Answers to Questions
RFP No. Chem-HCWM-20-001

Bidding and Offer Submission

Can we bid for the individual segments or do we have to bid for them all?
Answer: As stated on page 6 of the RFP, “Please note that offerors are only expected to bid on the segment or segments that they can reasonably complete. For example, a firm that provides primarily technical assistance consulting services is not expected to bid on health care waste management services and vice versa. Organizations are also welcome to bid on all segments.” The RFP further states on page 6, “Offerors are not required to bid on all segments in order for a proposal to be considered complete.”

Can we team up with other companies if required?
Answer: As stated on page 5 of the RFP, “Offerors may present their proposals as a member of a partnership with other companies or organizations. In such cases, the subcontract will be awarded to the lead company in the partnership. The leading company shall be responsible for compliance with all subcontract terms and conditions and making all partnership arrangements, including but not limited to division of labor, invoicing, etc., with the other company(ies). A legally registered partnership is not necessary for these purposes; however, the different organizations must be committed to work together in the fulfillment of the subcontract terms.”

It is stated that there is a limit of 3 attachments of 5 mb. Are Annex 1 and 2 documents as specified (certifications & CVs) considered to be attachments? Is the limit 5 mb for each or total for both?
Answer: As stated on page 5 of the RFP, “The offeror must submit the proposal electronically with up to 3 attachments (5 mb limit) per email.” Offerors are welcome to submit multiple emails to adhere to this requirement, which is put in place to ensure that emails are not rejected for size limitations and arrive in a timely manner. Offerors are welcome to incorporate the annexes into the same document as their technical proposal or to submit as separate documents, depending on size limitations.

Must the Consultant be able to provide TA in all the listed countries in Exhibit 1?
Answer: No. Offerors should only propose technical assistance for countries in which they can reasonably perform work. The table is for illustrative purposes to demonstrate the reach of the current GHSC-PSM project and demonstrative of where technical assistance services could be requested over the life of project.

Information for any proposed subcontractors: Please clarify, if this provision of information on all proposed sub-contractor for the TA must be submitted at this stage?
Answer: Yes. As the RFP states in section 3.2 offerors who bid on Segment 1 must complete the table in RFP Attachment 1, Pricing Tables, tab 1 “Technical Assistance.” This means all technical assistance rates for which the offeror is bidding must be provided at this time.

We understand that the program is funded by USAID, a United States federal agency, and that the Consultant will enter an Indefinite Quantity Subcontract (ISQ) with Chemonics International, Inc., a Washington-based firm. We would like to clarify whether other governing law, such as a European country, are acceptable for the Contract between the Consultant and Chemonics. This because, as a European firm, we are not able to operate under US Law.
Answer: Terms and conditions of dispute resolution, including governing law, forum, venue, and exclusive jurisdiction and arbitration clauses may be discussed pursuant to negotiation following selection of the Apparent Successful Offeror(s) and drafting of the subcontract(s) to follow. To the maximum extent reasonably practicable, and subject to (i) the prime contract terms and conditions and controlling law and regulation, (ii) Chemonics’ duties and obligations as prime contractor to the US Government and steward of US funds, Chemonics commits to undertake good faith and fair dealing in its negotiations with the Awardee to ensure mutually satisfactory and agreed-to terms and conditions.

**Does Chemonics have any current or active projects in this technical area or a current status report on HCWM for each country listed in the RFP?**

Answer: Yes, within Chemonics’ Global Health Supply Chain Office (GHSCO), Chemonics has numerous active projects that have conducted healthcare waste management activities—including both technical assistance, and treatment and disposal activities. For example, current active GHSCO projects funded by USAID include GHSC-PSM (global), GHSC-Technical Assistance Francophone Task Order (select francophone countries), Integrated Health Supply Chain (Côte d’Ivoire), Strategic HIV and AIDS Response Program (Nigeria), Integrated Malaria Program (Mozambique), Human Resources for Health 2030 (global), and Achieving Universal Health Coverage (Bangladesh). The GHSCO portfolio also includes active projects funded by The Global Fund, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Population Services International.

“If bidding on health care waste management, provide address and location of health waste treatment and disposal facilities.”, does that mean that in the case of bidding with Segment 1 only, this does not apply?

Answer: Yes. If the offeror is only bidding on segment one, addresses of facilities are not necessary.

**Providing a DUNS number is applicable for countries outside USA as well? Can you suggest some alternatives for companies registered in the EU?**

Answer: Yes. A DUNS number is required for any entity receiving U.S. Government funding. However, companies are not required to have a DUNS number in order to bid; one only need to be acquired prior to award. Chemonics is happy to assist and provide instructions for companies who need assistance in acquiring a DUNS number at that time.

