



Millennium Challenge Account Belize

CLARIFICATION NOTICE No. 1

Quality Assurance and Policy Reform

Ref. No: MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007

Issue Date: 28 August 2026

No	Reference of RFA	Question	Answer/Response
1.	--	Could MCA-Belize confirm whether [The entity that requests clarifications], as a United Nations entity, may submit an Offer as lead Offeror under this specific RFP?	MCA-Belize does not make determinations regarding the eligibility of prospective Offerors prior to the submission and evaluation of Offers. Offerors are responsible for reviewing the eligibility requirements set forth in the Request for Offers and determining whether they meet all applicable eligibility criteria. Eligibility will be assessed by MCA-Belize as part of the evaluation process based on the Offer submitted and the requirements established in the Solicitation Document. Accordingly, MCA-Belize is not in a position to provide advance confirmation regarding the eligibility of any specific prospective Offeror.

2.	--	If so, could MCA-Belize please clarify whether the “special arrangements” for contracting with multilateral organizations, including United Nations entities, referenced in <i>Section 4.15 of the MCC Accountable Entity Procurement Policy & Guidelines</i>, may apply to this QCBS procurement? If applicable, could you indicate what contractual, eligibility, certification, liability, privileges and immunities, tax, payment, dispute resolution, and intellectual property/property-related adaptations may be considered for a United Nations entity such as []? In particular, could alternative documentation or wording be accepted for the Beneficial Ownership Disclosure Form, Government-Owned Enterprise Certification Form, Compliance with Sanctions Certification Form, dispute resolution clause, and intellectual property/property provisions?	With respect to the provisions referenced in Section 4.15 of the MCC Accountable Entity Procurement Policy & Guidelines, we clarify that those provisions are not applicable to this procurement already established as a Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS). The referenced provisions relate to arrangements that may be established between MCC, an Accountable Entity such as MCA-Belize, and a multilateral or public sector organization as an alternative to a standard procurement using methods elaborated in MCC’s PPG. . For this competitive procurement, all Offerors will be subject to the same requirements, evaluation criteria, and contractual conditions specified in the Solicitation Document, consistent with the principles of fairness, equal treatment, transparency, and competition.
3.	--	We would also like to formally request an Organizational Conflict of Interest determination regarding the potential participation of Dr. Neulin Villanueva as Team Lead in a proposal for this consultancy. Dr. Villanueva has informed us that, as part of a previous assignment with MCA-Belize, she served as an independent consultant responsible for drafting the Terms of Reference for this consultancy. Given this prior involvement, we wish to ensure full compliance with MCC procurement rules and avoid any actual or perceived unfair advantage. We therefore respectfully request a written determination confirming whether her participation as Team Lead would be permissible, and whether MCA-Belize considers her prior role to create an actual or perceived conflict of interest.	MCA-Belize appreciates the prospective Offeror's proactive disclosure of a potential conflict of interest and its efforts to ensure compliance with the applicable procurement requirements set forth in ITO 5.10. In keeping with the framework established in the Solicitation Document, MCA-Belize does not issue advance determinations regarding the eligibility of proposed personnel or the existence of actual or potential conflicts of interest prior to the submission and evaluation of Offers. Offerors are responsible for reviewing the relevant provisions of the Solicitation Document, Section I Instructions to Offerors, 5 Eligible Consultants, Conflict of Interest, 5.8 and 5.9, including those relating to eligibility, conflicts of interest, and unfair competitive advantage, and for assessing the applicability of such provisions to their proposed personnel. Any matters relating to eligibility or potential conflicts of interest will be considered, as applicable, during the

