

GLOBAL URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE STUDY

Pre-Proposal queries and replies

Reference No: CDRI/02-09/2/2021-DIR_HR-OPS

RFP Title: GLOBAL URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCE STUDY

Name of the Organisation: Coalition for Disaster Resilient Infrastructure

The following table collates the written comments/queries/requests received by CDRI on or before 23 July 2021, 6 pm IST from various agencies and replies of CDRI thereon. This document is being published alongside the project RFP.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
1.			Kindly clarify volume of travel (no. of visits) is expected within the project	Please Refer page 51 of RFP document.
2.			We request you to kindly provide two weeks of extension for bid submission deadline. May of our international experts in EU and US are on their annual summer leave.	Corrigendum Point No. 1
3.		3.4.2	Based on your criteria of experts, 20 cities with 15 months' time horizon, it would really help us put this project in perspective if you could also provide a range for the budget. This is particularly important as we are a Swiss based organization competing in the regional market. (GIB Foundation)	This is a global study inviting international agencies; therefore, it is not limited to the regional market. Kindly develop your financial proposal accordingly.
4.		12 (Instruction to Agencies) Earnest Money Deposit Amount = INR 5,00,000/- (Rs. Five Lakh Only)	We would like to request to waive off the EMD. It is a general practice in international organisations such as World Bank, ADB, UNDP and others, that no EMD is asked in a consulting tender. CDRI being an international organisation, we would request to consider this.	Corrigendum Point No. 2
5.		15.4 & 15.6 Evaluation Criteria for Qualification Documents: Point 2. Financial Eligibility: The Agency should have a minimum average turnover of INR 20,00,00,000 or equivalent) for the last 3 financial years. Academic and research institutions may be exempted.	We would like to request to reduce it so that start-up companies can also participate.	As per RFP.
6.		Point 3. Technical Eligibility: The Agency must have experience of at least 5 years in conducting similar projects with International/national governments/research institutions and/or large multi-national organizations. (Self-declaration will suffice).	We would like to request to reduce the experience to at least 3 years so that start-up companies can participate	As per RFP.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
7.	59	Additional Project Requirements- Facilities to be provided by the Clients Please note that CDRI may facilitate the process of data collection and meetings with the requisite stakeholders. But the primary responsibility for these will lie with the Agency. The CDRI will not be providing any facilities to the Agency for this study.	We would request for letter of support from CDRI so that we can engage with the stakeholders at city level for achieving the timelines of the project	CDRI would be pleased to provide a letter of introduction to the contacts in each of the selected cities local administration as provided to CDRI by the appointed agency. The primary responsibility for interactions with the stakeholders during this project is of the agency. However CDRI will be responsible for sustaining ongoing relationships with the stakeholders after the completion of the project. Therefore, all stakeholder contacts are to be shared with CDRI by the appointed agency.
8.	51	Location for performance assignment /datasheet Sl. No. 19	We understand that the location of performing most of the assignment would be offsite excluding the mentioned field visits at Page 51 of the TOR. This clarity will help us plan our response in terms of work plan and resource mobilization effectively and efficiently.	The location is specified as New Delhi as the final outputs will be submitted to the CDRI Secretariat, located in New Delhi. The understanding is correct that that the location of performing most of the assignment would be offsite.
9.		General Query - Exposure data	Considering the exhaustiveness of the assignment and allotted timeline for the same- We assume that GIS based exposure data for different infrastructure classes as mentioned in the TOR will be readily available and provided to the consultant by relevant stakeholders of the selected countries to complete the deliverables within the fixed timelines. We further assume that any type of exposure data development is not part of the current assignment considering the limited number of experts in the core team.	The selected agency will be responsible for all data collection including developing GIS maps and associated content. While the project requires a core team, the selected agency is free to include team members or partners as per the requirements of the project depending on the methodology they propose.
10.	54	Essential/Desirable experience/qualifications, Sl. no. 6	Sectoral Resilience Experts may not be available therefore the same could be relaxed and separate provisions for sectoral resilience experts in the team may be incorporated in the revised TOR as this would enable us to attain holistic approach in terms of technical knowledge and resource mapping across	This project allows for constituting Joint Venture as well as a consortium. Sectoral Resilience Experts can be brought on board through this mechanism.
11.		General Query	Considering the project timeline of 15 months, we request to reduce the number of selected countries maximum up to 10 as this is enable the consultant to focus their efforts on the deliverables more comprehensively considering the limited number of core experts across the TOR	As per RFP.
12.		General Query - Qualification	The current assignment is niche and is new to the consulting landscape hence it is very difficult to find an expert with higher set of educational qualifications, hence we request CDRI to remove additional weightage for PHD qualification of the experts.	Kindly Refer to Page 21 of RFP document: Equal weightage is given to PhD or Masters.
13.	17	3.2 The lead member of the association of the Agency shall be the Agency who has been selected by CDRI and CDRI shall deal with only the lead member for the purpose of this assignment.	Is it possible that the Deputy Team Leader represents the consortium, and his organisation/agency is the lead agency and contractual partner with CDRI?	It may be noted that by the term 'The lead member' in the clause, we mean the lead organization. The team lead must be from the lead organization/agency.
14.	14	17.2 (The ownership of the raw data collected by the Agency during the study and the deliverables including documents, maps, images, processed data, etc. will rest with CDRI. The Agency will keep the data and work products confidential and will share them only with the express permission of CDRI.) 17.3 (The information/data and the report of the study shall not be	Can we discuss a solution to able to use some of the raw data collected to publish journal articles out of this work?	As per RFP.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
