

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
SUBMISSION DEADLINE
July 16, 2026 (17:00 SGT / GMT+8)

RFP TITLE: PHILIPPINES LOGISTICS PILOT — PHASE 1

RFP CONTACT:

Name: Charlotte Tan
Phone #: +65 67376233
Email: Chatan@ct.ussec.org

PROPOSAL DEADLINE: JULY 16, 2026 (17:00 SGT / GMT+8)

1. Introduction & Context

USSEC's market development mandate in Southeast Asia requires a clear-eyed view of the logistical barriers that constrain trade competitiveness, customer adoption, and the economics of U.S. commodity imports. In the Philippines — one of USSEC's priority SEA markets — bottlenecks in vessel discharge, port handling, storage, and inland distribution create friction across the entire supply chain, eroding the delivered cost advantages of U.S. soybeans and soy meal.

This study provides a structured, data-driven assessment of that logistics chain, anchored by direct customer engagement with key Philippine importers, feed millers, integrators, and logistics operators. The output is not a desk study and not a descriptive port study — it is a commercially actionable toolkit: a binding-constraint diagnosis, an investment-grade financial model, prioritized interventions with indicative investment requirements, and a framework exportable to other SEA markets (e.g. Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, and Malaysia).

Phase 1 is a Representative Pilot, not a National Master Plan

Phase 1 is scoped as a representative Philippines pilot built around a small number of deep-dive corridors and a representative customer lens, with each corridor treated as a representative deep dive into selected routes, ports, and customers agreed with USSEC at inception. It is intended to prove the methodology and produce a credible, defensible investment case on a focused basis — not to deliver exhaustive national coverage of every port, route, or customer. National or multi-market expansion is reserved for future phases.

2. Purpose & Objectives

2.1 Purpose of RFP:

USSEC's standard practice is to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) every three years in an open and competitive manner. This regular cost analysis and benchmarking process helps determine fair market value for the services to be performed. It also allows USSEC to evaluate qualified proposals and select the best contractor based on technical qualifications, relevant industry experience,

managerial abilities, strength of industry connections, and a suitable cost/time structure that meets the needs of this contract.

2.2 Objectives:

The study is structured around the following interconnected objectives:

- Assess end-to-end logistics efficiency across the full vessel-to-facility flow, on a representative corridor basis
- Validate market realities through structured customer engagement, stakeholder interviews, and field/site observation
- Identify and sequence the binding constraints (first, second, third) in each corridor, not merely list that bottlenecks exist
- Quantify the marginal value of unlocking each successive bottleneck, and the point at which further investment no longer creates proportional benefit
- Evaluate operational, infrastructure, and investment solutions with feasibility assessments
- Deliver an unlocked, investment-grade financial model and CEO/CFO-level ROI framework grounded in real customer and corridor data

The Philippines pilot is explicitly designed as a replicable framework. Phase 1 findings will inform whether and how to extend the methodology to Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, or Malaysia under future phases.

3. Pilot Scope & Geographic Focus

Phase 1 is to be conducted as a representative pilot anchored on a small number of deep-dive corridors that together capture the principal logistics realities of feed ingredient imports into the Philippines — each treated as a representative deep dive into selected routes, ports, and customers agreed with USSEC at inception, not exhaustive coverage of every port, route, or customer:

Luzon Corridor	Anchored on the principal Luzon import gateways (e.g., Manila, Batangas, Subic). Primary deep-dive corridor given import concentration and customer density.
Cebu / Visayas Corridor	Cebu and the broader Visayas as a representative inter-island and secondary gateway corridor, reflecting transshipment and distribution dynamics.
Mindanao Corridor	A representative Mindanao corridor (e.g., Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos) reflecting southern demand centers and feed/integration activity.
Benchmark / Comparator (Optional, Lighter)	A lighter benchmark or comparator port — domestic or regional — may be included at a reduced level of effort to contextualize Philippine performance against external standards.

