

Government of Bermuda

Ministry of Education

Headquarters

Addenda

For

Education Reform – Strategic Programme & Project Development Plan

Procurement No.: MOE/RFP0821

Issued: Tuesday, August 31, 2021

Submission Deadline: Friday October 01, 2021 04:00:00 PM AST

Addenda No.01

Addenda Type: Questions and Responses / Supplement

The following addendum supersedes information contained in the solicitation document issued for this procurement to the extent referenced. This Addendum forms part of the solicitation documents and will be subject to all of the conditions set out in the contract conditions.

Questions and Reponses to Questions

Question 1:	Will Public Work's technical team be assisting with developing capital estimates?
Answer 1:	The Public Works Team will not be able to provide any technical support. The Team will be looking for assistance in developing the Capital Estimates from the proponents. The key is looking at how the Government can create the infrastructure for the schools. The development of capital estimates will depend on the various options presented. This is more of a business planning exercise for the proponents.

Question 2:	In order for us to better determine the potential financing and procurement options that are available in the current market, are you able to confirm to what extent there will be government capital funds made available? Linked to this are there any defined revenue budget parameters we should be aware of?
Answer 2:	This cannot be confirmed however the Government is committed to Education Reform. Financial options are being requested in the RFP and should be presented based on different creative financial scenarios. For example, it can be assumed that the Government has no funds at all; or the Government can fund 25%, 30% or 50%, etc. There is no revenue generated by the Ministry of Education. The Government does not earmark revenue which not guaranteed if it is based on projections.

Question 3:	Are you able to provide an understanding as to the requirements that would need to be fulfilled in the development of the business case?
Answer 3:	The business case needs to be compelling and capture the quantifiable and non-quantifiable characteristics of this particular project/programme. The business case should be aligned with the Education Reform Vision for Learning. Some of the high notes should include:
	•Strategic Need and Priority
	Is there a clear strategic need aligned to the Educational priorities?
	•Rationale and Timing of Proposal
	What are the consequences of not proceeding with the investment, and why is funding required?
	•Creating Value for Money
	Has a wide range of options been assessed to demonstrate whether or not the investment delivers/considers the best use of money?
	•Clear definition of scope
	Is the scope clearly defined and linked to the Ministry objectives in a way that will enable and deliver the intended benefits?
	•Sound Management of Risks
	Is there a demonstrated depth of knowledge and leadership to manage and respond over the course of 5 to 7 to risks? The PMO will be responsible for this.
	•Delivery Capacity and Capability
	Is there a sufficient appreciation to procure and deliver the project in such a way to realise the claimed benefits at planned phases?
	The requirement would identify phases and benefits of each phase. What resources will most likely be required/by stage phase?
	The Business Case will speak to the PMO being in alignment with this and ensuring the success of many projects.

Question 4:	Is there an indicative capital estimate to deliver the 10 Parish Primary Schools and seven Signature Schools? Do you expect revisions to this capital estimate in that if it were \$X then it would need to be reduced by 10%, 20%, for example
Answer 4:	There is no indicative capital estimate. The RFP is intended to find out what the capital estimate will be. There should be different procurement options and strategies. In the end the Ministry wants to inform Cabinet and the Ministry of Finance that this strategy programme and project development plan will be in the region of \$X. The key is meeting the Education Reform Vision for Learning and using the current Government assets as resources to achieve the vision. There should be some choices on how to achieve the vision.

Question 5:	Are you able to provide any indication of budget that has been set aside for delivery of the services for the specification and the proposed 4 month delivery period?
Answer 5:	The Ministry is not able to provide an indication of the budget set aside for the delivery of the services. The Ministry is moving forward with the approach that there is a need for a programme and project development plan. Therefore, based on the experiences of the proponent the Ministry is asking that the programme and project development plan is mapped out against the vision for learning which is critically important for Education Reform. A road map is needed to show the best path that will achieve the vision with the associated costs which will be considered.

Question 6:	In reference to Appendix D, para 2.2. please can you confirm what assumptions if any we should be making in order to set the Total Allocated Fund (TAF) requirement for the next 6 years? For example, is this assuming solely Government funding?
Answer 6:	The RFP requests that the Proponent provide financial options. So assumptions can be varied in that there is no Government funding or specific funding amounts the Government may able to provide. The proponent should provide creative financial options/solutions.

Question 7:	What is the assumed scheme pipeline over these 6 years? What assumption should be made in regards to mix of capital /revenue budgets?
Answer 7:	The life of the project is not known. The intent is to develop a capital programme that will support the Education Reform Vision for Learning which may extend beyond 6 years.
Question 8:	Recognizing the price template is split into the component parts, is it the intention that you require all 7 components of the specification outlined in Appendix D to be delivered within the proposed 4-month delivery period?
Answer 8:	At this point the 4-month delivery period is fixed. The Ministry needs a programme and project development plan within that time period as there are several dependencies involved.

Question 9:	Are the work packages and time period to deliver fixed or can bidders suggest alternative approaches?
Answer 9:	If there are any practical splits in the 7 components that the proponent can envision as alternative approaches, this can be submitted for consideration.

Question 10:

Is there a proposed time horizon to deliver the 17 new schools?

Is there more insight into the methodology that was leveraged to identify the two signature schools that are already being considered; and should the proponent be using this analysis or assessment information for the future roll out of the other signature schools.

