

AMENDMENT #2: USTDA ACTIVITY NO. 2021-11006A NIGERIA: SOSAI SUSTAINABLE MINIGRIDS FOR ENERGY ACCESS AND SOCIAL INCLUSION 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 NIGERIA: SOSAI SUSTAINABLE MINIGRIDS FOR ENERGY ACCESS AND SOCIAL INCLUSION 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 below.

Question: The RFP specifies areas of expertise for our team, however, are there specific roles and backgrounds expected of our personnel? i.e., staff positions, minimum degree, years of experience, etc.

Answer: The requirements are only what are outlined in the RFP. The Grantee will evaluate how well your proposed staff meet the areas of expertise, which could include assessing levels of degree and years of experience. The Grantee notes that it is important that the staff you propose meet the criteria and are able to deliver high quality deliverables.

Question: The RFP mentions "preliminary" engineering and environmental and social management plans for each of the 100 sites, will these be used for contracting the project and a "detailed" ESMP be generated by the contractor later?

Answer: The preliminary engineering and environmental and social management plans are the ESMPs that the Grantee will submit when seeking permitting from the Rural Electrification Agency ("REA") or other relevant bodies. The expectation is that the Contractor/Offeror put together an ESMP, not an ESIA, for each site.

Question: The RFP mentions that there are a "number of households [identified] for [the] 34 sites in Kaduna State", is this same information available for Kogi State and Plateau State now? Will this be provided prior to the commencement of the feasibility study, or will the Offeror be responsible for gathering this information?

Answer: Where available, this information will be provided to the Contractor/Offeror by the Grantee prior to the commencement of the feasibility study. However, this information is not available for already available for most sites and the Offeror is expected to determine this information for each site.

Question: The RFP does not mention an anticipated duration for the feasibility study to take place. May the Offeror provide a timeline at its own discretion?

Answer: The Offeror/Contractor is welcome to provide a proposed timeline. The Grantee expects the feasibility study to take approximately one year, although the Grantee would welcome a shorter timeframe. The Grantee will favorably view Offerors who propose efficient use of time in performing the feasibility study.

Question: Is there existing information about the status of women inclusion in the complete Desk Study?

Answer: There is no further information about women inclusion in the Desk Study. It is clear in the Terms of Reference what is expected of the Offeror/Contractor in terms of generating information in support of women's inclusion for the implementation of the project.

Question: Please clarify the Host Country subcontractor maximum participation percentage – page 7, section 2.11, states that up to 20% of the amount of the USTDA grant may be utilized for subcontractors from the Host Country however, Annex II-3, section C(3) states that it is up to 30%. Is this percentage threshold inclusive of the Host Country subcontractor's incidental costs? Please provide a definition and list of incidental costs as discussed on page 63, Annex 11-4 section C(6). Must Offerors provide both a statement confirming the availability of the proposed project manager and key staff over the duration of the project (per 3.4), as well as letters of commitment from the individuals proposed confirming their availability for contract performance (per 3.6)?

Answer: Annex II-3, section C(3) is correct that, for this particular feasibility study, the maximum amount of the USTDA grant that can be used for local host country labor is **30 percent**. This is inclusive of host country labor incidentals. USTDA does not have a USTDA-specific definition for incidental; it is a common term and the common definition applies.

Question: Will the Contractor or Grantee determine which local surveyors are used?

Answer: The Contractor/Offeror should select which local surveyors to use. The Contractor will be responsible for the cost of the local surveyors under the USTDA grant.

Question: Please clarify the financial responsibility of the Contractor vs. the Grantee with respect to the Site Assessments:

- a. Which party is funding and selecting the survey team?
- b. Which party is funding the travel and associated logistics of the survey team?
- c. Is the Contractor required to fund the Grantee's travel?

Answer:

- a.) Contractor;
- b.) Contractor; and
- c.) The Contractor is not required to fund the Grantee's travel; however, the Contractor can provide transportation for the Grantee if it is convenient and at no additional cost to the Contractor (e.g. there is an available seat in the vehicle).

Question: With reference to the Site Assessments, will high risk sites be excluded from the selection?

Answer: The Grantee is very familiar with the area and will participate in all of the site visits. If there is a site that the Contractor does not deem safe to travel to, the Contractor should raise this with the Grantee and USTDA to seek resolution.

Question: Please clarify which jurisdiction define the specifications of the preliminary engineering (Nigerian or the US).

Answer: The Nigerian jurisdiction should be used for preliminary engineering specifications. The Nigerian jurisdiction will define most of the work since the project will be implemented in Nigeria.

Question: Please clarify whether the preliminary engineering drawings require an engineer of record to certify the drawings? If an engineer of record is required, is there a jurisdiction?

Answer: An engineer of record is not absolutely required; what is important is the accuracy and veracity of the designs.

Question: Regarding Task 4 of the TOR “The network connectivity model shall be built in a tool such as GridLab-D, MilSoft WindMil, or Opus One Solutions IDP.” There are several other commercially available tools that can be used to conduct the GIS network connectivity analysis described in Task 4. What are the specific requirements for the tool that must be met for this feasibility study?

