



Memorandum of information European tender 'Knowledge component Reversing the Flow (RtF)', selection fase.

Date: 30 January 2023.

In this memorandum of information, the contracting authority provides answers to the questions asked and remarks posted in the context of the above-mentioned European tender. This memorandum of information forms an integral part of the tender document (with reference 202203038, Publication date 5 January 2023).

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
1.	Selection Instructions 4.1	What are the three different levels of experience required for the tenderer to facilitate knowledge exchange? Does this mean knowledge exchange concerning assistance in policy influencing and/or programme monitoring?	The three levels for facilitating knowledge exchange and learning are: (1) knowledge exchange and learning between all stakeholders of the programme, (2) knowledge exchange to facilitate policy dialogue, and (3) knowledge exchange to facilitate the monitoring of the programme.
2.	Selection Instructions 4.1	How many case studies are required for question 1B: is it 2 cases for 1B or 2 cases per level?	It is 2 case studies in total for question 1B.
3.	Selection Instructions	Is the requirement to compile a maximum of 3.5 pages in one Expression of Interest or as three separate documents?	The Expression of Interest should be one document, whereas the assessment criterion Experience should be max 2 pages, criterion Knowledge max 1 page and Relevant network max 1,5 pages.
4.	Selection Instructions	Are annexes allowed in the submission, to include more detailed reference information?	No, annexes are not allowed. See the answer to question number 3.
5.	ToR	Which entity is responsible for mobilizing the target groups and beneficiaries: the hubs?	Yes, the hubs are responsible for the direct contact with communities.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
6.	General	Are online learning and information sharing platforms available and if so, in what format?	These have not yet been created for Reversing the Flow. The way to share knowledge should be set up by the knowledge partner(s) in this assignment. The format is still open.
7.	General	How many and which countries will be involved? Selected countries at present are KE, BF, SU and ET correct? Will it stay at 4 or will more countries be added? (Is Niger or Nigeria on the potential list? Not clear.)	This is not defined yet. For now, the Tendering Authority is planning to work in Kenya, Burkina Faso, Sudan and Ethiopia. Conversations with Uganda and Bangladesh are ongoing. The other countries on the list are still potential countries for RtF to be implemented, but less likely at this point. The Tendering Authority expects to work in 5 countries, with a maximum of 6. Potentially we might also look at Mozambique and Niger to include in our learnings as embassy programming there might be interesting to include. This potential list includes Niger, not Nigeria.
8.	General	How many hubs will be involved? Only the selected hub in KE is known (Impact).	The Tendering Authority plans to work with 10 hubs in the next few years. At this point the Tendering Authority is cooperating with 1 hub (IMPACT in Kenya). Conversations with other potential hubs are taking place in Sudan, Burkina Faso and Ethiopia at this moment.
9.	General	If the max of 10 hubs are selected in max 6 countries, the reserved budget of Eur 1.000.000 over 4 years will result in Eur 25.000 per hub per year or Eur 41.667 per country per year, just as an example. This is a tight budget compared to the expected deliverables of the knowledge hub. This is not even taking into account a consortium with multiple parties or countries with various hubs and landscapes. Please explain rational and expectation more clearly?	The maximum of 1.000.000 euro set for this assignment is intended for the knowledge partner(s) to provide overall support to the Reversing the Flow programme with knowledge brokering. The division of the budget is not fixed to each hub, this could be divided based on the expected work by the knowledge partner(s). Learning and monitoring activities could also involve all hubs in once. RVO directly supports financially the hubs to implement the RtF programme in their landscapes. This financial support is separated from the knowledge component assignment.
10.	General	Could you explain and elaborate on the three strategic lines, i.e. funding, knowledge	Funding: this means the direct financial support from RVO to the hubs to implement RtF.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
		development and exchange, and engaging dialogues. Present wording is very high level.	Knowledge development and exchange: it is the task of the knowledge partner(s) to make sure hubs are supported during the implementation of RtF in their landscape. This includes support in knowledge sharing between the hubs/with relevant stakeholders, making sure lessons learned are collected during the implementation of RtF and used to improve RtF and other (future) programmes. Engaging (policy) dialogues: policy dialogues take place at multiple levels. The knowledge partner is expected to support hubs, communities and RVO/ MoFa with information and learnings that can be used to influence policy to support direct implementation and changing the development sector approach to become more locally-led.
11.	General	WASH is not being mentioned in the document but there is mentioning of 'utilities'. Is WASH and drinking water out of scope or should it be part of the total solution?	This is up to the needs of the targeted communities. WASH could be in the scope of the solution to mitigate the results of climate change. The activities that will be financially supported by RVO through the hubs, are not defined in advance as this is a community-led programme.
12.	General	The document talks about 'landscapes' and several countries (like SU and ET) contain a range of different landscapes. Are the landscapes pre-determined or are they limited to the geographical presence and reach of the local hub(s) within the country?	The landscape selection depends on the hubs that will be selected. This is not yet determined. The landscapes in the different countries could vary greatly.
13.	General	Will the choice of landscapes and thus hubs in the different countries be similar to one another in order to create synergy in the knowledge component?	See the answer to question 12.
14.	General	Are there criteria regarding existing working relations to the selected hubs?	No.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
15.	General	Is local presence in all countries required or is online an option for some countries? Increased local policy dialogue is one of the outcome expectations which makes local presence relevant but makes it cost ineffective? What are the thoughts on this challenge (output/outcome cannot be based on online only, or...)?	The knowledge partner is expected to have a (potential) network in all countries where Reversing the Flow might be implemented. There are no fixed requirements on how to work together with the different hubs. However, considering the community-led approach and the close relations that should be formed with the hubs, it is recommended to have the option of (local) presence in a country.
