

Request for Proposals for Project Management Services for the AgResults Indonesia Aquaculture Project

Answers to Questions

1. Would it be possible to share a copy of your policy on indirect costs and grant payment terms for international NGO applicants?

AgResults Response: AgResults does not have an indirect cost policy. There are no grants associated with this procurement. This will be a fixed price contract, so all costs should be individually budgeted to the extent feasible. Any “lump” sum costs (i.e. office supplies, etc) should be described as fully as possible.

2. The RFP states that: “All staff filling these key personnel positions are subject to approval by the AgResults Secretariat and may be replaced only with *equivalent or more qualified personnel* with the Secretariat’s prior written approval.” If a staff member is replaced, would the Secretariat’s approval be based on the minimum requirements listed in the job description, or would it be based on the qualifications of the original person hired?

AgResults Response: Key personnel and any replacements must meet the original requirements of the RFP/ any resulting contract.

3. Re the Advisory Committee (AC) – it states clearly that the members of this committee (5 persons) are not direct hires of the Project Manager, they are a “volunteer body” and therefore “will not be paid”. However, they “may be reimbursed for travel expenses/provided an honorarium as appropriate”. From our experience – especially for public sector officials in Indonesia – ‘experts’ would expect some sort of honorarium/payment, otherwise it would be quite difficult to get experts engaged in the committee if they were participating purely on pro-bono basis. This is especially given that the AC will play important role for the implementation of this project which what could be considerable inputs during the pre-launch phase as well as during the annual review of Competitors applications and annual lessons learning workshops. Can you please clarify:

- Does AgResults have a policy that could guide a supplier in determining an appropriate honorarium?
- Does any such honoraria or travel expenses for the AC are expected to be covered within the budget envelope for the Project Management Service (US\$1m) or come from a separate budget?

AgResults Response: AgResults does not have a blanket policy on honoraria. Offerors should propose any expenses related to AC member engagement that are fair and in line with operating norms in Indonesia for this type of service. Any AC member costs should be included in the offeror’s cost proposal and would be funded from the Project Manager budget envelope.

4. Are we expected to already identify at tender stage (potential) members of the AC?

AgResults Response: It is not expected.

5. It says “the Project Manager will seek Government of Indonesia approval for the AgResults Project through appropriate channels”. Could we clarify at what stage the project is in this regard? E.g. have there been any preliminary discussions with GoI so far on the Project? If so, which Ministry? Our experience is that the approval process can take time – it would be good to know whether the Project will start from scratch. Also, which Ministry will likely sponsor this project could determine how easy/fast or time-consuming this process is.

AgResults Response: AgResults has had initial conversations with officials from the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MMAF). It is expected that the Project Manager will build on these conversations and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the MMAF.

6. Engagement between Project Manager and Competitors – it says that “the Project Manager shall act as a general contest resource for Competitors only. Under no circumstance shall the Project Manager provide or coordinate technical assistance for Competitors.” Could we clarify what they mean by “technical assistance”? Again, our experience from managing similar facilities is that there will be areas where Competitors (private enterprise-partners) may need some support or assistance. In a number of M4P-type projects, some TA is provided to partner-firms (e.g. helping them develop ESG policies, brokering partnerships between them and other enterprises/value chain actors). In a way, the RFP acknowledge this when it talks about this tool that the Project Manager will develop/pilot and then share with Competitors to support their marketing strategy to women and other SHF. Helping enterprises become more gender-friendly often requires some TA. The other areas where some form of TA might be required would be helping Competitors to develop (or at the very least, identify) financing options for the equipment they will sell/rent to SHFs. Would this be outside of the Project Manager’s role?

AgResults Response: The Project Manager must act as an impartial facilitator throughout the project. The Project Manager may provide general information – for example, during the launch phase the Project Manager may conduct roadshows that describe the benefits of the proposed technologies to potential competitors. However, this support does not and should not include individualized brokering of partnerships, communications, or financing support. The goal of AgResults is to remain as agnostic and hands-off as possible to let competitors find solutions on their own, in line with “pull” financing. On an as-needed basis and with approval from the Steering Committee and Secretariat, the Project Manager may from time to time engage in high-level activities that raise general awareness of all project competitors on financing options or other freely available resources.

7. Will there be a conflict of interest for the supplier selected as the Project Manager to also provide Verification support? From our experience, the PM will provide an overall project Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting function, and the Verification normally falls under that. As the PM support supplier must not have any links with the private sector Competitors as to avoid any perceived or actual conflict of interest, we expect there shouldn’t be any conflict for the PM to take up the Verification function. The benefits of such model are clear: better oversight of the project, increased value for money through economies of scale for the project operational costs, and better retention of learning.

AgResults Response: Yes there would be a conflict of interest. The Project Manager is expected to oversee the verification process and its integrity. Therefore the Verifier must be a third-party entity procured separately from the Project Manager.

8. Re: the Legal Support Services – we note that the PM should identify and contract local law firm that will provide advisory services to the project. Can you please clarify:
- Are we expected to identify at tender stage a potential local law firm that could provide such services?
 - Does the cost of legal advice is expected to be covered from the budget envelope for the PM Services or come from a separate budget?

AgResults Response: Identification of a law firm at this (tender) stage is not expected. The cost of legal advice should be included in any offeror's cost proposal.

9. Re: Price Proposal – we understand the price proposal should solely consist from the tables in Appendix 6 Pricing Template. Can you clarify:
- Is it allowed to include a narrative alongside the tables in Pricing Template to explain assumptions behind our commercial proposal?

AgResults Response: Per the RFP, *“All expenses should be listed separately, with sufficient detail to allow for evaluation as to the reasonableness of the items proposed.”* If an offeror wishes to submit a cost narrative to provide this detail, this will be allowed.

10. What methodology will be used to determine best value for money during the commercial evaluation process?

AgResults Response: AgResults will use a best value analysis that aligns with World Bank procurement standards.

11. Can you explain what should be included under 'Cost Category' and 'Labour Category' in Column B in Labour Pricing tab and Other Direct Costs tab?

AgResults Response: “Labor category” would include a specific position, if for a named person, or a general role if describing a function performed by a group such as a financial or admin team. “Cost category” would help offerors and the Secretariat categorize proposed costs along common categories like office supplies, local travel, etc.

12. We noted that the PM should make payments for the hatchery prizes (US\$750 x up to 300 = up to US\$225,000) which will be then reimbursed together with the quarterly milestones. Is this included in the overall budget envelope for the PM service (US\$1m) or separate? Can you confirm that the PM is not required to make direct payments of any other prizes?

AgResults Response: We confirm that the PM will not make direct payments of any other prizes. No prize amounts are included in the budget envelope, nor should they be included as part of any offeror's cost proposal. However, offerors can and should budget for any fees associated with administering the hatchery prizes.

13. What entity will be issuing the contract for the PM services? Will it be AgResults Secretariat, or AgResults Trustee (WB), or Deloitte, or other?

AgResults Response: The agreement will be issued by Deloitte in its role as AgResults Secretariat.

14. Which country or under what jurisdiction the contract will be issued from (Indonesia? US? UK? Other?)?

AgResults Response: The jurisdiction will be New York, USA.