



**UNITED STATES  
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

USAID/MADAGASCAR  
2040 ANTANANARIVO PLACE  
DEPARTEMENT OF STATE  
WASHINGTON D.C. 20521-2040

USAID/MADAGASCAR  
C/O AMERICAN EMBASSY  
B.P. 5253 - Antananarivo 101  
MADAGASCAR  
TEL: 22-539-20-FAX: 22-538-86

February 13, 2004

To all TASC II IQC Contractors

**SUBJECT:** Request for Task Order Proposals No. 687-04-P-009, Amendment No. 01  
Technical Assistance for the implementation of activities under the “Use of Selected Health Services and Products Increased, and Health Practices Improved” Strategic Objective.

The purpose of this amendment is to (1) change the proposal submission date to March 08, 2004 at 12:00 (noon); (2) delete the requirement for a separate management proposal; (3) delete the reference to the six month extension (4) revise the evaluation criteria; (5) provide responses to questions (6) amend Annex D: Applicable Documents; and (7) change USAID/Madagascar address.

As a result of this modification, the following changes are made:

I- RFP cover letter, closing date, DELETE “February 29, 2004” and REPLACE with “March 08, 2004”

RFP cover letter, time, DELETE “4:00 p.m. (local time)” and REPLACE with “12:00 p.m. (noon) local time”

II- RFP cover letter, delete all references to the requirement for submission of a separate management proposal.

III- Statement of Work , Attachment A Section F, delete Period of Performance in it’s entirety and replace with the following:

“F. Period of Performance

The period of performance of the Task Order is approximately 54 months through o/a September 30, 2008, subject to the availability of funds.”

IV- DELETE Attachment B and SUBSTITUTE in lieu thereof with the following:

**EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**1. EVALUATION**

Technical, cost and other factors will be evaluated relative to each other, as described herein.

- a) The technical proposal will be scored by a technical evaluation committee using the criteria shown in this Section.
- b) The cost proposal will be scored by the method described in this Section.
- c) The criteria below are presented by major category, with relative order of importance so that Offerors will know which areas require emphasis in the preparation of proposals. The criteria below reflect the requirement of this particular solicitation.


Offerors should note that these criteria (1) serve as the standard against which all proposals will be evaluated, and (2) serve to identify the significant matters which Offeror’s should address in their proposals.

**Technical Evaluation Criteria: 90 points**

- 1. Technical approach 40 points
- 2. Key personnel 20 points
- 3. Management approach 14 points
- 4. Prior experience and past performance 10 points
- 5. Small business concerns and disadvantaged enterprise participation 6 points



**Cost evaluation criteria: 10 points**

 Cost proposal should include a budget with explanatory notes for the full period of performance. The cost proposal will be evaluated on (1) consistency with the technical proposal; (2) and overall cost effectiveness (Best value)

**Total: 100 points**

**2. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

<b>TECHNICAL APPROACH</b>		<b>40 points</b>
a.	Clear articulation and demonstration of high quality technically sound approaches and strategies (i.e. can the proposed technical approach reasonably be expected to produce the specific performance measures); specifically addresses gender considerations; and addresses SO5 priority technical areas and Intermediate Results, as presented in the RFP.	
b.	Clear articulation of the integration of priority SO5 technical focuses across contract activities and approaches.	
c.	Clear articulation of specific yearly targets for achievement of benchmarks and how targets will be achieved.	
d.	Clear articulation of how contract activities will complement, coordinate, and collaborate with SO5 Expanded Program activities to promote synergy and increase impact of technical interventions.	
e.	Clear articulation of how approaches and activities will achieve or contribute to the integrated results of the Mission ISP and other USAID SOs (Env/RD, Ag/Trade, and DG).	



<b>KEY PERSONNEL</b>	<b>20 Points</b>
a. Qualification and relevant experience of proposed technical personnel, including quality of experience in developing country settings.	
b. Appropriateness and rationale of the proposed technical positions (long- and short-term) to the proposed technical approach.	
c. Qualifications and experience of proposed home office support or management personnel and explanation or justification for the use of these classifications.	
<b>MANAGEMENT APPROACH</b>	<b>14 Points</b>
a. Clear articulation of how the Offeror will implement activities including partnering approaches with local and international organizations, other SO5 Expanded Program implementing organizations, and governmental institutions to achieve the project results.	
b. Detailed organizational and management plan for establishing and maintaining operations.	
c. Clear articulation of how the Offeror will recruit and retain qualified US, local, and expatriate professional staff.	
d. Clear articulation of how the Offeror will successfully provide managerial and technical back-stopping for a program of this size and complexity.	
<b>PRIOR EXPERIENCE AND PAST PERFORMANCE</b>	<b>10 points</b>
a. Demonstrated prior experience and institutional capacity in SO5 priority technical areas and Intermediate Results, as presented in the Statement of Work.	
b. Detailed listing of capacity and experience in implementing collaborative programs with other USAID implementing organizations and in managing sub-contracts and grants, donor-supported technical assistance and training activities to local communities, non-governmental and other governmental organizations in a developing country setting.	
c. Details on past performance records in providing similar services on past contract, including satisfaction of past clients with the Offeror's services and/or products.	
d. Details on past performance records on the Offeror's responsiveness to past clients including responsiveness to host country counterpart concerns.	