16.	General	While monitoring can be done remotely (in a faraway location in the long run), the start-up of the knowledge component will require 'working' with the hubs and maybe even the local communities. Creative solutions will help to solve this problem (smart phones etc), but the start-up period will be quite cost inefficient and will require quite some investments. With the relatively small budget the questions of financial sustainability pops up. How to go about this?	We are asking the knowledge partner to come up with a feasible proposal on the set up of the knowledge development and monitoring assignment.
17.	General	What are the goals and objectives of the hubs and how do they align with the knowledge component? What do the hubs expect from the knowledge component (insight in the selection process and requirement of the hubs would be greatly appreciated)?	The objective of the hubs is to improve the resilience of communities within a certain landscape to the consequences of climate change. They do this by providing funding to local initiatives, enabling access to knowledge, facilitating knowledge development and learning and engaging in policy dialogues. The Tendering Authority implements the programme Reversing the Flow with the principles of Locally-Led Adaptation in mind. Therefore, project ownership lies entirely with the hubs. The knowledge partner(s) will support the hubs with knowledge sharing, policy dialogue and monitoring of the project, while keeping the ownership of the project at the hub. Hubs are aware of the RtF approach and of the knowledge partner that will support them during the implementation of the programme.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
18.	General	Can or must the knowledge component work through the hub or is it expected (and sometimes necessary) to engage directly with the local communities?	The hub will be working directly with communities. The knowledge partner will always work through the hub.
19.	General	How will quality and expectation be managed by RVO when knowledge component is dependent on the willingness of hub(s) to disseminate and share information, the quality of information shared and provided, the timeliness etc?	RVO expects open and transparent communication from the knowledge partner(s) and the hub(s). In case there are hick-ups in the implementation of the work of the knowledge partner(s) or the hub(s), RVO expects to be informed and will be able to provide extra support if needed.
20.	General/planning	What is the timeframe for working in different countries? Are continuously more countries added to collaborate with the local hubs in parallel, or does every country have a specific period for baseline and knowledge exchange allocated?	Hubs are selected on a continuous base. RVO has experienced in the first year of the RtF programme that this selection takes time. RVO aspires to select (most of the) 10 hubs in 2023. Baseline researches will be done when a hub is selected, this is not fixed to a specific period. The knowledge exchange could start immediately (as the first hub in Kenya has already started), and newly selected hubs could be added on a continuous base.
21.	General/planning	What does the baseline study that is currently executed in Kenia entail? Does that also include a study of the wants and needs of the community?	The baseline study that was implemented in Kenya entailed a proposal for a baseline approach that could be used by all hubs to map the needs of communities in a landscape. The baseline approach needs further thinking and learning. The hub in Kenia is now using the baseline to verify with the communities. Needs and challenges as well as aspirations are part of the current baseline.
22.	Selection Instructions 1.2 page 7	What role is expected from the knowledge partner in relation to the baseline studies by the Hubs?	The knowledge partner(s) is expected to facilitate hubs with support to the implementation of a baseline study and share the lessons learned (both on the approach and the outcomes) among the hubs. The execution of the baseline study is a responsibility of the hub.
23.	Selection Instructions 1.2	Do we look at 1 landscape or watershed per country? Or do you expect multiple	RVO expects to work in multiple landscapes per country.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
		landscapes/watersheds per country (with a max of 10 in 4 to 6 countries?)	
24.	Selection Instructions 1.2 page 7	Can we expect more than 1 Hub per country, potentially covering 2 watersheds/landscapes?	RVO expects to work in multiple landscapes per country. Our current expectation is that each landscape will be covered by a different hub.
25.	Selection Instructions 1.2 page 7	How will different hubs work together (also on baseline) for consistency purposes and so on?	The role of the knowledge partner(s) is to make sure that hubs will learn from each other and have the ability to share knowledge and lessons learned. The 'how' is not yet determined, this depends on the proposed approach of the knowledge partner(s) that will be selected through this Tender.
26.	Selection Instructions 1.2 page 7	How and by whom are the hubs and their quality of work and consistency among hubs coordinated?	All hubs and their approaches are different, this is a locally led approach. RVO coordinates the partnership.
27.	Selection Instructions 1.2 page 7	How will collaboration between hubs and the contracted knowledge partner be organized?	This is not determined and open for proposal in this Tender procedure.
28.	Selection Instructions page 10 sub-chapter 2.1	"national knowledge institutes", do you mean in the country like Kenya?	Yes, for example in Kenya.
29.	Selection Instructions page 10 sub-chapter 2.1:	"international platforms" could you provide examples of what international platforms you are considering?	For example international platforms on Locally-Led Adaptation, or on Climate Resilience. The goal should be to learn from other initiatives on locally-led climate adaptation and bring back the lessons learned within the RtF programme to the international community.
30.	Selection Instructions page 10 sub-chapter 2.1:	"Learning in the landscapes should be demand driven": Could you share more information or details on how the hubs, working on the baseline, also collect the demands for learning in the communities in the landscapes?	This means that the hub(s) will maintain the ownership of their project(s). It is not determined yet which interventions will take place in which landscapes, and the learning should be adapted to the reality of the RtF-programme. The hubs will form the intermediary partner in this and will be in direct contact with the

