

Tender Project:

- A. Consultant for the End-Term Review of the ASEAN Work Plan on Youth 2021-2025 and Visioning Exercise of the Post-2025 ASEAN Cooperation on Youth
- B. Consultant for the End-Term Review of the ASEAN Work Plan on Sports 2021-2025 and Visioning Exercise of the Post-2025 ASEAN Cooperation on Sports

Some Information to share based on Questions and Answers

- 1. Question: Is the assignment open to regional consulting firms (based in Singapore), or restricted to individual consultants?
 - Answer: Assignment is for an individual consultant. We have no objection for regional firm based in ASEAN to submit a consultancy team.
- 2. Question: The TOR notes support for one expert to attend both workshops. Would it be acceptable for Verian to field two team members, with the second fully self-funded? For confirmation: the **accommodation, airfare, transport and meals** of the first expert will be covered by ASEC, as stated in the TOR.
 - Answer: The workshop will be organised by the ASEAN Secretariat with budget allocation for accommodation, airfare, airport transfer and meals for the engaged consultant and one additional expert (to be identified).
- 3. Question: Are both workshops (ETR and Work Plan development) intended to be **in-person (physical, in Indonesia)** and **1 day each (on separate trips)**, as outlined in the activity timeline?
 - Answer: There will only be one in-person workshop for 2 days tentatively in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, with 1 day allocated for the finalisation of the ETR and the second day for the drafting the ASEAN Work Plan on Youth 2026-2030 (day 2) involving the sectoral focal points and the ASEAN Secretariat.
- 4. Question: Are other **stakeholder consultations** expected to be **conducted online**, or should we anticipate any additional in-country engagements beyond the workshops?
 - Beyond the physical workshop, all national and regional consultations will be done online individually or through virtual meetings/FGDs.
- 5. Question: The TOR mentions “quantitative and qualitative” data collection—can you confirm whether a **survey** is expected, or if the emphasis is on desk review and qualitative consultations?
 - Consultant may design online surveys as part of the data collection.
- 6. Question: Is there an **indicative budget range (in USD)** we should consider when preparing our proposal?
 - Unfortunately, the budget cannot be disclosed.
- 7. Question: Would it be acceptable to submit the proposal in **softcopy only**, given that we are based in Singapore?

- Question: Yes, she can send the proposals in softcopy, protected by different passwords for technical and financial proposals. This has been mentioned in the RFP.
8. Q: Can I submit a proposal as an individual/independent consultant (not as a registered company). Are they considered for this project? And if the process is different as an individual consultant let me know how I can proceed to submit the proposal.
- A: Assignment is for an individual consultant. We have no objection for regional firm based in ASEAN to submit a consultancy team.
- A: The process is the same for individual consultant.
9. **Potential Case for Integrated Implementation:** The tenders document for both sectors are similar in implementation arrangements, suggested project workflow processes, timelines, and even structure of deliverables. Indeed, the evaluation objectives and structural similarities are so alike that the two tenders can possibly be implemented in parallel and/or in tandem. To this end, we would like to raise the question as to whether the two projects can be bid as a single project. If the procurement rules dictate bidding the projects separately, how can the prospective contractor avoid being penalized in presenting a value for money case given that there will be economies of scale in contractual costs that benefit both projects?
- Proposals for integrated implementation are possible. However, the procurement rules specify that there should be two separate proposals. The proponent may indicate shared person-days in the technical proposal and pro-rated budgeting in the financial proposal.
10. **Identified Key Reference Outcome Documents:** The Background and Current Status sections of both RFPs references in the last sentence to the ASEAN Post 2025 Strategic and its Strategic Plan. Have those outcome documents not been superseded by the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on ASEAN 2045: Our Shared Future and the ASEAN Community Vision 2045?
- The document Kuala Lumpur Declaration on ASEAN 2045: Our Shared Future and the ASEAN Community Vision 2045 was recently adopted and superseded the ASEAN Post 2025 Vision. ACV 2045 and its Strategic Plan will be the main reference documents. At the point of RFP, this was not adopted yet.
11. **Inception Report:** There are some differences between the RFP and TOR's description of the Inception Report. Both the RFP and the TOR should adopt a common and consistent description of the elements of the Inception Report.
- Thank you for the feedback. The main elements of the Inception Report include final work plan for the ETR and visioning exercise in consultation with ASEC and SOMS/SOMY. Proponent could provide detailed methodology/approach, risk assessment, etc. if deemed necessary.
12. **Possible KPIs for the Consultant:** Please clarify the intent of inclusive representation of women, and persons with disabilities in the context of the youth sector.

- The KPIs of the consultant are indicative and to guide the proposal development of the proposal. The intent of the inclusivity primarily pertains to designing the ETR and the visioning exercise, i.e. equal participation of respondents or interviewees to ensure that marginalized voices such as young women and youth with disabilities are heard and considered.
- 13. Timeline:** Given that tender proposals are to be submitted by or on 23rd of June, the earliest starting date would need to be accordingly shifted to July at the earliest.
- July is the intended start month or the earliest date possible after signing the contract.
- 14. Stakeholders and Partners:** The use of these terms appear to be broad and not exclusively defined. Would therefore appreciate clarification on the definition of the terms used in several sections of the RFP and/or TOR to be inclusive of exactly which entities of parties.
- The stakeholders and partners could be further clarified and agreed upon with the SOMS/SOMY during the inception phase. Indicative stakeholders and partners are as follows: ASEAN Member States, Education Youth and Sports Division and other ASEAN Secretariat Divisions (for cross-sectoral issues), SOMY/SOMS and other relevant sectoral bodies (for cross sectoral issues), Dialogue, Sectoral and Development Partners, ASEAN Entities, Entities associated with ASEAN, multilateral and international organisations, youth/sports civil society organization who have been invited to the open sessions of SOMS/SOMY.
- 15. Other relevant documents and frameworks:** Would be grateful to indicate specifically which ones.
- In addition to the Kuala Lumpur Declaration on ASEAN 2045: Our Shared Future and the ASEAN Community Vision 2045, the TOR mentioned ASEAN references which are available in the ASEAN website, such as the ASEAN Work Plan on Sports 2021-2025, ASEAN Work Plan on Youth 2021-2025. There are also relevant ASEAN Declaration pertaining to sports and youth in the ASEAN website. ASEC will be able to provide more documents during the inception.
- 16. Youth Engagement toolkit:** Kindly indicate what does this entail and since it is only mentioned in the RFP and not in the TOR, should it then appear in the latter as well?
- We have standardized the RFP to remove the toolkit in the RFP and to align with the TOR. Submission of toolkit as part of the proposal is fine but not a requirement.
- 17. Timeline:** Propose to shift the tentative timeline for Activity 7 - Finalizing ETR, Recommendations of Draft AWP on Youth 2026-2030 which appears in the Timeline table from September to October 2025 as the former is already packed with four Activities 3 to 6 taking up 13 consultant days, practically equivalent to the 14 days in August. This way October will entail three remaining Activities comprising 10 days which would be more evenly spaced out.

- Timeline can be adjusted based on the proponent's design, except for the conduct of one workshop September for youth back-to-back with one workshop for sports. Each workshop will have an end-term review report finalization and the drafting of the next work plan. The third week of September has been fixed for the workshop with host Member State and the ongoing procurement of workshop venue and accommodation. Lastly, part of the criteria is the timing of the output delivery, which should be 4 to 6 months.