

Reference: GCF/RFP/2018/C/010

ADDENDUM NO. 2**Request for Proposals for Technical Advisory Services on the Piloting of Activities for the Preparation of Country Programmes and Related Processes**

The Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents remains in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their Proposal.

I. Responses to requests for Clarification

No	Clarification requested	Response
1	<p>P.42 of the RfP indicates that “the Technical Proposal shall be of no more than 25 pages in length. Appendices with resumes/CVs and may be included”. In addition, TECH-2-B and TECH-4 indicates respectively that it needs to be 20 and 25 pages maximum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do you confirm that the entire technical proposal, including all CVs of experts on Package 1 and Package 2, the methodology, the consortium experience and description (tech 1 to tech 8) shall be no more than 25 pages? - If so, this seems quick complicated, since our firm will bid in consortium with another firm (TECH-2 quite massive). Could we provide a proposal of 30 pages, excluding appendices and CVs (TECH-6)? 	<p>We are sorry for the confusion regarding the number of pages across the RFP annexes.</p> <p>The Secretariat’s intention is to limit the full written technical proposal to 25 pages. Appendices, including team members’ resumes may be included in addition as an annex to the 25-page submission. The Secretariat would prefer a more succinct written proposal, but ultimately the Secretariat is seeking high quality submissions with well-explained information; and although the page limit is indicative, we do not expect proposals to exceed 25-30 pages, at most.</p> <p>Please note, there is an interview component as a part of the evaluation, and we expect that could also be an opportunity for bidders to explain their proposal and ideas.</p>
2	<p>Are GCF accredited entities in conflict of interest, or could they apply as members of a consortium?</p>	<p>The response to this question will be addressed in a subsequent Addendum. The Secretariat is currently reviewing whether an accredited entity would be in conflict of interest by carrying-out this work.</p>
3	<p>Process and basis of pricing for Package 1 We understand that the top three Consultants will be appointed to Package 1. What is the process for allocating the 8-10 countries across these three Consultants? Given that the countries are not known at this stage and, as the ToR points out, the pilot countries are all at different stages and with different support needs, it is only possible for bidders to provide a ratecard (USD/day) of possible team members who might delivery the services for Components 2 and Components 5. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	<p>Each of the top three winning Consultants will carry-out work for their own set of 8-10 countries. Effectively, this means the work piloted under this TOR would be for a total of 25-30 countries.</p> <p>The determination of country selection will happen upon contract award and in coordination with the Secretariat based on country needs, geographical balance, expertise and preference of the winning Consultants, and/or other factors which could be determined during the inception phase of the assignment. As noted in the RFP, it is expected that</p>

No	Clarification requested	Response
		<p>there will be a geographical balance and the needs of countries will be considered for any eventual selection.</p> <p>Yes, considering the country selection is not determined at the time of bidding, a ratecard of team members delivering the services would be acceptable. Proposing Consultants may also include some element of travel cost in their proposal; though it is understandable that some variance may be needed since country selection at time of inception could change the costing. If a Consultant has a certain regional expertise this can be noted, and travel costs could be based on that region for travel. If a Consultant is confident of delivering the services globally, then indicative travel costs for a broader multi-regional approach could be provided.</p>
4	<p>Approach to ensure consistency for delivering Package 1 Much of Component 1 (e.g. Activities 1 and 2) appear to be common for the three successful Consultants. What is the scope for this group to work together rather than separate to promote efficiencies and, if so, how do you anticipate this being implemented practically?</p>	<p>Yes, we do expect the selected firms to collaborate together on delivering Activities 1 and 2. The Secretariat can facilitate introductions among the selected firms, and during the inception phase, the Consultants as well as the Secretariat can devise a possible way to practically implement the work.</p> <p>For bidding purposes, however, the Secretariat would be keen to see how the firms would approach these activities as if they were to deliver the services on their own. The financial proposal should also take this into account in determining the overall time and effort required so that the evaluation is consistent across all bidders. However, after contract award, if the three firms work together on delivering the services, it is of course expected that there may be some cost savings and/or duplication of efforts that can be minimized among the firms. This can be determined during the inception phase of the assignment.</p>
5	<p>Process and basis of pricing for Package 2 As we interpret it, those top three Consultants who are invited to negotiate terms with the Secretariat under Package 1 also qualify to participate in the <i>ad hoc</i> technical assistance provided to non-pilot countries under Package 2. As The ToR does not give further clarity on the scope of work involved in delivering this <i>ad hoc</i> support, it is only possible for bidders to provide a ratecard (USD/day) of possible team members who might delivery the services. Please confirm this is acceptable.</p>	<p>Yes, this is acceptable. The Secretariat does not have information on how many countries may submit their Country Programs for review under Package 2; however, we do not expect there will be more than 40-50 non-pilot countries submitting their country programs (i.e. approximately 15-20 per Consultant). For the purposes of bidding, it is envisaged that the work under Package 2, though ongoing and of an intermittent nature, should not involve more than 15%-20% of the Consultant's total time allocated for both packages.</p>

