

AMENDMENT #1: USTDA Activity No. 2020-31012A – Indonesia Asam Island LNG Project

POC: Anna Amaya, USTDA, 1101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1100, Arlington, VA 22209-3901,
Tel: (703) 875-4357, Fax: (703) 775-4037, Email: RFP@ustda.gov.

Please note that the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the FEASIBILITY STUDY for the Indonesia: Asam Island LNG Project is amended, as follows:

Questions, Answers and Clarifications: This amendment consists of clarifying questions and answers submitted by potential Offerors regarding the RFP packet. Responses to submitted questions are attached.

As noted in the responses, Offerors are advised that any responses to questions regarding the desk study report included in the RFP packet are provided on the basis of the Grantee's current information on the project; some elements may have evolved since the desk study report was originally completed in 2019.

No.	RFP Section (if referenced in Q)	Question	Answer
1		Please clarify the definition of “Offeror” provided in the RFP. Specifically, does this mean that a U.S. Firm can have the subcontractors from any other countries or that all the subcontractors must also be U.S. firms?	Offerors may include either U.S. or local (Indonesian) subcontractors as a part of their proposal; no additional third-country subcontractors may be included. For international firms with significant U.S. presence via U.S. subsidiary/offices, the international firm’s U.S. entity may be eligible to serve as a U.S. subcontractor, provided that work can be contracted with the entity’s U.S. office and all personnel included on the subcontractor’s project team are U.S. nationals or hold U.S. work authorization.
2		Please clarify whether the below partnership would meet the conditions for bidding on this RFP. 1. Main Consultant: US company; 2. Subconsultant: A multinational company, with legal entity established in Indonesia as subconsultant in which part of the man powers work outside Indonesia. Would this partnership be eligible to bid to the Indonesia Asam Island LNG Project (USTDA Activity)?	All firms and personnel included in the Offeror’s proposal must meet USTDA’s Nationality, Source, and Origin requirements. Specifically, the prime contractor must be a U.S. firm; this firm may subcontract to other U.S. firms, or to local firms registered in Indonesia. Indonesian entities may make up a maximum of 20% of the grant value. All personnel working on the project must be either: (a) U.S. citizens or permanent residents; (b) citizens of other jurisdictions holding current, valid U.S. work authorization; or (c) Indonesian nationals. No other firms or personnel may be included in the proposal.
3		With respect to this USTDA RFP opportunity, is there any pre-bid work we need to complete to allow us to submit a proposal?	As the terms of reference for this activity are already defined, it is anticipated that all firms will be able to respond to the RFP on the basis of information provided in the packet, including the appendices. No additional pre-bid work is anticipated for proposal development.
4	Section 2 - Clause 2.23 Complete Services	Will grantee provide local transportation, office space and secretarial support?	The Grantee will prepare office space as part this project.
5	4: Award Criteria	How will host country input in our team/proposal be assessed in the offer evaluation?	RFP Section 4: Award Criteria - provides explanation regarding evaluation factors.
6	4: Award Criteria - Factor A	Sub Factor A.2 requires evidence of firm capabilities as lead member of a consortium	Providing the “E” in EPC would be sufficient for purposes of meeting the minimum qualifications. Relative competitiveness

		providing EPC services for implementation of and LNG terminal. We have provided E in EPC but we have not led an EPC consortium for an LNG terminal. Is it sufficient to lead on the engineering?	of the Offeror's proposal in such a case will depend on a number of factors, including the depth of relevant project experience documented by all Offerors. RFP Section 4: Award Criteria provides further explanation of the factors under consideration by the Grantee.
7	4: Award Criteria - Factor C	How important is the timeline? Would a reduced timeline (less than 6 months) be more attractive or is an extended timeline preferable?	Offerors should present what they believe to be a realistic timeline aligned to their proposed methodology for completing the full TOR. The Grantee will evaluate the proposed timeline in the context of the explanation and justification of such methodology for completing the technical scope.
8	Annex 1 ToR Task 1	ToR states that Grantee will provide all relevant background information. We request that Grantee provide a full list of this of background information to support our bid preparation, to include: Document title, Author, Date and no. of pages.	RFP Appendix 2, Section B.2 (pdf p. 30) provides a listing of prior studies.
9	Annex 1 ToR Task 1	ToR states Kick off meeting– to be held in Batam, Indonesia or Singapore Please advise if this still the plan with current travel restrictions?	USTDA is currently in the process of introducing standard guidance for addressing COVID-19 related travel impacts and transition of in-person meetings to virtual formats. Requests for changes of this nature related to COVID-19 impacts may be negotiated by the selected Offeror and the Grantee following award, and are subject to notification to and concurrence by USTDA in its role as the funding entity.
10	Annex 1 ToR Task 1	ToR states requirement for site visit and meetings with ministry etc Question as above and do we need to allow for accommodation and travel on the island? How many days should we allow; what is Grantee's expectation?	Offerors should propose a travel plan sufficient to meet the objectives of their proposed methodology for completing the TOR. The budget as provided is expected to cover all costs associated with Contractor travel for the Study.
11	Annex 1 ToR Task 3 Market assessment	ToR states we will need to cover markets outside Indonesia – to be agreed with Grantee.	All relevant information to prepare an adequate proposal has been presented under the Terms of Reference. The Grantee will discuss additional potential markets with the selected

