# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

## Hosting, Maintenance, Support and Development of the MedsPaL Platform

| | |
|---|---|
| **DATE OF ISSUE**: | 06.11.2026 |
| **QUESTIONS DUE**: | 20.11.2026 |
| **PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS:** | 18.12.2026 |
| **FINAL PROPOSALS**: | 29.01.2027 |

**Medicines Patent Pool**
Rue de Varembé
1202 Geneva
Switzerland
+41 22 533 50 50
office@medicinespatentpool.org

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Overview

The Medicines Patent Pool (MPP) is a United Nations-backed public health organisation that improves access to affordable, quality-assured medicines and health technologies in low- and middle-income countries through voluntary licensing and technology transfer.

MPP invites proposals for the hosting, technical maintenance, operational support and continued development of MedsPaL, its public Medicines Patents and Licences database.

Through this competitive process, MPP wishes to compare providers and technical approaches for its continued operation and development. Bidders should explain what they would provisionally propose, why, and the likely costs, dependencies and benefits. The outcome may be continued development of the existing platform or an agreed programme of modernisation, with either the current provider or a new provider.

The contractual arrangements will reflect the selected proposal, agreed scope and applicable internal approvals. Retention of the current provider does not preclude agreed changes to the services or architecture; appointment of a new provider does not itself require a rebuild.

For the purposes of this RFP, the "MedsPaL platform" comprises the public MedsPaL user interface (UI), the internal Admin Dashboard, the underlying databases and business logic, the data-ingestion and publication processes, the hosting infrastructure, and the integrations and structured-data outputs described in this RFP.

MPP seeks reliable, cost-effective services that maintain platform stability, security, data integrity and continuity, while supporting agreed improvements. Neither a change of provider nor a rebuild is assumed. Where a change of provider is required, the selected provider must support an orderly transition.

For more information, please see:

www.medicinespatentpool.org
https://www.medspal.org/about
https://medicinespatentpool.org/what-we-do/medspal

## 1.2. Timeline

MPP has planned the following indicative timeline for this RFP. MPP reserves the right to amend the timeline. Any material amendment will be communicated in writing to participating bidders.

**Two-stage proposal process**

**Stage 1:** bidders must submit preliminary proposals based on this RFP and the public MedsPaL interface, covering relevant capabilities, the proposed service approach, a preliminary technical position with supporting rationale and assessment methodology, indicative timing, indicative operating costs and development rates, any proposed

modernisation cost range, and assumptions, exclusions and information needs. No technical pack or codebase access will be provided at this stage.

MPP will shortlist preliminary proposals based on the technical evaluation criteria set out in this RFP. Preliminary prices will inform clarification but will not be financially scored. Shortlisted bidders will be invited to the platform demonstration and clarification stage before submitting final proposals.

**Stage 2**: shortlisted bidders will receive an equivalent platform demonstration and opportunity for clarification. Material new information and answers to material questions will be shared with all shortlisted bidders. MPP will confirm the final-offer scope and specify the cost items and any comparison period, development hours or other pricing assumptions needed before final offers are due. MPP may also establish a common minimum service-level baseline, as described in section 3.4. No minimum service levels are prescribed at issue; bidders must propose commitments at the preliminary stage.

Final-stage clarifications will establish a common service and pricing basis without introducing undisclosed evaluation criteria or changing the published weights. Any material amendment will be communicated in writing to all affected bidders, with sufficient time to respond.

Final technical and separate financial proposals are due on **29 January 2027.** They supersede preliminary proposals and will be evaluated afresh. Bidders must distinguish firm prices from conditional estimates and identify unresolved dependencies; material differences must be clarified consistently before ranking.

MPP does not commit to providing source-code or infrastructure access during the procurement. Where needed, MPP may arrange a technical assessment through controlled source-code access or the provision of more detailed technical information for shortlisted bidders, subject to agreement on scope, confidentiality and security, including a confidentiality disclosure agreement (CDA) where required. Full repository or infrastructure access is not guaranteed. Any material information or access made available before award will be offered on equivalent terms to all shortlisted bidders. Bidders must identify the access and information needed for their proposed services and explain how any remaining gaps affect their proposed approach, timing and prices. A definitive recommendation or fixed replacement price is not required where the necessary evidence is unavailable. Operational commencement following a provider change remains subject to agreed access and handover arrangements.