<b>SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS AND DISADVANTAGED ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>6 points</b>
a. Percentage of contract funds for the participation of small business concerns and disadvantaged enterprises in project activities.	
b. Clear articulation of the active participation, roles, and responsibilities of small business concerns and disadvantaged enterprises in project activities.	
<b>TOTAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION</b>	<b>90 POINTS</b>

V- Below are responses to all questions: Note the responses to the questions below are meant to be informative only and are not to be relied upon for the purposes of formulating the proposal. Offerors are responsible for the contents of their proposals.

1. On page 2 in the cover letter, it states that the offeror should provide CVs for all proposed personnel, including TCNs and CCNs. Are CVs also required for all proposed short-term consultants?

- Please confirm that biodata sheets are required only for long term personnel proposed under this contract.

**CVs and biodata sheets for short-term professional consultants that are known at this time should be included with the proposal. This will eliminate the need for later CO approval.**

2. In RFP Annex E, Questions and Answers to the draft Statement of Work posted for comments, question 22 asks if the MPH training will be limited to training at US-based Universities, with a positive response. Can the US-based Universities be located in other countries, such as American Universities in Cairo, Lebanon, etc?

**Yes, the MPH training could be with US affiliated universities. See ADS 253 for more details.**

3. Under both the Statement of work and section 3, Contractor Requirements, it states that the Contractor shall be responsible for the procurement of any and all equipment and commodities (not elsewhere specified as USAID procurement) which are necessary to carry out activities, and responsible for proper warehousing, inventory, and reporting requirements for all commodities under the contract. Can you please clarify what types of commodities are expected to be procured under this contract?

**The majority of commodities will be procured outside the contract. Vaccines are provided through GAVI, UNICEF, and other donors. Contraceptives will be procured by USAID outside this contract and through other Donors. Socially marketed commodities including nets, treatment kits, safe water, condoms, and contraceptives are supplied through other donors and/or USAID outside this contract. It is possible, depending on the type of activities proposed, that other commodities may be required to be procured by the Contractor. The Offeror is best placed to describe these based on the activities.**

4. Related to question 3, RFP page 32 (first paragraph, Procurement of Commodities) states that "The Contractor shall be responsible for the procurement of any and all equipment and commodities... which are necessary to carry out activities." In the absence of any additional information it is difficult to estimate appropriate budget amounts for these commodities. Again, to ensure comparability among budgets, could USAID provide some standard assumptions or a sample (plug) amount to be used by all offerors?

Does the government anticipate commodity procurement to be undertaken in this program?

**It is not possible for USAID to provide a plug amount because the equipment and commodities are in direct relation to the activities proposed.**

5. Under attachment C, Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal, it is requested that single spaced, 10 pitch type or larger font is used. Please clarify if this is 10 point font or 12 point font, and if a specific font, i.e. Times New Roman, is preferred?

**Please prepare proposals in 10 point font or larger.**

6. In Attachment B, the technical evaluation criteria include prior experience and institutional capacity as separate categories. Can the institutional capacity be interpreted as the contractor's proposed management plan? If the answer to this question is affirmative, would criterion (b) listed under "institutional capacity" (Details on experience, capability and strategies...) be included as a sub criterion under "Prior experience"?

**The technical evaluation criteria is revised by this amendment to clarify this item.**

7. a) Related to question 5, under attachment C, Instructions for the Preparation of the Technical Proposal, letter (d), it states that the technical proposal shall contain Annexes, consisting of at a minimum information on Offeror's team, Institutional Capacity and Past Performance References and a proposed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Can we interpret these instructions to mean that the description of the Offeror's Institutional Capability and description of the proposed implementation consortium can be included in the Annexes and does not have to be included in the main text?

b) Please clarify the overall page length of the proposal. The thirty (30) page limit refers to the technical strategy and approach only or does it include the executive summary, institutional capacity, management plan and staffing strategy?

