

Water for as Resilient Cities Leverage Asia

Questions and Answers “Water as Leverage for Resilient Cities Asia”

These questions have been answered by the Water as Leverage Call for Action team of the Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO.nl). Update: 12 June 2018.



Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Questions and Answers until 27 April 2018	4
2.1	Questions from the information meeting on 26 April 2018 in The Hague.....	4
2.2	Other questions received by mail or from the market consultation that are not processed in the final call for action documents.....	5
3	Questions and Answers until 18 May 2018.....	6
4	Questions and Answers until 25 May 2018.....	11
5	Questions and Answers until 4 June 2018.....	15
6	Questions and Answers until deadline	18



1 Introduction

Questions that have been send to WAL@rvo.nl and asked during the information meetings will be answered in this document. This will be published on <https://english.rvo.nl/waterasleverage>.

This Q&A document will contain a summary of questions and answers from the information meeting and those addressed to wal@rvo.nl. **The Q&A document will be updated regularly until 3 working days prior to the closing date for bids.** The identity of the questioner will not be disclosed.

Please note that the deadline to submit your questions at wal@rvo.nl was Wednesday 6 June 2018.



2 Questions and Answers until 27 April 2018

2.1 Questions from the information meeting on 26 April 2018 in The Hague

Q1: What are the conditions of a bankable project?

A: The goal is to connect the best proposals for bankable implementable projects to funding opportunities and (co-)financiers, such as AIIB and FMO. The proposals must therefore be developed with a feasibility component and a preliminary costs benefits analysis to ensure the necessary evaluation for bankability. AIIB and FMO will help identify bankable projects during the workshops, support their development and open its capacity for implementation.

Q2: Are there already MoU's or agreements with local governments?

A: Water as Leverage focuses on pre-project preparation, which is a process focused on a collaborative design process. The local design workshops will help the teams to develop these design processes in close collaboration with local stakeholders and also to share ideas, information and data as well as discuss their conceptual designs/proposals with the local community and the other city team. Water as Leverage, through RVO.nl and the existing networks such as embassies, will simultaneously focus on the support of a fitting institutional environment for implementation.

Q3: Will there be a an appointed person in local government?

A: The Knowledge Support Track will enable teams to access existing data, networks and information. Local government representatives will be present during the local workshops and provide feedback on the institutional and policy environment in their respective cities. RVO.nl will liaise with local government representatives.

Q4: What's the legal framework for governance within teams?

A: The organisations within a team will manage their own organisation/project management. The contract will be awarded to one main contractor of the (winning) team, who is responsible for proper management and contracting of consortium members.

Q5: Do you facilitate matchmaking between Dutch and local parties as RVO?

A: There will be no active matchmaking by RVO.nl, but a LinkedIn Group was created to facilitate matchmaking. The Water as Leverage for Resilient Cities Asia – Team Meeting Spot can be found here: <https://www.linkedin.com/groups/13597329>

Q6: How much knowledge is available, how much needs to be created by team?

A: Expertise should be within the team. The Knowledge Support Track will facilitate exchange on policy, planning, existing studies, cultural sensitivities etc.

Q7: How can there be collaboration between teams if they also have to compete against each other?

A: There is no competition between the winning teams. There's only competition between proposals.

Q8: How to deal with similar urban water type projects local stakeholders work on?

A: Come up with an idea that fits in the local context and that's an addition to these projects and proposals that are already there.

Q9: Formal agreements on focus area?

A: The city of Semarang suggested to focus on the upstream area. The coastal area is rather occupied with projects and stakeholders already. This focus is not an obligation.

Q10: Maintenance of infrastructure and sustainability is taken care of?

A: The programme Water as Leverage is focussed on the pre-project preparation phase. End result is proposal for urban water project(s) with focus on physical infrastructure. Operation and



maintenance is important in the feasibility and implementation phase that are not part of the Water as Leverage programme.

Q11: Looking for out of the box solutions, but also focus on infrastructural solutions, how do they work together? Is a non-infrastructural project also an option?

A: Banks fund infrastructural projects. It's an open process to work towards the end result (proposal for urban water project(s) with a focus on physical infrastructure. The proposals will have to be integrated, so open to engineering as well as soft (or other) solutions.

Q12: To what extent will the in-kind contribution be part of the evaluation of proposals?

A: The in-kind contribution will be looked at under the award criteria 'The extent to which the Bid shows a clear approach to reach the deliverables as described in the Call for Action document (see paragraph 4.1), within the timeframe and budget of the Contract' based on the 'table of overall costs' of the 'Bid part 2_proposal format' document that have to be filled in.

Q13: It is possible to hand in multiple bids. Will one contractor possible be in three cities?

A: Yes, it is possible to apply for more than one city and/or for more than one proposal per city.

Q14: What's the scale of the proposals in time and size? Seen as a prototype?

A: This is open in the Call for Action. Scaling up and replicating are part of the award criteria (as mentioned in the Call for Action document): 'The extent to which this idea could address urban, water and climate change challenges in other cities (opportunity to replicate and scale up the proposals).'

2.2 Other questions received by mail or from the market consultation that are not processed in the final call for action documents

Q15: is there a geographical area within Chennai the team has to look at/the bid/proposal as to focus on?

A: No.

Q16: Can anyone individual, group of students or a community group from one of the cities submit a proposal?

