

Our Ref: PPDA/MKCC/023

29<sup>th</sup> August 2024

The Accounting Officer  
Ministry of Kampala Capital City and Metropolitan Affairs  
P.O. Box 7186  
**KAMPALA**

**BID PREPARATORY AUDIT EXERCISE FOR PROCUREMENT OF CIVIL WORKS CONTRACTORS AND CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR KAMPALA CAPITAL CITY AUTHORITY UNDER THE GREATER KAMPALA METROPOLITAN AREA URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (GKMA-UDP)**

Reference is made to the above subject.

The Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority (hereinafter "PPDA or Authority") on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2025 conducted a bid preparatory audit into the procurement of the following:

**Table 1: List of procurements reviewed procurements**

S/No	Procurement Refer. No	Subject of Procurement
<b>Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP</b>		
1.	KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/00008/1	Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) + Kireka Link (0.4Km) + Lance Road (0.9Km)
2.	KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/00009/2	Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (Wandegeya to Bwaise 2.55Km Dual lanes)
3.	KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/00010/3	Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (2.64Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual lanes
<b>Provision of Consultancy Services for Supervision of Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP</b>		
1.	KCCA-GKMA/CONS/25-26/00011	Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) including Kireka Link (0.4Km) and Lance Road (0.9km) Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (2.55Km Dual carriageway) Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (4.8Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual Carriage Road

**Head Office :**  
PPDA - URF Towers,  
Plot 39, Nakasero Road  
P.O. Box 3925, Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: +256-414-311100  
Email : info@ppda.go.ug

**Western Regional Office :**  
RDC's Building, Bishop Stretcher Road,  
Opposite BOU Currency Centre,  
Mbarara-Kabale Road,  
P.O. Box 1353, Mbarara, Uganda  
Tel: +256-417-733800  
Email : mbararaoffice@ppda.go.ug

**Northern Regional Office :**  
Plot 1, Lower Churchill Drive,  
P.O. Box 999, Gulu, Uganda  
Tel: +256-417-432010  
Email : guluoffice@ppda.go.ug

**Eastern Regional Office :**  
Oval Plaza, Plot 1, Court Road,  
P.O. Box 2173, Mbale, Uganda  
Tel: +256-417-890100  
Email : mbaleoffice@ppda.go.ug



**Provision of Consultancy Services for Supervision of Environmental and Social Safeguards on Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP**

1.	KCCA-GKMA/CONS/25-26/00005	Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) including Kireka Link (0.4Km) and Lance Road (0.9km) Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (2.55Km Dual carriageway) Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (4.8Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual Carriage Road
----	----------------------------	--

The audit exercise involved a review of the procurement planning, requisition/initiation and solicitation document issued to bidders following the Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets Act, Cap 205, the PPDA Regulations, 2023 and PPDA Guidelines.

The objectives of the audit were to:

1. Ensure that public procurement planning and requisition was conducted in a manner which promotes transparency, accountability and fairness in accordance with the PPDA Act, Cap 205, the PPDA Regulations, 2023 and attendant Guidelines; and
2. Establish whether the solicitation documents issued to bidders were prepared in accordance with the provisions of the PPDA Act, Cap 205, the PPDA Regulations, 2023 and attendant Guidelines.

The Authority identified some exceptions for the attention of management. The purpose of this letter therefore is to communicate the following findings and recommendations for your attention and action.

***Objective One: To establish whether the public procurement planning and requisition process was conducted in a manner which promotes transparency, accountability and fairness in accordance with the PPDA Act, Cap. 205, the PPDA Regulations 2023 and relevant Guidelines***

**1. Format of the procurement plan**

The Authority noted that the Entity uploaded onto the Electronic Government Procurement System its procurement plan for the Financial Year 2025/26 on 24<sup>th</sup> July 2025 but found that it was in the format issued by the Authority on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2021 and not the revised multi-year procurement plan format as issued by the Authority on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2024.

Use of a wrong procurement format impedes implementation and monitoring of some elements of the procurement plan.

**Recommendation**

The procurement plan should be revised taking into consideration the format issued by the Authority on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2024 and should be reuploaded by 5<sup>th</sup> September 2025.