| | |
|---|---|
| 06.11.2026 | RFP issued |
| 20.11.2026 | Written Questions Due (see 1.3 Contact and inquiries) |
| 30.11.2026 | Response to Vendor Questions |
| 18.12.2026 | Preliminary Proposal Deadline |
| 09.01.2027 | Completion of preliminary technical evaluation and shortlisting |
| 11.01.2027 - 22.01.2027 | Shortlisted Vendors invited to virtual presentations and MedsPaL platform demonstration by MPP |

| | |
|---|---|
| 29.01.2027 | Final proposal deadline for all shortlisted bidders |
| 08.02.2027 | Final Vendor Selection |
| Feb 2027 | Project Kick-off |

### 1.3. Contact and inquiries

Questions about this RFP should be addressed to:

Name: Amina Larbi and Dana Mozaffari
E-mail: alarbi@medicinespatentpool.org and dmozaffari@medicinespatentpool.org

MPP will issue written responses to material questions simultaneously to participating bidders, anonymising questions where appropriate. Only written clarifications confirmed by MPP and shared with bidders may be relied upon.

Inquiries received after the deadline may not be considered or answered.

Requests to amend the RFP must also be submitted by the question deadline.

## 2. Background, Environment

### 2.1. MedsPaL platform Overview

MedsPaL provides free access to patent, licence and selected regulatory-exclusivity information concerning medicines, selected vaccines and health technologies.

MedsPaL supports governments, procurement agencies, manufacturers, product developers, public-health organisations, researchers, and other stakeholders seeking to understand the intellectual-property status of health products in different jurisdictions.

The public interface supports search, filtering, record review, exports, analytical reports and data visualisations. The current interface launched in 2024; the platform was introduced in 2016.

**The internal Admin Dashboard enables authorised MPP personnel to manage, review, approve and publish data. It supplies JSON documents and the Algolia search index consumed by the public interface.**

The platform is currently maintained by an external service provider.

### 2.2. MedsPaL UI

The public interface is available at www.medspal.org. Its principal functions are:

- Search and filtering of patent, licence and regulatory-exclusivity information by product, jurisdiction and other attributes.
- Searchable results and detailed patent and licence records.
- Interactive reporting and visualisation, including maps, timelines and charts.
- User accounts, saved searches and automated update notifications.
- Responsive access across desktop and mobile devices.

**MedsPaL relies on the following technologies:**

1. Next.js
2. React
3. TypeScript
4. Algolia
5. Chart.js
6. Mapbox GL
7. Kubernetes - single deployment serving Next.js
8. Cloudflare - provides DNS, CDN, and TLS
9. DigitalOcean - Managed Kubernetes and Spaces (for loading JSON documents)

## 2.3. The Admin Dashboard

The Admin Dashboard is the principal internal data-management and publication system supporting MedsPaL. It contains the underlying data model, business rules and administrative interfaces used by authorised MPP personnel to create, review, update, approve and publish information.

The Admin Dashboard manages interconnected product, technology and organisation records; patent families, applications, publications and applicants; legal events and statuses; jurisdictions and filing coverage; licences and territories; and regulatory exclusivities.

The system supports manual and automated data-management processes. Depending on user role and system configuration, authorised users may create and update records, manage associations between records, search and filter large tables, export data, perform approved bulk operations, review proposed changes and publish approved information.

The Dashboard includes a change-control workflow. Proposed changes may be held as pending changes for review, editing, approval or rejection before they are written to the database. Certain trusted or predefined automated changes may be written directly, according to the relevant business rules.

Role-based access controls govern user permissions and automated system processes.

Approved data are published in formats consumed by the public MedsPaL interface and related MPP platforms. Publication outputs include structured JSON documents, search-index records and selected CSV files.

## 2.4. Admin Dashboard technology

The Admin Dashboard is built using:

1. PostgreSQL - primary data store
2. Ruby on Rails - models, views, controllers, business logic, presentation layer, change control, scrapers (see Current data-ingestion processes below)
3. React - Used to construct forms and tables
4. Sidekiq - Run the European Patent Office (EPO) Open Patent Services (OPS) scrapers, publishes data to MedsPaL, delivers emails

5. Redis - backend for Sidekiq queues and Websocket pub/sub
6. Kubernetes - application orchestrator which controls the Rails application, Redis, and Sidekiq processes
7. DigitalOcean - cloud hosting platform which manages Kubernetes, PostgreSQL, load balancing, TLS termination
8. DigitalOcean Spaces- file storage, used to store exported JSON documents for use by MedsPaL
9. Algolia - search-as-a-service, used to store exported JSON documents and provide search functionality on MedsPaL
10. Cloudflare - provides DNS, CDN, and TLS