A: Aim is to have international multidisciplinary teams. Individuals, students and/or community groups from the cities can be part of those teams. Expression of interest can be done through the LinkedIn Group for WaL teams: <https://www.linkedin.com/groups/13597329>

Q17: At a more practical level, will national/state/local government facilitate work permits/valid visa?

A: the team is responsible for arranging its own work permits/valid visa.



3 Questions and Answers until 18 May 2018

Q18: In-kind investments. What kind of investments? Is there a % of the € 200,000.00 for in-kind investment that applies to the consortium as whole (main contractor and subcontractors) To what extent subcontractors contribute to this or is it an internal consortium matter.

Q19: Financial conditions: The Contractor will perform the Services for a fixed aggregate fee of € 200,000.00 Are there any rules about calculating personnel cost at for instance actual salary rate or are we free to choose our own rates and overhead?

A: A fixed budget of €200,000 is available per team. The ambitions and quality standards of WaL process and deliverables are likely to require additional team investments (financial and/or in-kind). There is no required percentage of the lump sum for in-kind contributions.

Q20: In-kind contribution. On page 9 of the Call for Action document the in kind investment is mentioned referring to what is said about it in the WaL guidelines. In the guidelines almost the same sentence is used but not clearly explained how in-kind investment is dealt with in this Call. Could we receive some clarity about this?

A: The Approach described in the Bid will require sufficient time investments by specific Experts (introduced in the Bid). The evaluation of Bids received in the Call will be based on the match between approach-experts-time/budget.

Q21: Water as Leverage should lead to physical investments. Does FMO or AIIB have an idea of range of investments?

Related to question:

Q22: Participants in the call are invited to do 'in-kind investments' in this initiative as the budget is limited. However, when this Call for Action results in downstream work (that is the idea!), can RVO guarantee that the parties that took initiative can still participate in tenders for that work?

A: Water as Leverage is an open innovative process in which FMO and AIIB are partners. The range of investments is not pre-described and because of the character of the programme we cannot predict on beforehand if the end results of the teams will fit into the boxes of potential funders or will need more than one funder. For that reason, FMO and AIIB are participating in the programme from the very beginning.

Q23: Did you think of how to prevent double work and potentially double requests for information and collaboration to local governments between the two teams operating in one city? And if so, how?

A: A point of contact will be provided to the winning teams in the city of their choice and information between teams about ideas and conceptual designs will be shared during the local design workshops. Also RVO and partners 100RC and PfR will support teams to prevent unnecessary duplication of work. See also Q26 and Q27.

Q24: How is the process embedded in the concerned government planning procedures? For example for Bangladesh, clearance from ERD etc. would be required to ensure smooth implementation of feasibility studies.

A: Water as Leverage (WaL) is designed in such a way that local, regional and/or national governments are participants in the WaL pre-project preparation phase. Through their participation governments together with the teams can anticipate the local planning procedures during the pre-project design phase. WaL aims to run a process (through design workshops and stakeholder involvement) which paves the road for a smooth transition of proposals into the next phase of feasibility studies.

Q25: If we understand it correctly for each of the three cities, two parties will be selected to develop a project. Will this be a competitive process between these two



parties, in the sense that only one of the two outputs will be brought to maturity and be brought to the attention of IFIs like the AIB?

Q25 is related to question Q7, already published, in chapter 2 of this document:

Q7: How can there be collaboration between teams if they also have to compete against each other?

A: There is no competition between the winning teams. Only the bidding phase for entering WaL is competitive.

Q26: To what extent is cooperation between the two teams working in the same city encouraged in the pre-bid and bidding stage?

Q27: Can two or more proposal be coordinated during the bidding stage to achieve some form of complementarity from the start?

A: Teams are free to coordinate and/or cooperate during the bidding phase until 18 June, 12:00 CEST, the deadline for submitting the bids. Cooperation and coordination between teams is also allowed and encouraged after contracting.

Q28: Can the same companies/organisations be part of more than one team for the same city?

Q29: Can an organisation participate in more than one proposal/consortium as main contractor and as subcontractor? Can a subcontractor participate in more than one consortium?

Q28 and Q29 are related to question Q13, already published, in chapter 2 of this document:

Q: It is possible to hand in multiple bids. Will one contractor possible be in three cities?

A: Yes, it is possible to apply for more than one city and/or for more than one proposal per city.

Q30: The level of feasibility to be achieved by each a contacted party is not clear to us: on the path from pre-design to detailed design what is the ambition level of WaL, also in view of the budget? Has this been compared to similar processes followed by other development banks? Typical ADB and KfW budget for example for feasibility studies would range from US\$750,000 to US\$1,5 m. Or is this be expected to be phased approach in which the current call will result in a concept note or a pre-feasibility study and a full-fledged feasibility study be commissioned in a next stage.

A: The combination of Phase 1, "Research and Analysis for the Development of Conceptual Designs" and Phase 2, "Development of Proposals for Urban Water Projects" operationalises the pre-project preparation phase and prepares the uptake of these Proposals into the feasibility phase. The feasibility phase itself is not part of the Contract within the Water as Leverage programme. The feasibility phase (phase after this Water as Leverage Call) entails for example detailed technical and financial feasibility, ESIA and other assessments to refine the Proposals for Urban Water Projects into implementable projects.

Q31: Will participating organisations qualify for work in ensuing phases if a project makes it to the next level?

