

## 質 問 書

2023 年 3 月 31 日

「シエラレオネ国レジリエンス強化のための能力向上プロジェクト(ガイドライン改訂・モニタリング体制構築)」

(公示日:2023 年 3 月 22 日/調達管理番号:22a00963)について、質問と回答は以下の通りです。

番号	当該頁項目	質問	回答
1	p6 本案件は、業務管理グループ(副業務主任者 1 名の配置)の適用対象案件ではありませんので、「若手育成加点」は適用されません。	本案件は若手育成加点が適用されないものの、プロポーザルにおいて副業務主任者の配置を提案することを妨げるものではないと解釈してよいでしょうか。	本案件は、業務管理グループの適用対象案件ではありませんので、副業務主任者を配置しても評価対象者となりません。契約約款第7条の3項にある業務主任者の代理も不可とします(プロポーザル作成ガイドラインの 23 ページに記載のとおり)。そのうえで、業務主任者以外の従事者に「副業務主任者」の名称を与えたいなどの事情がある場合は、契約交渉時にご相談ください。
2	p8 2021 年 6 月~2023 年 7 月プロジェクトリーダー/地方行政、 2021 年 6 月~2023 年 5 月ガイドライン普及/業務調整専門家を配置している。(同職種の後任長期専門家も配置予定。)	活動にも関わりますので、各々の長期専門家について、後任の赴任予定時期を教えてください(2023 年▲月頃等)。	後任となるガイドライン普及/業務調整専門家は 5 月上旬に赴任予定です。 プロジェクトリーダー/地方行政専門家については、人選中のため未定となりますがなるべく早めの配置を目指しております。
3	p8 ガイドラインの改訂	改訂中のガイドラインの改定の方向性につきましては、概要で良いので共有していただくことは可能でしょうか。	変更の可能性はありますが、別添資料をご確認ください。

4	<p>p11 3)能力強化の対象 本業務の実施にあたり、地方行政官だけでなく MLGCA 内の地方行政を指導する部局、或いは地方行政職員の能力向上・技術レベルの評価を担当する Local Government Service Commission (LGSC)指導やモニタリング及び監査を司る MoPED、MoF、NaMED、Audit Service、さらに大統領府などの関連省庁や、MLGCA の地方での監督業務を担う District Officer、地方議員に加え、Chiefdom 議会関連職員等多岐にわたる組織、レベルを能力強化の対象とする必要があることに留意する。</p>	<p>能力強化の対象に挙げられている諸機関名は、例えば配布資料 1「シエラレオネ国レジリエンス強化のための能力強化プロジェクト R/D」における Project Design Matrix で明記されていないものでありますが、濃淡はあっても能力強化の対象に含めるということでしょうか。</p>	<p>PDM 時点で記載のなかった機関についても、成果発現のため能力強化の対象とすることが必要と考えています。濃淡の差をつけるかどうかは、事業実施の段階での相手国政府下での状況などを踏まえ検討・判断することを想定しています。</p>
5	<p>p14 「受入業務」「監理業務」は JICA が行い、受注者は「実施業務」を行う。 22 頁 (4)定額計上について 国内業務費:3,000,000 円</p>	<p>国内業務費として計上される 3,000,000 円は、受注者が行う「実施業務」のみに係る経費と解釈してよいでしょうか。もしくは、貴機構が担当する「受入業務」「監理業務」の経費を合わせた額になりますでしょうか。</p>	<p>当該定額計上額には、受入業務及び監理業務の経費は含みません。</p>

6	その他	本業務において現地庸人の雇用の提案は可能 でしょうか。	ご提案は可能です。
---	-----	--------------------------------	-----------

以上

別添

## Proposed Revision Points to the Guidelines

### 1. Proposed Revision Points

The Working Group under the Guidelines Revision Committee proposes the following revision points based on the lessons learned and comments from the Joint Coordination Committee (JCC) and eleven Local Councils.

Revision points were prepared from the perspectives of how to make the Guidelines more helpful in enhancing local service delivery. The following revision points will be updated as necessary.

#### (1) Background, the goal of the Guidelines (pp. 1 to 2)

Items	Revision points
Background, Goal, Assumption, Processes followed in developing the Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is recommended to revise the descriptions as necessary based on the current act, regulation and policy.</li></ul>

#### (2) Role of the stakeholders (pp.2 to 13)

Items	Revision points
Organizational structure for local councils project implementation process, role of stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is recommended to revise the information on the stakeholders (role, responsibilities) and coordination mechanisms, such as DDCC, based on the current act, regulation, and policy. (5.2~5.6 of the Guidelines)</li></ul>

#### (3) Work Flow of Local Councils' Development (pp.14 to 15)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions	Revision points
[Project management] <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>There are comments suggesting the need to clarify the roles of core staff, collaboration, and decision-making processes in development projects (Kenema CC, Kodu, Bo DC, Moyamba)</li></ul>	[Clarifying role, responsibilities, and report line in LC] <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Upon these comments, it is recommended that the roles and responsibilities of key LC staff and decision-making processes in development projects be summarized in a table in 6.1 for development projects.</li></ul>