**Objective Two: To establish whether the solicitation documents issued to bidders were prepared in accordance with the provisions of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205, the PPDA Regulations 2023 and relevant Guidelines**

## **2.1 General Observations**

The Authority reviewed the procurements for construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP – Lots, 1 2 and 3 and made the following cross-cutting findings:

### **1. Local Content**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation documents and noted that Sub-Factor 6.2.11 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology provided that in accordance with the PPDA Guideline issued on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and the Local Content Bill, 2019, bidders must submit evidence of a sub-contracting arrangement or other agreement with a local company or local companies (a local company is defined as a company registered in Uganda and wholly owned by Ugandans) that shall include details of the works with the local company(ies) amounting to at least 30% of the scope of contracted works.

The Authority found that the PPDA Guideline issued on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 was supplanted by the PPDA Guideline No. 12 of 2024 on Reservation Schemes to Promote the Participation of Local Providers in Public Procurement.

Further, PPDA Guideline No. 12 of 2024 on Reservation Schemes to Promote the Participation of Local Providers in Public Procurement provides for sub-contracting of a minimum of at least 30% of the value of the works to national or resident providers for the procurement of road works above UGX 45 Billion for foreign bidders instead of 30% of the scope of works as proposed in Sub-Factor 6.2.11 of the qualification criteria.

Use of outdated an outdated Guideline may render the criterion on local content unenforceable while ambiguity between “scope” vs. “value” of works may lead to inconsistent submissions by bidders. Further, misalignment of requirements may hinder effective monitoring of actual local participation.

### **Recommendations**

Sub-Factor 6.2.11 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology should be amended to:

- Remove citation of the PPDA Guideline issued on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 and Local Content Bill, 2019 and align with PPDA Guideline No. 12 of 2024.
- Include a requirement for sub-contracting a minimum of at least 30% of the value of the works to national or resident providers instead of 30% of the scope of works.

### **2. Post-Qualification**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation documents and noted that Clause 9 of the evaluation methodology and criteria provided that post-qualification would be undertaken as below:

- i. Legal Requirements: Due diligence shall be done to verify ownership of the company and its registration with appropriate body in the country of principal business.
- ii. Technical Requirements: Due diligence shall be done to:
  - a) Verify and validate the bidder’s performance on previous indicated private and public contracts in the bidder’s submission.
  - b) Verify and validate current commitments and litigation record of the bidder.

- c) The PDE shall carry out physical inspection of selected referenced projects to verify equipment's, completion status, Human resource and any other key aspects.
- iii. Financial Requirements: Due diligence shall be done to verify and ascertain the bidder's financial contracting capacity and bank commitment to provide a credit line to the bidder.

The Authority found that Clause 9 of the evaluation methodology and criteria in the solicitation document provided due-diligence requirements instead of post-qualification criteria in contravention of Regulation 11 of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023. Ambiguity of evaluation criteria may lead to award of contracts to non-compliant providers.

### **Recommendation**

Clause 9 of the evaluation methodology and criteria in the solicitation document should be amended to replace the generic due diligence steps with defined post-qualification criteria inclusive of quantitative thresholds for legal, technical, and financial capacity or withdrawn in the event that post-qualification criteria are not available in accordance with Regulation 11 of the PPDA (Evaluation) Regulations, 2023.

## **2.2 Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP - Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) + Kireka Link (0.4Km) + Lance Road (0.9Km) (KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/00008/1)**

### **1. Specific experience**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted that Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology provided that bidders must meet the requirement of participation as contractor, in at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 70 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries that are similar to the proposed works. The similarity shall be based on the physical size, complexity, methods/technology or other characteristics as described in the Statement of Requirements. The minimum key requirements shall include upgrading/reconstruction of not less than 8km of roads in an urban environment, laying of crushed stone aggregate, Dense Bituminous Macadam (DBM), asphalt concrete and installation of solar street lights.

The Authority found that the criterion was restrictive as the requirement of having undertaken at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 70 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries implies that only bidders that have undertaken works in western Africa, eastern Africa, middle or Central Africa, and Southern Africa are eligible to participate in the procurement.