3.1 Customer Lens

The customer lens is to remain representative across customer archetypes and must not become a single-company audit. The proposed coverage is:

- A large integrated customer (e.g., UNAHCO)
- A second large integrated / processing customer (e.g., GMC)
- At least one mid-scale feed miller or integrator, to capture the economics of smaller and independent operators

Abovementioned company names are illustrative only; final participants confirmed with USSEC at inception, subject to access, availability, and relevance. The intent is a representative cross-section sufficient to validate corridor-level findings, not an exhaustive customer census.

3.2 Scope Boundary for Inland Elements

For the purposes of this pilot, "feed ingredient imports" refers principally to U.S. soybeans, soybean meal, and closely related soy products, with other imported feed ingredients considered only where they share the same vessels, corridors, or handling infrastructure and materially affect the logistics economics under study. The contractor should treat bulk and, where relevant, breakbulk, containerised, and bagged cargo, noting the handling differences between them.

Materiality Boundary — Trucking, Storage, Customs & Inter-Island Distribution

Trucking, storage, customs/regulatory clearance, and inter-island distribution are included in scope only where they have a measurable impact on discharge rates, vessel/cargo dwell time, demurrage exposure, landed cost, service reliability, throughput, or the feasibility of proposed improvements. This keeps the study genuinely end-to-end while remaining focused on practical, investment-relevant decisions rather than exhaustive coverage of every inland segment.

4. Phase 1 — Scope of Work

Phase 1 encompasses eight workstreams designed as an integrated sequence — from baseline corridor mapping, through binding-constraint sequencing, customer validation, and investment-grade financial modelling.

#	Workstream Title	Description & Key Activities
WS 1	End-to-End Logistics Flow Assessment	Map and quantify the full logistics chain on a corridor basis: Ocean Vessel → Port Discharge → Storage → Inland/Inter-Island Distribution → Customer Facility. Establish benchmarks for transit times, costs, dwell, demurrage, and loss points across the Luzon, Cebu/Visayas, and Mindanao corridors.
WS 2	Vessel Discharge Productivity & Port Assessment	Assess discharge rates, berth availability, equipment adequacy, draft restrictions, and vessel queuing at the corridor gateway ports. Benchmark against regional and global standards.
WS 3	Bottleneck Sequencing & Binding-Constraint Analysis	For each port/corridor, identify and rank the sequence of constraints — first, second, third — in the flow (e.g., discharge capacity → truck availability → storage/receiving). Identify the binding (first-order) bottleneck, quantify the value of unlocking it, and show what the next binding constraint becomes once it is

		solved. Inland elements assessed per the materiality boundary in Section 3.2.
WS 4	Key Customer Consultation & Market Validation	Structured interviews, workshops, and site visits with the representative customer lens (Section 3.1) plus logistics providers and terminal operators. Validate operational findings against commercial realities. Where site access is unavailable, apply the alternative validation methods set out in Section 7.2.
WS 5	Representative Customer / Corridor Case Studies	Develop case studies across the representative customer archetypes and corridors to illustrate logistics profiles, binding constraints, and ROI opportunities — kept representative, not a one-company audit.
WS 6	Customer Improvement & Investment Options Assessment	Identify a menu of practical interventions — operational (near-term, low cost), infrastructure (medium-term), and strategic (longer-term). Assess implementation requirements, feasibility, sequencing logic, and stakeholder roles.
WS 7	Investment-Grade Financial Modelling & ROI Evaluation	An unlocked, fully editable Excel workbook — documented assumptions, base/upside/downside scenarios, CAPEX/OPEX, payback, sensitivity, marginal value by bottleneck, and costs/benefits by corridor and intervention — built so a CEO/CFO, bank, or shareholder can pressure-test it. See full requirements below. A required, standalone deliverable — not an appendix. (reference D7)
WS 8	Regional Adaptation Framework	Distil the Phase 1 methodology, data templates, and model structure into a replicable framework applicable to other SEA markets. Identify market specific adjustments for Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, and Malaysia.

