



Last Update: 05.01.16

## Program Improvement Competitive Grants Questions and Answers File

**Q.1** According to the RfP guidelines section 3.3 (page 20) the applicants should supply the following documents in order to allow the ISWD TAT and TEP to verify the Submission of supporting documents for short-listed proposals. Should these documents be provided as part of the proposal or after short-listing? If these documents should be provided during full proposal submission prior to short listing then why these documents are not listed in the check list? Could you please provide information on phases of the project proposal development. We could not find this information in the RfP or elsewhere. We are having challenges understanding the process.

**A.1** All documents as listed and required in the section 3.3 of the RfP have to be submitted with the Full Application (“The Full Application should be submitted with the set of supporting documents which will be examined for the eligibility of its applicant and the partners.”) Failure to provide documents or failure to meet the eligibility requirements listed in the Annex IV Checklist may lead to exclusion of the application during the administrative and eligibility checking from further consideration. Please, note that “Pre-bid partnership agreement” under item 14 of Annex IV should read as “Pre-application partnership agreement”. The other documents listed under section 3.3 of the RfP have also to be provided at the time of the submission of the full application. However, failure to do so, will not lead to immediate excluding the application from further review and evaluation. In case, such documents are not provided or are incomplete, the ISWD reviewers and technical evaluation panel will request the applicant to provide the missing document/information within a given deadline. Failure to provide the missing information within the given deadline will lead to exclusion of the application from further review and evaluation.

In 3.1.3 of the RfP the application process (phases in project proposal development” are defined – “The application process under this Request for Proposals will take place in two stages: (i) development and submission of a Concept Paper, and, (ii) development and submission of Full Application of short-listed concept papers.”

Section 5 of the RfP described the review and evaluation steps of the short-listed (full) proposals. During this process applicants may be requested to consider rebalancing of their proposals to meet fully MCC’s ESP and SGI requirements and relevant risk mitigation measures.

**Q.2** Page 20 of the RFP requires to provide "Proof of at least 3-years operation in the local or international market". What kind of documents do you accept as "proof" of operation in the last 3 years?

**A.2** Copies of Agreements or Contracts of the projects/programs implemented by your organizations in the vocational education area for the last 3-years in the local or international market with references for accomplished worked can be submitted together with proposal as a proof of your organization’s experience in implementing similar projects.



Q.3 In the checklist for the proposal, two different items are labeled with the number 6. In the second time, it reads "The applicant and each partner organization has completed and signed a Partnership statement and the statements are included (if any)". Item 14 reads very similar, namely "A pre-bid partnership agreement is provided in English and Georgian". Can we ignore the second item that is labeled with the number 6 and just take Item 14 as relevant? If not, please clarify which of the two items in the checklist are relevant and which are obsolete (if any). Will the PICG reimburse the part of costs incurred before grant awarding?

A.3 Repetition of number 6 is a technical mistake. Please, note that it has been corrected.

"A pre-bid partnership agreement" in #14 of Annex IV should read as "a pre-application partnership agreement". The Partnership Statement Annex III.2 is part of the Full Application form and it should be signed by each partner organizations (including the lead applicant).

A pre-application agreement, Annex IV Checklist #14 (#15 in the corrected version), has to be provided at the Full Application stage in English and Georgian. The Pre-application partnership agreement should outline clearly the following as a minimum:

- the project management and partnership arrangements;
- description of division of roles;
- inputs by the parties;
- main functions and responsibilities vis-à-vis project activities and deliverables;
- partnership representation and representation officer authorization;
- handover of equipment and project assets arrangements before the end of the project.
- partnership management seat of office and project office address and communication contact details.

The Pre-application partnership agreement should be notary certified and an original with the notary signature and seal should be presented.

There is no template for the pre-application agreement.

PS: Please, note that at the stage of full application submission a pre-application agreement with wet signatures will suffice.

Q.4 The RFP, Section 3.3 (p. 20), states that all applicants (lead organization and all partners) must provide a copy of the latest audited balance sheets for 2013 and 2014 .

How is this handled in case that a partner does not have the audited statements? (Please note that an audited statement is not obligatory in Georgia.)

- Should it be the financial audit report or the tax audit report?
- Are there requirements regarding the firm which has done the auditing?
- Can we forge partnership with foreign, public or private TVET registered in Ukraine?

A.4 You can provide the latest audited report instead of a Balance Sheet. If a partner or a lead organization does not have an audited report, they can provide last two years Income Statement (profit-loss statement), Balance Sheet and Act of Comparison (submitted to Revenue Service). Audited financial reports or financial report certified by competent public body should be submitted by an applicant for 2013 & 2014 instead of audited balance sheets. There are no requirements for auditing organizations as long as they are registered and certified (local or international) auditing companies.



Q.5 The RFP, Section 2.1.1 (p. 9), states that "applicant's (main applicant and partners) average annual turnover for the last two audited financial years should be equal or above the requested grant contribution." Could you please clarify whether this means that the sum of average turnovers of applicants and partners taken together should be above the requested grant contribution or whether the average turnovers of each individual partner must fulfill this requirement?

A.5 The average turnover of all partners together in a partnership/consortium for the last two audited financial years – 2013 & 2014, should be equal or above the requested grant contribution.

Q.6 The RFP, Section 2.4 (p. 14), says that "scholarships and stipends, as well as salaries for existing staff for existing activities" are ineligible for funding. Does this rule out that the students who study in the VET program we intend to set up receive living stipends funded by the MCA grant?

A.6 Yes, the assumption is correct, stipends are not allowable costs.

Q.7 Page 20 of the RFP requires to provide "Proof of at least 3-years operation in the local or international market". What kind of documents do you accept as "proof" of operation in the last 3 years?

A.7 Act of Establishment, bylaws and registration as legal entity. Copies of Agreements or Contracts of the projects/programs implemented by your organizations in the vocational education area for the last 3-years in the local or international market with references for accomplished worked can be submitted together with proposal as a proof of your organization's experience in implementing similar projects. Annual reports and other documents that can prove existence and operations in local or international market.

Q.8 According the RFP requirements applicant should submit Court Registration or Legal Act of Establishment – notary certified copy. The lead partner is Legal Entity of Public Law and LEPL is established based on the decree of the Minister of Education and Science. The decree is officially published on the legislative herald of Georgia Matsne.gov.ge. In this case, is it still obligatory for LEPL to submit notary certified copy of its establishment?

A.8 In the case of TVET provider, Legal Entity of Public Law (LEPL), it is sufficient to provide a copy of the decree of the Minister of Education and Science.

Q.9 According the RFP requirement, applicant should submit latest audited balance sheets for 2013 and 2014. In case of LEPLs they are audited by the Internal Audit Department of the Ministry of Education and Science. Accordingly, they do not require auditing by the external auditor (costs of the external audit is not allocated in LEPLs' budget which is approved by the Ministry). Is it sufficient if the lead applicant submits the latest statements audited by the Ministry of Education and Science?

A.9 In the case of LEPL, it is sufficient to submit the latest statements audited by the Ministry of Education and Science.



**Q.10** Is it possible to submit scanned copy of signed partnership agreement and other required documents? Or should we submit originals?

**A.10** Pre-application partnership agreement, outlining clearly the following as a minimum:

- the project management and partnership arrangements;
- description and division of roles;
- inputs by the partners;
- main functions and responsibilities vis-à-vis project activities and deliverables;
- partnership representation and representation officer authorization;
- handover of equipment and project assets arrangements before the end of the project;
- partnership management seat of office and project office address and communication contact details.
- should be notary certified and an original with the notary signature and seal should be presented.

Other documents have to be provided as requested in the RfP.

PS: Please, note that at the stage of full application submission a pre-application agreement with wet signatures will suffice.