No	Clarification requested	Response
6	<p>My question relates to the fact that currently our firm has a Concept Note shortlisted by the GCF under the Requests for Proposals on Mobilising Funds at Scale.</p> <p>We would like to understand if we are eligible to submit a proposal for RFP 2018/C/010, considering that we also have a Concept Note under the Mobilising Funds at Scale shortlisted.</p>	<p>The response to this question will be addressed in a subsequent Addendum. The Secretariat is currently reviewing whether entities shortlisted through the Mobilizing Funds at Scale RFP process would be eligible to submit a proposal under this RFP.</p>
7	<p>The referenced template for the model contract (uploaded) includes blanks under 10.1 for the performance security (in Korean Won or USD) and 12.1 for liquidated damages (as a % of the total contract). Can a range for each of these be provided, based on past, similar contracts?</p>	<p>For this particular contract Clause 8: Performance Standards, Clause 10: Performance Security, Clause 11: Deductions and Clause 12: Liquidated damages will not be applicable.</p>
8	<p>For component 3, Activity 8 related to ad hoc services: can an estimate, range, or maximum of expected time for support be provided for this activity?</p>	<p>The Secretariat does not expect that ad-hoc support to this assignment will increase beyond 10% of the overall work. The Secretariat is keeping this flexibility within the TOR in order to accommodate for any unknowns that may arise during the course of the assignment for which it would rely on the expertise and technical skills of the Consultant to deliver.</p> <p>In addition, the Secretariat would welcome and encourage bidders to propose alternatives to the TOR presented if there is some expert advice or guidance that the Consultants may be able to provide to strengthen the TOR, which the Secretariat has not already articulated within the scope of this work.</p> <p>Proposers are at liberty to reallocate the time that may be needed to successfully deliver the assignment (based on their expert advice and previous track record on delivering such services), including adding additional activities if needed, but the Secretariat would like to reserve 5%-10% flexibility in the TOR as ad-hoc support to deliver on services that may be within the scope of the work but unforeseeable at this stage.</p>
9	<p>On local presence (pg 18/50), how is the consultant to demonstrate a strong local presence without a list of countries? How will this be evaluated?</p>	<p>The Secretariat would like the Consultant to demonstrate that it can have presence in any of the countries where the work will be carried-out. This work is intended to build local country capacity, and the Consultants' ability to show that it has the ability to undertake work in-country (for 25%-35% of its time) in a manner that builds long-lasting local capacity while delivering the work, is an important part of the TOR and will be evaluated as a part of the proposal.</p>
10	<p>If a firm is shortlisted, will interviews be conducted in person or via teleconference?</p>	<p>Interviews will be conducted via teleconference.</p>

No	Clarification requested	Response
11	Is the RFP it is extended until the 25th May 16:00 or 26th May 16:00. Indeed the revised Acknowledgement letter specifies the 25th May; whereas the “Addendum” pager shows 26th May on the upper section, and 25th May in the table	There closing date is Friday 25th May, 2018 at 1600 hours.