5. Bottleneck Sequencing & Marginal Value

A central requirement of this RFP is that the contractor must not simply confirm that bottlenecks exist. The contractor is required to identify the sequence of constraints by port and corridor, determine the binding constraint, quantify the value of relieving it, and demonstrate what the next binding constraint becomes once the first is resolved.

Worked Illustration (Indicative)

In one port the first bottleneck may be vessel discharge capacity, the second truck availability, and the third storage or customer receiving capacity. In another port or corridor that sequence may be reversed. The required output identifies the binding constraint, quantifies the value of unlocking it, and shows the next constraint that emerges.

This matters because investment in discharge capacity may not realize full value if trucking, storage, customs clearance, or inter-island distribution immediately becomes the next constraint. The financial model must therefore show the marginal value of each successive intervention and the point at which further investment no longer creates proportional benefit.

This sequencing logic must be reflected in both the analytical narrative and the financial model. The model must allow USSEC and third parties to see the incremental return of addressing constraints in sequence, rather than presenting a single undifferentiated investment figure.

6. Phase 1 — Deliverables

The following deliverables constitute the full Phase 1 output. All narrative deliverables are to be provided in both formal written report format and executive presentation format. All outputs must be handed over in editable native files (see Section 7).

#	Deliverable	Description & Format
D1	Inception Report / Methodology	Approved workplan, corridor and customer selection, data collection methodology, stakeholder interview/site-visit protocol, and timeline. Submitted within 2 weeks of contract execution.
D2	End-to-End Logistics Flow Assessment	Corridor-based mapping of the full logistics chain with quantified cost, time, dwell, demurrage, and loss benchmarks at each node.
D3	Bottleneck Sequencing & Binding-Constraint Analysis	Port/corridor ranking of first, second, and third constraints; identification of the binding constraint; quantified value of unlocking it; and the next constraint that emerges once resolved.
D4	Key Customer Consultation Summary & Market Findings	Synthesis of stakeholder interviews, workshop outputs, and site-visit observations, validated by USSEC contacts.
D5	Representative Customer / Corridor Case Studies	Detailed logistics profiles and ROI scenarios across the representative customer archetypes and corridors.
D6	Customer Improvement & Investment Options Assessment	Prioritized menu of practical interventions with feasibility, sequencing logic, implementation requirements, and stakeholder mapping.
D7	Investment-Grade Financial Model (Excel) <i>MUST-HAVE</i>	A fully unlocked, fully editable Excel workbook with transparent formulas (no hidden, locked, or password-protected calculations) and clearly documented assumptions held in a dedicated assumptions tab. The model must present a base case with upside and downside scenarios, CAPEX/OPEX, payback, and sensitivity analysis, and must show marginal value by bottleneck as well as costs and benefits broken out by corridor and by intervention. It must state its currency, exchange-rate assumptions, inflation assumptions, and time horizon. Outputs must feed a simple management dashboard that a CEO/CFO, bank, or shareholder can read, react to, and pressure-test without the consultant present. A required, standalone deliverable — not an appendix.
D8	Executive Decision Toolkit	Prioritized opportunities with indicative investments, ROI comparisons, and quick-wins vs. longer-term options — formatted for USSEC leadership and external stakeholder use.

D9	Final Report & Executive Presentation	Comprehensive report integrating all workstreams, plus a polished presentation deck, with all editable native files and source-data annexes handed over.
D10	Recommendation on Future Phases	Assessment of which SEA markets and opportunities should be prioritized for subsequent phases and what adaptations the methodology requires.

D7 Financial Model — Must-Have Deliverable
 The financial model is a hard, must-have deliverable. It must be delivered as an unlocked, fully editable Excel workbook with transparent formulas and documented assumptions — base case, scenarios, CAPEX/OPEX, payback, sensitivity analysis, marginal value by bottleneck, and a management dashboard. A model that cannot be opened, audited, and pressure-tested by a CEO/CFO, bank, or shareholder will not be accepted as meeting this requirement.

