

Our ref: ERB/105.3

 28th December, 2018

To Shortlisted Bidders

1. AF Mercados EMI – (Spain)
2. Parsons Brinkerhoff – (USA)
3. Synergy Consulting Infrastructure and Financing Advisory Services Inc. – (USA)
4. The Energy Resources Institute (TERI) – (India)
5. Energy Market and Regulatory Consultants (EMRC Group) – (UK)
6. Ricardo Energy and Environment T/A Ricardo AEA Limited – (UK)

Dear All,

RE: CLARIFICATIONS - REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL FOR CONSULTING SERVICES TO UNDERTAKE THE ELECTRICITY COST OF SERVICE STUDY AND DETERMINATION OF ECONOMIC COST REFLECTIVE TARIFFS - RFP NO. ERB/RFP/003/2018

Reference is made to the above captioned subject.

The ERB received some requests for clarifications from bidders concerning the request for proposals (RFP) for the above captioned tender. Consistence with ITC clause 13.1 of the RFP, the following responses have been provided to all shortlisted Consultants including an explanation of the query but without identifying its source:

Item	Consultant's Query	ERB's Response
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We would be grateful if you would grant a two-week extension to the tender programme. The current tender programme spans an extensive holiday period 2. We would like to request an extension to the deadline of 1 week and would kindly ask for the submission date to be changed to 22nd January 2019. This allows for some additional time after the Christmas holiday period 3. Please may we request for a two week extension to the 	<p>In our update to key stakeholders including the Government of the Republic of Zambia, we have already committed the 15th January as the date for submission of proposals. Kindly note that there is pressure to have the study completed in the shortest possible time. Further note that any amendments to the RFP would require a 'No Objection' from the financier (African Development Bank) who approved the RFP which is not feasible due to time constraints.</p>

	proposal submission deadline. This is requested in light of the holiday period and complexity of the work for which the tender is being prepared	
2	<p>1. Table 1 in the ToR provides a list of eleven experts and minimum years' experience, while the Data Sheet provides a slightly different list including nine Key Experts. Please confirm that the Data Sheet has the correct list</p> <p>2. We would like to clarify the composition of the team composition. The table, located in page 62 of the ToR, indicates 11 positions, as to evaluation criteria, located in page 23-24 of the Data Sheet, indicates 9 positions (merger for the Power Economist & Pricing Specialist, and the none inclusion of the Utility Operations and Maintenance Engineer). We tend to feel that the team included in the Evaluation criteria is more appropriate but we would like a confirmation form the ERB</p>	We hereby confirm that the list provided in the data sheet is correct and is what will be used to assign scores during the proposal evaluation.
3	Please advise whether 5-years' experience would be acceptable for positions K6-K9: our understanding of section 9.3 of the TORs is that "the rest of the core team members in the power sector" means positions K1-K5.	Years of experience is correlated to knowledge of the job of the proposed personnel. Therefore compromising on a number of years implies compromising on quality of the personnel. The TORs have set the minimum number of years of experience for each position. Therefore if a bidder proposals to use personnel with numbers of years of experience less than what is stipulated in the TORs, then that will be non-responsive to the TORs and that particular personnel will be awarded a zero score on experience for not meeting the minimum number of years. Further note that any amendments to the TORs would require

		a 'No Objection' from the financier (African Development Bank) who approved the ToRs which is not feasible due to time constraints. Other than position K-8 which has a minimum of 10 years of experience, the rest of the positions require minimum of 15 years of experience.
4	Please confirm whether it is necessary to have a Resident Study Manager permanently in Lusaka. Would it be acceptable to have presence in Lusaka for just the data-gathering and workshops?	Yes it is necessary to have a Resident Study Manager permanently located in Lusaka for the duration of the study to serve as the link between the Client and the Consultant, facilitate the gathering of information, quick and effective resolution of emerging issues, discussions of comments of the Client on the various reports of the Consultant. It is expected that this would ensure overall effective of conduct of the study, and an eventual successful outcome.
5	As stated on page 54 of the ToR, within Task 4, " <i>the electrical network planning models, such as PSS/E or similar models should be utilized in developing the least-cost transmission and distribution expansion programs</i> ". We would like to inquire whether the client or beneficiaries have already undertaken a study on those matters, and if so, which model was used. This is to accommodate in our proposal the best option has we have experience in several models	The ToRs have not stipulated what model to be used. We have only indicated that we want a dynamic computer model capable of optimising the plan or results. Therefore the consultant is at liberty to propose any model. The bidder is required to propose the methodology or approach for each task as part of the Technical Proposal which includes proposing a computer model for use in the development of the least cost generation, transmission and distribution expansion plan. This is what will be assessed and scored during the evaluation of bids

Yours faithfully,

ENERGY REGULATION BOARD



B. Lombe

MANAGER – PROCUREMENT AND SUPPLIES