

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034946-1

Project Title: National Support for Local Investment Climates / National Support for Enhancing Local and Regional Economic Development

A. AMENDMENT

1. At Section 1, Instructions to Bidders - Data Sheet, Paragraph Reference Definitions (ee) – REPLACE in its entirety with the following:

The RFP Closing Date is **28 April 2015 at 14:00 hrs**, Eastern Daylight Saving Time (EST/EDT).

B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q1 Tech 2 requires the Bidder be a Canadian legal entity. Our proposed approach would have member firm in Canada working with staff from the Indonesia member firm to implement the project. Each member firm of which is a separate legal entity. With respect to Requirement #1 Experience, would a project managed and implemented by the member firm in Indonesia be considered as acceptable?

A1 The bidding entity, and if the bidding entity is a consortium, each member of the consortium must comply with the certifications contained in Tech-2 as specified in articles 4.3 and 9, Technical Proposal.

Q2 Page 35 of the proposal (Tech 5 - Methodology) indicates that this form is not applicable to the RFP. However, page 72 indicates a requirement to provide a description of methodology for implementing the project. Do you require that we complete Tech 5 with this information?

A2 No, by stipulating in Form Tech 5, Methodology, that this form is not applicable for this RFP, DFATD is indicating that no particular format is to be used in preparing the response to requirement 2, which appears on page 72 of the RFP. The directions contained in the description of requirement 2 stipulate a maximum of 8 pages.

Q3 Page 43 indicates the \$2 million innovation fund is a flow through expense. Is it correct to assume that the \$2 million for this fund is additional to the total available funding of \$17.3 million?

A3 No, the \$2 million innovation fund is included in the total available funding for the contract.

Q4 According to the RFP, the Methodology Section (TECH Form 5- p. 35) is stated to be “not applicable to this RFP”. However, on p. 72, the Methodology Section is indicated as a requirement with 290 points of evaluation. Could you kindly clarify the discrepancy?

Q4 Please see the response A2 above.

Q5 Since DFATD has shifted from its standard 80/20 (technical/financial) weighting to 70/30 as per Data Sheet 11.3, we request that DFATD raise the minimum technical score or Passing Mark specified in 11.10 and 11.13 of the Data Sheet from 420 (60%) to 525 (75%)? (A rationale was provided but is excluded here)

A5 The weighting of the components of the RFP were carefully considered by the project team during the preparation of the RFP. Therefore DFATD cannot accede to this request.

Q6 Clarification is requested on the following: As per 16.1 of the Data Sheet, we note that DFATD requires a performance security in the amount of 10% of the total contract. It then states that the performance security must be in the form of an Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit. We question why DFATD is requiring a banking product (i.e. ISLC) for performance security, where an insurance product such as a Performance Bond is more commonly used for such purposes. An ISLC is a banking

Addendum 1

SEL: 2015-A-034946-1

instrument; it is neither appropriate nor intended to act as a performance security instrument.

A6 It is DFATD standard policy to require an Irrevocable Standby Letter of Credit (ISLC) as performance security for contracts as evidenced in clause 16.1 of the Instructions to Bidders contained in the RFP.

This requirement cannot be modified.

Q7 With regard to Requirement 3.4, bullet three (p. 75) (“Identification of how the RBM framework needs to be adjusted (e.g. indicators) to better capture progress and provide guidance on future planning and project directions (up to 5 points).”), given that a draft RBM framework is not provided in the RFP, with the exception of the Logic Model on p. 55, can DFATD please confirm that this criterion refers to the adjustment of the NSLIC RBM framework developed as part of the PIP – i.e. PMF, Logic Model and associated data collection activities – as needed during the implementation phase?

A7 No. Requirement 3 requests the bidder to describe its proposed plan to manage the project described in Section 4 – Terms of Reference. Included in the project management plan should be a strategy for integrating Results Based Management which addresses the listed points.

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