Consequently, potential bidders who have undertaken much larger and much more complex works in other parts of the world are ineligible to participate in the procurement due to geographic restriction of experience to "Sub-Saharan Africa".

The criterion may lead to an artificially narrowed bidder pool due to its restrictive nature which limits competition and affects value for money.

**Recommendation**

Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology should be amended to remove the geographic limitation while maintaining focus on technical similarity and contract value regardless of location to promote competition and value for money in accordance with Section 46 of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205.

**2. Duplicated bills of items for relocation of utilities**

Item 12.02 of the bills of quantities under Series 1000 (preliminaries and general obligations) provides that bidders should quote for the following:

- i. Arrange and pay for removal and/or alteration to services provided by agencies for electricity supply, water supply or telecommunication services for which a provisional sum of UGX 5.8 Billion was allocated by the Entity; and
- ii. Supply and install standard timber poles (min 300mm diameter) for internet cables relocation in new positions outside the Right of way of the road.

The Authority found that the scope of Item 12.02 (a) covered the relocation of telecommunication services which included internet cables rendering Item 12.02 (b) redundant.

Duplication of items in the bills of quantities can lead to payment for works/services not rendered leading to nugatory expenses.

**Recommendation**

Item 12.02 of the bills of quantities under Series 1000 (preliminaries and general obligations) should be amended to withdraw Item 12.02 (b) due to its redundant nature.

**3. Unjustified use of provisional sums**

Item 25.08 of the bills of quantities under Series 2000 (drainage) for Old Kira Road provides that bidders should include a provisional sum of UGX 300 Million as being for construction of drainage outlet channels with the details to be provided by the Engineer.

The Authority found that a consultant had been contracted by the Entity to prepare detailed designs for the roads and as such, the drainage outlet channels should have been fully designed and included as measured bills of quantity items. The item should have been provided as provisional in nature only if the scope could not be defined before tender due to approvals, right-of-way, or third-party dependencies that are genuinely uncertain.

Unjustified use of provisional sums reduces cost predictability and may lead to inflated or non-competitive pricing. Further, undefined scope allows post-contract variations and scope creep without competitive re-pricing.

**Recommendation**

Item 25.08 of the bills of quantities under Series 2000 (drainage) for Old Kira Road should be amended to reclassify Item 25.08 as a measured BOQ item based on the available designs.

## **2.3 Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP - Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (Wandegeya to Bwaise 2.55Km Dual lanes) (KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/00009/2)**

### **1. Specific experience**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted that Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology provided that bidders must meet the requirement of participation as contractor, in at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 30 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries that are similar to the proposed works. The similarity shall be based on the physical size, complexity, methods/technology or other characteristics as described in the Statement of Requirements. The minimum key requirements shall include upgrading/reconstruction of not less than 6km of roads in an urban environment, laying of crushed stone aggregate, Dense Bituminous Macadam (DBM), asphalt concrete and installation of solar street lights.

The Authority found that the criterion was restrictive as the requirement of having undertaken at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 30 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries implies that only bidders that have undertaken works in western Africa, eastern Africa, middle or Central Africa, and Southern Africa are eligible to participate in the procurement.

Consequently, potential bidders who have undertaken much larger and much more complex works in other parts of the world are ineligible to participate in the procurement due to geographic restriction of experience to "Sub-Saharan Africa".

The criterion may lead to an artificially narrowed bidder pool due to its restrictive nature which limits competition and affects value for money.

### **Recommendation**

Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology should be amended to remove the geographic limitation while maintaining focus on technical similarity and contract value regardless of location to promote competition and value for money in accordance with Section 46 of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205.

### **2. Overheads and profits as a percentage of provisional sums**

The Authority reviewed the bills of quantities issued to bidders and observed that several items were provided as provisional in nature with bidders required to quote for overheads and profits as a percentage of the provisional sums.

However, only Item 12.04 (b) of the bills of quantities provided for a percentage to be charged by the bidders as overhead and profit of the provisional sum while others were left of the determination of the bidders.

The Authority observed that when the overhead and profit percentage is fixed and stated in the tender documents, all bidders apply the same markup to provisional sums. This prevents bidders from manipulating margins to gain a pricing advantage, ensuring a level playing field and allows the Entity to forecast total cost exposure on provisional sums with greater accuracy.

