

**Project Title:** Asia Pacific Trade and Investment Technical Assistance Facility (TAF)

## A. AMENDMENT TO THE RFP

- 1 At Definitions (ee) contained in the Instructions to Bidders – Data Sheet of the RFP, **DELETE** the words «2016-07-29» and **REPLACE** them by the words «2016-08-04».
- 2 At clause 9.8 (c) and 11.19 contained in the Instructions to Bidders – Data Sheet of the RFP, **DELETE** the words «Project Director 500» and **REPLACE** them by the words «Project Director 380».
- 3 At clause 10.7 and 11.17, Available funding, contained in the Instructions to Bidders – Data Sheet of the RFP, **DELETE** the words:
  - a) « a budget of \$4, 980,000 CAD including administrative mark-up for other Personnel and Contractors who are identified during project implementation and are required to carry out technical assistance and capacity building (Responsive Technical Assistance Fund) as well as the design and maintenance of a web site; and
  - b) a budget of \$2,560,000 CAD for the Reimbursable Expenses for other Personnel and Contractors (technical experts) for the mandates as specified in paragraph 10.4 (g). »and **REPLACE** them by the words:
  - a) « a budget of \$3,360,000 CAD including administrative mark-up for other Personnel and Contractors who are identified during project implementation and are required to carry out technical assistance and capacity building (Responsive Technical Assistance Fund) as well as the design and maintenance of a web site; and
  - b) a budget of \$3,680,000 CAD for the Reimbursable Expenses for other Personnel and Contractors (technical experts) for the mandates as specified in paragraph 10.4 (g). »
- 4 At Section 3., Financial Proposal Standards Forms, Form FIN-1A, Cost of Personnel, **DELETE** the words «Project Director 500» and **REPLACE** them by the words «Project Director 380».
- 5 In the same section, FORM FIN-1B, Administrative Mark-Up Cost of Additional Sub-Consultants and Contractors, **DELETE** the words «\$4,980,000 million» and **REPLACE** them by the words «\$3,360,000».
- 6 In the same section, FORM FIN-3, Reimbursable Expenses, **DELETE** the amount «2,560,000» and **REPLACE** it by the amount «3,680,000».

## B. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

- QUESTION 1**            The available funding for the contract resulting from the RFP is CAN \$11,627,000 (excluding applicable taxes). This includes CAN \$4,980,000 (including administrative mark-up) set aside for other personnel and contractors identified during the project implementation to carry out technical assistance and capacity building and CAN\$2,560,000 for reimbursable expenses for the mandates. In light of the minimum level of effort determined for the seven required personnel positions, there is

## Addendum 2

SEL.: 2017-D-003045-1

---

concern that the remaining budget is insufficient, particularly given the anticipated premium costs for part-time personnel. Could DFATD elaborate on how it determined the budget for Personnel based in Canada or in the Recipient Country?

**ANSWER 1** DFATD determined the amount based on the department's recent experience related to personnel costs for similar positions on other projects. However, DFATD has revised the budget; an amount of \$1,120,000 has been redirected from FIN-1B, Administrative Mark-up Cost of Additional Sub-Consultants and Contractors, to FIN-3, Reimbursable Expenses. This is to account for the travel cost related to deployments, which are accounted for under Reimbursable Expenses. DFATD also revised the level of effort required for the director position. Please see Part A of this Addendum for the modification to the RFP.

**QUESTION 2** Reference RFP, Roles and Responsibilities – Consultant (p.44): The RFP states: "The Consultant and affiliated organizations will not be permitted to deliver or implement the proposed or approved TAF Mandates." Could DFATD please clarify and define 'affiliated organizations' as it relates to this statement?