#### (4) Formulation of DDP and AWP in Steps 0 and 1 (pp. 16 to 18)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions, comments from LCs	Revision points
[Contents of the DDP] <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ward priorities, priority sector, and priority projects per sector were not</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It is recommended to clarify the items to be included in the DDP (need to</li></ul>

<p>captured in the DDP (Pujehun, Kenema, Moyamba, Kailahun, Bonthe).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for all DDPs to be harmonized using a single template. This will help DPOs to easily execute any council DDP in case they are being transferred (Kailahun, Kenema DC)</li> </ul>	<p>discuss with MoPED).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended to include the table of contents of the DDP in 6.2.1 (need to discuss with MoPED).</li> </ul>
--	--

(5) Project Selection in Steps 2 and 3 (pp. 18 to 23)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions, comments from LCs	Revision points
<p>[Project selection procedure]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A key challenge is that the procedure and criteria vary by project and donor (Kenema CC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that the project selection procedure with criteria per (i) government project and (ii) donor project shall be clarified in step 2 in 6.2.2 or table 6-3.</li> <li>• The project selection criteria should be set by LCs.</li> </ul>
<p>[Documentation on the selection result and project profile]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some LCs took time to prepare project documents such as (i) “MoU” on the project selection result and (ii) “Project Profile” (especially monitoring and O&amp;M plan) (ELSD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A completed “MoU” and “project profile” are recommended to be attached to the Guidelines as a sample. (Projects not listed in the AWP such as donor projects are recommended to develop MoU.)</li> <li>• It is recommended that the community roles, monitoring, and O&amp;M plans described in the project profile be shared and agreed upon with the community.</li> </ul>
<p>[“District Profile”]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were challenges in obtaining basic data about the district e.g., the number of project beneficiaries and ward population. (Kono, Kenema CC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is proposed that the need for data collection should be described in 6.2.1.</li> <li>• Including the “district profile” template in the annex is recommended (need to check with MoPED).</li> </ul>

(6) Procurement in Step 4 (pp. 23 to 27)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions, comments from LCs	Revision points
[Database]	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A database of reliable contractors always gives good results. (Moyamba DC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended to mention the need for preparing a database for local contractors and potential bidders to proceed procurement process smoothly in (3) Procurement and Award of contract” in “6.2.5”.</li> </ul>
--	--

(7) Community Sensitization (pp. 26 to 27)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions, comments from LCs	Revision points
<p>[Description on community sensitization]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity of the Community sensitization should be included.</li> <li>• The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) component should also be included (Moyamba).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that the Guidelines include an example of community sensitization activities and agenda in 6.2.5 (2) or the annex.</li> <li>• All sensitization sessions should include information on the GRM.</li> </ul>
<p>[Number of community sensitization]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A high frequency of community sensitization may be a burden on project activities and costs, especially if the site is far away (Kailahun).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although three community sensitizations are proposed in the model project, it is suggested that the number of times to be implemented be determined according to the situation and budget of each LC in 6.2.5 (2) and “checkpoint” in annex 1.</li> <li>• It would be preferable to conduct sensitizations; before project implementation and at the handover. (Number should be determined per LC/project duration.)</li> </ul>
<p>[Budget of Community Sensitization]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget line for community sensitization and monitoring should be clearly identified in the project budget (Kenema cc).</li> <li>• The budget line for Community sensitization on projects should be included in the council’s Annual Work Plan.(Koidu)</li> <li>• The budget was limited for community sensitization (Pujehun, Bonthe MC)</li> <li>• Council’s unwillingness to pre-finance the community sensitization (Moyamba)</li> </ul>	<p>[Budget of Community Sensitization]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget line for monitoring, sensitization, and O&amp;M are under discussion and vary per LCs (Budget allocation should be determined per LC/project.)</li> <li>• It is recommended that the budget allocation method used in the model project (5% of the total project budget) be included in the guidelines as an example.</li> </ul>

(8) Implementation (pages 23, 26 to 28)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions	Revision points
<p>[template]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Templates for monitoring (including community monitoring) should be developed and included in the guidelines (Koidu)</li> </ul>	<p>[Including template]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that a monitoring template be included in the annex.</li> </ul>

(9) O&M (pages 28 to 29)

Lessons learned, challenges, suggestions	Revision points
<p>[O&amp;M]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities in O&amp;M, roles and responsibilities, and budget line of LCs and communities are not clear (Kono, Kenema CC, Kenema CC, Koidu)</li> <li>• The line budget for O&amp;M of projects should be included in the council's AWP/budget including Devolved Sectors (Koidu)</li> </ul>	<p>[Clarifying role and responsibilities for O&amp;M]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended to include clear roles and responsibilities of stakeholders such as LC, MDAs, and communities for O&amp;M in 6.2.5 (per sector, if possible)</li> <li>• It may be necessary to mention that "O&amp;M training" does not apply to all development projects.</li> </ul> <p>[Briefing on O&amp;M to community]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunity of the final community sensitization can be utilized to discuss the outline and purpose of the O&amp;M with community.</li> </ul>

END