As a result of a failure to fix the overhead and profit percentage, bidders may apply inflated or inconsistent overhead and profit rates to gain advantage.

### **Recommendation**

The Entity should Include a clause in the preamble to the bills of quantities stipulating the percentage of overhead and profit entitled to Contractors on provisional sums, which shall be deemed to cover all associated costs unless otherwise stated.

### **3. Error of the bills of quantities**

The Authority reviewed the bills of quantities issued to bidders and observed that Item 17.02 (a) of the bills of quantities required bidders to provide a provisional sum of UGX 40,000,000 as being for payment of the employers nominated service provider for annual environmental and social audit while Item 17.02 (b) of the bills of quantities provided for a percentage to be charged by the bidders as overhead and profit of the provisional sum on Item 17.02 (a) for which the amount of UGX 30,000,000 was indicated as the provisional sum upon which the overheads and profits would be charged.

This implies a discrepancy of UGX 10,000,000 between the provisional sum of UGX 40,000,000 for payment of the employers nominated service provider for annual environmental and social audit and the sum of UGX 30,000,000 upon which overheads and profits were to be charged for payment of the employers nominated service provider for annual environmental and social audit.

Ambiguity between Item 17.02 (a) and Item 17.02 (b) invites gaming (e.g., zeroing overhead and profits line or applying own base), hence distorting financial evaluation.

### **Recommendations**

- Use “Prime Cost Sum” when paying an employer nominated provider through the contractor, with stated attendance and use “Provisional Sum” only for undefined scope to be instructed.
- Confirm whether the Prime Cost Sum is UGX 40,000,000 and state that overheads and profits in 17.02(b) applies to UGX 40,000,000.
- If the correct Prime Cost Sum is UGX 30,000,000, amend 17.02(a) to UGX 30,000,000 and keep 17.02(b) aligned.

## **2.4 Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP - Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (2.64Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual lanes (KCCA-GKMA/WRKS/25-26/000010/3)**

### **1. Specific experience**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted that Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology provided that bidders must meet the requirement of participation as contractor, in at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 30 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries that are similar to the proposed works. The similarity shall be based on the physical size, complexity, methods/technology or other characteristics as described in the Statement of Requirements. The minimum key requirements shall include upgrading/reconstruction of not less than 6km of roads in an urban environment, laying of crushed stone aggregate, Dense Bituminous Macadam (DBM), asphalt concrete and installation of solar street lights.

The Authority found that the criterion was restrictive as the requirement of having undertaken at least two contracts within the last five years, each with a value of at least UGX 30 Billion, that have been successfully and substantially completed (at least 80% complete) in Sub-Saharan African countries implies that only bidders that have undertaken works in western Africa, eastern Africa, middle or Central Africa, and Southern Africa are eligible to participate in the procurement.

Consequently, potential bidders who have undertaken much larger and much more complex works in other parts of the world are ineligible to participate in the procurement due to geographic restriction of experience to "Sub-Saharan Africa".

The criterion may lead to an artificially narrowed bidder pool due to its restrictive nature which limits competition and affects value for money.

**Recommendation**

Sub-Factor 6.2.8 of the qualification criteria in the evaluation criteria and methodology should be amended to remove the geographic limitation while maintaining focus on technical similarity and contract value regardless of location to promote competition and value for money in accordance with Section 46 of the PPDA Act, Cap. 205.

**2. Overheads and profits as a percentage of provisional sums**

The Authority reviewed the bills of quantities issued to bidders and observed that several items were provided as provisional in nature with bidders required to quote for overheads and profits as a percentage of the provisional sums.

However, only Item 12.04 (b) of the bills of quantities provided for a percentage to be charged by the bidders as overhead and profit of the provisional sum while others were left of the determination of the bidders.

The Authority observed that when the overhead and profit percentage is fixed and stated in the tender documents, all bidders apply the same markup to provisional sums. This prevents bidders from manipulating margins to gain a pricing advantage, ensuring a level playing field and allows the Entity to forecast total cost exposure on provisional sums with greater accuracy.

