

Clarification Responses No.01

Issue date: 11 September 2026

Purpose

These questions and answers are circulated to all registered organisations to ensure that all organisations have the same information in relation to this procurement activity.

Approach details

Procurement reference number	FPSP-RFP-2026-056
Proposal Title:	Design and Development of Literacy Years 1 – 4 Decodable Readers and evidence – based and culturally relevant Teacher Resources
Approach issue date	12 August 2026
Deadline for Clarification	2 September 2026
Program	Australia Fiji Education Program (AFEP)

Questions and Answers

No.	
1	Question I. Q1: This task focuses on support to the Ministry of Education (MoE) to improve early grade literacy outcomes through the provision of curriculum aligned decodable readers. Are you able to explain how decodable readers align with MoE's curriculum or whether the curriculum will also be changed (at the moment the curriculum is informed by a different constructivist ideology that is incongruent with the evidence that supports use of decodable readers)? II. Q2:The RFP states 'Establish and train teacher writing teams to co-develop high-quality decodable texts'. Decodable texts are typically not written by teachers as significant skill in Science of Reading (SoR) is required and such texts are embedded within Structured Synthetic Phonics (SSP) resource kits. Is there a contingency plan to establish a SSP team within the curriculum unit to undertake long-term training on SSP to ultimately lead this significant body of work? III. Q3:The RFP mentions 'A comprehensive literacy scope and sequence (Years 1-4), and 'Design and produce a graded series of decodable readers aligned with the curriculum scope and sequence'. A phonics scope and sequence is needed to produce decodable text. Are you able to provide further information on the

	phonics scope and sequence and how this aligns with the literacy and curriculum scope and sequence references in the RFP? IV. Q4: The RFP states 'Develop aligned teacher resource materials, including lesson plans and assessment tools'. Recent 2026 Abt advertised roles in Fiji mention ongoing use of PM Benchmark assessment tools. How will the assessments for this RFP interact with PM Benchmark tools as PM benchmark tools do not assess phonics skills in a way that aligns with and informs the use of decodable readers? V. Q5: The RFP states 'strengthening of national capacity to produce and sustain such materials'. Is there a plan to de-implement PM Benchmark assessments, guided reading, sight words and analytical phonics? These balanced-literacy tools and practices are referenced in publicly available Fiji Year 1–4 resources and have been de-implemented in Australia and New Zealand as they conflict with current SoR and SSP evidence and the use of decodable readers whilst also limiting access to literacy learning especially for students with learning difficulties? VI. Q6: We note the program includes a Training Program Delivery Phase 2. What plans are going to be put in place to build teachers' knowledge of the importance of utilising a scope and sequence for phonics instruction, the importance of building skills in a sequenced and cumulative way and how decodable texts fit within the cycle of learning? What plans are in place to support the implementation of effective phonics instruction and how decodable readers can be used in effective instruction? Answer Overall: The Ministry welcomes proposals that draw on current literacy research, including evidence around explicit phonics, phonological awareness and the effective use of decodable texts. At the same time, this RFP is not intended to be a process for adopting a new national model of literacy instruction. The role of the successful bidder is to support the Ministry to develop high-quality resources that align with Fiji's existing curriculum, phonics scope and sequence, multilingual context and broader educational priorities. Any decisions related to changes to curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, or the continuation or removal of particular approaches sit with the Ministry and will be considered through the formal Years 1–4 curriculum review. Bidders are very welcome to bring relevant expertise and evidence to the table, but they should not assume the direction or outcomes of that review, or make wider curriculum change a condition of the resource-development work. <i>The answers to the Questions are labelled in Roman numeral with response beginning with 'R'</i>
--	---