		Please advise which markets Grantee is considering.	Contractor following project kick-off; at this time markets under consideration would be located in Southeast Asia and greater Asia Pacific region.
12	Annex 1 ToR Task 5 Engineering Study	The concept at present is an onshore 180,000m3 LNG storage and regassification facility. Is the facility throughput fixed/determined or does it depend on the market study?	Facility throughput is an initial estimate, to be further validated and refined based on the market study.
13	Annex 1 ToR Task 5 Engineering Study	Is the 180,000m3 storage fixed or to be optimised?	Storage is an estimate to be further validated and refined.
14	Annex 1 ToR Task 5 Engineering Study	Is the use of FSRU a possible alternative? Item 1 c in Task 4 Site Analysis seems to allow for FSU or FSRU – is this correct?	Open; possible alternatives may be discussed with the Grantee during the course of the study.
15	Annex 1 ToR Task 5 Engineering Study	Sub-task 5.1 notes “Grantee to confirm phased expansion capacity goals, on-shore/off-shore components, potential nearshore harbor, and jetty developments, and supporting infrastructure.” This will be important for us to understand the scope of the work. Can any of this this be confirmed by the Grantee now to support our bid preparation?	The focus of the current study should be on the receiving, breakbulk, and bunkering operations, with limited conceptual analysis of potential future expansions of the project scope. Specific details regarding future expansion analysis will be discussed between the Grantee and selected Contractor as a part of the work planning process.
16	Annex 1 ToR sub-task 6.3	ToR states possible requirement for Contractor to accompany Grantee on 1-month road show to potential US operators/financiers. Please confirm that in this event Grantee will cover Grantee’s expenses	The budget associated with this scope of work includes U.S. travel costs associated with participation of one (1) member of the Contractor team to accompany the Grantee, if so requested. If additional Contractor participation is required outside of these parameters, these costs would be borne separately by the Grantee and compensated directly to the Contractor.
17	Annex 1 ToR Task 10 Implementation plan	How important to Grantee is early implementation of the scheme? For example, there could be 2 solutions, one quick to get up and running but less flexible, another takes	Alternatives analysis may be presented as a part of the proposed methodology and should be further discussed with the Grantee at the time of study kick-off.