**Q.11** The lead of the consortium is LEPL and it is eligible to receive the grant according the Georgian legislation, but partners of the consortium are private companies (LTD) which are not eligible to receive grant. What kind of agreement should be signed between the lead and partner private company? Is it possible to sign service contract between the lead applicant and partners? Should we pay VAT? Is it possible that service contract amount exceeds 25 000\$ (for instance, partner is responsible to organize study tour abroad, or partner is responsible to organize and conduct training courses (including development of the training content, training module, materials, organizing training facilities, venues etc.). What kind of financial reporting is required by the partner in case of service contract? Should the partner submit bank statements on each transaction it makes under the service contract?

**A.11** One pre-application agreement has to be signed between all the project partners. Service contracts can be signed only after a competition procedure. Partners cannot participate in the grant sub-contracting competition under the PICG proposals. PICG grantees have to pay VAT on all expenses made under tender procedures carried out by them, i.e. when below US \$25,000. If the procedure is carried out by MCA-Georgia, i.e. when equal or above US \$25,000, VAT will be co-financed by the Government of Georgia (Compact funds are not expensed on VAT).

Service contracts with partners are not allowable under the PICG. For project deliverables for which partners will be responsible, respective CVs of involved experts and outlined tasks can be provided with the full application. Bidding procedures have to be planned and held for all other services and deliverables production as per the PICG applicable procurement rules.

Financial management and reporting among partners have to be agreed among the partners. The awarded project have to follow the PICG reporting requirements. Bank statements on transactions among partners may be requested by the ISWD during implementation phase for monitoring purposes.

PS: Latest instructions from MCA-Georgia are that VAT should not be included in the budget estimates.



**Q.12** What kind of reporting is required for in-kind contribution? If applicant indicates salaries of the consultants as an in-kind-contribution, should applicant submit bank statements to justify in-kind contribution?

**A.12** To prove in-kind contribution of staff time and services to the project, the grantee will have to provide the following proofs during the implementation stage:

- Copy of the contract of the respective staff;
- Administrative order of the respective manager for the assigning of the respective staff member to the project with the specified task, responsibilities and reporting requirements;
- Copy of the payroll sheet;
- Time sheet recording the time and the type of services provided by the relevant staff member- or other reports;
- Materials evidence of the results of the work done (deliverables (inputs towards such));

**Q.13** If applicant indicates the building as an in-kind contribution, can private auditor justify the market value of the building or should we submit the report of Samkharauli Expertise Bureau? Should the report be translated in English and notary certified? Can we submit only translation?

**A.13** Either evaluations of market value of buildings will be acceptable. Translation by certified translator is enough.

**Q.14** According the RFP “Where the documents are not in English, a translation has to be provided into English of the relevant parts proving eligibility and for the purposes of the analyzing of the application.” Should these documents be notary certified?

**A.14** These documents should not be notary certified.

**Q.15** Should each partner fill the fourth part of the grant application - CAPACITY TO MANAGE AND IMPLEMENT PROJECTS? Or only the lead applicant should submit requested information?

**A.15** The Section: Capacity to Manage and Implement Projects should present the aggregated data of all the partners together.

**Q.16** Taking into the consideration, program development, repairing works, purchase of infrastructure, procedures related to the accreditation/authorization requires significant amount of time, it might be impossible to launch pilot programs during the project implementation period (2 year). Should priority be given to the projects which entails not only VET program development but launch and piloting of the programs?

**A.16** As per the RfP, the changes into the TVET system regulations have to be taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the PICG project proposals. Thus the TVET programs have to be developed in modular format and meet the requirements of the validation process, relevant to modular programs. Piloting the TVET program(s) is desirable although this may mean contract extension in some cases, depending on the level and duration of the TVET program.



**Q.17** RFP states that Payment to civil servants or other officials of the public administration unless in leave of absence during project assignments. Could you please specify and define “other officials of the public administration”?

**A.17** As a general rule, civil (public) servants (as per Law of Georgia on the Public Servants - [http://www.fin.ge/source/test\\_folder/sajaro%20samsaxuris%20Sesaxeb%20kanoni%2012.12.2014.pdf](http://www.fin.ge/source/test_folder/sajaro%20samsaxuris%20Sesaxeb%20kanoni%2012.12.2014.pdf)) cannot be employed to serve as full-time experts under the PICG grant scheme. In the cases when such expertise is essential for the implementation of the project activities, such experts may be contracted under the PICG grant project with a written permission of the head of the respective institution. For the PICG, “other officials of the public administration” means state and public law bodies officers, whose salaries are paid by the national budget as well as the ones defined in chapter 4 of the above-mentioned law.

**Q.18** Should applicant submit detailed TOR for purchase of the infrastructure works (which amounts \$25,000) at the proposal submission stage?

**A.18** The scope of work and drawing of infrastructure related buildings are needed at the full application submission stage.

**Q.19** How detailed should be the cost related to the repairing works?

**A.19** Detailed costing of all infrastructure rehabilitation measures have to be provided in the full application in the Bill of Quantities.

**Q.20** When submitting a full proposal in a consortium, what would be the financial management of the project budget? Would we be able to transfer money to each partner based on an internal agreement (that will be signed between the grant holder and the project partner organizations) in the consortium and the partner organizations carry out budget spending and reporting to the applicant organization?

**A.20** In case of a consortium, internal financial management arrangements are up to the consortium partners to agree, desirably in an internal partners agreement as long as these do not conflict and contradict the PICG terms and MCC guiding documents.

**Q.21** Do all supporting documents of the full application, for instance, audit balance sheets etc. need to be submitted in English and Georgian?

**A.21** Not all documents have to be submitted into English and Georgian. Only documents as indicated in the RfP and the Application template (and annexes) have to be provided in both languages.





- Q.22 We could not find a pre-bid partnership agreement forms in the application dossier that needs to be submitted. Could you refer to this document specifically?
- A.22 “Pre-bid agreement” should be read as “pre-application agreement” wherever mentioned in the RfP or the application documents. There is no pre-application agreement template. Please, check previous Q&A for contents of the pre-application agreement.
- Q.23 Who should we approach to get the data of labor market research results presented during the last two day training?
- A.23 All the presentations delivered at the full application development training are uploaded on the ISWD Project web-page: [www.iswd.ge](http://www.iswd.ge).
- Q.24 In our understanding, the RFP says on pages 20/21 that an "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment" has to be provided only if "works and/or refurbishments" are planned. Also in the Compliance Assessment Grid of the proposal, the "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment" is only a compliance criterion "in case of infrastructural improvement and/or refurbishment". However, some of the verbal explanations given at the training could be understood as if the "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment" would have to be provided regardless of whether refurbishments or infrastructural improvements are planned. Could you please clarify?
- A.24 The applicable standards (MCC Environmental Guidelines) require the identification of all potential impacts and risks that could have place during planned activities. The Environmental Impact Assessment (ESIA)/ Environmental Review is the impact/risk identification instrument. Therefore, all applicants should deliver the ESIA/ Environmental Review. All shortlisted projects fall in Category B or C, applicants should submit only abbreviated ESIA, i.e. Environmental Review. All applicants should also submit the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and its integral Grievance Mechanism.
- Q.25 According to the RfP guidelines section 3.3 (page 20) the applicants should supply the following documents in order to allow the ISWD TAT and TEP to verify the Submission of supporting documents for short-listed proposals. Should these documents be provided as part of the proposal or after short-listing? If these documents should be provided during full proposal submission prior to short listing then why these documents are not listed in the check list? Could you please provide information on phases of the project proposal development. We could not find this information in the RfP or elsewhere. We are having challenges understanding the process.
- A.25 All documents as listed and required in the section 3.3 of the RfP have to be submitted with the Full Application (“The Full Application should be submitted with the set of supporting documents which will be examined for the eligibility of its applicant and the partners.”). Failure to provide documents or failure to meet the eligibility requirements listed in the Annex IV. Checklist may lead to exclusion of the application during the administrative and eligibility checking from further consideration. Please, note that “Pre-bid partnership agreement” under item 14 of Annex IV should read as “Pre-application partnership agreement”.