No.	
	I. R1 Fiji already has a phonics scope and sequence that guides early literacy instruction. The proposed decodable readers will be aligned to this sequence and to the existing curriculum. Fiji's existing yrs 1–4 literacy curriculum is compatible with decodable reading. The current curriculum already recognises phonics and phonological awareness as essential components of early reading instruction. The Years 3–4 Literacy Teacher's Guide (TG) explicitly identifies the 'big six' interdependent components of reading which include phonological awareness and phonics. The curriculum also already provides for explicit instruction. The suggested daily literacy block includes daily targeted phonics instruction alongside oral language, modelled reading, shared and independent reading, guided reading and writing. The introduction of decodable reading does not mean that we are intending to adopt a completely different theoretical model of literacy teaching. We have introduced decodable readers to strengthen children's grapheme–phoneme correspondence which the curriculum demands be taught explicitly. Decisions concerning the theoretical and pedagogical premise of Fiji's national curriculum are matters for the MoE and the formal curriculum review process. The aim of this procurement process is to develop resources that align with our current curriculum and educational priorities. The procurement process itself does not provide a mandate for replacing the broader curriculum with a specific external model of literacy instruction. II. R2 The MoE recognises that we need specialist knowledge of phonics progression, text construction and early literacy pedagogy to develop decodable readers. This is precisely why the RFP aims to set up teacher writing teams working together with appropriate technical expertise. However, the MoE does not accept that Fijian teachers should simply be passive recipients of external expertise, or that we need to establish an "SSP-specific" unit. The co-development model represents the spirit in which this curriculum reform has always been carried out. It aims to bring together technical knowledge about decodability with Fijian teachers' knowledge of learners, languages, communities, curriculum and classroom realities. These forms of expertise are complementary. This is especially important in Fiji's multilingual context. The existing curriculum explicitly recognises that speaking and reading in vernacular languages provide foundations for learning to speak and read in English. The TG also recommends classroom use of vernacular languages alongside English in oral-language activities. The objective is to build Fiji's national capacity to develop curriculum-aligned literacy resources, rather than establish dependence upon a single externally defined literacy methodology.

No.	
	III. R3 Fiji already has a phonics scope and sequence so decodable readers can be aligned. The broader literacy scope and sequence has a different purpose: it describes progression across the wider literacy curriculum. The Years 3–4 TG clarifies this distinction. It has separate scope-and-sequence and teaching sections covering listening and communicating, reading and viewing, phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, creating and composing/writing, spelling and other aspects of literacy. The Guide also explains that the Year 3 and 4 syllabuses articulate learning outcomes in a “logical, sequential and incrementally rigorous progression”, complemented by year-level scope-and-sequence documents. The decodable-reader series needs to be mapped against the relevant phonics progression within, rather than in place of, the broader literacy progression. The MoE is seeking bidders to demonstrate how their resources align with the Fiji curriculum, rather than suggest an entirely new curriculum architecture. IV. R4 The MoE recognises that PM Benchmark is not designed as a comprehensive diagnostic assessment of phonological awareness, grapheme–phoneme knowledge or decoding. We believe that we can strengthen assessment of these skills via complementary diagnostic measures. However, the PM Benchmark gives us information about other important dimensions of reading, including assessment of reading level, reading strategies, oral fluency, retelling and comprehension within and beyond the text. A coherent literacy assessment system needs more than one instrument to measure every component of literacy. We aim for an assessment process that collectively provides teachers with useful information about phonological awareness, phonics and decoding as well as fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and children's ability to read connected texts. Any wider decisions regarding national assessment instruments is outside the remit of the resource-development procurement and would be considered through the MoE’s curriculum and assessment review processes. V. R5 No decision has been made to “de-implement” the practices or assessment approaches listed in the question here. The MoE does not regard broad labels such as “balanced literacy” or “Science of Reading” as sufficient, in themselves, for determining national curriculum policy. Teaching practices need to be evaluated according to their purpose, evidence base, implementation and most importantly, their suitability for Fiji's learners and educational context. For example, the existing Fiji curriculum incorporates daily targeted synthetic phonics instruction while also using modelled, shared, guided and independent