		disclosed to any third party and any right for disclosure will remain with CDRI)		
15.	17	As per the pre-qualification documents Year-wise annual turnover details for the last 3 financial years (from 2017-18) with supporting documents.	Can you specify what exactly you like to see? It will be difficult to disclose such information.	Agency needs to submit details of their P&L account and balance sheet certified by a Chartered Accountant. Alternatively, the turnover details for the last 3 years can be provided with the certification of a Chartered Accountant.
16.	36	FORM TECH-9	Can we propose to change clause 17.2 (p. 14) to allow use of data for other publications and set the Performance Bank Guarantee (PBG) to 0 in the contract (Clause 4.1.2 in contract)?	All clauses to remain as per RFP. Any request for exemption in Performance Guarantee with a proper justification may be considered on a case by case basis, and the decision will be communicated separately.
17.		Contract	Are amendments to contract possible? For example, IP rights (p. 72) or Indemnification in Clause 12.2 (p. 81) could become a problem.	Kindly refer to the Corrigendum Point No. 4 for IP clauses. All other clauses to remain as per RFP.
18.	12	9.6	We believe that the suggestion for a financial proposal as a lump sum (Datasheet, p 19, item 16), in the form of a single figure, and unconditional may not be the most optimally tailored to this proposal. Indeed, in view of the breadth of the study and the objectives laid out for Phase 1, it would be necessary to review the financial proposal at the completion of Phase 1, once the rest of the phases of the study, in scope, approach, and methodology, is approved and outlined in detail. We are happy to provide an unconditional financial proposal for Phase 1 here, as well as an indicative cost breakdown and proposal for the rest of the phases, pending review upon approval of the rest of the study, at the end of Phase 1. Would you be happy with this?	As per RFP.
19.	11-12	9.5 /9.6	Do you require the format of the technical and financial forms to be strictly followed or may we use them as targets of content but follow the format we consider to best promote our proposal?	As per RFP.
20.	14-15	17	You indicate you wish the Agency to follow Open Data licensing and protocols, and as such ask data gathered and generated through this study to be considered as public – with no right of ownership by the Agency. However, in clause 17.2. (p14) you write that the ownership of the data will rest with CDRI (see also 59), which seems to conflict with the Open Data clauses (see also p58). Could you please clarify?	Corrigendum Point No. 3.
21.	18	15	In the first line on page 18, you mention “the three PDF should be put in a single zip file – could you please clarify which of the four documents mentioned after you are speaking of? PQ, Tech and Fin?	The three PDFs are PQ, Technical and Financial proposal.
22.	19	16	Criteria for PQ Could you please confirm, upon our understanding of the pre-bid meeting answers, that “the Agency” should be understood here	PQ documents are required only for lead agency.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
			as the lead agency? i.e., only the Agency set out as the lead Agency should meet the criteria laid out (e.g., financial eligibility), whilst partners in the consortium may not need to?	
23.	20	16	Criteria for Technical bid Could you please confirm that the evaluation grid set out spans across the experience of all parties involved in the consortium and not only of the lead agency?	This is correct.
24.	30	Tech 4	It is mentioned that workplan and organization of staffing should be included in Tech 4 while it is also included in Tech 8 and Tech 8 and 7.	For detailed information related to Tech Forms, please refer to the point 9.5 (page 11).
25.	30	Tech 4	<p>a. Work Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You suggest that the work plan starts with the proposal and justification of the activities. It might be easier to follow and read if the activities were outlined at the end of section a. Would you agree? You also mention that a list of deliverables should be included. We understand this to be an indicative and non-exhaustive but representative list of what will be reasonably expected to be delivered – to be firmed up in Phase 1. Would you agree? 	<p>Work Plan should be prepared as per the RFP.</p> <p>The understanding related to the list of deliverables is correct.</p>
26.	30	Tech 4	<p>b. Organization and Staffing</p> <p>Although not mentioned, we assume the staffing also includes managerial staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could you also please clarify what is meant by “support staff” here? 	All other personnel, except those mentioned in the list, shall be treated as support staff.
27.	31	Tech 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could you please clarify what you mean by “professional staff” here? Is the list only for technical and managerial staff and NOT for support staff for example? 	Please refer to the ToR for details of the staff considered as professional staff. The list does not include details of the support staff.
28.			<p>Team composition and task assignment/jobs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We assume this list should span across all members of the consortium. If professional staff is employed as a contractor by one of the key members of the Agency, should the “Name of the firm” to appear by the subcontracting agency or the member of the consortium putting the proposal forward? 	Team composition will span across all members of the composition. Only the names of the consortium members to be used.
29.	32	Tech 6	<p>Item 9. Countries of work experience</p> <p>Could you please clarify if that refers to projects’ location experience or company offices’ location where the position was held?</p>	Please indicate projects’ locations as well as office location.
30.	39	Fin2	<p>“Taxes, if any, should be shown separately”.</p> <p>Could you please clarify where you would like them to be shown in the proposal?</p>	The consolidated tax amount can be shown in Fin-1.
31.	40	ToR	“Error! Bookmark not defined.” at end of 2 nd paragraph.	Footnote: UNDRR (2020) Options for Addressing Infrastructure Resilience https://www.undrr.org/media/47069/download
32.	40		“Scalable template” (see also 2.3. p45; and “the tool” p 58) – could you please describe in much more detail your expectations for this for us to understand what is to be developed? This target seems to be absent of the Scope of Work presented after as well	With respect to “scalable template” Section 2.3, page 45, the sentence- “The assessment will document these intricacies and create infrastructure assessment templates for other cities within each typology” should read as “The assessment will document these