			evaluation of Offers based on the information submitted and the requirements of the Solicitation Document. In the interest of ensuring transparency, objectivity, and the usefulness of this clarification for all prospective Offerors, MCA-Belize hereby confirms that the individual referenced in the request for clarification participated in the preparation and review of the Terms of Reference for the present procurement process. This information is being disclosed to all Offerors to ensure equal access to relevant information and to support the integrity and fairness of the procurement process. We encourage prospective offerors to avoid any potential or actual conflict of interest.
4.	--	We understand that the “Form TECH-11, Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Proposed Key Professional” is to be used only for experts whose CVs will be evaluated under Criterion 3, namely the “Team Leader / Education Quality Assurance and Systems Reform Expert” and the “Education Data, Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Specialist.” Could you confirm that we have understood this correctly?	MCA-Belize confirms that Form TECH-11 Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Proposed Key Personnel applies only to the Key Personnel described in Section III Qualification and Evaluation Criteria, 3. Key Personnel Qualifications and Experience, and shall be included in the offer.
5.	Page 41	Solicitation Reference: MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007 Page Number: 41 Relevant Solicitation Language: ii. Work Plan The Offeror shall present a detailed work plan demonstrating how the Services will be implemented during the 68-week Base Period of Performance. The work plan should include, at a minimum: • Sequence of activities and major implementation phases including all deliverables. • Logical sequencing of activities and deliverables. • Timeline identifying key milestones. • Coordination arrangements with MCA-Belize, the MoECST, and other stakeholders.	Yes. MCA-Belize confirms that Offerors may provide a concise, high-level narrative in Form TECH-6 and cross-reference Forms TECH-8, TECH-9, and TECH-10 for the detailed staffing tables, schedules, bar charts, and work plan graphics, provided that Form TECH-6 adequately addresses the required evaluation criteria. Form TECH-6 should present the Offeror's overall technical approach, methodology, work plan, organization, and staffing strategy in narrative form, while Forms TECH-8, TECH-9, and TECH-10 may be used to provide the detailed supporting schedules, personnel allocations, and graphical presentations. Cross-references should be clear and specific. The twenty (20)-page limit applies only to Form TECH-6, as stated in the RFP.

		• Proposed schedule for consultations, validation workshops, pilot implementation, training, and delivery of final outputs. • Identification of key assumptions, dependencies, and mitigation measures. iii. Organization and Staffing The Offeror shall describe how the assignment will be organized and managed. At a minimum, the Offeror shall provide: • An organizational structure (organigram) for the proposed assignment. • Reporting relationships among team members. • Roles and responsibilities of each proposed Key Expert and supporting personnel. • Allocation of personnel across the major tasks and deliverables. The Technical Offer shall not exceed twenty (20) pages for Form TECH-6, including charts, diagrams, organigrams, tables, and work plan graphics. Question: Form TECH-6 requires the Offeror to provide an allocation of personnel, reporting relationships, and a timeline of key milestones and deliverables. Forms TECH-8, TECH-9, and TECH-10 require the submission of specific tables and bar charts detailing team composition, staffing schedules, and work schedules. To avoid redundancy and ensure optimal use of the page allocation, can MCA-Belize confirm if Offerors may provide a high-level narrative in Form TECH-6 and cross-reference Forms TECH-8, TECH-9, and TECH-10 for the detailed graphics and tables?	
6.	Page 68	2. Solicitation Reference: MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007 Page Number: p. 68 Relevant Solicitation Language: The Consultant will support the improvement of data quality across the education system to ensure that the EQA	The Data Quality Review Report is not available for distribution. Offerors should prepare their offers based on the requirements and information provided in the RFO.

		Framework is underpinned by accurate, consistent, timely, and transparent data. This will include strengthening data collection, validation, reporting, and use within BEMIS and related systems, in alignment with findings from the Data Quality Review Report and MCC data quality standards. QUESTION: Can MCA-Belize please provide a copy of the Data Quality Review Report?	
7.	Page 71	3. Solicitation Reference: MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007 Page Number: 71 Relevant Solicitation Language: Component 4: Reform of Licensing, Appraisal, and Career Pathways Under this component, the Consultant will provide technical assistance to the MoECST to reform policies and regulations governing the licensing, hiring, appraisal, promotion, and certification of teachers, and school leaders. These reforms will be aligned with the provisions of the proposed Education Act 2026 and informed by consultations with relevant education stakeholders, including representative organizations of teachers, school leaders, and Managing Authorities. QUESTION: In the TOR, Component 4 articulates reforms of licensing, appraisal and career pathways – aligned to deliverable ix. Draft Licensing and Career Reform Policy and Regulatory Package. In the evaluation criteria for the technical approach, methodology and work plan on pages 11-12, licensing, appraisal and career pathways are not mentioned. Can MCA-Belize please clarify how the technical approach to Component 4 will be evaluated?	Component 4 is part of the overall Scope of Services and is reflected in Deliverable (ix), Draft Licensing and Career Reform Policy and Regulatory Package. Offerors are expected to address their proposed approach to Component 4 within their overall technical approach, methodology, and work plan presented in Form TECH-6. The evaluation of Component 4 will not be conducted as a separate scored sub-criterion. Rather, MCA-Belize will consider the adequacy, coherence, and feasibility of the proposed approach to licensing, appraisal, and career pathway reforms as part of its assessment of the overall Technical Approach, Methodology, and Work Plan, including the Offeror's understanding of the Terms of Reference and its approach to delivering all required components and deliverables.
8.	--	Would MCC kindly consider extending the deadline to ensure Offerors have sufficient time to properly digest and incorporate critical information from	The Offer Submission Deadline has been extended. Please refer to Addendum No. 1 to the RFO.

