

Title: Nature Credits Pilot Project Development Services

RFP No.: CFD-003-2023

Response to Bidder Questions

Distributed on 24 October 2023

Question	Response
<p>1. In the Financial proposal template, does the bidder have to include pricing and charges likely to be incurred by sub-contractors? Attachment 3 of the RFP asks for ‘margin or overhead applied for pre-selection and <u>management of any sub-contractors</u>’. Can clarity please be provided on how sub-contractors are to be included in the Financial Proposal Template.</p>	<p>There are two different costs we are interested in as it relates to sub-contractors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Illustrative example: If you have an existing relationship with a sub-contractor it would be appreciated if an indicative price associated with those services is provided as part of the illustrative scenario, also noting who that sub-contractor may be (or if there isn’t one the basis for cost assumptions). 2. General sub-contractor overheads: In addition, we would separately like to understand the general margin or overhead that is applied for sub-contractor selection and/or management, irrespective of what an individual contractor may charge. For example, this could be a % margin that you apply to the lump sum and/or charges of sub-contractors. <p>Outside of the illustrative scenario, we do not require the specific rates of possible other sub-contractors, as sub-contractors would not be known until a task order is developed.</p>
<p>2. Can clarity please be provided in the ‘margin or overhead applied for pre-selection’. How is this to be interpreted? What is the pre-selection?</p>	<p>Pre-selection or pre-qualification is the process of sub-contractor selection to understand their risk profile and their ability to comply with obligations under the Master Services Agreement. This often includes an assessment of technical capability and other due diligence matters.</p>
<p>3. The Financial proposal template is to be completed based on a hypothetical work program in the Philippines. How will actual project costs for work in the Pacific, Africa and Latin America be negotiated where there are significant differences in actual</p>	<p>The purpose of the hypothetical or illustrative example is to assist with a comparison between proposals. A Master Services Agreement will be issued to the successful service provider. From there, written task orders will be established and cost negotiated on a case-by-case basis, based on specific scope and using the proposed current pricing rates for bidder’s key personnel.</p>

<p>prices between the Philippines hypothetical and the other regions.</p>	
<p>4. Does the bidder have to detail likely sub-contractors to be used for the work across the Pacific, Asia, Africa and South America? Or is it suitable to establish a process by which such sub-contractors would be identified, approved, and incorporated into the team for each specific tasks order, as needed throughout the duration of the MSA term?</p>	<p>To the extent there are existing relationships we are interested in understanding with whom they may be. If there are no existing relationships we are interested in the <u>process</u> that the bidder would undertake to identify suitable sub-contractors.</p> <p>As the proposal notes, “CI does not expect or assume that service providers will have the capability to carry out the comprehensive list of services outlined in attachment 2 spanning all locations and covering all standards. Instead, CI is interested in the <u>demonstration of networks and the process service providers would undertake to identify suitable sub-contractors within the regions where projects are located, aligned to specific elements of the work.</u> In addition, there may be circumstances where CI’s project partner is best placed to directly engage any sub-contractors and instead the service provider will need to work with the project partner in supporting the scoping and review of deliverables.” So yes, it is suitable to establish a process by which such sub-contractors would be identified, approved, and incorporated into the team for each specific tasks order, as needed throughout the duration of the MSA term.</p>
<p>5. One of the evaluation criteria is “Does the bidder have the necessary logistical infrastructure to undertake the assignment, including the necessary legal clearance to work in relevant countries in the Pacific, Asia, Africa and/or South America?” The bidder can not fully respond to this evaluation criteria without knowing the exact locations of the proposed project sites under CI’s “project portfolio”? Similarly, for each region (Pacific, Asia, Africa, South America), are there any specific areas or countries of priority for CI? For purposes of local regulations and governmental constraints we should be focusing on.</p>	<p>A list of CI offices and countries can be found at www.conservation.org. We have not fully established the locations of possible projects; however, at this stage activities may include the following countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Philippines - Peru - Brazil - South Africa - Australia - New Zealand <p>The intent of this criteria is to understand whether the bidder has either a global presence or e network of consultants and partners to enable work in those countries. If for other reasons, there are restrictions to working in certain specific countries the bidder should disclose them.</p>

