

**Project Title:** Strengthening Education for Mining in Ethiopia (STEM)

## **A. AMENDMENT TO THE RFP**

This addendum 2 does not provide any changes to the RFP SEL: 2016-D-000284-1.

## **B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The following questions have been received by DFATD for which DFATD is providing the answers below:

**Question 1** – Can you please clarify the points in Section 10.8 (b) 1) and Section 11.15, 11.18, and 12.4 (d) of the Data Sheet regarding ceiling rates and adjusted monthly rates?

Please confirm that the quoted ceiling rate is strictly for **in-country living costs** as specified in Section 10.8 (b) 1) and are **exclusive** of relocation costs as specified in Section 10.8 (b) 2).

**Answer 1** – The monthly rate shown in article 10.8 (b) 1) in the Section 1: Instructions to Bidders – Data Sheet is to cover the cost items listed in article 10.8 (b) 1) of Section 1: Instructions to Bidders.

**Question 2** – Please confirm that said costs are in **addition** to Fees as specified in Section 10.8 (a).

**Answer 2** – Please refer to article 10.8 (a) in Section 1: Instructions to Bidders for a description of what is included in Fees.

**Question 3** – Please confirm that in-country living costs are assumed to apply **only** to the Canadian Project Director position as per the Minimum LOE quota.

a. If not, please confirm what is the ceiling rate for all other personnel types.

**Answer 3** – Please refer to article 10.8 (b) 1) in Section 1: Instructions to Bidders – Data Sheet for the Personnel for whom monthly rate applies.

a. Please see the answer 3 above.

**Question 4** – Please confirm that only the eight (8) personnel identified in the RFP are to be included in the technical and financial proposal.

**Answer 4** – Please refer to article 9.8 in Section 1: Instructions to Bidders and in Section 1: Instructions to Bidders - Data Sheet under articles 11.15, 11.18, and 12.4 (d), Evaluation of financial proposals “Should the Bidder include any positions...”.

**Question 5** – Under Section 5, Evaluation Criteria for Requirement #1, it states that in a case where a project was carried out by a consortium or joint venture, “only the experience of the consortium member who is identified for overall management and implementation [...] will be evaluated” (p. 90 of the RFP). While we understand from the RFP that a member from a consortium or joint venture on this bid can only present project experience for which they were lead, we would like additional clarification on the following:

Please confirm that a consortium or joint venture bidding on this initiative is permitted to present project experience (under Requirement #1) from any members (not necessarily from the Member in Charge, as identified on Form Tech-1) of their consortium or joint venture (as mentioned in the guidance to bidders of the Form Tech-4 (p. 34 of the RFP)).

**Answer 5** – For a clarification on whose experience to present for Requirement 1, please refer to the note at the end of Requirement 1, which follows: “In this criterion:”, “Where the project was carried out by a consortium or joint venture...”.

**Question 6** – We note that the Personnel LoE table in the data sheet does not include any time for HQ management and administration. Furthermore, the clause under ‘Evaluation of financial proposals’ in the data sheet indicates that any positions added by the bidder will not be considered in the financial evaluation or the resulting contract. However, we also note Section 1, 10.8 (iii), Pricing Basis, does not list those costs as being part of the overhead/indirect costs. Given these are direct project costs, how should the bidder present these project costs?

**Answer 6** – Please note the guidance note to Bidders contained in Form FIN-1B in Section 3: Financial Proposal – Standard Forms, which states “The Bidder must provide its administrative cost for the management of the Sub-consultants and Contractors determined during project implementation”.

**Question 7** – We have a question with respect to preparation of Form Tech-5A: Work Breakdown Structure – List of Sub-Activities. The Guidance to Bidders provided on page 36 of the RFP suggests that sub-activities for all activities listed in the Logic Model should be presented: “The WBS organizes **all** programming and management activities into basic work packages...” However, the instructions provided Section Five are to identify two sub-activities for each of the activities 1111, 1113, 1121, 1123, 1211, 1213, 1214 and 1222.

Could you please confirm that the WBS should only include sub-activities for the eight activities listed on page 92, Requirement 6?

**Answer 7** – The sentence “The WBS organizes all programming and management activities into basic work packages called WBS categories” is intended as an explanation of the WBS. It is confirmed that the bidders are to identify two (2) sub-activities for each of the activities 1111, 1113, 1121, 1123, 1211, 1213, 1214, and 1222.

**Question 8** – As well, could you please confirm that for Form Tech-5C: Project Performance Measurement Framework we are requested to develop indicators, data sources, data collection methods, frequency and responsibility only for outputs 1111, 1113, 1121, 1123, 1211, 1213, 1214 and 1222 as indicated in the Form provided on pp. 39-41 and the instructions included on page 91, Requirement 3?

**Answer 8** – Yes, this is the case.

**Question 9** – Please clarify the criteria for Evaluation of financial proposals as described in Section 11.15, 11.18, and 12.4 (d) of the Data Sheet. Specifically, Section 10.8 (b) 1) states that “*the average monthly rate is not to exceed the ceiling amount*”, and yet the example cited shows a winning bid with an average monthly rate which **does** exceed the ceiling amount. Also, please clarify how and why the **adjusted monthly rate** is used since the adjusted rate is lower than the originally proposed average rate.

**Answer 9** – The tables in the example contained in article 11.15, 11.18, and 12.4 (d) are meant to illustrate the adjustment that is made to a proposed ceiling rate that exceeds the ceiling rate set by DFATD. Thus, in the example, the average proposed ceiling rate of \$2250 is divided by DFATD’s ceiling rate of \$1800 to arrive at a ratio which is used to multiply the proposed yearly ceiling rates. (See explanation in the clause between the tables).

**D. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.**