A: if with ensuing phase is the procedure to move to phase 2 is meant, this has been described in the Call for Action document, paragraph 4.1 and more in detail in the WaL guidelines chapter 6.

Q32: As the process is described as a rather flexible and open planning approach, how will selected organisations be protected against scope creep? If additional requirements emerge during the study process, will additional budget be available?

A: The available budget is fixed at €200,000 per team (for Phase 1 and Phase 2 together). The Call for Action describes the deliverables of the process. Teams need to be aware that these deliverables focus on operationalizing the pre-project preparation phase, which doesn't entail a full feasibility study (which is the subsequent phase). It is however possible (see previous questions on in-kind investments) that additional efforts by the team are needed to reach such a quality level of the deliverables that a smooth transition from WaL to feasibility study is possible.

Q33: Who will be the local counterpart for these projects? What will be their mandate? What support will they provide to teams?

A: Involvement of local stakeholders is needed in order to reach locally embedded and supported proposals. Involvement of local communities, representatives and governmental agencies will be



organised through the Knowledge Support Track, which is described in the Call for Action document.

Q34: Will there be a role for the Netherlands embassies in the concerned countries? If so, what will that role be?

A: RVO is working closely with the Netherlands Embassies for this programme to ensure the embedding of WaL in a broader policy and project context and/or connecting WaL to ongoing projects of the Netherlands and other partners.

Q35: To what extent has there been prior coordination with other funders active in the same cities?

A: Coordination with other projects funded by donor countries and IFI's has been limited. Connecting the future proposals of WaL to this broader context will be part of the local design workshops.

Q36: We assume that the €200,000 budget also meant to cover costs for travel to Singapore for the regional workshop(s)?

A: Yes. Please note that the team needs to be sufficiently represented during regional workshops, which doesn't mean the entire team needs to be present.

Q37: For the bid submission, are images/sketches required/desired or just text?

A: Teams are free to submit Bids which include plain text and/or images and/or sketches and/or other type of illustrations.

Q38: What is the max file size for submissions? Is it possible to use a WeTransfer link to submit proposal?

A: The WaL Guidelines describe the conditions and requirements for submitting a Bid. See <https://english.rvo.nl/waterasleverage> WeTransfer may be used to submit a Bid, but the Team will remain responsible for the timely submission and availability for download of the Bid and associated documents.

Q39: Is there an expectation of size (number of parties/ size of companies) or composition of team (beyond age and gender)? How will you assess the capacity of the team? You mention water, climate, urban and financial experts - is every team meant to cover all of these specialisms, plus some?

A: How the Bid (including the quality of the team and project management) will be assessed has been described in the award criteria of the Call for Action document (paragraph 4.4). The team needs to cover all expertise required to translate the Approach (described in the Bid) into Conceptual Designs (Phase 1) and Proposals (Phase 2). This means the composition of the team is determined by the chosen approach.

Q40: Are there any restrictions on affiliation of team members? e.g. can a team include a 'contractor' / partner who has a connection with someone in the Advisory Board? or who has a previous connection with the project (e.g. Deltares, Architecture Workroom Brussels, FABRICations)? or an organisation that is affiliated with one of the municipalities involved in the project?

Related question:

Q41: We understand that there is a conflict of interest for those firms and experts that have been involved in the preparation of the call for action, am I right? Are they allowed to be part of a team?

A: the firms and experts that were involved in the research done last year in the preparation of the Water as Leverage programme have not been part of the preparation of the Call for Action as to avoid conflict of interest. The Call for Action is executed by RVO and only supported by 100RC, Partners for Resilience, FMO and AIIB. Firms involved in the research for WaL are therefore allowed to submit a bid as a part of a team.



A: Prevention of (potential) conflict of interest regarding the Advisory Board is described in paragraph 4.6 of the WaL guidelines document: 'Experts, employees of the CA and other persons invited to support in the assessment and award process will handle all information confidentially in accordance to above. Those with a conflict of interest with one or more of the proposals will not assess these proposals. All parties involved in the assessment procedure will sign a non-disclosure agreement and a conflict of interest form prior to assessing the proposals.'

A: Affiliated organisations, more specifically public entities (a.o. the ultimate beneficiaries as described in the Call for Action) cannot be included in a Team.

Q42: The example contract on the website states that 'payment of the fee takes place as follows after receipt of the invoices: tbd' - what is the proposed payment schedule? Will payment/invoicing be possible upfront? Or only after completion of the phase?

A: More specific information on the payment schedule will be provided shortly.

Q43: Who is the anticipated/intended end client for the projects developed? i.e. who would receive the money from AIIB or FMO? It is clear that this phase is outside of the scope of the project, but it has implications for the pre-project preparation phase. We expect that only a public body (such as the municipality or state) would be in the position to receive such volumes of funding. Therefore the state/municipality is the anticipated client?

A: The cities of Chennai, Khulna and Semarang are the ultimate beneficiaries.

Q44: Ownership. For this call, we are planning to develop a conceptual design followed by the development of a proposal for the physical infrastructure including a business model(cost-benefit analysis), if we do this we will be sharing confidential and sensitive information with you. How can you assure this information is well protected and does not become available to the public? Is it possible to sign a confidentiality agreement before us sending anything?

A: see paragraph 4.6 of the WaL Guidelines for the process on confidentiality.