## 2.5. Current data-ingestion processes

The MedsPaL Admin Dashboard supports several administrator-triggered data-ingestion processes ("scrapers"). These processes must be maintained, monitored, and adapted when external source formats, data structures or endpoints change.

| Integration | Data and purpose | Operation |
|---|---|---|
| **European Patent Office (EPO) Open Patent Services (OPS) legal and family data** | Patent families, applications and legal events creation and updating. | Administrator-triggered; changes may be written directly or held for review according to business rules. |
| **EPO OPS bibliographic data** | Applicants, publication details and invention titles. | Administrator-triggered retrieval for patent publications. Changes are written directly |
| **United States Food and Drug Administration (US FDA) Orange Book** | Product mappings that support identification and creation of patent families for selected medicines. | Administrator-triggered<br>Monthly source updates; downloadable text files. |
| **Health Canada Patent Register** | Product mappings and identification of relevant patent families. | Monthly source updates; downloadable text files. |

OPS is a web service which provides access to the EPO's data via a standardised XML interface. MedsPaL accesses: Bibliographic data, Family data, Legal status data.

US FDA Orange Book and Health Canada Patent Register data is updated monthly and is available for download via text files.

In addition, the system supports manual data entry and expert review using information obtained from national and regional patent offices, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) PATENTSCOPE, patent-holder disclosures, licence agreements and other relevant sources.

MPP personnel remain responsible for substantive patent analysis, expert data curation, legal-status review and publication approval. The provider must maintain the workflows, business rules, interfaces and data structures that support this work.

# 3. Scope of Work

The base offer covers hosting, maintenance, support, security, operational documentation and service commencement, including transition where applicable. Proposals must also describe continued development of the existing platform and any recommended improvement or replacement, with separate prices or pricing bases. Development, detailed assessment and modernisation require an approved scope, estimate and written authorisation before work begins; they may be commissioned under the resulting agreement or another appropriate contractual arrangement. Award of base services does not automatically authorise additional work.

## 3.1. Hosting and infrastructure operations

The provider will operate the production and staging environments and monitor the applications, databases, queues, ingestion and publication processes. The service must include agreed infrastructure and dependency updates, backups and recovery, environment separation, and management of hosting performance, capacity and costs. Bidders must identify which hosting accounts and third-party charges are managed or paid directly by MPP.

## 3.2. Application maintenance and support

The provider will maintain the application and its integrations, resolve technical issues and support authorised MPP users. Incidents, changes and releases must be tracked through an agreed issue-management process.

Bidders must identify which maintenance, corrective work and adaptations to external-service changes are included in recurring fees, which are separately chargeable, and any applicable correction or warranty arrangements. New functionality must be distinguished from maintenance. Bidders must also complete the service-level response schedule.

## 3.3. Security, documentation, and knowledge transfer

The provider will protect access and credentials, manage vulnerabilities and security updates, maintain appropriate logs and encryption, and notify MPP of incidents under an agreed procedure. The Data Governance, Privacy, and Security Standards below also apply.

At service commencement, the provider must review available documentation, identify gaps and distinguish one-off creation costs from routine updates. Documentation must support continued operation and transfer, covering architecture, data model, integrations, deployment, recovery, service accounts and third-party costs.

On exit, the provider must transfer agreed code, data exports, account access, configurations, documentation and the issue register to MPP or its successor. Any restrictions and additional exit-assistance charges must be disclosed. This requirement concerns materials and access within the selected provider's control and does not imply that MPP already holds access to the incumbent's systems.

## 3.4. Service levels

Bidders must complete the service-level response schedule and describe escalation arrangements, root-cause analysis for major incidents and periodic service reporting. Identify any additional charges associated with the proposed commitments, including critical out-of-hours support.