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
			as the indicated timeline breakdown. A template or tool development would be a separate item of work, requiring specific skillsets and additional time. Could you please clarify whether this is part of this study, or a future study on the back of this one possibly? Or whether you would need to amend the scope of work and timeline to allow for this target to be met?	intricacies and allow CDRI to adapt the final tool/s (including iterations for different typologies of cities) to formulate infrastructure assessment templates in the future for other cities within each typology". Therefore, this study includes the development of city infrastructure assessment tools that will form a part of the Outputs of Phase 2, 3 and 4. Regarding the "the tool" Section 3, Study Phases Page 58 , Refer Page 49 and 50; "The Concept Note for Urban Infrastructure Resilience Studies which accompanies this ToR provides a summary of existing tools and frameworks intended to help the agency in developing its assessment of the city's infrastructure resilience. The agency is expected to make preliminary recommendations on the assessment framework based on these existing tools, typological considerations and their own experience. Proposals for assessment framework to be used in this study will be finalized with CDRI, in consultation with urban infrastructure resilience stakeholders at the time of inception."
33.	45	2.1	"Priority actions for key stakeholders" Please note that prioritization is a highly perspective-dependent exercise. Priorities of different stakeholders across a system may be different, diverging, sometimes even conflicting. As the urban system is vast, many stakeholders interact. It is important you define the key perspective/stakeholder for which the priority is to be assessed. Is it to be the local governments for example? A high-level discussion on multi-stakeholders' variability of perspective could be added to the findings, but priority actions cannot be listed for all stakeholders involved in the timeline and for the number of cities given as targets.	Please assume the stakeholders requiring the prioritised plans are the local government decision makers and it is assumed that the local government has consulted with its community on service levels and appropriateness of infrastructure.
34.			"City appetite for the study should be a final criterion in city selection and related pre-engagement work will likely be necessary" . Could you please elaborate on what you mean by related pre-engagement work?	Pre-engagement here has been included with the objective of ensuring the cities are onboard when implementing the study. For this, the agency should ideally have engaged with the cities or have in-principle agreement from the cities.
35.	49	4. Study Phases	Phase 1 – inception The pre-bid meeting seemed to indicate that a list of 20 cities should be submitted, but the description of Phase 1 does not seem to indicate this as a prerequisite. Could you please confirm?	For Phase 1, refer page 49, "Key outcome of this phase will be to agree the selection of cities for the study, the boundaries of the study and the research methodology as outlined in the successful proposal"; therefore, list of 20 cities is necessary.
36.			Could you please clarify your intentions with regards to the review and approval mechanisms expected, the time implications, and clarify the intended process to move from one Phase to the other. This shall significantly help and impact the workplan. Specifically, could the city-by-city Phase 2 to 4 progress asynchronously – to allow for the fact that the work on some cities will take longer than on others? This would ensure greater efficiency and team mobilization across the programme.	For purposes of the workplan please assume a two-week turnaround for the approvals that are required from CDRI. It is up to the agency to propose the most effective workplan and if they want to run tasks concurrently.
37.	51	4	City assessment and reporting Many KPI are mentioned in this section, including "capacity, reliability, accessibility, affordability". Can we assume these are	The baseline assessment of current infrastructure would need to cover at least these four indicators. Please feel free to add any other indicators.