Q45A: Leadership. After phase 1 and 2 are concluded successfully, the teams are introduced to a potential funder/investor. About this step we have a couple of questions: What is the role of RVO/Contracting Authority in the contact with the investor? Are you still planning to be engaged in the feasibility and execution phase and in what way? Or is the contracted party left on its own?

Q45B: Besides that, after concluding step 2, could we go and look for other investors on our own or do we need to keep strict on the proposed investors, in other words, do we keep in charge/lead of the project?

A45A: As described in the Call for Action document, the teams behind the winning Proposals of WaL Phase 2 will be introduced by the Contracting Authority to the potential funder(s) (amongst others AIIB and FMO) to present their winning proposals. The aim is to smoothen the transition to the feasibility phase, which will be led by a potential funder as it is not part of the Water as Leverage programme. This introduction will be set up and attended by RVO.nl, the Special Envoy for International Water Affairs, the relevant partnering city and if necessary other partners of the Water as Leverage Programme.

A45B: It is up to the team to decide on other potential funders.

Q46: In the application form, can we add more than one applicant and main applicants? In our case we are partnering with a very important firm. Due to administration issues they will be the applicant with VAT registration number, however although we are co-leading the initiative, we cannot provide such information. Is it ok to have two applicants in this case but providing the information of only one?



A: There is only one main applicant, he receives the fee and is responsible for distributing the fee to the subcontractors. It is possible to have a project leader (question 2 in the form) that is not working for the main contractor, but for subcontractor 1. The declaration however needs to be signed by an authorised person from the main applicant.

Q47: Will the subcontractors have to be representatives of companies/organizations that the contractor intends to collaborate with or the companies itself?

A: The main contractor needs to present a Team of experts. This means information on the individual experts and associated organizations is required.

Q48: If each subcontractor/contractor has a team working under him, will their names be listed as subcontractors or as team members in the main Proposal Document? Also do we need to submit the CV of each team member or just the contractors and subcontractors?

A: the organization names of the main contractor and subcontractors have to be mentioned in the 'Bid part 1_WaL application form' and per organization the name of a person. In the document 'Bid part 2_WaL proposal format', Table 1 'Team members & relevant expertise/experience', all names of the experts that are part of the team should be included. CVs should be included as annexes. The (organization)names of the main contractor and subcontractors should be mentioned in table 2 'Table of overall costs'.

Q49: Can individuals (either working independently or just completed a course and in between jobs) be team members if they have experience in resilience related projects?

A: Yes. A Team Meeting Spot is facilitated through <https://www.linkedin.com/groups/13597329>



4 Questions and Answers until 25 May 2018

Q50: How much consultation with Government of India and local government has been done and will need to be implemented in the procedure?

A: Water as Leverage (WaL) is in the process of engaging national, regional and local government, which will be an ongoing process. We are working with partners (local representation Netherlands Embassy and 100RC) on the ground in Chennai to engage local and regional governments and on a national level through the Netherlands Embassy. We have also informed the Indian Ambassador in The Hague.

Q51: Procurement. Table of costs you mention overheads as a percentage, what do you mean?

A: The Percentage is meant as an indication for the team to get a clear idea on how to allocate the budget and for the Contracting Authority to get an insight on how the budget will be allocated in terms of expert hours and overhead.

Related question:

Q52: Our company applies different overhead rates for various offices, for partners and external hired staff? How to deal with this, since just one line is provided in the template asking for a fixed percentage?

A: It is not obliged to give a percentage. You can add extra lines in to the Table with overall costs or you can add up all overhead costs.

Q53: Cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is part of phase 2 and team will have to have a look at it in phase 1. Will there be a general formatting to use for a CBA, also for comparison and evaluation purposes?

A: The important elements of the CBA are in the document 'Format end report phase 2' published on <https://english.rvo.nl/waterasleverage>. CBA will also be part of the discussions with AIIB and FMO in the process of the coming year. Aim is to have a CBA that makes comparison and evaluation possible. A more detailed format will be developed during the process.

Q54: To what extent will proposals be evaluated to scale up in other Asian cities?

A: Upscaling and replicability to other cities is part of award criteria 2 'Quality of the approach and first ideas to address the city challenge' of paragraph 4.4. of the Call for Action document and described as follows: 'The extent to which this idea could address urban, water and climate change challenges in other cities (opportunity to replicate and scale up the proposals).'

Q55: How did you come up with the selection of the three cities?

A: A study was carried out which included among others the hotspot analysis from the report '[The geography of future water challenges](#)' of the Netherlands Environmental Assessment Agency. The 'Setting the scene' document on www.waterasleverage.org provides more background (p. 40-43).

Q56: To whom did RVO and others talk in the three cities and banks?

A: A list of organisations that have been engaged will be made available to the winning teams for the city of their choice.

Q57: How should local buy-in be organised?

A: The WaL Knowledge Support Track will support the teams in organising local buy in. Local buy in can also be secured by engaging strong local experts in teams. See also Q61.

Q58: The banks also have an interaction with for example the teams?

A: Yes, most likely during the regional workshops.



Q59: What data is already available?

A: Most available information is listed in chapter 4 'Sources' of the Setting the Scene document on www.waterasleverage.org. WaL has some information (maps, reports) from the research phase of WaL. That information will be made available to the winning teams. Additionally, the Knowledge Support Track will help teams to find data.

Q60: If we are already working with the potential beneficiaries and part of the proposal building, can we recognize them?

A: Local beneficiaries cannot be part of a team. However they certainly can be part of the network of the team.