7. Data Sources, Engagement & Handover Requirements

7.1 Minimum Data Sources

The contractor must triangulate official and market sources. At a minimum, proposals should set out intended use of:

- Official sources — e.g., Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA), Philippine Ports Authority (PPA), Bureau of Customs, Bureau of Animal Industry, and relevant trade/agriculture agencies
- Trade and market data — e.g., USDA FAS / GATS, customs and import statistics, port and terminal operator data, and recognized commercial market intelligence
- Primary data — customer, terminal operator, and logistics provider data gathered directly through interviews and site visits

7.2 Required Stakeholder Engagement

Proposals must commit to a minimum programme of primary engagement, to be confirmed at inception, including:

- Structured interviews with the representative customer lens (Section 3.1) and with terminal operators, truckers, and logistics providers across the deep-dive corridors
- Site visits to the principal corridor gateway ports and at least one representative customer facility per corridor, where access permits. Where physical access to a port or facility cannot be arranged, the contractor must propose alternative validation methods — such as remote or virtual interviews, review of operator data and records, photographs or video, process maps, and secondary-source triangulation — sufficient to validate corridor-level findings to a comparable standard.
- At least one validation workshop with USSEC and/or key stakeholders to test findings prior to finalization

7.3 Handover Formats

All outputs must be handed over in editable, native formats in addition to PDF:

- Reports and written deliverables in editable Microsoft Word (DOCX)
- Presentations in editable Microsoft PowerPoint (PPTX)
- The financial model and all supporting data tables in fully unlocked Microsoft Excel (XLSX), with all formulas intact and no hidden, locked, or password-protected calculations (see D7 for the model's content and structure requirements)

- Source-data annexes — underlying datasets, interview notes (anonymised or aggregated in line with Section 7.4), and assumption logs sufficient for USSEC to audit and re-use the work

7.4 Confidentiality of Customer and Stakeholder Information

- Primary data, interview notes, and other commercially sensitive information obtained from customers, terminal operators, and logistics providers must be protected by the contractor and used only for the purposes of this study. Such information must be anonymised or aggregated in all deliverables unless the relevant stakeholder and USSEC have given prior approval for direct attribution. This requirement is in addition to, and does not limit, the confidentiality terms set out elsewhere in this RFP and in the resulting contract.

8. Contractor Qualifications

USSEC is seeking a team that can produce a credible investment case — not only polished slides. Proposals will be evaluated against the following qualification criteria and must include CVs for all proposed team members and comparable project references.

Bulk / Feed Logistics Experience	Demonstrated experience in bulk agricultural commodity and/or feed ingredient logistics, from origin through discharge to end-user.
Port & Maritime Operations	Hands-on expertise in port operations, vessel discharge, terminal handling, and supply chain optimization.
Philippines / SEA Market Experience	Demonstrated experience in Philippine and broader Southeast Asian logistics and agricultural trade markets; local market knowledge strongly preferred.
Investment-Grade Modelling Capability	Proven ability to build unlocked, auditable financial models — CAPEX/OPEX, scenarios, payback, sensitivity, and dashboards — suitable for CEO/CFO, bank, and shareholder scrutiny.
Stakeholder Engagement	Capability to conduct structured stakeholder interviews, facilitated workshops, and field site assessments in commercial settings.
Team & CVs	Identified lead consultant and supporting personnel with clear role assignments and CVs; local Philippine market expertise on the team is valued.
References	A minimum of two comparable project references — ideally investment-case or logistics-economics studies — with client contact details.

9. Proposal Requirements

Proposals must address all the following elements. Incomplete proposals may be disqualified. All submissions are to be treated as confidential.

9.1 Technical Proposal — Required Components

- Company profile and overview of relevant experience, with emphasis on experience directly related to this RFP

- Technical methodology for each of the eight workstreams, including the bottleneck-sequencing approach
- Detailed workplan with milestones, activity descriptions, and responsible personnel
- Proposed corridor and customer coverage, and intended data sources and engagement program
- Proposed project timeline and level of effort, consistent with the schedule set out in Section 11
- Assigned personnel — CVs/resumes, roles, and time allocation per workstream
- At least two comparable project references (similarly sized clients) with client contact details
- Statement of assumptions, exclusions, and any dependencies on USSEC access or data provision. To enable consistent comparison across proposals, bidders must state the key technical and financial assumptions underpinning their approach and financial model, including: currency and exchange-rate basis, inflation treatment, treatment of CAPEX and OPEX, payback period, time horizon, and the data years to be used.