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
			knowledge partner(s) and the communities to see and communicate where learning is needed.
31.	Selection Instructions page 10 sub-chapter 2.1:	"Hubs play an intermediary role in linking communities to (technical) experts to support the design (and sometimes realisation) of their plans. The knowledge partner might be able to play a role here." a) Could you explain who the (technical) experts are? Are they involved in different contracts or do you mean the knowledge partner? (as providing knowledge/expertise on specific interventions is not requested) What kind of role do you foresee for the knowledge partner?	RVO does not know yet which interventions will be implemented in the RtF programme. These interventions could include technical solutions, such as dams, where possibly (technical) experts are needed to support the implementation if this knowledge is not available in the communities or with the hub. Hubs have financial means to seek this (technical) support if needed. However, it could be expected that hubs reach out to the knowledge partner(s) in such cases for advice on what kind of (technical) support is needed, or for examples from other contexts (knowledge brokering).
32.	Selection Instructions page 10 sub-chapter 2.1	Would it be possible to indicate what would be the division of the roles between hub and knowledge partner of the activities for level 1, 2 and 3? <i>Original question has been translated from Dutch</i>	It is difficult to give an indication of the division of roles for the different levels. This might depend per hub. The hub(s) will maintain the ownership of their project(s). The knowledge partner will have a role in facilitating and supporting the hub with the implementation of the programme. The level of support required per hub for each level can be different based on their experience and the difficulties that they encounter during the implementation.
33.	Selection Instructions 2.1	The knowledge partner is mostly dependent on the quality of the results of the hub and collaboration with the hub. How will be dealt with the risk that the quality is insufficient and/or the collaboration between hub and knowledge partner would not go well? <i>Original question has been translated from Dutch</i>	RVO expects open and transparent communication from the knowledge partner(s) and the hub(s). In case there are hick-ups in the implementation of the work of the knowledge partner(s) or the hub(s), RVO expects to be informed and will be able to provide extra support if needed. This is also part of the reflexive monitoring approach by RVO.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
34.	Selection Instructions 2.1	Is there yet (<i>draagvlak</i>)/support of local, regional and national government for this locally-led approach? Willingness to support this approach?	RVO tries to get support from local governments and in some cases national government institutes on this locally led approach during the selection process of hubs.
35.	Selection Instructions 1	When will the definite number of countries be announced?	This is not yet determined, as RVO is currently looking for hubs to implement the RtF programme. We aspire to select (most of the) 10 hubs in 2023. RVO does not yet know in which (or how many) countries these hubs will be located, indication is max 6 countries.
36.	Selection Instructions 6	Is there a possibility to add more collaborating organizations throughout the project to adjust to the demand (e.g., knowledge needed) of the project?	Yes, but please note that the budget will remain a maximum of 1.000.000 euro until the end of 2026.
37.	General	Can a break-down of the 1 million euro budget be given? Is an annual breakdown foreseen, or allocated budgets per country?	This is to be proposed by the knowledge partner(s) in the second phase of the Tender procedure.
38.	Selection Instructions 2.1	The call frequently refers to 'knowledge exchange, facilitation, brokering' but it is unclear what type of activities are expected. Can examples be provided?	For example the communities or hub(s) might need expertise to implement the activities. The knowledge partner might be asked where to find the right expertise. Also, there might be interesting learnings in one country that might be relevant elsewhere. The knowledge partner is expected to signal and connect relevant actors in this process.
39.	General	Which security arrangements are made when it comes to working in (at present) fragile state environments such as Sudan and potentially Mali?	The knowledge partner(s) has its responsibilities according to the ARVODI. RVO also has a duty of care and is willing to support with an insurance in 'red' areas. RVO is working closely with the Netherlands embassy and the local hub which can provide relevant security information. At the moment Mali is not actively on the radar of RtF.
40.	General	The call suggests stakeholder engagement and participation of local communities in driving and deciding about water and climate change adaptation initiatives. Have local consultations	RVO tries to get support from local governments and in some cases national government institutes on this locally led approach during the selection process of hubs.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
		regarding this approach, for example with regional governments, been taken place? Do local, regional or national governments endorse this approach?	
41.	Selection Instructions 2.1	Will the knowledge partner be involved in the selection of hubs in the follow up countries?	No. This is the role of RVO.
42.	General	Addressing structural inequalities is one of the criteria for locally led adaptation, is this being done by the Hub or is this an explicit responsibility of the knowledge partner?	This is for all partners within the consortium to be aware of, discuss and learn from.
43.	General	The overall proposal will need to be finetuned per country. Can we assume that the preparation of country-tailor-made proposals are included in the contract?	This could be included in the proposed budget that selected parties for the second phase of the Tender procedure are expected to submit.
44.	Selection Instructions 1 page 9	Could you give a more detailed schedule for the second phase? On 27 March 2023 the Tender documents will be shared to submit a tender. Could you already share expected deadline(s) for question rounds and submitting the tender?	<u>The preliminary planning is:</u> 28 March 2023: Publication of the Tender Document and invitations to the selected Candidates to submit a Tender. 11 April 2023: Closure of question round: deadline for the Candidate to submit questions regarding the 2nd phase. 25 April 2023: Issuing of Memorandum of Information, 2nd phase. 15 May 2023: Deadline for the receipt of tenders/ offers. 12 June 2023: Announcement of the award of the Contract. 3 July 2023: Deadline for asking questions and/or filing an application for a preliminary injunction in relation to the announcement of the award of the Contract. 4 July 2023: Announcement of the definite award of the Contract. No rights can be derived from this information.

