

**QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

**Date:** January 18, 2022

**Reference Request for Proposal Number:** RFP CATALYZE-217772-Edu-2021-0243 - Readvertised

Dear Offerors,

Please see below answers to the questions submitted to: [catalyze.procurements@thepalladiumgroup.com](mailto:catalyze.procurements@thepalladiumgroup.com).

No	Question	Answer
1	Page 6, (c) Past experience information/Capacity statement does not have a page limit. Does (c) past experience information/capacity statement fall under (b) background on the firm and relevant expertise with a 2 page maximum or is (c) different from (b) with a separate page limit?	There is no set page limit, but the section is anticipated to be 3 pages. This section is separated from Section (b).
2	Page 6, (d) Technical proposal and management approach does not have a page limit. Is (e) proposed workplan with a maximum of 2 pages part of (d) technical proposal and management approach?	Section (d) should have a limit of 10 pages. The workplan (e) should be a separate document not tied to the limit for (d).
3	Should Offerors describe the assessment team in (d) technical proposal and management approach?	Yes, please include a description of the proposed assessment team in section (d).
4	Page 9, Under phase 1 of this assignment, the offeror is asked to conduct a market assessment in select countries. Furthermore on page 10, the offeror is asked to “formulate a recommendation to USAID, particularly identifying countries and key entry points and opportunities where USAID’s comparative advantage can be applied.” Four weeks (according to the timeline on page 5 is not sufficient to provide a list of countries to USAID. This would require a comprehensive deep dive into programming in all USAID countries. Rather, we would propose that the assignment requires a landscape analysis and a recommended methodology for selecting countries for further USAID consultation and co-creating with partners.	For the purposes of this RPF, components and specifications are fixed. Offerors are requested to develop proposals within these parameters, including initial recommendations for potential countries for the subsequent phase of work.
5	Page 5, the key deliverables and timeline table doesn’t seem to allow for time for USAID to review deliverables prior to the submission of the next deliverables. The period of performance is supposed to be Feb 20-May 31, 2022, but the key deliverables and timeline table shows that the work would be completed after 9 weeks.	The timeline included in the RFP is a tentative one. The offeror can propose a more aggressive schedule.
6	Page 5, the key deliverables and timeline table shows 9 weeks/45th business days after receipt of draft report feedback. If the draft report were to be due on March 28, and USAID were to provide comments within 2 weeks, the final deliverables would be due 9 weeks after March 28 which would be June 6 and outside the estimated period of performance. Can Palladium confirm that the deliverable #7 is due 9 weeks/45th business days after the receipt of draft report feedback?	The timeline to submit the final report from the date the feedback is received is hereby modified to delete 9 weeks and replace it with 7 weeks. Final timelines will also be negotiated/adjusted before the subcontract is awarded.

<b>7</b>	Please confirm that USAID will provide a list of thought partners, implementers and funders from which the offeror should gather insights from.	Yes, confirming that once the award is made, an initial list of thought partners, implementers and funders will be shared with the successful bidder.
----------	---	---