No.	
	reading and modelled, shared and independent writing. We consider these approaches compatible and appropriate, rather than mutually exclusive. The ongoing curriculum review will consider the evidence for particular practices and identify areas requiring strengthening or refinement. These decisions will be made taken through the formal Ministry curriculum–review process, taking account of Fiji's curriculum goals, multilingual context, teacher capacity, learner diversity and available evidence. We would expect the successful bidder to work within those parameters rather than influence national curriculum policy through the resource–development process. VI. R6 Teacher PD will include understanding of the Fiji phonics scope and sequence; phonological and phonemic awareness; grapheme–phoneme correspondences; explicit phonics instruction; blending and segmenting; cumulative practice; and the appropriate use of decodable texts. However, PD will reflect the full literacy curriculum, rather than position decodable texts or SSP as a complete theory of teaching literacy, including listening and communicating, reading and viewing, writing and composing, vocabulary, text structure, grammar, spelling and related areas. PD must help teachers understand where decodable readers fit within a comprehensive literacy programme, not reposition the programme around the readers. Training will predominantly respond to Fiji's multilingual classrooms, i.e. where children's existing vernacular language knowledge is seen explicitly as a foundation for English literacy development.
2	Question Proposed Adaptation to Scope of Services: Hybrid Decodable Reading Program In alignment with Section 1.2 (Scope of Services), we are fully committed to supporting the MoE by training a Fiji teacher–writing team to produce high–quality, non–fiction decodable texts. We propose developing 10 local non–fiction titles per level across Years 1–4 (40 titles total). This ensures students engage with texts deeply rooted in Fijian culture, traditional knowledge, and environmental protection. To complement these new non–fiction texts and maximise efficiency, we propose blending teacher–created non–fiction with a curated selection from our existing, field–tested decodable fiction library. Crafting effective decodable fiction requires balancing strict phonemic progressions with natural language and engaging storytelling. Utilising our established fiction pool offers key benefits: Optimised Teacher Workload: Allows the teacher–writing team to focus their expertise on high–value, locally specific non–fiction without overburdening them with high–volume fiction production.

No.	
	Empowered Local Curation: Fijian educators will serve as co-curators—reviewing, selecting, and adapting the fiction titles that best align with local classroom contexts and student interests. Cultural Customisation: Selected fiction texts will undergo local review, with options for re-illustration or text adaptation to reflect Fijian contexts where appropriate. Proposed Resource Allocation per Year Level: Year 1: Fijian educator team selects 30 fiction titles (from our core pool of 60) + 10 newly authored Fijian non-fiction titles (Total: 40 readers) Year 2: Fijian educator team selects 30 fiction titles (from our core pool of 48) + 10 newly authored Fijian non-fiction titles (Total: 40 readers) Year 3: Fijian educator team selects 15 fiction titles (from our core pool of 21) + 10 newly authored Fijian non-fiction titles (Total: 25 readers) Year 4: Fijian educator team selects 15 fiction titles (from our core pool of 20) + 10 newly authored Fijian non-fiction titles (Total: 25 readers) Total Program Library: 90 Curated Decodable Fiction Readers + 40 Co-Created Fijian Non-Fiction Readers (130 Total Books). Could the MoE/AFEP evaluation panel confirm whether a hybrid strategy—combining newly authored local non-fiction with teacher-selected and contextualised pre-published fiction—meets the tender requirements for Scope 1.2? Answer MoE/AFEP evaluation panel is unable to confirm the acceptability of any specific methodology outside the formal tender evaluation process. Bidders may propose solutions that combine newly developed and existing resources, provided they clearly demonstrate how the approach meets the requirements of Scope 1.2, aligns with the Fiji curriculum and Phonics Scope and Sequence, supports cultural relevance, builds sustainable local capacity, and achieves the objectives set out in the RFP. All proposals will be assessed through the formal evaluation process against the published criteria.
3	Questions A. Project outcomes and success criteria <i>Inquiry 1. Success Criteria</i> (a) Could you please describe the specific outputs and outcomes that, if delivered, would mean the engagement has fully met expectations at the targeted month 9 and/or month 12 if the mentioned extension is provided. If possible, a table or list setting out expected outputs at each stage would be greatly appreciated, so that respondents can scope and price accurately against a shared understanding of the expected deliverables.