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
45.	Selection Instructions 6.3	It is stated here: If the principal contractor relies on the capacity of subcontractors in order to demonstrate compliance with the applicable Suitability Requirements, see section 4 of this document). Question: is this reference correct? The Suitability Requirements are mentioned in section 3.3 of the document. <i>Original question has been translated from Dutch</i>	Yes indeed, well noted. Suitability Requirements are mentioned in section 3.3.
46.	Selection Instructions, appeal to third parties	If the candidate meets the Suitability Requirements in section 3.3 but uses sub-contractors for the Selection Criteria in chapter 4, does the contracting authority see this as reliance on the capacity of third parties? If yes, do these sub-contractors need to fill in their own ESPD forms? <i>Original question has been translated from Dutch</i>	Yes, the Contracting Authority sees this as reliance on the capacity of third parties for the Selection criteria and therefore they have to fill in the ESPD form. In the selection instruction section 6.3 on page 23, you can find additional information.
47.	Assessment Criteria	Is the cover sheet included in the maximum amount of pages? <i>Original question has been translated from Dutch</i>	The coversheet is not included in the required maximum amount of pages. Coversheet should not contain additional information relevant to the criteria.
48.	General	Is there a need for co-funding?	No. Complementarity of funds is possible.
49.	General	Is there a template for applying?	There is no specific template to submit your interest (Assessment criteria). The ESPD form has to be filled in.
50.	General	Can we have access to results and learnings of the Shared Resources Joint Solutions program referred to on page 11 of the document "Restricted procedure knowledge component"?	Yes, you can find this information at: https://ap.lc/eiUIQ