Q61: Will government representatives and other stakeholders be invited to the local workshops?

Q61 is related to Q3, already published, in chapter 2 of this document,: Will there be an appointed person in local government?

A61: Yes. To support the teams and cities, RVO.nl will organise local design workshops in each of the three cities in cooperation with Partners for Resilience (PFR) as part of the Knowledge Support Track. RVO.nl, PFR and 100 Resilient Cities will work with each city to bring together leaders of local communities, local experts and local government representative(s). Partners of the Water as Leverage Programme will participate as well. Teams are invited to have their (local) networks be present as well. It's a partnership.

Please bear in mind that it is the responsibility of the teams to engage in building local coalitions, capacity and local support during the process and as part of the deliverables.

Q62: How to deal with low-hanging fruits in the three cities?

A: WaL is not directly aiming at low hanging fruit projects but at innovative transformative projects. However as a result of the involvement of the banks in the cities in WaL process it might very well be that low hanging fruit projects will come to the attention and interest of the banks.

Q63: Does a team need to have a Dutch element?

A: Dutch representation in teams is not part of the award criteria for WaL.

Q64: How many proposals do you expect? Is there more interest for one city and less for another?

A: At this moment we cannot give a clear indication on these matters.

Q65: Do we need to submit CVs and project references in a specific format/template?

A: no

Related question Q66: The WaL-proposal format (part 2) mentions that annexes can be max. 10 pages for CV's and reference projects (see snapshot below). This seems a bit too restrictive for coalitions to describe all team members. Is it possible to allow for more pages? Or give no restriction for these annexes and limit the length of CV's to 0,5 - 1 A4 per person?

A: The proposal has a maximum of 10,000 words (about twenty pages of which 10 pages annexes).

Q67: Can we consider this contract to be a deliverable/output-based contract? Or are we expected to detail all our expenditure in invoices based on timesheets, vouchers and other proof documents for each payment?

A: Yes. It is a deliverable/output-based contract. For our internal administration we will ask you to send invoices for a certain percentage of the contract fee.



Q68: What is the level of detail required for the drawings and calculations at the conceptual design stage (phase 1) and proposal for Urban Water Projects stage (phase 2)?

A: The Call for Action does not pre-describe the level of detail required for the drawings and calculations at the conceptual design stage (phase 1) and the proposal(s) for Urban Water projects (phase 2). This is because the type and scale of solutions that teams will present in the deliverables of the Call are not determined in the call, but are left open for the teams to fill in themselves as we expect a wide range of interventions. In paragraph 4.1 of the Call for Action document it is described that the deliverables of phase 1 should explain clearly what the proposed solution(s) looks like and how it will contribute to solving the problem(s) and it should clearly address bankability. The deliverables of phase 2 should be (a.o.) bankable design solutions and have a feasibility component and preliminary costs benefits analysis (to ensure the necessary evaluation for bankability). This requirement to clearly explain, the bankability, the feasibility and the preliminary costs benefits analysis are leading to determine the level of detail of the drawings and calculations for the deliverables of each phase. In such a way that a plausible financial (and technical) feasibility will be given to a potential funder and the local government, being solid enough to be taken up for further development in a next phase (feasibility phase, that will not be part of the Water as Leverage programme).

The exact level of detail for the drawings and calculations in phase 1 and phase 2 will be more clear during the process through collaboration with the stakeholders.

Q69: Conceptual designs should be projected on a site within the city of choice (WaL guidelines, pg 10). Is this physical site or a website? Who pays for the hosting costs?

A: This refers to a physical location within the city of choice.

Q70: Will the Contracting Authority pay completely for the organization of the Local and Regional Design workshops, including travel and accommodation costs of the representatives from the Contractor? If not, how many experts of the Contractor should at a minimum attend the design workshops?

A: The teams are responsible for covering the costs associated with participation in the local and regional workshops. Full (or near full) participation of the team during the local design workshops is strongly encouraged. A smaller delegation of team representatives may be present during the regional workshops.

Q71: Could you be more specific on the mandate of the direct local counterpart with whom the Contractor will work on a day-to-day basis? Will the Contracting Authority pay the local counterpart for men days of support?

A: Involvement of local team members should be included in the budget of the team.

Representatives from local government and stakeholder groups will be present during the local and regional workshops.

Q72: It is suggested to draw from the 5 approaches mentioned in the Call for Action document. Do we need to use all five approaches or just one?

A: The 'Setting the Scene' document describes the five pathways. They are described as potential pathways that are intended to help the applicants transform their proposals into relevant project plans. This means all, a selection or none of the pathways may be used.

Q73: When WaL was first announced, the motto for Semarang was "From Pond to Polder." In the Call, that motto doesn't show up and I notice a tendency to be more cautious about thinking about Semarang in terms of a polder. This caution is most forcefully expressed on page 110: "Is it sustainable to build a hard-coastal defense infrastructure in a place that is drastically sinking; or is it eventually more feasible to retreat and [partially] move the city to higher ground?" Has your thinking about the situation in Semarang evolved since the first announcement? Was this the result of on-



site research? Are city and provincial planners also involved in re-evaluating the coastal defense plan in this way?

A: The title 'From Pond to Polder' described the current situation rather than to provoke an ambition. During the Water as Leverage programme, city and regional/national planners will be involved. The ambition is that the proposals of the teams – if comprehensive, inclusive and implementable – will make a great deal in order to convince the authorities of a different approach.