S. No.	Page No.	Clause	Comments / Query / request from Agencies	CDRI Reply / clarification
			indicative only or do they reflect set targets that you have identified?	
38.			Also, it seems that “capacity” in the first and second bullet points is used in two different meanings. Could you please clarify?	Refer page 51, bullet 2 of sub-section 4 of the Study phases; it indicates a deep dive into the current capacities of the infrastructure in context of managing shocks and stresses.
39.			Could you please clarify what is meant here by “critical functionality”? Is it providing adequate levels of service from emergency response to recovery?	
40.			There is no clear mention of a resilience assessment of the infrastructure system, but instead mention of the baseline assessment of the current infrastructure service. Could you please clarify?	Refer page 51, “This phase will draw together data collected during phases 2 and 3, through the selected assessment framework, in order to draw conclusions around the resilience level of the city’s urban infrastructure Systems’; clearly indicates the resilience assessment of the infrastructure systems.
41.	52	5	“provide a prioritized set of tangible and actionable recommendations”. Please clarify which stakeholder for? The local government?	Yes, the recommendations are definitely meant for the local government decision makers as well as other relevant stakeholders in urban infrastructure resilience domain, depending on the city.
42.	54	5. Desired Experience	Infrastructure lead specialist and 3x infra resilience specialist The descriptions of the roles of the lead specialist and specialists are exactly the same. Could you please make the difference in roles explicit in the description?	The roles have been kept similar to allow flexibility for the agencies to set up a team that is suitable for carrying out the study effectively. The intent is to have four Infrastructure Resilience Specialists with specific expertise in Power, Transport, Telecom and Social Infrastructure. Anyone of the four proposed Infrastructure Resilience Specialists can be designated as the Infrastructure Resilience-Lead Specialist. The agency can assign specific tasks to each of the Infrastructure Resilience Specialists to meet the objectives of the study.
43.	56		You mention a couple of times “evaluations”. Could you please clarify what is meant by that?	Page 56, “evaluations” connotes to assessments.
44.	55	6. Schedule	May we suggest changes in our proposal in the payment schedule should we find that it does not reflect well the distribution of work across the phases?	As per RFP.
45.	57		“Milestones should be defined by Agency.” What are you requiring as a definition here?	We would require some details against each milestone.