

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE PROCEDURE OF THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF THE CHILEAN CLEAN TECHNOLOGIES INSTITUTE

The [RE 256 of 2020](#) modify the following clauses of the RFP procedure:

1) In clause 11.2.1, "Evaluation criteria", regarding the criterion "I. RELEVANCE OF THE DIAGNOSIS", the text related to score 2 is replaced with the following.

"2, proposals that present identification of opportunities and partial or unclear gaps in the three areas, making it difficult to justify the models of technical-economic sustainability."

2) In clause 11.2.1, "Evaluation criteria", regarding criterion "II. COHERENCE OF THE PROPOSAL", in the section "Infrastructure and equipment proposal", the entire score table is replaced with the following.

"5. proposals for infrastructure and equipment that are clear, consistent and relevant with the strategic development plan and the areas of interest described in section 4, for each of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

4. infrastructure and equipment proposals that present weaknesses in clarity, coherence or relevance with the strategic development plan and the areas of interest described in section 4, for one of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

3. infrastructure and equipment proposals that present weaknesses in clarity, coherence or relevance with the strategic development plan and the areas of interest described in section 4, for two of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

2. infrastructure and equipment proposals that present weaknesses in clarity, coherence or relevance to the strategic development plan and the areas of interest described in section 4, for the three stages defined in section 9.5.

1. infrastructure and equipment proposals incomplete in some of the three stages defined in paragraph 9.5."

3) In clause 11.2.1, "Evaluation criteria", regarding criterion "II. COHERENCE OF THE PROPOSAL", in the section "Budget", the entire score table is replaced with the following.

"5. coherent and relevant budgetary formulations between the requested funds and their financing structure over time, with the objectives and work plan, for each of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

4. budgetary formulations that present weaknesses in coherence or relevance between the requested funds and their financing structure over time, with the objectives and work plan, for one of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

3. budgetary formulations that present weaknesses in the coherence or relevance between the requested funds and their financing structure over time, with the objectives and work plan, for two of the three stages defined in section 9.5.

2. budgetary formulations that present weaknesses in the coherence or relevance between the requested funds and their financing structure over time, with the objectives and work plan, for the three stages defined in section 9.5.

1. incomplete budgetary formulations in some of the three stages defined in section 9.5."

4) In clause 11.2. "Postulation Evaluation", the second paragraph is replaced with the following.

"It should be noted that officials or members of other State Administration Bodies may form part of the Evaluation Commission. Moreover, during the evaluation process, pertinent information related to the call and its objectives may be requested to other bodies of the Administration of the State."