		MCC's responses to submitted questions from Offerors?	
9.	--	Please clarify whether a Cover Page, Table of Contents and Acronyms List may be included in the proposal and excluded from the stated page limits.	We confirm that cover page, acronyms lists and table of contents are not included in the page limit.
10.	--	May Offerors use smaller than 12 point font for graphics, tables and charts, diagrams and figures, as long as readability is maintained?	The solicitation document does not establish any restrictions regarding font type, font size, or graphic design elements for the preparation of proposals. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that their submissions are clear, legible, and professionally presented. Proposals may be formatted in the manner that offerors consider most appropriate, provided that all required information is included, and readability is maintained.
11.	--	Is there a page limit for CVs?	According to Form TECH-11, page limit is not required.
12.	Page 86	On page 86 of the RFP: Can MCC please clarify by what it means by this sentence, <i>"Experience shall be evidenced through submitted reports, frameworks, methodologies, or similar deliverables produced by the proposed expert?"</i> Should these be listed as examples in candidates' CVs; should the Offeror include attachments to the CVs with examples of previously prepared deliverables; or are these simply examples of the types of deliverables expected of the successful candidates?	The requirement does not obligate Offerors to submit copies of reports, frameworks, methodologies, or other deliverables prepared by the proposed experts under previous assignments. Offerors should list and briefly describe the relevant assignments and outputs prepared by the proposed experts in a manner that clearly demonstrates experience in services similar to those specified under the evaluation criterion. The reference to reports, frameworks, methodologies, or similar deliverables is intended as evidence of the type of work and expertise that should be reflected in the expert's qualifications and experience. MCA-Belize reserves the right to request additional information or clarification regarding the qualifications and experience of any proposed expert whenever deemed necessary during the evaluation process.
13.	--	Please kindly confirm that the budget should be for Base Services of 68 weeks only.	MCA-Belize confirms that the estimated budget of USD 2,300,000 is for the Base Services.

14.	TECH-9 and TECH-10	Form TECH-9 and TECH-10 Clarification: The Terms of Reference identify a Base Period of Performance of 68 weeks. However, the sample TECH-9 Staffing Schedule and TECH-10 Work and Deliverables Schedule provided in the RFP appear to be formatted in a 12-month period only. Should Offerors expand these forms to reflect the entire 96-week Period of Performance, or should the forms be completed using the 12-month format included in the RFP? If the forms are to be expanded, are Offerors permitted to modify the format as necessary to accurately reflect the full Period of Performance?	Offerors are required to submit a complete staffing and deliverables schedule covering the entire Period of Performance of the Consultancy (68 Weeks). While the schedules should include, at a minimum, the information suggested in the forms, Offerors may adapt or modify the format as they deem appropriate to clearly present their proposed implementation schedule.
15.	--	While Optional Services shall only be authorized through a formal Contract Amendment, should Offerors speak to their capacity to provide these potential Optional Services in TECHs 4 and 6, or should they only speak to those required for provision of the Base Services?	Optional Services will not be evaluated. If Optional Services are required, the corresponding proposal, negotiations, and evaluation will be conducted solely with the selected Consultant.
16.	--	Has MCC pre-approved the non-competitive method for approving the potential Optional Services contracts or will MCA Belize have to go through High Level Review for each potential Optional Services contract?	Should Optional Services be required, MCA-Belize will obtain all necessary approvals in accordance with the applicable requirements before exercising or authorizing such services.
17.	--	Deliverables, Acceptance, and Payment Schedule Clarification under CGG 17.3: The RFP states that payments are tied to MCA-Belize's written acceptance of deliverables and that deliverable due dates are calculated from the Contract Commencement/Effective Date, regardless of the timing of review or acceptance of prior deliverables. Given that certain activities under the Scope of Services may require input, review, approvals, decisions, data, access, or other actions from MCA-Belize, MCC, the Ministry, or other stakeholders, please clarify: a. Approximately how many stakeholder organizations and reviewing parties are expected	Reviewing parties The main institutional reviewers are expected to be MCA-Belize, MoECST, and MCC, where applicable. MCA-Belize is the formal acceptance authority and will serve as the Consultant's primary point of contact. Other stakeholders identified in the ToR will participate mainly through consultations, validation workshops, and piloting rather than as separate approving authorities. a. Adjustment of deadlines and payment milestones Adjustments will not be automatic. The ToR states that all due dates are cumulative and calculated from the Contract Commencement/Effective Date. If a delay is demonstrably caused by an outstanding