**Common service-level response schedule**

MPP is not prescribing minimum service levels at issue. At the preliminary stage, bidders must specify their proposed service levels in the response schedule. Following review of preliminary proposals, MPP may communicate a common minimum service-level baseline to all shortlisted bidders before final proposals are due. If a baseline is established, final proposals must state compliance and identify any deviations or associated additional costs. Distinguish the public interface, Admin Dashboard and essential ingestion/publication processes. The recovery time objective (RTO) is the target restoration time; the recovery point objective (RPO) is the maximum tolerable period of data loss.

| Service item | Service parameters / final baseline | Bidder commitment / deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Support window and time zone | Days, hours, time zone and critical out-of-hours cover. | To complete |
| Critical incident | Production unavailable, material data-integrity failure or major security incident; acknowledgement and restoration targets. | To complete |
| High / medium / low incidents | Severity definitions and acknowledgement/restoration targets. | To complete |
| Availability and monitoring | Target, measurement period, monitored components and permitted exclusions. | To complete |
| Backups and recovery | Backup frequency, retention, restoration-test frequency, RTO and RPO. | To complete |
| Maintenance / incident reporting | Planned-maintenance notice, security-incident notice and service-report frequency. | To complete |

## 3.5. Service commencement and transition, where applicable

Where a provider change is required, the selected provider must prepare a transition and handover plan identifying access, information and cooperation needed from MPP and the outgoing provider. If the current provider is retained, identify any agreed changes to services, documentation or operating arrangements; no supplier handover is required.

The plan must state dependencies, timing, costs and readiness checks covering deployment, rollback and backup restoration, proportionate to the proposed arrangements. Where applicable, deliverables include a handover inventory and concise findings and priorities report. MPP will approve service commencement against agreed milestones and acceptance checks. A detailed architecture assessment is separate and requires specific commissioning.

## 3.6. Development and continuous improvement

Enhancements will be prioritised and authorised by MPP through agreed estimates, scope, testing and acceptance criteria. Areas may include workflow automation, reporting, data visualisation, accessibility, performance and agreed integrations. Development funding and priorities may vary from year to year; no minimum volume of development work is guaranteed. Bidders must explain how capacity, estimates and delivery would be managed as funding changes. No rebuild, replacement or additional platform integration is authorised by the base services award alone.

## 3.7. Preliminary technical approach and any subsequent detailed assessment

Based on the available information, bidders must state whether they would provisionally continue with the existing architecture, improve or refactor selected components, or propose phased replacement, potentially using another language or framework. Identify a preferred approach where the evidence permits, explain the rationale, expected benefits, risks and assumptions, and distinguish the Rails Admin Dashboard from the Next.js/React public interface. More than one viable option may be presented, but a methodology alone is not sufficient: explain the preliminary position and what evidence could change it.

Any commissioned assessment must consider maintainability, security, performance, scalability, technical skills and dependency support, test coverage, data and integration complexity, total cost of ownership, implementation effort, transition risk and vendor lock-in.

Where a detailed assessment is needed to validate the preliminary position, identify the required access and information, proposed scope, deliverables, duration and price or pricing basis. MPP may decide whether and when to commission it; this RFP does not commit MPP to appointing a preferred provider before that assessment or to authorising a rebuild. Identify decisions that can be made from the available evidence and those that remain conditional.

The assessment must distinguish the Admin Dashboard, public interface, infrastructure and integrations. Refactoring improves existing code without changing its intended behaviour; changing language or framework is a replacement or re-platforming decision. Proposals will be assessed on reasoning, not a preference for rebuilding.

For each proposed material improvement or replacement, provide an indicative cost range or phased estimate, scope boundaries, duration, dependencies, confidence level and expected operating costs afterwards. Include data migration, integrations, testing, continuity, training and handover where applicable, and explain what cannot yet be estimated reliably. Do not invent a fixed price where technical information is insufficient.

Material refactoring, re-platforming or rebuilding requires MPP's prior written approval of the architecture, business case, implementation plan, budget, risk controls, rollback arrangements and acceptance criteria. The existing platform must remain supported until an approved alternative is successfully transitioned.

Bidders proposing replacement need not commit to indefinite development of the existing stack but must explain how it would remain supported during assessment and

implementation. Identify responsible parties, skills, any subcontractors, cooperation needed from the current provider and associated costs. Cooperation beyond arrangements confirmed by MPP must be stated as a dependency, not assumed.

