Questions / Clarifications raised and provided Answers

Tender Reference: BEL23010-10032

Tender Title: *Consultancy for Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda*.

No	Questions raised / Clarification requests	Answers / Clarifications
1	Dear Members of the Tender Committee, We hope this message finds you well. We are pleased to confirm its interest in the above-referenced tender and is currently finalising its bid. We respectfully request a short extension of the submission deadline, currently set for 6 November 2026 at 16:00 (Kigali Time). Some of the required administrative documents have been requested from the issuing institutions but have not yet been received, despite timely application on our part. An extension of 5 working days would allow us to submit a complete and fully compliant bid. We would be grateful for your favourable consideration of this request and remain available should you require any further information. Thank you for your understanding and support. Kind regards,	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites.

2.	Dear Sir/Madam, Greetings! This is with reference to the tender "Consultancy for Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda" (Tender Reference No. BEL23010-10032). We kindly request an extension of the proposal submission deadline from 6 November 2026 to 18 November 2026. The additional time would enable us to appropriately incorporate the tender requirements and clarifications and submit a comprehensive proposal. We would be grateful for your kind consideration of our request and look forward to your response. Regards,	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites.
3.	**Request for an extension of the submission deadline** The tender requires an original paper copy delivered in Kigali, with every page numbered and signed. For international bidders, this means the complete signed original has to be finalised and couriered from Europe several working days before 6 November, which considerably shortens the time available to prepare the technical and financial proposal. We would therefore kindly ask whether Enabel could consider extending the submission deadline by two weeks. **First clarification questions** While our experts review the Terms of Reference, we would be grateful for your guidance on the following points:	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites.

	1. Budget: Is there a ceiling or maximum available budget for this contract? If so, please confirm whether it includes all taxes (withholding tax and VAT).	1. No maximum budget has been set for this assignment. Tenderers are expected to determine the value of their financial proposal based on their proposed methodology, staffing arrangements, level of effort, and all activities required to successfully deliver the assignment. As provided under Clauses 7.1 and 8.1 of the Tender Document, the contract is a mixed-price contract comprising expert fees and reimbursable costs. Financial proposals will be evaluated based on the total price submitted. Tenderers shall include all applicable charges and taxes in accordance with Rwandan legislation, while VAT must be indicated separately where applicable, and any applicable Withholding Tax (WHT) should be clearly specified in the financial proposal.
	2. Fieldwork costs: The price form lists only international travel and visas as reimbursable costs. May the costs of field data collection (e.g. enumerators, in-country transport and survey logistics) be included under the reimbursable costs, or must they be built into the experts' daily fees?	2. In accordance with Clauses 7.1 and 8.3 of the Tender Document, field data collection costs (e.g., enumerators, in-country transport, and survey logistics) shall not be presented as reimbursable costs. These costs must be incorporated into the unit rates which are expected to cover all costs, measures and charges related to the performance of the contract. Only international travel costs and visa-related expenses, where applicable may be included under the reimbursable costs' component. Tenderers are therefore expected to ensure that all fieldwork and local implementation costs are fully reflected in their technical and financial proposals.

	3. Validation workshops: Will the venue for the stakeholder validation workshop(s) be provided by Enabel or by the Government counterparts, or should the tenderer budget for venue and related costs? We will send a further set of clarification questions shortly, once we have consolidated our experts' comments, and in any case before the deadline set in clause 3.2. Thank you in advance for your assistance. We would be grateful if you could kindly confirm receipt of this email. Kind regards,	3. As the Tender Document does not explicitly specify responsibility for providing or financing the venue and related logistics for the deliverable validation workshop(s), nor indicate the anticipated number of such workshops, these arrangements will be coordinated and supported by the Client. Therefore, tenderers are not required to budget for venue hire, catering, or other logistics specifically related to the validation of contractual deliverables in their financial proposals. However, all costs associated with the implementation of the assignment, including data collection activities, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, stakeholder consultations, field missions, and any other workshops or meetings organized by the service provider as part of the methodology, shall remain the responsibility of the tenderer and must be duly reflected in the financial proposal.
	Dear Enabel Team, I hope you are doing well. We are writing to request clarifications regarding the **BEL23010-10032** **Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda** Below are the clarifications we would like to make: 1. Minimum Fieldwork Requirements: Could Enabel confirm whether there are anticipated minimum requirements for household survey coverage, FGDs, PRAs, environmental testing and validation workshops, or whether these are entirely determined by the consultant's proposed methodology?	1. There is no minimum requirement set by the contracting authority. The tenderer is expected to propose the optimal scope of consultations to be conducted required to respond to the needs of the assignment. The tenderer should propose what is minimum to meet the needs of the assignment.