		longer to monetise, but more flexible in the long run – or lower capital cost?	
18	Annex 1 ToR Task 11 Final Report	Will the Grantee (and their consultant) be the only reviewers of our work before USTDA, or are local government agencies or others to be involved in review of draft reports	The Grantee will be the reviewer of the contractor's work during the course of the study. All deliverables are submitted to USTDA for review as a part of the final report deliverable, subject to the terms presented in the Grant Agreement (including annexes).
19	Annex 1 ToR Task 11 Final Report	Is the final report the only deliverable to be issued in draft for review/approval by Grantee or are other deliverables in tasks 1-10 also subject to review and approval?	Each deliverable is subject to intermediate review by the Grantee. Payment will be based on milestones associated with the delivery of each Task deliverable, and its approval by the Grantee. Offerors may view an example contract with details of the milestone structure on USTDA's website: https://ustda.gov/wp-content/uploads/Example-Secondary-Agreement-Contract-Website-Version.pdf
20	Appendix 2 Background Desk Study	Will the full USTDA sponsored Desk Study (portions of which are in the RFP) be provided to the Offeror on award?	Available portions of the desk study report are provided in the RFP packet. In addition, the selected Offeror will receive access to the Grantee's prior studies on the site.
21	Appendix 2 Background Desk Study	Exec Summary – notes financing of roughly \$1 billion will be required. Is this to be taken as an indicative budget for the facility outline design? If our work suggest it will be say \$2b, would we need to de-scope the facility or simply advise the budget change?	This is an initial estimate and is subject to validation by the selected consultant.
22	Appendix 2 Background Desk Study	Are we expected to enter into discussions with Pertamina or PLN during the project regarding their possible role?	Contractor interaction with Pertamina or PLN are anticipated to be limited to meeting for purposes of additional information gathering, if such needs are identified during the course of the Study.
23		Do you already have the "Metocean Data" from the previous studies on the Asam Island? If so, can you possibly share them with us so that we can perform comprehensive analyses on the Jetty Location?	The Grantee's prior market study and concept plan for oil tanking included an analysis on the location of the Jetty, with limited Metocean information. The analysis consists of wave condition, water current, temperature, wind and rainfall. However, such data was not collected using a typical

			<p>Metocean monitoring equipment we find on a normal Engineering study. The Grantee will share all information collected under this study with the selected Offeror. In addition, the selected Contractor is expected to prepare a 12 months cycle Metocean analysis that could, for example, use 30 days data collection, and nearest available data to interpolate the required data to achieve the 12 months cycle.</p>
24		<p>Given the scope of the Feasibility Study, please confirm that Topography and Bathymetry Survey are NOT necessary?</p>	<p>Topography and Bathymetry Survey are required under the TOR. The Grantee has existing topography information for the full island, but some information may need to be revalidated. For Bathymetry, the Grantee currently has data to cover the West and Southwest areas of the Island. The Contractor would need to conduct additional analysis, most likely to validate the West and Southwest area and as new analysis for the remaining areas around the island not covered by prior data collection.</p>
25		<p>Do you already have and can you share with us, the Preliminary Site Data such as Soil Test and Underwater Soil Test from previous study(ies)?</p>	<p>The Grantee does not have existing soil test data. The selected Offeror is expected to perform on-shore geotechnical analysis/soil testing as is necessary to meet the requirements of the TOR; for off-shore analysis, desktop study will be sufficient at this time for purposes of using preliminary site data to assess, for example, whether any significant engineering hurdles could be anticipated.</p>
26		<p>Will the "Environmental Assessment Report" will be used as an Official Documentary Submission to the Government of Indonesia for the purpose of getting the approval (known as "AMDAL" in Indonesia), or the Environmental Assessment Report shall only be used by the Project Owner as a Preliminary Study?</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment Report covers two areas. First, for the purpose of government approval. Second, for the purpose to support investor assessment on the environmental implication of the project. The Grantee has previously submitted all the required approval (known as "AMDAL" in Indonesia) for a specific purpose of whole Industry including light and heavy industry. However, with the current change to LNG Terminal, revision of the prior information to fit with the new requirement and resubmission of the documents as an addendum is required. Much of the old submission is relevant, as both Oil Storage and LNG are under the Oil and Gas regime.</p>