9.2 Commercial Proposal — Pricing

- A base bid covering the core Phase 1 scope (the three deep-dive corridors, the representative customer lens, and all must-have deliverables including the D7 financial model)
- Separately priced options — for example, the optional benchmark/comparator port, additional customers or corridors, or extended sensitivity/scenario work — so USSEC can scale scope to available budget
- Pricing itemised by workstream, showing daily rates, effort (days) by team member, and expense assumptions, so that the basis on which the fee was derived is clear

10. Optional Future Phases

This RFP covers Phase 1 (Philippines Pilot) only. USSEC reserves the right to initiate one or more future phases based on Phase 1 findings, stakeholder interest, available funding, and mutual agreement between USSEC and the selected consultant.

Anticipated future phase scope may include:

- **Phase 2:** Application of the Philippines methodology to one or more additional SEA markets (Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia) — sequenced by strategic priority and funding availability
- **Phase 3:** Deep-dive investment feasibility study for a specific high-ROI opportunity identified in Phase 1 (e.g., dedicated feed ingredient terminal, inter-island logistics optimization, shared storage infrastructure)
- **Phase 4:** Implementation support, monitoring framework development, and stakeholder engagement program for adopted interventions

11. Project Timeline & Milestones

Our expectation is for the study to be contracted from late July 2026, with final delivery by mid-September 2026 or earlier. We are asking that the Project Proposal include details of the proposed timeline, milestones, and level of effort. The engagement is expected to run approximately seven to eight weeks from kick-off, structured around the milestones and periodic USSEC check-ins set out

below. USSEC reserves the right to adjust these dates; any changes will be communicated promptly during the procurement process.

11.1 Procurement Schedule

Stage	Target Date
Project kick-off / inception	week of 27 July 2026
Final delivery (target)	Latest on or before Tuesday, 15 September 2026

11.2 Project Milestones & USSEC Check-Ins

The study is to be delivered against the following milestones. Each milestone includes a scheduled check-in with USSEC so that progress, emerging findings, and any course corrections can be reviewed on a periodic basis. Indicative timing is shown from contract kick-off; the contractor should confirm exact dates in the Inception Report (D1).

Milestone	Indicative Timing	Activities & USSEC Check-In
M1 — Kick-off & Inception	Week 1 (by ~1 Aug)	Kick-off meeting; confirm deep-dive corridors, customer lens, data plan, and detailed workplan. Submit Inception Report (D1). USSEC sign-off on approach before fieldwork begins.
M2 — Fieldwork & Data Collection	Weeks 2–3 (by ~14 Aug)	Stakeholder interviews, site visits, and corridor mapping underway. Progress check-in with USSEC; short written progress update; early data gaps flagged.
M3 — Interim Findings & Bottleneck Sequencing	Week 5 (by ~28 Aug)	Present preliminary bottleneck sequencing and draft financial-model structure. Interim review / validation workshop with USSEC to test findings and confirm direction.
M4 — Draft Deliverables & Model Walkthrough	Week 6 (by ~5 Sep)	Submit draft report and draft executive presentation; live walkthrough of the unlocked financial model. USSEC returns consolidated review comments.
M5 — Final Delivery & Presentation	Week 7 (by ~15 Sep)	Final report, executive presentation, unlocked Excel model, and all editable handover files and source-data annexes. Final presentation to USSEC leadership; acceptance and sign-off.