Answer: The tool should generally help with the simulation of smart grid technologies for integrated modeling of power systems, energy markets, building technologies, and the plethora of other resources and assets that are becoming part of modern electricity production, delivery, and consumption systems. Offerors are welcome to propose alternative tools to what is referenced in the RFP. However, if a different tool is proposed, the Offerors should justify its selection and include a brief comparative analysis in its bid.

Question: Annex I-2, “Contractor shall undertake a quality control review process” – Please elaborate on the requirements of the quality control review process. Will the Contractor be required to maintain in its files a formal paper trail and records of the complete quality control review process for each deliverable?

Answer: Yes. Generally, the Contractor will ensure a proper quality control review process. The Contractor/Offeror shall evaluate each individual section, as well as the complete feasibility study, to ensure they exhibit the following basic characteristics:

- **Completeness** – All required sections are complete based on the “Detailed Requirements” of the TOR.
- **Consistency** – Information presented in the report remains consistent, both within individual sections and across the entire set of deliverables. Report should not contradict each other.

- **Clarity** – The language used in the report is understandable and unambiguous.
- **Traceability** – Traceability among all sections is clearly identifiable and maintained throughout the entire development life cycle.
- **Standard** – Report is consistent with existing feasibility study standards.

Question: Annex I-2, “Contractor shall submit monthly progress reports to the Grantee” – Please elaborate what the requirements for the monthly reports are (e.g., what should be included in these reports).

Answer: The Monthly Progress Report shall include: accomplishments of the preceding month; planned activities for the following month; problems encountered and resolutions; and ongoing consultations and communications activities. This report should also include a monthly project financial analysis. In addition to the Monthly Progress Reports, the Contractor/Offeror should schedule monthly teleconference calls between the Contracting team and the Grantee.

Question: Considering the scope of work in the proposal to be undertaken by local contractors, would USTDA confirm an approval of up to 30% local labor costs out of the overall USTDA budget of \$996,781?

Answer: Yes, USTDA confirms an approval of up to 30 percent local labor costs out of the overall USTDA budget of \$996,781.

Question: Are drones mandatory for the above portion of the work for all sites, for specific sites, or optional in all cases with the options for obtaining the Geospatial information for every potential connected customer being any combination (or single option) of the below:

- a. Contingent on the quality of the satellite imagery, manually geotag the satellite images, and/or,
- b. manually geotagging drone aerial imagery, and/or,
- c. Use a handheld unit to collect the coordinates for each dwelling in person.

Answer: No, drones are not mandatory. Drones and/or manual geotagging are both acceptable as long as the information collected is of a high quality and meets the specifications of the terms of reference.

Question: Annex I-7, “*The Contractor’s supervisory staff shall accompany the surveyors during the first ten initial site assessments*” – What are the requirements for being categorized as “supervisory staff”?

Answer: The “supervisory staff” are Contractor/Offeror team members that would be exceptionally knowledgeable about the work and will follow the Contractor/Offeror’s surveyors to the field to ensure they are collecting the data in the way and of the quality required.

Question: Annex I-9, “*GIS and Network Connectivity Model*” – The success of the type of baseline engineering analysis being required in the TOR to *validate correct wire sizes and distances, pole locations, and correct generation system sizing* needs accurate information about

the percentage of actual subscribers and is also highly dependent on the geospatial distribution of low, medium, and high income households in the community. Even after a site assessment (e.g., as in Tasks 2 and 3), all developers will typically face uncertainties in accurately estimating the percentage of subscribers and precisely locating low, medium, and high-income households in the community based on limited sampling of only ~25 customers (as required by the TOR). Based on our experience in developing similar connectivity models using the software listed in the TOR, these analyses are typically time consuming and expensive relative to the overall cost of the feasibility study. That is why such detailed analyses are typically done only for sites that are both technically and economically viable and have all required data prior to actual construction. What is the objective and anticipated benefit of conducting such a high precision engineering analysis for all 100 sites at such an early stage when there are bound to be significant uncertainties in the input data? Instead, would it be possible for the Contractor to conduct the analysis as a “proof of concept” on a smaller sample of the 100 sites (e.g. 5 or 10 representative mini grid site designs based on distribution grid size, total generation capacity, or economic viability).

Answer: The TOR language describes the requirement here. The Grantee envisions most sites being viability and therefore needing this level of detail for implementation.

Question: Annex I-9, “*Contractor shall deliver a conceptual plan for distribution systems in the format required by the Nigerian Government*” – Please elaborate on what “format” is required by the Nigerian Government and provide an example or a link where this information can be obtained.

Answer: This can be found on the REA and the Nigerian Electricity Regulatory Commission (“NERC”) websites.

Question: Annex I-15, “*Contractor shall support the Grantee in (a) uploading required technical designs to the PBF Program*” – What are the requirements of the PBF Program with respect to details and specifications of technical designs? Please provide a link where this information is available, if possible.

Answer: This can be found on the REA and NERC websites.