No.	
	(b) Recognising that all three matter, where trade-offs arise in practice, could you please indicate how MoE and AFEP would rank the following in order of priority: (i) adherence to the indicated timeline (speed of delivery); (ii) educational outcomes (quality of materials for the intended educational outcome); and (iii) cost? Understanding this priority order will help respondents like us shape their proposed approach, schedule and pricing to reflect what matters most. In forming this view, the production context we outline in Question 10 may be relevant. Answer R(a) The bidder should clearly define their offer which will describe the (maximum) 12-month delivery. The expected outputs are defined in the RFP and should be responded to. R(b) The successful bidder will provide an offer that fits within the described scope of the RFP for the best value for money. We look forward to your bid responding to the three elements. B. Financial proposal <i>Inquiry 2. Financial proposal structure</i> Part A section 2.8(d) indicates the fees section of the financial proposal should be itemised per workshop topic, including delivery cost per workshop (for example, two-day and three-day workshops). However, the scope of services includes substantial activities beyond workshop delivery — including the scope and sequence review, materials development, illustration and design contributions, editorial work, and pilot support. Could you please provide some further guidance on how you would like the financial proposal to be structured? Specifically, should respondents present a full itemised budget covering all phases and activities of the scope, and is a further per-workshop itemisation then still required for the training components? Answer R(B) MoE teacher/administrator/leader workshop costs will be financed by AFEP and are not required to be included in the bid. Workshop costs should be solely for bidder's personnel and associated costs. The financial proposal should clearly be aligned to the technical proposal. Inquiry 3. Pricing basis and reimbursable expense mechanics (a) The Response Form (Part B) requests a daily rate inclusive of all costs, while Part A section 1.3 (Table 2) and section 2.10 describe lump-sum payments against milestones, and section 2.8(c) and (e) require a separate reimbursable expenses section. Could you please confirm whether pricing should be presented as a lump sum against milestones, a daily rate, or both, and how the reimbursable expenses section relates to each?

No.	
	(b) Could you please confirm the frequency with which reimbursable expenses may be claimed (for example monthly, or per milestone)? (c) Could you please confirm whether the reimbursable expenses estimate submitted with the proposal operates as a ceiling under the contract, and if so, what the mechanism is for adjustment where actual costs exceed the estimate? (d) Could you please confirm whether any specific travel policy applies to this engagement? If so, could you provide the policy? (e) Section 2.8(b) asks that proposals be VAT exclusive and clearly notated as such. For an organisation registered outside Fiji and pricing in AUD, could you please confirm whether Fiji VAT is expected to apply to the services, and that a proposal clearly notated as VAT exclusive will be evaluated on that basis? Answer R3a+b The financial proposal should be indicated as fees (against the number of days envisaged by each expert) and reimbursables, the costs incurred by the firm and individuals to achieve each deliverable. Payments will be made against deliverables, calculated as days inputted (fees), and costs incurred (reimbursables) for the period of that particular deliverable. The overall financial proposal should provide clear statement on expected cost using these two categories. R3c Reimbursable expenses will be paid up to the agreed ceiling. In the event of inflationary pressure, such as the fuel crisis, the firm and the contracting authority may review as per the evidence at that time. R3d the firm should only consider travel of its consultants R3e For evaluation purposes, submissions will be assessed based on the pricing provided in the proposal, consistent with the requirements of the Request for Proposal. Bidders are responsible for determining and complying with any applicable tax obligations relevant to their circumstances. The procuring entity is unable to provide tax advice regarding the applicability of Fiji VAT to individual suppliers. Should Fiji VAT or any other taxes be applicable, these should be clearly stated in the proposal. For clarity, a proposal submitted in AUD and clearly marked as GST exclusive will be evaluated on that basis in accordance with the RFP requirements. Any applicable taxes may be addressed during contract negotiations with the successful bidder, where relevant Link: Commonwealth Procurement Rules Department of Finance <i>Inquiry 4. Participant fees and payment mechanics</i> — teacher writers and illustrators For both the teacher writing team (Phase 2) and the local artists and illustrators (Phase 5), could you please clarify: (a) whether participants will be drawn from existing MoE staff, sourced externally, or a mix of both; (b) which party is responsible for sourcing/engaging said participants and managing their fees and related costs – the engaged company, with costs managed and on-billed through the financial proposal, or

