Q1: Could you please confirm that you would only like Ethambutol 400mg in blisters? OR could we submit a bid for Ethambutol 400mg x 56 tabs in HDPE bottles?


Q2: Page 15, clause 3.7.6: is a digression from past GDF tender. Over last few years the transparency/visibility has reduced in GDF’s tenders. Till 2014, we were given weightage of each evaluation criteria and we were informed our final score. In 2016, the weightage was given but score were not announced during market share allocation. And now in 2017 tender even weightage of each clause under Technical / Financial bid has not been announced. This lack of visibility is not fair to vendors. Vendors should know the evaluation criteria from the beginning and the final score should be announced, as it was done in till 2014.

A2: The Bid evaluation will be conducted based on the cumulative analysis of the Technical and Financial Bids, with a weighting as described in sections 3.7.3 and 3.7.4 of the ITB document. There are no changes in the method applied since previous 2016 tender (FLD). For additional clarification on point’s allocation per evaluation criterion for the technical evaluation please refer to sections 3.7.5, 3.7.6 and 2.1.

Q3: Clause 2.1.B and 3.7.7 are contradicting each other. Past two tender have had these points and at the time of evaluation clauses similar to 3.7.7 were not honored to support clause similar to clause 2.1.B. Therefore clause 3.7.7 should be removed from this tender.

A3: The suppliers outside competitive range of maximum delta may still be awarded as stated in section 3.7.7, therefore there is no contradiction with clause 2.1.b.

Q4: Clause 3.7.4 for suppliers having no supply history and giving same score to them as average of incumbent suppliers is not fair. This allows the new vendors to take advantage of good performance of incumbent suppliers.

A4: GDF/IDA expects good performance of all suppliers. GDF/IDA does not consider using average score as being advantageous to new suppliers.

Q5: a) Wherever patient appropriate formulation is available for example Dispersible versus Non-Dispersible for pediatric population, which product will be preferred? b) Will pricing of Dispersible be compared with pricing of Non-Dispersible product?

A5: If both, dispersible and non-dispersible formulations are available for the same products, the evaluation will be done for dispersible tablet as it is preferred formulation. Non-dispersible formulation might be granted auxiliary status. Pricing for different formulations will be evaluated separately.
Q6: Clause 3.2.1 states Bidder should ensure that PDF documents are high resolution and easily readable. Please let us know if there is a size limit per email? How many emails in bid response are allowed?

A6: For the relevant IDA email addresses, there is a maximum capacity of 25 MB per e-mail, but bidder needs to see their limits for their outgoing server limitations, and accordingly send e-mails. Multiple e-mails are allowed in the same chain, but this must be clearly specified in respective email headers in the subject (1 of 5, 2 of 5, 3 of 5 etc.).

Q7: Clause 3.1.7 Annex C: If the registration certificate is issued in a language other than English, Russian or French, Bidder must provide an English Translation. Does it mean translation of certificates in Russian and French Language is not required? Please clarify.

A7: English translation of certificates if issued in Russian or French language are not required

Q8: We would like to request clarification on the possibility of quoting more than one presentation or a different presentation for Item nº1 of schedule 4 (Water for injection). For example, quoting box of 100 and box of 20 ampoules, or only quoting a box of 20 ampoules.

A8: Please refer to Annex B - List and technical specifications of products FLD for the preferred secondary packaging and ITB document section 2.4. Conditions/eligibility for ITB participation and section 3.8.7 d) market share allocation