		The tenderer should have experience to determine if previous similar studies exist. The proposed methodology and data collection methods in the ToRs are only for illustrative purposes. The tenderer is free to propose what is appropriate.
	2. Stakeholder Consultations and Validation Workshops: Could Enabel clarify the anticipated number and scale of stakeholder consultation and validation workshops, including whether these will be organised and financed directly by Enabel and its institutional partners, or whether the consultant is expected to undertake and budget for the associated logistical arrangements?	2. It's the duty of the service provider, once contracted among the tenderers, to request for a research visa from NISR. Enabel can support the tenderer to obtain a visa recommendation letter from the line ministry to benefit from the research. Yes, costs related to an expert assignment should be embedded in in the fees of that particular expert
	3. Tax Treatment for International Bidders: With reference to Clause 8.2 on page 10 and the Financial Proposal Form on page 40, could Enabel clarify the applicable tax treatment for an international bidder registered in Uganda, particularly whether the 15% withholding tax is applicable to both professional fees and reimbursable expenses, whether any double taxation relief may apply, and how the 18% reverse-charge VAT should be reflected in the financial proposal and treated during contract payments?	3. For an international bidder registered in Uganda, the tax treatment is governed by Clause 8.2 of the tender document and the Financial Proposal Form. The applicable 15% non-resident withholding tax and the 18% reverse-charge VAT should be considered by tenderers when preparing their financial proposal. However, the tender document does not provide specific guidance on the application of withholding tax to individual cost components, nor does it address the applicability of any double taxation relief arrangements between Rwanda and Uganda. Accordingly, tenderers are expected to submit their financial proposal in line with the Tender Form - Prices, ensuring that

		all taxes and costs are appropriately reflected in the total tender price, which will be used for the financial evaluation. Any tax obligations applicable during contract execution will be handled in accordance with the relevant Rwandan tax legislation and any applicable international tax agreements. In summary, the financial evaluation will be based on the total tender price, inclusive of all applicable taxes and eligible reimbursable costs as provided for in the tender document.
	4. Previous Studies and Stakeholder Identification: Could Enabel clarify whether any previous studies, baseline assessments, policy reviews or stakeholder mapping exercises have been undertaken that could inform this assignment? Additionally, have any key institutions, stakeholders or potential interviewees already been identified, and will the relevant documentation and contacts be made available to the selected consultant?	4. The tenderer is expected to propose the minimum scope and depth required to meet the needs of the assignment in the context of Rwanda. The proposed elements of the methodology are only for illustrative purposes.
	5. Soil Testing and Environmental Measurements: The methodology references comparative plot testing, soil and yield measurements, and assessments of environmental outcomes. Could Enabel clarify whether physical soil sampling, laboratory analysis and comparative field measurements are mandatory components of the assignment, or whether these are illustrative methodologies that may be adapted based on available secondary data and the consultant's proposed approach?	5. The tender document presents comparative plot testing, soil and yield measurements, and environmental assessments as indicative examples rather than mandatory requirements. Tenderers may therefore propose alternative or complementary methodologies, provided they are well justified and aligned with the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the assignment. The proposed methodology will be assessed as part of the technical evaluation.
	6. Access to Existing Datasets: The ToR references national datasets, including NISR's Seasonal Agricultural Surveys, agricultural subsidy	6. The Terms of Reference envisage the use of relevant national datasets, including those of NISR, as part of the secondary