No.	
	MoE/AFEP directly; (c) where the engaged company is responsible for payments, whether fixed or prescribed rates will apply for teacher writers and for illustrators, or whether rates are to be proposed and negotiated by respondents; and (d) where MoE/AFEP manages participant payments directly, whether respondents should exclude these costs from the financial proposal entirely? Answer R4 AFEP is responsible for MoE personnel and illustrators fees. MoE, AFEP and the successful bidder will jointly develop the criteria and identify the best personnel for the activity. As above, the bidder should only include costs of its consultants and associated reimbursables. C. Delivery model, teams and logistics <i>Inquiry 5. Pilot scope and design Could you please clarify:</i> (a) the indicative number of schools and districts anticipated, to inform costing of travel, data collection and support activities; (b) the anticipated duration and timing of the pilot, including how it is expected to align with school term dates — noting that with the pilot report indicated at month 8 and final materials at month 9, the time available for classroom use, data collection and revision of materials appears limited, and we would welcome clarity on whether there is flexibility in this part of the schedule; (c) whether the pilot is expected to utilise all titles across grades and schools, or a representative subset of books across one or more grade levels; (d) what data and measures MoE and AFEP expect the pilot to capture – for example classroom usability, student engagement and reading outcomes – or whether the pilot design and measures are to be proposed by respondents; (e) whether the engaged company will be able to shape the design and methodology of the pilot, working with MoE and AFEP, drawing on its experience of trialing reading materials in classrooms; (f) what is expected to follow from the pilot findings — in particular, the anticipated scale of revisions to materials, and how findings reported at month 8 are expected to be accommodated within final materials due at month 9; and (g) whether MoE and AFEP would be open to an iterative approach to piloting — for example, beginning classroom trials with a small number of schools earlier in the development process and expanding as materials develop — in addition to, or instead of, a single late-stage pilot? Answer R5 (a) Answer as per Inquiry 4, clarified above. R5. The pilot implementation will be limited to approximately 20 schools. There is flexibility as to the length of the pilot, and the bidder is encouraged to develop their

No.	
	approach. The time periods used in the RFP are indicative and it is expected for bidders to bring their experience to the proposal in the scope and how they will implement the pilot, as well as other aspects of the activity. <i>Inquiry 6. Teacher writing team — size, sourcing, selection and accountability</i> (a) Could you please provide an indicative size of the teacher writing team MoE anticipates establishing under Phase 2 (number of teacher writers per grade level)? (b) Will MoE source and nominate candidates for the teacher writing team, or is the engaged company expected to source candidates? (c) Where MoE sources candidates, will the engaged company be able to contribute to the selection process — for example by providing selection criteria and participating in assessing candidates' suitability, background skills and abilities for the project? (d) Where the engaged company does not participate in the selection of teacher writers, could you please clarify how accountability for the quality, outcomes and timelines of the written materials will be treated? Answer R6 This is answered partially above. Bidders should make recommendations as to the number of teacher writers required and the approach for identification of writers <i>Inquiry 7. Illustration team — size, sourcing, selection and accountability</i> (a) Could you please provide an indicative size of the illustration team MoE anticipates establishing? (b) Will MoE source and nominate candidates for the illustration team, or is the engaged company expected to source candidates? (c) Where MoE sources candidates, will the engaged company be able to contribute to the selection process — for example by providing selection criteria and participating in assessing candidates' suitability, background skills and abilities for the project? (d) Where the engaged company does not participate in the selection of the illustration team, could you please clarify how accountability for the quality, outcomes and timelines of the illustrated materials will be treated? Answer R7 MoE, AFEP and the successful bidder will jointly determine the illustrators and number to be used. Accountability for the quality of the illustrations will not rest with the successful bidder <i>Inquiry 8. Delivery locations</i> and mode Section 2.1 indicates the location as Suva, with some anticipated travel to districts in Fiji and some remote input. To inform costing of travel, accommodation and personnel allocation, could you please confirm:

No.	
	(a) whether the Phase 2 foundational training and applied writing workshops are anticipated to be delivered centrally in Suva, or across multiple district locations — and if multiple, could you please indicate the anticipated locations; (b) which components of the services are expected to be delivered in-country and which, if any, may be delivered remotely — and in particular whether a blended model (in-country intensive workshops with remote mentoring, quality assurance and editorial support between blocks) is acceptable; and (c) whether there are any expectations regarding the overall proportion of the engaged company's personnel time spent in-country versus remotely? Answer R8. Training will be done by MoE, AFEP and the successful bidder with a gradual release model building system capacity to continue the professional development. Indicatively, training will take place in Suva for all workshops. Activities outside of Suva will likely be school visits to understand current classroom practices. The amount of time to be spent in Fiji will be determined by the bidder's proposal. <i>Inquiry 9. Contract award timeframe</i> Could you please advise the anticipated timeframe for evaluation and contract award following the 14 September closing date? Answer R9. The deadline for bid will be extended to 28 September 2026. Notification of award to the successful bidder will be provided upon the evaluation of the bids received. D. Production, illustration and timeline <i>Inquiry 10. Meaning of "draft readers" and the production timeline</i> (a) Section 1.3 (Table 1) indicates draft readers are submitted iteratively across months 3–6, with final materials at month 9. Could you please clarify whether the "draft readers" are expected to include full illustration, design, editorial finalisation and layout in collaboration with artists and graphic designers? If not largely complete in draft form, could you please clarify the timeframe within which fully illustrated print-ready and web-ready versions of all titles are expected? (b) Decodable texts come in many flavours depending on the learning intention, and some will be much quicker to develop than others. We would be guiding the development based on our experience, but would like to understand if there are any specific expectations around the types of decodable texts you wish to produce, and what the mix of those types are (or if you are happy to take our guidance as part of our proposal). (c) Having produced published decodable texts for more than two decades, we believe production of all titles at this scale even with the fastest to produce decodable texts will, potentially substantially, exceed the timeframe allowed for this — assuming a high-quality educationally sound output, and assuming the full volume of texts mentioned are required to be completed in the 9 month period. Illustrations alone could be as high as 1,500 unique artworks to meet the indicative volume of up to 140 texts. Noting our

No.	
	Question 1 above regarding the intended end-state, we would welcome guidance on whether respondents should propose a production schedule and staging they consider more realistic for quality, professional text delivery, and the ultimate independence to develop future texts with equal quality and the outcomes in mind, with the indicative timeline treated as subject to agreement per section 2.10. Answer R10. Bidders are expected to present their approach in their bids. As the illustrations are not the direct responsibility of the successful bidder, final print ready and digital versions may not be complete at the time of the successful bidders fulfilment of contract. R10(c) Please include in your response to RFP and in your proposal. <i>Inquiry 11. Artist profile and art direction Regarding Phase 5, could you please clarify:</i> (a) what profile of artists MoE anticipates engaging — established professional illustrators, emerging artists, art students, or a mix — and whether contributions of community or student artwork are envisaged in any form; and (b) whether MoE is comfortable for engaged artists to work within a coordinated art direction and series style framework managed by the engaged company, to develop visual consistency of texts themselves (even if the artwork style varies to an extent), readability and educational suitability of the artwork given the intended educational outcome of the page and the overall text? Answer R11. Illustrations are expected to be a Fijian blend of traditional and modern images supporting the reader's engagement with the text. Illustrators will be identified by MoE, AFEP and the successful bidder based upon agreed criteria. <i>Inquiry 12. Artist capability development</i> In our experience, illustration of decodable readers involves specialised skills that directly support the development of students' reading abilities. An understanding of what both helps, and hinders is important, as is understanding how the art, and text combine (which can vary, depending on the goal of the specific decodable text type). Could you please confirm whether training and mentoring of local artists in these skills is considered within the engaged company's scope, and whether time and budget for artist capability development should be included in the financial proposal? Answer R12. As R11 above <i>Inquiry 13. Volume staging and timeline flexibility</i> Section 1.2 (Phase 3) notes indicative volumes are to be agreed with MoE, and section 2.10 notes that milestone deliverables will be agreed between the parties. Could you please confirm whether Abt Global and