11.3 Progress Reporting & Invoicing

In addition to the milestone check-ins above, the contractor is required to provide the following on a periodic basis, in the prescribed USSEC template, throughout the engagement:

Frequency	Description of Deliverables
Bi-weekly (every two weeks)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide bi-weekly progress reports in the USSEC template summarising services rendered and activities during the period, upcoming activities, and any risks or data gaps. 2. Provide invoices for services provided, in line with the agreed payment schedule.
At each milestone	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide an updated workplan and implementation status reflecting USSEC feedback from the previous check-in, including any agreed adjustments to scope, sequencing, or timeline.

Payment Linked to Milestones (Indicative)

USSEC's preference is for payment to be linked to milestone acceptance rather than time elapsed — for example, a portion on acceptance of the Inception Report (M1), a portion at interim findings (M3), and the balance on final acceptance (M5). Proposers should set out a proposed milestone-linked payment schedule in their commercial proposal.

PROJECT TIMELINE:

Our expectation is for the study to be contracted from **late July 2026**, with final delivery by **mid-September 2026 or earlier**. We are asking that the Project Proposal include details of the proposed timeline, milestones, and level of effort. The engagement is expected to run approximately seven to eight weeks from kick-off, structured around the milestones and periodic USSEC check-ins set out below. USSEC reserves the right to adjust these dates; any changes will be communicated promptly during the procurement process.

RFP TIMELINE:

- **RFP Distribution:** June 22, 2026
- **Deadline for clarification questions:** July 2, 2026 (by 17:00 hours SGT)
- **USSEC responses to clarifications:** July 7, 2026
- **Project Proposals Due:** July 16, 2026 (17:00 hours SGT / GMT+8)
- **Evaluation, shortlisting & clarification interviews:** July 17 – 23, 2026
- **Contract award & notification of proposers:** By Friday, 24 July 2026

INSTRUCTIONS:

Proposals must contain at a minimum the specific criteria listed below:

1. **Submission Method:** Please email the proposal to RFP@USSEC.ORG and Chatan@ct.ussec.org by **17:00 SGT/GMT+8 on July 16, 2026**
2. **Qualifications & Experience:** Provide a description of the prospective contractor's capabilities, resources, and prior experience – especially any experience relevant to the requirements of this RFP.
3. **Technical Proposal:** Submit a thorough proposal outlining the proposed work plan, anticipated deliverables, and timeline for completing the work.

4. **Key Personnel:** Include resumes or CVs for all personnel who will be directly involved in executing the contract. Highlight each individual's qualifications and experience in relation to this role.
5. **References:** Provide at least two references (client names and contact information) from similarly sized projects or clients, for whom you have performed comparable work.
6. **Budget:** Submit a detailed budget breakdown. Clearly explain how the total fee was calculated – including, for example, daily or hourly rates for personnel, estimated level of effort for each task, and any other cost components.
7. **Length & Format:** Proposals should be written in English and not exceed 10 pages (standard 8½" x 11" or A4 size). This page limit does not include appendices such as resumes or references.

Notes and Conditions:

- Proposals will be duplicated for internal review by USSEC staff and legal counsel, and they will not be returned. USSEC reserves the right to retain all proposals submitted. Submission of a proposal indicates acceptance of all conditions contained in this RFP, unless specifically noted otherwise in the proposal and confirmed in the contract.
- Without USSEC's prior written consent, Prospective Contractors and their officers, employees, agents, affiliates, or subcontractors shall not disclose to any third party any documents, materials, or information provided by USSEC in relation to this RFP.
- During the evaluation process, USSEC may request additional information or clarifications from proposers, or allow correction of errors and omissions.
- USSEC reserves the right to reject any proposal that is inconsistent or irregular, and to waive any defects or deficiencies in proposals. USSEC also reserves the right to request additional information and/or negotiate modifications with any prospective contractor.
- Prospective Contractors agree that the fees proposed are in lieu of any and all other benefits or compensation (including, but not limited to, health or life insurance, retirement contributions, and paid leave).
- Any income taxes, value-added taxes (VAT), or other direct or indirect taxes on the compensation paid under the contract are the responsibility of the Contractor (neither USSEC nor the funding sources will withhold or pay such taxes on the contractor's behalf).
- Prior to receiving any payment, the selected contractor must provide the appropriate tax form (e.g., a W-9 for U.S.-based contractors, or W-8/W-8BEN for non-U.S. contractors).
- **Non-Competition:** For the duration of the contract, the Contractor shall not act as an agent or representative for any product or service that is directly or indirectly competitive with U.S. soybeans or soybean products.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION AND BACKGROUND

