



**RFP #23-227256**

**TITLE:**

**Field Support Services Project (FSSP) in Mozambique –**

**AMENDMENT AND QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS #1 dated April 23, 2024**

---

**QUESTION 1**

Reference Annex A – Statement of Work, Section 6.1 : Office Space (p. 32)

The requirement states “The Contractor may be required to provide an area for occasional meetings throughout the duration of the contract. Should the Contractor require the space, it will be their sole responsibility to source and cover the associated fees. All meetings are encouraged to be held virtually. Should the Technical Authority request a meeting, it will either be held virtually or at a Government of Canada site, where appropriate security measures must be followed.”

No specifications are provided on the dimensions of this space for meetings and the facilities therein, for how many people or square meters etc? For example, are facilities such as internet connection, projector or sound system required?

Also could you please clarify the phrase: “Should the contractor require the space, it will be their sole responsibility to source and cover associated fees.”

**ANSWER 1**

**DFATD will never reimburse or ask the Contractor to provide a Meeting space for DFATD or its representatives. Should the contractor decide a meeting space is required for their use, their meetings or to engage with stakeholders it is the Contractors responsibility to identify, source and pay for meetings rooms.**

**As well, we have updated the section 6.1 in the RFP to remove the following sentences: The provision of a physical office is required. The physical office provides working space as needed for the FSSP Resources.**

**QUESTION 2**

Annex B – Basis of Payment, Table 7 Operational costs office space only (p. 38)

Could you please specify the required office space. The price offered by the bidder depends greatly on size and location of the office space. There are A, B, C, and D class locations (distance from the CHC is not a useful criteria because there are D class neighborhoods about 2 KMs from the High Commission and A class locations at 5 km). Obviously D class will be considerably cheaper than A class neighborhood with parking. The same applies to size, without further specification the bidder can offer 50m<sup>2</sup> for the 3 core FSS staff members and would fulfill the requirement of the RFP.



Without specifications - the playing field will not be level.

There are different types of buildings class I, II, III, and IV. And class IV building in a D class area without parking will considerably cheaper than an Class 1 building in an A class area.

Please clarify to ensure the playing field is level for all bidders.

## **ANSWER 2**

**The RFP has been updated to state as follows:**

**4.2 Location of Work: The resources must be based in Maputo, Mozambique, offering services throughout Mozambique.**

**6.1 Office Space: Should the Contractor require office space, it will be their sole responsibility to source and cover the associated fees. All meetings are encouraged to be held virtually. Should the Technical Authority request a meeting, it will either be held virtually or at a Government of Canada site, where appropriate security measures must be followed.**

**6.1.1 Facilities and Workplace: The Contractor and their resources will be required to provide their own workspace, software and equipment needed to render the services required.**

**As well, we have removed the Table 7 in the basis of payment from the RFP.**

## **QUESTION 3**

Taxation :

Reference Part 6, Resulting Contract Clauses - Paragraph 6.7.1 (A) Professional Services – Firm Daily Rate (p.22) “Customs duties are included and applicable taxes are extra”. This statement appears to suggest that GAC will be responsible for the payment of the value added taxes.

Please clarify if GAC will pay the Value Added Taxes in Mozambique- over and beyond the quoted prices as proposed by the Contractor or should the Contractor embedded these costs in their financial proposal?

Please note the same question is also valid for points B, C,D, and E.

## **ANSWER 3**

**The contractor is required to identify associated taxes in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the contracts and country of origin. Taxes will be reimbursed at cost.**

## **QUESTION 4**

We would like to inquire if there was an incumbent for this above mentioned project?



#### ANSWER 4

**There is no incumbent for the currently-advertised RFP, which is currently open to qualified bidders.**

**There is currently an active Field Support Services contract in Mozambique, with the supplier “Consortium World University Service of Canada / Consultores HODI”. For additional information, consult the Global Affairs Canada Project Browser page specific to this contract: <https://w05.international.gc.ca/projectbrowser-banqueprojets/project-projet/details/d000027001>**

#### QUESTION 5

On page 43, under Definitions, Stakeholders – only 4 stakeholder categories are listed but the resources’ stakeholder requirements (RTC1.6; RTC2.6) require 5 or more different types of organizations to achieve full points.