The other documents listed under section 3.3 of the RfP have also to be provided at the time of the submission of the full application. However, failure to do so, will not lead to immediate exclusion of the application from further review and evaluation. In case, such documents are not provided or are incomplete, the ISWD reviewers and technical evaluation panel will request the applicant to provide the missing document/information within a given deadline. Failure to provide the missing information within the given deadline will lead to exclusion of the application from further review and evaluation.

In 3.1.3 of the RfP the application process (phases in project proposal development” are defined – “The application process under this Request for Proposals will take place in two stages: (i) development and submission of a Concept Paper, and, (ii) development and submission of Full Application of short-listed concept papers.”

Section 5 of the RfP described the review and evaluation steps of the short-listed (full) proposals. During this process applicants may be requested to consider rebalancing of their proposals to meet fully MCC’s ESP and SGI requirements and relevant mitigation measures.

**Q.26** Can we include the learning program that has not yet been accredited by EQE? The application period for new programs is from February 1 to March 1; so does it mean that we will have the possibility to obtain accreditation after the deadline for full proposal submission (December 4)?

**A.26** As per PICG objectives, if grant proposals focus on the development of new TVET programs, this implies their accreditation or validation during the project implementation period.

**Q.27** Regarding the budget, can we include the salaries of various project team members (project manager, coordinator, etc, as mentioned in the budget annex 9) if they are employees of the Applicant, in other words our employees?

**A.27** Salaries to applicant’s staff can be included in the proposal budget for specific roles and tasks which they will perform under the project. However, such cost are not allowable if they cover “salaries for existing staff for existing activities” as per the terms of Section 2.4 of the RfP.

**Q.28** We need to submit 6 English and 2 Georgian copies? But do you mean several copies of only the grant application form or the checklist and declaration as well?? And what about the budget, logical framework, partnership statement, environmental and social impact assessment report and other documents?? Do you also need several copies of those or only the application form? Please specify.

**A.28** Only the main body of the application form without the annexes and the supporting documents should be provided in the number of copies required.

**Q.29** Does a Georgian version have to have a wet signature? Or only the English Original version?





- A.29 Georgian version also needs a wet signature, standing for authenticity and identicalness of the translation.
- Q.30 The table on page 4 of the grant application form (paragraph 1.6. Justification) is distorted (it is split in two). Please be kind to upload the corrected version on [www.ISWD.ge](http://www.ISWD.ge).
- In the table mentioned above (page 4, paragraph 1.6. Justification), the column “duration of training” means the duration of the learning course we want to implement, right? Please confirm.
  - What exactly do the columns “average current cost of the TVET course delivery” and “expected cost of the TVET course delivery “ mean?
- A.30 Thank you for noting this problem. Application is re-uploaded. That’s correct - duration of the training means the duration of the TVET program/course(s) the applicant wants to implement. The “average current cost of the TVET course delivery” means all operational and maintenances costs for offering the course or similar course at the present. “Expected cost of the TVET course delivery” mean all operational and maintenances costs for offering the new TVET course once it will be developed under the PICG grant project.
- Q.31 In the “project implementation plan” table (page 8, paragraph 1.9. duration and activity implementation plan) how are we supposed to fill in the “milestone” column? The milestone could be an event or a task itself. Do you want us to indicate whether an activity/output is a milestone or not? Or do we have to indicate which part or subtask of the activity is a milestone?? That would be difficult because not all the activities represent milestones.. please specify.
- A.31 For the purpose of this application, a milestone is an interim output that that is a step towards the production of the deliverable. It may be achieved through the implementation of one or more activities.
- Q.32 Also, in the above mentioned table, in the column “required resources”, should we fill in the percentages or numbers?
- A.32 Lump sums in numbers have to be filled in the respective boxes of the implementation plan.
- Q.33 On page 10 of the application form (paragraph 4 budget for the project), you mention: “Fill in Annex 9 to the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the total duration of the project”. Which document do you mean?? We have two annexes for budget: Annex 9 and Annex 9.1. please specify what is meant by “Annex 9 to the Request for Proposals (RFP)”??
- A.33 The instruction relates to both annexes (Annex 9 and Annex 9.1)
- Q.34 For the purposes of the section 1.4 (Summary) who should be consider as Partners? In our case we have two categories of partners:



- Shareholding partners: the entities which have established the applicant;
- International partners: company and university. The applicant has entered into partnership arrangements with these partners.

A.34 Founders of a partner (lead applicant or partner organizations) cannot be seen as partners unless they are formally included into the consortium/partnership established for the purposes of application under the PICG grant scheme.

Q.35 The English version suggests there are several Overall Objectives of the project – which is not an established practice in absolute majority of logframe development works. On another hand, the Georgian version suggests slightly different interpretation than English template – there are several “specific objectives” in Georgian document while there’s only ONE “specific objective” in English version. Please provide clarification on overall hierarchy of objectives that will be applicable and consistent to both language documents.

A.35 In the templates, the provided examples are just indicative. Applicants have to define their own versions of the overall and specific objectives, which should be in harmony with the PICG objectives. Text in English and Georgian versions have to be identical.

Q.36 Government institution of Georgia is planning to inject a building required for educational purposes. Could you please clarify what should we consider as the value of in-kind contribution. Value of the whole building, or value of the area of classrooms, laboratories etc?

A.36 Only the value of the premises (whole building or parts of a building and relevant facilities), which are directly related to the development of the new TVET programs can be considered as an in-kind contribution.

Q.37 Do we have to annex a report of valuation of the in-kind contribution elaborated by independent auditor and what should be the period of right of use that should be covered/valuated with this report?

A.37 Applicants are required to provide in-kind contribution with an appropriate justification of the current market value of the equipment, works or services. It can be done by providing auditors or qualified experts written report. The period of right of use can be considered 7 years.

Q.38 Do we have to include detailed budget for manufacturing of training simulators, that we’re planning to procure with MCA grant. Meaning, do we have to include detailed bill of quantities for simulators or just offer from respective supplier is sufficient? This is important because in terms of some simulators information about details of the equipment is commercial secret.

A.38 Detailed budget for any procured services, goods or works have to be included into the project budget. But, in the particular case, detailed breakdown of parts of the simulator is not necessary. Please include total cost of the simulator. In order to be sure that the technical specifications accurately reflect the requirements and do not favor a certain brand or unfairly



discriminate against certain brands, Specifications shall be based on relevant characteristics and/or performance requirements and should state ranges of specific characteristics, instead of particular values. References to brand names, catalog numbers, or similar classifications shall be avoided. In specific cases when equipment/goods is unique and it is necessary to quote a brand name of a particular manufacturer, the words “or equivalent” shall be added after such reference. In this case the specification shall permit the acceptance of offers for goods which have similar characteristics and which provide performance at least substantially equivalent to those specified.

Q.39 The international partners and suppliers of training simulators are requesting clarification re payment method. Could you please clarify are they supposed to receive payment directly from MCA or such payment shall be done to the bank accounts of the applicant for the purposes of its further transfer to the international partners and/or suppliers.

A.39 When the tender is organized by MCAG, the payment will be made directly to the supplier.

Q.40 Do we have to include sort of, bill of quantities in case of training simulators or just offer provided by respective supplier is sufficient? The price of simulators cannot be provided in details, so is there any problem in this regard?

A.40 In the case of supply of goods, detailed technical specification has to be provided in Annex 9.1. There's no need of detailed breakdown of prices of the parts of training simulator. Instead, a total price of training simulator should be provided.