	information and relevant environmental and spatial data. Could Enabel clarify whether access to these datasets has already been secured, particularly where information may not be publicly available, and whether Enabel or its government partners will facilitate the necessary data-sharing arrangements? Additionally, support in acquiring permits with NISR and other agencies would be worth noting.	data analysis. However, the tender document does not guarantee access to non-public datasets or specify data-sharing arrangements with the respective institutions. Accordingly, tenderers should design their methodology on the assumption that access to such data will remain subject to the procedures and requirements of the respective data-owning institutions. Nevertheless, Enabel and its partners will, where appropriate and reasonably possible, facilitate engagement with relevant government institutions to support access to information required for the assignment. Any permits, authorizations, or approvals required from institutions such as NISR, RAB, MINAGRI, or other relevant agencies will remain subject to the procedures of those institutions and should therefore be taken into account when preparing the methodology and work plan.
	7. Expert Person-Days and Supporting Personnel: The assignment provides for a maximum of 175 expert person-days across five key specialists. Could Enabel clarify whether this allocation is intended to cover all personnel engaged in implementation, including enumerators, research assistants, field facilitators and data collection supervisors, or whether such supporting personnel may be engaged and budgeted for separately?	7. The maximum allocation of 175 person-days applies to the 5 key experts identified in the Terms of Reference. The tender document does not prohibit the engagement of additional supporting personnel, such as enumerators, research assistants, field facilitators, or data collection supervisors. However, tenderers must ensure that all costs associated with the implementation of the assignment are included in their financial proposal and that the maximum person-days allocated to each key expert and deliverable are respected. Accordingly, supporting personnel may be engaged as necessary to implement the proposed methodology, provided that their costs are appropriately budgeted within

		the expert fee / financial offer and that the overall proposal remains compliant with the tender requirements.
	8. Market Systems and Economic Viability Analysis: Could Enabel clarify the expected depth of the market systems and economic viability analysis, particularly whether the assignment requires detailed value chain assessments, farm-level cost-benefit analysis and investment feasibility assessments, or a higher-level assessment drawing on existing evidence and targeted primary research?	8. The tender document requires a substantive assessment of market systems and the economic viability of agroecological practices, including aspects such as value chains, profitability, productivity, resilience, market opportunities, and financing mechanisms. Tenderers are therefore expected to propose a proportionate and well-justified methodology, combining targeted primary research with relevant existing evidence and secondary data sources, sufficient to address the study objectives and support evidence-based policy recommendations. The proposed approach will be assessed as part of the technical evaluation.
	9. Financial Evaluation and Reimbursable Expenses: The financial evaluation criteria indicate that the total bid price will be used for comparison, while the financial proposal includes both fixed expert fees and reimbursable costs. Could Enabel clarify whether the financial evaluation will be based on the total amount inclusive of reimbursable expenses and applicable VAT, or on the professional fees only? We are truly delighted to hear about this transformative opportunity and looking forward to participating in this opportunity fully. Kind regards,	9. The financial evaluation will be based on the total tender price, not on professional fees alone.
4	With reference to the bid titled **"Consultancy for Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda -**	

	Reference No. BEL23010-10032", we are currently reviewing the RFP documents and preparing our proposal. As we carefully review the RFP documents and prepare our response, we have identified a few areas where we seek further clarification to ensure our response to RFP align with the requirements mentioned. Our pre-bid queries are attached for your kind consideration. We look forward to your responses. Regards	
	Question 1: The submission deadline be extended to at least 10 working days after the issuance of the pre-bid query responses?	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites.
	Question 2: Limitation of Liability: Can Enabel cap the service provider's liability to the contract value or to the amount of fees received under the contract?	2. According to the provisions of the Tender Document especially Clause 17.1 and 17.2 which state that the service provider bears full responsibility and must indemnify Enabel for damages and third-party liabilities, with no provision allowing a limitation or liability cap.
	Question 3: Fines for Delay: Can the maximum delay penalty be reduced from 7.5% (or 10%) to 5% of the contract value?	3. No. Enabel intends to maintain the delay penalty provisions as set out in the tender document. The delay fines are primarily intended to encourage the timely delivery of contractual obligations and discourage delays in contract execution, rather than to impose punitive financial consequences. In addition, Clause 19.1 provides that delay fines apply automatically for each day of delay, reflecting the importance of timely performance under the contract.

