



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

CLARIFICATION NR: 1

12.02.2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: Clarification Nr. 1 RFP dated 21 January 2015 with Ref UNDP-TUR-RFP-PROJ(EEB)2015/01 for provision of "Renewable Energy Technologies Economic Analysis Tool (RET-EAT) Algorithm and Testing Models Development, Preparations for Tender File, Provision of Post-Handover Support Services during RET-EAT Software Development" within the scope of PIMS3646:Promoting Energy Efficiency in Buildings in Turkey Project

Further to inquiries from prospective offerors, we hereby provide you with answers to questions to enable you to submit proposals in relation to our RFP dated 21.01.2015 with Ref: UNDP-TUR-RFP-PROJ(EEB)2015/01.

You are kindly requested to prepare your proposal with the consideration of the answers to questions, provided in this letter. Please submit your proposal latest by **17:30 on 18 February 2015** to the address stipulated in our solicitation documents.

Yours Sincerely

Matilda Dimovska
Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP Turkey

Attachment 1: Questions and Answers (3 pages)

ATTACHMENT -1

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

****FOR THE RFP DATED JANUARY 21, 2015**

Ref: UNDP-TUR-RFP-PROJ(EEB)2015/01**

| | |
|------------|--|
| Q1 | Is it possible to allocate more than one person to the “key personnel” positions defined in the TOR. |
| A1 | No, the offerors are required to propose one expert for each key personnel position in line with the requirements set forth for each position in the Terms of Reference (TOR). However, as stated in H.1.4 section of the TOR, the contractor will mobilize additional experts (non-key experts) as per the requirements of the various phases of the assignment. The offeror is required to provide detailed description of works to be performed by these additional personnel and their working relations with the key personnel under Section 7. Technical Proposal Form, Sub-section 3.2 Key Personnel. |
| Q2 | If the key personnel will be allocated as consultants, then do you require contracts? If so, is it required to have notarized contracts with the consultants? |
| A2 | The offerors are not required to submit the contracts signed with their consultants. |
| Q3 | Should all the contracts (with project partners or consultants) be in English? |
| A3 | The partnership / joint venture agreements in Turkish is acceptable at this stage. However, UNDP reserves the right to request English versions in any further phases of the evaluation process. The offerors are not required to submit the contracts signed with their consultants. |
| Q4 | If the key persons to be allocated for the project are already working under the payroll of the offeror, do you require partnership / joint venture agreement? |
| A4 | As explained in Data Sheet Line 26, – copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Letter of Intent to form a JV/Consortium, or Registration of JV/Consortium is required in case the Offeror is a Joint Venture/Consortium. In this regard, consultants and their legal engagement with the Offeror does not have a relation to partnership / joint venture agreement. |
| Q5 | Should the reference letters be notarized and in English? |
| A5 | Please refer to “Instructions to Proposers – Data Sheet – Line 26. Original or notarized copies are required. However in case the Offeror does not submit originals or the notarized copies of these documents with their proposals, UNDP reserves the right to request them in any phase of the evaluation process. It is possible to submit reference letters in Turkish. However, UNDP reserves the right to request English versions in any phase of the evaluation process. |
| Q6 | Is there an official format for ‘Statement of Satisfactory Performance’ required from the top 5 clients? Or declaration of invoices is sufficient? |
| A6 | No, there is not an official format and only declaration of invoices is not acceptable. |
| Q7 | Should the details of the works be mentioned in the reference letters? |
| A7 | The RFP requires the Offerors to submit ‘Statement of Satisfactory Performance’ from the top 5 clients. These statements should mention the details of the work performed so that the satisfactory performance of the Offeror can be verified through the information provided. |
| Q8 | Will the Declaration of Quick Ratio be certified by public accountant? |
| A8 | Yes, as per “Instructions to Proposers-Data Sheet- Line 26”, it is required to be certified by a public accountant.i.e. For quick ratio, certified public accountant’s certification is not mandatory. |
| Q9 | Are the local firms exempt from declaration of quick ratio? |
| A9 | No, all the offerors are obliged to declare quick ratio based on their latest financial statements certified by a public accountant. i.e. for quick ratio, certified public accountant’s certification is not mandatory. |
| Q10 | Will the financial documents (balance sheets,etc.) be approved by certified public accountant? |