As a result of a failure to fix the overhead and profit percentage, bidders may apply inflated or inconsistent overhead and profit rates to gain advantage.

**Recommendation**

The Entity should include a clause in the preamble to the bills of quantities stipulating the percentage of overhead and profit entitled to Contractors on provisional sums, which shall be deemed to cover all associated costs unless otherwise stated.

**2.5 Provision of Consultancy Services for Supervision of Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP - Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) including Kireka Link (0.4Km) and Lance Road (0.9km), Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (2.55Km Dual carriageway), Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (4.8Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual Carriage Road (KCCA-GKMA/CONS/25-26/00011)**

**1. Discrepancies in man-months for completion of the assignment**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the estimated man-months (the estimated number of professional staff-months required for the assignment) between the Instructions to Consultants (ITC) and the terms of reference.

Whereas ITC 13.1 provided the estimated man-months for the assignment as 370.5 (315.5 man-months for design review and construction supervision and 55 man-months for defects liability), the terms of reference provided the estimated man-months for the assignment as 373.5 (318.5 man-months for design review and construction supervision and 55 man-months for defects liability).

A 3-man-month difference could skew pricing by bidders and as such bids may be financially non-comparable. Additionally, the discrepancy may reflect an underlying inconsistency in scope definition e.g. missing tasks, overlapping roles, or misallocated inputs which could lead to underperformance, scope creep, or disputes over deliverables.

**Recommendation**

The correct man-months total should be confirmed and a clarification issued to all bidders.

**2. Discrepancy in completion period**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the period for completion of the services between the Special Conditions of Contract and the terms of reference.

Whereas GCC 18.1 provided that the period within which the services shall have been completed following commencement of the services is 30 calendar months (18 months for construction supervision and 12 months for defects liability), the terms of reference provided the completion period for the assignment as 32 calendar months (2 months for design update, 18 months for construction supervision and 12 months for defects liability).

The discrepancy may reflect an underlying inconsistency in scope definition e.g. missing tasks, overlapping roles, or misallocated inputs which could lead to underperformance, scope creep, or disputes over deliverables.

**Recommendation**

The correct period for completion of the services should be confirmed and a clarification issued to all bidders.

**3. Unjustified inclusion of provisional sums**

The Authority reviewed the terms of reference in the solicitation document and noted that the consultant will be required to update the information provided in the design drawings on existing utility services location. Any utility services not shown on the drawings but requiring relocation shall be identified and verified. The consultant will liaise closely with the utilities authorities concerned on all proposed relocation of any services affected by the works and shall update the

relocation schemes (prepared by the previous design review consultants) that will be ready for implementation by the contractor. All official dealings with the utility providers shall be conducted through the client. The Consultant should allow a provisional sum of UGX 20,000,000 to facilitate this exercise.

The Authority however found from a review of the terms of reference that Including a provisional sum for relocation of utilities risks double payment or scope ambiguity, especially if the provisional sum is not clearly ring-fenced due to the following:

- i. The bidders are expected to quote for the design update, which includes utility coordination;
- ii. The terms of reference provide that all official dealings with utility providers shall be conducted through the Entity. If the Entity is the lead interface, then the consultant's role is technical support, making a provisional sum for coordination misplaced;
- iii. Provisional sums should be used only where scope is genuinely indeterminate or third-party dependent. In this case, the consultant is not expected to incur costs directly (e.g. payments to utility providers), so a lump-sum or reimbursable provisional sum without clear eligibility criteria invites nugatory expenses; and
- iv. If the provisional sum is not uniformly defined (e.g. whether overhead and profit applies, what documentation is needed), bidders may treat it differently leading to non-comparable financial proposals.

In light of the above, the Authority found that the inclusion of the provisional sum of UGX 20,000,000 was unjustified which could lead to nugatory expenses.

#### **Recommendations**

- Remove the provisional sum and require bidders to price utility coordination as part of their fees.
- If costs are expected (e.g., travel, stakeholder meetings), bidders define them clearly and include them in reimbursable expenses not as a provisional sum.

#### **4. Discrepancies in man-months for the design update**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the estimated man-months for the design update.