		to participate in the review and approval process for consultant deliverables? b. If a deliverable is delayed, revised, or cannot be finalized due to the absence of required actions, approvals, information, feedback, or decisions from MCA-Belize, MCC, MoECST, or other government stakeholders, will the corresponding deliverable due dates and payment milestones be adjusted accordingly? c. In situations where the Consultant has completed the required work and submitted the deliverable on time, but acceptance is delayed due to stakeholder review timelines, requests for input, or dependencies outside the Consultant's control, how will such delays affect payment eligibility and overall contract performance timelines? d. Is there a mechanism under the contract for extending deliverable deadlines and associated payment milestones when delays are attributable to government or stakeholder actions rather than Consultant performance? The purpose of this question is to better understand how schedule and payment risks will be managed when successful completion of a deliverable is dependent on actions or approvals from parties other than the Consultant.	action, approval, decision, information, or access required from MCA-Belize, MCC, MoECST, or another government stakeholder, the Consultant should promptly notify MCA-Belize in writing and explain the impact. MCA-Belize will assess whether an adjustment is justified and, if approved, document it in writing in accordance with the Contract. b. Delayed acceptance and payment eligibility The ToR allows 10 business days for MCA-Belize to accept a draft deliverable, raise concerns, or provide comments. The Consultant then has five business days to address the comments. Payment remains subject to MCA-Belize's written acceptance. However, if a complete and compliant deliverable was submitted on time and acceptance is delayed solely because of stakeholder review timelines, the delay should not be treated as Consultant non-performance. Any impact on subsequent timelines will be assessed and addressed through the applicable contractual process. c. Mechanism for extensions The ToR allows the 68-week Base Period of Performance to be extended in accordance with the Contract. The Consultant must submit a timely written request identifying the cause of the delay, its effect on the work plan, mitigation measures taken, and the proposed revised deadline. Any extension or adjustment to a payment milestone must be formally approved in writing. Until approved, the existing contractual deadlines remain in effect.
--	--	---	--

18.	--	While reviewing the solicitation documents for the following procurements, we noted that both indicate the same estimated budget of USD 2,300,000 under ITO 12.4(c): · MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007 – Quality Assurance and Policy Reform · MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3008 – TVET Technical Support Consultancy Could you please confirm whether the estimated budget of USD 2,300,000 is correct for each procurement?	MCA-Belize confirms that the estimation indicated in the RFOs for both consultancies are correct.
19.	--	We would also appreciate clarification regarding participation in both procurements. Could you please confirm whether the same firm may participate as a joint venture or consortium member in both procurements as part of a different consortium for each assignment, provided that it participates in only one offer per procurement?	Procurements MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3007 and MCA-B/EDU/QCBS/26/3008 are independent procurement processes. There is no restriction preventing a firm from participating in both procurements, whether individually or as a member of a joint venture, consortium, or association, provided that it submits only one offer per procurement. Offerors are advised to refer to Clause 5 (Conflict of Interest) of the Instructions to Offerors to ensure they are fully informed of any actual or potential conflict of interest situations that may apply.
20.	--	The ToR indicate that the Quality Assurance and Policy Reform Consultant will collaborate with the implementing partner(s) of Sub-Activity 1.2 – Equipping Educators. We also understand that certain prospective organizations for Sub-Activity 1.2 may have previously participated in a Program Partnership Solicitation process and subsequent co-creation and/or co-design activities with MCA-Belize, MCC, MoECST and other education-sector stakeholders. In this context, and in accordance with the conflict-of-interest requirements set out in ITO 5.8 and 5.9, could MCA-Belize please clarify the following: Eligibility: Whether an organization that participated in the Program Partnership Solicitation and/or subsequent co-creation or co-design process for Sub-	Eligibility The ToR does not automatically exclude an organization that previously participated in the Program Partnership Solicitation or related co-creation or co-design activities for Sub-Activity 1.2. The ToR anticipates coordination between the Quality Assurance and Policy Reform Consultant and the implementing partner(s) for Sub-Activity 1.2.

