

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034948-1

Project Title: Contributing to Sustainable Food Production in Cuban Municipalities

A. AMENDMENT

1. At Requirement 3 of Section 5 Evaluation Criteria – **REPLACE** Article 3.2 in its entirety with the following:
 - 3.2 Provide six (6) indicators and their data sources, collection methods, frequency of collection and responsibility namely, one indicator each for 1100 and 1200, and two indicators each for 1110 and 1210, for a total of 6 indicators. Indicators are not to be provided for results 1120 and 1220. (up to 40 points) (up to 40 points)
 - A. Indicators will be evaluated on their realism. A realistic indicator is one that answers Yes to all of the following questions: (1 point per “Yes” answer, up to 4 points per indicator, for a maximum of 24 points)
 - i. Validity: Does this indicator actually measure the outcome or output? (y/n = 1 point)
 - ii. Sensitivity: When the result changes, will the indicator be sensitive to those changes? (y/n = 1 point)
 - iii. Utility: Will the information be useful for investment management (decision making, learning and adjustment)? (y/n = 1 point)
 - iv. Affordability: Can the project afford to collect the information i.e. Is this indicator collectable at a reasonable cost (i.e. no more than 5% of the total evaluation & monitoring budget)? (y/n = 1 point)
 - B. Information on the data sources, collection methods, frequency of collection and responsibility will be evaluated on their realism (up to 16 points)
Realism is defined as:
 - i. Data Sources: Does the information provided by the Bidder under the Data Sources column incorporate data from a variety of sources and best suit the indicator in question? (i.e. be immediately linked to the element the indicator will measure) – (y/n = 4 points)
 - ii. Collection Method: Does the data collection method consider the practicality and costs of each method? – (y/n = 4 points)
 - iii. Frequency of Collection: Does the selected frequency best suit the indicator in question? – (y/n = 4 points)
 - iv. Responsibility: Does the responsible party(ies) best suit the indicator in question ? – (y/n = 4 points)

B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question 1	Regarding the RPF for the Contributing to Sustainable Food Production in Cuban Municipalities Project, can DFATD confirm that the professional services outlined in section 3.3 of Appendix B are not Cuba-based positions?
Answer 1	Yes, DFATD can confirm that the professional resources listed in section 3.3 of Appendix B are not Cuba-based positions.

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034948-1

Question 2	Can DFATD confirm the total duration of the project in months? The Summary Description on page 3 of the RFP states five years, but section 5, Project Duration, notes “a 4-month inception mission period ... followed by a four-year implementation period,” and then refers to “the remaining year.” It is not clear whether that means there will be an additional full year beyond the four years of implementation, or the remaining time.
Answer 2	DFATD can confirm that the total duration of the project is five years which includes a 4-month inception period (following signature of the contract).
Question 3	Related to the budget : a. Have the procedures been initiated by the Cuban counterpart for the purchase or provision of a vehicle in Cuba, as part of this RFP, so that that a vehicle will be available starting the first month of implementation of the project? b. Should the financial proposal not surpass \$5,000,000 Can (FIN - 1C) including the \$ 700,000 portion of section FIN-B? For example, if this were the case, the GRAND TOTAL of section FIN-1C should not exceed \$ 4,300,000. c. Will the field project office be located on the premises of the Institute of Sols of MINAG? d. Is a project office required in the Municipality where the project “pole” is to be situated (I’m assuming of the project will be located)?
Answer 3	a. Please refer to Section 4 Terms of Reference, Annex B, para 5, Support to be provided by DFATD and/or Recipient Country requirements and consultations to take place within four (4) months after contract signature. b. Please refer to Section 1, Data Sheet, 11.17. The maximum funding for the Contract resulting from this RFP is \$5,000,000 CAD, excluding Applicable Taxes. Note that the Form Fin-1C includes \$1,500,000 for procurement and Form Fin1-B provides \$700,000 for contractors and the remainder for technical assistance and capacity building. c. The project office location and office staff will be decided during the Inception Phase, and in consultation with the MINAG/Soils Institute. For more information, the Consultant should review page 73 section 3.4 (Provision of Additional local professional services and contractors). d. Please see above response 3.c.
Question 4	Technical questions: a. Are the food production plans the same as the agricultural production plans? b. It mentions on page 89 that the consultant needs to produce 6 indicators. According to the Logic Model, there are 10 indicators. Are there results for which we do not have to provide indicators... as mentioned on page 38 where the boxes for the indicators for results 1120 and 1220 are in grey?
Answer 4	a. Yes, food production plans and agricultural production plans are the same. b. As indicated in section 3.2 of the Evaluation Criteria described in this RFP, the Bidder is to provide 6 indicators. Namely, one indicator each for 1100 and 1200, and two indicators each for 1110 and 1210, for a total of 6 indicators. Indicators are not to be provided for results 1120 and 1220.
Question 5	Form TECH-5C: please confirm that we don’t need to include data for immediate outcomes 1120 and 1220. The instructions on pg. 38 suggest that the only row that should not be filled in is that for the Ultimate Outcome.