Q.41 Does MCA issue a grant agreement to the winner applicant that ensures zero VAT exception from the Georgian Tax Law? If not, and service contract will be signed winner applicant will have to pay VAT to the suppliers as per Georgian Tax law, which will affect the contract value. Is it possible that in this case MCA makes direct payments to third parties on request of the contractor? Please, provide clarifications.

A.41 The MCAG grant agreement does not provide tax exempt status to the grantee. In procurement operations carried out by MCAG, i.e. equal or above US \$25,000, the VAT will be financed by the Government of Georgia.

Q.42 In case of refurbishment to be completed by Subcontractor, there will be first BOQ, elaborated during the design and the second one – when the proposal is made from the construction company invited on the bidding process. All the refurbishment works has to be performed by the subcontractor not by the grantee itself which means that this subcontractor has to provide BOQ in the format indicated in the attachment 9.1? Please provide clarifications.

A.42 In the case of infrastructure rehabilitation, the scope of work and drawings have to be provided by applicant and prices have to be provided in the BoQ as per the template in Annex 9.1.



Q.43 Is there any kind of preference regarding the construction standards? If yes, please provide the detailed requirements.

A.43 The design documents shall be prepared in accordance with the latest requirements of the Design Criteria (Version of January 5, 2015 commented by ESIDA, MES, MCA-GEORGIA) as well as applicable Georgian national and local requirements (including prices of construction material - Quarterly publication of Construction Assessment Union).

Design Criteria can be found:

A) Georgian version

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8mGbVsKFHLjZGhWaEtPa1BOSnM/view?usp=sharing>

B) English version:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B8mGbVsKFHLjCDBkNTVxcWt1WjA/view?usp=sharing>

Applicable national laws and regulations-SNIP-s ( Construction Norms and Rules ), etc.

Quarterly publication of the “Union of Builders of Georgia” for market prices

Q.44 Considering that the Applicant was established recently, in August, 2015, we are not able to submit a copy of a certified auditors reports for the last two years. Instead of this, do we have to submit certified auditors reports of Shareholding partners and international partners.

A.44 In this case you can submit your partners’ organizations auditors report for the last two years.

Q.45 Could you please clarify what does the pre-bid agreement mean? What is the difference between the pre-application and pre-bid agreements. As far as we understand pre-bid agreement is the agreement entered between the applicant and the partner before submission of concept paper form, while pre-application agreement is the one entered between the applicant and the partners before submission of the final application, which defined all terms of cooperation in detail. In our case we have only pre-bids with shareholding partners, and one of the international partners. The applicant does not have pre-bid agreement with another international partner, and the applicant cooperates with such partner in the frame of MoU entered between one of the shareholding partners and this international partner. Can we consider this MoU as pre-bid agreement?

A.45 Please, check relevant answer on pre-bid/pre-application agreement in previous answers. MoU can be considered as pre-application agreement as long as it covers all relevant aspects as per clarifications provided in previous answers.

Q.46 Do we have to notarize signatures on pre-application and pre-bid agreements (if these are supposed to be separate agreements) with shareholding partners and international partners? In case of international partners do we have to apostle signatures on these agreements?



A.46 “Pre-bid agreement” should be read as “pre-application agreement” wherever mentioned in the RfP or the application documents. There is no pre-application agreement template. Please, check previous Q&A for contents of the pre-application agreement. Apostle signatures are not required on the pre-application agreement. Only wet signatures will suffice at the stage of the full application submission.

Q.47 Could you please clarify to what detail should pre-bid/pre-application agreement regulate relations between the applicant and the partners? Could you please clarify do we have to enter into one pre-bid/pre-application agreement with all partners (including international and shareholding partners) or should we enter into separate pre-bid/pre-application agreements?

A.47 Issues related to pre-bid (pre-application) agreement between applicants and partners are described in the RFP section 2.1.1. PICGS Scheme Eligible organization. Please, also see relevant clarifications in answers provided previously. Applicants are required to sign one pre-application agreement with all partners in the project proposal.

Q.50 The applicant plans to carry out Environmental and Social Impact Assessment particularly for the education facility and relevant rehabilitation works to be executed. Are there additional areas that the assessment considers as obligatory apart from the ones related to particular education facility?

A.48 The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment/review should cover the particular education facility and the immediate adjacent areas.

Q.49 Provided that we’re not requesting financing of the Infrastructure works do we still have to submit following documents:

In case of infrastructural improvement and/or refurbishment the following documents should be presented:

1. Pictures of the Building(s) and Architectural Plan(s) (if applicable) of the premises (and surroundings) to be refurbished;
2. Notary deed for real estate property - copy, certified “Identical with the original” by the Applicant;
3. Idea (conceptual) or technical designs of the works in case of infrastructural improvements, including a proposed budget for the works;
4. An assessment of environmental and social risks and impacts;
5. Proposed Environment and Social Impact Mitigation Plan as per provided template and budget for undertaking any necessary follow-up studies, assessments; developing and implementing management plans and reporting plans, included in the grant application budget;
6. A proposed work plan and timeline for any infrastructure investments, including incorporation of related environmental and social work, with costs included in grant application budget;

A.49 In case of not having any infrastructure related works applicant are still required to submit Environmental and Social Impact Assessment form, where in the Chapter 9 (Environmental and Social



Impact ) applicant should describe and assess the project's likely positive and negative impacts and risks on the surrounding physical, biological and socio-economic environment described in the baseline section (e.g., air, water, geology, soils, vegetation, wildlife, cultural resources, project workers, TVET teachers and students, local communities, land use, traffic, waste disposal, water supply, etc.). These should include any potentially significant direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and any reasonably foreseeable effects that may be associated with the project. Please take into consideration that among other impacts/risks you respectively address OHS issues.

**Q.50** What is the difference between the pre-application and pre-bid agreement. The question arises, because the pre-bid agreement is enlisted in check-list as well as it is described in the RFP. However, the pre-application agreement is listed and evaluated in evaluation grid and respective explanation of this document is not provided elsewhere.

**A.50** Whenever “pre-bid agreement” is used in the RfP and the application documents should read as “pre-application agreement”. Please, check the other answers and clarifications of similar questions.

**Q.51** Could you please clarify whether the pre-bid agreement needs to be authorized by the full application submission date – 04.12.2015 or the notarized version will be required at the later stage in case the project is supported?

**A.51** The pre-application agreement needs to be signed (wet signatures) and presented at the stage of the application deadline.

**Q.52** Could you please clarify the evaluation and selection process as the RFP doesn't provide clear picture of the process and accordingly what documentation has to be submitted, when and by whom. Namely, the RFP, section 3.3 (page 20) states that the supporting documents should be submitted by the short-listed proposals. Please note that in Georgian version of the RFP it is not indicated at all that these documents need to be submitted by “short listed applicants”

**A.52** The English version of the RfP and the application documents is preceding in case difference between the English and the Georgian versions. As described in section 3.5 of the RfP the evaluation process will involve the following steps:

1. Opening and Administrative Check;
2. Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) Compliance Assessment;
3. Due Diligence Check and Site Visits;
4. Due Diligence Orientation (Feedback) Session and Project Re-balancing Negotiation;
5. Cost-benefit Analysis (CBA);
6. TEP Final Evaluation and Merit-Based Ranking (based on a Due Diligence report by the ISWD TAT, CBA findings report, oral presentations and scoring as per the evaluation grid, annexed to the application form.

All supporting documents listed in section 3.3 of the RfP have to be provided by the time of application submission deadline. Failure to provide supporting documents and meet requirements,





listed in Annex IV Checklist, may lead to exclusion from further review at the stage of the administrative check. Please, see other answers and clarifications to other similar questions.

**Q.53** Does this mean that the full applications, submitted on 04.12.2015 will be revised and short-listed on the bases of the documents provided in the check-list and thereafter the successful applicants will be asked to provide the supporting documents mentioned in RFP section 3.3 (page 20) and the evaluation grid.