**ANSWER 2** "Affiliated organizations" means entities that have an ownership relationship.

**QUESTION 3** We would like to draw GAC's attention to the fact that the budget available for FIN-1A (Cost of Personnel) is insufficient for bidders to propose a suitably qualified team. As per 10.7 and 11.17 of the Data Sheet, the maximum total budget before tax for the Contract is \$11,627,000. From this total, one must deduct the budgets set-aside for the Responsive Technical Assistance Fund of \$4,980,000 for contractors and \$2,560,000 for reimbursable expenses. This leaves a budget balance of \$4,087,000 for the consultant services (fees and expenses) for 5,505 fixed LOE person days for the nominated team members, as well as the costs of the non-chargeable financial security as per 16.1 of the Data Sheet. This is woefully inadequate if bidders are expected to nominate qualified personnel (in Canada and in the region) who are able to deliver the anticipated Terms of Reference. This being the case, is GAC able to either (a) increase the total budget or (b) reduce the amount of the budget to be 'set-aside' for the Responsive Technical Assistance Fund such that bidders are able to propose suitably qualified personnel?

**ANSWER 3** Please see answer 1 in this Addendum.

**QUESTION 4** The AP-TAF limited budget and DFATD's decision not to "pay for any costs associated with mobilization and demobilization of personnel based in the Recipient Country, as well as living expenses in the Recipient Country" limits the candidates that can be nominated for the field-based Project Manager post to local professionals already based in the region. Both of these constraints will result in bidders not proposing a

---

highly qualified Canadian/International in this key position even though the TORs for this position imply that the role would be best suited to a Canadian professional with the experience, expertise, language and management skills required to perform this role in a way that most effectively advances Canada's trade and development interests in the region. This being the case, would DFATD consider removing the restriction against financing relocation and living costs in the field and, in turn, allowing access to the TAF Fund to finance these additional required expenses to ensure the best possible candidates for this position are put forward by bidders?

**ANSWER 4**

In designing this project, DFATD determined that there was sufficient expertise in the region as to not require the installation of long term personnel in the field. Therefore, DFATD will not finance relocation and living costs in the field for long term personnel.

**QUESTION 5**

Due to the limited budget available, and given the substantial fixed costs associated with renting office space in the region over seven years and the nature of AP-TAF, will the successful contractor be permitted to co-locate its office at no cost within the relevant Canadian embassy in the selected Southeast Asian country? Should this not be possible, we would request that bidders be given the option of not establishing a separate office in the region, as the benefits of a field office are unclear in the context of the high associated costs and very limited budget.

**ANSWER 5**

The successful contract will not be permitted to co-locate its office within any Canadian embassy. Article 3.2.1, Incpetition Phase, of Annex B – Specific Mandate of the Consultant, contained in the RFP specifies that the Consultant must establish a field office located in Southeast Asia. The RFP does not preclude bidders from using their existing field office (if any) and billing, on a prorated basis, the specific portion used for the TAF project.

**QUESTION 6**

The qualifications criteria for the Project Administrator (Requirement 6) state that the candidate "should have at least a Bachelor's degree." Many highly qualified candidates for this role will not have Bachelor degree, let alone a Masters. If a candidate is put forward without such a degree, can DFATD confirm that the maximum points at stake would be the nine associated with criterion 6.1.1 and that the candidate would not be disqualified altogether, leading to a score of 0/54 for Requirement 6?

**ANSWER 6**

The qualifications criterion for the Project Administrator is modified in item 3 of Addendum 1. With regards the scoring for the Project Administrator's academic qualifications, it is confirmed that a candidate not possessing a post-secondary degree would not be disqualified altogether, he would not be awarded the points for that criteria.

**QUESTION 7**

All of the above questions are in essence budget-related. In this context, will GAC consider increasing the capped budget for the AP-TAF? For the quality of personnel GAC is expecting for this project there is a significant

## Addendum 2

SEL.: 2017-D-003045-1

---

shortfall in the available budget. The result will be bidders staffing with more affordable "B" and "C" candidates to fit the budget, rather than have more space in the budget to consider stronger "A" candidates.

**ANSWER 7**

Please see answer 1 of this addendum.

**QUESTION 8**

Due to the delay in the provision of the Bidder's Conference meeting minutes (3 weeks) and the additional questions submitted to-date, whose outcomes will have significant impact on recruitment/staffing and the development of our proposal response; we'd kindly request that a 2 week extension to the proposal submission deadline is considered, making proposals due: August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2016 and 2pm EST.

**ANSWER 8**

DFAD agrees to extend the deadline for proposal submission to August 4<sup>th</sup>. Please see Part A of this Addendum for the modification to the RFP.

**C. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.**