

**Addendum No. 2**

<b>RFP# 25-26-12: Small Business Technical Assistance Services</b>	<b>Date: 9/3/25</b>
<b>Prepared By: Tish Williams</b>	

**General Questions, Clarifications & Requirements:**

1. **Q:** The RFP outlines the challenges small businesses are facing very clearly. From the city’s perspective, what challenges has Greenville itself experienced in supporting these businesses effectively?  
**A:** The City recognizes that small businesses in Greenville face challenges related to limited capacity, access to capital, and effective marketing strategies.
  
2. **Q:** Are there lessons learned from previous technical assistance efforts that you’d like this program to build upon or improve?  
**A:** The City has learned that providing consistent, tailored support and clear communication is essential to helping businesses succeed. Lessons from prior technical assistance efforts—such as the recently completed cohort, showed strong value in hands-on guidance, peer networking, and measurable business outcomes.
  
3. **Q:** Since a cohort just wrapped up, what outcomes or elements of that experience does the city most want to preserve going forward, and what would you like to see done differently?  
**A:** We would like to preserve the elements referenced in Question#2 while improving support and tracking long-term impact.
  
4. **Q:** Will the City be responsible for selecting and enrolling the eight (8) or more small businesses?  
**A:** Yes.
  
5. **Q:** Does the City have any specific requirements or preferences regarding templates or guidelines for regulatory audits and risk assessments? If so, what are they?  
**A:** At this time, the City does not have specific templates or guidelines for regulatory audits or risk assessments, but providers are encouraged to propose tools and approaches that are practical and aligned with industry best practices.
  
6. **Q:** Growmetix is MWBE certified. Are we required to complete any of the forms regarding MWBE utilization? If so, which?

**A:** If a proposer is HUB or DBE certified, it may be referenced under Tab 2: Corporate Background and Experience in the proposal. A proposer is required to complete and submit Form 1 or Form 2 in the proposal, based on whether sub-service providers will be used to complete the scope of work or not.

7. **Q:** As an MWBE certified vendor, we do not intent to utilize sub-service providers. Would you please confirm what type(s) of supporting documentation would justify past performance without the use of subcontractors?

**A:** Proposers may demonstrate past performance through documentation of their own work, such as relevant project descriptions, reports that illustrate the quality of services, or examples of outcomes achieved for clients. The City would like evidence of the proposer’s ability to successfully deliver the scope of services.

8. **Q:** When is the program expected to begin? Does the city have specific date or timeframe in mind?

**A:** The start date has not been set. However, the City anticipates launching the program this fall, following the contract award.

9. **Q:** Does the city prefer in-person, remote or hybrid delivery? If remote or hybrid, which meeting platforms does the city prefer and/or currently use?

**A:** The City is open to in-person or hybrid delivery. Proposers are encouraged to recommend the delivery method that will most effectively meet small business needs and achieve program outcomes. If hybrid delivery is proposed, the City currently uses Microsoft Teams for virtual meetings but is open to other accessible platforms.

10. **Q:** In Section 2: Scope of Work, the RFP indicates “The goal is to enroll a minimum of eight (8) eligible small business in this program. Is there a maximum capacity of participants in the program?”

**A:** The RFP specifies a minimum of eight (8) eligible small businesses for enrollment. There is no set maximum capacity. Proposers are encouraged to outline the number of businesses they can effectively serve within their proposed program, available resources, and within the budget.

11. **Q:** As per Section 3.1, “RFP Required Documents Format,” could you please confirm how “tabs” would be represented in an electronic submission?

**A:** For electronic submissions, “tabs” refer to a title page for each section that mirrors the required documents format. Proposers may also use PDF bookmarks that clearly identify each required section.

12. **Q:** In Appendix III, Section 4 Payment Terms, the RFP states: “. . . However, the City shall not be obligated to make payment to the Contractor for any services performed under this contract.” Could you please clarify the intent of this statement? Under what circumstances would the City not be obligated to pay for services rendered?

**A:** The language in Appendix III, Section 4 reflects standard contract language. The City will not be obligated to make payment for services that have not been authorized, performed, or invoiced in

accordance with the contract terms. As long as services are properly delivered and documented per the agreement, payment will be made.

13. **Q:** The RFP asks for comparable contracts specifically with government entities. Given that the services themselves will be delivered directly to small business owners, what makes government contracting experience especially important for this program?

**A:** While the program services will be delivered directly to small businesses, government contracting experience is important because it demonstrates familiarity with public-sector compliance, reporting, and accountability requirements.

14. **Q:** In emphasizing prior government contract experience, which aspects matter most to the City — for example, comfort with compliance and reporting, etc.?

**A:** Government contracting experience helps ensure that providers can successfully manage the administrative aspects of the contract and reporting while also focusing on service delivery.

15. **Q:** Can you share more about how the City intends to use the hourly rate information in evaluating proposals and/or managing the contract? If a program model does not naturally break down into hourly rates, how would the City prefer to see those costs presented so that you can evaluate them fairly?

**A:** Hourly rate information helps the City better understand the basis of costs, compare proposals, and evaluate if, overall the proposed pricing is reasonable. If a program model does not naturally break down into hourly rates, proposers may present costs as deliverables-based per business, provided they clearly explain how the pricing aligns with the proposed scope of work.

16. **Q:** In Section 3.1.2 Corporate Background and Experience, the RFP requests “. . . detailed information regarding the proposer’s experience preparing comparable plans for similar cities . . .” Could you please clarify what is meant by “comparable plans”?

**A:** “Comparable plans” refers to structured technical assistance programs or initiatives that support small businesses in areas referenced in the scope of work section of the RFP. The City is most interested in examples of prior work that demonstrate a proposer’s ability to design and deliver programs with similar goals and outcomes, whether for other municipalities, economic development agencies, or comparable organizations.