Q74: I detect a more emphatic appreciation of the kampong as a resilient system and prototype for expansion of the city. I've been encountering a lot of new research along these same lines, but am also aware of the political controversies, especially in Jakarta, relating to evictions. What is the background of WaL's taking this position on the role of the kampong in city expansion?

A: The part about the kampong in the 'Setting the Scene' document derives from the results of the on-site research describing that the prototype of the kampong can play a crucial role in developing a resilient system, as one of many ideas mentioned in this document.

Q75: The status of the Kota Lama (old city) strikes me as ambiguous. From speaking with numerous stakeholders in Semarang and NL, I have the impression that it has not been determined whether or in what form it will be possible to preserve the Kota Lama. It could be an asset, but it could be a losing proposition. Does WaL have a position on the Kota Lama?

Q75 is related to Q9, already published in chapter 2 of this document: Formal agreements on focus area?

A75: No. Kota Lama is part of Semarang city and as such potential element in the bids. It is true though that there is already a number of other initiatives specifically targeting Kota Lama.

Q76: Could you tell me who was the principal person involved in doing the site research in Semarang?

A: The organizations FABRICations and AWB were present at the field visit in Semarang last year, together with 100 Resilient Cities.

Q77: In the 'BID part 1_Wal application form' you mention the guidelines for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). We could not find them online. Do you mean the Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises? These are sector related and not (all) relevant for water related innovations. It may take a lot of time to explicitly demonstrate that we comply with these guidelines and with the IFC Performance standards. What do you expect from us in this matter?

A: In chapter 4 of the Call for Action document the hyperlinks for both the OECD guidelines¹ and the IFC Performance Standards² are included. They are both not sector specific. In the application form you are asked to declare that you will conduct the activities in accordance with these guidelines, not to demonstrate that you comply with them fully at the moment of submitting your bid. It should be kept in mind for the IFC Performance Standards that social and environmental impacts (and more specifically avoiding unacceptable negative impacts) should be taken into account in the deliverables of the teams, as part of the pre-feasibility/bankability and the preliminary costs benefits analysis.

¹ <http://mneguidelines.oecd.org/guidelines/>, see also link to download: <http://www.oecd.org/daf/inv/mne/48004323.pdf>

² https://www.ifc.org/wps/wcm/connect/Topics_Ext_Content/IFC_External_Corporate_Site/Sustainability-At-IFC/Policies-Standards/Performance-Standards



5 Questions and Answers until 4 June 2018

Q78: What does the payment schedule of the contract will look like?

Related to Q42, already published, in chapter 3 of this document: **The example contract on the website states that 'payment of the fee takes place as follows after receipt of the invoices: tbd' - what is the proposed payment schedule? Will payment/invoicing be possible upfront? Or only after completion of the phase?**

A78: The payment schedule will be as follows:

- 70% of the total amount of phase 1 after the contract has been signed and the invoice has been received by RVO.nl;
- 30% of the remaining amount of phase 1, at the end of phase 1 when the deliverables of phase 1 are approved by the Contracting Authority (CA) and the invoice has been received by RVO.nl;
- 70% of the total amount of phase 2 when the team has a 'go' from the CA on the selected Conceptual Design(s) and when the invoice has been received by RVO. The go/no go decision by the CA is described in more detail in paragraph 4.1 of the Call for Action document and in paragraph 6.3 of the 'WaL guidelines' document;
- 30% of the remaining amount of phase 2, at the end of phase 2 when the deliverables of phase 2 are approved by the CA and the invoice has been received by RVO.nl.

Q79: Can you share more on the involvement of the AIIB?

A: The Special Envoy for International Water Affairs, Henk Ovink, met with the President of AIIB in November 2016, where they exchanged views on water, sanitation, resilience and climate change. The pitch of the concept of Water as Leverage at AIIB headquarters in Beijing early 2017 by the Special Envoy, was the start of the involvement of AIIB. As water is an important sector for AIIB, the bank is engaging early in the conversation, with a view of financing worthwhile water projects as they develop.

Q80: In the documents we are requested to provide prices excluding Dutch VAT. Can we consider this project to be tax exempt? We will receive an official confirmation on tax agreements between GoB and GoNL for this specific project, so we have certainty where tax needs to be paid?

A: The distinction between Dutch VAT and local VAT is described in paragraph 4.3 of the Call for Action document in which it states that 'The predefined contract price (for phase 1 and phase 2 combined) is € 200,000.00 per selected team, which should include all team's costs (time commitment of staff members, travel & DSA costs etc.). The contract price is exclusive of Dutch VAT, inclusive of local VAT. If any duties, custom fees, taxes or other charges are applicable then these should be included in the predefined contract price.'

With regard to the Dutch VAT, this means that main contractor, if based in the Netherlands, is responsible for paying Dutch VAT. For international main contractors, RVO.nl will pay the Dutch VAT of the pre-defined contract price. If tax exemptions are possible for Dutch main contractors, the total available budget for the specific team will remain 200,000 euro. There are no tax agreements between GoB and GoNL or any of the other governments within the WaL programme.

Q81: Reading the Proposal Format we see that the Annexes should contain CVs and reference projects. Are the reference projects the short descriptions of 5 – 10 projects that highlight previous work as mentioned under Chapter 3. Team experience? Is it ok to not describe them in Chapter 3 but in the Annexes?

