



## **Response to Request for Clarifications**

“Water & Energy for Increased Food Security and Socio- Economic Development. Promoting Clean Cooking Solutions and Solar Technologies”

# Consultancy Services for Baseline Studies and Selection of Communities

**International Consultancy Firm**

25 October 2023



**“Water & Energy for Increased Food Security and Socio- Economic Development. Promoting Clean Cooking Solutions and Solar Technologies”  
Consultancy Services for Baseline Studies and Selection of Communities**

No.	Question	Response
1	Clean cooking. Is 2 experts a definitive number? In the three countries to cover we would envisage a composition of 3 experts by adding an additional Project Manager person. Would that be possible? we would keep the proposal within the days suggested.	The number of experts specified in the ToR's is a <u>minimum</u> requirement. The number of professionals is nevertheless orientative; you have to bear in mind that proposals will be evaluated by their technical quality and financial offer.
2	The 1st [question] has to do with your eventual requirements concerning the type, and mainly dimension of the company you might contract to execute this project: will accounting elements certifying the financial health of competing companies be required, and if so, will some limits on annual results be imposed, such as revenue in the last 3 years, others?	The company will not be evaluated at this stage by its dimension or revenues.
3	Will it be acceptable for a company to sub-contract one of the two required technical experts? If so, will it be any kind of restrictions concerning the nationality (or any other kind of limitation) of the sub-contracted expert?	Yes, It will be acceptable that the company subcontract the expert. There will be no restrictions concerning the nationality of the experts.
4	Concerning the Delivery of equipment namely (1) solar pumps, (2) PV systems, (3) cooking solutions and (4) fish smoking systems, its not clear if the intention is for the awarded company to include the delivery of such equipment in its SoW (Scope of Supply), as in many parts of ToR the word “Fornecimento” is directly and widely applied, or if on the contrary the intention is only to study the best solutions in for the selected communities and, based on that studies, to perform dedicated ToRs for afterwards equipment acquisition on the market (in fact, section 3.1. mentions the following: "A final report with recommendations for on-site interventions should be produced and will serve as the basis for drawing up the ToRs for the supply of equipment to the communities". [...]);	The services that are to be procured under this call are Baseline studies and report. No equipment will be purchased under this tender. The final report that will be prepared by the consultants must include recommendations of equipment proposed to fill the gaps on the selected communities and value chains. They will have to respond to the needs of the communities, so the report will be checked by ECREEE so that there is no conflict of interest in the equipment proposed by the awarded consultant firm.



5	<p>Section 3.2, 2) defines de following: “ <b><i>Six (6) communities will be proposed by the consultancy firm for on-site interventions. These communities must have the potential to implement the interventions on site</i></b>”. The question is: should we consider the intention is to balance these communities in the 3 countries, meaning each country shall have two communities to be selected?</p>	<p>Yes, two communities must be proposed by the consultant for each country.</p>
6	<p>Is the intention for now just to pre-qualify companies (meaning <u>interested companies should only for now send their EoI</u>), or on the contrary is <u>your intention already to receive Technical and Commercial Proposals</u>, as it seems Section 9 is suggesting? [Note: providing your intention is to already receive Technical and Commercial proposals, we will then need to ask for further clarifications];</p>	<p>As stated in the ToR, section 9, applications must include technical and financial proposals.</p>
7	<p>One question regards the language in which the proposal should be sent;</p>	<p>As expressed in the ToR, the language of the mission will be English and Portuguese, with the reports being prepared in English. However, the proposal for this tender can be submitted in any of the three ECOWAS official languages. In case of being shortlisted, the experts will have to prove fluency in one or the two (depending on their role) requested languages for the mission.</p>
8	<p>Another question regards the fact that only two consultants are considered to undertake work in 3 countries and one of the criteria for the selection of the provider is Cost effectiveness / financial proposal. As the assignment includes quite substantial gathering of information, and requires a deep knowledge of the national context, and only allows a limited time available in each country, the much local support can be gathered the best. However, the ToR only allow for two experts. Counting with local support would render the proposal more costly. The question is, will the ECREEs' NFIs be actively participating in this assignment to support/conduct the local gathering of information ?</p>	<p>Consultants can provide their own proposal for the local gathering of information, always in a separate item of the financial proposal. When the time comes and the value chains are selected, we will evaluate the possibility of counting with local support from the NFI's in each of the countries.</p>