For lead applicants:

1. Court Registration or Legal Act of Establishment – notary certified copy.
2. Current Legal Standing Certificate – original or notary certified copy. This document must be issued not later than 90 days prior to the full proposal deadline;
3. Organizations' status and list of key staff (if applicable);
4. Certificate, stating that the applicant is not in procedure of bankruptcy, issued by the relevant court. This document must be original or notary certified copy and must be issued not later than 90 days prior to the full proposal deadline;
5. A copy of the applicants (including lead organization and all partners) latest audited balance sheets for 2013 and 2014;
6. Proof of at least 3-years operation in the local or international market;
7. Copies of contracts and project references, proving TVET related experience;
8. A pre-application agreement undersigned by all partners;
9. Information about number of employees locally and/or internationally, projection of increase or decrease in numbers for the next five years, outlining staff with specific TVET background.

For Partners:

1. Court Registration or Legal Act of Establishment – notary certified copy;
2. Current Legal Standing Certificate (if applicable) – original or notary certified copy. This document must be issued not later than 90 days prior to the full proposal deadline;
3. Certificate, stating that the partner organisation is not in procedure of bankruptcy, issued by the relevant court or public authority. This document must be original or in notary certified copy and must be issued not later than 90 days prior to the full proposal deadline.

**A.53** Yes, the assumption is correct. The administrative compliance check will be carried out on the basis of Annex IV Checklist. Please, also note the TEP Compliance Assessment criteria in section 3.5 in the RfP. These will be used to short-list the applications for further evaluation and consideration for grant award.

However, the Due Diligence check (please, see section 3.5 of the RfP) will commence immediately after these initial checks whereby the other documents listed in section 3.3 of the RfP will be used. If these are not provided or are provided in incomplete form, ISWD and TEP will require additional clarification and the submission of the missing documents within a given deadline (usually 10 business days from the date of issuance of the notification letter).

**Q.54** Please confirm that on 04.12.2015 only those documents have to be submitted that are listed in the check-list?



- A.54 All documents listed in the section 3.3 of the RfP have to be submitted with the application by the submission deadline.
- Q.55 Please give a clear definition of all costs that belong to the Incremental operational costs (are they identical with variable costs?)
- A.55 Incremental Operating costs are somehow identical with variable costs, but may include some fixed costs also. It is any additional costs which will be arisen after the new program is implemented. It can be utilities, rent, consumables, office supplies, text books and etc. For example teachers' salaries can be traced as fixed costs for small period but for our purposes it will go under Operating costs. Operating costs do not include costs which can be capitalized.
- Q.56 Please give a clear definition of all costs that belong to the Incremental maintenance costs (are they identical with fixed costs?)
- A.56 Incremental maintenance costs are any funds that will go to regular and periodic maintenance: regular upkeep like cleaning, small/large repairs, replacement of equipment and ets.
- Q.57 On the base of which exchange rate (Euro/Dollar/Lari) should the financial budget be calculated? (Covering exchange rate risks?)
- A.57 Exchange rates should be used from National Bank of Georgia [www.nbg.ge](http://www.nbg.ge), also if there is necessity you can use 2% variation.
- Q.58 Which kind of taxes can to be implemented in the financial budget?
- A.58 In the budget you should consider all the taxes payable by the Georgian tax code <http://www.rs.ge/4713> .
- Q.59 All the required documents that need to be signed, should they be send as originals per post or is a scan enough?
- A.59 The following required documents, listed in Annex IV Checklist have to be submitted in originals: Annex III.2 Partnership Statement, Pre-application partnership agreement and Declaration by the Applicant. All other documents listed in Annex IV or listed in section 3.3 of the RfP may be provided in scanned form. Originals or certified copies should be provided by the applicant when requested by the ISWD TAT and/or TEP after the completion of the evaluation. Failure to do so will lead to exclusion of the applicant from consideration for grant award.
- Q.60 What exactly is the Court Registration or Legal Act of Establishment, is it identical with the Trade register excerpt? Is it possible to send it in German?
- A.60 It is the document certifying the initial legal establishment registration of the organization from a respective public authority. If this is the Trade Registry in your country, excerpt from the registry should suffice. Translation into English of the object of activity should be provided.



**Q.61** What is the Current Legal Standing Certificate? Where can you get it in Germany? Is it still necessary if we hand in a credit reference or a bank reference?

**A.61** Current legal standing certificate is a document issued by a public authority, usually the one doing the initial registration certifying that the organization is still in existence at the time of the issuance of the document and noting current authorized legal representation of the organization. Credit or bank references are different type of documents.

**Q.62** Personal data in Germany is confidential, therefore we could not send you a list from our HR department. The information that is indicated on our homepage can be used. Will it be enough and useful?

**A.62** A summary information of the number and the type of employees of the organization should be provided in the application. No personal data is required except for the authorized legal representatives of the organization.

**Q.63** Will you need a bank reference or a credit reference? Or both? Could it be used a certificate that the applicant is not in the procedure of bankruptcy?

**A.63** An official document that the applicant is not in a procedure of bankruptcy has to be provided. In some countries such documents are issued by the national tax authorities. In case when there is no such public body, a reference from the bank should be sufficient.

**Q.64** Is it necessary to notary certify a document that is already issued by the bank?

**A.64** Original documents from a bank or public authority do not need notary certification.

**Q.65** The balance sheet from 2013 is available, the one from 2014 so far not, as it is not completed. Can we hand in only 2013 or will you need 2012 in addition?

**A.65** Balance sheet for 2012 and 2013 will be sufficient for the submission of the application. However, 2014 balance sheets should be provided at earliest possibility and before signing a contract if grant is awarded.

**Q.66** As all contracts are confidential it will not be possible to send you our contracts with our partners. Can you accept a list with all the names of our partners? The running study programs and the running projects should be proof enough for our working cooperation.

**A.66** A list of partners with contract objects has to be provided as a minimum.

**Q.67** As long as our project is for creation of new professional educational center, we have concerns regarding p. 1.7 - one of the parts of our project is creation of the curriculum, which,



obviously at the moment we do not have (and cant' have until the project is kicked off), hence we do not have codes. Can we fill the application form without codes, then?

A.67 Yes

Q.68 We are planning to implement three different programs, which we might start step by step. In this case, will it be considered that the school has been started and the project is finished if only one program has started out of three and the other two are under development.

A.68 All project deliverables have to be provided and accepted by the ISWD TAT before the end of the project duration.

Q.69 It is important for the educational center which month the courses start. How is this regulated by the MCA program, since according to the requirements the project shall be calculated only 1 year or 2 years duration?

A.69 Project duration may vary between 12 and up to 24 months. TVET programs/course are not regulated by MCA. The regulations of the relevant educational authorities and bodies in Georgia have to be taken into account.

Q.70 P.3 - description of the applicant. In our case, when the school is to be found, do we need to provide the information regarding the founding company or about the new company (hence we will be able to provide only the forecast what the new company will look like)?

A.70 Information on the applicant (lead organization and partners) have to be provided on the relevant sections of the application template.

Q.71 The ministry of health has not yet published the report regarding the employment market study. Can you please help us in obtaining the results of the study.

A.71 The ISWD TAT cannot obtain documents from Georgian Government institutions for the applicants.

Q.72 During the training course it was mentioned that all contracts above 25 000 USD shall be tendered according to MCA requirement by MCA. How does this work in case of purchasing the services from the project's partner? In our case we are talking about contracting our partner, Western hospitality educational institute in creating the curriculum, training the trainers and consulting on infrastructure, etc. The total amount of the deal is obviously more that 25 000, but the whole concept of our proposal is based on partnering with this particular school. Will we have to tender them as well, or the partners have certain advantages?