**Regarding the documentation related to Environmental Impairment Liability or Pollution insurance coverage with a $5,000,000 claim limit: in the case of a joint venture, is it needed to be provided by each partner?**

Answer: In the case of a joint venture, the certificate of insurance evidencing coverage would need to show the joint venture name as the insured entity. Each partner would not need to provide the insurance as long as the joint venture is covered by the policies. In many cases, the majority partner would purchase insurance covering the entity’s operations so the insurance would show that partner as the first named insured, but also include the joint venture name, which could then be shown on the certificate of insurance or other evidence of coverage as the “insured.”
**Personnel**

Could you please clarify the degrees and acronyms in the “minimum qualifications” for personnel? We assume BA, BS, QA, and MS (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Quality Assurance, and Masters of Science).

Answer: Yes, that is correct. Please note however that “QA” is not a listed degree on the pricing table.

The staff listed in the personnel section do no match those listed in Annex 2: Pricing Schedule; should it be assumed that all Labor Categories to the Annex apply?

Answer: There is no mismatch between the sections. The tables in the Cost Proposal instructions on Page 10 of the RFP and Attachment 1 are identical. The key personnel listed in Technical Proposal instructions on Page 7 of the RFP are key; this is not intended to be exhaustive of all personnel.

Are only the labor categories here and or the Annex to be used; what if other labor types are needed for executing the work (for example, and AutoCAD specialist, a design engineer, or a field technician?)?

Answer: No other labor categories will be accepted at this time.

Is it acceptable to assume that more that one staff professional can have the same labor category designation, such as one “Senior PM Specialist” involved with HCWM auditing or SOPs and another for engineering and design for HCWM systems? If so, could both be added with different hourly rates?

Answer: Yes, multiple staff professionals may be slotted into the same category. No, different rates are not accepted. Additionally, please note that the rates requested are DAILY.

Labor Rates for professional staff under each of the various categories (and other categories) are never standard or the same but usually substantially different for any private-sector professional, consulting, engineering, legal, architectural firm, etc.; and this is more so for firms having office locations in multiple states. Several individual professional staff persons within the same labor category may be exceptionally well-qualified, capable and experienced for providing required work or services under a SOW activity, but their respective salaries, and therefore rates, are almost always different because of a number of factors: such as, total years of experience; levels of education; professional certifications and licenses; specific, unique specialty experiences; years within the firm or organization; level or rank within the firm or organization; and office location. This is typical and universally standard; and quite different from many if not most government, military, and public sector employees (such as E and GS grades) in which salaries are standard and the same for those within category rankings. Accordingly, what would be considered an acceptable Labor Rate to enter for different professional staff persons within the various listed Labor Categories that have differing Labor Rates? Would a range of rates be acceptable for each or some categories?

Answer: It is not acceptable to provide different rates for different staff positions. One daily rate must be proposed for each labor category in the RFP on which the offeror wishes to propose personnel. This is intentional; offerors must propose a rate that is inclusive of all staff who may slot into the category.

Is there an acceptable escalation factor (percentage) to be applied to labor rates should the contract be extended beyond on year? If so, should a labor cost tabulation for future years be included?
Answer: Escalation factors will not be accepted or considered at this time. The proposed FUR should be valid through November 2023.

In the provided Excel file, it is stated that unit rates should be provided for all labor categories. On page 10 of the RfP, it is stated that “Offerors are not required to complete all labor categories in order for their cost proposal to be considered complete.” Should we provide unit rates for all labor categories or only selected categories? Should the proposed unit rate include travel time to the countries listed in Exhibit 1? If so, please provide details on the average length of input in the countries for each travel. Should the proposed unit rate include travel and accommodation expenses?

Answer: Attachment 1. Pricing Tables states that “per the RFP, cost notes for each labor category are required.” We have amended this to be more clear: “Per the RFP, cost notes for each labor category on which the offeror bids are required.” Unit rates should only be provided for labor categories on which the offeror can reasonably bid.

Additionally, unit rates should not include travel costs. The RFP has been amended accordingly to state clearly that travel costs will be handled on a cost-reimbursement basis at the sub-task order level.

**Past Performance**

It is stated that 5 project examples are to be listed with references but as many as 13 activities are listed in Segment 1 (HCWM Technical Assistance) page 20. Should it be assumed that 5 project examples are not needed for each?

Answer: Yes. Five examples total are requested. Additionally, please note that the activities on page 20 of the RFP are illustrative only (“Illustrative activities include:”).

**Would it be acceptable to recognize or regroup HCWM activities into more standard, recognized categories for clarity and then provide up to 5 project examples for each category?**

Answer: No. As stated above, the activities are illustrative only. Five project examples are requested in totality.

**Scope of Work and Evaluation**

**Would it be acceptable to reorganize or regroup the 13 listed HCWM activities into more standard, recognized categories for clarity comparable to those that were shown listed in our RFI Submittal of August 18th?**

Answer: Chemonics will not be changing the grouping of the activities in the scope of work. Offerors are required to submit bids that reflect a technical approach consistent with the scope as currently presented in the RFP.

**Why are Belgium, UAE, and South Africa on the list of countries in the RFP?**

Answer: Belgium, UAE, and South Africa are the strategic locations of three Regional Distribution Centers, which serve as supply chain hubs that service the global GHSC-PSM project.
Section 1.8 – Evaluation & Basis of Award (pp 12-13) clearly identifies the evaluation points assigned to the major work included in each of the work Segments. However, it is requested that clarification be provided as to specific point identification procedures that will be applied when comparing firms that ONLY propose to provide Segment 1 work to those firms that propose to provided ALL work Segments.