**b) The thirty page limit includes the technical approach, management approach, staffing strategy and the executive summary.**

**Institutional capacity, past performance references, CVs of proposed staff, and the Monitoring and Evaluation plan information can be included in the annexes.**

8. Attachment C, Instruction, of the RFP seems to indicate that Institutional Capacity section of the technical proposal should be annexed. Please confirm this.

**Please see response to question 7b above.**

9. Could USAID please clarify how many separate proposal volumes it wishes to receive? The RFP cover letter (page 2, first paragraph) appears to require 3 separate volumes - technical, management and cost - but there is no guidance on what would be included in the "management" proposal, nor is a management proposal mentioned in the evaluation criteria. We believe that two volumes (technical and cost) would be sufficient to include all the items requested from offerors. Can you confirm that this is correct?

**There should be two proposal volumes (technical and cost with annexes). The separate management proposal requirement has been deleted.**

10. On page 39 of the RFP, Section F (Period of Performance) states that "The period of performance is approximately 54 months... with option to extend for an additional six months subject to availability of funds." This raises two questions:
- If the base period is 54 months, one of the five project years will obviously need to be shorter than the others. To ensure comparability among the budgets submitted by various offerors, could you specify whether the short year should be Year 1 or Year 5? (Unless USAID objects, we would suggest shortening Year 5.)

**We agree year 5 should be the short year.**

b) Should the budget include a separate price for the 6-month option period?

**The requirement for a six month option period has been deleted.**

11. a) In RFP Annex E, the answer to Question 23 stated that guidance would be provided on desired funding levels for local NGOs. To prevent offerors' budgets from being distorted by varying assumptions about these funding levels, could USAID provide a sample (plug) figure for proposal purposes?

b) In Annex E, USAID's response to question number 23 states "Guidance will be provided by USAID/M and the University of Michigan Population Fellow" as to the desired funding levels for local NGO's including Voahary Salama. We note that such guidance was not provided in the RFP and would like to know when this information will be provided.

**Guidance for funding levels for NGOs will be provided following award. Offerors should propose funding levels for proposed activities.**

12. Could you provide copies of the certificates required to be included with the proposal (i.e., items 5, 6, 10 and 11 from the list on pp. 2-4 of the RFP cover letter)? Also, what is being requested under Item 9, which is a FAR clause with nothing to fill out?

**The forms are available at [http://www.usaid.gov/procurement\\_bus\\_opp/procurement/forms/](http://www.usaid.gov/procurement_bus_opp/procurement/forms/)**

**Item No. 9, Anti-Kickback Procedures (FAR 52.203-7), if the proposal exceeds the simplified Acquisition Threshold, currently \$100,000. Offerors are requested to follow the procedures. There is nothing to fill out.**

**Item 10:**

**“ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT IF INTEREST REPRESENTATION”**

1. (a) The offeror represents, to the best of its knowledge and belief, that an award of it of a contract does ( ) or does not ( ) involve an organizational conflict of interest.

(b) The term “Organizational conflict of interest” means that a relationship exists whereby an offeror or a contractor (including its chief executives, directors, proposed consultants or subcontractors) has interest which (i) may diminish its capacity to give impartial technically sound, objective assistance and advise or may otherwise result in a biased work product, or (ii) may result in an unfair competitive advantage. It does not include the normal flow or benefits from the performance of a contract

(C) The term “Contractor” means any person, firm, unincorporated association, joint venture, partnership, corporation or affiliates thereof, which is a party to a contract with the United States of America. As used in this definition the term “affiliate” has the same meaning as provided in FAR 19.101.

2. If the offeror indicates above that there is an organizational conflict of interest, said offeror shall provide a statement which describes in a concise manner all relevant facts concerning present or current planned interest (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to the work to be performed in the proposed contract and bearing on whether the offeror has a possible organizational conflict of interest with respect to being able to render impartial, technically sound, and objective assistance or advice, or being given unfair competitive advantage. The offeror may also provide relevant facts that show how its organizational structure and/or management systems limit its knowledge of possible organizational conflicts of interest relating to other divisions or sections of interest relating to other divisions or sections of interest relating to other divisions or sections of the organization and how that structure would eliminate or neutralize such organizational conflict.

Name of Offeror: -----

Signature: -----

Typed or Printed name of Authorized Official:  
-----  
-----

**Item No. 11, Certification regarding terrorist financing is deleted.**

13. Which of the items listed in the cover letter are required from proposed subcontractors, and which are only required from the prime contractor?

