

AMENDMENT #3: USTDA ACTIVITY NO. 2020-11025A NIGERIA: DARWAY COAST ENERGY ACCESS 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 the FEASIBILITY STUDY for the Nigeria: Darway Coast Energy Access 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: For the ESIA in Task 6 Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, the TOR states that “The Contractor shall use publicly available information as well as observations and brief surveys during the Site visits to prepare the baseline studies”. However, according to the referenced REA document and the TOR, the ESIA appears to require a very detailed site analysis for each and every of the 95 sites, including sampling and measurements for example: Surface and Ground water quality, Surface:(testing of: pH, TDS, DO, COD, BOD), Ground:(testing of: pH, Arsenic, TDS, alkalinity, Cl, Fe), Soil Quality. Can you please confirm that this level of detailed analysis and measurements is required for all 95 sites? Is the Grantee able to provide an example of an ESIA from one of its existing mini grid sites?

Answer: Please see Annex D (ESMP) and Annex VI (ESIA) of this document, which provides sample guidelines: <https://esa.afdb.org/sites/default/files/ENVIRONMENTAL-SOCIAL-MANAGEMENT-FRAMEWORK-FOR-NIGERIA%20ELECTRIFICATION%20PROJECT.pdf>. The Grantee will endeavor as much as possible to avoid Category 1 sites which require an ESIA. It is safe to assume the most of the sites would only require an ESMP. The grantee expects that the contracting team will have its environmental consultant either accompany the survey team or travel independently to the sites to gather the relevant data needed for the ESMP/ESIA. The grantee is working with four DISCOs, and the Contractor can expect to have sites in each of the following states within each DISCO: Enugu DISCO (Enugu, Ebonyi, Abia, Imo, and Anambra); Eko DISCO (Lagos); AEDC (Niger, Kogi, Nassarawa, and FCT), and PHED (Rivers, Cross River, Bayelsa, and Akwa Ibom).

Question: In Subtask 1.1. of the TOR, it states: “The Contractor shall work with the Grantee to clarify all issues related to the management and staffing for the Study, reporting arrangements, Study team participants” assignments and requirements of the Grantee’s time and resources (e.g., local transportation for Contractor personnel to candidate Project sites, office space for Contractor personnel, and local administrative support).” Will the Grantee be providing local transportation for Contractor personnel to candidate project sites? Please clarify what local transportation costs will be included, e.g. for how many teams, from Abuja or Lagos, and/or will security be provided by the Grantee?

Answer: No, the grantee will not provide transportation or security for Contractor personnel. While the grantee considers all sites as safe, the grantee recommends using or including local employees/contractors for the site survey/assessments whenever possible.

Question: Regarding the CI&I sites, can the Grantee provide additional information on the 15 sites, including average number of customers per site, i.e. how many are large markets with dozens or hundreds of customers vs. sites with a single large customer such as a hospital or agricultural operation.

Answer: The grantee expects there to be a mix of CI&I sites. At the moment, the grantee has identified 4 markets that have large numbers of customers (one with 878 outlets, one with 770 outlets, one with 250 outlets, and one with 1800 outlets). The grantee is exploring other sites that would have single large customers such as local universities, hospitals, and industrial customers but these sites are still under discussion.

Question: Task 2 states “The Grantee shall reflect these sites in a compiled list of the identified 80 Community Mini-Grid and 15 CI&I sites which will be the focus of the rest of these TOR (the “Sites,” or “Final Site List”). In consultation with the Grantee, the Contractor shall categorize the 80 Community Mini-Grids Sites into three groups (“Group A”, “Group B”, and “Group C”) and the 15 CI&I Sites into three groups (“Group 1”, “Group 2”, and “Group 3”). To facilitate the advancement of the Study, as soon as the Contractor and the Grantee have agreed upon any single grouping of Sites, the Contractor shall continue on to Task 3 for those Sites. For example, if the Contractor has agreed with the Grantee upon a group of Sites to comprise Group A, the Contractor shall proceed to the Task 3 with regard to the Group A Sites. The total Sites for the Study shall not exceed 80 Sites for Community Mini-Grids and 15 Sites for CI&I.” Is the total number of sites to be evaluated in Task 2 the 80 Sites for Community Mini-Grids and 15 Sites for CI&I already identified by the Grantee? Our understanding is that these groupings are made in order to prioritize for further analysis. Is it known on what basis these sites will be prioritized (e.g. generation size, population, number of CI&I customers, ability to pay)? Is it known what is the number of sites in each group (e.g. an equal number)?

Answer: There is no set number of sites for each grouping. The TOR and the grouping systems was designed to create some flexibility to allow the Contractor and the Grantee to move forward flexibly with groups of sites. Although the feasibility study is expected to last 18-24 months, the expectation is that the Grantee will be implementing the project over several years, and the grouping will assist with prioritization and identification of implementation financing. The hope is that the Contractor and the Grantee can identify the sites that are likely to be ready most quickly, are priorities based on Nigeria’s COVID recovery efforts, and/or are most promising in the near term for Group A/Group 1 to allow for those sites to move forward most quickly. These sites will be evaluated based on things such as ability to pay, telecommunications access, external COVID recovery programs etc. Again, the hope is for groupings to reflect discussions between the Grantee and the Contractor, utilizing their respective expertise and creating flexibility to allow the parties to advance in the way that makes most sense. The grantee is working with four DISCOs, and the Contractor can expect to have sites in each of the following states within each DISCO: Enugu DISCO (Enugu, Ebonyi, Abia, Imo, and Anambra); Eko

DISCO (Lagos); AEDC (Niger, Kogi, Nassarawa, and FCT), and PHED (Rivers, Cross River, Bayelsa, and Akwa Ibom).

Question: Regarding TASK 9: Development Impact Assessment in the Terms of Reference, could you please provide a copy of the USTDA Development Impact Guide as recommended?

Answer: USTDA does not have a Development Impact Guide to share. The Contractor only needs to follow the Terms of Reference as written for Task 9. The USTDA Development indicators for the feasibility study are included there as well as directions for what information to include in the development impact assessment.