# 4. RFP Submission, Evaluation & Terms

## 4.1. Evaluation Criteria

MPP will evaluate preliminary proposals for shortlisting and final proposals for selection in accordance with the two-stage process described in this RFP. Proposals will be assessed against the following criteria:

| Evaluation criterion | Weight |
|---|---|
| Understanding of MedsPaL, patent information and complex data workflows | 15% |
| Architecture assessment and modernisation approach | 15% |
| Transition, service continuity and internal workload | 15% |
| Hosting, support and reliability | 15% |
| Security, privacy and AI safeguards | 10% |
| Delivery, quality assurance and governance | 5% |
| Relevant capability and delivery resourcing | 5% |
| Cost and value for money | 20% |
| **Total** | 100% |

The seven technical criteria account for 80% of the final score; cost and value for money accounts for 20%. The seven technical criteria above will be assessed using the following rating scale at both the preliminary and final proposal stages:

**0 – No usable response:** The response is absent or provides no usable information against the criterion.

**1 – Poor:** The response contains major gaps or does not adequately address the criterion.

**2 – Partially meets expectations**: The response addresses the criterion but contains material weaknesses or insufficient supporting information.

**3 – Meets expectations**: The response is clear, credible and adequately addresses the criterion.

**4 – Exceeds expectations:** The response is well substantiated and demonstrates particular strengths relevant to MPP's requirements.

**5 – Excellent**: The response is comprehensive, convincing and supported by strong, relevant evidence.

Technical scores will be calculated using the weights shown in the table. Assessment will reflect the information reasonably available at each stage. Bidders will not be penalised for

not providing conclusions that require technical information or access that MPP has not made available.

For each technical criterion, weighted points equal the rating divided by 5, multiplied by the criterion weight. The seven weighted technical scores total a maximum of 80 points at each stage; preliminary financial proposals are not scored.

The detailed descriptions below explain each criterion.

***Understanding of MedsPaL, patent information and complex data workflows:*** demonstrated ability to understand patent-family structures, jurisdiction-specific patent status, licensing relationships and regulatory-exclusivity data, and their implications for the public interface, Admin Dashboard, integrations and publication controls. Assess the ability to translate complex subject-matter requirements into reliable technical solutions, identify ambiguities and validate proposed changes with MPP specialists. Prior patent-information experience is a strong advantage; bidders without it must demonstrate comparable complex-domain experience and a credible learning and validation approach.

***Architecture assessment and modernisation approach:*** quality and credibility of the preliminary technical position, rationale for retaining, improving or replacing components, expected effects on reliability and future development, evidence and assessment methodology, dependencies, continuity risks, and credibility of the implementation effort and indicative cost assumptions. A promise to rebuild or a preferred programming language is not itself an advantage.

***Transition, service continuity and internal workload***: feasibility of the proposed service commencement, transition and continuity arrangements, including the expected workload for MPP personnel during any transition or proposed modernisation, dependencies on the current provider, knowledge transfer, validation and training needs, and measures to minimise disruption to MPP's ongoing activities.

***Hosting, support and reliability:*** suitability of the proposed hosting arrangements, monitoring, maintenance, incident management, backup and recovery, and proposed service levels provided under section 3.4.

***Security, privacy and artificial intelligence (AI) safeguards:*** adequacy of security and data-protection measures, including safeguards for any proposed use of AI-assisted development tools.

***Delivery, quality assurance and governance:*** development and testing practices, change control, communication, reporting and management of scope, costs and risks. This includes validation of requirements and acceptance tests with MPP subject-matter specialists, delivery within variable annual funding, and arrangements for correcting issues introduced by changes. Assessment will also consider operational documentation, MPP's ownership and access requirements, and arrangements for an orderly exit and transfer to a successor provider.

***Relevant capability and delivery resourcing:*** comparable experience, references, proposed team, availability and ability to support the existing technology stack. Assessment will consider the proposed personnel's ability to work with complex relational data and subject-matter specialists, and how domain knowledge would be acquired, documented and retained within the team.

***Cost and value for money:*** evaluated costs of final proposals using the cost items and, where needed, common comparison periods, development hours or other pricing assumptions communicated by MPP to all shortlisted bidders before final submission. These may include relevant one-off costs, recurring charges, development costs and assessment or modernisation costs, without double counting. Pricing completeness, inclusions, exclusions and conditions will be clarified before scoring.

**Preliminary proposals and shortlisting**

Preliminary proposals will be assessed against the seven technical criteria using the rating scale and weights set out above. MPP intends to shortlist between three and five of the highest-ranked bidders, provided that sufficient satisfactory proposals are received. MPP may shortlist fewer than three bidders if fewer proposals adequately meet its requirements.

Preliminary prices will be treated as indicative and used to inform clarification, rather than financially scored.

