



16 April 2021

Reference: RFP 2021/005 (hn)

ADDENDUM NO. 2

**Request for Proposals no. RFP 2021/005 –
Simplified Approval Process (SAP) and Project Preparation Facility (PPF) Review**

This Addendum no. 2 is issued to complement and will constitute integral part of the Request for Proposal. The original Request for Proposal document will remain in full force and effect. Respondents shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting their Proposals.

Please find below GCF's responses/answers to clarifications submitted by Tenderers of this RFP.

No.	Tenderer's Query/ Clarification	GCF's Responses
1	What is the total budget envelope for the overall Framework contract (3 + 2 years)? Does this include both expert fees and incidental expenditure?	<p>The GCF is not able to inform any tenderer the total budget for the potential framework contract.</p> <p>Successful tenderers will be awarded Long-Term Agreements (3 years) which will be based on Work Orders, and possibly renewable for another 2 years. Each working order will have a budget estimated in working days which can vary with the extension and complexity of the review.</p> <p>The Work Orders are costed with the fees that the tenderer indicated in the financial proposals, according to the level of seniority of the consultants that should be assigned in the review. Other expenditure outside the fees will be determined by the GCF coordinating team and specified in each work order.</p>
2	FIN-2 form is strictly linked with the case study mentioned in TECH – 4 part II SAP019 (https://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/gcf-b27-02-add16) and will serve as an indication of what the expert fee rates (except incidental expenditure) and proposed timeframes may look like for a specific contract; pls confirm.	<p>Correct, please note that the main indication in the FIN-2 form shall be for the daily fees according to the seniority of the consultant and the Firm's expected team composition. The case study is an indication of your understanding of the work and this will be considered in the technical evaluation.</p>
3	According to footnote 10 pertaining to FIN-2 form, travel costs are not to be included in the budget configuration [" The GCF shall arrange for the travel costs (If air transport is needed) when the consultants are required on-site. For travel within Republic of Korea, the GCF shall reimburse the travel	<p>If in the specific work order it is envisaged that the GCF needs the experts to travel, the full cost of traveling will be determined at that time and embedded in the budget associated to that work order. These costs will be treated as indicated in the RFP and will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p>

No.	Tenderer's Query/ Clarification	GCF's Responses
	costs upon presentation of relevant receipts. Daily subsistence allowance to cover for meals and accommodation shall be provided based on the prevailing UN DSA (United Nations' Daily Subsistence Allowance) rates for Incheon]; may we assume that all these costs are to be treated as incidental expenditure?	The FIN-2 should exclude these costs as per the footnote to ensure equal comparison of the Firms' bids.
4	FIN-3 form is aimed to provide prices information for possible additional services requested by the GCF when issuing Work Orders under the resultant contract; however, the 1st position mentioned is that of Team leader which cannot be seen as additional service this being in fact the main service; could you pls clarify	Thank you for requesting this clarification. FIN-3 form should give the GCF a clear understanding of the daily rates that the tenderer will apply to the consultants in relation to their seniority. This does not refer to additional services but daily rates of the Firm's experts in the review of proposals. While we would envisage three main levels of seniority (senior, mid-level, junior-associate), we leave flexibility to the tenderer to add other type of consultants' seniority/profiles. However, we recommend that the tenderer to be very specific and report at least on the three levels indicated: senior consultant – consultant (mid-level) and junior (associate level).
5	Neither FIN-2 nor FIN-3 seem to require the expert fee rates as such (FIN-2 relates to a specific case scenario whilst FIN-3 relates to additional services); pls confirm whether this understanding is correct	Please note that both forms ask for the expert rates but in different context. FIN-2 form relates to a specific case study; while FIN-3 form asks for a general overview of the rates at different levels of seniority. It is expected that the team composition deployed for different assignments will be some combination of the experts displayed in FIN-3. We expect that both forms will be consistent in terms of fee rates by seniority.
6	Point 7.3 of the TOR states that the reviewing team is expected to have at least the following professional profiles for the review of an SAP funding proposal; is there no similar requirement as well for the review of a PPF funding proposal?	Please refer to point 7.5 of the TOR. The PPF reviews will require a Team Leader and an Environmental and Social Safeguard Specialist. The professional profiles for these positions are similar to the Funding Proposal reviewers (detailed in Annex I)
7	Point 7.3 of the TOR enumerates 7 expert profiles and point 7.4 of the TOR states that if needed, the Firm shall be in a position to recruit ad-hoc specialist in specific niche of expertise; may we assume that the 7 required expert profiles will be the key experts for the whole duration of implementation of this framework	We do not comment on how each specific Firm will hire, manage or decide to retain their experts/consultants assigned to the work orders. It is the Firm's responsibility to show availability of such experts to engage in the review tasks. The expected duration will be for each specific work order (assigned review task). Nonetheless, we would expect that there is an indication on how the

No.	Tenderer's Query/ Clarification	GCF's Responses
	contract? If so, should these experts sign a Statement of Exclusivity at this stage?	Firm will ensure that there is (i) business continuity and (ii) knowledge retention/transfer among the consultants that overtime will be employed in the assignments.
8	Appendix I (General Terms of Reference of Sector Experts and Technical/Compliance Experts) enumerates 11 roles for Group 1 Sector Experts – senior Consultants, Team Leader (min 11 years of experience) and 10 roles for Group 2 Compliance/Technical Experts - Consultants/Associate Consultants (min 9 respectively 5 years of experience); could you pls clarify if this is the pool of experts required to be presented and if these criteria relate or not with the 7 expert profiles under point 7.3 and with the ad-hoc niche expertise mentioned under point 7.4	<p>Please note that, in the first place, it is recognized that each Firm might have specific sectors/areas of expertise in relation to the GCF Results Management Framework (RMF) Impact Areas, therefore it is envisaged that there could be more than one Firm awarded the long-term agreements in order to cover all the spectrum of activities of the GCF RMF.</p> <p>On your specific question, the Group 1 refer to 7.3 (a) profiling and 7.4. The other profiling in 7.3 (b to g) refers to group 2. Appendix I is meant to give you more insights on the duties and professional profiles requested.</p>
9	Is there a minimum or maximum number of expert profiles that we should present?	There is no minimum or maximum of expert profiles; however, we advise to clearly indicate which of the required profiles in the ToR each of them will cover.
10	Is there a specific CV length we should observe?	TECH-6 provide a sample and there is no recommended specific length we require.
11	In the table under point 3 of Annex 3 Evaluation Criteria, one of the requirement under point 1.1 is “Demonstrated availability of in-house or roster of experts/key individuals with applicable skills to provide the requested services (Must provide CVs of key staff that shall be involved in the assignment with the qualifications described below”; is this the same pool of experts whose expertise and experience is scored under point 2.2 of the same table?	<p>Your understanding is correct:</p> <p>Point 1.1. looks at your organizational capability to have in-house experts or available roster of experts that can be deployed for the assignment once the work order is sent.</p> <p>Point 2.2. looks at the quality of the CVs you will provide as part of your bid.</p>
12	Form TECH-8 Estimated Work Schedule (for Work Order) is aimed to present an example for a random general work order or does it relate to the case study mentioned in TECH – 4-part II SAP019?	Thanks for your question. Yes, please use it against the case study suggested in Tech-4.