27	TOR Task 4	Task 4: Site Analysis, Item 2 mentions that the evaluation will include topographic and bathymetry analysis, however, it does not provide details on the expectations for these two items. Have any previous topographic and bathymetry surveys been done in the area? If not, to what level of detail is required for this particular effort?	Topography and Bathymetry Survey are required under the TOR. The Grantee has existing topography information for the full island, but some information may need to be revalidated. For Bathymetry, the Grantee currently has data to cover the West and Southwest areas of the Island. The Contractor would need to conduct additional analysis, most likely to validate the West and Southwest area and as new analysis for the remaining areas around the island not covered by prior data collection. Topography information could, for example, become the foundation in preparing for the FEED (Front end engineering design) relevant for the LNG Storage and other supporting facility in the land portion of the project. Re: Bathymetry, the Contractor should use the Bathymetry survey in assessing the viability of the jetty as proposed, and the information may also support later preparation of FEED (Front End Engineering Design) relevant for the sea portion of the project (re: Jetty). For the avoidance of doubt, FEED is outside the scope of this Study.
28	TOR Task 6	Task 6: Subtask 6.3 requires that the contractor conduct an outreach and in person meetings. For the purpose of budgeting and resource management, how many meetings/trips should be assumed as part of this effort, and the potential subsequent one-month roadshow?	Offerors should propose a travel plan sufficient to meet the objectives of their proposed methodology for completing the TOR. The budget as provided is expected to cover all costs associated with Contractor travel for the Study.
29	Section 3.8	Please confirm that a Gantt Chart output from a scheduling application such as Primavera or Microsoft Project can be used in lieu of the form shown in 3.8 TECH 6: WORK SCHEDULE.	A Gantt chart is acceptable, with a preference for Microsoft Project file format.
30	Section 3.9	The CVs of many of our subcontractors' employees may not have their complete career histories that can be summarized on the CV form in 3.9 TECH 7: CURRICULUM VITAE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL. In this case, would	Prospective Offerors are encouraged to be as detailed and complete in their response to the personnel criteria as reasonably possible in order to achieve the highest possible scoring. The presentation format suggested in the question could be appropriate provided the details are responsive to the

		providing career histories of at least 20 years of relevant experience be acceptable except for people with less than 20 years of experience who would be required to provide their complete career history?	evaluation factors and sufficient for evaluating personnel experience.
31	Section 3.9	In previous proposals, a Commitment Letter signed by each Key Individual was required to be included in the proposal. Please confirm that only the Certification at the end of 3.9 TECH 7: CURRICULUM VITAE OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL is required in the proposal and that the Commitment Letters are not required for each Key Individual.	Confirmed that individual commitment letters are not required. Offerors should certify using the language in Tech 7 on behalf of their proposed team.
32	TOR Task 6	Please confirm that participating in the one-month roadshow mentioned in Subtask 6.3 Investor and Operator Engagement is optional and that the cost of the participation in the roadshow is not included in the scope of work. Should the Grantee request the Contractor to accompany the Grantee representatives for the roadshow, would the costs for time, travel, accommodations, etc. be compensated to the Contractor and/or Subcontractors separately by the Grantee?	The budget associated with this scope of work includes U.S. travel costs associated with participation of one (1) member of the Contractor team to accompany the Grantee, if so requested. If additional Contractor participation is required outside of these parameteres, these costs would be borne separately by the Grantee and compensated directly to the Contractor.
33		Should proposed changes to the Terms of Reference regarding travel and meetings be included in the proposal, or can they be submitted later?	USTDA is in the process of addressing standard guidance on travel modifications due to COVID-19. If requested travel and meeting modifications are related ONLY to COVID-19 travel disruptions, these may be addressed at a later time, based on current information, and will be subject to concurrence by the Grantee and USTDA. Any other proposed modifications to the Terms of Reference may be noted as a part of the proposal, but acceptance of such modifications would be solely at the discretion and approval of both the Grantee and USTDA, and is subject to a formal amendment approval process.

34		The text talks about the project being on Asam Island near Batam Island. The RFP map (figure 3) locates the project at what appears to be Assan Island, not near Batam. Can the location be clarified and any site specific map or location information be provided?	The island's labeling may have slight variations depending on your mapping software (e.g. Asam, Assan); the island is located in the Karimun municipality, neighboring to Karimun Besar Island with coordinate: 1°07'36.9"N 103°18'15.3"E.
35		As far as firm capabilities and experience are concerned (ref.: subfactor A.2), according to required SoW (feasibility study and consultancy services) we understand that company is required to have been involved (with a leading role) in LNG projects during the EPC stage. We kindly ask you to confirm that also previous experience as Owner Engineer (during the EPC stage) and/or PMC services in LNG projects fulfill the requirement.	Confirmed, please mention clearly in the proposal on your previous role in prior LNG projects.
36		Is it possible to provide a preliminary assessment of the timing of the contract award?	Timing for final contract award depends on a number of factors, including number of proposals received and associated review timeline, time needed for completing required legal due diligence on the selected firm, and negotiation of the final contract. At this time, the goal is for final contract award to occur no later than December 2020, but that timing is subject to change depending on any of the factors listed above, or other factors beyond the Grantee or USTDA's control.
37		In light of the current COVID-19 pandemic and the impact on travel, are there options available to hold virtual meetings to fulfill the requirements of the RFP for a kick-off meeting and meetings with local government entities being held in Indonesia?	USTDA is currently in the process of introducing standard guidance for addressing COVID-19 related travel impacts and transition of in-person meetings to virtual formats. Requests for changes of this nature related to COVID-19 impacts may be negotiated by the selected Offeror and the Grantee following award and are subject to notification to and concurrence by USTDA in its role as the funding entity.
38		In what format will the Grantee provide the background study report information?	Available sections of the background desk study report are already provided under Appendix 2 of the RFP. Two additional