		Activity 1.2 is eligible to submit an Offer for the present Quality Assurance and Policy Reform assignment, whether as a single entity, a member of a Joint Venture, or a Sub-Consultant.	
21.	--	Conflict of interest / competitive advantage: Whether MCA-Belize has determined that such prior participation does not constitute a conflict of interest or create an actual or potential unfair competitive advantage arising, for example, from access to non-public information, stakeholder consultations, institutional assessments, program design discussions, or other information that may be relevant to the preparation of an Offer for the present assignment.	Such an organization may therefore submit an Offer as a single entity, Joint Venture member, or Sub-Consultant, subject to ITO 5.8 and 5.9. The organization must disclose any actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest, including access to non-public information or involvement that may provide an unfair competitive advantage. MCA-Belize will assess each situation individually. Where a conflict cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, the organization may be deemed ineligible.
22.	--	Equal access to information: If such organizations are considered eligible, whether all information arising from the Sub-Activity 1.2 solicitation and subsequent co-creation/co-design process that could reasonably be relevant to the preparation of Offers under the present RFP has been, or will be, made equally available to all prospective Offerors. Where MCA-Belize determines that prior participation may give rise to a potential conflict of interest but that such conflict can be mitigated, we would also appreciate clarification regarding the applicable mitigation measures, including whether such measures would require approval by MCA-Belize and MCC's no-objection in accordance with the provisions of the RFP.	Based solely on the ToR, prior participation in the Program Partnership Solicitation or related co-design activities does not expressly disqualify an organization from submitting an Offer. The ToR requires the Consultant to work closely with the implementing partner(s) for Sub-Activity 1.2 to ensure aligned processes. However, the ToR does not establish specific eligibility or conflict-of-interest requirements. Eligibility must therefore be determined separately under ITO 5.8 and 5.9 and the other applicable provisions of the RFP.

23.	--	Is the Consultant expected only to specify the EQA information system under Component 2B, or also to develop, host or license any part of it? The ToR requires specifications that "provide sufficient detail to support the preparation of technical bidding documents and subsequent system development", which reads as specify-only — please confirm that system development is a separate future procurement.	Yes. Under the Base Services, the Consultant is expected to: • Conduct the system needs assessment; • Recommend either a standalone QAMIS interoperable with BEMIS or a customized EQA module within BEMIS; and • Prepare detailed functional and technical specifications sufficient to support bidding documents and subsequent system development. The ToR does not require the Consultant to develop, configure, host, license, operate, or maintain the system. System development is therefore expected to be addressed through a separate future procurement or contractual arrangement. If activated by MCA-Belize, Optional Service 1 may require the Consultant to prepare technical bidding documents and assist with procurement clarifications; however, it does not include actual system development.
24.	--	Would MCA consider an existing, proven analytics and reporting platform as an acceptable route to the dashboard, analytics and reporting requirements in Components 2B and 2C, or must all functionality be delivered within BEMIS/OpenEMIS?	Yes. The ToR permits either: • A standalone QAMIS that is interoperable with BEMIS; or • A customized EQA module within BEMIS. Therefore, an existing, proven analytics and reporting platform may be considered, provided the needs assessment demonstrates that it meets the functional, technical, data-governance, security, reporting, and sustainability requirements. All functionality does not have to reside within BEMIS/OpenEMIS. However, the proposed platform must integrate or interoperate with core BEMIS functions and, where relevant, other education data systems such as INSAMS. The final recommendation should be technically justified and approved by MCA-Belize and MoECST.