**The Prime Contractor is required to submit the requested documentation. The Prime's subcontractors named in the proposal are also required to submit the documentation if not pre-approved in the TASC II IQC. Note that FAR Subcontracts clause 52.244-2 Alternate II is incorporated by reference in the basic TASC II IQC and applies to any resulting task order .**

14. According to the USAID Business Forecast for FY 2004 posted on the USAID website, the estimated cost range for this project is 17-18 million dollars. Could USAID either confirm that this figure is still current, or provide a revised estimate?

**No, we can neither confirm nor provide an estimate.**

15. We note that the web link on page 10 of the RFP is not working. Please inform us if a new site has been set up where these documents are available.

**We are working on the website. Meanwhile, please contact Elizabeth Fox at USAID Washington GH/HN/CS (202.712.5777) to requests CD-ROMs containing the documents.**

16. On page 10, section B of the RFP it is noted that "USAID will select one or more..." Please confirm that USAID will award one contract to carry out the activities discussed in the RFP, to either a single firm or a consortium.

**No, we can not confirm at this time.**

17. As the HIV/AIDS funds are separate from those allocated for the other foci of the proposed program, please verify if USAID would like a separate CLIN budget for HIV/AIDS activities.

**We request as detailed a budget as possible for each of the four foci areas including the HIV/AIDS activities.**

18. On page 3, item 12 of the RFP, you use the terms "intermittent employee" and "consultant." Would you please provide your definition of these terms?

**The ADS Glossary defines "Intermittent employee" as a person who does not have a regular work schedule defined in advance and is compensated on a "when actually employed" basis.**

**The ADS Glossary defines a "consultant" as a person serving as an advisor to an officer or instrumentality of the Government, as distinguished from an officer or employee carrying out an agency's duties and responsibilities. Ordinarily, consultants are experts in the field in which they advise, but need not be specialists.**

19. (a) We note that instructions for the technical volume were provided starting on page 47, however no instructions were provided for the management or cost volumes. Would you please provide instructions for these volumes as well? (b) Additionally, related to instructions for the cost and management volumes, could you articulate in which volume (cost, technical, or management) each of the items listed on pages 2 and 3 of the proposal should be included? (c) Are the certifications and forms listed on pages 1-15 of the RFP required for each member in a consortium, or only from the prime contractor?

- a) **The separate management proposal requirement has been removed. For the cost instructions, please refer to RFP page 4 no. 13.**
- b) **All certificates and forms should be included in the cost proposal.**
- c) **See the answer to question 13 above**

20. We understand "Best Value to the Government" to mean that a firm will be awarded a contract based on its entire proposal offering the "best value" (both in technical approach and total cost) to USAID. The "best value," in other words, is when the expected outcome of an acquisition provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement in USAID's estimation. Given this understanding, it would seem contradictory to evaluate the cost based both Best Value and Lowest Overall Cost weighted each at 5 points. We ask that you provide clarification as to your scoring rationale.

**We have reformulated the cost criteria. Proposals will be scored only on "Best Value" weighted at 10 points.**

21. Should local hire expatriate/TCN personnel be considered in the four allocated long term expatriate candidates?

**The Offeror should propose qualified personnel for the allocated long-term key positions whether they are local or international hires.**

22. Please describe the multisectoral information service center referred to on pages 22 and 29 of the RFP. How will this be created and what is its purpose?

**Please refer to the Good Governance program RFA 687-04-A-003.** Available at <http://www.fedgrants.gov>

VI. DELETE Annex D: Applicable Documents in Attachment C and SUBSTITUTE with the following:

#### **Annex D: Applicable Documents**

The ISP and extensive other background pertinent to this contract are available on CD-ROM. Please contact Elizabeth Fox, USAID Washington GH/HN/CS (202.712.5777) for CD-ROM requests. The included documents are presented below.