			prior studies completed by the Grantee will be made available to the selected Contractor following kick-off of the Study.
39		Please confirm that the full desk top study report (and other pertinent information) will be provided to the successful offeror by the Grantee?	Available portions of the background desk study report are already included as Appendix 2 of the RFP. Two additional prior studies completed by the Grantee will be made available to the selected Contractor following kick-off of the Study.
40	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	How was the schedule (page 11) developed? The period between the start of construction and in-service date seems unrealistic, especially given the remoteness of the location and lack of existing infrastructure.	The schedule serves as an initial estimate, subject to further validation and updating during the course of the FS.
41	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	Does the scope envision the discussion of bunkering vessels, including costs, operational safety, security and maritime access to the proposed site?	Consistent with the requirements in TOR Tasks 5 and 9, the FS is anticipated to include consideration of these elements and costs.
42	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	Where is Shell’s proposed project located (page 12)?	The Shell site referenced here is in the Masela block. Information presented in Appendix 2 was current as of May 2019, but may have changed since the time of original Study.
43	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	Is there any information in the Desk Study regarding pipeline access rights, terms and conditions?	No further information is available from the Desk Study report.
44	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	What is the “modest fee” Pertamina will charge for supplying LNG (page 13)? Will they also expect to pass through their LNG supply costs even if they are “out of the market”? Will their supply costs be provided to the Grantee?	The concept is called toll fees, which is still under discussion outside the scope of this project. The toll fees will affect the final cost of gas. The project entity will have borne the supply cost of all related cost in the distribution of gas.
45	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	Did the desk study consider alternative locations for the import terminal? If not, what drove this location, other than the prior studies for oil terminals and oil infrastructure?	The desk study is designed to analyze the project as proposed. Outside of the scope of this study, the Grantee has been engaged in prior discussion on alternative locations for the import terminal. Key considerations include potential of Karimun municipality as an Energy hub, including existing Energy project nearby of Marquard & Bahls Karimun Oil Tanking Terminal and Saipem Karimun Yard.

46	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	How many “project sites” are there on the island (page 16)?	The whole of the island is available for development under the LNG terminal project. Under preliminary analysis, the size of the island allocated for terminal is 200 ha and another 150 ha for utilities and greenery. Previous studies have also identified the most suitable location for jetty infrastructure, which would serve as foundation for the project site.
47	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	What is the basis for the statement on page 17 regarding operational impacts of the terminal?	All analysis under the desk study report is preliminary; further validation of operational impacts is required by the selected Offeror as defined in the TOR for the Study.
48	RFP Appendix 2 – Desk Study Report*	Did the desk study identify any break bulk opportunities beyond bunkering operations?	These elements would be further discussed by the Grantee and Contractor following study kick-off.
49	TOR	Will there be any meetings with Pertamina?	No meetings with Pertamina are currently required under the TOR; however, a future need for engagement with Pertamina may be identified based on the results of the information requirements identified by the Contractor and Grantee during the work planning process following study kick-off.
50	TOR	Did the prior studies (Annex1-4, Task 4.1.a) include subsea soil conditions? If not, will desktop be enough given the costs of performing physical subsea soil condition assessments?	The Grantee has not conducted prior subsea soil analysis; desktop analysis of subsea soil conditions will be sufficient for purposes of this study.
51	TOR	Does NPP have rights over the entire island? (Annex 1-4, Task 4.1.b)	Confirmed, NPP has received a request from the Government of Indonesia to support the development of Asam Island, located in Karimun District, Kepulauan Riau. This includes the coastline for a possibility of reclamation.
52	TOR	What is the “long term ports system development plan” (Annex 1-4, Task 4.1.e)?	The FS as designed focuses on initial phase elements of the bunkering and breakbulk operations on the island, as well as some conceptual consideration of a potential future phase, which could include interconnection to the 80 km subsea pipeline. Under this dichotomy, the port system development plan can also be further divided into phase 1 and phase 2, with phase 1 port development focusing on bunkering and breakbulk operations on the island. For the purpose of delivery,

