

ENVIRONMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY: Since March 1999, the World Resources Institute (WRI) has been funded to improve the ability of local NGOs to advocate for better environmental policies in Uganda. The focus is on environmental advocacy, litigation, and law enforcement, as well as better natural resource management and implementation at the local level. This activity's objectives reinforce those of PRIME.

Proposals will need to reflect cognizance of Uganda's fragile resource base, and to ensure that APEP activities are environmentally sound in design and implementation, thus consistent with long-term economic sustainability. Proposed activities should be accompanied by brief statements outlining potential adverse environmental impacts. These statements should discuss how environmentally sound best practices and measures to mitigate adverse impacts will be incorporated in activity design.

Tasks & Deliverables

Design Phase I

...

Identification of environmental issues for incorporation in the Initial Environmental Examination, of measures to ensure APEP activities are environmentally sound in design and implementation, and steps that will be taken to mitigate any adverse effects;

Design Phase II

...

Completion of the IEE in consultation with the USAID Environmental Officer; and

VII. PROPOSAL PREPARATION

A. Questions Related to the RFP

(NOTE: CO will fill in the standard language prior to RFP issuance.)

B. Content and Schedule for Preparation

TECHNICAL

The technical component will address:

- How APEP elements will be analyzed, selected, prioritized, and sequenced in the design phase;

- Integration of APEP with PRIME and U-TRADE as well as with transition activities and Title II, and with AID/Washington special initiatives. Phasing of particular APEP elements with respect to SO7 transition activities, and related levels of effort, must be discussed in preliminary terms in proposals and in detail in design.
- How the design process will ensure effective communication with the GOU and other partners, and will involve small farmers, rural micro, small and medium enterprises, district and local government, other customers;

What steps the offeror will take to ensure that elements and activities are environmentally sound in design and implementation;

- How the offeror will seek to identify opportunities to address cross-cutting issues cited in the ISP for all three SOs in design and implementation. The cross-cutting issues are gender, conflict, HIV/AIDS, food security, information and communication technology, and regional trade. Offerors should refer to related analyses in ISP volume II.

...

- How APEP will be consistent with and contribute to the objectives of the AID Administrator’s Agriculture Initiative, the Global Development Alliance, and TRADE.

VIII. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

Technical, cost and other factors will be evaluated relative to each other, as described herein.

- (a) The technical, staff and past performance content of the proposal will be scored by an evaluation committee using the criteria shown in the related sections below.
- (b) The cost proposal will be scored by the method described in the cost section.
- (c) The criteria below are presented by major category, with relative order of importance so that offerors will know which areas require emphasis in the preparation of proposals. The criteria below reflect the requirements of this particular solicitation.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following factors totaling 500 points:

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 1. Technical approach | 135 pts (27%) |
| a. Feasibility and workability of the proposed technical approach, i.e., can the proposed technical approach reasonably be expected to produce the expected results? | 40 pts |

b. Evidence of understanding of Uganda’s current agricultural context and the factors bearing on enhancing productivity and commercialization of the sector 30 pts

c. Innovative approaches and strategies in proposed design and implementation that incorporate attention to both technical (including A/AID’s Initiative for Agriculture, GDA, TRADE) and socio-cultural (gender, vulnerable groups) factors and concerns in enhancing agricultural productivity and commercialization 30 pts

d. A clear and convincing methodology for addressing environmental soundness and adverse impact mitigation in activity design and implementation 20 pts

e. A clear and convincing methodology for achieving expected results and for performance monitoring 15 pts

2. Personnel 125 pts (25%)

a. Qualifications and experience of proposed long- and short-term expatriate technical personnel, including experience in developing country settings, preferably in Africa 40 pts

b. Appropriateness of the proposed technical positions (long- and short-term) to the proposed technical approach 40 pts

c. Qualifications and experience of proposed Ugandan personnel 35 pts

d. Assurances of attentive and appropriate home office support of field activities by experienced persons. 10 pts

3. Past Performance 100 pts (20%)

a. Demonstrated success in providing similar services on past contracts, including satisfaction of past clients with the offeror's services and/or products. 75 pts

b. Offeror's responsiveness to past clients in terms of ability to adapt to different country settings and host country priorities and concerns. 25 pts

4. Institutional Capability 100 pts (20%)

a. Clarity of organizational plan, including intentions regarding a formal “consortium” or partnership mechanism for managing implementation, and arrangements to ensure regular interaction with

Ugandan public and private sector actors and NGOs/ CBOs.	45 pts
b. Demonstrated ability to recruit and retain qualified U.S., local and expatriate professional staff.	30 pts
c. Demonstrated ability to provide managerial and technical back-stopping for a requirement of this size and complexity.	25 pts
5. Cost	40 pts (8%)
a. Cost realism, i.e. line items costs should be reasonable, and should approximate true market costs	40 pts
b. Cost effectiveness (See note below)	--

NOTE re cost criterion: The Government is not obligated to award a negotiated contract on the basis of the lowest proposed cost (see FAR 16.605) or to the offeror with the highest technical evaluation score. Although, for this procurement, technical proposal merits are considered significantly more important than cost relative to deciding which offeror might best perform the work, price and other factors are considered. Therefore, after the final evaluation of the proposals, the Contracting Officer will make the award to the offeror whose proposal presents the best overall value to the Government, considering both technical and cost factors.