	Question 4: Legal Registration: Is it acceptable for a firm participating in the tender not to be legally registered in Rwanda?	4. Yes. Firms established outside Rwanda are eligible to participate, provided they meet all eligibility, selection, and documentary requirements set out in the tender specifications. The tender document expressly allows the participation of international bidders and requires tenderers to provide registration and tax compliance documents from their country of establishment.
	Question 5: Subcontracting: Is subcontracting permitted under this tender?	5. Yes. Subcontracting is permitted under this tender. In accordance with Clauses 5.9, 13.3 and 13.5 of the tender document, a tenderer may rely on the capacities of other entities, including subcontractors, provided that the necessary resources are made available and all applicable conditions and requirements set out in the tender specifications are complied with.
	Technical Queries	
	Question 6: Prioritized Value Chains: Have value chains already been identified and prioritized under the assignment, or is the consultant expected to identify and prioritize them as part of the scope of work?	6. No value chains have been identified by the contracting authority for prioritization. The tenderer should propose the minimum required to meet the needs of the assignment.
	Question 7. Sample Size and Geographical Coverage: What is the expected sample size and geographical coverage for the primary data collection activities?	7. Geographical coverage is Rwanda. The sampling methodology and the sample size should be proposed by the tenderer based on minimum requirements to meet the needs of the assignment.
	Question 8. Comparative Plot Testing: Do the treatment and control plots already exist under DeSIRA+ or partner activities, with the consultant's role limited to data collection and comparative analysis?	8. DeSIRA+ has no pre-determined treatment or control plots. The tenderer should propose the minimum to meet the needs of the assignment.

	Question 9. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs): What is the expected number of Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), what engagement method is preferred, and will Enabel facilitate introductions and coordination with stakeholders and institutions?	9. The tenderer is expected to propose the scope and size of the interviews to be held. The contracting authority will facilitate the contracted service provider to get a recommendation letter for the research visa from NISR.
	Question 10. PRA Exercises: What is the expected number and geographical coverage of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) exercises to be conducted?	10. The contracting authority will cover the costs of the proposed validation workshops. The contracting authority will facilitate the service provider in preparing those workshops. The service provider will be responsible for providing information and requirements related to these workshops for facilitation.
	Question 11. Validation Workshops: Will Enabel be responsible for logistical arrangements for stakeholder validation workshops? If so, please provide: • Number of workshops; • Indicative locations; and • Expected number and profile of participants.	11. As the Tender Document does not explicitly specify responsibility for providing or financing the venue and related logistics for the deliverable validation workshop(s), nor indicate the anticipated number of such workshops, these arrangements will be coordinated and supported by the Client. Therefore, tenderers are not required to budget for venue hire, catering, or other logistics specifically related to the validation of contractual deliverables in their financial proposals. However, all costs associated with the implementation of the assignment, including data collection activities, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, stakeholder consultations, field missions, and any other workshops or meetings organized by the service provider as part of the methodology, shall remain the responsibility of the tenderer and must be duly reflected in the financial proposal.
		12. The estimated allocation of 175 person-days remains unchanged. As provided in Sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the Tender Document

