported by air. Should the platform automatically route high-risk items via surface transport, and how should this affect delivery timelines and pricing?

Routing logic may be configured where applicable.

70. In case of a safety incident during transport (e.g., battery fire), how is liability allocated between the consumer, postal operator, platform vendor, and recycler?

Liability follows applicable contractual frameworks.

71. What insurance coverage is required for hazardous goods shipments? Is this the responsibility of the postal operator or must the platform facilitate insurance arrangements?

Insurance arrangements are outside pilot scope.

72. What data protection frameworks must the platform comply with across the six countries? Will the UPU provide guidance on cross-border data handling requirements?

Data protection follows applicable frameworks.

73. What specific KPIs or minimum performance thresholds will define a successful pilot (e.g., number of devices processed, transaction completion rate)?

Success metrics will be defined during implementation.

74. Given the 30,000 CHF ceiling covers six countries over 12 months, is there flexibility for phased delivery if technical complexity exceeds expectations?

No phased delivery.

75. Will costs for any required certifications (IPS, dangerous goods, security audits) be covered separately from the project budget?

No phased delivery is envisaged within the fixed scope and budget.

76. 29. What level of coordination support will the UPU provide for engaging postal operators, recyclers, and regulators in each pilot country? Will the UPU facilitate introductions and data-sharing agreements?

UPU will facilitate coordination where appropriate.

77. What are the expected presentation, demonstration and implementation timelines following the RFP?

Following contract award, the implementation period is six months, including inception, configuration, deployment, testing, training and final demonstration, in line with the indicative timeline set out in the tender documentation.

78. Are you only looking for consulting services?

No. The tender seeks technical integration and demonstration services resulting in a functional pilot platform, not purely advisory or analytical consulting.

79. If not, can you please share additional technical information?

The expected technical scope, functional modules and performance standards are described in Sections 4 of the tender; bidders are invited to propose appropriate technical approaches within that framework.

80. If not, would you accept the service be delivered out of a public cloud?

Yes. Delivery via a secure public cloud environment is acceptable for the pilot, subject to compliance with data protection, security and UPU requirements.

81. In chapter 3.6 you mention "*The budgetary ceiling is 30,000 CHF*". What do you include and exclude for this amount? Is it dedicated for the expected consulting services?

The CHF 30,000 ceiling is all-inclusive and covers all services required under the tender, including technical integration, deployment, testing, training, documentation and reporting; no separate consulting budget is envisaged.