**Final proposals and selection**

Final technical proposals will be assessed afresh against the same seven technical criteria, using the same rating scale and weights. Preliminary scores will not be carried forward. Financial proposals from bidders meeting the mandatory submission and scope requirements will then be evaluated using the method under **Financial proposal and pricing schedule** below. Selection will be based on the combined technical score out of 80 and financial score out of 20. No minimum numerical technical score applies.

Bidders must clearly identify assumptions, exclusions, dependencies and any conditions affecting their proposed services or prices. MPP may seek clarification to establish a consistent basis for comparison.

Evaluation will assess the quality of the preliminary technical position, its supporting rationale and the proposed approach to resolving uncertainty. Bidders will not be expected to provide definitive conclusions that require information or access MPP has not provided.

Presentations and references may be used to clarify or substantiate proposals against the criteria above. Proposed assessment, improvement or replacement costs must be separately identified. Their inclusion in financial evaluation will depend on the cost items and comparison assumptions communicated to all shortlisted bidders before final submission. Inclusion in evaluation does not authorise the work.

## 4.2. Submission Format

Use the six response headings below at both stages. Preliminary responses may be concise and indicative; final responses must be updated after the demonstration and clarifications. Identify assumptions, exclusions, dependencies and deviations once, against the relevant service or response heading. Place responses to the first five headings and the service-level schedule in the technical file. Put the financial proposal, all prices and any priced service-level deviations in the separate financial file, cross-referenced to the technical response.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Relevant experience and proposed team** | • Provide comparable assignments and references, highlighting experience with complex data-driven applications.<br>• Describe relevant technology-stack expertise and experience working with relational data and subject-matter specialists.<br>• Identify proposed personnel and any subcontractors, including their roles, availability and time zones.<br>• Explain how MedsPaL-specific knowledge would be acquired, documented and retained within the team.<br>• Designate a primary contact. |
| **Approach to required services** | • Describe your approach and estimated timeline for providing each required service, including inclusions, exclusions and dependencies.<br>• Explain your understanding of MedsPaL's data relationships and workflows, and how requirements and acceptance tests would be validated with MPP specialists.<br>• Explain your proposed hosting arrangements, maintenance capacity and support. Complete the service-level response schedule under section 3.4 and identify any deviations.<br>• Describe your development, testing and release practices, including how work would be estimated, prioritised and approved, and capacity managed when annual development funding varies.<br>• Include all related prices in the separate financial proposal. |
| **Service commencement and continuity** | • Describe the proposed transition and handover arrangements, where applicable, including timing, dependencies, continuity measures and readiness checks.<br>• Identify the activities and estimated time required from MPP personnel during transition and any proposed modernisation, including knowledge transfer, requirements clarification, testing, validation and training. State the assumptions and measures proposed to minimise MPP's workload and disruption to ongoing activities. |
| **Improvements and assessment approach** | • State your preliminary retain/improve/replace position and rationale, expected reliability benefits, risks and evidence needed. Provide the assessment methodology and access requirements needed to validate it.<br>• Explain how enhancements would be scoped, estimated, tested and accepted.<br>• A definitive recommendation or detailed design is not required without sufficient evidence. A preliminary position and indicative cost range or phased estimate for any proposed modernisation are required, with assumptions and confidence stated. |
| **Security, documentation and governance** | • Describe security and data-protection measures, including hosting and personal-data processing locations and material subprocessors.<br>• Explain your approach to documentation, knowledge transfer, reporting and change control.<br>• Disclose relevant licensing, ownership or access restrictions, and explain how agreed code, data, documentation and account access would be transferred on exit.<br>• If proposing AI/LLM tools, disclose the tools and providers, external processing, retention/training settings, subprocessors and associated costs. Explain human review, testing, security and licensing safeguards. Include costs only in the separate financial proposal.<br>• Confirm that MPP confidential code or data will not be sent to external AI services without prior approval. AI use is optional and attracts no additional points.<br>• Include the conflict-of-interest disclosure required by the General Terms. |
| **Financial proposal (separate file)** | • Complete the financial schedule in one permitted currency (CHF or USD). Submit the completed service-level schedule with the technical proposal under Approach to required services.<br>• Cross-reference and price any service-level deviations or optional commitments; keep the technical description in the technical file.<br>• Identify recurring and one-off costs, hourly development rates, third-party charges, taxes and mark-ups.<br>• State rate validity and escalation provisions.<br>• Distinguish firm prices from conditional estimates.<br>• Enter zero for included or uncharged items and identify any bundled costs.<br>• Do not double-count costs. |