25.	--	ToR 3.4 states that all outputs become MoECST property. Please confirm this applies only to deliverables created under the Contract and does not extend to the Consultant's or a sub-consultant's pre-existing methodologies, statistical models, software or licensed products. Will MCA accept a background-IP carve-out with a perpetual licence to MoECST for the outputs?	ToR 3.4 applies to outputs developed under the consultancy. It does not expressly transfer ownership of a Consultant's or Sub-Consultant's pre-existing methodologies, models, software, or licensed products. However, the ToR does not specifically provide for a background-IP carve-out. MCA-Belize may consider such a provision during contracting, provided that: • All background and third-party intellectual property is disclosed; • MoECST receives a perpetual, royalty-free licence sufficient to use, reproduce, modify, maintain, and further develop the contracted outputs; and • No licensing restriction limits MoECST's full and sustainable use of the EQA system outputs. Any carve-out and associated license terms must be agreed in writing and incorporated into the Contract, subject to Procurement/Legal review.
26.	--	Which datasets will the Consultant be given access to (NSAS results, BEMIS, INSAMS), at what level of identifiability, under what agreement, and with what restrictions? Specifically: may pupil-level data be processed or hosted outside Belize?	The ToR anticipates the use of relevant data from BEMIS, NSAS and, where applicable, INSAMS. However, it does not specify the exact datasets, level of identifiability, access arrangements, or hosting location. These matters will be determined through the system needs assessment and the data-governance protocols developed with MoECST and MCC. Access will be limited to data necessary for the assignment and subject to applicable data-sharing or data-processing agreements, defined user-access levels, confidentiality requirements, security controls, and national education-sector data-protection requirements. The Consultant should not assume that identifiable pupil-level data may be processed or hosted outside Belize. Any cross-border processing or hosting would require prior written authorization, an appropriate legal and security assessment, and contractual safeguards approved by MoECST, MCA-Belize and/or MCC, as applicable. Where possible, de-identified or aggregated data should be used.

27.	--	Which national and education-sector data protection requirements apply to this work, and is there an existing MoECST data-sharing or data-processing agreement that the Consultant would be expected to sign?	The ToR requires compliance with national and education-sector data-protection requirements but does not identify the specific legal instruments or confirm whether MoECST currently has a standard data-sharing or data-processing agreement. These requirements and any applicable agreement will be confirmed with MoECST during inception. The Consultant will be required to execute any necessary agreement before accessing personal or restricted data.
28.	--	Is there a persistent and fully unique pupil identifier used consistently across BEMIS and INSAMS?	The ToR does not confirm whether a persistent, fully unique pupil identifier is used consistently across BEMIS and INSAMS. The Consultant will be expected to assess this during the system needs assessment, document any identifier or data-matching limitations, and recommend appropriate interoperability and data-quality measures.
29.	--	Which grades and subjects are currently tested annually under NSAS, how are results returned and stored, and what proportion of pupils are covered?	Based on the Compact, NSAS will be applied to students at Standard 1, 4, and 6 at the primary level and all four forms at the secondary level in Language and Mathematics. The subject areas are Math, English, Science and Technology, and Belizean Studies. Offerors should note that the NSAS is a new activity that is currently in the pilot stage. Successful consultants will be briefed on procedures once finalized.
30.	--	How many primary and secondary schools are in scope, and approximately how many pupils per year group cohort?	The ToR does not provide the total number of primary and secondary schools or the approximate number of pupils in each year-group cohort. For the pilot, the Consultant must include at least: • 24 primary schools; and • 12 secondary schools. These schools must represent all six administrative districts, different management types, and both rural and urban locations. The final EQA Framework is intended for national application across the primary and secondary education sectors. Updated

			school and pupil numbers will be provided or confirmed with MoECST during the Inception Phase and pilot-sampling process.
31.	--	Are there any restrictions on the use of subcontractors for key technical components?	The ToR does not expressly prohibit or restrict the use of Sub-Consultants for technical components. However, the lead Consultant remains responsible for all services, deliverables, coordination, and quality assurance.
32.	--	Are there any mandatory requirements for joint ventures, consortiums or lead partners that are not already specified in the RFP?	Please note that all aspects of the present procurement process are governed by the provisions set out in the Request for Offers (RFO) document, including all applicable policies and requirements contained therein. This includes, without limitation, the Accountable Entity Procurement Policy and Guidelines, the reference and link to which are provided in Section A – General of the Instructions to Offerors (ITO), under Clause 1.1, Definition (y). Accordingly, offerors are expected to comply with all provisions, policies, procedures, and requirements established in the RFO and the referenced procurement framework documents.
33.	--	Can a proposed key expert fulfil multiple expert roles where qualifications and availability permit?	No. A proposed Key Expert may not fulfil multiple expert roles. MCA-Belize expects each Key Expert to be fully dedicated to the role for which they are proposed, ensuring the most effective staffing arrangement and minimizing the risk of future conflicts, competing commitments, or availability constraints that could affect contract performance.
34.	--	Are there any nationality, residency or location requirements for non-resident key experts beyond those stated in the ToR?	There are no additional requirements of nationality, residency, or location for non-resident key experts beyond those stated in the ToR.
35.	--	Is prior MCC contract experience mandatory or desirable?	Previous MCC contract experience is not mandatory.
36.	--	Will equivalent donor-funded experience (World Bank, IDB, USAID, FCDO, etc.) be considered equivalent where MCC experience is limited?	Equivalent relevant donor-funded experience will be considered in accordance with the RFO evaluation criteria.