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034948-1

Answer 5	Data is not to be included for Immediate Outcomes 1120 and 1220.
Question 6	FIN-1B: Is the \$700,000 a fixed amount for the purposes of the proposal, or can the Bidder propose a lower amount? Is this amount included in the total budget of \$5 million, or is it an additional amount?
Answer 6	The Bidder is not being asked to propose an amount for FIN-1B. The Cost of Additional Personnel and Contractors in FIN-1B (\$700,000) is included in the total project maximum budget of \$5 million.
Question 7	FIN-1C: Is the \$1,500,000 for equipment purchases a fixed amount for the purposes of the proposal, or can the Bidder propose a lower amount?
Answer 7	The amount of \$1,500,000 for purchase and transportation costs of equipment and supplies is a ceiling amount provided for costs that are dependent on a diagnostic study. The bidder is to respect this amount.
Question 8	Can we submit costs for additional international consultants that may be required? If so, is this included as part of FIN-1B or FIN-1C?
Answer 8	The cost of additional international consultants is included in FIN-1B Cost of Additional Personnel and Contractors.
Question 9	Pg. 48 (footnote) states that four months after project start-up a diagnostic study will be finalized to establish which of the five municipalities will become the focus of the project. Should we plan for a project that targets five municipalities? If some of the original five are not chosen as targets as a result of the diagnostic study, could other municipalities be proposed? We ask because the number of municipalities included will have implications for budget planning, and on final beneficiary number.
Answer 9	The bid should target a maximum of the five municipalities identified. The diagnostic study and further consultation with the MINAG/Soils Institute may result in modifications to the originally targeted municipalities.
Question 10	Pg. 49 states that the proposed project will continue to focus on private farmers and cooperatives, as they are responsible for 70% of the island's food production. Have the targeted cooperatives/farms been selected with MINAG/Soils Institute? Or is this expected to be done during the inception phase? This will also have budget and planning implications.
Answer 10	The targeted cooperatives have been selected. However, as stated in the response above, the diagnostic study and further consultation with the MINAG/Soils Institute may result in modifications to the originally targeted municipalities.
Question 11	Pg. 66 – section 3.2.1 b states that it is the responsibility of the consultant to open a fully functional project office in La Havana. However, it also states that “the Consultant will not reside in Cuba for the purposes of work because of Cuban residency restrictions.” Therefore, will the local office be staffed only by local Cuban staff (hired by the Consultant as per section (c) on pg. 66) and staff of the Soils Institute assigned to the project? Will the project office be located on the premises of the Soils Institute?
Answer 11	As stated above, the project office location and office staff will be decided during the Inception Phase, and in consultation with the MINAG/Soils Institute. For more information, the Consultant should review page 73 section 3.4 (Provision of Additional local professional services and contractors).
Question 12	Pg. 70 – Positions described in section 3.3: Are there nationality requirements for the five positions?
Answer 12	No.

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034948-1

Question 13	Pg. 73 – Positions described in section 3.4: If local resources have already been identified and are currently engaged by the consultant (via PALCO), can they be suggested and included to fulfill these roles?
Answer 13	Yes.
Question 14	Pg. 85, Bidder's Experience: the RFP states that "the criterion will evaluate only the experience of the member identified in the proposed methodology as responsible for the overall management and implementation of the resulting contract. This criterion will not consider the experience of other members of the consortium." First, does this mean that only one member of a consortium can be responsible for management and implementation of the project, rather than proposing an arrangement whereby the project is jointly managed by both members? Second, is the "member in charge" also considered the member responsible for overall management and implementation of the contract? Third, if only one member can be responsible for management and implementation of the project, does that mean that both project descriptions must come from that member?
Answer 14	Requirement 1 is intended to assess the bidder's experience in managing and implementing projects. Requirement 1 does not ask for a proposal for the management of the project. Where a project was carried out by a consortium or joint venture, the Bidder should clearly identify which member was responsible for the management and implementation of the project. This criterion will not consider the experience of other members of the consortium.
Question 15	Section 1.6 (pg. 8) of the RFP document states that "If DFATD does not organize a site tour [.....] Bidders are encouraged to undertake a visit to the project area before submitting their proposals. Bidders are requested to contact the Point of Contact in the data sheet to arrange their visit". We would like your clearance for a visit to Cuba to project sites, including meeting with project partners, including the Soils Institute. Please note that we already have presence on the ground, and thus we do not need support in arranging/organizing the visit – we just need clearance to be able to undertake it and meet with local project partners. Please advise on whether we can move forward.
Answer 15	As stated in 1.6, "If DFATD does not organize a site tour and if one is specified in the Data Sheet, Bidders are encouraged to undertake, at their own discretion and cost, a visit to the project area before submitting their Proposals." DFATD has not organized a site tour nor is a site tour specified in the Data Sheet; all the information needed to prepare a valid proposal has been included in the RFP. Therefore a site visit is not needed.

C. All other terms and conditions of the RFP remain unchanged.