## Financial proposal and pricing schedule

Complete the pricing schedule at both stages. Present three distinct cost views: continued operation and development of the current platform; any proposed improvement or replacement, including post-change recurring costs; and any assessment needed to validate the proposal. Development is funding-dependent and no annual development spend or volume is guaranteed. For each applicable view, distinguish one-off costs, recurring charges and development costs or rates. State inclusions, maintenance/support capacity limits, exclusions, dependencies, minimum commitments and third-party mark-ups. Identify how costs replace or overlap with other items, including changes to recurring charges. Enter zero for included or uncharged items and identify where they are included; do not count the same cost twice. Preliminary prices may be indicative; final prices must distinguish firm prices from conditional estimates.

Currency: quote all prices in either Swiss francs (CHF) or United States dollars (USD), using one currency throughout the proposal and specifying the invoicing currency. CHF is preferred for bidders based in Switzerland; choosing either permitted currency will not affect the technical score. For financial evaluation, MPP will convert USD prices to CHF using one exchange-rate source and reference date communicated to all shortlisted bidders before final offers.

Taxes: quote fees excluding VAT and show any VAT or other applicable taxes separately, with the rate and amount, or explain why none is charged. MPP will compare prices on the same basis, including taxes it would have to bear and could not recover.

| Cost item | Pricing basis | Price (specify CHF or USD) |
|---|---|---|
| A. Current platform: commencement / transition | One-off, where applicable; all bidders must enter zero if no charge. | To complete |
| A. Current platform: hosting / infrastructure | Monthly fee; identify annual charges and the services covered. | To complete |
| A. Current platform: maintenance / support | Monthly fee; state included activities, hours/capacity and excess-work rates. | To complete |
| A. Current platform: third-party subscriptions | Monthly or annual; list services, payer and any mark-up. | To complete |
| A. Current platform: development | Hourly or role-specific rates and charging model; state any minimum commitments. | To complete |
| A. Current platform: other mandatory charges | Itemise; distinguish monthly, annual and one-off charges. | To complete |
| B. Improvement / replacement: implementation | Estimate or pricing basis for the proposed work, including migration, testing, training and handover where applicable; state scope, assumptions and dependencies. | To complete |
| B. Improvement / replacement: post-change recurring costs | Hosting, maintenance, support and third-party charges after implementation; identify which Section A costs are replaced and any period of overlap. | To complete |
| C. Assessment to validate the proposal | Scope, deliverables and estimate or pricing basis; state whether included elsewhere, | To complete |

| Cost item | Pricing basis | Price (specify CHF or USD) |
|---|---|---|
| | separately chargeable or credited against later work. | |
| Other: optional exit assistance | State scope, rates and any estimate; identify what is already included elsewhere. | To complete |
| VAT / other applicable taxes | Show separately, stating rate and amount and the fees to which they apply. | To complete |

### Financial comparison

Preliminary financial proposals will inform clarification of requirements and pricing assumptions but will not receive a numerical financial score.

Before final proposals are due, MPP will specify the cost items to be included in the financial evaluation and, where needed, a common comparison period, number of development hours or other pricing assumptions. The same basis will be communicated to all shortlisted bidders. Relevant costs may include one-off commencement and transition costs, recurring charges, development costs, and assessment or modernisation costs. Costs must be presented without double counting, and alternative or additional options must be identified separately.

Financial evaluation will account for 20% of the final score. Financial points will be calculated as the lowest eligible evaluated cost divided by the bidder's evaluated cost, multiplied by 20. Evaluated costs will be calculated using the cost items and assumptions communicated to all shortlisted bidders, converted to CHF using the exchange-rate source and reference date specified by MPP, and including applicable non-recoverable taxes.

Bidders must explain any price ranges, conditions, exclusions or dependencies. MPP may seek clarification on a consistent basis before financial scoring. Any assumptions used to convert a range or conditional estimate into an evaluated cost will be communicated to all shortlisted bidders before final proposals are due. Material differences in scope or unresolved price conditions must be addressed before proposals are ranked. Zero-cost or unusually low proposals will require clarification before scoring.

For development and other additional work, bidders must state the proposed roles and rates, rate validity, escalation provisions, estimation approach, and any minimum commitments or bundled capacity. Where MPP specifies a common development-hours allowance or workload assumption, bidders must provide the corresponding cost and identify assumptions and exclusions. Where costs depend on further assessment or access to information, explain how they would be validated and agreed.