No.	
	MoE would consider a staged delivery schedule — for example, prioritised grade levels fully produced within the contract period, with remaining titles and grades completed over time, potentially largely by MoE staff with periodic oversight, mentoring, and feedback provided by the engaged company until all titles can be completed? Answer R13. The bidder may respond to the RFP and propose their approach as they see best. The bids will be compared and evaluated according to the RFP. <i>Inquiry 14. Print production and delivery</i> (a) Could you please confirm that the Phase 5 deliverable is limited to print-ready and digital files, with volume printing of the reader series to be procured/managed separately? (b) Is printing under this contract for training materials a reimbursable expense or managed by Abt / MoE? (c) For the subsequent printing and delivery of the reader series, does MoE have an established printing and delivery partner (or partners) that the engaged company would be expected to work with, or is the engaged company expected to assist in identifying and verifying suitable print and delivery partners? (d) Is capability development for the print production side — for example ensuring texts meet print specifications, pre-press requirements, quality control processes and procurement readiness — within the engaged company's scope, and should time and budget for this be included in the financial proposal? (e) Are there any expectations or preferences regarding local (Fiji-based) versus international print production (Australia in our case — we have Australian print partners for books that qualify as "Australian Made") that respondents should take into account? Answer R14. Subject to illustrations being complete/print ready in time, the production of the readers is the responsibility of MoE/AFEP. The bidder will not be involved in the contracting of the printer. <i>Inquiry 15. Digital delivery and distribution Phase 5 requires outputs in digital format. Could you please clarify:</i> (a) how the digital versions of the readers and teacher resources are expected to be delivered and accessed — for example, does MoE have an existing platform or system through which digital materials will be distributed to schools, teachers and families, or is the provision of a digital delivery solution within (or outside) the scope of this engagement? (b) if MoE has an existing platform or system, what file formats, standards or technical requirements should digital deliverables meet?

No.	
	(c) what are MoE's expectations regarding access control and copyright protection for the digital materials — for example, open distribution versus controlled or authenticated access; (d) is training and capability development for MoE staff in digital publishing and distribution – including managing digital assets, access and updates over time – within the engaged company's scope, and should time and budget for this be included in the financial proposal; (e) where a digital delivery solution forms part of the engagement, could you please clarify the expectations regarding hosting and infrastructure – in particular, whether there are any requirements for hosting to be located in Fiji or for data sovereignty more generally; which party would source, procure and contract the hosting arrangements; which party would own and operate the solution and infrastructure over the longer term; and whether the engaged company would be expected to assist MoE in identifying and selecting suitable hosting providers; and (f) where a digital delivery solution forms part of the engagement, could you please advise what IT security and related standards apply – for example, any Fiji Government or MoE ICT security policies, Abt Global or DFAT digital and cyber security requirements, and any security assessment or testing required before deployment? We note the draft contract (clause 13) requires compliance with the Australian Privacy Principles, including in relation to overseas disclosure of personal information; could you please clarify how these obligations are expected to apply to any digital solution, particularly regarding access controls and the protection of any student, teacher or family user data? Answer R15. Delivery of the digital versions is the responsibility of the MoE/AFEP. The successful bidder should include in their proposal the final recommended digital version with justification. MoE will hold the copyright to all materials. The digital delivery solution rests with MoE. Notes to Clause 13: The bidder is requested to propose any contract clause amendments within the Technical Response Form. Please note that any proposed amendments will only be considered and reviewed should the bidder be identified as the successful respondent <i>Inquiry 16. Capability development across the end-to-end publishing process The scope identifies capacity building for the teacher writing team</i>, and we have asked above about capability development in relation to illustration, print production and digital distribution. In our experience, producing professional published readers of the quality and educational effectiveness sought involves further specialised functions across the end-to-end process beyond writing and illustration alone — for example, editorial functions such as proofreading, and technical preparation for production. Could you please confirm whether MoE and AFEP are open to proposals that include training and capability development for additional participants and functions across the end-to-end publishing process, where respondents consider this necessary to achieve a

