

CLARIFICATION QUESTION- RFP REFERENCE NO. RFP/SSF3/DLGA-JSP/007.

1. As PDRC, we are forming a consortium to prepare a proposal on Democratisation, Local Governance, and Accountability (DLGA) Partner -Jubaland, South West State, and Puntland. However, we request you to extend the deadline for proposal submission beyond 27th March since forming a good consortium that will successfully deliver this programme requires more time.
We look to receiving a positive response as you respond to clarification questions for this Call for Proposals.

SSF Response

SSF III will be extending the validity of this procurement for one additional week.

The submission dates have been extended **Thursday April 4th, 2024**.

2. Could you please clarify what the SSFIII Workstream 3 Strategy is? Is there a separate overarching document available that details the strategy?

SSF Response

SSF III will support local governance and democratisation processes at technical and institutional levels. Here, SSF III can utilise the assessment methodology developed under SSF II to determine whether a district exhibits the socio-political cohesion and economic viability for a district council to take root and endure. SSF III is also part of the Inclusive Politics Working Group, via which the team will work with partners in the space to coordinate, cohere, and deconflict support to local councils and wider democratisation processes in policy and practice.

SSF III recognises that communities and governments at all levels travel along distinct democratisation pathways. SSF III will therefore provide support to build political consensus, alongside technical, recurrent, and capital assistance tailored to the specific circumstances in which communities and governments move towards more participatory governance.

3. Could you please clarify what the overarching programming goals are for SSFIII? Is there a strategic document available for consultation?

SSF Response

1. **The Political Settlement**, fragile and partly informal, among Somalia's elites;
2. **Conciliation** for the inter-communal and inter-personal lack of trust due to a violent past and ongoing fighting resources, including land that inhibits a shared narrative for a shared future;
3. **Democratisation and local governance**: the sensitive and contested path towards a widely invoked democratic local and higher-level governance, as well as the delicate balance involved in fostering responsive and legitimate local governance; and
4. **Somalia's social contract**, limited by a lack of safe and impactful direct and indirect engagement between government and citizens to foster transparency and accountability amidst a still-often violent political marketplace.²

4. Is it possible to share a model contract template to clarify what the contractual requirements would be for the successful bidders/consortium.

SSF Response

No, contract terms will be shared with the successful bidder.

5. Some consortium organisations implement programs together with local civil society organizations through a sub-granting model. This model encourages localization, builds ownership and maximizes impact, ensuring that resources are used effectively. This approach also empowers local civil society, local governments, and rights holders in a way that promotes sustainable development. We would appreciate clarification on whether this approach is applicable for this call.
 - a. Are there specific conditions stipulated under SSF III on contracting of service providers by the consortium partners to deliver specific activities?

SSF Response

The contracting of service providers for specific activities within approved Projects is allowable. However, SSFIII does not see this as a pass-through agreement. For example, the winning bidder will not dispense grants to additional downstream partners. The inclusion of local partners in bidding consortiums is allowable, and welcome.

6. Are the CVs required only for technical experts or for the entire program team, including staff employed by different consortium members, for the purpose of implementing this program?

SSF Response

CVs are required for key personnel as per the TOR.

7. One of the eligibility requirements, especially for the lead organisation, is registration in each specified FMS. We would appreciate clarification if registration of the lead organisation at the federal level (for example with the Ministry of Interior, Federal Affairs and Reconciliation), which allows for operation across Somalia, would suffice to cover for this eligibility requirement.

SSF Response

The prime must be registered at FGS level while registration in each of the FMS is considered critical for programme implementation. The sub consortium members must have registration and ability to work in their relevant member states.

8. Is there a limitation on the number of partners within a consortium? Is there a limit on the number of International Organisations within a given consortium? Can more than one International Organisations work as direct implementers within one consortium?

SSF Response

There is no limit to the number of organisations, international or otherwise, within a consortium.

Question	Reference	SSF Response
<p>9. We are considering an innovative methodology consisting of a national framework implemented at the local level through various municipal activities over subsequent years. The workplan design will involve representation from all states, while the initial implementation will focus on Puntland, South-West, and Jubaland States as pilot areas. Upon achieving the expected proven and measurable results, this approach can be expanded to include other states in future opportunities beyond this specific tender. Would this approach be acceptable? Also, Tender RFP/DLGA-GHB/006 is similar in scope and differ on the geographic coverage. Can the portfolio submission be based on a national coverage tacking all prescribed states?</p>	<p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Purpose and Objectives, pg. 40</p> <p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Geographic Scope, pg. 43</p>	<p>Primes will not be considered for both DLGA RFPs so the latter will not be feasible.</p> <p>The former is allowable however SSFIII makes no commitment to any additional support beyond the scope of this RFP.</p>
<p>10. Would project descriptions from mayors within a consortium composed of local municipalities solely funded by Federal and State sources be considered evidence of organizational capabilities and experience? Additionally, would a letter of support from State leadership be regarded as a point of reference?</p>	<p>Section 3 Qualifications and Evaluation Criteria, Form TECH-3</p>	<p>At the discretion of the bidder</p>
<p>11. Given that the first year is dedicated to constructing the portfolio's work plan and objectives, and since activities for years 2-5 are contingent upon this work plan, it's critical to focus our budget and planning efforts solely on the first year. The exact activities for years 2-5 would be determined once the scoping for the workplan has been completed and validated. Therefore, this tender's budget and work plan should be developed exclusively for year 1 initially. Subsequently, once the workplan, <i>"is informed by stakeholder engagements, lessons learned and in liaison with SSFIII's technical specialists the partner will define problems, identify the implementing consortium member, and design effective and efficient projects finalized and approved,"</i> the work plan can be expanded to include cost estimates for years 2-5, aligning with its corresponding activities. This assumption appears to be reasonable. If</p>	<p>Form FIN-1: Financial Proposal Submission Form</p> <p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Purpose and Objectives, pg. 40</p> <p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Timelines, pg. 42</p>	<p>The first year is not dedicated solely to workplaning. Bidders will be expected to implement activities within year one.</p> <p>SSF expects an indicative workplan and budget for year one only as per TOR.</p>

<p>indeed this is the case, would SSF advise structuring the tender response around year 1 exclusively?</p> <p><i>"Any relevant information on how funding will be divided/utilized by consortium members."</i></p> <p>12. It's challenging to determine funding utilization for Year 1 if the workplan hasn't been finalized with cost estimates for activities. I suggest removing this line</p>	<p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Key Personnel, pg. 43</p>	<p>See above (11)</p>
<p>13. Its mentioned that 'part of the Core team is expected to be based in Nairobi and/or Mogadishu, or to be able to travel to Nairobi and Mogadishu frequently, as well as on short notice, to meet with the SSF 111 team in person and present to, as well as debrief, the SSF 111 team, partners, and joint donors."</p> <p>The above mentioned to be based in Nairobi and/or Mogadishu. Is both cities required or would one suffice with travel to the other as determined. Based on the above and past experiences, what was the number of visits made in Nairobi?</p>	<p>Form FIN-3: Breakdown of Reimbursable Expenses by Activity, pg. 32</p> <p>Section 6: Terms of Reference, Purpose and Objectives, pg. 43</p>	<p>Both cities are not required. Implementation is in Somalia. Composition and location of team members are at the discretion of bidding parties. Partners will be expected to maintain close ties with the SSF III team in Nairobi and Somalia and be ready to represent their consortium in Nairobi on at least a quarterly basis.</p>