A.72 MCC procurement guidelines and the PICG applicable rules have to be applied for the supply/delivery of goods, services and works. Curriculum development, training of trainers, consulting on infrastructure and other outputs of project products and services can be defined as separate deliverables as long as these are not superfluously split and the applicant's staff (lead applicant's and



partner's) can be submitted with the application. Alternatively, deliverables which cost less than US \$25,000 can be tendered under the simpler shopping procedure as per the PICG procurement rules.

**Q.73** When will the sustainability and minority integration training take place?

**A.73** ISWD will offer additional training on social and gender integration (SGI) issues to short-listed applicants SGI experts. The information about the event will be published on the project web site: [www.iswd.ge](http://www.iswd.ge). Applicants who have notified ISWD TAT of the experts they propose will also be e-mailed about the event.

**Q.74** RFP (2.1.1.) guideline states: "TVET provider applicants that do not have authorization from the NCEQE by the time of initial grant application should obtain the necessary authorization within three months after selection for awarding a grant". Does this mean that after winning in full application stage we have three months for getting authorization? Also, here is another issue. We can get accreditation only if we have authorization. Therefore, we need another 90 days (max.) for getting accreditation too.

**A.74** Applicants have to be authorized within three months after notification of the grant award decision. Grant agreement will not be signed if such evidence is not provided. Accreditation of the proposed new TVET programs should be planned in the project implementation plan and budget. Modular design, development and delivery of TVET program may require validation of the new TVET programs, which has to be consulted by applicants with NCEQE.

**Q.75** Lead applicant is LEPL and it disposes building which is the state property. Is it possible to indicate this building as an in-kind contribution according its book value?

**A.75** As LEPL does not own the building, it can include only the cost for the use of the premises only for the proportion of use by the new TVET courses the applicant proposes. Documentary evidence for the right to use the state property has to be provided (i.e. copy of contract or another document). If the project is expansion/extending of existing TVET courses, there are no grounds for claiming use of premises as an in-kind contribution. All other co-financing requirements stated in the RfP have to be met as well.

**Q.76** LEPL full time staff is receiving remuneration from the state budget, in case of grant award their task and responsibilities will be enlarged. Is it possible if they receive remuneration from the PICG grant project?

**A.76** As per the RfP "salaries for existing staff for existing activities are ineligible" cost, salaries of existing staff for additional project related activities are eligible cost. However, the applicant has to provide proof during the implementation that such activities are not duplicating regular staff activities. Overtime of existing teachers and staff should not be in conflict with regulatory (Labour Code) and trade union requirements concerning employees' rights for rest and recuperation. Applicants have also to take into consideration that the new TVET courses provision are generally expected to be provided by newly recruited teachers/trainers.



- Q.77 Points to be clarified RE audit reports/balance sheets: The list of supportive documents to be submitted includes: A copy of the applicant's (including lead organization and all partners) latest audited balance sheets for 2013 and 2014. One of our partner organizations, Georgian National Tourism Administration, is a legal entity of public law and cannot provide these documents. Are there any other options defined for public institutions in such case?
- A.77 Income statement, balance sheet and act of comparison can be provided by LEPL.
- Q.78 A checklist for full grant application form mentions that the applicant shall include: A copy of a Certified Auditor's reports for the last three years in English or Georgian, while two years (2013, 2014) are mentioned elsewhere throughout the form as well as RfP. Please verify which is correct.
- A.78 Two years (2013, 2014) auditor's report will be sufficient.
- Q.79 Points to be clarified RE pre-bid partnership agreement: Please confirm that in case of a consortium this implies preparation of one single document for signature by all parties. Also, is there any preferable template/format the applicant shall follow? May this agreement have electronic signatures or be a scanned copy (if signatures of international partners can be obtained only electronically).
- A.79 There is no template for the pre-application partnership agreement. It should be one single document signed by all the parties of the consortium. Wet signatures of all partners are required on the document.
- Q.80 RfP mentions that a notary certified pre-bid agreement in English and Georgian versions shall be submitted prior to signing a grant contract, suggesting that this is not required at the time of submitting full application. Please confirm that at this stage applicant is asked to submit English and Georgian versions of agreement without notary certification.
- A.80 The pre-application (pre-bid) partnership agreement has to be provided with the full application submission with wet signatures of all partners as inputs and commitments of partners will be reviewed and checked during the Due Diligence check evaluation step. Notary certified versions should be provided if selected for grant award.
- Q.81 We are approached by a "Consortium Partner" that had given their "Concept Note" with the deadline of 14th of September. We were not their "Consortium Partner" when they had submitted their "Concept Note". Their Concept Note has been successfully "Short-Listed". Now, they want that we are their official "Consortium Partner" for their full proposal which has the deadline of the 4th of December (changed to 15th January 2016). Our question is, if we are allowed to be the official "Consortium Partner" now for the full proposal, although we were not a part of their Concept Note?





A.81 Changing consortium partners from the concept note stage at the full application stage is not allowed as this will question the fair and equal treatment of all applicants.

Q.82 We would like to phrase our next question with an example: If let's say there is a proposal of 3 million dollars with 3 Consortium Partners. Let's say that 1 million dollars is needed for equipment. How does it work? Does MCA Georgia announce another tender for the required equipments according to the proposal? If yes, does MCA Georgia contract an equipment provider independent from the "Consortium's decision?"

A.82 The procurement rules stipulated in the RfP section 4.2. will be applicable in this case.

Q.83 If one "Consortium Partner's" role is to provide trainings, transfer know-how, certify and etc. in the full proposal, and if the amount of the mentioned services are clearly written as the role of one "Consortium Partner" with a clear needed amount, let it be another 1 million as an example, does MCA again make another tender for the services (such as trainings, transfer know-how, and certification and etc.) as mentioned in the proposal? If yes, how can MCA be sure that the Consortium reaches the defined targets as mentioned in the full proposal with an "x service provider"? Or, does MCA make a tender for the services which would be needed and would cost more than 25.000 dollars, but would not clearly be mentioned in the full proposal who and how actually those services be delivered?

A.83 The applicant should design and plan their project proposals in accordance with the terms stated out in the PICG RfP and related applicable standards and guidelines. In case of need of unique equipment or services, which may be required for the successful implementation of the project a particular brand may be mentioned together with the phrase "or equivalent". In any case, the PICG applicable procurement rules will be applied.

Q.84 If we are a "service provider" with a specific role as a "Consortium Partner" in the full proposal, would we then be contracted by "MCA GE" or by the "Lead" of the "Consortium"?

A.84 The cost of services provided by project partners (lead and partner organizations) should be included into the PIU deliverables part of the budget and respectively into the human resources section of the budget with the respective CV's of experts providing the services and observing the PICG applicable procurement rules.

Q.85 Should SMP activities (publication on our web-page, response to questions and grievances of the stakeholders, meetings with them) be included in the list of project activities?

A.85 ISWD TAT cannot advise applicants on specific project content. All project activities should contribute to the achievement of project objectives and lead to clearly defined deliverables and milestones (outputs). Stakeholders Engagement Plan of which Grievances Redress Mechanism is an essential part should be included as some of the first deliverables under the PICG financed projects.



**Q.86** In section 1.5 (objectives) of the full application form, you ask us to specify the “level of certification students will achieve in programs”. Do you mean the levels of vocational education (I, II, III, IV, V)?

**A.86** Yes, TVET programs offered by the projects should lead to a certification under the vocational education levels as per the RfP and the National Qualification Framework in Georgia.

**Q.87** During our last SGI seminar, your experts mentioned that the market survey will probably not be published on MOH website until the deadline of full application submission; however, in section 1.6 (justification) you recommend to use the survey. Your experts mentioned that a link of a different survey will be sent on our emails to help us with the statistical information. We did not receive anything yet could you please help with this?