No.	
	professional, sustainable result and the educational outcomes sought — and whether such additional scope should be included and costed in the financial proposal? Answer R16. The bidder is permitted to provide comment to the RFP and make their technical proposal as per the RFP and their comments. Bids will be evaluated as per the RFP. <i>Inquiry 17. Alternative approaches and multiple options (a) In achieving the objectives and deliverables described in the RFP, may respondents propose alternative delivery models, phase structures or timelines informed by their experience, or are respondents expected to adhere strictly to the phases and structure as outlined?</i> (b) May a single respondent submit more than one proposed approach or option for consideration? (c) If multiple options are permitted, should these be submitted as separate complete proposals, or as a single proposal presenting clearly documented alternative options? (d) Where multiple options or proposals are permitted, could you please confirm how the 20-page technical proposal limit applies — in particular, whether the limit applies per proposal or option (for example, 20 pages each for two options), or to the submission as a whole? (e) Would you consider options being presented within a proposal, that you may be able to include/exclude (that would push some things in or out of scope)? Answer R17. The bidder is permitted to provide comment to the RFP and make their technical proposal as per the RFP and their comments. Only one approach is expected. Bids will be evaluated as per the RFP. The 20-page limit relates only to the technical proposal and additional pages may be used for support documentation, CVs, etc. <i>Inquiry 18. Work samples — scope Part A section 2.5 (page 11) requires "Two samples of previous relevant work, including education research in Fiji and other relevant research work," while section 2.7 (page 13) refers to "Samples of previous relevant work, including rehabilitation program designs/plans." Could you please confirm the intended scope and nature of the work samples required for this RFP? Can this include educational work in Fiji that is not research (but has a research/evidence base)?</i> Answer R18. The RFP requires two examples of work that are most relevant to the scope of work. It is for the bidder to determine what are most relevant. <i>Inquiry 19. Response Form confirmation Part B (Response Form) refers throughout to an RFQ and RFQ section references. Could you please confirm that Part B as issued is the correct response form for this RFP and should be completed without modification or if determined this is in error, can you provide an updated version?</i>

No.	
	Answer R19. The response form will be reviewed by the team, and any changes deemed necessary to accommodate bidder preferences will be incorporated. An updated version of the form will then be published on the website. <i>Inquiry 20. Statement of Contract Compliance Part A section 2.9(f) calls for a Statement of Contract Compliance identifying any provisions of the draft contract the respondent is unwilling to comply with, while section 2.10 (page 15) states that requested amendments to the Draft Contract must be stated in the Response Form. Could you please confirm where suggested amendments should be presented (or whether both are required), and that suggested amendments to provisions of the draft contract at Schedule 1, including the Intellectual Property provisions, will be considered as part of the evaluation and contract negotiation process?</i> Answer R20. As per R19
4	Questions 1. Part A refers in one section to previous work samples including “rehabilitation program designs/plans”, while elsewhere the supporting documents refer to education research in Fiji and other relevant research work. Could you please confirm what type of previous work samples are required for this literacy procurement? 2. Could you please confirm the required currency for an international respondent? Part A indicates pricing may be submitted in AUD or FJD and notes that international organisations would contract in AUD, while Part B refers to the Offered Price being stated in FJD. 3. Within the Experience and Track Record criterion, there is reference to familiarity with “Disability Inclusive Education Advisory”. Could you please confirm whether this wording is intended to apply to this RFP? Answer 1. R1 Previous work samples are required that best respond to the scope of work and best demonstrate your firm’s experience working within this scope of work 2. R2. AUD or FJD 3. R3. This is an error and should read, “development of literacy years 1–4 decodable readers and evidence–based and culturally relevant teacher resources”