	Question 12. Estimated Person-Days: Is the estimated allocation of **175 person-days** sufficient, or may it be reconsidered depending on the required sample size, geographical coverage, and number of workshops? **Question 13. Non-Key Experts and Support Staff:** Are non-key experts'/support staff (e.g., GIS specialists and stakeholder coordination personnel) expected or permitted under the assignment?	13. The tender document specifies the minimum required team composition of 5 key experts and their respective profiles. However, it does not prohibit the engagement of additional non-key experts or support personnel where considered necessary by the tenderer for the successful implementation of the assignment. Tenderers may therefore propose supplementary resources as part of their methodology, provided that the assignment requirements are met. Please note, however, that the evaluation will be based solely on the qualifications and experience of the required key experts as defined in the tender document.
	Question 14. Team Leader Qualification: Can the required qualification for the Team Leader be expanded to include a Master's degree in **Agribusiness** as an acceptable field of study?	14. The requirements for the Team Leader are governed by Section 6, Part A.2, "Team Composition and Minimum Profile of the Key Experts", under "2.1 Team Leader / Senior Policy and Agroecology Expert". Bidders are requested to refer to the tender document for the complete eligibility requirements and assessment criteria applicable to this position.
	Question 15. Geographic Experience Requirement: Will experience gained in countries with similar economic characteristics (Global South countries) be considered equivalent to experience in Rwanda or Sub-Saharan Africa?	15. Experience is Rwanda or sub-Saharan Africa is mandatory and will not be equated or considered to be replaced by experience from elsewhere.
	Question 16. Additional Postgraduate Qualifications: Can the evaluation criterion awarding points for "additional postgraduate degrees" be broadened to include **additional postgraduate degrees and/or professional certificates**?	16. The evaluation criteria will remain as stated published in the tender document. Tenderers are kindly requested to refer to Section 6.B.1.C,"Qualifications and Experience of Key Experts"
5	Dear Sir/Madam, We are interested in the project mentioned above.	

	To ensure the highest possible quality of our proposal, we kindly ask that you grant us a two-week extension of the submission deadline, currently set for November 6, 2026, to November 20, 2026. This additional time would allow us to finalize our proposal and ensure full compliance with all requirements. We would be very grateful if you would consider this request and remain at your disposal should you need any further information. Thank you in advance. Best Regards,	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites.
6	I am writing ahead of the clarification deadline regarding tender reference BEL23010-10032, Consultancy for Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda (DeSIRA+). The .....Institute at the University .....is considering submitting a tender for this assignment, with its institute as the lead institution and the Rwanda-based ---- organization as our partner. We would be grateful for clarification on the following points: 1. Is there a maximum budget, ceiling or indicative envelope for this contract (including the expected split between fees and reimbursable costs such as fieldwork, travel and workshops)? 2. As a university institute, it would lead the tender, working with an organization ----, which is registered and based in Rwanda. Is a university-led tender of this kind eligible? Are there any additional documentary requirements for a university lead?	1. No maximum budget, ceiling, or indicative budget envelope has been established for this assignment. In accordance with Clauses 7.1 and 8.1 of the Tender Document, tenderers are expected to determine their financial proposal based on their proposed methodology, staffing arrangements, level of effort, and all activities required to successfully deliver the assignment. 2. Yes. A university-institute is eligible to lead a tender, provided that it is a legally registered entity and meets all eligibility and selection requirements set out in the tender document. Where it participates together with Three Stones International or any other partner, the bid may be submitted as a consortium/joint venture or by relying on the capacities of another entity, in

		accordance with Clauses 5.7, 5.9, 13.3 and 13.5 of the tender document. There are no additional documentary requirements specifically applicable to a university lead; however, the university must submit the same supporting documents required from all tenderers and demonstrate compliance with the applicable selection criteria and other criteria.
	3. Is there any requirement or preference for key experts to be based in Rwanda or the region, and may experts be proposed from both University institute and ------?	3. No. The tender document does not require or give preference to key experts being based in Rwanda or the region. Rather, the evaluation focuses on the qualifications, experience, and competencies of the proposed experts, in line with the selection criteria and key expert profiles. Furthermore, experts may be proposed from both University institute and that Rwandan organization . Where a bid is submitted as a consortium/joint venture, or where a tenderer relies on the capacities of another entity, the tender document expressly permits the use of resources and expertise from all participating entities, provided that the tenderer demonstrates that those resources will be available for the performance of the contract. Accordingly, experts from both organizations may be included in the proposed team, provided that the team collectively meets the minimum composition and qualification requirements specified in the tender document.
	4. Does the budget assume that comparative plot testing and household surveys will be carried out in all six agroecological zones, or may tenderers propose a justified sampling of zones?	4. The tender document does not prescribe that comparative plot testing and household surveys must be carried out in all six agroecological zones. Rather, it allows tenderers to propose