37.	--	Does MCA-Belize have a preferred approach between a standalone QAMIS solution and a BEMIS-integrated solution?	The ToR does not establish a preferred option. The Consultant is expected to assess and recommend the most appropriate approach: • A standalone QAMIS interoperable with BEMIS; or • A customized EQA module integrated within BEMIS. The recommendation should be based on the needs assessment and considerations such as functionality, interoperability, data governance, security, sustainability, cost, and MoECST's capacity to operate and maintain the system. Any proposed solution must integrate with or be interoperable with core BEMIS functions and, where relevant, INSAMS.
38.	--	Are there any preferred technologies, hosting arrangements or interoperability standards that must be used?	No. There are no preferred technologies, hosting arrangements, or interoperability standards prescribed for this assignment. Offerors are encouraged to collaborate with the Ministry of Education on proposed technologies, solutions they consider most appropriate, to ensure compatibility and alignment with BEMIS.
39.	--	Can MCA-Belize provide: 1 The Belize Education Data Qualifications Assessment Report 2019? 2 The latest draft Education Act? 3 School-level enrolment, attainment and performance data? 4 Existing BEMIS/OpenEMIS documentation?	Belize's Education Act is currently going through the required legislative process. MCA is unaware of any issue that may hinder the Act's progress at this time and therefore remains confident that the Act shall be enacted by end of September 2026. MCA is, however, not authorized to release any version of the proposed legislation at this time. It is the expectation that once enacted, the Act will be published and available to all. Similarly, MCA-Belize is not in possession of the other requested documents. It is expected that these documents will be available in time for the consultant's drafting of the inception report.
40.	--	Which quality assurance tools, inspection frameworks, supervision processes or school evaluation documentation already exist and should be incorporated into the assignment?	The ToR does not identify specific existing tools or document to be incorporated. The consultants are advised to propose the quality assurance tools, frameworks, processes, etc. Relevant to the assignment.

41.	--	What weighting should be given to: 1 Quality assurance system design? 2 School improvement? 3 Data systems and EMIS integration? 4 Policy and licensing reform?	The ToR does not prescribe separate weightings for these four technical areas. Offerors should propose an appropriate allocation of expertise and level of effort based on their methodology and work plan.
42.	--	Are suppliers currently active on the National Student Assessment System eligible to work on the QA project as a prime-contractor, sub-contracted to another supplier, or JV partner with another supplier?	The ToR does not expressly exclude suppliers currently working on the National Student Assessment System from participating as a prime Consultant, Sub-Consultant, or Joint Venture partner. Eligibility will be determined under the RFP's conflict-of-interest provisions. Any participating supplier must disclose its current NSAS role and any actual, potential, or perceived conflict, including access to non-public information or circumstances that could create an unfair competitive advantage. MCA-Belize will assess each case individually. Participation may be permitted where no conflict exists or where it can be adequately mitigated.
43.	--	Can Belize projects in set-up stage be included as references?	Only completed or substantially completed projects will be considered, in accordance with the applicable evaluation criteria.
44.	--	What is the anticipated start date given the 120-day bid validity period?	The estimation is to sign the contract within the offer validity period, approximately between December 2026 – January 2027.
45.	--	Can MCA-Belize please answer the following questions below regarding the EMIS Key Personnel role: a. Is the role expected to be full-time or part-time? b. How much time is the candidate expected to be in Belize? c. If the role is expected to be full-time, can applicants propose to shift an expat staff to part-time as the role transitions to a local staff?	The Key Personnel is expected to be full-time in-country for the duration of this contract/base period.