Building a Preference for U.S. Soy: USSEC's overarching strategy and vision can be found on its website. In summary, USSEC is a dynamic partnership of key stakeholders representing U.S. soybean producers, commodity shippers, merchandisers, allied agribusinesses, and agricultural organizations. Through its global network and strong U.S. support, USSEC works to build a preference for U.S. soybeans and soybean products, advocates for the use of soy in feed, aquaculture and human consumption, promotes the benefits of soy through education, and connects industry leaders through a robust membership program. This strategy is guided by the long-range plans of the U.S. soy industry and is supported by various funding sources (including U.S. soybean farmer checkoff funds, industry co-operators, and USDA Foreign Agricultural Service programs).

BUILDING A PREFERENCE FOR U.S. SOY

USSEC's strategy can be found here: <https://ussec.org/about-ussec/>

USB's Long Range Strategic Plan can be found here: <https://www.unitedsoybean.org/strategic-plan/>

We are a dynamic partnership of key stakeholders representing soybean producers, commodity shippers, merchandisers, allied agribusiness and agricultural organizations.

Through a global network of international offices and strong support in the U.S., we help build a preference for U.S. soybeans and soybean products, advocate for the use of soy in feed, aquaculture and human consumption, promote the benefits of soy use through education and connect industry leaders through a robust membership program.

Our 15-member board of directors is comprised of four members from the American Soybean Association (ASA), four members from the United Soybean Board (USB), and seven members representing trade, allied industry, and state organizations.

New board members are seated annually. We are receiving funding from a variety of sources including soy producer checkoff dollars invested by the USB and various state soybean councils; cooperating industry; and the American Soybean Association's investment of cost-share funding provided by the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Foreign Agriculture Service.

The United Soybean Board, created by the 1990 Farm Bill to manage and direct the National Soybean Checkoff, is dedicated to marketing and research for the soybean industry. USB is comprised of 73 volunteer soybean farmers representing the interests of fellow growers nationwide. Each board member is nominated by Qualified State Soybean Boards (QSSBs) and appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

Because of the limitations on administrative and salary costs established in the Act, USB outsources the majority of its program management responsibilities to USB's three primary contractors:

- U.S. Soybean Export Council (USSEC), Inc. for international marketing and global opportunities activities.

As one of these three primary contractors USSEC may also undertake initiative activities on behalf of USB. USB considers primary contractor staff (approximately 60 people) as core USB staff. These three primary contractors use a number of subcontractors and, together, these entities carry out approximately 450 projects each year for USB. USB also manages approximately 10 subcontractors.

Non-Discrimination Statement

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 {voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at [How to File a Program Discrimination Complaint](#) and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) [email:program.intake@usda.gov](mailto:program.intake@usda.gov).

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

Civil Rights Clause

Contractor agrees that during the performance of this Agreement it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital or family status, parental status or protected genetic information. Contractor further agrees that it will fully comply with any and all applicable Federal, State and local equal employment opportunity statutes, ordinances and regulations, including, without limitation, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Nothing in this section shall require Contractor to comply with or become liable under any law, ordinance, regulation or rule that does not otherwise apply to Contractor.

