



Funded by
the European Union



Call for Proposals

“VaMoz Digital! Digital Competences, Entrepreneurship and Services as Opportunities for Youth Growth in Mozambique”

(Ref: 01/2023/VaMoz Digital/AICS_NDICI Africa/2023/442-998)

REPLIES TO FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ)

(replies updated to **15th March 2024** – most recent questions on top)

- 1) Are the Community Media Centers (CMCs) mentioned in the Call for Proposals (CfP) already existing centers/infrastructures or are they to be established from scratch during the project implementation? Furthermore, must these CMCs be established outside the tech hub and within the city's administrative borders?**

A few CMC's are already existing in each province and they are far from the main cities because they are a historical response to the need of connectivity in the rural areas. The CIUEM (ICT Centre of UEM in Maputo) has been supporting them for many years, also through programmes involving their community radios, and might fill the applicants with useful information.

In the Guidelines it is requested that some of them be revitalised and supported (a reasonable number, according to the presence in the selected province, their current status and general health), since this was requested as an additional element by the Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education. The basic intervention consists in (re)training their managers (some are public servants, others community volunteers) and purchasing for them some equipment for continuing their work with more capacity, therefore a need assessment for the target ones (at this stage and possibly after the award) is necessary.

- 2) According to section 2.2.2. “Where and how to send applications” of the Guidelines for Applicants, applications must be submitted in one original and one copy in A4 size, each bound. What do "original applications" mean? Do the co-applicant mandates or the statement of affiliated entities (integrated in Part B of Annex A) have to be submitted with the original signature and (in addition) the scanned version?**

The original application is the physical package of sheets with the actual (pen) signatures. A copy is a photocopy or a print-out of the scan of the signed original copy. All the documents requiring a

signature (such as the Application form with the mandates by Co-applicants, etc.) need to be submitted in original + 1 copy.

Besides, yes, an electronic/digitalised version must be added on an adequate support drive (such as a USB flash-drive): **one single file for the application, one single file for the budget and one single file for the Logical Framework. Please see the specifications on the format in the Guidelines, page 26.**

3) As for the deliverable “10 courses on technologies, tools and devices for job seekers” set for Output 2.3. “Skills of ICT professionals upgraded”, our association is with Output 2.2 as it refers to job seekers and not to ICT professionals. What does it refer to or what is expected from this deliverable associated with Output 2.3?

You are right, the deliverable should read “10 courses on technologies, tools and devices for **ICT professionals**”. The “Guidelines for Applicants” were amended accordingly.

4) About the deliverable “3 awareness-raising campaigns (mainly in high schools) on crucial role of digital skills, on digital rights and principles” set for Output 2.2, how is the association with the activities suggested for outcome 2 “Inclusive opportunities for youth employment, innovation and digital entrepreneurship are enhanced”? In particular, to which activity is it connected?

The awareness campaigns are actually the activity, but their successful implementation (i.e., effective in changing attitudes towards STEM studies and technical jobs, as well as in terms of awareness on rights and principles in a digital environment), reaching a satisfactory number of youth in high schools (or other kind of youth gatherings), may be seen as the deliverable.

In general, the Guidelines encourage all applicants to discuss and propose changes to the list of activities, deliverables, targets, while asking for some motivation to these improvements. In conclusion, we suggest drafting a proposal that convinces the consortium’s members/partners and maximises the compliances with the set of outcomes, outputs, deliverables and suggested activities, while not necessarily trying to respond to every single line of the (detailed) Guidelines for Applicants.

5) May a business group that has a European company as a Co-Applicant have a Mozambican company belonging to the same group as an affiliate?

There is no obstacle to apply in the situation you are proposing: the operational capacity of the applying consortium will be strengthened by the Mozambican affiliate (though the Lead Applicant still needs to show how it will be able to operate, send and use the funding, legally hire professionals and staff dedicated to the programme, etc.).

6) Regarding the indicated deliverables in the outcomes, are the costs of the deliverables part of the budget? Examples: Purchase of computers, the awards, start-up costs, etc.

By definition, the budget should cover all the costs to implement the programme and deliver the desired results. If the deliverables listed in the Guidelines are too ambitious, in the opinion of the candidates, the applying consortium may justify and argue that only a part of those deliverables are realistic and propose a different set of deliverables (e.g. by cutting some of them, explaining why it is a sensible adjustment), or reduce the targets for each deliverable.

7) Are there public opening sessions?

