

**Aanbesteding:** A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Aanbestedende Dienst:** Invest International Public Programmes B.V.  
**Referentie:** D2B21RW01

**Toelichting:**

**Ref.nr.** **Onderwerp:**  
1 Tender Document

**Vraag:**

In line with article 2.71 of the Dutch Public Procurement Act 2012 for open tenders which states that, as quoted: “For open procedures, the time limit for submitting tenders shall be at least 45 days from the date of dispatch of the notice”, may we please request an extension to the bid submission deadline to allow for the statutory 45-day period?

**Antwoord:**

The time limit for submitting a proposal should be at least 40 days, when providing all documents electronically via a platform such as TenderNed. Invest has updated the time schedule, in the updated Tender document (par. 3.4) and in TenderNed. The deadline for submitting a proposal has been adjusted to 11 April 2023.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Proces

**Ref.nr.** **Onderwerp:**  
2 Appendix 04: Terms of Reference

**Vraag:**

Appendix 04: Terms of Reference on Section 3.2.3.2: Environmental and Social Scoping Report including a Terms of Reference for the Focused Environmental and Social Assessment (the last bullet point) states that, as quoted: “The result of this phase is a scoping report and a Term of Reference for the ESIA.” According to the ToR, this deliverable is part of Phase II. From our previous experience, we understand that an ESIA ToR typically can only be developed when a project (or project option) is already defined. In this case, according to the ToR, the decision on the preferred project option will only be taken in the next phase (Phase III). Please kindly clarify on this.

**Antwoord:**

We understand your concern. However, we do believe that the selection of the options and scoping can be done in parallel. If this is not the case it can be discussed and if necessary moved up a phase.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Inhoud

**Ref.nr.** **Onderwerp:**  
4 Appendix 04: Terms of Reference

**Vraag:**  
Appendix 04: Terms of Reference on Section 3.2.3.4: Market feasibility, its bullet point states, as quoted: “The consultant will list the inputs necessary for at least three proposed options and compare those to existing market conditions and they can determine the best option to be selected.” Kindly clarify and elaborate more on this sentence.

**Antwoord:**  
The sentence was indeed not entirely clear. We would like for the consultant to work out 3 options, define the inputs for these 3 options, compare these options to similar projects and suggest the best solution going forward.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Inhoud

**Ref.nr.** **Onderwerp:**  
5 Appendix 04: Terms of Reference

**Vraag:**  
Appendix 04: Terms of Reference on Section 3.2.3.7: Ranking states, as quoted below:

After the feasibility assessments, when the minimum of three project options are developed, propose a ranking of the different project options based on a number of objective key criteria (which are linked to the different feasibility domains); this can be performed as a Multi-criteria analysis (MCA). An MCA framework needs to be developed which contains clear instructions on how scoring is performed; the criteria and their respective weighting will be discussed and agreed upon with the Steering Committee or the Technical Committee (to be discussed during the inception phase 0). Afterwards, all project options should be scored independently. This will result in a ranking of the project options, for which a clear rationale is formulated (based on the

key criteria scoring).

- Rank the project alternatives in terms of capital cost, recurrent cost implications, need for training and education, GOR policies, time plan, environmental and social impact, etc.
- Test for sensitivity against the developed scenarios.
- Propose and argue best available project alternative

We would like to receive clarification upon the below aspects regarding this section:

- a. Regarding the development of the MCA, the statement states that “the criteria and their respective weighting will be discussed and agreed upon with the Steering Committee or the Technical Committee (to be discussed during the inception phase 0)”. Kindly clarify whether the statement inside the brackets means the MCA’s development will be started since the inception phase, or whether the Technical Committee’s formation is to be discussed during the inception phase (although we understand that the project management set up will include the TC), or whether the statement refers to other meanings.
- b. Please elaborate more on the 2nd bullet point stating “test for sensitivity against the developed scenarios”. Does this mean testing the sensitivity of the MCA framework against multiple scenarios that can happen in the course of/impact each of the project alternatives, a pilot testing of the MCA framework, or does it refer to other meanings?

**Antwoord:**

In answer to question a: During the inception phase it will be decided who will make up the members of the SC and TC and which of these two committees will be tasked with agreeing on the scoring.

In response to question b: It is up to the consultant to develop the approach. The aforementioned options need to be weighed against each other.

**Perceelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Inhoud

**Ref.nr.**  
6

**Onderwerp:**  
Appendix 04: Terms of Reference

**Vraag:**

Appendix 04: Terms of Reference on Section 3.2.4.2: Functional plan and preliminary designs for infrastructure and equipment components, on the 3rd bullet points, states, as quoted: “Develop proposed simulation of the selected project.” We understand “simulation” here as 3D graphical simulation. Kindly confirm.

**Antwoord:**

A 3D graphical simulation is not necessary. During the implementation of the project, it can be discussed what kind of simulation the competent authority would prefer.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Inhoud

**Ref.nr.**

7

**Onderwerp:**  
Appendix 05: Program of requirements

**Vraag:**

Appendix 05: Program of requirement on Section 1.3: Requirements relating to the services required (point RS2) states, as quoted: “The Consultant allows for a maximum review time of 4 weeks for each draft and final deliverable, unless otherwise indicated, and include sufficient resources and time to adjust deliverables accordingly on basis of comments and observations.”

Please confirm whether this means a waiting time of max. 4 weeks each for the review of each draft deliverable before finalization AND also for the review of each final deliverable before moving to the next phase – which means up to max. 8 weeks review period in total per final deliverable.

**Antwoord:**

This is a maximum, of course we will aim to do this quicker. Some deliverables can be done in parallel, so we don't believe it will give unnecessary waiting time.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Proces

**Ref.nr.**

8

**Onderwerp:**  
Appendix 05: Program of requirements

**Vraag:**

Appendix 05: Program of requirements Section 1.3: Requirements relating to the services required (point RS6) states, as quoted: “The (feedback) sessions that need to be organized with the Competent Authority (MOH) and the Project Steering Committee are included in the proposed coordination plan. These are necessary and instrumental to achieve per phase a final Go/No Go decision by Invest International Public Programmes B.V. If necessary, it is expected from the Contractor that additional (feedback) sessions will get

organized without impact on the overall planning.”

However, Appendix 04: Terms of Reference only indicates two (2) Go/No Go moments - between Phase II and III, and between Phase III and IV – while the RS6 states per phase. Please clarify on this discrepancy on expected feedback session(s) and Go/No Go moment, especially regarding the moment between Phase I and II. Furthermore, please advise on the expected timeline/duration to reach each Go/No Go decision.

**Antwoord:**

There is only twice a formal approval at the two stages. For the Go/No Go the same time frame will be held as mentioned in the answer of question 7.

**Percelen:** P1 A1.001.2023 Studies for the Expansion of the College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Rwanda  
**Beantwoord op:** 21-03-2023  
**Label:** Proces