Question	Chapter/ Paragraph from the selection instructions/the tender document	Question	Answer
51.	General	Are all 10 hubs meant to be covered by one Tenderer for a total amount of Euro 1 million?	Yes.
52.	General	Can the tender be used to purchase hardware?	No.
53.	General	When will the final decision, on which countries to be in the RtF program, be taken?	This is not yet determined, as RVO is currently looking for hubs to implement the RtF programme. RVO aspires to select (most of the) 10 hubs in 2023. RVO does not yet know in which (or how many) countries these hubs will be located.

Remarks regarding ARVODI-2018/Procedure/ Evidence

No.	Article from Arvodi 2018/procedure/evidence	Reason for objection	Textual suggestions / Clarification	Answer
1.	ARVODI 2018	We feel that the regular ARVODI that is part of the tender dossier is not applicable for this particular assignment. We think that in this case the “Academic Policy Oriented Research’ ARVODI” applies: Academic-Policy-oriented_research_contract_ARVODI_2018-sep-2020.docx (live.com) If this is not acceptable, we propose the following amendments to the ARVODI 2018 of the tender dossier (2 to 11):		Not accepted, this is not an Academic Policy Oriented Research assignment.
2.	Article 31	Proposal: Article 31 also applies to the Contracting Authority		Not accepted. For some publications it is required to mention the supplier’s name. Furthermore, RVO does not use supplier names for marketing/advertising purposes.
3.	Article 26.2	Article 26.2, first sentence to be: “Upon request by the Contracting Authority, the Contractor will present insurance certificates for the insurances referred to in paragraph 1”.		Accepted.
4.	Articles 24.1, 24.6 and 24.7	Proposal: Articles 24.1, 24.6 and 24.7 are not applicable.		Not accepted, they’re applicable. Final report and other documents are part of the deliverables and RVO wants to be the owner of these documents.
5.	Article 24.3	Article 24.3 will be: “The Contractor will remain the owner of all knowledge		Not accepted.

		and intellectual property that he owned before the start of the Services, as well as the knowledge and intellectual property developed outside the framework of the Services. Methods and techniques, as well as improvements thereof, will remain the property of the Contractor”.	The proposal is partly covered already: - The Contractor retains ownership of all knowledge and intellectual property rights it owned before the start of the Services. Please see Article 24.3 in which this is already covered. - “or which he has acquired outside the scope of the Services”. See Article 24.1 which states that this already only concerns results of the Services performed by the Contractor that relate to the agreement in question. - Methods and techniques, and improvements thereto, remain the property of the Contractor. This is agreed insofar as it concerns methods etc. that already exist or have been obtained outside the scope of the Agreement (see after all Articles 24.1 and 24.3).	
6.	Articles 21.3 and 24	Proposal: Article 21.3 will also be applicable to Article 24.	Violating intellectual property rights can carry a huge liability. If the Contracting Authority were to make concessions in this respect, this could lead to enormous damages. Moreover, the Contracting Authority has no insight whatsoever into the possible violation of intellectual property rights by the Candidate. On the other hand, the Candidate itself is pre-eminently capable of preventing infringement of	Not accepted.

			intellectual property. It is therefore very acceptable to leave the risk where it belongs, that is with the Contractor.	
7.	Articles 22.2 and 22.3	Article 22.2 and 22.3 will not be applicable. Instead, the statutory provisions regarding force majeure will apply.	The Dutch Civil Code states: <i>"Een tekortkoming kan de schuldenaar niet worden toegerekend, indien zij niet is te wijten aan zijn schuld, noch krachtens wet, rechtshandeling of in het verkeer geldende opvattingen voor zijn rekening komt."</i> (translation) "A shortcoming in the performance cannot be attributed to the debtor if it is not due to his fault, nor is it his responsibility by law, legal act or generally accepted practices." Article 22.3 ARVODI-2018 gives some substance to this by listing what, in any case, what constitutes is not to be understood by force majeure (a non-attributable failure). The examples are circumstances over which the Contracting Parties each have control, either by taking preventive measures in advance, or by taking measures in response to the situation that has arisen.	Not accepted.

