|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S/No** | **Section** | **Comment** |
| 1 | Figure 1.1 | The map is not legible. A simple county map of Kenya without the background would suffice – designed for A5 |
| 2 | Figure 2.1 | Captions are placed before the graphic, and above for a table  The training is missing from this chart |
| 3 | Table 2.1 | Provide the model and technical specifications of the UAVs that will be used by each team. Same for the GNSS receivers. |
| 4 | Table 2.2 | Technical Specifications: whereas the RFP and contract provides a range for several the requirements. Can the consultant provide exact figures/measures based on the equipment they’ll use? For instance, what spatial resolution will be the outputs? or they will vary from one settlement to the other? |
| 5 | Sec 2.3 | How will the boundary of the settlement i.e. limits of the flights be marked/determined? It is suggested that, as the consultant and SEC leaders walk the boundary, a rapid mapping of these extents be done, at least using hand-held GPS. I believe such an input will be required for flight planning. |
| 6 | Figure 2.3, 2.13 | Some captions are repeated.  In some maps, the location and the main maps are same. What’s the essence of including both? |
| 7 | Sec 2.4 | *“…The elevation mapping will be registered to the most important or most clearly defined ground control point and the remaining survey points will be evaluated for validation…”* This statement is unclear. Could the consultant clarify whether the elevations will be based on a local benchmark or tied to the national leveling network?  “*…Benchmarks will be built and located to an accuracy* ***better than 10cm*** *and will be located on the site for future reference…”* It will be better to stick to static figure rather than a range  *“….The Ground Control Points will be distinct features on areas of level ground at least* ***20m*** *from buildings…”.*  Considering that these are informal settlements, made of iron sheets and in close proximity, will this be achieved? In the event it can’t, what alternatives do we have to ensure the desired accuracies are met?  *AOI, Aoi, …. Standardize* |
| 8 | Figure 2.16 | Provide the list coordinates for the control points on the map (preferably inside).  Include a paragraph or two on the processing of the GCP control network GNSS observations. |
| 9 | Sec 2.5 | Please provide the name and version of the flight planning application  *“….The aerial survey will cover the entire project area of interest at reasonable spatial resolution….”* I believe at this point the consultant has determined, based on the equipment, the actual resolution the images will be provided on. Please state that.  Refer to comment #5 on boundary definition |
| 10 | Figure 2.18 | Could we at least localize the images? I believe the consultant has photos of the UAVs that will be used and also own photos of past mapping exercises |
| 11 |  | What does survey-grade analysis mean? |
| 12 | Figure 2.6 | It is important to elaborate on the consistency checks to ensure that they meet the set accuracy standards. |
| 13 | Section 2.6 | This is the most important part of this exercise. Could the consultant consider a flowchart presentation and step by step explanation? Its difficult to follow the steps as currently provided.  The contractual requirement for the DTM is *1m and above*. The consultant is proposing 1.5m DTM. What’s the interpretation of above? Higher or lower? The expectation would be <=1m.  The processing of GNSS data should be moved to another section as proposed on comment #8 |
| 14 |  | The consultant should include a section in this report detailing the submission and approval process of the GNSS-derived control points by the director of surveys |
|  | Sec 2.8 | *Training and capacity building will cover the following courses: - delete one*  The proposed Remote sensing training is on ERDAS Imagine, a commercial software. Will the client have the required licenses post-training? Could open solutions for Remote Sensing such as GEE, OpenDroneMap, etc, have been more appropriate?  **Recommendation**:   1. Align the training content to RS topics that will allow the staff within KISIP exploit the collected data and other open data to perform RS analysis in the slums. 2. Within reasonable limits inculcate the open RS alternatives in the proposed course outline 3. Customize the proposed topics to meet informal settlement requirements for instance how does “. Locate Site for Military Barracks” exercise help in this context?   The proposed courses seem to be a set of standard trainings offered by the consultant. These will require customization to meet KISIP’s needs.  My overall view is that the training proposals should be reviewed and aligned to the KISIP project bearing in mind that some of the staff may not have a strong Remote Sensing background.  Furthermore, the drone training should be separate, replicating the steps the consultant will follow in mapping the slums. |
| 15 | RPC | Clarify to what extent will the consultant support/facilitate the trainees acquire the RPC licenses. Are the listed topics in alignment with expected KCAA approved courses? If so, it would be great for the consultant to include an annexed for references purposes |
| 16 | TWG | This is proposal is highly recommended. It will help for a joint review and acceptance of the outputs from the consultancy |
| 17 | Training Report | If the consultant will train the staff to acquire RCPS, it is important to provide a clear timeline, guided by KCAA provisions. This will in a great way help in planning on the client’s side |
| 18 | Table 3.3 | Provide separate timelines for the two different trainings |
| 19 | Pilot review | The consultant should consider a joint review of the pilot results before rolling out to the rest of the counties |
| 20 | Approvals | If the approvals have been granted, please annex them to this report |