| | |
|------------|---|
| A10 | As per Line 26 of Data Sheet of the RFP, the offerors are required to submit their latest audited financial statements (Income Statement and Balance Sheet) including Auditor's Report. Therefore, the documents that are submitted along with the proposal shall be approved by certified public accountant. |
| Q11 | We note the conditions of contract which are generally acceptable. Should our tender be of interest we would wish to discuss a few issues, for instance the insurance requirements. Following advice from our insurers we would also wish to discuss the inclusion of a limit of liability. |
| A11 | 'UNDP General Conditions Of Contract For Services' are the global conditions for all corporate service contracts to be signed by UNDP and cannot be changed. |
| Q12 | Should all the documents of the firms (authorized signatures list, certificate of registration, etc) be in original? |
| A12 | Please refer to Instructions to Proposers-Data Sheet- Line 26. Original or notarized copies are required. However, in case the Offeror does not submit originals or the notarized copies of these documents with their proposals, UNDP reserves the right to request them in any phase of the evaluation process. |
| Q13 | Is there a foreseen programme for load calculation like BEP-TR or Energyplus? Otherwise there is a need to re-write existing BEP-TR programme software if the load calculation will be done with the software. What is meant with third software programme usage? |
| A13 | This tool will only use hourly load data that have been prepared by other third party sources prior to the usage of the tool. This tool will not prepare a load calculation program. The only exception is the fast track method where hourly degree days values and an overall U value will be used. |
| Q14 | According to paragraph 6 on page 32 and paragraph 5 page 33, the RET-EAT does not calculate the building energy loads as these will be imported into the tool from an external calculation source such as Energy plus, IEs etc. Therefore this tool cannot assess improvements in the buildings core energy related characteristics such as U values, thermal mass, glazing characteristics, occupancy density, hours of operation. However in Method 1, the last paragraph on page 32, asks for the tool to predict energy values for heating, cooling, domestic hot water and electrical energy use. Please provide a clarification on this. |
| A14 | Method 1 is the Annual Approach (Fast Track) method and relies on annual heating and cooling degree hour values. This tool will not assess improvements/changes about the building by itself. It will use an already designed or operating fixed building hourly data set. However if the user wants to iterate on such building changes he/she runs a different hourly simulation set and feeds the data back to the RET tool. Ret tool either Method 1 or Method 2 only calculates the performance of the electro-mechanical system versus a given set of hourly data. In Method 1, in order to facilitate a shorter methodology, hourly simulated data input is not required. Instead the annual sensible heating and cooling degree hours will be used as a basis for predicting hourly sensible loads first. See 2-6 on Page 50 Method 1. This method relies on average U values of the building for heating and cooling seasons. The calculation algorithm for U values needs to be developed by the vendor. See Sub-task 2-11. The annual sensible heating and cooling loads will be calculated using degree hour values. Annual renewable energy supply will then be calculated and their annual contribution will be assessed. Alternatively (preferably) hourly loads will be predicted by using the overall U values and the hourly average outdoor and indoor temperatures and hourly renewable supply will be compared using meteorological data for the given location. |
| Q15 | The scenarios in Annex IV appear to be incomplete or in draft form. Is it the intent to define and agree the 3 scenarios for each RET with the key client team at the start of the project? |
| A15 | Please refer to the note on page 67. It should read: This scenario is same with scenario 2 except that the assumed capacity of the CHP system will be 75% of the peak (annual) power demand of the building. |
| Q16 | Sub-task 2.6, page 50, Method 2 defines the intent for imported hourly energy loads for database. Cold water consumption amounts are asked for in terms of kWh per hour. Is the RET-EAT to assess |

| | |
|------------|---|
| | water systems? Steam is also asked for but is this relevant to building energy needs? |
| A16 | Please ignore cold water. This is for information only. The tool does not cover water systems. Yet steam demand is required to be known on the electro-mechanical supply side. This is needed because in buildings like hospitals etc steam is needed. |
| Q17 | Sub-task 2.12, page 52 – does the reference to work package 2.9 mean 2.10? |
| A17 | Yes. |
| Q18 | Sub-task 2.17, page 53, provides details on the EAT pay-back algorithms which are to provide optimistic and pessimistic results based on the 3 scenarios * 3 cost predictions. ‘Simple pay-back’ calculations are asked for. Yet the EU Energy Efficiency Directive 27/2012 asks for Life Cycle Cost Analysis that factors in discounted cash flow techniques instead of Simple Pay Back calculations. With the information collected and analysis performed, the EAT should be able to meet the req’ts of Annex VI.c in the EED. Can you please clarify? |
| A18 | Simple pay back analysis is the requirement. However the vendor may opt to add this feature too. |
| Q19 | Sub-Task 2-17 refers to sub work package 3.1 but this is not included in the RfP. Is it meant to refer to sub-tasks 2.10, 2.12 and 2.16? |
| A19 | Yes. |