			If one of the Contracting Parties cannot fulfil its obligations under the contract because of force majeure, it is not realistic that the other Contracting Party is obliged to maintain the contract . In view of this, it is not agreed to delete Articles 22.2 and 22.3. Incidentally, the contracting party has the right to rescind the contract. It is not a duty. In practice, dissolution of the contract on grounds of force majeure is rare.	
8.	Article 13.3	Proposal to introduce a time limit of maximum 6 months after the presentation of an interim report or final report.		Not accepted. The Contracting Authority is the only party entitled to publish the report.
9.	Articles 13.1 and 13.2	Proposal: Articles 13.1 and 13.2 are also applicable to the Contracting Authority.	Contracting Authority sees no need to reciprocate Article 13.1 and 13.2 ARVODI-2018. The Contracting Authority is an independent administrative body to which the general principles of good governance apply. The Contracting Authority complies with the rules laid down in the General Administrative Law Act (Awb) and the Act establishing the ACM, which provides sufficient safeguards for the duty of confidentiality incumbent on the Contracting Authority, also in light of its supervisory role.	Not accepted.
10.	Article 4.2	Proposal: after the word "Services": introduce "due to professional misconduct"		Not accepted, in order to avoid discussions about what constitutes professional misconduct.

11.	Article 3.1	Proposal: replace the word "guarantees" with the words "has a best effort obligation"	It is too non-committal that the contractor only wishes to make best efforts to meet these requirements. After all, the Contracting Authority should be able to assume that the assignment is carried out in accordance with the agreement made on this between the parties. E.g. because the Contracting Authority needs the results of the assignment to meet its own obligations.	Not accepted.
12.	Procedure	Could ESP document be sent around separately? (document doesn't download).		On TenderNed you can show your interest as a possible Candidate. To all interested parties we will send the ESPD document separately as a message via TenderNed.
13.	Procedure	If working in a consortium, do all partners need to fill in the qualitative selection criteria mentioned on page 15 and 16 of the document Selection Instructions separately or should it be a combined effort?		It should be a combined effort. Each party need to fill in the ESPD form. Assessment(qualitative selection criteria) should be a combined effort.
14.	Evidence for Financial and economic standing	Are all 3 evidence documents needed as evidence or can we meet this requirement with 1 of these 3 evidence documents?		Evidence for Financial and economic standing to be submitted when requested and in general cases one of three would be sufficient
15.	Evidence documents parent company	If the Candidate needs the holding company for evidence does the Contracting Authority see this as reliance on the capacity of third parties and if yes, does the holding company need to fill in the ESPD as well? <i>(Indien inschrijver voor één van de bewijsmiddelen de gegevens van de holding nodig heeft, ziet OG dit dan als "beroep op een derde" en moeten</i>		No, it's not necessary for the parent/holding company to fill in the ESPD. The Tendering Authority just needs a statement from the parent/holding company that specifies that the parent/holding company unconditionally acts as a guarantor for the obligations to be undertaken by the subsidiary company and for any debts arising from the Contract incurred by the subsidiary company.

		<i>we namens de Holding dan ook een ESPD invullen en indienen?)</i>		The statement by the parent/holding company must be signed by a legally authorized representative.
16.	Evidence documents parent company	You state: If the data of the Candidate's parent/holding company are used as evidence for the aspect of financial-economic capacity, then the Candidate must provide a statement from the parent/holding company that specifies that the parent/holding company unconditionally acts as a guarantor for the obligations to be undertaken by the subsidiary company and for any debts arising from the Contract incurred by the subsidiary company. Question: Is a Dutch 403 declaration sufficient to meet this requirement?		Yes, Dutch 403 declaration will be sufficient
17.	Subcontractors	Participants are requested to complete part IID of the ESPD. Is it also possible to add subcontractors during the Phase 2 of this tender?		it is not possible to add subcontracts during phase 2, as you have to submit ESPD form according to instructions in Selection Instruction document section 6.3 p 23.
18.	Consortium	Do you know any other parties that would be interested to work in a consortium?		See appendix 4
19.	Consortium	Can an African company, not registered in Europe, be a leading Contractor?		If this company fulfills all the requested requirements as stated in the selection instruction document, it can be a leading Contractor unless The Netherlands does not allow trading with the country where this African company is vested and registered.