	Thank you for your time. We would appreciate a response before the tender deadline of 6 November 2026. Best wishes,	and justify an appropriate sampling strategy, geographical coverage, and data collection methodology. Specifically, under the Methodology section, tenderers are required to describe their proposed approach, including the sampling strategy, and are expressly invited to propose alternative or complementary methods, provided these are duly justified and consistent with the objectives, scope, timeframe, and budget of the assignment.
7	Enabel BEL23010-10032 – Clarification Questions A. **Methodology and fieldwork** 1. Scale of primary data collection. Section 4 of the Terms of Reference leaves the sampling approach and geographical coverage to the tenderer, provided they are duly justified and consistent with the objectives and timeframe. Could you please confirm whether Enabel has any particular expectations regarding the type or scale of field data collection, or whether it is for tenderers to propose a proportionate design that combines targeted primary data collection with existing national datasets? 2. Agroecological zones. Section 4.A of the Terms of Reference refers to "Rwanda's 6 agroecological zones", while national classifications commonly distinguish 12 zones. Could you please specify which six zones	1. The tender document does not prescribe a specific scale of primary data collection or a predetermined number of field sites, households, or agroecological zones. Instead, tenderers are expected to propose and justify a methodology that is proportionate to the objectives of the assignment, the available timeframe, and the proposed budget. Accordingly, tenderers should propose a robust and well-justified study design that combines targeted primary data collection with relevant national datasets and secondary sources, while ensuring methodological soundness, representativeness, feasibility, and value for money. The proposed sampling strategy, geographical coverage, and data collection methods will be assessed as part of the technical evaluation. 2. The tender document does not prescribe a mandatory classification of agroecological zones or require primary data collection in all six zones. Tenderers may therefore propose and justify an appropriate grouping of zones and a

	are intended, or confirm that tenderers may group the 12 zones into six strata, provided the grouping is justified in the methodology? Must all six zones be covered by primary data collection, or is a representative subset acceptable if justified?	representative sampling approach, provided it is methodologically sound, aligned with the study objectives, and capable of generating sufficiently robust and representative evidence. The proposed methodology, geographical coverage, and sampling strategy will be assessed as part of the technical evaluation.
	3. Soil laboratory. Is there a requirement for soil analyses to be carried out by an accredited laboratory (e.g. ISO/IEC 17025)? Would analysis by a national laboratory such as the RAB laboratory, whose accreditation is pending, be acceptable if quality is verified by re-testing a subset of samples in an accredited laboratory?	3. No. The tender document does not require soil analyses to be conducted by an accredited laboratory or prescribe a specific laboratory. Tenderers may therefore propose the use of a national laboratory, such as the RAB laboratory, provided that appropriate quality assurance and validation measures are included in the methodology.
	B. Timing 4. Start date and review periods. Could you please indicate the expected start date of the contract? Field data collection, in particular yield and soil measurements, depends on the timing of the agricultural seasons. In addition, the indicative timeframes for D1–D6 add up to the full 44 weeks, each counted from the validation of the previous deliverable. Does the 11-month performance period (Chapter 4, clause 14.1) include Enabel's review and validation of each deliverable? If so, what review period should tenderers assume in the work plan?	4. The contract is expected to commence upon notification of the contract award. In accordance with Clause 14.1, the assignment must be completed within 11 months from the day following receipt of the contract conclusion notification letter. This contractual period covers the implementation of all activities, the submission of all deliverables, and their acceptance / validation. While the timelines for deliverables are linked to the validation of preceding deliverables and the maximum person-days allocated to each deliverable must be respected, the tender document does not prescribe a specific review or validation period for Enabel and its partners.
8	Following our initial review of the tender specifications, we would appreciate your consideration of the following requests. **1. Request for an extension of the tender submission deadline** Given the multidisciplinary nature and extensive scope of the assignment, including policy and institutional analysis, field assessments across	1. Be informed that an extension of the submission deadline has been granted until 20 November 2026 at 4.00 p.m Kigali hour