A public opening of the proposals is not in the PRAG procedure, especially because there is no competition by financial bids (all proposals must have the same budget of 2,512,000 Euro). However, all the selection procedures are transparent and, if a candidate is unhappy about the results or suspects there was any flaw, it can request to access the documents.

8) The tender does not refer to the profiles of the teams to be involved. What are the profiles and assessment criteria for these teams?

The programme requires strong competences and experience in a set of fields/subsectors and matters. The Guidelines do not specify titles, experience or specific skills of each professional involved in the project, but it is up to the applicants to show that the consortium is bringing together a team of organisations and professionals who can deliver the services and achieve the results.

9) Regarding the evaluation process, are there any metrics for evaluating the partnership?

In order to prove it is eligible, a public-private partnership or consortium will need to gather enough competences, expertise, sensitivities and understanding of all processes mentioned in the Guidelines: digitalization, training, incubation, development of new services, networking and dialogue with the private sector, creative counterproposals to reach the desired results through alternative strategies or means, etc. Moreover, in the evaluation grid of the concept note and of the full proposal, several elements in the grid's lines allow the evaluation committee's members to reward a strong and coherent, wide consortium, capable of complying with its commitments.

On the contrary, there are no hidden scoring criteria such as country of establishment, or nature of each applicant, or number/size of applicants, which the evaluation committee may specifically reward.

10) What is meant by courses on technologies, tools and devices for job seekers? Are those courses about access to job portals? how to research for jobs online? knowledge of technological devices that will help facilitate their access to a job? Is it all the above applicable or not? Or is the aim of this deliverable different?

All your proposals are acceptable articulations of the idea of improving the employment chances of youth, and there would be more (e.g. short courses to improve an educated beneficiary's set of skills with a specific new and crucial competence, if the labour market beacons this would make a difference). However, that specific line was just amended because the deliverable was meant especially for "ICT professionals", not "job seekers" in general.

11) Any specific guidance for the start-ups? or it is open to the trainees/beneficiaries' imagination?

The objective of this Call for Proposals is to increase job opportunities in the target area selected by the consortium (within the wide range of provinces mentioned in the Guidelines for each lot). The local economic system and the embryonic digital ecosystem will determine which subsectors are most suitable to create jobs through digital start-ups and others, still in the traditional sectors, which can boost their competitiveness through the digitalisation of some business processes.

12) Shall all the training sessions be presential or can they be remote/hybrid?

As a continuation of the previous answer (just below), it is up to the applicants to devise a strategy to provide services to the intended beneficiaries, thus if some target groups own or can be given appropriate devices, hybrid training is an acceptable modality of delivering.

13) Will the courses to the selected ICT teachers be delivered at the tech hub? or should they be delivered outside of the tech hub context?

The tech hubs are meant to be new assets in the city and the area where there is a strong probability that youth, the private sector and the community at large will be able to boost development and employment. They will provide training space and courses in addition to the existing supply or to complement it, or to saturate its capacity. So the applicants' analysis and strategy will determine the solutions that can maximise the achievement of the desired results.

14) In the deliverable "100 support measures to ensure that particularly disadvantaged youth (financially or materially) are supported to access to courses and/or incubation services", what is meant by support measures? Could you list some examples, please?

It is the applicant who should show some creativity and project design skills to devise such measures. A simple example is ensuring free or adequate transport (or accompanying volunteers, etc.) to a selected number of people with disabilities to reach the training rooms or the incubation facility. Others can be technology-assisted training and coaching could be offered to people with disabilities, or just scholarships, or starter kit for micro-entrepreneurs, etc.

15) When supporting training institutions, can the institutions supported be from both the private and public sector? or only public sector institutions??

The goal is to have as many young women and men trained as possible: through public and private institutions, and of course through the tech hub, if it is more effective for the social and development purposes of the programme. Support to training institutions should be proposed, organised and implemented by keeping in consideration the number, capacity and availability of the existing actors in the local market. The applicants may see the potential for a good performance by public institutions and support them (as in classic development cooperation projects), but they may also see promising private institutions which may be allowed to use the new facilities or supported at their own facilities in terms of equipment and capacity building, new curricula or assistive technologies to include people with disabilities: in this case, however, these private institutions shall offer their services at heavily subsidised prices, or/partly for free for specific categories of beneficiaries. In other words, the awarded grantees managing the tech hub and the project resources should not "enrich" any private institutions, but they may involve and support some of them to supply courses to the project's target beneficiaries at the appropriate conditions (e.g. to many beneficiaries for free, to some categories at low price, to few categories at reasonable price, etc.). The range and list of training courses and sub-implementing agents are proposed by the applicants, though they will be adjusted to the needs expressed by the private sector in the beginning of the project.