Answer 10:

The Government committed to a 5 to 7 year roll out plan. However, there is the need to look at what is going on inside the school buildings and then consider the idea of new builds and new renovations along with the creative and innovative solutions that will help get to that end point.

The proponent will outline with a business case whether the 5 to 7-year period is practical or is this more like a 10-year project development plan?

The Ministry is on-track to open up two senior signature schools in September 2022 as the two properties have already been identified However there are other signature schools to be brought on-line. So the total number of schools is15. It will be important for the proponent to show what this means for the roll out plan and how schools will be looped in and brought on line. Also, what will be the budget ceilings for each roll out.

A comprehensive infrastructure plan is needed that brings together not just the shovel in the ground but all of the transitions periods, the transition points, the students and the builds that have to along with the work.

The Ministry can give insights into the methodology on some of the analysis that was used in looking at the two current signature schools. The selection was based on several different criteria such as the existing facilities, staffing complement, programmes running within the schools currently that can leverage some of the partnerships. However, the criteria will be unique based on the signature learning programme for each school site. There may be an equity piece across the lines of minimum expectations that will start to differentiate. The insights on the methodology will be provided once the PMO is established.

Question 11:	Are the parties that compiled this document to be retained/consulted for the implementation of future initiatives such as this?
Answer 11:	All of the work being conducted under Education Reform stem from Plan 2022 the strategic vision for public school education. There are specific adaptive and technical strategies that are being executed under Education Reform. The Strategic Plan was not linked to a Consultant, the Government or the Department of Education. It was a Community Driven Plan resulting from thousands of voices in the community stating what they wanted for public school education. The Vision for Learning Document condenses the strategies in Plan 2022 under Priorities 4 & 5. The Ministry team that compiled the Vision for Learning document which is directly linked to Plan 2022 will be available for the implementation of future related initiatives. Plan 2022 can be sourced from the Ministry's website.

Question 12:	Is this vision the approved path forward by the Government of Bermuda?
Answer 12:	Education Reform is a huge initiative but one that is needed for the public school system. The Government's October 2020 Platform speaks to Education Reform and what initiatives have been promised for public schools. The Government has supported the plans at each step of the way and is committed to the Vision.

Question 13:	Are the programme of works required to deliver the new schools likely to be new build solutions or is there an intention to consider refurbishment/reconfiguration?
Answer 13:	The Proponent would provide a business case for each school outlining a new build versus renovations and vice versa, a hybrid approach. The proponent's architectural expertise would be used to asses and propose inclusive of costs. The proposal will be predicated on the Education Reform Vision for Learning in that the Ministry is moving from a 3-tier to a 2-tier system – pages 5 to 10 in Annex C of the RFP.

Question 14:	The Education Reform Vision for Learning has already identified the sites to be retained - are you able to disclose how these schools/sites were identified
Answer 14:	The sites identified were chosen to accommodate the Education Reform Vision for Learning. A Proposal was developed for the Introduction of 10 Parish Primary Schools and presented for consultation with key stakeholders earlier this year. The methodology is clearly outlined on pages 34 to 60 in the Document entitled: "Consultation on a Proposal for the Introduction of Parish Primary Schools." This document can be sourced from the Ministry's website. The sites had to be the best site to accommodate the future Vision for Learning. A second document – The Decision Report – provides for the final decision on what school sites were retained. The Executive Summary in the Report extends pages 6 to 13 and can be found on the Ministry's website.

Question 15:	With regard to developing the specifications and design standards for the minimum expectations of the vision for school facilities, is it anticipated that the consultant will work with Public Works' technical professionals or is the Ministry seeking external technical expertise to be provided?
Answer 15:	The expectation is for the proponent to obtain the architectural design and planning expertise to interpret the vision for education and how it meets the existing estate, that is, the existing schools which will be updated for the most part. The Ministry of Public Works can provide historical information on the plans and drawings for each school and the conditions survey.

Question 16:	In our reading of the Procurement notice and the RFP, we note a slight disconnect between the language specified. For example, the procurement notice speaks of building an infrastructure plan, whereas the RFP APPENDIX D – RFP PARTICULARS has specific sections (5 - 7) speaks about school design and education measurements. Would appreciate some clarification in the preferred path forward.
Answer 16:	The education measures in this context does not include system accountability data points. The Proponents should focus on metrics that are aligned with infrastructure measurements and success factors. This could include, but not be limited to post occupancy data driven reports.

Question 17:	Is there a maximum page limit or word count we should be aware of in developing our response?
Answer 17:	The Ministry cannot say what the page limit or word count is in a response. Proponents are encouraged to provide the responses that best fits the spirit and intent of the question. It is important to understand what the deliverables are which are a bit more detailed than what is listed in the Procurement Notice. There are no maximum or minimum page limits. Be cautioned in providing too much information that is not related.

Supplemental Information – Amendment to Weighting Percentages

Reference Section:	Appendix D-RFP Particulars						
	Section F: RATED CRITERIA						
Supplemental Information:	#	Category	Weighting (%)	Threshold			
	1	Pricing	15	N/A			
	2	Experience and Capability	10	N/A			
	3	Formulation and Design	25	N/A			
	4	Local Benefits (Social, Economic & Environmental)	30	N/A			
	5	Quality Assurance	20	N/A			
	Tota	al Points	100				
Supplemental Information: Reference Section:							
Supplemental Information:							
	<u> </u>						
Reference Section:							
Supplemental Information:							

End of Addenda No. 01