9	If not, can the necessity of having substantial local knowledge and information be addressed in the proposal without being automatically excluded due to higher cost?	It is true that proposals will be evaluated by technical quality and cost effectiveness / financial proposal. However, the fact that we have asked for a separate item in the financial proposal for the trips and local gathering of information is because we want to optimize resources as much as possible. In case of availability of local support, the consultancy firm may not be requested to fully provide for these services, but we need to have your tariffs and proposals in advance in case they are finally required.
10	Can you please clarify whether the Energy Expert has to take the role of the Team Leader mandatorily or if is possible to attribute the Team Leader role to the Environmental/ Agricultural Expert?	It is possible indeed, as long as the Energy expert participates in the exchanges with the energy experts of the ECOWAS Member States during consultations.
11	In the ToRs page 14 chapter four (4), at the end of page twelve (12) it is written the following: <i>'the consultant must foresee 1 trip to each of the 3 countries for data collection'</i> : Can you please clarify whether a minimum number of working days to be spent in Cape Verde and/or The Gambia and/or Guinea Bissau has to be foreseen for data collection?	In section 6 of the ToR it is expressed the following: <b>Short trips:</b> <i>The interested consultants must propose as a separate item a short trip to each of the 3 countries (5 days each) to assess the communities selected.</i> So you should foresee a minimum of 5 days in each country to visit the community, but always in a separate item of the financial proposal.
12	Can you please clarify whether it is advised that only one of the two experts undertakes those missions or if it is up to the consultant to propose a work plan that attributes the field missions to the Expert 1 and/or to the Expert 2?	Second option, you can propose a workplan that you consider appropriate to deliver a quality job.
13	Can you please clarify whether an earliest starting date has been established for the project?	No, but awarded consultancy firm will not start their assignment before the end of November.
14	Can you please clarify whether a latest starting date has been established for the project?	No, this has not been established.
15	Can you please clarify whether a maximum number of pages has been established for the 'Work Description and Methodology' document?	No, there is not a limitation on the number of pages of the documents comprising the proposal. However, we recommend that produced documents remain concise and clear whilst delivering all the requested information.



<b>16</b>	Can you please clarify whether a maximum number of pages has been established for the Experts' CVs?	Idem, responded in previous question.
<b>17</b>	Can you please confirm that Experts' CVs must have among their annexes only university degrees, certifications and licenses?	You can include any support information you consider relevant for this assignment, as long as it is clearly identifiable and included in an Annex.
<b>18</b>	Can you please clarify whether Experts' CV have to be provided in a specific format (such as Europaid, Europass or other)?	No specific format defined.
<b>19</b>	Can you please clarify whether there is a minimum budget foreseen for the project?	Applicants must propose their best financial proposal; there is not a reference price, neither maximum nor minimum.
<b>20</b>	Can you please clarify whether there is a maximum budget foreseen for the project?	Already responded
<b>21</b>	During the assessment of the proposals, can you please clarify which percentage of the overall score will be attributed to the 'Work Description and Methodology', which percentage will be attributed to the CV of the Expert 1, which to the Expert 2 and which to the Cost effectiveness?	Candidates will be assessed according to their compliance with the requested in the ToR, in a fair and equitable evaluation process.
<b>22</b>	Whats the reference number of the ToR published by ECREEE? Usually, in international tender there is available a doc ref <sup>a</sup> number to be used as project reference in proposals.	The reference for the tender is 'CONSULTANCY SERVICES FOR BASELINE STUDIES AND SELECTION OF COMMUNITIES. Solar Technologies and Clean Cooking Solutions', there is not a reference number.
<b>23</b>	According to ToRs, its not clear in each language we should present our proposals, whether in English or Portuguese. It's a fact that section 7 is mentioning reports should be made in English, and so we are presuming the same language should be used for proposals. Could you confirm it?;	No, the proposal can be submitted in any of the three ECOWAS official languages.



<b>24</b>	<p>According to your clarifications below, the Scope of Work (SoW) for this assignment will not demand the delivery of equipment, and on the contrary Baseline studies and report, with recommendations of equipment to fill the gaps of selected communities. Although the general principle is well understood, and in most of the applications will be enough for our proposals, there is however a quite specific case that needs to be previously clarified,[...] Looking first to the cases where groundwater supply will be possible, the resulting doubts are the following: (1.1) First, assuming the worse situation (the groundwater resource is not yet known), will it be required for the Consultant to perform the necessary studies to know what's the quality vs quantity of the resource there? Meaning, will it be required for the Consultant to perform test holes to confirm if the resource exists, and in case it exists, what's its sustainable available quantity (meaning for how long a required flow can be pumped), its head (need for pump dimensioning and consequently for PV dimensioning), and quality (a too much salty groundwater will be useless for some applications)? (1.2) or, assuming the better case, where some deep wells are already existing, should the consultant be responsible to determine and guarantee the head vs available sustainable flow (and water quality) of that "deep" well? However, going now to the case (2) where the groundwater resource doesn't exist, and the alternative is sea water desalinization [...], should the consultant be responsible for the dimensioning of a specific and dedicated desalinization system (eventually possible, although too costly, in coastal areas, but not so possible on a technical point of view in inland cases), or just for the dimensioning of the PV systems strictly necessary to pump water from existing desalinization storage tanks (or from a connection point of the existing distribution networks)?</p>	<p>The consultant is not required to conduct any of the aforementioned studies for the selection of the communities. The report will be built in consultation with the competent authorities of the water, food and energy sector of each of the three countries, which will have to provide with the information available on the matter. These consultations must be complemented with desk research of the consultant on other existing information and reports. Just as a clarification: the expected outcome of the project is to improve socio-economic development of the communities by providing solar energy technologies that can be used for productive uses in the value chains: irrigation systems, cold storage systems or smoking facilities for conservation... This will be complemented with the provision of institutional clean cookstoves so that the community can benefit of the holistic approach, improving efficiency of value chains, increasing food security and reducing CO emissions. For that, the selected communities must comply with certain criteria so that the project is feasible, like having an entry point for irrigation systems.</p>
-----------	--	--