16) Can UNESCO (or other UN agencies) be considered eligible as Lead applicant under this Call for Proposals?

Please refer to paragraph 2.1.1, where International Organisations (IO's), as such, are explicitly mentioned as eligible organisations, since they comply with the requirements of not-for-profit nature and legal constitution, to start from. A specific annex ("e3h11_derogations_ios") of the contract

model (Annex G and its components) is mentioned and is part of the package made available online in terms of derogations of contract rules when the awarded organisation is an IO.

It is up to UNESCO (or other interested UN agency) to check the other eligibility requirements (country of establishment, legally authorised to operate in Mozambique, experience and competences to cover all the relevant areas for the programme, either on its own or in partnership with co-applicants, affiliates, associates...).

17) Considering that the physical space of the Tech Hub is owned by a public entity that is a partner in the project, can the Lead Partner pay directly for the rehabilitation work, or is it necessary for the public entity that owns the building/structure to undertake the procurement and expenditure for the rehabilitation of the space?

The simpler and faster, the better. If the procurement procedures of the Lead applicant and its partners are shorter and faster (as it is most probably the case), and especially because the transfer of funds from the Lead applicant to the public entity and its re-use for the refurbishment purpose would take long time, it is definitively preferable that the procurement and actual work on the building/structure be done by the awarded implementing agencies, with benefit for the public entity.

Given our recent experience in transferring funds to Government institutions' bank accounts and their constraints in the actual use of these resources, AICS does not recommend the sub-transfer of funds to the public entity partner for the first activities to be carried out (e.g. the preliminary refurbishment works and equipment of the tech hub). The consortium's members need to assess which partner is likely to get the job done in the shortest time.

18) Considering that personnel costs in the Lead Partner's office can be allocated as direct cost of the project, if some staff at the office are self-employed, can they be budgeted in the Human Resources category, or should they be budgeted in the Services category?

There are not recommended percentages for each category of costs (though a balanced budget structure, coherent with the activities planned, is one specific aspect on which the evaluation committee focuses on and scores); therefore, it is up to the applicants to draft a budget which represents faithfully the real nature of the costs for the resources applied to carry out the activities and pursue the results. The self-employed type of contract does not change the nature of the resources (which will be probably directed under hierarchical lines as "human resources"), but only determines the ways the procurement needs to be done for these staff.

19) In case of purchase of goods, what is the maximum value for which there has to be a formal donation to beneficiaries at the end of the project? Do the AICS or UE rules apply?

This Call for Proposals and the management of the grants to be awarded follows the PRAG procedures and the contract models published with the package of annexes on this very website page (See Annex II, General Conditions, of Annex G, Contract, Article 7, points 7.5 and 7.6). Some rules also apply from the Italian legislation on public procurement procedures, but the reference for this matter is the PRAG.

20) Is it necessary within the project proposal to identify already an entity that will take over the management of the tech hub, or is it possible, during the project duration, to work on the sustainability of the tech hub and study/implement strategies for it to be sustainable at the end of the project activities?

In the Appendix to the Guidelines for Applicants (last 3 pages of the Guidelines), the tech hub model indicative document states that there are various approaches to try to achieve sustainability for the most relevant activities and functions of the tech hubs. As the question suggests, the project experience will contribute to define the best model, the most appropriate and effective entity to take the responsibility to run the asset in the future. During the project implementation, it may be decided that the public entity (formal owner of the tech hub) tenders to bidding companies the concession to run it, or a donor agency may come in and offer a grant to continue the activities and fundraise for more donations, or other negotiations will produce a better solution. If the applicants have already a (non-binding) strategy to propose, it may strengthen the credibility and increase the worth of the proposal.

21) Regarding the project procurement plan, for this call, do the EU rules apply (annual procurement) or the new ones introduced by AICS (total procurement plan over the 32 months of the project)?

This Call for Proposals and the management of the grants to be awarded follow the EU PRAG procedures. Please refer only to the rules stated in the Call for Proposals and its package of annexes.

22) In the Guidelines for Applicants of the Call for Proposals, paragraph 2.2.1 point 4 states 'the lead applicant must provide an audit report produced by an approved external auditor where it is available, and always in cases where a statutory audit is required by EU or national law. That report shall certify the accounts for up to the last three available financial years.' Could you better specify what is meant by 'required by EU [law]'?