MANDATORY CONTRACTUAL TERMS

Contracts: *the following terms are required:*

1. USSEC, as well as the Secretary of Agriculture, may terminate the contract and be relieved of payment. USSEC will pay for all work performed under contract until the date of termination.
2. Any work a contractor undertakes prior to contract approval by AMS is at their own risk and USSEC is not financially liable if the contract is not approved.
3. Funds paid to the contractor may not be used for the purpose of influencing legislation or governmental policy or action. "Influencing legislation" is defined as any attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any segment thereof concerning current or proposed legislation or any attempt to influence legislation through communication with any member or employee of a legislative body or with any government officials who may participate in the formulation of legislation. "Government officials" refers to federal employees outside of USDA, foreign, and State governments/officials, legislators, and legislative staffs. "Influencing of governmental policy or action" is defined as any action the principal purpose of which is to bring about a change in existing policy or regulation or affect the outcome of proposed policy or regulation, except those actions which are specifically provide for in the Soybean Act and Order.
4. The contractor must (a) keep accurate records, books and documents involving transactions relating to the contract; (b) retain the records, books and documents for 3 years; and (c) said records, books and documents may be subject to inspection and audit by a representative of USDA and/or USSEC.
5. EEO policy statement: contractor agrees that, during the performance of this Agreement, contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, protected genetic information, or reprisal. Contractor further agrees that it will fully comply with any and all applicable Federal, State and local equal employment opportunity statutes, ordinances and regulations, including, but not limited to, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, Genetic Information Act of 2008, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Nothing in this section shall require contractor to comply with or become liable under any law, ordinances, regulation or rule that does not otherwise apply to the contractor.
6. Subcontractors. Subject to USSEC's approval, the contractor may subcontract specific tasks to outside parties. Should the contractor elect to subcontract specific tasks,

subcontractors will be subject to the same contractual terms as its contract agency in regard to:

- (1) Reporting and record keeping;
- (2) Travel expenses;
- (3) Title of property;
- (4) Confidential information
- (5) Influencing legislation and/or influencing governmental policy or action;
- (6) Federal civil rights policies.

The primary contractor agency who has a direct contract with USSEC will be fully responsible for the quality of all work product, including any approvals from AMS. Any such authorization in the contract must state that entering into a subcontract does not relieve the contractor of primary responsibility to carry out the terms and conditions of the underlying contract in accordance with the Act, Order, Regulations and USDA policies.

7. Confidentiality

Financial or commercial information obtained under contract with USSEC that is privileged and confidential shall be kept confidential by all persons, including employees and former employees of USSEC, USDA and the contractor having access to such information.

Contracts: ***the following terms are not allowed:***

1. Indemnification provisions, unless it is clear that the indemnification will in no way obligate the U.S. government to pay on a potential claim.
2. Liquidated Damages

Intellectual property. Rights will be governed by the Bayh Dole Act, 35 U.S.C. §200-212 for any entity that is a “contractor” as defined by the Act at §201(c).

Expenses. The following expenses are prohibited under the Act and Order:

1. University Principal Investigator salaries;
2. University overhead/indirect costs; non-Principal Investigator salaries are an exception
3. Entertainment expenses;
4. Spousal/family/companion expenses;
5. Personal expenses (except as specifically allowed in USSEC’s Travel policies);
6. Open bars;
7. Funding of capital equipment unless the equipment is purchased (a) in direct connection with a plan or project, and (b) necessary for the completion of the plan or project.

Request for Proposal Budget Development

Company Name:	
Contact Person:	
Proposal Name:	
Total Budget:	\$ -

This budget proposed contains information including all consulting fees, overhead, travel expenses or any other type of expenses incurred to effectively complete the services/deliverables agreed upon. The payment represents the sole and complete liability of USSEC for services rendered in relations to the agreement.

PROFESSIONAL FEES:

Total Fees	
\$	-

TRAVEL EXPENSES

Provide the anticipated travel expenses to successfully execute the project:

Domestic Travel	International Travel	Purpose
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	
\$ -	\$ -	

Other

Provide list of any other costs related to the project that are not included in Professional Fees or Travel Expenses

Type of Expenses	Cost	Purpose
	\$ -	
	\$ -	
	\$ -	
	\$ -	
	\$ -	
	\$ -	
	\$ -	

Budget Summary

Professional Fees	\$ -
Travel Expenses	\$ -
Other	\$ -
	\$ -