**Questions & Answers**

**Date: August 11, 2023**

**Reference Request for Proposal Number: RFP-CATALYZE-Edu-2023-0011**

Dear Offerors,

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Question | Answer |
| 1 | The statement “the subcontractor will submit... any other pre-agreed results determined during the contracting period” implies that additional results could be added beyond those outlined in the RFP and submitted in the offeror’s proposal. Can Palladium please explain how under a pay-for-results mechanism the Subcontractor will be paid for additional results in addition to those agreed in the subcontract? | The subcontractor will be paid for the results agreed to in the subcontract. The results will be agreed-to after award and before a subcontract is signed and may include additional indicators to the examples listed in the RFP (namely capital mobilized, schools and learners supported, and improvements in learning outcomes). However, these are the key expected results and we do not anticipate any major changes at this time. |
| 2 | Can Palladium clarify how offerors should distinguish between “Past Experience Information/Capability Statement” and “Description of relevant projects previously performed by the firm”? | “Past Experience Information/Capability Statement” should speak to an offeror’s general organizational capacity to implement a donor funded project. “Description of relevant projects”, meanwhile, should speak specifically and in greater depth to an offeror’s experience on relevant projectsin capital mobilization, sustaining private finance for low-cost private primary schools, and increasing access to quality education. |
| 3 | 2 pages are assigned to the Body of the Proposal. However, this appears to be a heading, not a proposal section, since “background and relevant expertise” are covered in the subsequent bullet points. Please clarify. | Thanks for noting this. Please disregard the page limit assigned to the body of the proposal; the following bulleted sections should comprise the body of the proposal and those page numbers are included there. |
| 4 | Please clarify the distinction between the proposal sub-sections “Past Experience Information/Capability Statement (max 2 pages)” and “Description of relevant projects previously performed by the firm (max 4 pages). | Please see Answer 2 above. |
| 5 | Can Palladium clarify whether to include the pass/fail evaluation criteria documents as attachments to the proposal? | Yes, please include the applicable supporting documentation as attachments to the proposal. |
| 6 | Under sections (e) and (f) of the first set of pass/fail criteria, Palladium requests offerors to provide a confirmation statement under “background and organizational capacity on the firm”. However, this specific section is not listed among the proposal body components as mentioned. Can Palladium clarify the appropriate section where this statement is to be included in the proposal? | This can be included in the Cover Letter. |
| 7 | Can Palladium specify whether team members’ technical resumes/CVs should be submitted as attachments to the proposal? | Yes, please include team members’ CVs as attachments to the proposal. |
| 8 | Relevant project expertise” is evaluated as a factor under the Technical Approach Evaluation Criterion, which is assigned a total of 20% of the points. However, past experience and information of previous projects accounts for maximum 7 pages (35%) of the 20-page proposal (past experience [2 pages], relevant projects [4 pages] referees’ contact [1 page]). Will Palladium consider assigning more points to relevant project experience to align better with the proposal requirements? | We do not anticipate changing the evaluation weighting or criteria. In addition to the 20% allocated to Technical Approach, an additional 20% is allocated to Team Structure and Expertise. |
| 9 | In regards to impact milestones and deliverables, is USAID Catalyze looking for direct technical support to be delivered to schools and learners? Or will improved outcomes resulting from increased access to finance in the form of monitoring and measurement be sufficient? | CATALYZE welcomes potential offerors to develop an activity design using innovative approaches to meet the objectives listed in the RFP, and as such, does not want to be prescriptive towards any single approach.  Offerors will be evaluated on both their plan and demonstrated ability to measurably improve learning outcomes. As such, direct technical assistance or support to schools and learners is one of several approaches that an offeror may consider, but any approach proposed must clearly and credibly demonstrate how they will improve learning outcomes in addition to mobilizing private capital and increasing access |
| 10 | What documents will be required to demonstrate "capital mobilized" (e.g., proof of commitment? term sheets?, etc.)? | The approach for verifying capital mobilized will vary depending on the approach taken by the offeror, however a few key principles apply.  CATALYZE considers both debt (e.g., loans) and non-debt financing (e.g., grants) for private capital mobilization. Debt-financing requires proof of commitment, such as proof that a loan was approved by a financial institution and accepted by a borrower. Non-debt financing (e.g. grants) require proof of disbursement.  Both debt and non-debt financing must comply with Congressional Guardrails (listed in Section V of the SOW in the RFP) to be accepted by CATALYZE and count towards achieving programmatic results. For capital mobilized through financial institutions directly to schools or families, for example, anonymized data on loan listings will be required from partner financial institutions to verify that financing and other supports are 1). delivered in line with the Activity’s priority sector and geography; and 2). are serving low to lower-middle income populations, as defined by Congressional Guardrails.  Compliance with the Guardrail is measured by using the lowest school fee that a school charges. The benchmark of the lowest school fee must be set by the Activity at the start of interventions. The benchmark may vary by geographic location. For example, the lowest school fee that schools in urban areas may be is higher than the lowest school fee charged by schools in rural areas. |
| 11 | In regards to priority geography, do "informal settlements in urban areas" need to be located in the prioritized Northeastern counties of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera? | No – the priority geography is informal settlements in urban areas ***and*** schools in the Northeastern counties of Garissa, Wajir, and Mandera. Informal settlements in urban areas do not need to be in the named Northeastern counties. Rather, proposals should make a reasonable case for how they will reach low-cost private primary schools in informal settlements in urban areas such as Nairobi, Mombasa, Kisumu, etc., while also providing some level of interventions in the Northeastern counties. Given the nature of the Northeastern counties, interventions there will not be taking place in major urban areas. . |
| 12 | We kindly ask if Palladium would be amenable to extending the proposal submission deadline by one week, from Friday, August 18th to Friday, August 25th? | Palladium is amending the RFP to extend the closing date to August 25th, 2023, at 5PM EDT. |
| 13 | We kindly request the budget template to enable us respond to the above RFP. | The CATALYZE budget template is uploaded to the CATALYZE Procurements opportunities page as part of the amendment to this RFP. |