



RFA No.: RFA-688-12-000001 – Amendment 1

Amt. 1 Issuance Date: March 3rd, 2012

RFA Closing Date: April 10, 2010 9:00 A.M. Malian Local Time

Subject: Northern Mali Development Program (NOMADE)

Dear Prospective Applicant:

This Amendment 1 modifies the RFA number RFA-688-12-000001, Northern Mali Development Program, to provide answers to the questions that were raised by potential applicants for the general consideration of the interested parties.

The questions/answers related to the RFA number RFA-688-10-000001 are in Attachment A.

Except for the specific changes transmitted through this Amendment 01, all other terms and conditions of the RFA remain unchanged.

Sincerely,

/S/
Michael P. Rossman,
Regional Agreement Officer

Attachment A: Questions/Answers

ATTACHMENT A – QUESTIONS/ANSWERS**General****Re security**

Reference: RFA Section V.B (2), Organizations Systems and Management, Page 31.

(a) The RFA references “security plan” and “illustrative grant cycle”. Please confirm that these required items can be included in an Annex to the Technical Application.

(b) The RFA states “USAID’s evaluation will be based on the application and presentation and will focus on the proposed staffing structure, organization chart, management processes, security plan, field offices plan, and illustrative grant cycle.”

- Would USAID kindly confirm that for the April 10, 2012 proposal submission, Offerors are only required to provide a general outline of the standard security measures that would implement for a program such as NOMADE and that a detailed security plan is only required at the time of notice of award?

- If a general outline of the standard security measures is required, would USAID kindly confirm that it should be included as an annex to the technical application?

(c) Given the revolt in January, does USAID have new security guidance for implementing partners working in the North?

Response:

(a) Yes, the response can come as an annex to the technical application.

(b) Yes, an outline is acceptable, as long as it will guide the USAID to determine that the approach and related costs are realistic.

(c) Please consult the U.S Embassy’s Website in Bamako for the updated information at: mali.usembassy.gov

2. Construction

Reference: RFA Section VI.B (5 & 6), Construction Provisions, Page 33.

(a) PWD & standards - The RFA states, “Any new or renovation construction project funded by USAID must allow access by people with disabilities (PWDs). USAID promotes universal design over accessible design.... All new construction activities that include USAID financing will incorporate universal or accessible design. Additionally, changes to an existing structure that affects, or could affect the usability of the structure will consider standards that facilitate access by PWDs.” While the second sentence states that universal design is promoted by USAID for renovation or construction, the second to last statement states that all new construction can incorporate either universal or accessible design. Please confirm that all new construction can incorporate either universal or accessible design and please clarify the requirements for renovation (universal or accessible). Please confirm whether the American Disabilities Act (ADA) applies. The RFA cites codes and standards of work for the execution of construction or renovation activities. Which standards should be will exercise ultimate control over the construction and renovation requirements, i.e. International or Ministry Standards? It may be difficult for local sub-contractors to follow the stringent code

requirements of the IBC, IPC, IMC, NEC, NFPA and USACE, for example for required materials and workmanship. What codes related to plumbing, electrical, etc., should be adhered to for renovation works to ensure compatibility?

Responses:

- *The new construction should incorporate the Universal design Only.*
- *The American Disabilities Act (ADA) Applies.*
- *Between two standards, the highest will apply.*

- (b) The RFA mentions individual task orders (“Ministry standards and criteria for designs as specified within individual task orders”). Will there be task orders for construction and rehabilitation works?

Response:

These relates to sub-awards. The prime-recipient is responsible of determining the best mechanisms to be used for ordering the construction and rehabilitation works.

3. Environment

Reference: RFA Section I.G (1), Environmental Compliance, Page 12.

Question: The RFA states that the “application shall contain an environmental mitigation and monitoring plan which will address the environmental concerns and the instructions in Section IV. D. II (1) below” (page 12). The referenced section, Cost/Business Application Format and Guidelines, does not cover instructions for the EMMP. Please confirm if respondents are to include their approaches to achieving environmental compliance and management in the **technical application** per the guidelines in Section IV.C(b)(2), Environmental Compliance, or if an EMMP should be submitted with the **cost application**. If the former, please confirm if this plan may be included as an annex. If the latter, please clarify instructions for the cost application, Section IV. D.

Response: The EMMP can come as an annex to the technical application, and the costs associated with the implementation of the plan shall be taken into account in the cost application.

Reference: RFA Section IV.C (b)(2), Environmental Compliance, Page 25.