**A.87** The available survey was mailed out to short-listed applicants by the ISWD TAT.

**Q.88** In section 1.6.4, you ask us to fill the table provided. In columns 7 and 8, you mention “average current cost of the TVET course delivery” and “expected cost of the TVET course delivery”. Could you specify:

- what do you mean in “current cost of the TVET course delivery?” Do you mean salaries of teachers + equipment maintenance costs + utilities..? could you please specify?
- Same question for “expected cost of the TVET course delivery”;
- if so, “expected cost of the TVET course delivery” would be equal to “average current cost of the TVET course delivery” + incremental costs mentioned by your financial expert during the seminars, right??

**A.88** Please, refer to Q&A No30 in the published Q&A file:  
[http://www.iswd.ge/uploads/documents/29/FA\\_Q-A\\_file\\_ENG\\_15\\_12\\_2015.pdf](http://www.iswd.ge/uploads/documents/29/FA_Q-A_file_ENG_15_12_2015.pdf).

**Q.89** In section 1.6.4, you ask us to provide estimated number of the main stakeholders, target groups and final beneficiaries. What exactly do you mean? The stakeholders include students, their parents, the representatives of our partner companies, the private sector companies etc. how are we supposed to provide number of all the stakeholders? Also, the amount of student groups in our programs per year is determined, but the total amount of students prepared by our programs during the whole lifetime of the projects (which could be 5-10-15 years..) is much more.. please specify what exactly do you require us to provide.

**A.89** Stakeholders of a project are all institutions and groups, which may influence or be influenced by the project. Target groups are those stakeholders, which are involved in and benefit from the project activities directly. Final beneficiaries are those groups, which will benefit from the project, in the case of PICG – TVET students, during and beyond the duration of the project. The table under 1.6.4 requires data on the students per TVET course developed with the project support.

**Q.90** Can we include the value of our equipment (e.g. computers) that we are going to use for implementation of our new programs in our contribution?



A.90 Applicants may justify and include the value at market price (depreciated) of equipment, which will be used in the implementation of the project activities. Please, refer to the cost-sharing section of the RfP for further details.

Q.91 Can we include salaries of our staff who will be involved in various project activities (we will be very accurate and clear in describing their involvement in the project) in our contribution?

A.91 Salaries of applicant's staff directly involved in the implementation of project activities is allowable cost and thus can be included in the cost-sharing own contribution.

Q.92 In section 1.8.3 you mention "How the project relates to other similar projects and initiatives in the TVET field and industry sector". What exactly do you mean? The projects implemented by us (main applicant), generally? What do you mean by "similar"? projects in the exact same field we are proposing the new programs in? in IT field in general? Please specify.

A.92 Similar projects in this case mean projects in the TVET field carried out by applicant (lead organization and partners) as well as by other implementers and/or donors.

Q.93 In section 4.1 (experience of similar projects) you ask us to "provide a summary of the projects managed by your organization over the past five years in the fields covered by this program, taking care to identify for each project. Please, include also major new TVET program(s) introduced". Considering that the programs we are requesting the grant for are totally new, we cannot have an already implemented project in the fields covered by the programs. However, we can certainly describe all the TVET programs recently introduced by us. Will that be OK with you? Of not, please specify.

A.93 Project references may also include projects implemented by applicant (lead organization and partners – national and/or international) abroad. It is OK to describe the introduced TVET programs.

Q.94 In section 5 (bill of quantities) you clearly emphasize that only in case of refurbishment or infrastructural improvements the applicant must fill in annex 9.1 (bill of quantities). Hence, if we do not have any if this envisaged in our project activities, we do not have to fill in annex 9.1. is it right?

A.94 In case of no infrastructural refurbishment, improvement and rehabilitation it is not required to fill in the BoQ annex.

Q.95 In section 6 (technical specification) you ask us to fill in sheets 6 and 7 of annex 9.1 (BOQ) if we have equipment to be purchased. Does this mean that we have to fill in sheets 6 and 7 even if we do not have any refurbishment or infrastructural improvements and we only need to purchase some equipment (e.g. computers)?

A.95 Yes.



Q.96 Sheets 6 and 7 of BOQ mention fixed assets and training materials that we are going to purchase. Do we need to fill in the assets and materials that we are going to include in our (applicant and all partners) contribution or only what we are requesting the MCA grant for?

A.96 The project proposal budget has to include all items, which will be purchased with project funds, regardless whether these will be covered by MCA- Georgia grant or applicant's own funds.

Q.97 The section IV (checklist) only mentions Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Report and Mitigation Plan with associated costs of follow-up studies and mitigation included in the grantee's budget as required (prepared with assistance of ISWD TAT) (number 9). Does this include Stakeholder management plan and grievance mechanisms? Because the latter is not mentioned anywhere else in the checklist. Please specify.

A.97 Yes. Please, see ESP presentation's slides # 5, 6 and 17 in the Final Q&A clarification session presentations published at the project web-page: [www.iswd.ge](http://www.iswd.ge).

Q.98 Number 10 and 11 of the checklist mention "Proposed work plan for any infrastructure improvements, including for relevant studies, resources and permits, and infrastructure-related environmental and social work (prepared with assistance of ISWD TAT)" and "Draft Conceptual or technical designs for infrastructure improvements, with cost of works incorporated in the budget". In case if we do not have any refurbishment or infrastructural improvements, we do not need to provide these documents, right? Please specify.

A.98 You are right in your assumption.

Q.99 In the table "project implementation plan", first column is titled "activity/output". Why did you put those together?? Output is more similar to deliverables (column 3). How are we supposed to put activities and outputs in one column? Is that a mistake? Please specify.

A.99 All activities of the project have to be included as per the specific outputs they are expected to produce and linked as you rightly note to deliverables and milestones. In the implementation plan just the name of the activity as per 1.7 has to be specified.

Q.100 In the table "project implementation plan", the last column is titled "implementation mode (procurement procedure)". Does this mean that we have to fill in this column only for the activities that involve procurement procedure? If so, what information do you want us to fill in? when exactly will the purchase be done? How are we going to pay? Something else? Please specify.

A.100 Under this column of the Implementation plan the applicant should include how the deliverable will be produced: by PIU (applicant's staff, shopping procedure, i.e. below US \$25,000 or competitive bidding procedure, i.e. above US \$25,000).



Q.101 We would like to know if we have to provide English version of EMMP (Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan - EMMP) in addition to Georgian version?

A.101 Please, check the uploaded document on ISWD website. Among other grants' documents you will find two ESP related templates, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESI) and Mitigation Plan, English and Georgian versions. Please, fill in the templates (English and Georgian) and submit them together with the Full Application at the due date.

Q.102 Unfortunately the file that is on MCA-G-s website regarding the Q&A is probably outdated and the question 3 in this file doesn't tell anything about pre-application agreements. Could you check whether we are talking on the same file? Here is the link of Q&A sessions file on MCA-G website: [http://mcageorgia.ge/cms/kcfinder/upload/files/Q-A\\_file\\_ENG%2009%2009%202015.pdf](http://mcageorgia.ge/cms/kcfinder/upload/files/Q-A_file_ENG%2009%2009%202015.pdf)

A.102 Please, check the following link: [http://www.iswd.ge/uploads/documents/29/FA\\_Q-A\\_file\\_ENG\\_15\\_12\\_2015.pdf](http://www.iswd.ge/uploads/documents/29/FA_Q-A_file_ENG_15_12_2015.pdf). You have been looking at the Q&A file of the concept paper development stage. The Full Application Development Q&A file is different and is at the above link.

Q.103 Should budget estimates include the VAT.

A.103 The project budget should be presented without VAT regardless of whether the amount is below or above US\$ 25,000.

Q.104 The RFP says that the application must be written in Times New Roman, Font -10, however the full application template says, it should be filled in Times New Roman, Font – 12.

A.104 Please, use what is said in the Full Application template. Using Times New Roman, Font – 10 will not be a reason for exclusion as well.

Q.105 If the Full Proposal is awarded, are we allowed to assign international experts directly according to the budget in Annex 9, or will this go through tendering process, when the amount exceeds 25,000 USD?

