

**CLARIFICATIONS ON AUDIT CONSULTANCY SERVICES TO CARRY OUT
TECHNICAL AND PERFORMANCE AUDITS FOR RMLF PROGRAMMES KWS FYs
2021/2022 to 2023/2024**

TENDER No. KRB/179/2021-2022/PKGTA4

Clarifications and Responses to Bidders Queries - November 2021

No.	Bidders Questions/ clarifications	Kenya Roads Board Responses
1.	Is it in order to consider those graduate engineers with experience in materials to qualify as material technologists?	<p>Criterion 3 for Material Technologist/Technician is explicit on the academic, professional and experience requirements of the material technologist and Bidders are advised to refer to and adhere to it.</p> <p>Additionally,</p> <p>Item 4.1- Key Experts under Professional Qualifications, the table indicates that Material Technologist must be “Registered Member, Institution of Engineering Technologists & Technicians)”</p> <p>The table is hereby amended to read: - The technologists may be Registered Member of Institution of Engineering Technologists & Technicians. However, qualified Material Technologists / Technicians that demonstrate that they are registrable will be considered.</p>
2.	There has been emphasis on the need for collaboration between the Technical and Financial Consultants:	<p>Collaboration is specifically during reporting and only on the aspect of the APRP implementation Matrix. The said collaboration shall be done through the Client. It is expected that the Financial Auditors, who shall have proceeded with the audit a month before Technical Auditors, shall have completed the sampling process and populated their sections of the APRP Implementation Matrix. They shall then submit it to the Client, who shall promptly issue the same to the technical consultant for them to populate their areas (i.e. certified amounts, achieved outputs and physical progress of works). The said matrix is as attached in Item 8. 1. 1. 3 of the Appendixes.</p>

No.	Bidders Questions/ clarifications	Kenya Roads Board Responses
	<p>i) Noting that these are two different consultants shall documents be submitted separately or they shall be combined?</p> <p>ii) In the event that they will require to be combined whose responsibility shall this be?</p> <p>iii) What happens in a case where the expected collaboration fails to be effective in terms of the level of engagement between the two different parties.</p>	<p>i) Consultants shall submit their documents separately.</p> <p>ii) The reports from the Financial and Technical Auditors shall not be combined and each consultant shall submit their own full, final and stand-alone report. Both parties, as explained above, shall collaborate populate the APRP matrix.</p> <p>iii) The client shall appoint project managers for each contract who shall ensure smooth running of the contracts. If either party has not populated their areas in the Matrix on time as stipulated in the ToR, noting reporting is the main deliverable; it may be construed as a breach.</p>
3.	<p>It was mentioned that the Financial Audit consultant will start their audits one month ahead of the Technical Audit consultant. In that case they will have completed the sampling process by the time the Technical Auditors commence their audits. Is it in order for them to adopt the sample by the financial audit consultant?</p>	<p>Sampling will be as per the APRP implementation Matrix and therefore the Technical Consultant shall adopt the sample by the Financial Auditor. However, if the Technical Auditor, once in the field identifies a case that requires to be reported upon, then such a case will be added to the list of sampled projects.</p>
4.	<p>Are there any variations expected on the APRP implementation matrix? And if so, would there be any allowance for renegotiation with the client?</p>	<p>The Matrix should be viewed as a form of a report. The client may change the reporting format which may not have any financial implications since it does constitute extra work. However, there could be instances where the consultant is instructed to do extra works, which may be in form of Adhoc audits, in which case an instruction shall be issued, and the Auditor shall be reimbursed as per the Terms of Reference.</p>

No.	Bidders Questions/ clarifications	Kenya Roads Board Responses
5.	Sought clarification if scanned signatures of the Key Experts are acceptable	The board clarifies that the signatures are a commitment that the owner of the CV has authorized use of the CV and that shall be available for the assignment. The ToR stipulates that either the owner of the CV or the Authorized Representative shall sign the CV. One of the signatures may be scanned BUT the second one must be a WET signature.
6.	Sought clarification if certification of Copies of Certificates done by an Advocate of the High Court of Kenya are acceptable.	There is NO requirement in the Terms of Reference for certification of copies of certificates by an advocate or a commissioner of oaths.
7.	Please clarify if under ToR 5.2: Completion and Submission of Reports ; each Technical Audit Team (as in Table 3.2) will compile stand-alone Reports.	The three (3) teams are constituted, as in Table 3.2, with the aim of shortening the time it takes to undertake the Audits to accommodate the client's the reporting requirements. The three teams will submit only one (1) joint report for KWS covering all 16 No. parks.