In the European Union, the rules regarding the mandatory audit of annual accounts vary depending on the size and legal form of the company or of other types of entities (including not-for-profit, which is an eligibility requirement for the Lead applicant in this Call). Public interest entities (PIE's) and other organisations are subject to Directive 2013/34/EU's rules on the annual financial statements, consolidated financial statements, and related reports. For other companies and organisations, the rules depend on national legislation, which may exempt small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) from the requirement to audit their accounts or provide for simplified auditing procedures for smaller entities.

This means that, if one organisation is obliged by law in Europe or by its national rules to periodically undergo auditing exercises, then it must submit those audit reports referring to the recent past when applying under this Call for Proposals.

23) Is a financial guarantee requested at the signature of the contract with the awarded Lead Applicant, and which is the amount requested?

Yes, a financial guarantee (by a bank or an insurance company) needs to be submitted before the payment of the first tranche of the contract. In principle, the amount is equal to the first instalment.

24) Could you confirm that the lead applicant does not need to be established in Mozambique, though there is a provision about its capacity to operate there, among the eligibility criteria?

As per the eligibility criteria set in the Guidelines for Applicants, the Lead Applicant may be established in any country of the long list of the NDICI beneficiaries (including Mozambique), besides in any Member State of the European Union. The requirement of being already capable to operate

in the country may be complied with either by directly registered and authorised by the competent authority, or through affiliates (see the Guidelines for a tight definition), or by any demonstrated mechanism of channelling funds to and through project-dedicated bank accounts, hiring local staff, let international staff operate and reside in the country.

25) Can you share a format for the signed agreement to help us in its elaboration?

There is no specified format or template: the agreement needs to list the members of the applying consortium, their specific tasks and responsibilities, the expertise they contribute with (or the infrastructure in the case of the mandatory Mozambican public entity which avails it). It does not need to specify the budget allocations between lead applicant, co-applicants, etc., because this emerges from other parts of the application package.

26) Can you share in a short time the contacts of the focal persons at the ministries/authorities involved (MCTES, INAGE, INTIC)?

First, please note that there is a difference between the MCTES and the other institutions mentioned in the question: the former has participated in the discussions and in the drafting of the terms of reference for the Call (guidelines for applicants) and is the competent supervising authority, which will monitor with AICS the work carried out by the grantees in the target regions. The latter are potential members of candidate consortia, so they may be approached on a technical level for inputs or as potential partner themselves.

Having clarified that, the *Direcção Sistemas de Informação, Estudos e Projectos* of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education is the central unit interested in the programme, though its support has not been fully formalised yet within Government. Under this programme, there is no specific requirement to present the Ministry's endorsement of the proposals, nor to plan any joint activity with the government partners, who collaborate with AICS in tighter coordination under other initiatives (e.g. "DIGIT").

27) We have an idea for one project to cover both Central and Northern Mozambique. Would you prefer 1 proposal for 2 lots, or 2 separate proposals, 1 for each lot?

As specified more in detail in the Guidelines for Applicants, please submit one separate proposal per lot. Do not combine the two (this would be a reason for exclusion), but you may mention in each proposal the fact that you would have possible economies of scale, or effective synergies, if both programmes were awarded the grant in the respective lots.

28) Is it possible to get ahold of international entities to whom we could connect and make partnerships for the applicant consortium, similar to we have with the useful study "[Ecosystem Mapping for Maputo](#)" [published on the same website pages, just below the Call for proposals]? It would help us create partnership that better align with the initiative and meet the required standards.

AICS launched this Call for Proposals through international channels and expects that international entities with the desired expertise will soon look for local partners and apply for the grant(s). There is not a list of such potential partners available for local partners or international companies who need a not-profit-making organisation to lead the consortium. However, please read the reply to the previous question (just below) about the possibility that these international entities avail show interest in building a public-private partnership.

29) How can a university with valuable expertise in the fields required for the applicants be part of a consortium applying for the grant, if it has no eligibility because it is not authorised to work in Mozambique, nor is its partner in the country?

Universities established in the eligible countries as per the Guidelines for Applicants may team up with other entities as co-applicants or associates, if they do not qualify under all the eligibility criteria as Lead Applicant, including the proven capacity to operate in Mozambique.