Whereas the terms of reference related to design update provided that the man-months required for the design update would be 9.5, the proposed time-input for the design update as provided in the Tables 6 and 7 of the solicitation document indicate that the proposed man-months for the design update would be 15.5 man-months. This invites non-comparable pricing and post-award staffing disputes.

#### **Recommendation**

The correct man-months total for design update should be confirmed and a clarification issued to all bidders.

**2.5 Provision of Consultancy Services for Supervision of Environmental and Social Safeguards on Construction of Batch 1B Roads in Kampala Capital City Authority under GKMA-UDP - Lot 1: Old Kireka Road (6.2Km) including Kireka Link (0.4Km) and Lance Road (0.9km), Lot 2: Bombo Road 2 (2.55Km Dual carriageway), Lot 3: Yusuf Lule Road (4.8Km) and Binaisa Road (2Km) – Dual Carriage Road (KCCA-GKMA/CONS/25-26/00011)**

**1. Inconsistencies in road length**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the length of the road where the services are to be provided.

Whereas ITC 1.3 provided the lengths of Yusuf Lule Road and Binaisa Road as 4.8Km and 2Km respectively, the terms of reference provided the lengths of the roads as Yusuf Lule Road and Binaisa Road as 1.32Km and 1Km respectively. Misalignment of road length affects scope, staffing, and pricing.

**Recommendation**

The User Department should reconcile road lengths across all the solicitation document and issue a clarification to bidders on the same:

**2. Inconsistencies in contract duration**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the duration of the period within which the services are to be provided.

Whereas GCC 18.1 of the solicitation document provided the period within which the services shall have been completed following commencement of the services is 21 months from date of commencement order, Clause 3.4 of the terms of reference provided the duration of the services shall be 18 months construction supervision period followed by 24 months defects liability period for a total of 42 months.

The discrepancy may reflect an underlying inconsistency in scope definition e.g. missing tasks, overlapping roles, or misallocated inputs which could lead to underperformance, scope creep, or disputes over deliverables.

**Recommendation**

The correct period for completion of the services should be confirmed and a clarification issued to all bidders.

**3. Discrepancies in man-months for completion of the assignment**

The Authority reviewed the solicitation document and noted discrepancies in the estimated man-months (the estimated number of professional staff-months required for the assignment) between the Instructions to Consultants (ITC) and the terms of reference.

Whereas ITC 13.1 provided the estimated man-months for the assignment as 30 (18 man-months for construction supervision and 12 man-months for defects liability), the terms of reference provided the estimated man-months for the assignment as 38 (20 man-months for construction supervision and 18 man-months for defects liability).

A 8 man-month difference could skew pricing by bidders and as such bids may be financially non-comparable. Further, the discrepancy may reflect an underlying inconsistency in scope

definition e.g. missing tasks, overlapping roles, or misallocated inputs which could lead to underperformance, scope creep, or disputes over deliverables.

**Recommendation**

The correct man-months total should be confirmed and a clarification issued to all bidders.

**4. Role Duplication**

The Authority reviewed the terms of reference in the solicitation document and requirement that bidders were required to show evidence of the employment of both a Health and Safety Officer and an Occupational Health and Safety Officer.

It was noted from a review of the roles and responsibilities for the Health and Safety Officer and Occupational Health and Safety Officer that both positions had overlapping duties which could be undertaken by only the Health and Safety Officer.

This could lead to redundant staffing and inflated costs.

**Recommendation**

The roles of the Health and Safety Officer and an Occupational Health and Safety Officer should be merged and an addendum issued to that effect.

This is to communicate to you the findings and recommendations of the Authority. You are requested to submit to the Authority a status of implementation of the recommendations within two weeks from the date of this letter.



Dr. Aloysius M. Byaruhanga  
**FOR: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

- cc: The Accounting Officer – Kampala Capital City Authority
- cc: Chairperson, Contracts Committee – Ministry of Kampala Capital City and Metropolitan Affairs
- cc: Head, Procurement and Disposal Unit – Ministry of Kampala Capital City and Metropolitan Affairs
- cc: Chairperson, Contracts Committee –Kampala Capital City Authority
- cc: Head, Procurement and Disposal Unit - Kampala Capital City Authority