46.	--	Is any international travel expected for either of the Key Personnel roles?	No international travel outside Belize is currently anticipated for either of the two full-time Key Personnel roles. Both personnel are expected to reside in Belize for the duration of the Base Services, and the principal activities—including consultations, meetings, training and fieldwork—will be conducted in Belize. Any international travel required to mobilize or demobilize foreign personnel, or otherwise necessary to fulfil the assignment, should be included in the fully loaded prices submitted in the Financial Offer.
47.	--	The RFP refers to Form FIN-2 Price Summary which states that the person-month rates are fully loaded prices (including any international travel, communication, local transportation, office expenses, shipment of personal effects, direct and indirect costs, all required insurances, overhead, profits and any other expenses required to carry out the assignment successfully as per Terms of Reference and Conditions of Contract). In quarterly reports, will the Offeror have to provide a breakdown of all the costs associated with the deliverable including indirect costs?	No. The Quarterly Reports are intended to provide progress updates, including performance against agreed indicators, actual monitoring data, relevant source documentation, and explanations for any deviations from targets, as specified in Section 4 of the Terms of Reference. This is a fixed-price contract, and payments will be made as fixed amounts assigned to each deliverable, following MCA-Belize's written acceptance. The fully loaded rates submitted in Forms FIN-2 and FIN-3 cover all direct and indirect costs, overhead, profit, travel, insurance, and other expenses required to complete the assignment. Therefore, the Consultant will not be required to provide a detailed breakdown of these costs, including indirect costs, in each Quarterly Report. However, the Consultant must maintain appropriate supporting records and provide any financial documentation that may be separately required under the Contract, applicable invoicing procedures, or audit requirements.
48.	Section III.A	Solicitation Reference: Section III.A.4, Table 2; Form TECH-11; Page Number: 47 Relevant Solicitation Language: Form TECH-11. Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Proposed Key Professional Personnel Question: Can MCA-Belize confirm that CVs are only required for the two key	According to Section I Instructions to Offerors (ITO), C. Preparation of Offers, Technical and Financial Offer Format and Content, 12.5 (l), CVs of the Key Personnel signed by the staff themselves according to Form TECH-11 are the required Curriculum Vitae.

		personnel positions evaluated in Section III (Team Leader / Education Quality Assurance and Systems Reform Expert; and Education Data, Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Specialist)?	
49.	TECH-4	Solicitation Reference: Form TECH-4 Page Number: 38 Relevant Solicitation Language: References [provide reference letter from client]: Question: Many Offerors possess highly relevant, large-scale education reform past performance funded by agencies that have recently been reorganized or dissolved—such as USAID. Because these entities no longer exist in their previous operational structures, obtaining new, formal reference letters from the client is very challenging. Can MCA-Belize please confirm that reference letters are not required with the initial proposal submission in Form TECH-4, and that providing alternative official documentation (such as historical past performance evaluations/CPARS or project closeout documentation) or former client contact information will be deemed sufficient to substantiate our claimed experience?	Offerors shall comply with the requirements of Form TECH-4. Where a client reference letter cannot reasonably be obtained because the client organization has been dissolved or reorganized, the Offeror may submit equivalent official documentation, together with an explanation and available client contact details. MCA-Belize will assess the evidence submitted and reserves the right to independently verify the claimed experience.
50.	--	Solicitation Reference: Form FIN-2 and FIN-3 Page Number: 60-61 Relevant Solicitation Language: “including... all required insurances” Question: In order to properly budget for all necessary insurance costs, can MCA-Belize please confirm if the Belize compact contained reference to Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance ((48 CFR) FAR 52.228-3) that would flow down to the Contractor on this opportunity?	Defense Base Act (DBA) insurance is not specified as a requirement under this RFO. Offerors shall provide for the insurance requirements stated in GCC 36.1 and any insurance required by applicable law.

51.	--	1. Solicitation Reference: Section v. (TOR), 7. Staffing Page Number: 79 Relevant Solicitation Language: “The Team Leader / Education Quality Assurance and Systems Reform Expert and the Education Data, Monitoring, and Quality Assurance Specialist shall be full-time and resident in Belize for the duration of the Period of Performance of the Base Services.” Question: Can MCA confirm that 'full time' includes long term consultants working flexible days and hours who are present in Belize for the duration of the contract?	For purposes of proposal preparation, the term "full-time" means that the Key Personnel shall be assigned exclusively to the Project and shall reside in Belize throughout the duration of the consultancy, subject to satisfactory performance.
-----	----	---	---

These clarifications are issued for interpretative purposes only and do not constitute an amendment to the RFO document. All terms and conditions remain unchanged.