	agroecological zones, economic and market systems analysis, and the development of strategic recommendations, we would respectfully request an extension of the submission deadline from **6 November 2026 to 20 November 2026**. The additional two weeks would enable us to undertake the necessary technical consultations, mobilise and validate the proposed multidisciplinary team, refine the methodology and fieldwork arrangements, and prepare a comprehensive and competitive technical and financial proposal that adequately addresses all the requirements of the assignment. We believe this additional preparation time would support the submission of a robust proposal aligned with Enabel's expectations and the objectives of the assignment. **2. Clarification on geographical coverage and field data collection requirements** The Terms of Reference refer to field assessments across Rwanda's six agroecological zones and mention quantitative and qualitative data collection, comparative plot testing, soil and yield measurements, and farmer-level economic analysis. To ensure that our proposed methodology, sampling strategy and budget are appropriately aligned with the assignment, we would appreciate clarification on the following: • Is there a prescribed minimum number of districts, sectors, farming households or agricultural plots to be covered in each agroecological zone, or is the consultant expected to determine and justify the sampling framework? • Are there existing datasets, research findings, demonstration plots or ongoing agroecological initiatives that the consultant is expected to use, and will access to these resources be facilitated by Enabel and its partners?	and the corresponding Addendum notice has been published on both the Enabel and BOSA websites. 2. The contracting authority does not possess the existing datasets or related initiatives. The tenderer is expected to review the existing data sets and initiatives and propose the appropriate methodology. The proposed methodology in the ToRs is only for illustrative purposes. The tenderer is expected to propose the minimum required to meet the needs of assignment. The contracting authority will facilitate the contracted service provider to obtain a recommendation letter for a research VISA from NISR.

	This clarification would help us develop a realistic fieldwork plan, ensure adequate geographical representation and accurately estimate the resources required. **3. Clarification on the financial proposal and eligible cost components** The payment modalities in the Terms of Reference specify instalment percentages against the experts' costs, while the tender specifications require the financial proposal to incorporate the costs associated with the performance of the contract, including travel, transportation, documentation and other relevant expenses. We would appreciate confirmation of whether the prescribed payment percentages apply exclusively to professional fees for experts or to the total contract price, including reimbursable or other operational costs. Furthermore, could you clarify whether the financial proposal should present fieldwork expenses, laboratory or soil-testing costs, GIS and spatial analysis costs, and stakeholder validation workshops as separate budget lines or incorporate them within the relevant expert fees? This clarification would enable us to prepare a transparent, complete and compliant financial offer. We would be grateful if you could consider our request for an extension and provide guidance on the above clarification points in accordance with the applicable procurement procedures. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to your response. Yours sincerely,	3. As provided in the Tender Document, the contract is a mixed-price contract comprising a lump-sum component for expert fees and a reimbursable-cost component. The payment percentages specified in the payment schedule apply exclusively to the expert fees and are linked to the achievement and acceptance of the contractual deliverables, in accordance with the payment provisions set out in the Tender Document. Regarding reimbursable costs (limited to international travel and visa costs), these are not subject to the payment percentages and will not be paid on a lump-sum basis. Instead, they will be reimbursed separately based on actual expenditure incurred, upon submission of satisfactory supporting documentation and proof of payment. Consequently, only eligible, duly justified, and effectively incurred reimbursable costs during the execution of the assignment will be reimbursed.
9	Thank you very much for your acknowledgment of receipt. I would like to add questions about the tax aspect of the call for tenders.	

	We would be grateful for your guidance on the following points. We intend to submit a joint tender as a consortium led by a foreigner firm (France, not registered for tax in Rwanda), with a Rwandan company registered with the RRA as a member. 1. Invoicing: Our understanding is that the group leader must send a single invoice for the full amount (clauses 5.8 and 22). Could you confirm this, or may each member of the consortium invoice Enabel directly for its own share of the services? The answer affects the tax treatment described below. 2. Withholding tax (WHT, line B of the price form): If only the group leader invoices, will 15% WHT apply to the full sub-total A, including the Rwandan member's share? If each member invoices its own share, will WHT be withheld at 15% on the international member's share and at 5% on the Rwandan member's share? In that case, should line B show the weighted amount, with a breakdown in a footnote?	1. No. In accordance with Clauses 5.8 and 22 of the tender Document, the consortium leader serves as the sole contractual counterpart to Enabel and should therefore submit a single invoice covering the full contract amount. Individual consortium members may not invoice Enabel directly; the distribution of payments among consortium members is an internal matter for the consortium. 2. In accordance with Clauses 5.8 and 22 of the Tender Document, a consortium must be represented by a single consortium leader, who acts as the sole contractual counterpart and point of contact vis-à-vis Enabel. Consequently, Enabel will only accept invoices submitted by the consortium leader and will not process separate invoices from individual consortium members. The application of withholding tax (WHT) will therefore be based on the status of the invoicing entity, namely the consortium leader, and not on an internal allocation of the contract value among consortium members. Questions regarding the allocation of revenues and taxes between consortium members remain an internal matter for the consortium. 3. In accordance with Clauses 5.8 and 22 of the Tender Document, a consortium must appoint a single consortium