Question: The mission’s environmental compliance conditions for this award do not include clauses 3, 6, or 7. Please confirm if there are additional conditions or if this is a typo.

Response: Clause 3 is included. Clauses 6 and 7 are not mentioned on purpose. It means that there are no categorical exclusions and no negative determination in the IEE for these two.

4. Evaluation Criteria

Reference: RFA Section IV.C (b)(4), Institutional Capacity and Experience, Page 27

Please clarify under which evaluation criteria the information submitted in response to this requirement will be evaluated, given that that there are no evaluation points assigned to the institutional capacity and experience according to Section V.B, Technical Merits Evaluation Criteria, Page 30.

Response:

It is under criteria 2, Organization Systems and Management, that this requirement will be evaluated.

5. **A&A – guiding principles**

Reference: RFA Section V.B (1)(i), Strategic/Technical Approach, Page 31.

Question: The RFA references “guiding principles”, but they are not mentioned anywhere else in the RFA. Please clarify.

Response: *The guiding principles follow the sentence. The sentence shall read: “The Applicant should propose activities that demonstrate a clear understanding of the below guiding principles.” See a, b, c, d.*

6. **A&A – Typo - start date**

(a) Reference: RFA Cover Page and Section II, Award Information, Page 14 – Period of Performance

The RFA lists a period of performance of three (3) years with an anticipated start date of September 1, 2012. However, Section II.A. Anticipated Award Schedule states that a four-year cooperative agreement will be awarded, and there are references to a four-year cooperative agreement elsewhere in the document, including in the RFA cover letter. On the RFA cover page, in the second paragraph, it states “The period of performance is four (04) years with an anticipated start date of September 1, 2012.” And again under Section II – Award Information, B. Funding Level, Support And Duration of The Award it states “Applicants should estimate a funding level for the Cooperative Agreement of \$12,500,000 over four years.” However, on page 14, under Section II – Award Information, it states “The period of performance is three (3) years with an anticipated start date of September 1, 2012.” Can USAID confirm that the period of performance for this project is four (4) years?

Response: *the anticipated period of performance is four years with a total estimated amount of \$12.5 million. The Section II.A shall read: four years.*

(b) Reference: Section IV.C(b) – Technical Application format & content

On page 23, under Section IV - Application And Submission Instructions, C. Technical Application Preparation Guidelines, (b) Technical Application Format and Content, it states “The technical application may contain the following sections, as more fully explained below: (a) Cover Page (1-2 pages), (b) Table of Contents, (c) Executive Summary (1-3 pages), (d) Program Description (20 pages), (e) Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and (g) Annexes (Curriculum Vitae/Resumés, Past Performance References, and Letters of Commitment from implementing partners, if any).”

- Can USAID confirm that the Table of Contents does not count against any page limitation?

Response: *the table of contents does not count against any page limitation.*

- Can USAID confirm that the total page limitation for the Technical Application is 25 pages, including the Cover Page (2 pages), Executive Summary (3 pages) and Program Description (20 pages)?

Response: *the total page limitation is between 22 and 25 pages depending on the following: 1 to 2 pages for the cover page, 1 to 3 for the executive summary, and maximum 20 pages for the program description*

- Can USAID confirm that the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan should be included as an annex to the technical application?

Response: *the Monitoring & Evaluation Plan can come as an annex.*

- Can USAID confirm that the Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) should be included as an annex to the technical application?

Response: *the EMMP can come as an annex.*

- Can USAID also confirm that the Organizational Chart should be included as an annex to the technical application?

Response: the Organizational Chart can come as an annex.

7. A&A – Typo - Application review information

Reference: RFA Section V.A, Application Review Information, Page 30.

The RFA references “the countries of Chad, Niger, Burkina Faso, and Mauritania.” Please clarify.

Response: This program will be implemented only in Mali. Apologies for the confusion.

8. A&A – Branding

Reference: RFA Section V.A, Application Review Information, Page 30.

The RFA mentions that Evaluation Criteria include consideration of the Branding Strategy and Marking Plan. Please confirm that the submission of the Branding and Marking Plan is not required at this stage and will only be requested from the Apparently Successful Applicant, as stated elsewhere in the RFA.

Response: as stated in Section II.H, the submission of the Branding & Marking plan will be requested from the apparently successful applicant. Information is provided in the RFA stage for information and consideration in the development of the technical application/ proposed activities and cost applications.

End of Attachment A

End of Modification 1