Development and other additional work require an agreed scope, estimate and MPP approval before work begins. The comparison period and any assumed workload are for evaluation purposes only and do not determine the contract duration or guarantee any volume of work or expenditure.

### 4.3. Proposal Submission

Submit preliminary proposals by 23:59 Central European Time on 18 December 2026, and final proposals, if shortlisted, by 23:59 Central European Time on 29 January 2027, to alarbi@medicinespatentpool.org and dmozaffari@medicinespatentpool.org. Use the subject "MedsPaL RFP - [Bidder name] - Preliminary" or "Final" and separate technical and financial files.

## 5. Data Governance, Privacy, and Security Standards

The selected provider must comply with all data-protection and privacy requirements applicable to the services, including applicable Swiss data-protection law. Where the processing of personal data falls within the territorial or material scope of other legislation, the provider must identify the relevant requirements and describe how compliance will be ensured. Where the selected provider processes personal data on behalf of MPP in connection with the services, the provider shall enter into an appropriate data processing agreement with MPP before such processing commences.

Bidders should identify the proposed location(s) for hosting and processing personal data and any material subprocessors involved in providing the services, and provide an overview of the data protection and security measures applicable to the services.

The selected provider must cooperate with proportionate security assessments and audits authorised by MPP, subject to appropriate confidentiality, scope, and scheduling arrangements.

## 6. Terms of Service

### 6.1. General Terms

A. All non-public information disclosed by MPP in connection with this RFP, including during demonstrations, clarification discussions and any subsequent due diligence or technical assessment, shall be treated as confidential and used solely for the purposes of participating in this RFP process. MPP may require shortlisted bidders to enter into a separate confidentiality agreement before access to non-public technical information is provided.

B. Final proposals must remain valid for 60 days from the final proposal deadline. Preliminary proposals are indicative and will be superseded by final offers. Any extension of final-offer validity will be requested in writing on consistent terms.

C. The selected provider shall not subcontract any material part of the services without MPP's prior written approval. The provider shall remain fully responsible for the acts, omissions and performance of its subcontractors and shall ensure that approved subcontractors are subject to obligations consistent with those applicable to the provider, including confidentiality, data protection, information security and intellectual property obligations.

D. MPP reserves the right, at its discretion, to reject any or all proposals, request additional information or clarification from bidders, negotiate with one or more bidders, award all or part of the services to one or more providers, modify or discontinue the procurement

process, or decide not to award a contract. No bidder shall be entitled to compensation in connection with the preparation or submission of a proposal.

E. MPP will inform participating bidders of the outcome of the procurement. Subject to confidentiality, legal and procurement requirements, MPP may provide unsuccessful bidders with a summary of the principal reasons for the outcome. MPP will not disclose another bidder's confidential information, trade secrets, or commercially sensitive information.
F. Proposals will be evaluated by a committee of at least two members appointed by MPP. Evaluation committee members will be required to disclose relevant conflicts of interest and maintain the confidentiality of proposals.
G. Bidders must disclose any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest relevant to this procurement, including any relationship with MPP personnel or other circumstances that could affect, or reasonably appear to affect, the integrity of the procurement process.
H. All costs associated with preparing and submitting a proposal are to be borne by the bidder.
I. All data and content supplied by or on behalf of MPP, and all data created specifically for MPP through operation of the services, will remain accessible to and under control of MPP, and must be made available to MPP in commonly usable formats, subject to any applicable third-party rights expressly identified in the proposal. Bidders must identify any pre-existing vendor materials, open-source components, third-party services, licensing restrictions, and recurring costs that could affect modification, transfer, or continued operation. The final contract will address ownership or licensing of custom developments, source-code and repository access, documentation, infrastructure accounts, and transition support.
J. By submitting a proposal, the bidder confirms that it has reviewed the RFP and public interface and has identified assumptions, exceptions and information gaps. This does not constitute confirmation that the bidder has inspected the codebase or verified the internal architecture.
K. MPP reserves the right to amend the solicitation documents at any time. Any amendments will be posted in the 'Request for Proposals' section of the MPP website and we kindly request you to monitor the section before submission. Material amendments will also be communicated in writing simultaneously to participating bidders, with deadline adjustments where appropriate.

## 7. Legal Matters

The resulting contract is expected to be governed by Swiss law, with disputes subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the competent courts of the Canton of Geneva, Switzerland, unless otherwise expressly agreed by MPP in the final contract.