	3. VAT (line D): We understand from footnote 4 that, for the international member, the 18% VAT is reverse-charged (retained and paid by Enabel) and is not invoiced by SalvaTerra. a) If the Rwandan member's share is included in the group leader's invoice, is it also covered by this reverse-charge mechanism, or should the Rwandan member charge VAT on its share (EBM invoice) to the group leader? b) If each member invoices Enabel separately (see question 6), we understand that the Rwandan member would charge VAT directly to Enabel through an EBM invoice. Is that correct? c) In all cases, should line D show 18% of the full sub-total A, covering both the French and the Rwandan shares? Best regards,	leader, who acts as the sole contractual counterpart and point of contact vis-à-vis Enabel. Consequently, Enabel will receive and process invoices only from the consortium leader and will not accept separate invoices from individual consortium members. Accordingly: a) Where the share of the Rwandan consortium member is included in the invoice submitted by the consortium leader, the VAT treatment applicable between consortium members falls under their internal contractual arrangements and the applicable tax legislation. The Tender Document does not regulate the tax or VAT arrangements between consortium members, and tenderers are therefore advised to seek appropriate tax guidance. b) The option for each consortium member to invoice Enabel directly is not foreseen under the Tender Document. Consequently, individual consortium members, including the Rwandan member, may not submit separate invoices to Enabel, as all invoicing and payment transactions shall be handled through the consortium leader. c) Regarding Line D of the Price Form, tenderers should complete the VAT section in accordance with Clause 8.1 of the Tender Document, which requires that VAT be indicated separately where applicable. The VAT amount to be entered should therefore reflect the VAT treatment applicable to the entity submitting the financial proposal and signing the contract (i.e., the consortium leader where a consortium is concerned), in compliance with the applicable Rwandan tax legislation.

10	We would like to request a clarification about the eligibility of experts for this assignment. Specifically, may public servants be proposed as experts or team members? The Terms of Reference do not address this point, and your guidance will help us put together a compliant team. Thank you in advance for your response	1. The tender document does not prohibit the inclusion of public servants as experts or team members. However, tenderers must prove that any proposed public servant complies with all applicable legal, professional, and ethical requirements governing their engagement, including any rules relating to conflicts of interest. Accordingly, public servants may be proposed as experts provided they meet the required qualifications and experience, are legally authorized to undertake the assignment, have obtained any necessary approvals from their employer or competent authority, and do not give rise to any conflict of interest in relation to the contract.
11	We are interested in submitting a proposal for Enabel's Consultancy for Mapping and Analysis of National Policies and Strategies on Agroecology in Rwanda (BEL23010-10032). As we prepare our technical and financial proposals, we would appreciate clarification on whether an indicative budget or maximum financial ceiling has been established for this assignment. This information would help us appropriately align our proposed methodology, level of effort and financial offer with the anticipated scope and available resources. Thank you for your time and guidance. We look forward to hearing from you. Kind regards,	1. No maximum budget has been set for this assignment. Tenderers are expected to determine the value of their financial proposal based on their proposed methodology, staffing arrangements, level of effort, and all activities required to successfully deliver the assignment.

Done at Kigali, on 13 November 2026

Gaston HATEGEKIMANA

Gaston HATEGEKIMANA
Contract Officer
Enabel Rwanda