Related to **Q82: Reading the Proposal Format we interpret that the cover, title page, table of contents and public summary of the proposal do not count in the maximum number of pages and words. Could you confirm this?**



Related question Q66, already published, in chapter 4 of this document: **The WaL-proposal format (part 2) mentions that annexes can be max. 10 pages for CV's and reference projects (see snapshot below). This seems a bit too restrictive for coalitions to describe all team members. Is it possible to allow for more pages? Or give no restriction for these annexes and limit the length of CV's to 0,5 -1 A4 per person?**

A81: The most relevant project references should be mentioned in chapter 3, otherwise these will not be taken into account in the assessment. For more information on these projects, you could refer to the annexes.

A82: Yes, that is correct.

Q83: Reading the Proposal Format and Guidelines, we see that the youth and gender balance is to be described and evaluated under both Award criterion / Chapter 2 (Quality of approach) and Award criterion / Chapter 3 (Team and project management). To avoid duplication, we think it is most logical to describe and evaluate it just once, in Chapter 3. Please react if this a good proposal and if you can change the proposal format and evaluation in this line.

A: The youth and gender balance is mentioned in both award criteria in paragraph 4.4 of the Call for Action document, because youth and gender has a different approach in each award criterium. So please apply it this way. In criteria 2 'Quality of approach and first ideas to address the city challenge' it refers to the approach and the extent to which it shows youth and gender balance in the local coalitions and in the way to build local capacity. In award criteria 3 'Quality of the Team and project management' it refers to the team composition.

Q84: WaL-model-contract. The penalty of Article 2.3 of the WaL-model-contract will be payable to the Contracting Authority without prejudice to other rights or claims. This would mean that the Contracting Authority can claim both the penalty and the damages and a contractor must pay twice. Can you agree that the Contracting Authority can only claim damages in so far as the damage suffered exceeds the penalty?

A: This article is included in the WaL model contract to make the teams/main contractor aware that this may be the case. The Contracting Authority will always consider if the decision to be taken is 'reasonable and fair'.

Q85: Can you confirm there is no need for an accountant check within the scope of the project?

A: Yes, this is correct, there is no need for an accountant check for the deliverables of the team.

Q86: Transfer of Intellectual property rights to the Contracting Authority under the conditions specified in Article 5.3 of the WaL-model-contract is not desirable for us. Are you willing to delete this phrase from the contract?

A: The Contracting Authority (CA) included this article in the model contract to stress that Intellectual Property Rights is there for teams to take an active approach on it by referring to 'appropriate right of use'. If this may not be the case, the CA will be able to take the actions as mentioned in the rest of the article: 'In addition, the Contractor is obliged upon request to grant licenses to third parties at a fair market price. If, within four years of its creation, [...] the Contractor (and any potential subcontractors) shall if requested by the Contracted Authority assign the intellectual property rights to the Authority.'

Q87: The bid forms are very much oriented to an executive project but in this case it is more an ideas and pre-project bid. Therefore the roles of contractor and subcontractors are slightly difficult to define and the budget not easy to divide at this stage. The questions are, can we propose an estimated budget aggregated by groups of without defining the quantities for each team collaborator or subcontractor? Can the budget quantities and roles be redefined in the case we are awarded with one of the projects?

A: For phase 1, the team composition and the budget division should be clear. The only difference with phase 2 compared to phase 1 is that the budget in phase 2 will be an estimation, as also



mentioned in the 'WaL proposal format', chapter 4 'Table of overall costs'. With regard to the team composition, the following is mentioned about it in the 'WaL guidelines' document:

- 5.5 Changes during Phase 1: In good consultation, changes can be made during Phase 1. Written consent from RVO.nl is required for every change that has consequences for the results of this phase.
- Subcontractors can be changed during the execution of the assignment, provided the results does not suffer. When a subcontractor is replaced, the new subcontractor must have at least the same competences as the old subcontractor and comply with all the contractual conditions, rights and obligations that are in contract: e.g. respecting the same IPR conditions.
- 7.4 Changes during Phase 2: The conditions for changes during phase 2 are the same as those for phase 1.

Q88: COMPOSITION OF THE TEAM: We understand that the main contractor can be a consortium of different (organizations) but we don't know if this organizations can be NGO's and/or Universities. Could be this clarify, please?

Related to Q16, already published, in chapter 2 of this document: **Can anyone individual, group of students or a community group from one of the cities submit a proposal?**

A: RVO.nl will award a contract to the main contractor of the winning team. The main contractor can only be one party. This main contractor is responsible for the result and is administratively in charge of the project. This party can be private, non-profit, not-for-profit or educational. In paragraph 3.3 of the 'WaL guidelines' doc more info on the main contractor and subcontractors has been described.

Q89: WORKSHOPS: How many local workshops apart of the two Regional workshops in SINGAPORE are planned along the research project?

A: 3 local workshops per city will take place, which means 9 local workshops in total. The information about the local workshops including the preliminary timetable are described in paragraph 6.1 of the Call for Action document.

Q90: SELECTION: "Under supervision of the Netherlands Special Envoy for International Water Affairs. in his position as chair of the Advisory Board, the maximum 6 highest ranked proposals per lot from the preliminary ranking will be determined." " These (maximum) 6 proposals per lot will be assessed individually by the members of the Advisory Board."

Q91A: Do you mean by lot = team per city?