<p><b>25</b></p>	<p>Still on a strict technical point, we see this ToRs consider the PV as the exclusive power generating alternative. We agree that most probably, PV will be the cheapest alternative, but it's not the only one available, specially whenever we are discussing fishing and agriculture communities, eventually with sufficient residual organic matter to support small dedicated anaerobic digestion systems, allowing the produce biogas to be used for power generation or just to clean cooking (usually biogas, depending on the feedstock, has a methane content &gt; 60 %), or, ultimately, to produce cold. Otherwise, such existing residual organic matter will be rooting to the atmosphere. We fully understand that the price of the power generation solution will always be a must, but on the other hand as this project requires an holistic approach, and the adoption of low carbon technologies, allow us to ask if it will be acceptable for us to propose to check the feasibility of the implementation of such technologies, side by side with PV solutions, even if the predictable resulting CAPEX will be higher?</p>	<p>Resources are limited for this project, so we would like to focus on PV technologies for electricity generation, but biodigesters could be used to feed the institutional cookstoves. Nevertheless, if during consultation phase we find that other low carbon technologies fit in the budget and can contribute to the objectives of the project, it will be analyzed and discussed with the stakeholders so that they can be added to the evaluation criteria of the value chains and/or the report recommendations.</p>
<p><b>26</b></p>	<p>5. ToRs are mentioning in its section 2.3 that the study for the selection of the 6 target communities must be made in consultation with the [...] stakeholders in the 3 countries. This might mean the consultation to some private entities, but for sure the majority will be the consultation of local public stakeholders, as agriculture directorate, energy directorate, etc. This very same section also defines that:</p> <p>5.1. "National meetings will be organized with all relevant sector stakeholders in order to contribute to the baseline study and provide relevant information for the design of on-site interventions and selection";</p> <p>5.2. "Regional virtual seminar with national focal institutions to launch the project."</p> <p>but doesn't define who will have the responsibility to organize such seminars, whether the Consultant, if ECREEE/AECID, and obviously this might have a huge impact in the project planning and consequently in the project itself.</p>	<p>The organization of these meetings under 5.1. and 5.2. is under ECREEE's responsibility.</p>



<p><b>27</b></p>	<p>i. Who in this project is going to have the responsibility to define who are the relevant public stakeholders?, and, more important, Stakeholders will be proposed by ECREEE and its national focal institutions.  ii. Who is going to have the responsibility to contact such stakeholders and guarantee that the required meetings really happen, and happen on a pre-defined scheduled that?  iii. ECREEE or somebody else?</p>	<p>Stakeholders will be proposed by ECREEE and its national focal institutions. ECREEE will contact them for the meetings mentioned in 5.1 and 5.2 above. However, bilateral consultations of the consultancy firm with each stakeholder must be scheduled and agreed between these two parties.</p>
<p><b>28</b></p>	<p>i. Who in this project is going to have the responsibility to define who are the relevant private stakeholders (from the sector, from the industry, and from final market), for each individual agriculture product?, and, more important,  ii. Who is going to have the responsibility to contact such private stakeholders and guarantee that the required meetings really happen, and happen on a pre-defined scheduled that?  iii. The local focal points in each country or somebody else?</p>	<p>Already responded in the previous response, No. 26.</p>
<p><b>29</b></p>	<p>ToRs are mentioning in its section 6, “Duration and Location”, that (1) maximum total duration of the mission shall be 50 days (35 do Expert 1 and 15 to Expert 2). However also specifies that consultants may propose extra 5 mission days in each one of the 3 countries, meaning a total of 15 days. Therefore, the question is:  - As we are assuming these 15 extra days in the 3 countries are independent and in addition to the back-office maximum of 50 days, but in any case are working days, ware we allowed to charge them as working days (with a working day rate, eventually the same one used for back-office working days), besides all other usual travelling costs? If so, the total maximum working days to be charge would be 50 + 15 = 65 days?</p>	<p>Yes, these 15 days should be added to the estimated 50 working days. However, we would like to add that the 50 + 5 +5 +5 days are just an estimation and the consultancy firm is free to propose the schedule that they consider appropriate to comply with the task, although considering that the proposal will be evaluated using technical and financial criteria. The team defined in the ToR is only a proposal, the consultancy firm can propose a different arrangement to conduct the works.</p>