In general, AICS Maputo will publish through frequent updates to these FAQ a list with the names and contacts of every prospective Lead Applicant which sends to Maputo@aics.gov.it its willingness to participate and to network with local or other organisations for applying together as a consortium the contacts.

30) May private for-profit companies be beneficiary partners under this call?

Yes, the eligibility criteria for Co-applicants do not exclude for-profit companies. However, the no-profit rule of the PRAG procedures for grants (Section 6) states that these companies (Co-applicants or Associates) will not be allowed to make a profit within the programme supported by the two EU/AICS grants.

However, private companies whose nature is profit-making may not lead a consortium (see eligibility criteria for Lead Applicants).

Also note: a company which is non-profit making by statute is eligible as Lead applicant.

31) May it be an EU company which desires to operate a tech hub/training centre/incubator in one of the eligible regions?

For the reason stated in the previous answer, if an EU (or any international) company desires to operate such a structure in the Centre and/or in the North of Mozambique, it may start the “adventure” as part of the applying consortium and accept the no-profit rule of the European grants for the duration of the award contract, thus exploring the potential markets, creating relationships, etc., then negotiate a concession from the public owner of the tech hub to operate it as a normally functioning private business. An international or local company may also decide to participate in the applying consortium just for promoting and expanding the local digital ecosystem, reaping the benefits in terms of increased commercial opportunities.

32) We read in the FAQ already published on your website that [...] and this seems contradicting the Guidelines [...]

Each call for proposals has its own specific rules, eligibility criteria for lead applicants, co-applicants, etc. Therefore, the Guidelines for Applicants and the annexes published with **code NDICI AFRICA/2023/442-998**, as well as **these Replies** to FAQ are the only set of rules and indications to refer to.

On 24th November 2023 a **public consultation and presentation** of two upcoming similar Calls for Proposals (for the “DIGIT” programme and for this one) had been carried out and another “FAQ” document, produced after that session, was published. However, that informative and consultative virtual presentation was still discussing a set of rules and mechanisms which had not yet been definitively approved. Now the two Calls for Proposals were published and their specific documents need to be used for reference.

33) Among the indicative deliverables for Output 2.2 there are “100 support measures to ensure that particularly disadvantaged youth (financially or materially) are supported to access to courses and/or incubation services”. Did you mean 100 [different kinds of] measures or 100 people to benefit from one or a few types of support measures?

The quoted text means that 100 beneficiaries from vulnerable groups (e.g. People with Disabilities - PWD) shall benefit from some forms of support allowing them to participate into the activities as the other people, therefore “not leaving [them] behind”.

34) Is there a total number of beneficiaries to reach? When the Guidelines indicate the desired number of beneficiaries per category, shall the proposal add them to determine the total?

The Guidelines indicate the desired targets of beneficiaries, articulated by categories, which look to the contracting agency ambitious but reasonably attainable. The *total* number is not relevant: the real challenge is covering (if possible) all the various categories to ensure that the programme has the desired width.

Besides, in few cases the categories are defined in such a way that adding the beneficiaries of the categories would duplicate the number: e.g. the beneficiaries of the measures to ensure that people with specific vulnerabilities access the opportunities created by the programme – such as training courses, start-up incubation services, hackathon competitions – will be (partly) the same people benefiting from the very courses, services, etc.

35) Are operational/operating costs only eligible under indirect costs (7%)?

No. It depends on the definition of operating (operational) costs. In general, many operating costs are eligible as direct costs: please see the General Conditions to be annexed to the contract, published among the annexes (Annex II to Annex G), at Section 14.2, where a list of the eligible direct costs should clarify this question.

36) In the call for proposals, it is written that “if any of the applicants or affiliated entity(ies) is in receipt of an operating grant financed by the EU, it may not claim indirect costs on its incurred costs within the proposed budget for the action” (Section 2.1.5. Eligibility of costs). What if the duration of the project is shorter than that of the Vamoz Digital programme? When an applicant is receiving funding for indirect costs from the EU under another programme, may it insert the 7% of indirect costs in this grant’s budget, too?

The Guidelines’s standard note mentioned in this question (common in all EU-funded grant terms of reference) is a general principle meant to avoid duplication in the costs which are covered by the EU and/or its implementing partners’ grants.

Therefore, if all operating costs of an organisation were covered by an operating grant of the EU, these specific costs should not be covered also by the 7% indirect costs eligible under this grant. However, if they are covered until a certain date which is closer than the end of the VaMoz Digital grant period, then the costs for the very functioning of the organisation can be covered with the indirect cost part for the remaining period.