1. Academy for Education Development. Madagascar Food Security Analysis, FANTA 2001.



2. Behets, F. et al. Evidence-based treatment guidelines for sexually transmitted infections developed with and for female sex workers. *Tropical Medicine and International Health*. 8:251-258. 2003.
3. CRS. Final Evaluation DAPS 1999-2003. Madagascar. 2003.
4. CRS. CRS Madagascar Strategy Statement 2003-2008. Madagascar. 2003.
5. Demographic Health Survey. Enquête Démographique et de Santé 1997. Madagascar. 1997. (Please refer to the following website:  
[http://www.measuredhs.com/accesssurveys/search/search\\_surv\\_std.cfm?Action=region](http://www.measuredhs.com/accesssurveys/search/search_surv_std.cfm?Action=region) )
6. European Union. Expertise concernant les implications et les perspectives sur le secteur du médicament de l'évolution des modalités de Participation Financières des Usagers (PFU) à Madagascar – Rapport de mission 8-30. October 2002
7. GAVI. Plan de formation sur le management du PEV 2002-2004.
8. GAVI. Rapport Annuel GAVI Madagascar. 2001-2003.
9. GOM. DSRP. Document Stratégique. 2003
10. GOM. La stratégie nationale dioranao-WASH. Madagascar. 2003.
11. INSTAT. La situation démographique à Madagascar.
12. INSTAT. Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2000 Madagascar – November 2001  
<http://www.childinfo.org/MICS2/newreports/madagascar/madagascar.htm>
13. JSI. JSI final report. Madagascar. 2003.
14. JSI. Assessment of the Behavior Change Strategy for Young Child: Nutrition, Vaccination and Family Planning – Antananarivo & Fianarantsoa October 2002. 2002.
15. Kleinau, E., Rosensweig, F., and Tain, F. Integration of Health, Population and Environment Programs in Madagascar.
16. Linkages/Madagascar. RAP 2002. Madagascar. 2002.
17. MOH. Business Plan Summary : 2003-2005
18. MOH. Malaria prevention and treatment strategy in Madagascar. Madagascar. 2003.
19. MOH. Plan Directeur 2003. Madagascar. 2003
20. MOH. Plan Strategique National de lutte contre le VIH/SIDA – 2001-2006
21. MOH. Promotion et protection de la santé du couple mère et enfant.
22. MOH. Revue à mi-parcours du programme élargi de vaccination (WHO, UNICEF, USAID, BASICS).
23. Population Services International. PSI Annual Report 2002. Madagascar.
24. Struminger, B.B. Linta River Syphilis/HIV Prevalence Study. 2000.
25. USAID. Family planning and HIV technical guidance. Washington, DC. 2003.
26. USAID. Integrated Strategic Plan. Madagascar. 2001.
27. USAID. Madagascar Case Study: Improving Family Health Using an Integrated, Community-Based Approach.
28. USAID. Madagascar HIV/AIDS country profile. Washington, DC. 2002.
29. USAID. Memorandum of Understanding between: SALAMA/UNFPA/USAID/MOH for improved contraceptive availability and coverage. Madagascar.
30. USAID/DCHA/Office of Food for Peace. Non-Emergency Program References. Washington, DC.  
[http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/humanitarian\\_assistance/ffp/nonemergency.html](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/nonemergency.html)
31. USAID/Madagascar STI/HIV/AIDS Strategy 2003-2008
32. Van Damme K et al. International Congress of Sexually Transmitted Infections 24-27 June 2001 – Vol. 12 Supplement 2 – 2001: a) STI prevalence and associated factors among female sex workers – b) High STI incidence among female sex workers in two cities of Madagascar – c) Baseline socioeconomic and behavioral characteristics of female sex workers in Madagascar . *International journal of STD & AIDS* . 2001
33. Voahary Salama. Initiative de Programmes Intégrés, Rapport final assemblée générale. 30 juillet 2002.
34. WASH. Déclaration de politique nationale pour l'eau et l'assainissement
35. WASH. Projet pilote d'alimentation en eau potable et assainissement en milieu rural 2002 – aide mémoire
36. World Bank. Aide Memoire de la mission de suivi du deuxieme projet d'appui au secteur de la sante. Madagascar. April-May 2003
37. World Bank. PMPS/MAP (Multisectoral STI/HIV/AIDS Prevention project, Project Appraisal document.

VII- Cover letter, DELETE USAID/Madagascar address for the submission of the five (05) copies of technical and management proposal and two (02) copies of cost proposal and REPLACE with the following:

“Five (05) copies of technical proposal and two (02) copies of cost proposal must be submitted to:

Ms. Frederique Rakotoarivelo  
Acquisition Specialist  
USAID/Madagascar  
6th Floor, ZITAL Tower  
ZI Taloumis Ankorondrano  
Antananarivo 101  
Madagascar

E-mail: FRakotoarivelo@usaid.gov  
Tel: 261-20-22-539-20  
Fax: 261-20-22-538-86 or 261-20-22-538-87”

X- Except as provided herein, all other terms and conditions of the original RFP remain unchanged, in full force and effect.