Q91B: DO you mean that 18 teams might be selected for the whole call?

A91A: a lot is one city

A91B: RVO.nl will sent the best 6 proposals per city to the advisory board, the members of the advisory board will assess these. In the assessment meeting the Advisory Board will rank all proposals per Lot and will make the final recommendations for award to RVO.nl. In each of the three Lots the highest ranked proposals will be contracted. RVO.nl intends to award a contract to six (6) teams, two (2) teams per city following a selection procedure during which the submitted Bids will be assessed according to the award criteria. See also chapter 4 of the Call for Action document.

Q91: AWARD CRITERIA: Have you already establish a minimum nrs of points to be one of the selected 6 proposals?

A: No, you need to have at least 70% of the points to be eligible for a contract. Only the two highest ranked proposals per city will get a contract. We cannot predict how high the proposals will score on beforehand. See also paragraph 4.4. of the 'WaL guidelines' document.



6 Questions and Answers until deadline

Q92: Together with the banks, bankable projects will be developed. Then the implementation phase starts with some kind of a tendering procedure. How do you look at the eligibility of consortia to be part of the tendering?

Related to question:

Q22: Participants in the call are invited to do 'in-kind investments' in this initiative as the budget is limited. However, when this Call for Action results in downstream work (that is the idea!), can RVO guarantee that the parties that took initiative can still participate in tenders for that work?

A: Water as Leverage is an open innovative process in which FMO and AIIB are partners. The Intellectual Property Rights will be assigned to the main Contractor (par 4.3 of the Call for Action document). This gives teams a position in the following phase (feasibility phase, not part of Water as Leverage, see for example also Q30). The involved banks have indicated that teams or participants in teams will be eligible for work in subsequent phases. However, we are not able to guarantee that teams or participating organisations in teams will be eligible for tenders in subsequent phases since these phases fall outside the responsibility and authority of the CA. Furthermore, because of the character of the programme we cannot predict beforehand if the end results of the teams will fit into the boxes of potential funders or will need more than one funder. In order to facilitate better connection between the phases, FMO and AIIB are participating in the programme from the very beginning.

Q93: To which degree are the local workshops organized by Water as Leverage and to which degree will the design team be responsible for this?

A: RVO.nl will organize the local workshops together with Partners for Resilience and 100 Resilient Cities. As mentioned in the Call for Action document, paragraph 6.1 'The winning teams are obliged to participate actively in the local design workshops organized in their selected city. It is the responsibility of the teams to engage in building local coalitions, capacity and local support during the process and as part of the deliverables.'

Q94: Are there presentation moments/meetings with local stakeholders/beneficiaries arranged during these workshops or do we need to organize those by ourselves?

A: Presentation moments could be arranged during the workshops.

Q95: How many days should we book for a joint programme during the regional workshops?

A: The regional workshops will be two days for each workshop.

Q96: Is the in-kind contribution only defined by the difference between Total Costs and Total Funds Required? In other words: do we need to describe all the costs of in-kind contributions? For eg. education/knowledge exchange programmes, this is hard to quantify.

A: You need to describe all costs directly related to the project.

Q97: In these kind of bids, with many collaborating parties in one coalition, it can be more convenient to embed overhead costs in the direct staff costs. Is it obliged to specify overhead costs separately, or is this optional?

A: This is optional as long as you explain below the 'Table of overall costs' of the 'WaL proposal format', chapter 4, how you included the overhead costs.



Q98: In the Bid-part-1_Wal-application-form a number of maximally 7 Subcontractors can be filled in. However, we will have most likely more than 7 Subcontractors. How can we insert this in the form?

A: If you like to add more than 7 subcontractors, please send a mail to wal@rvo.nl to receive the WaL application form in Word format.

Q99: Do you accept an application as a team of three professionals where we will get on board the other local and global experts and stakeholders after a possible acceptance, or we must create the overall team (including all the actors and participants) before the application?

A: The quality and composition of the team are part of the award criteria for team selection in the Call. New team members, organizations and individuals, added after the close of the Call will not be taken in consideration for the team selection. In case an awarded team wishes to make changes in their team composition, the procedure is described in the 'WaL guidelines' document (see also Q87).

Q100: Are the dates of the local workshops and regional workshops already available?

A: Yes, these dates are relatively fixed by now:

September 2018	Local workshops in Semarang 3 and 4 September Chennai 6 and 7 September Khulna 10 September
Early December 2018	Local workshops in Chennai 26 and 27 November Semarang 29 and 30 November Khulna 3 and 4 December
6 and 7 December 2018	Regional workshop in Singapore, connected to the local workshop
Early December 2018	Completion of Phase 1
December 2018	Contractors notified of Phase 2 decision
Early March 2019	Local workshops in Semarang, 4 and 5 March 2019 Khulna 7 (and 8) March Chennai 11 and 12 March
1 and 2 April 2019	Regional workshop in Singapore
Early April 2019	Completion of Phase 2

Q101: When will the winning teams be informed?

A: RVO.nl will contact the contact person of the main applicant that is mentioned in the 'WaL application form' of the 6 winning teams on Friday 13 July.



This is a publication of
The Netherlands Enterprise Agency (RVO.nl)
Prinses Beatrixlaan 2
PO Box 93144 | NL- 2509 AC The Hague
T +31 (0) 88 042 42 42
E wal@rvo.nl
www.rvo.nl