In any case, please note that operating costs may include both direct and indirect costs. Operating costs encompass all expenses associated with the day-to-day functioning of an organization, which includes both costs directly tied to specific projects (direct costs) and those that support the organisation as a whole (indirect costs).

The second part of the question proposes a case of two programmes with different activities and budgets, both with the right to claim also 7% of the respective direct costs: this percentage of eligible indirect costs is set as a support amount for each programme and these indirect costs do not even need to be detailed or justified. The case is different from the situation considered in Section 2.1.5. of the Guidelines.

37) The applying consortium need to include at least a “public entity” (as active member or at least as the entity contributing with a facility where the tech hub will be established). Does this mean a central government entity or also a municipality, a public university, a vocational training institute, etc. is eligible to apply? Can you provide a definition of public entity?

Yes, the public entities applying as Lead applicant or Co-applicant or Associate (one of which must contribute with the facility to refurbish or expand and serve as tech hub), include municipalities, public universities, national public institutes, public vocational training institutes, research institutes, among others.

In general, a public entity may be defined as a legal entity that operates under the control, influence, or ownership of the government and serves a public purpose. This term encompasses various organizations and institutions established to carry out functions of public interest. The specific characteristics and categories of public entities may vary depending on the legal frameworks of individual countries. In Mozambique, for example, public entities may consist of government ministries, local councils (municipal, district, and provincial), public institutes, state-owned enterprises, and parastatal entities. These organizations play a role in governance, service provision, and economic activities, often with a focus on meeting the needs of the public.

38) May the Ministry of Science, Technology and Higher Education (MCTES) bid for the same project?

No, because its Directorate for Information Systems, Studies and Projects (DiSIEP) has discussed and contributed to the Terms of Reference (Guidelines for Applicants) of this Call for Proposals. Nevertheless, public universities and other public institutes supervised by the MCTES with statutory technical and financial autonomy and are eligible.

39) Is it mandatory to make a consortium to apply?

Since it is unlikely that the only mandatory member of an applying consortium (the Mozambican public entity which contributes at least with a structure/facility for the tech hub) possesses alone all the experience and competences in various fields required to be eligible as Lead applicant, in practice there will be the need to involve more partners in the applying team. The programme encourages and was designed to be implemented by a public and private partnership, with or without the civil society organisations which are used to manage EU or national governments' grants, but there are no further mandatory indications on the composition.

40) Can an Italian (or German, or Spanish, Tanzanian) association of municipalities (private entity, but no profit making) be a lead applicant, while creating a consortium with a Mozambican public entity and would this be enough? Or should an international organization be part of the consortium?

As reminded in the previous reply, the relevant principle is that the expertise and management capacity to implement and account for the grant need to be ensured by the applying team.

41) Does a co-applicant need to be exclusive to one consortium?

Yes, under each lot the Guidelines specify that the team members must be exclusive to an applying consortium. But one organisation may be co-applicant or lead applicant in another consortium applying to the other lot.

42) Is there a guidelines document in Portuguese?

Unfortunately not, but please check in the Guidelines the faculty to write (and submit) the proposal (with logical framework and budget) also in Portuguese, so to facilitate the communication exchanges and coordination with local partners.

43) Should the application be only submitted by the delivery of physical documents or is there an alternative online channel to submit a proposal?

Unfortunately, the European procedure adopted for this Call for Proposals indicates only the physical option (hand delivery or couriers such as UPS, SkyNet, DHL, Portador Diário, etc.).

44) Are the two lots supposed to be complementary? If yes, may we propose that one of these tech hubs is based in Maputo?

The Southern region is excluded by the Guidelines of Applicants. Please check the eligible geographical areas. The complementarity should emerge by the design of these two lots and the other programme financed by AICS (see "DIGIT" Call for Proposals for Maputo), since the purpose is to cover the national territory as much as possible with these development initiatives contributing to the digital transformation of Mozambique.

45) We saw that there is the obligation of submitting an MOU/Agreement stating the roles and the commitments towards the implementation of the programme by the consortium members. Must just one comprehensive MoU/Agreement be submitted or may the agreements among the members be articulated into more than one MoU?

Since it is crucial that all participants in the bid are aware of the other members' respective tasks and commitments and considered that the contracting authority is not demanding a legal constitution of such consortium (or notary-recognised identities), a unique agreement with the signatures of all members' representatives is requested.