<p>6. It is unclear which organisation is responsible for on-ground implementation. Can CI please clarify this? As an example, the bidder must support (develop) “training materials to meet Standard and CI requirements for FPIC”, but which organisation is responsible for the on-ground implementation of an FPIC process? Likewise the bidder must “identify data gaps and develop procedures to fill gaps”, but again which organisation would be responsible for the on-ground data collections processes to actually fill these identified data gaps?</p>	<p>Which organization is responsible for on the ground implementation will vary on a case by case basis dependent on project partner capabilities. In some instances sub-contractors may need to be engaged, for example to run the community engagement, negotiation and FPIC processes. Similarly, in regards to biodiversity data gaps, there may be a requirement to engage a sub-contractor to assist with filling those. As the proposal notes, “CI does not expect or assume that service providers will have the capability to carry out the comprehensive list of services outlined in attachment 2 spanning all locations and covering all standards. Instead, CI is interested in the demonstration of networks and the process service providers would undertake to identify suitable sub-contractors within the regions where projects are located, aligned to specific elements of the work. In addition, there may be circumstances where CI’s project partner is best placed to directly engage any sub-contractors and instead the service provider will need to work with the project partner in supporting the scoping and review of deliverables.”</p>
<p>7. Are the Credit Readiness deliverables expected to be delivered in the sequence outlined in the RFP? The training component is very early and as structured, may be detailing a training program that is not fully grounded in project reality, i.e. the training is expected before the field visit and before the project is fully drafted?</p>	<p>Not necessarily. As per deliverable 1 a detailed project plan will need to be developed. This will inform, based on individual project circumstances, the sequencing of tasks. For example, it may be that as part of the field visit there is a level of initial training developed to support the capacity building of the project partner and perhaps some initial key stakeholders, with further tailored training developed for community engagement and any other elements at a later point in time.</p>
<p>8. Is CI expecting all pilot/project sites to commence activities all at once, or is a phased approach anticipated by CI? Likewise can CI provide an expectation of the size or scale of the project (ie number of project sites) to help the bidder understand intended resource allocation across the 3 year period?</p>	<p>CI is still in the process of building out the project portfolio, the number of projects in the three year period is yet to be fully determined. There are 2-3 projects that may require the services as outlined in the RfP initially with possible expansion to an additional 3 over the next year to two years.</p>
<p>9. Are there any criteria for subcontractor selection beyond those mentioned in the RFP?</p>	<p>There are no additional criteria beyond those in the RfP. The selected bidder will be solely responsible for delivery of assigned task orders and oversight of sub-contractors. All providers are subject to the terms and conditions provided as Attachment 4, including but not limited to Sections 8, 9, 10, 11,14, 15 and CI code of ethics.</p>

10. What are the target outcomes or success indicators for each of these projects?	Attachment 2 details the intended outcomes and acceptance criteria associated with key deliverables for each project.
11. In case of unforeseen challenges or changes in scope, what's the process for discussing and negotiating adjustments to the initial RFP?	A Master Services Agreement will be issued to the successful service provider. From there, written task orders will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis, based on specific scope needs. Changes in scope will be addressed through amendments to the task order.
12. In Attachment 2, are the expectations for each deliverable (project readiness, development, and issuance) the same across all projects, or do they vary?	At the highest level the deliverables are similar in order to ultimately meet the intent of credit issuance, however, they will vary in order to respond to project circumstances, risks and context. In addition, deliverables will need to be tailored as appropriate so that they can be implemented and sustained where required by the project partner.
13. The cost proposal and the Financial proposal template is for only one year. But the illustrative costing requires both costing of Credit Readiness and Credit Issuance. This is unlikely to happen in a 1 year period. Therefore should we assume 1 year of project work for Credit Readiness and 1 year of project work for Credit Issuance?	<p>The proposal notes that 'CI anticipates entering into fixed-price deliverables-based Task Orders, based on the Bidder's current pricing for one year.' This means for the purpose of the outline of the pricing scheme (for personnel and sub-contractors) we are interested in this being based upon rates that will remain static over the course of one year.</p> <p>This is separate to the basis of assumptions for the illustrative example. It is correct that we do not assume the work for both readiness and issuance to be completed within a year. It is a valid assumption therefore to assume (and note this within the template) that the work for crediting readiness takes a year and the work for credit issuance takes a year.</p>

<p>14. Are the projects to be developed under this MSA distinct from the projects considered under the previously advertised RFP for “Natural Climate Solutions Carbon Project Development Services” (RFP No: CF-002-2023)?</p>	<p>Yes, the projects under this MSA are distinct from RfP No: CF-002-2023. As CI’s project pipeline builds, there may be projects that stack biodiversity crediting and carbon projects. However, for the purposes of this RfP they should be considered distinct.</p>
<p>15. Are tasks related to capacity building expected to be completed through in-person / field-based activities, or primarily delivered through remote support, guidance, and training?</p>	<p>This will likely vary to a degree. However, given that capacity building is most effective when delivered in person, it should be expected that this will be the case, but aligned with any field activities to the extent possible to recognize cost efficiencies.</p>