As such, we would be request that the following stakeholders list be used, based on previous RFP requirements (such as FSS Colombia, FSS Burkina Faso, FSS Kenya, Somalia, and South Africa; FSS Vietnam) :

**International development assistance stakeholder(s):** includes the following types of organizations involved in international development: civil society organizations (CSOs), the private sector, think tanks, academia, multilateral organizations, donors, local or national governments.

#### ANSWER 5

**In the DEFINITIONS section on page 43, we have removed the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet with the limited list of stakeholders and instead refer only to the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet “International Development Assistance Stakeholder(s):,which provides many more stakeholder categories.**

#### QUESTION 6

On page 32, section 8.1 Key Project documents and Narrative Reports, the Initial Work Plan (IWP), under the deliver date it reads: ‘*Approved version* within 90 calendar days of contract.’ We would request that “*Approved version*” be removed as the wording is not aligned with previous RFPs and contracts.

There may also be unforeseen challenges in country that could impact project start-up and the team’s ability to meet this deadline as well as unpredictability regarding a submission time as approval would depend on the GAC PTL and their workload and turnaround time.

#### ANSWER 6

**The RFP has been updated. We have update section 8.1 FSSP Deliverables and reporting. Specifically, we have removed the words “approved version” as requested.**



## QUESTION 7

On page 43, under definitions, the Project Countries are listed as Mozambique, Angola and Eswatini. And countries under the project region are listed as Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

On page 58 and 59, under the Bidder's experience, sections RTC 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, at the bottom of each section lists additional points if the project was implemented in Mozambique, but not the other countries. We would request this be removed as it does not align with the requirements for each of the proposed resources under sections RTC1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, and RTC2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 as well as previous FSSP RFPs and how points have been allocated for Bidder's experience and the projects submitted.

This change would bring this section in line with RTC 1 and RTC 2, and other FSSP RFPs, such as

- FSSP Kenya, Somalia, and South Africa; FSSP Caribbean; FSSP Mali, FSSP Jordan which provided different points level depending on if the project was from the project countries, regional countries, or developing countries outside of those two lists.
- FSSP Colombia; FSSP Burkina Faso; FSSP Vietnam which only required projects from developing countries.

We request that the additional points should be changed.

## ANSWER 7

**We have considered it very carefully, however, the current formulation of the text will stand, in alignment with the operational requirements of this particular contract.**

## QUESTION 8

Reference D – Evaluation criteria

RTC1.3 and RTC2.3 Demonstrated PM Experience and PC Experience: requirement refers only to **completed** projects. This means that experience in ongoing FSS projects cannot be presented as experience. Please confirm.

## ANSWER 8

**The RFP has been updated. We will accept ongoing projects as well, provided that the bidder demonstrates that any submitted and ongoing projects are more than 50% complete, in terms of timeframe and budget, at the time of bid submission. We have updated RTC1.3, RTC2.3 and RTC3.3**

## QUESTION 9

RTC 1.3, RTC 2.3 Demonstrated PM experience and PC experience: The requested experience can have been gained in a position that may not have been titled Project Manager or Project Coordinator respectively. Is this experience admissible?



## ANSWER 9

**Yes, this is permissible.**

## QUESTION 10

RTC4

“a project is defined as a contract, agreement or arrangement signed by the bidder”

“have an average project value of at least \$750,000 per year”

Reference to the two statements (requirements) and seek clarification on eligibility of the bidders experience.

A Firm is hired to manage an existing standalone 5 year project. This project has its own bank accounts etc, staff, etc. The Firm is selected by the financier of the project to manage this project and be the overall manager, administrator and coordinator bringing together resources required to execute the project. The value of the project is a \$ 1,000,000 and the funds flow through the books of this project. However the specific contract with the firm is valued at \$ 200,000 per year. The contract further states that the firm must take all responsibilities for managing this project. Will the value be assessed to be 200,000 \$ or 1,000,000 \$? Please clarify

## ANSWER 10

**The RFP has been updated (see updated RTC4). So in the example above, the project would be accepted.**

-----