			the Contractor would need to prepare deliverables aligned to the so-called “phase 1,” with high-level analysis of phase 2 expansion.
53	TOR	“Connectivity” to what (Annex 1-4, Task 4.1.f)?	Connectivity here refers to potential future connection to the subsea pipeline.
54	TOR	Is it correct to assume the pipeline technical analysis is a desktop exercise (Annex 1-4 Task 4.)?	Yes.
55	TOR	Annex 1-6, task 5.2 contains a reference to a “port lease” but there is no Port Authority identified on page A-2. Can this be clarified?	The Republic of Indonesia Ministry of Transportation would serve as the relevant authority.
56	TOR	Annex 1-9 refers to a one-month road show that Contractor must attend. Who will pay for the travel expenses of Contractor?	The provided budget is anticipated to be sufficient for the U.S. expenses to support road-show travel of one (1) Contractor personnel, if so requested by the Grantee. If additional Contractor travel is required outside of these parameters, these expenses would be borne directly by the Grantee and would be reimbursed directly by the Grantee to the Contractor.
57	TOR	Annex 1-9 refers to U.S. gas suppliers as someone with whom Contractor should initiate communications, but there is no other reference to U.S. gas suppliers. What is intended here? Should the reference be to U.S. LNG suppliers and if so what is the context?	For purposes of Task 6, U.S. gas suppliers/companies are referenced in regard to their potential role as investors or operating/strategic partners for the project. The Contractor may also expect to engage with U.S. LNG suppliers as a part of the U.S. Sources of Supply analysis in Task 9.
58	TOR	Annex 1-11 refers to cumulative impacts. Will this include the oil facilities referred to earlier? Are there other developments not mentioned in the RFP that need to be considered as well?	Cumulative impacts refers to the overall anticipated impacts of the project as further defined under the FS. There are no oil facilities, and no other existing developments, currently on the island.
59	TOR	Annex 1-11, section I refers to a consultation process. What consultation process is envisioned given the limited scope of the EIA?	Consultation process, if determined applicable, would refer only to the possibility of engagement with relevant stakeholder such as Government (municipality, provincial, central) or State Owned Enterprises (BUMN). There are currently no communities/settlements on the island.
60	TOR	Annex 1-12, has the phrase “assume the baseline study has been completed” – what	This is in reference to prior environmental work completed. The Environmental Assessment Report covers two areas. First,

		does this mean? Does this refer to the baseline studies for the oil terminals?	for the purpose of government approval. Second, for the purpose to support investor assessment on the environmental implication of the project. The Grantee has previously submitted all the required approval (known as "AMDAL" in Indonesia) for a specific purpose of whole Industry including light and heavy industry. However, with the current change to LNG Terminal, we would need to revise the information to fit with the new requirement and resubmit the document to government as addendum of previous submission. Much of the prior submission is relevant, as both Oil Storage and LNG are under the Oil and Gas regime. However, the selected Offeror should be prepared to provide additional analysis to update the filing and provide information to potential investors regarding potential impacts of the LNG project.
61	TOR	Annex 1-13 (ii). What is meant by “the amount of U.S. exports supplied during throughout the term of the Study”?	This “the term of the Study” refers to the project implementation timeline as defined under this FS.
62	TOR	Annex 11-10 refers to a completion date of the Study of June 30, 2022, which is inconsistent with the schedule on page 11 of the RFP. Please explain the discrepancy.	The estimated completion date for the Study in Annex II may be updated to be reflective of the final study schedule following award by method of agreement between the Grantee and Contractor, and appropriate notification to USTDA. USTDA will provide notice of concurrence with appropriately noticed date extension requests provided that the revised completion date proposed by the parties is not in conflict with other terms of Annex II, in particular clause(s) governing time limitation on disbursement of funds under the Grant.

- * - Responses to questions regarding information from the Appendix 2 – Background Desk Study Report are provided from the current perspective of the Grantee. As noted in the RFP packet, all information in Appendix 2 was deemed current at the time the initial desk study review was completed in May 2019, but may have further developed since that time.