Answer: Offerors who choose to submit a proposal that responds to Segment 1 only will be evaluated against the Segment 1 total (30) points only. Whereas, offerors who respond to all work segments will be evaluated against the

The Evaluation Criteria Table on pp 13 appears to wrongly label or identify the title for Segments 2 & 3 work; specifically, it is labeled “Segment 2 & 3 – Health-Care Waste Management Services” which is not the name used for labeling such work in the SOW section (pp 22 & 23). In the SOW Section, Segment 2 & 3 work is described to comprise waste containerization for pickup, inter-country and trans-boundary transport, and ultimate treatment and disposal. HCW Management services are described to be included in Segment 1 work - not in Segment 2 & 3 work. Likewise, the Evaluation Sub-Criteria shown for “Segments 2 & 3 in the table (pp 13) is more applicable to HCW management and NOT to waste Treatment & Disposal procedures (per Segments 2 & 3); therefore, “Evaluation Sub-Criteria” shown for Segment 2 & 3 items should be changed to reflect activities involving waste collection, transport, treatment & disposal procedures.

Answer: Please see Amendment 2 to the RFP for updated language to clarify the label and scope of each work segment.

For the activities of each segment; is each activity considered as one task that that can be assigned separately as part of the contract?

Answer: No. Proposals will be evaluated based on the offeror’s ability to complete the entire Scope of each segment not individual activities.

Pricing

For segments 1, 2, and 3, there are fixed prices for the specialist but no section for travel, mobilization, or subsistence. Are these to be added separately per task order?

Answer: Yes. Please see the RFP amendment for updated language to this effect.

For segments 2 and 3, the price per ton for transport is very difficult to quantify. The reason being that we do not have an address in country, so it could be close or far away from the delivery point, especially if it’s in a large country. The other issue is, if you have 1 ton compared to 20 tons, this will make a difference especially as transport companies charge per truck or container. Finally, a price for transport now could change next year or even next month if there are variables.

Answer: Please refer to Amendment 2 of the RFP with regard to pricing. Please also note that the original RFP requests fixed unit rates for transport from point of origin to the specified inal destination, for each country on which the offeror intends to bid.
For segments 2 and 3, the price per ton is difficult to quantify per country. The reason is that not every country has disposal facilities that meet international regulations for the correct treatment of waste.

Answer: Please see Amendment 2 to the RFP, and specifically, the “Revised Attachment 1: Pricing Table Annex” for updated pricing units and cost instructions and guidance for segments 2 and 3.

Can we include in our fixed pricing per item for in country like packaging, PPE, and materials?

Answer: Yes. As stated in the RFP, the fixed price per item for Segments 2 and 3 are required to include packaging, PPE, and materials. The only element to be reimbursed outside of the fixed unit rate listed is travel costs.

Fees for disposal may change based upon market conditions including as an example the impact of COVID 19 on staffing/labor as well as government regulations. They may also change based upon what may be proposed to be disposed of versus what is actually found. We assume there will be some latitude regarding price negotiations even if we submit a proposal now.

Answer: When developing rates, please assume that these are final and could be used in a contract and not renegotiated if the offeror is selected.

Implementation

Does Chemonics have insight into potential projects in the pipeline so we can identify projects and associate resources to the contract?

Answer: Offerors should use the information offered in the RFP, the proposal conference, and their own research to complete the proposal.

The RFP states that successful candidates are required to adhere to the terms and conditions and that they are not subject to negotiation. If our understanding is correct, the subcontract works as a framework agreement and then you bid for specific task orders based on the unit prices and rates that you have submitted, and candidates are at liberty to choose the kinds of services and countries in relation to which they wish to bid.

Answer: The RFP does not state the terms and conditions are not subject to negotiation. These are standardized terms and conditions for USAID contracts, however, and should an award be made, are subject to limited negotiations based on the requirements set forth for Chemonics by the U.S. Government.

Yes, your understanding is correct. The IQS subcontract is a framework agreement with task orders that will either be issued competitively among IQS holders or directly to a holder.

For insurance services as listed on page 15 and 16 of the RFO: for services relate to the Defense Base Act, the candidates need to satisfy the insurance requirements deriving from this Act, unless they have secured a waiver for DBA coverage. But, there is also mention of DBA coverage to be obtained by USAID’s current insurance carrier.

Answer: Offerors are responsible for obtaining DBA insurance.

Is there an order of importance regarding the different segments (1, 2, 3)? For example: Bidder A only applies for segment 1 (technical assistance) and Bidder B only applies for segment (2-3). Both
bidders win the respective segment for one and same country. Is there a possibility for both bidders to work on the 3 segments → Bidder A does an audit and Bidder B takes care of 2-3 following the bidder A audit.

Answer: Offerors will only be offered work on the segments for which they bid. All segments are equally important.