A.105 In such case Procurement of services have to follow PICG applicable rules and procedures. Brief Terms of Reference for the assignment have to be included in the application package at the stage of the full application submission. If the international experts/organizations are partners at the same time, their services are the part of an applicant's project implementation (and is included in the budget) and their service costs exceed \$25,000 with the appropriate justification, an applicant may procure such service without tender announcement. The ISWD TAT will provide procurement training to applicants awarded a grant and will provide guidance on procurement issues at that stage.



- Q.106        Once we split the work to be done in concrete milestones (Deliverables), which would consist of concrete work-packages, including e.g. procurement and installation of equipment in a workshop, will this be tendered out by MCA, even though it will be part of the Deliverables?
- A.106        Procurement of any works, goods or services has to be broken down as deliverables/ milestones. In case the cost of the deliverable is equal or above US\$25,000 it has to be tendered out by MCAG.
- Q.107        Do we have to provide CV's of Project Manager and other relevant PIU members at this stage (using the CV format included in the Application Form)? What if we don't have a Project Manager identified yet, and we intend to tender out this position? Can we change the Project Manager later? Shall we provide CVs for all the experts, that are expected to be involved in the PIU, at the stage of the full proposal submission?
- A.107        CV's of Project Manager and Financial officer as a minimum have to be provided at the stage of the full proposal submission. In the Grants Operation Manual, the section 3.2.2. indicates that – "The application should consists of the following documents: CVs of the project manager, key project staff, accountant, including specific experience and education of senior workers.". Project Manager as well as other staff and experts can be changed later by applicant or at the request of ISWD TAT or MCA-Georgia. (GOM - 7.2.2 Minor Changes).
- Q.108        In the Grant Application Form, VI. Compliance Assessment Grid, Part II, a space for signature is available. We understood that the Applicant (i.e. us) does NOT need to sign this document. Can you please confirm?
- A.108        The referred to Checklist does not need to be signed by the applicant.
- Q.109        It is our understanding, that the translation into Georgian would include only the Application Form, the Logframe and the Budget. Could you please confirm? Also, some of the documents, like balance sheets and audit reports, will be in Georgian, hundreds of pages, do we need to translate those into English as well, or would just a summary page (in both languages) suffice? If just the summary page is enough, does it need to be notary certified? We are also compiling the list of necessary equipment to be purchased, with relevant specs, etc., in English. Do we need to translate it as well?
- A.109        Yes, the Georgia translation of the Application Form, Logical Framework and Budget need to be provided at the full application submission stage as well as the English translation of excerpts or summaries of documents (in both languages). Translations do not need to be notary certified. List of necessary equipment to be purchased can be provided in English. However, budget annex 9.1, which includes technical specification of equipment items and materials needs to be provided in both languages.





Q.110 There is a requirement of “proof of at least 3-years operation in the local or international market”. How shall we prove that - would a confirmation letter from the head of our organization suffice?

A.110 The “proof of at least 3-years operation in the local or international market” has to be proved by a combination of documents, such as:

- Act of legal establishment;
- Current legal status document or equivalent thereof;
- A confirmation letter from the head of the organization (this alone will not suffice)
- Any contract or agreements with local or international partners proving your organization’s operation in the local or international market in the field of vocational education and development.

Q.111 In the Application Form, namely in the section VI. “Compliance ASSESSMENT GRID”, there is a requirement to provide a copy of the applicants (including lead organization and all partners) latest audited balance sheets for 2013 and 2014. We, as the partner to a Georgian university for this submission, are not able to provide the requested information due to the following reasons: Our organization in Georgia represents a branch. Under the Host Government Agreement (HGA) with the Government of Georgia, we are exempt and not liable for local tax and audit requirements; hence, there is no balance sheet available that we can submit to you. The only thing that is available, is the Act of Comparison of the Revenue Services. We can print this document and affix our seal to it, if you deem this document to be sufficient. We can do the same for the 2014 as well. We can also prepare an explanation letter from our management explaining this issue, on our official letterhead.

A.111 The document and an explanatory letter from the management will suffice at the stage of the full application submission. If there will be a need for further clarifications and/or documents, this will be addressed at the Due Diligence checking as deemed necessary by the Technical Evaluation Panel and ISWD TAT.

Q.112 We have encountered a technical problem - The template CBA file is locked, so we cannot enter information. Could you please let us know how it works?

A.112 CBA file is formulas-formatted so that applicants can't change specific cells, which are essential for template, however applicants can make changes in cells which they need to use to calculate their projects cost-effectiveness. Obviously, applicants tried to insert numbers in wrong cells, otherwise it would have allowed them to insert numbers in appropriate cells to calculate CBA.

Q.113 Can we include a new or replace existing associated partner (an international organization) in the final proposal? If yes, can we include a sub-award (including honoraria, equipment purchase) to this organization in our proposal?

A.113 The RfP does not prohibit the adding to or changing of partners prior to full application submission because it is recognized that there may be circumstances in which this may be necessary. However justification for any changes in the partnership should be provided and such changes should have a neutral effect on the project design and implementation, bearing in mind that the RfP (Section 3.8) states that “The elements, such as main deliverables (outputs) and budget co-financing ratio,



contained in the concept paper cannot be modified in the full application form.” At full application stage a pre-bid partnership agreement(s) has to be provided in English and Georgian clearly describing the project management and partnership arrangements, description of division of roles, inputs by the parties, main functions and responsibilities vis-à-vis project activities and deliverables, partnership representation and representation officer authorization, partnership management seat of office and project office address and communication contact details. Sub-contracting is allowed within the scope of MCC’s procurement rules. Any change in the lead partner (i.e. applicant organization) is not permitted in any circumstances.

**Q.114** We would like to clarify following issue regarding the project selection and evaluation criteria. During the final consultation session (18.12.2015) PEM representative announced that on the final stage of project selection and evaluation process under the same conditions priority will be given to the applicant who is authorized establishment already. We were not informed about that before, moreover this was not stated in any document and was not mentioned during any consultation sessions. Our concept paper was submitted with the following scheme: The Georgian company is a primary applicant. In partnership with US based organization (introducing vocational programs in building information modeling) and a Georgian university. The programs will be implemented on the basis of the University, which is already an authorized establishment. If the condition mentioned above was known to us while submitting the concept paper the East European University would be the lead applicant on behalf of the consortium. According to all above mentioned please clarify whether we need to consider to put forward the authorized education institution as the lead applicant. We will greatly appreciate your prompt response on this matter for us to proceed preparing the application package.

**A.114** The RfP, p. 9, clearly states that “In the case of a consortium (TVET provider partnering with industry/association) the lead applicant should be a TVET provider organization/educational institution.” The fact that the lead applicant (not the partner) should be the authorized institution/organization by the time of signing of grant agreement was mentioned on numerous presentations and was also uploaded as a response to applicants questions. It is written in RFP as a main guiding document for applicants. Please, check our website and get relevant information from the following document: 1. Q &A answer file - question # 74; 2. Q & A presentations delivered on December 18, - slide # 9; 3. Information session presentation delivered on July 23, 24, 28, 29, - slide # 8; 4. Follow up Q & A session presentation delivered on September 9th, - slide # 5; 5. RFP section 2.1.1.

Concerning the project selection and evaluation process, the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) is responsible for applying the evaluation process and criteria in assessing the proposals as specified in the RfP and the grant operations manual. If, hypothetically, two proposals receive the same score and only one of them can be financed within the available funding envelop, the TEP may prefer the one led by authorized TVET provider as it will bear no risk of whether authorization will be received within 3 month after selection for grant award and before signing of a grant agreement.

Decisions as to the composition of the partnership and its leadership are of the competence of the applicants themselves. At the stage of the full application submission, it is not allowed to change lead applicants.